

University of Southampton Research Repository ePrints Soton

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g.

AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

FACULTY OF LAW, ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES

School of Humanities

**The Construction and Use of Gender in the Pamphlet Literature of the
English Civil War, 1642-1646**

by

Jennifer Frances Coble

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

March 2010

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF LAW, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

Doctor of Philosophy

**THE CONSTRUCTION AND USE OF GENDER IN THE PAMPHLET
LITERATURE OF THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR, 1642-1646**

By Jennifer Frances Cobley

This thesis examines how the authors of ephemeral print used the gender framework for political ends during the first Civil War. In particular it considers how both the royalist and parliamentary pamphleteers constructed and promoted a hegemonic, patriarchal definition of manhood amongst their male supporters in order to encourage them to fight for either king or parliament. It also demonstrates how the pamphleteers of each party drew upon deep-seated cultural allusions and a pre-existing language of insult in order to claim that their enemies were 'unmanly' or 'effeminate' and therefore unable or unwilling to uphold the patriarchal social order. The thesis shows that the pamphleteers of both sides set out to demonstrate that their own men were exemplars of patriarchal manhood, while simultaneously claiming that the anti-patriarchal behaviour of their opponents had betrayed their unsuitability for a position of authority within the commonwealth. Gendered language was therefore a powerful way to legitimise the claim of one's own side to patriarchal authority and political power while simultaneously delegitimizing the claim of one's opponents.

The introduction outlines the key questions which the thesis seeks to address and gives my reasons for undertaking this study. Chapter one examines the reluctance of past generations of historians to study the wartime tracts and highlights the importance of the new cultural history, gender studies and the linguistic turn in bringing the gendered language of the wartime tracts to academic attention. Recently, there has been a surge of interest in the print culture of the Civil Wars. In particular, the pioneering work of David Underdown has led other historians to explore how the wartime pamphleteers made use of cultural references in order to communicate political ideas. Chapter one situates my thesis within these recent developments in scholarship. Chapter two considers the main gendered themes of the parliamentary tracts during the first Civil War. It explores how and why manhood was constructed and how gendered insult was utilised by the pamphleteers. Chapter three focuses on how three principal royalist personalities were represented in parliamentary tracts, namely Charles I, Queen Henrietta Maria and Prince Rupert. Chapter four considers the broader gendered themes within the royalist literature of the period and tests the assertions of previous historians that royalist propaganda was frequently elitist and self-defeating. Chapter five explores the royalists' treatment of three key parliamentary figures: Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, Sir William Waller and Lady Ann Waller. It explores the careful treatment that Essex initially received from the royalist polemicists and contrasts this with the increasingly barbed attacks that were made against Waller, particularly by commenting upon the actions of his wife, Ann. The conclusion summarises the key arguments of the thesis and relates my findings to other broader questions regarding the operation and contestation of patriarchal power during the conflict, the practice of printing and how the use of gendered language developed in the polemical works of the later 1640s. The thesis ends with a brief discussion of some areas in which further research might enable us to better understand the vital role that gender played in reinforcing authority during the turbulent 1640s.

Contents

<u>DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP</u>	<u>IV</u>
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u>	<u>V</u>
<u>ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS</u>	<u>VI</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
Part 1.1 – Sources: Print Culture in the 1640s _____	10
<u>CHAPTER I: AN ‘EXCELLENT TALENT ... IN LYING AND SLANDERING’: PREJUDICE AND THE PRINT CULTURE OF THE CIVIL WAR</u>	<u>21</u>
Part 1.1 – Stigmatised Sources: Historians’ views of Civil War pamphlets, 1644 - circa 1890 ____	22
Part 1.2 – Pamphlets and Politics: The impact of Marxism and social history _____	23
Part 1.3 – Language, Gender and Power: The Emergence of Gendered Readings of the Wartime Pamphlets _____	29
Part 1.4 – Beyond the ‘Linguistic Turn’: the Birth of ‘New’ Cultural History _____	32
Part 1.5 - Sexuality and Social Order _____	42
<u>CHAPTER II: ‘WOMANISH’ CAVALIERS: THE USE OF GENDERED LANGUAGE BY PARLIAMENTARIAN PAMPHLETEERS, 1642-46</u>	<u>53</u>
Part 1.1 – ‘Quit yourselves like men’: Constructing Manhood _____	58
Part 2.1 – ‘The just contempt of understanding men’: Parliamentary Depictions of Royalist Unmanliness _____	65
Part 2.2 – 1642: The Gathering Clouds of War _____	67
Part 2.3 – 1643: The Conflict Deepens _____	73
Part 2.4 – 1644: Victory and Defeat _____	78
Part 2.5 – 1645-1646: The Triumph of the New Model Army _____	83
Part 3.1 – Conclusion _____	86
<u>CHAPTER III: REPRESENTATIONS OF ROYALIST PERSONALITIES IN PARLIAMENTARIAN PAMPHLET LITERATURE</u>	<u>90</u>

Part 1.1 – ‘The Queene of Troubles’ and her ‘weak-backed Lord’: Representations of Queen Henrietta Maria and King Charles I in Parliamentary Print Culture	90
Part 1.2 – 1642: A Role in the War	92
Part 1.3 – 1643: The ‘omnipotent over-ruling power of the Queen’	94
Part 1.4 – 1644: ‘[I]t had beene better for him that he had Conquer’d himselfe’: Questioning the Manliness of the King	101
Part 1.5 – 1645: ‘A Prince seduced out of his proper sphear’: The Impact of the Battle of Naseby	107
Part 1.6 – 1646: Defeat and Surrender	113
Part 1.7 – Conclusion	114
Part 2.1 – ‘A loose and wilde Gentleman’: Parliamentary Representations of Prince Rupert	115
Part 2.2 – 1642: Reviling Prince Rupert	116
Part 2.3 – 1643: Unrestrained, Unreasonable and Unmanly	119
Part 2.4 – 1644: Shattering Armies and Reputations: the Impact of Marston Moor	124
Part 2.5 – 1645: ‘Branded for a coward’: Prince Rupert’s declining Role in the War	126
Part 2.6 – Conclusion	128

CHAPTER IV: ‘CUCKOLD CAPTAINS’: THE USE OF GENDERED LANGUAGE BY ROYALIST PAMPHLETEERS, 1642-46 **130**

Part 1.1 – ‘A Perfect Souldier is a Perfect Man’: Constructing Manhood	136
Part 2.1 – ‘[T]he wiser sort hold ... Round-heads to be but ... Cuckolds’: Royalist Depictions of Parliamentary Unmanliness	145
Part 2.2 – 1642: ‘Our continuall scolding shall make them goe to the warres’	145
Part 2.3 – 1643: The Conflict Deepens	151
Part 2.4 – 1644: Defeat and Victory	158
Part 2.5 – 1645-1646: Railing in the Face of Defeat	161
Part 3.1 – Conclusion	163

CHAPTER V: REPRESENTATIONS OF PARLIAMENTARIAN PERSONALITIES IN ROYALIST PROPAGANDA, 1642-46 **166**

Part 1.1 – ‘A Cuckold and a Rebel’: Royalist depictions of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex	166
Part 1.2 – ‘The darling of the swordmen’: The Earl of Essex in 1642	167
Part 1.3 – Twists and reversals: the campaigns of 1643	170
Part 1.4 – ‘Tis the greatest blow that ever befell our party’: the campaign of 1644	179
Part 1.5 – 1645: Martial Impotence	182

Part 1.6 – Conclusion	184
Part 2.1 – ‘William the Conqueror’ and his ‘Ladie Generall’: Representations of Sir William and Lady Ann Waller in Royalist propaganda, 1642-1645	185
Part 2.2 – ‘William the Conqueror’: William Waller’s role in the war 1642-43	187
Part 2.3 – The Cost of Defeat: Summer 1643	190
Part 2.4 – An ‘Utter defeat’ and a ‘dishonorable blow’: William Waller’s Role in the War, 1644-1645	193
Part 2.5 – Conclusion	199
 CONCLUSION	 201
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 212
 PRIMARY SOURCES	 212
SECONDARY LITERATURE	232

DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I Jennifer Cobley....., [please print name]

declare that the thesis entitled

The Construction and Use of Gender in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Civil War, 1642-1646.....

and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me as the result of my own original research. I confirm that:

- this work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
- where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
- where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
- where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
- I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
- where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
- none of this work has been published before submission, ~~or [delete as appropriate] parts of this work have been published as: [please list references]~~

Signed:

Date: 19 March 2010.....

Acknowledgements

Over the course of my PhD research I have incurred a number of debts that I should like to acknowledge. First I should like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding my research. Second, I would like to thank the helpful staff of the British Library and the Parliamentary Archives, who have given kind permission to produce certain items in the appendix of this thesis. I would also like to thank the helpful staff of the Bodleian Library, the National Archives, Wadham College library and the University of Southampton Library. Third, I would like to thank Dr. Jason Peacey, Dr. Jason McElligott, Dr. Lloyd Bowen, and Dr. Michelle White for their interest in my research and for their helpful comments.

Fourth, I should like to thank the staff of the History Department at the University of Southampton. My particular thanks goes to Dr. Julie Gammon, whose early modern gender courses inspired my interest in gender history and in the history of the seventeenth century; and to Dr. Joan Tumblety, whose MA seminar on the history of masculinity opened my eyes to a fresh way of looking at the English Civil War. I would like to thank Dr. Julie Gammon and Professor Neil Gregor for a rigorous and constructive upgrade viva. I am also grateful to Professor John Morrill and Dr. Julie Gammon for a challenging and thought-provoking viva. Above all, I am most indebted to my supervisor, Professor Mark Stoyle. Mark has always been extremely generous with his time and has offered enthusiasm, advice, encouragement and support at every step. I could not have asked for a more diligent, kind or instructive mentor.

I have also benefitted from the postgraduate research environment at the University of Southampton and I offer particular thanks to the members of the Feminism Reading Group and to Dr. Alison Moore, Dr. John Ellis, Jaime Ashworth, Dr. Adam Chapman, Dr. Alistair Dougall and Dr. Mike Lally for their interest and advice. I would also like to thank my friends and family for their support, particularly: Dr. Andy Mayers, Dr. Andy Cobley, Hannah, Fran, Jimi, Isabel, Laura, Emily, Michelle and Tessa. My parents, Thomas and Barbara, and my brother, Mark, have, as always, offered unwavering support and useful comments. Finally, my deepest thanks must go to my fiancé Steve, who has always listened attentively and offered suggestions. Without him this thesis would have taken considerably longer to write and (like everything else in life) would have been a far less enjoyable experience.

Abbreviations and Conventions

AHR – The American Historical Review.

CJ – Journal of the House of Commons.

CSP Ven. – Calendar of State Papers, Venetian.

DNB – Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

EHR – English Historical Review.

HMC - Historical manuscripts commission.

HJ – The Historical Journal.

HLQ – Huntingdon Library Quarterly.

HWJ – History Workshop Journal.

JBS – Journal of British Studies.

JEH – Journal of Ecclesiastical History.

JMH – Journal of Modern History.

LJ – Journal of the House of Lords.

NP – No printer/publisher name.

NPP – No place of publication.

OED – Oxford English Dictionary.

P&P – Past and Present.

Political Culture and Cultural Politics – S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.)

Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995).

PMLA – Journal of the Modern Language Association of America.

STC – A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland: And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640* (Rev. edn. 3 vols. London, 1976-91).

TRHS – Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.

WHR – Women's History Review.

Wing – D. 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* (Rev. edn. 3 vols. New York, 1972-94).

Seventeenth-century spellings and punctuation have been kept throughout. [Sic] has been used to distinguish minor seventeenth-century spelling differences from modern-day conventions. Also, to aid clarity, abbreviations and contractions have been expanded and i, j, s, f, u and v have been distinguished. Dates follow the old style, but the year has been taken to begin on 1 January.

George Thomason frequently annotated the pamphlet literature in his collection with more detailed information regarding the author or specific date when a tract came into his hands. Asterisks have therefore been used in the footnotes and bibliography to indicate when additional information of this nature comes from an annotated comment.

Introduction

Lead, when moulded into Bullets, is not so mortal as when founded into Letters.¹

Andrew Marvell

The English Civil War of 1642-46 was not only a bloody military conflict; it was also a savage war of words, fought out on the pages of thousands of printed publications. While historians still debate the motives that drove men (and some women) to take up arms for king or Parliament, it is clear that printed polemic played a highly influential role in both the royalist and parliamentary war efforts. It was through the medium of print that divisions were deepened and two opposing parties were constructed. A wealth of evidence survives to suggest that contemporaries recognised only too keenly the unprecedented role that the printing press had played in the conflict. The Buckinghamshire gentleman Sir William Drake, for instance, noted in his commonplace book that, although the King was not without some degree of blame, it was ‘the indiscrete publishing and disseminating’ of criticisms of the government which were responsible for ‘so many discussions and confusions’.² The same claim was made by the parliamentary writer, Henry Parker, who concluded that, ‘the sword had never been so keene, had it not been whetted by the Pen’. Parker emphasised the role of the king’s propagandists by using militaristic language to describe them as the ‘Regiments of the King’s Pen-and-Inkhorne men’.³

Despite noting the ‘Paper-contestations’ that ‘became a fatall Prologue’ to the outbreak of actual hostilities, historians have been slow to study the flood of printed items that poured from the presses as the country readied itself for war.⁴ Primarily this was because the tracts often contained stories of a ‘libellous, scatological and patently absurd nature’ in order to besmear the reputation of the opposing side.⁵ This led many historians to dismiss the tracts as having been written for ‘the low and sordid Capacities of the

¹ Wing / 1036:20, A. Marvell, *The rehearsal transpros'd, or, Animadversions upon a late book intituled, A preface, shewing what grounds there are of fears and jealousies of popery* (London: 1672), p. 4.

² Sir W. Drake cited in K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 242.

³ E.87[5], H. Parker, *The contra-Replicant, His Complaint to his Maiestie* (London: 31 January* 1643), pp. 1, 3.

⁴ Wing / M1410, T. May, *The History of the Parliament of England* (London: 1647), book II, p. 20.

⁵ For a discussion of the Victorian aversion to the printed literature see J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2007), p. 48.

Vulgar’.⁶ A more detailed discussion of these prejudices follows in chapter one. It was not until the twentieth century, when historians shifted their view to studying ‘popular’ culture and ‘history from below’ that historians like David Underdown began to appreciate the political role of the ‘sermons, declarations, and pamphlets’ that ‘constantly bombarded’ the inhabitants of England and which were ‘all aimed at influencing a broad spectrum of opinion’.⁷ More recently, scholars like Joad Raymond, Susan Wiseman and Jason McElligott have further added to our understanding of the wartime literature, by demonstrating how ‘commonplace cultural and political symbols, references, and allusions’ were ‘consciously deployed’ in order to construct an unfavourable image of the enemy that would ‘destroy their ability to inspire fear or awe among the populace’.⁸

The present thesis concentrates on one particular polemical theme invoked by the pamphleteers – that of gender. As will be seen throughout this dissertation, in both parliamentary and royalist pamphlets throughout the war, words were invoked that had powerful gendered connotations for contemporaries: it is to these words that I refer when I use the term ‘gendered language’. Indeed, once noticed, gendered language is remarkably prominent in the printed literature of both sides. This thesis will examine how and why gendered language was used by the rival propagandists. Should the wartime pamphleteers’ repeated references to henpecked husbands, effeminate courtiers or uxorious monarchs be dismissed as light-hearted attempts to lessen the hardships of life in civil war England? Or should gendered language be treated as a serious and highly damaging polemical tool in its own right? It is these questions that will be explored in the present thesis. But in order to understand the wartime writers’ repeated references to gender it is first necessary to consider why gender was so important to contemporaries.

In the seventeenth century, just as today, gender was a fundamental way in which people of all sorts ordered and made sense of their world. In order to justify men’s privileged, dominant position over women and other dependents, religious doctrine and

⁶ J. Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year 1639 to the Murder of King Charles I* (London: 1682-83), vol. II, pp. 806-7.

⁷ D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 164.

⁸ J. McElligott, ‘The Politics of Sexual Libel: Royalist Propaganda in the 1640s’, *HLQ* 67:1 (2004), pp. 75-81; S. Wiseman, “‘Adam, the Father of all Flesh’: Porno-Political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and after the English Civil War’ in J. Holstun (ed.) *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1992), pp. 134-156; and J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996), esp. pp. 151, 180-182.

medical theories of the humoral body were used to support the argument that women were inferior to men.⁹ Based on these religious and medical arguments, a variety of texts promoted the belief that men and women were more inclined to certain opposing characteristics; for instance a man's greater capacity for heat made him more inclined to be reasonable, rational and physically strong, which, contemporaries argued, made men more suitable for positions of responsibility within society. In contrast, the preponderance of cold and wet humours in a woman's body, coupled with the beliefs about her derivative creation and weak moral nature, meant that women were often stereotypically portrayed as intellectually, physically and morally inferior to men, and therefore as more suited to work within the household, under the protection and guidance of its male head.¹⁰ The perceived differences between women and men therefore formed the basis for the patriarchal social order, which gave men 'political and social dominance' over women, children and other dependents.¹¹

Men exercised the power which their gender afforded them within the household, where they were expected to rule their wives and dependents and foster in them the correct obedience to society's laws. The family was seen as a 'microcosm of the whole kingdom, hierarchically ordered by bonds of obedience'.¹² Such a view of the household ensured that relations within the family were never without wider social significance.¹³ If a man failed to keep order in his household, it was believed that he not only betrayed his own inability to hold a position of responsibility within wider society, but also risked disordering the entire

⁹ See for example, T. Laqueur, *Making Sex, Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (London: Harvard University Press, 1994), pp. 63, 127; A. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 34; J. Eales, *Women in Early Modern England 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press Ltd., 1998), p. 4; and E. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), p. 4.

¹⁰ Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 29-30; such views were also expressed on the stage, see Foyster's brief discussion of *MacBeth* in Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 30-1. See also STC (2nd ed.) / 12121, W. Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties, Eight Treatises* (London: 1634), pp. 395-7; 'An Homily of the State of Matrimony', in *Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1802), p. 427; Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, chapter 5, esp. pp. 87-94, 131-33; S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 33; and B. Reay, *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1998), p. 6.

¹¹ S. Amussen, *An Ordered Society* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), p. 182; and Eales, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 4.

¹² L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 24.

¹³ Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, p. 203; S. Amussen, 'Gender, Family and the Social Order, 1560-1725' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 196.

social structure by failing to teach his dependents proper subjection.¹⁴ A vast array of conduct literature therefore stipulated the appropriate gender roles for men and women, and these gender norms were reiterated in sermons, catechisms and homilies.¹⁵ That these ideas were absorbed and internalised by contemporaries can be seen in the manner in which the correct gender roles were enforced through popular shaming rituals like charivari or skimmington rides if a member of the community was thought to have transgressed.¹⁶ Laura Gowing's work on the language of insult further highlights how expectations of appropriate behaviour for men and women were internalised and widely understood by contemporaries.¹⁷

In the present thesis, I have chosen to use the term 'gendered language' because it suggests the inherent nature of gender and the complex ways in which gender beliefs permeated society. It is true that the wartime writers used words like 'cuckold', which had an explicitly gendered meaning, and this more direct usage will be explored in the chapters that follow. But this was not the only way in which the gender order was alluded to by the wartime writers. For instance, the perceived differences between men and women, as asserted in patriarchal theory, meant that certain characteristics or behaviour took on gendered meanings, for instance: courage was considered by contemporaries to be a manly trait, which stemmed from a man's greater preponderance of heat.¹⁸ The extent to which courage was thought of as inherently 'male', can be seen in the descriptions of women who defended their homes during the civil war as having acted with, 'a courage even above ... [their] sex', or with 'a Masculine Bravery ... and manlike policy'.¹⁹ Through such

¹⁴ Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, p. 182. For examples see, STC / 628:02, R. Braithwait, *The English Gentleman: containing sundry excellent rules, or exquisite observations* (London: 1630), p. 155; and STC (2nd ed.) / 12121, Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*, p. 17.

¹⁵ See for example, STC / 1790:06, J. Dod and R. Clever, *A Godly Forme of Household Government: for the ordering of private families, according to the direction of God's Word* (London: 1612); STC (2nd ed.) / 11667, T. Gataker, *Marriage Duties Briefely couched* (London: 1620); and STC (2nd ed.) / 12121, Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties*.

¹⁶ For discussions of popular rituals, see D. Underdown, 'The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 116-137; and M. Ingram, 'Ridings, Rough Music and Mocking Rhymes in Early Modern England' in B. Reay (ed.) *Popular Culture in Seventeenth Century England* (London: Routledge, 1988), pp. 166-198.

¹⁷ L. Gowing, 'Gender and the Language of Insult in Early Modern London', *HWJ* 35 (1993), pp. 1-21; and Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, *passim*.

¹⁸ Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 61.

¹⁹ A. Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1984), pp. 184, 185, 189; and Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 78.

phrases, writers were able to praise the women in question for their brave behaviour but in a way that simultaneously reasserted that this was not a usual characteristic for women to possess. Conversely, the men of Bristol were on one occasion dismissed as having acted with 'effeminate cowardice' for allowing the town to fall to the royalists, thereby suggesting that their failure to be brave had automatically thrown their manliness into question.²⁰

As well as considering how gendered language was used by the pamphleteers to belittle the enemy, this thesis will also consider how manhood was constructed by each side during the conflict. The work of Robert Connell, Carol Cohn and John Tosh has shown that, during modern wars, governments often encourage certain masculine characteristics in order to 'mobilise support for war'.²¹ Evidence of similar tactics can be found within the print culture of the English Civil War. Indeed, this tactic was not new: just as conduct books, sermons, ballads and homilies had detailed how men, women and children were supposed to behave in pre-Civil War England, so the wartime writers used language to mould the behaviour of the men in their armies when war broke out. Through a close analysis of royalist and parliamentarian constructions of manhood, this dissertation will explore the characteristics that both sides considered essential for a man to display at a time of conflict.

As can be seen, the ubiquity of gendered beliefs meant that contemporaries would have automatically understood certain behaviour and characteristics to have gendered connotations. This thesis will demonstrate that, by making reference to the gender framework, the wartime pamphleteers of both parties were making their political ideas more accessible by exploiting a system of meanings that everyone in society would have understood. But this was not all. This dissertation will also argue that, given the early modern view of the fundamental importance of gender in supporting the social hierarchy, the assertion that their opponents were threatening the gender order with their anti-patriarchal, or even unmanly, behaviour carried implicit implications for the wider social

²⁰ E.65[8], *Certain Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome* (7-14 August 1643), p. 230.

²¹ R. Connell, 'Masculinity, Violence and War' in M. S. Kimmel and M. A. Messner (eds.) *Men's Lives* (Massachusetts: Simon and Schuster, 1995), p. 127. See also J. Tosh, 'Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender' in S. Dudink, K. Hagemann and J. Tosh (eds.) *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 41-58; and C. Cohn, 'Wars, Wimps and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War' in *Men's Lives*, pp. 131-143.

order: implications which would have been commonly understood by contemporaries. Therefore, the pamphleteers' references to gender were also powerful polemical attacks in their own right, for they questioned their opponents' ability to uphold the patriarchal social order while simultaneously demonstrating that their own soldiers were paragons of patriarchal manhood.

In order to explore the attempts of rival male groups to assert patriarchal control over other men, this thesis has drawn heavily on Robert Connell's work on the interrelationships of power among men. In an article published in 1985 and co-written with Tim Carrigan and John Lee, Connell argued for the existence of multiple masculinities that were simultaneously present in society at any given time.²² Connell advanced the concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' which he defined as 'a particular variety of masculinity' to which other masculinities 'are subordinated' because their 'situations are related in different ways to the overall logic of the subordination of women to men'.²³ In a later monograph dedicated to the subject of *Masculinities*, Connell argued that, while not every man could always fit entirely into the hegemonic masculine mould, 'the majority of men gain from its hegemony, since they benefit from the patriarchal dividend', that is, men's 'overall subordination of women'.²⁴

The historian John Tosh has drawn upon Connell's work, and explained that 'hegemonic' masculinity 'is constructed in opposition to a number of subordinate masculinities whose crime is that they undermine patriarchy from within or discredit it in the eyes of women'. Tosh went on to explain that '[s]ometimes an entire persona is demonized, as in the case of the homosexual; sometimes specific forms of male behaviour are singled out'. By branding certain behaviours as not truly masculine, the 'deviant' man's claim to patriarchal power is undermined. The failing was therefore seen to be that of the individual man in question, rather than the result of a more fundamental tension within the workings of patriarchy – and thus the patriarchal order was reasserted. Tosh asserted that the term 'hegemonic masculinity' was a 'convenient phrase' because it reminded scholars that masculinity makes 'socially crippling distinctions', not only

²² T. Carrigan, R. W. Connell and J. Lee, 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society* 14 (1985), pp. 585-9; and R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), esp. p. 36.

²³ Carrigan, Connell and Lee, 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity', pp. 585-593.

²⁴ Connell, *Masculinities*, p. 79.

between women and men, but also between 'different categories of men', and that these distinctions are 'maintained by force, as well as validated through cultural means'.²⁵

Most recently, Alexandra Shepard has built upon Connell and Tosh's ideas, in order to present a more sophisticated view of patriarchy that has taken into consideration 'precisely *which* men stood to gain [from patriarchy], *which* women stood to lose, and in *which* contexts'.²⁶ Following Connell's notion of 'hegemonic masculinity' to its logical conclusion, Shepard argues that manhood and patriarchy were not synonymous in early modern England because patriarchal manhood was only available to a specific group of men. Thus, she asserts:

Patriarchal manhood endorsed a gender hierarchy that exalted maleness as a cultural category by ranking men generically above women. This was patriarchy in a feminist sense. In its early modern sense, however, it most frequently served the interests of middle-aged, householding men, and, increasingly, those considered of 'able and sufficient' means.²⁷

A failure to realise this point, she claims, puts an historian at risk of asserting that 'there were only two options for early modern men: they either achieved manhood in the normative – or hegemonic – mode as dominant patriarchs ... or they failed in this endeavour'. Such a line of reasoning leads the historian to view men who were considered to have failed in their roles as patriarchs, as either victims of the patriarchal system, or as individuals who had 'somehow failed to be men'.²⁸ Shepard argues that this view is inaccurate. For some men the patriarchal ideal was out of reach, whether temporarily, in the case of young men, or permanently, in the case of men of lower social status whose reliance on wage labour meant that they would never know true economic independence.

²⁵ J. Tosh, 'What should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth Century Britain', *HWJ* 38 (1994), pp. 190-191.

²⁶ S. Amussen also notes that for 'the many men who were subordinate in the social system because of either age of status or both, it was impossible to be 'real' men'. See S. D. Amussen, 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Culture Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, pp. 216-17.

²⁷ A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 4, 246-47.

²⁸ *Ibid*, p. 6.

Yet, Shepard does also note that, generally speaking it was within men's interest to uphold the patriarchal system, even if at times it disempowered them, because, as Connell first noted, most men benefitted from the 'patriarchal dividend', that is, power over women.²⁹

Fundamentally, then, this thesis will argue that the parliamentarian and royalist pamphleteers used gendered language in order to portray their male supporters in hegemonic, patriarchal terms, thereby justifying their party's claim to patriarchal power. The ultimate insult was for the pamphleteers to liken their opponents to women by describing them as 'unmanly' or 'effeminate'; but, often it was enough to highlight their opponents' supposedly anti-patriarchal behaviour, which demonstrated the danger their opponents presented to the social hierarchy but which also emphasised their unsuitability to hold a position of responsibility within the broader commonwealth. In this respect, the civil war era, and the pamphlet literature produced during the conflict, provides historians with a rare opportunity to study the internal contestation of patriarchal power between two rival groups of men. Susan Wiseman has argued that the civil war saw a 'breakdown of agreement in the masculinist ordering of society'.³⁰ Diane Purkiss goes even further by claiming that the civil war 'made the nature and legitimation [sic] of masculine power a principal political issue'. Purkiss claims that even masculine 'constants' like 'honour and violence', did not 'come through ... the Civil War years unchanged, or unquestioned'.³¹ The work of Connell, Tosh and Shepard has suggested that it would be misleading to talk of a singular 'masculine power'. Instead, this thesis will consider whether the first Civil War did in fact see the questioning and redefining of the fundamental characteristics of 'hegemonic', patriarchal manhood.

As we will see, the main concern of the pamphleteers on both sides was to convince other men of the justness of their cause and of the need to fight to defend it. This dissertation will mirror the concerns of the pamphleteers and will focus upon the men that they addressed. Yet, as will be seen from the ways in which the pamphleteers appealed to their male readers, manhood and womanhood only 'have meaning in relation to each other', therefore desirable 'male' characteristics were defined in comparison to undesirable

²⁹ Ibid, p. 6.

³⁰ Wiseman, "'Adam, the Father of all Flesh'", p. 148.

³¹ D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 233-34.

‘female’ characteristics.³² In other words, although this dissertation focuses on the male participants in the conflict, it will inevitably include a parallel discussion of early modern womanhood.

As well as investigating the different ways in which the royalists and parliamentarians used gendered language, the present thesis will also explore how the use of gendered language developed during the early 1640s as writers reacted to the twists and turns of the war. Scholars like Lois Potter have already realised that royalist tracts became more ‘broadly based’ after 1647 than they had been in the earlier 1640s.³³ The royalist pamphleteers commented less on news, and instead focussed their attack on satirising the sexual practices of their political enemies in an attempt to sway popular opinion in favour of the crown.³⁴ Potter says little about this shift in tactics, observing merely that ‘[a]n incidental effect of press control seems to have been the channelling of political satire into the apparently more acceptable genre of the dirty story’.³⁵ But is she right to be so dismissive? Scholars like David Underdown, Jason McElligott, Joad Raymond and Susan Wiseman have recently begun to examine the use of sexual insult by particular authors in the later 1640s in greater detail.³⁶ Their work has yielded fascinating results which highlight the growing sophistication of the royalist writers in manipulating the news for the benefit of different audiences. The present dissertation suggests that these gendered approaches had their origins in the early 1640s and shows how these themes were honed and developed during the course of the first Civil War. Having explored the deployment of gendered language by writers during the period 1642 to 1646, I will argue that their use of sexual themes was not an ‘incidental effect’ but was rather a deliberate ploy which possessed very deep resonances for the contestation of both patriarchal power and political authority.

³² Connell, *Masculinities*, p. 44. See also Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 1.

³³ L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 13.

³⁴ J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996), p. 60.

³⁵ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 22.

³⁶ D. Underdown, ‘The Language of Popular Politics in the English Revolution’ in A. Vos (ed.) *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance* (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995), pp. 107-132; D. Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 180-82; Wiseman, “‘Adam, the Father of all Flesh’”, pp. 134-156; and McElligott, ‘The Politics of Sexual Libel’, pp. 75-81.

Part 1.1 – Sources: Print Culture in the 1640s

In order to explore the wartime pamphleteers' use of gendered language this thesis will make use of the thousands of pamphlets, ballads, newsbooks, broadsides and other forms of popular literature that poured from the metropolitan and provincial presses between 1642 and 1646 and which were eagerly collected and preserved by the London bookseller George Thomason. The very fact that Thomason collected such ephemeral productions suggests that 'he recognised their importance as documents of controversial times' particularly as he appears to have been the first person to have systematically collected English pamphlets.³⁷ As well as collecting diverse print genres, Thomason also collected tracts of a varied political and religious colour, including those that did not necessarily reflect his own views.³⁸ Thomason's practice of annotating the tracts with additional bibliographic information or – more commonly – with the precise date when an item came into his hands, provides the historian with additional valuable information about the climate in which a tract was written or sold.³⁹

Yet, as well as recognising the collection to be 'a remarkable resource', Joad Raymond has reminded historians of its limitations. By comparing the titles represented in Thomason's collection to those recorded in the Wing Short Title Catalogue, Raymond has estimated that Thomason's collection represents some 59.7 per cent of all publications that were produced between 1641 and 1650. Moreover, Raymond's work has shown that Thomason was far more industrious when it came to collecting newsbooks; he managed to collect some 80.9 per cent of all newsbooks, as opposed to 53.1 per cent of 'non-periodicals'. Moreover, through a brilliant and detailed analysis Raymond has shown that the tracts that tended to appeal to Thomason were those that were written on topics close to his own interests and political or religious leanings.⁴⁰ Raymond seeks to remind us that Thomason's collection is far from complete; it is therefore important to remain aware of these particular idiosyncrasies of the collection when approaching the tracts.

³⁷ J. Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 6.

³⁸ H. Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2008), p. 156.

³⁹ Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p. 192; and J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 23-24.

⁴⁰ Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp. 192-96.

The Thomason Collection of wartime literature is also of particular value to this study because of the unique conditions in which it was produced. Several factors combined to encourage the growth of print culture in the early 1640s. The Scottish reaction to the king's new prayer book in 1637; the subsequent Bishop's Wars and the recalling of the English Parliament in 1640 meant that the political temperature began to rise.⁴¹ On 5 July 1641 the Long Parliament abolished the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission: the two institutions through which licensing had formerly operated.⁴² This made publishing less restrained as printed works no longer had to be licensed in order to be legally produced. The elimination of the need to pay licensing fees further bolstered the printing trade by reducing the costs of printing.⁴³ Joad Raymond has demonstrated that the early 1640s saw a rapid growth in unlicensed pamphlets as authors, printers and publishers in the capital quickly realised that they could publish what would earn them the most profit- even if it was libellous or untrue.⁴⁴ The Irish uprising in the winter of 1641 followed by the outbreak of war between Charles I and Parliament in August 1642 only added to the hunger for news.⁴⁵

But Raymond argues that the lapse in licensing was not the only reason for the sudden increase in pamphleteering. Instead he asserts that the king and Parliament's direct appeals to the people encouraged other authors to write in similarly polemical ways.⁴⁶ Jason Peacey echoes this view, asserting that official documents produced by the king and Parliament became more polemical during 1642, and were 'intended to offer justifications and vindications of policies and actions ... as much as to outline policy'. The official documentation therefore became 'less distinct from the pamphlets being written and published by parliamentarian and royalist authors'.⁴⁷ Peacey goes even further, for his exploration of the 'exploitation of print by politicians' has suggested the intriguing

⁴¹ Joad Raymond, (ed.), *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660* (Moreton-in-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993), p. 11. See also Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp. 161-201.

⁴² Raymond, *Invention*, p. 86; and Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 1.

⁴³ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 81.

⁴⁴ Raymond, *Making the News*, p. 5. See also J. Peacey, "'The counterfeit silly curr': Money, Politics and the Forging of Royalist Newspapers during the English Civil War", *HLQ* 67:1 (2004), p. 27.

⁴⁵ Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp. 161-201.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁴⁷ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 52; A. Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), p. 176; and M. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Allen Lane, 2008), pp. 187-89.

existence of patronage links between certain prominent pamphleteers and members of Parliament. For instance, Peacey claims that unofficial publications were sometimes used by the MPs in order to gauge public opinion. Therefore the prolific printing of the wartime period was at times, it seems, encouraged by those in authority.⁴⁸

The evidence cited by Peacey to support his claim that certain authors were employed by parliament is compelling. But it is important to remember that not all London-based pamphleteers who wrote against the king did so with Parliament's approval.⁴⁹ Less is known about the operation of the royalist presses. Evidence suggests that they were more tightly controlled, but further work is needed in order to explore this claim.⁵⁰ In this dissertation I have categorised particular pamphlets as 'royalist' or 'parliamentarian' in order to make their political agenda plain, but in doing so I am not assuming that the authors had official backing. When it does seem likely that a certain pamphlet was officially produced I have described the tract as 'propaganda'. Joad Raymond and Kevin Sharpe have both questioned the suitability of the term in describing the wartime pamphlets, as the term is anachronistic and therefore unhelpful in describing the relation of print culture to political authority.⁵¹ Jason McElligott agrees that the term is often 'invoked in a simplistic way without any understanding of the problems associated with its use' or any definition of the term. Yet, McElligott also argues that the rhetorical and manipulative techniques used by the authors of royalist newsbooks display many of the 'key elements' of modern definitions of 'propaganda'.⁵² Peacey has made the same claim for certain

⁴⁸ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 1, 11, 19, 51. See also N. Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 56; and Braddick, *God's Fury*, p. 195.

⁴⁹ See, for example, *CJ*, vol. II (18 October 1642), pp. 812-813 where it was ruled that the pamphlet *The Examinations of Sir Ralph Hopton, &c* was to be suppressed as an 'obnoxious publication'; *CJ*, vol. VI (24 April 1646), pp. 520-521 where it was noted that the issue of the *Perfect Occurrences* (17-24 April) should be suppressed; and *LJ*, vol. VIII (21 and 23 May 1646), pp. 321, 325 which records that Marchmont Nedham, Thomas Audley and Robert White had been reprimanded for passages in *Mercurius Britannicus*.

⁵⁰ Both McElligott and Potter assert that John Berkenhead acted as a licenser at Oxford, see J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2007), p. 106; and Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 8. J. Malcolm argues that the king had a greater control over his presses, although more work is needed to test her assertions: see J. Malcolm, *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), p. 124.

⁵¹ K. Sharpe, *Remapping Early-Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 416-458; J. Raymond, 'Introduction: networks, communication, practice' in J. Raymond (ed.) *News Networks in Seventeenth Century Britain and Europe* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-18.

⁵² McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 9-10.

parliamentarian writers.⁵³ Therefore McElligott and Peacey, two of the leading scholars of civil war print culture, have both argued that the term ‘propaganda’, when used sensitively, is the most apt way of describing certain wartime tracts.⁵⁴ In order to justify his use of the term, Peacey has defined ‘propaganda’ as ‘polemical works which appeared with the connivance of those political figures whose interests were best served by the existence of such books’. In contrast, he labels books that were produced to advance a political message to a public audience as ‘political *polemic*’.⁵⁵ I believe that this is a helpful distinction, and it is one that I have made in this thesis. In addition, I have approached each printed work individually, for a writer like William Prynne might have written *The Popish Royal Favourite* with tacit approval from Parliament; however, this does not mean that all of his works were produced in this way and that he can accurately be described as a parliamentarian propagandist throughout the 1640s.⁵⁶

In order to assess the political role of the wartime pamphlet literature historians have attempted to identify the extent of the readership. But as Jason McElligott has argued, it is an extremely difficult task to ‘recreate communities of *actual* readers of ephemeral or topical print’. McElligott points to the fact that few pamphlets of the 1640s contain marginalia to suggest how they were read, and that, ‘at best, the historical sources provide the names of a few titles read by a small number of readers of high or middling status’. Instead many scholars, McElligott included, have turned to studying the tracts themselves ‘for clues as to who their authors believed or, perhaps more accurately, hoped would read them’.⁵⁷

Such is the approach of Margaret Spufford and Bernard Capp who have examined the cheaper end of the print market and have argued that the presence of certain subjects within this literature suggested that it was intended for a poorer audience that included women.⁵⁸ Moreover, Spufford claims that the modest price of this ‘popular’ literature

⁵³ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 2-4.

⁵⁴ McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 9-11; and Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, esp. pp. 2-4.

⁵⁵ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 208-9.

⁵⁷ McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 37-9.

⁵⁸ M. Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1981), esp. pp. 59, 60, 64; B. Capp, ‘Popular Literature’ in B. Reay (ed.) *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1988 edition), pp. 198-232; Using the same approach N. Würzbach has claimed that ballads were frequently intended for a female or

made it affordable to a greater number of people. Tracts did not even have to be bought to be seen, for Spufford has demonstrated that prints were pasted up on alehouse walls and were even used to wrap pies.⁵⁹ Equally, Kevin Sharpe and Barbara Donagan have both stressed the common practice of pamphlets and books being read aloud, whether in private homes or by officers to their men, further suggesting that the message of a printed tract could spread far beyond its initial reader.⁶⁰ Perhaps to facilitate this practice, but also to make their works more titillating and accessible for the semi-literate, the wartime pamphleteers frequently wrote in a conversational tone.⁶¹

Other wartime pamphleteers made their ideological messages more widely accessible to the illiterate or semi-literate by using techniques within their printed pamphlets which could aid the oral transfer of the pamphlet's message once it had been read or heard. Blair Worden and Thomas Cogswell have suggested that many writers used rhyming verse in order to make the lines easier to remember so that they could be passed on.⁶² Woodcut images were also used on title pages to reinforce the pamphlet's polemical message or to summarise the gist of a tract for the illiterate.⁶³ Raymond has noted that prior to 1640 woodcuts were only found in more expensive works or in ballads, the fact that their usage increased during the 1640s suggests that this was a deliberate tactic to appeal to the illiterate.⁶⁴ Most recently, Michael Braddick's narrative of the Civil Wars has offered a fascinating exploration of how the provinces were politicised by discussing the part that the

poor audience see, *The Rise of the Street Ballad 1550-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 54-55.

⁵⁹ Spufford, *Small Books*, pp. 48-9; See also S. O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England 1550-1850* (London: British Museum Press, 1999), p. 16; and Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, pp. 28-9.

⁶⁰ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 271; and B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 147.

⁶¹ C. Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Nelson, 1961), p. 183; See also, N. Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England*, p. 24, 34-40; Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 154-158; and A. Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 37.

⁶² T. Cogswell, 'Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 283; B. Worden, 'Wit in a Roundhead': the Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 322; and Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture*, pp. 22, 24.

⁶³ J. Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 41; T. Williams, "'Magnetic Figures': Polemical Prints of the English Revolution," in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (eds.) *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion, 1990), pp. 86-110; and Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, esp. introduction and chapter 5.

⁶⁴ Raymond, *Invention*, p. 28.

pamphlet literature played in disseminating ideas and placing this within a broader context of the unfolding political events of the 1640s.⁶⁵

Other writers communicated political messages to the masses via ballads or songs which could either be bought or heard performed in public places, like alehouses or fairs.⁶⁶ Richard Cust argues that ballads operated on two levels: they provided entertainment, but were simultaneously ‘a means of disseminating news and opinion to the illiterate and semi-literate [by] employing a familiar form derived from the ballad traditions of popular culture’. Cust asserts that ballads often ‘echo[ed] court news and more learned exchanges’.⁶⁷ Identifying ballads during the civil war has proven problematic because, as Angela McShane-Jones has noted, George Thomason ‘seems to have been largely uninterested in the black-letter broadside market’, therefore the small number of ballads that exist within the Thomason collection for the period 1642 to 1646 may not be representative of the ballads that actually circulated at this time.⁶⁸ Also, the royalists frequently incorporated white-letter ballads into their pamphlets, presumably because of a lack of paper and time to print broadsides separately, thereby blurring the boundaries between printed genres.⁶⁹ Given these difficulties, I have only referred to a work as a ‘ballad’ when a tune title is included, or when the work is printed in a recognisable ballad form, that is on a broadsheet or broadside and in ballad stanza. All other works have been classed as verse.

⁶⁵ M. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Allen Lane, 2008), esp. chapter 6.

⁶⁶ For evidence of ballads being sold or sung in the countryside see H. E. Rollins, ‘XV—The Black-Letter Broadside ballad’, *PMLA* 34: 2 (1919), pp. 303, 306-7, 311-12, 336; and Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture*, p. 382. Angela McShane-Jones notes that the ‘cost of new ballads may be irrelevant in tracing readership as this ignores the lending of items, the second-hand trade and the accessing of the song simply by being in the right place at the right time’ see, A. McShane-Jones, ‘Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689’ in A. Smyth (ed.) *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), p. 71.

⁶⁷ R. Cust, ‘News and Politics in Early-Seventeenth Century England’ in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), pp. 237-8. See also Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 328; and A. McShane-Jones, ‘Rime and Reason.’ *The Political World of the English Broadside Ballad, 1640-1689* (PhD. Thesis, University of Warwick, November 2004), p. 412.

⁶⁸ McShane Jones, ‘Rime and Reason’, p. 252. This is supported by comments that royalist ballads were sung in the capital, for instance see, E.52[2], *The shepherds oracle* (Oxford*: 19 or 23 June* 1644), esp. pp. 11-12.

⁶⁹ See for instance, Wing / K23A, *The devils last legacy* (London: 1642), unpaginated. For a discussion of the problems that hampered the royalist presses, see McShane-Jones, ‘Rime and Reason’, pp. 252-53.

While it is sometimes possible to loosely identify the intended readership of a tract from its form and style, occasionally a writer made more open assertions as to who they imagined their audience to be. For instance, Marchemont Nedham, the main editor of *Mercurius Britanicus*, claimed that his text was read by apprentices, farm labourers, and people from the ‘city to the country’.⁷⁰ While this may simply be one of Nedham’s notorious rhetorical flourishes, it does show that the authors of some newsbooks considered it desirable that their prose should be broadly appealing.⁷¹ Moreover, there is evidence to show that both the king and parliament went to great lengths in order to ensure the wider dissemination of their pamphlets. For instance, Jason Peacey has demonstrated that, by the end of July 1642, a parliamentary committee had been created that was solely responsible for circulating propaganda.⁷² Lois Potter has shown that royalist propaganda was smuggled into the capital from Oxford,⁷³ while Joyce Malcolm has examined how the king disseminated his propaganda in the provinces through the county networks of local noblemen and gentry, by using the post (when it was in royalist hands) and by using an ‘army of watermen, carriers, hawkers and Mercury-women’.⁷⁴ The myriad attempts to disseminate such printed material, coupled with the diverse genres, arguments and writing styles found within the wartime tracts, suggest that the tracts were produced during the first Civil War to communicate to and convince a socially and geographically wide audience.⁷⁵ The tracts therefore provide a unique view of how literature was produced to appeal to commoners as well as to the social elite.

What is more, the disruption in the regulation of the printing trade, coupled with the widening divisions within society, has led scholars like McElligott to argue that authors from diverse ‘social, economic, geographical, educational ... [and] religious’ backgrounds were able to have their work published.⁷⁶ For instance, men like John Taylor or Martin

⁷⁰ E.10[21], *Mercurius Britanicus*, (23 Sept-30 Sept 1644), p. 399. B. Worden notes that Nedham seems to have imaged his readership to be primarily London-based, see ‘Wit in a Roundhead’, p. 307.

⁷¹ Similar claims were made by the authors of other newsbooks, see Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper*, p. 46. See also the comment made by John Taylor in, E.46[13], *Mad verse, sad verse, glad verse and bad verse* (Oxford*: 10 May* 1644), p. 8.

⁷² Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 48-49.

⁷³ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 8.

⁷⁴ Malcolm, *Ceaser’s Due*, pp. 124-127.

⁷⁵ Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 128-9; Hill, *The Century of Revolution*, pp. 183-84; McShane-Jones, ‘*Rime and Reason*’, p. 10; and Braddick, *God’s Fury*, chapter 6.

⁷⁶ McElligott, ‘The Politics of Sexual Libel’, p. 81.

Parker do not appear to have received more than a rudimentary education. Taylor was a Thames waterman who first ventured into print in 1612 and had established himself as a popular writer by the 1640s, while it seems likely that Parker was an innkeeper.⁷⁷ Other writers were drawn from the minor gentry or middling sorts and had received a University education. Included in this group are men like John Berkenhead, John Cleveland, Edward Hyde and Peter Heylyn who wrote for the royalists;⁷⁸ and Thomas May, William Prynne and Marchmont Nedham who were parliamentary pamphleteers.⁷⁹ Penmen could also be found on both sides who had been born into wealthier gentry families, for instance, Francis Quarles who wrote for the king,⁸⁰ or Henry Parker who wrote for parliament.⁸¹ There are even intriguing suggestions that men of varying educational and social backgrounds may have composed pamphlets together. For example, John Booker claimed that John Taylor, John Berkenhead and George Wharton wrote polemical literature collectively.⁸² The wartime tracts therefore provide historians with a rare opportunity to glimpse the viewpoints of men who were not born into the social elite.⁸³ Moreover, the use of gendered language by pamphleteers of varied social backgrounds and ideological positions further demonstrates the fact that gender was a system of cultural values that was subscribed to by the majority within seventeenth-century English society.

Yet while it is possible to identify certain royalist and parliamentary authors, the majority of tracts that have been utilised for the present dissertation were published

⁷⁷ Capp, 'Popular Literature', p. 200; B. Capp, *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578-1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); J. Raymond, 'Martin Parker' in *DNB*.

⁷⁸ P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), esp. pp. 14, 16, 20. See also Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 131; A. Milton, 'Peter Heylyn' in *DNB*; C. Clay Doyle, 'Sir John Birkenhead' in *DNB*; A. D. Cousins, 'John Cleveland' in *DNB*; Peacey 'The counterfeit silly curr', p. 81; McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 81; and Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 104.

⁷⁹ Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper*, p. 49; Worden, 'Wit in a Roundhead', pp. 305-6; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 97; D. Norbrook, 'Thomas May' in *DNB*; and W. Lamont, 'William Prynne' in *DNB*. See also Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England*, p. 32; and McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 81.

⁸⁰ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 34; Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 131; K. J. Höltgen, 'Francis Quarles' in *DNB*; and Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 51;

⁸¹ H. Erskine-Hill and G. Storey (eds.) *Revolutionary prose of the English Civil War* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 13; and Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 95, 104, 113, 115.

⁸² E.2[22], J. Booker, *No Mercurius Aquaticus* (NPP: 19 July 1644), p. 3; and McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 102.

⁸³ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 81; Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 128-9; Underdown, 'The Language of Popular Politics', pp. 121, 129-130; Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, pp. 103, 105, 109; and Capp, *The World of John Taylor*, pp. 163, 171, 192.

anonymously. This allowed authors and printers in the capital to avoid retribution for the production of any work that might fall foul of parliamentary authority, for while Parliament had dismantled the mechanisms through which the king's licensing system had operated, sporadic attempts were made to try to regulate printing in the capital. While Raymond notes that much of Parliament's 'piecemeal legislation' was ineffectual and 'until 1649, had no teeth', the imprisonment of Thomas Audley and Robert White, for publishing the edition of *Mercurius Britanicus* containing a 'Hue and Cry' after the king in August 1645, demonstrates that Parliament did punish those who produced works that were considered too controversial.⁸⁴ The situation at Oxford, where it seems that John Berkenhead worked as a licenser, suggests that there must have been another explanation for widespread anonymity in royalist works.⁸⁵ Jason McElligott has argued that, by remaining anonymous, royalist authors 'were not limited to one part of the broad spectrum of royalist political ideas'. Instead he claims that they 'found it possible, and even desirable, to inhabit different parts of this spectrum at different times'.⁸⁶

The common practice of sharing the authorship of a piece of work amongst the author(s), publisher and printer further complicates the picture for it makes it almost impossible to identify the author(s) of a tract unless authorship was explicitly stated on the title page.⁸⁷ Marcus Nevitt argues that tracts were co-authored in order to share the responsibility for the pamphlet between a number of people, thereby making it harder for the authorities to identify who was responsible for a slanderous or seditious work.⁸⁸ Scholars like Blair Worden, Jason Peacey and Amos Tubb have tried to overcome this problem by attempting to identify the particular styles of certain writers so that they can

⁸⁴ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 23; Worden, 'Wit in a Roundhead', pp. 315-6; Raymond, *Invention*, p. 77; J. Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinions, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century' in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), p. 118; Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp. 169, 196; and Peacey, 'The counterfeit silly curr', p. 35; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 298-99.

⁸⁵ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 8; and McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 106.

⁸⁶ McElligott *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 8, 96.

⁸⁷ Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 21-2; and McElligott *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 100.

⁸⁸ M. Nevitt, 'Women in the Business of Revolutionary News: Elizabeth Alkin, "Parliament Joan," and the Commonwealth Newsbook' in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), p. 86.

recognise when they wrote in partnership with others.⁸⁹ However this technique is fraught with difficulties. Lois Potter has shown how, in the latter 1640s, writers would often emulate each other's styles when an author was arrested, in order for the newsbook to continue to be produced.⁹⁰ This practice has led Jason McElligott to claim that the newsbooks should be seen 'as the composite products of men with access to a communal arsenal of arguments, ideas and metaphors'. He argues that the authors took on the persona of the particular newsbook which they happened to be contributing to at that given moment.⁹¹ This makes the identification of a person's particular writing style extremely difficult. The widespread resort to anonymity, and the common practice of co-authoring works, often leaves the historian with very little clue as to what a particular author's agenda or background were, thus making it extremely difficult to understand the authorial intent behind the polemical approach of a specific work. It is for these reasons that the present thesis will only attribute tracts to a particular author when their name is stated on the title page; authorship will not be inferred from style alone.

The thesis will begin by examining the prejudices that have prevented the wartime pamphlet literature and, in particular the gendered language within these tracts, from receiving serious scholarly attention. Chapter two will go on to explore the gendered language found within the parliamentary pamphlets which was used both to construct the patriarchal manhood of the pamphleteers' own men, and to belittle the manliness of their opponents. Chapter three will turn to explore how the parliamentary writers set about slandering three prominent royalist figures in gendered terms, namely King Charles I, Queen Henrietta Maria and Prince Rupert. Chapter four will examine the ways in which the royalist pamphleteers made use of gender in order to describe their own soldiers as exemplars of patriarchal manhood, while simultaneously belittling their opponents as cowards and cuckolds. A more specific analysis of how the royalist propagandists attacked three prominent parliamentary figures – Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex and Sir William and Lady Ann Waller – will follow in chapter five. By analysing the broad gendered

⁸⁹ Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead", pp. 301-323; Peacey, "'The counterfeit silly curr'", pp. 27-57; and A. Tubb, 'Mixed Messages: Royalist Newsbook Reports of Charles I's Execution and of the Leveller Uprising', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), pp. 59-74.

⁹⁰ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 17. See also Raymond, *Making the News*, p. 21.

⁹¹ McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 103-4; see also Raymond, *Invention*, p. 67.

themes that were used against the entire parliamentary or royalist armies and comparing them with the more tailored gendered attacks that were aimed at specific individuals, the discussion will seek to demonstrate how the pamphleteers of both sides cast the characters and actions of their enemies in a negative light whenever possible.

Above all, this thesis seeks to analyse and to understand the stereotypes that were created and propagated by the parliamentary and royalist pamphleteers. Over the following chapters, it will be argued that the pamphleteers consciously chose to use gendered language to denigrate their opponents because such images invoked a code that everyone in society understood and struggled to conform to. Gender relations were constructed in order to assert and underpin the patriarchal social order in a way that naturalised the patriarchal structure, thus rendering it both invisible and ubiquitous. Any 'gender non-conformists' were seen to be placing the social order in jeopardy and therefore faced community censure. Gendered language had the potential to be an immensely powerful weapon: over the course of the present work it will become apparent that the pamphleteers of the 1640s knew this perfectly well.

Chapter I:
An ‘Excellent Talent ... in lying and slandering’:¹ Prejudice and the
Print Culture of the Civil War

On the night of 22 November 1641, the MP Sir Edward Dering gave a speech before the House of Commons in which he argued against the motion to publish the *Grand Remonstrance*. Dering asserted that the document had been intended to ‘represent unto the King the wicked counsels of pernicious counsellors’. ‘I did not dream that we should remonstrate downward’ he protested, or ‘tell stories to the people, and talk of the King as of a third person’.² Dering’s hostility to the printing of the *Remonstrance* demonstrates that contemporaries had recognised the important political role that the printing press could – and did – play in the conflict. This chapter will first consider why historians from the seventeenth century onwards have often been reluctant to study the surviving printed tracts. The following sections will explore the shifts in scholarship that brought the gendered language and sexual insults contained within the tracts under academic study. To this end, section two will consider the influence of Marxism and social history in the early decades of the twentieth century. Section three will explore the impact of women’s history in the 1970s and the linguistic turn in the 1980s. Section four will consider the impact of the ‘linguistic turn’ on both gender history and cultural history from the 1980s onwards and how this led historians to notice how cultural symbols and practices, including gender, were used to convey political messages by the wartime pamphleteers. Finally, the conclusion will consider the development of scholarship on sexuality and reputation in order to demonstrate how and why sexual misconduct was perceived to be damaging to the social order and, therefore, how sexual insult could be used to damage a person’s social standing. Yet, before we examine the developments of the last thirty years, we must first cast our eyes back to the historians of the seventeenth-century, and their reluctance to discuss the polemical pamphlets which had been produced during the conflict.

¹ Wing / N106, J. Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year 1639 to the Murder of King Charles I* (London: 1682-3), vol. II, p. 806.

² J. Rushworth, *Historical collections of private passages of state* (London: 1721-22), vol. IV, p. 425. For a more general account of the debates see *CJ*, vol. II (22 November 1641), pp. 322. See also C. Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Nelson, 1964), p. 125; and J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 37.

Part 1.1 – Stigmatised Sources: Historians' views of Civil War pamphlets, 1644 - circa 1890

For many years the pamphlet literature of the civil wars was regarded as scurrilous and unworthy of serious study: an attitude which can be traced back to those who lived through the conflict itself. There were three main reactions within these contemporary (or near-contemporary) histories: the historians concerned either ignored the pamphlet literature altogether;³ commented on the official declarations that passed between the king at York and the Parliament in London,⁴ or focussed solely on the printing activities of their opponents and neglected to mention their own party's use of polemic.⁵ It therefore seems that both the pro-parliamentarian and pro-royalist historians viewed only traditional and official channels of communication as acceptable.⁶ The comments of the historian John Nalson (1682-3) show that pamphleteering seems to have been primarily disapproved of because it was deemed to have been written for 'the low and sordid Capacities of the Vulgar'.⁷ The literature was recognised as having been produced for the consumption of the wider public – and the idea that the inner workings of government should thus have been laid open to the masses was considered appalling by the elites in both camps.⁸ Contemporaries believed that every person had their divinely appointed place in society. Appealing to the general public in matters of state was therefore highly subversive, as it encouraged men and women to rise above their station.⁹ Therefore it seems that the pamphlets were excluded from the contemporary histories not because pamphleteering was considered of no consequence to the Civil War, but because it was frowned upon by the

³ See, for example, Wing / 369:06, J. Sprigg, *Anglia Rediviva* (London: 1647); and E.1487[2], *Britannia Triumphalis; a brief History of the Warres and other State-Affairs of Great Britain* (London: 28 April* 1654).

⁴ See, for example, Wing / V313, J. Vicars, *Jehovah-Jireh* (London: 1644), p. 94; Wing / M1410, T. May, *The History of the Parliament of England* (London: 1647), vol. II, pp. 20, 24; and Wing / H1321, J. Heath, *A Chronicle of the late intestine war in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland*, (London: 1676), pp. 26, 31, 35-36.

⁵ For a parliamentary example see, Wing / V313, Vicars, *Jehovah-Jireh*, p. 94. A similar treatment of the pamphlet literature can be found in Wing (2nd ed., 1994) / W329A, C. Walker's *The History of Independency* (London: 1648). Walker only mentions the pamphleteering carried out by Cromwell's supporters – people that he strongly disapproved of, see p. 4. For royalist examples see, Wing / 2482:16, W. Dugdale, *Short View of the Late Troubles in England* (Oxford: 1681), pp. 97, 100; and E. Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (Oxford: 1702-1703), vol. I, book IV, p. 296 and book V, p. 370.

⁶ For a royalist example see, Wing / H1321, Heath, *A Chronicle of the late intestine war*, p. 31. For a parliamentary example see, Wing / V313, Vicars, *Jehovah-Jireh*, p. 94.

⁷ Wing / N106, Nalson, *An Impartial Collection*, vol. II, pp. 806-8. See also J. McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel: Royalist Propaganda in the 1640s', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), p. 80.

⁸ For a royalist example, see Wing / N106, Nalson, *An Impartial Collection*. For a parliamentary example, see Wing (2nd ed., 1994) / W329A, Walker, *The history of Independency*.

⁹ See for example, D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 9-10; and J. Walter, 'The Impact on Society: A World Turned Upside Down?' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 105-122.

social elite.¹⁰ The contemporary remarks with which this chapter began reinforce this view.

By the closing decades of the nineteenth century social attitudes were beginning to change. History had become increasingly professionalised as a discipline, largely under the influence of the German historian, Leopold von Ranke. Ranke stressed the importance of detailed archival research, in order to ‘show how things actually were’ in the past.¹¹ Given Ranke’s approach it is perhaps not surprising that he recognised the important historical value of the pamphlet literature in recounting ‘the public discussion that went on, at least in the capital’.¹² Similar views can be found in Samuel R. Gardiner’s seminal *History of the Great Civil War 1642-49* (1893) and John Roland Phillips’, *Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and the Marches, 1642-1649* (1874).¹³ Yet, because these historians set out to provide a political narrative of the conflict they also noted the limitations of the tracts because of their partisan nature.¹⁴ Equally, scholars like John Ashton (1883) and W. M. Chappell (1888), who made use of the pamphlet literature to examine seventeenth-century culture, felt it necessary to justify to the reader their decision to include tracts of a bawdy or salacious character.¹⁵

It was not until the twentieth century that social attitudes began to change, which led historians to pursue new avenues of enquiry. The next section of this chapter will turn to consider the work of the Marxist historian, Christopher Hill, who placed the tracts at the very centre of the mid-seventeenth-century conflict by demonstrating how their simplified style made political debate more accessible to a broader swathe of the population.

Part 1.2 – Pamphlets and Politics: The impact of Marxism and social history

In several articles and books, Christopher Hill stressed how seventeenth-century politicians had used publications, like the *Grand Remonstrance* to appeal ‘to opinion outside the

¹⁰ J. Oldmixon, *The history of England, during the reigns of the Royal House of Stuart* (London: 1730), pp. 182-83.

¹¹ J. Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (Harlow: Longman, 1999), p. 5.

¹² L. von Ranke, *A History of England: Principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey Ltd., 1992), vol. I, pp. 311-2, 377, see also pp. xii-xiii.

¹³ S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War 1642-49* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893), vol. I, pp. vi-vii, vol. III, p. 365; and J. R. Phillips, *Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and the Marches, 1642-1649* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1874, 1893 edition), vol. I, pp. 97, 98, 118-119, 121, 230.

¹⁴ Ranke, *A History of England*, pp. xii-xiii; and Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. III, p. 365. See Phillips, *Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales*, vol. I, pp. 121, 230.

¹⁵ J. Ashton, *Wit and Satire of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1883), p. vii, 94-6, 113; *The Roxburghe Ballads*, W. M. Chappell (ed.) (Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons, 1888) vol. I, p. xxvii; and M. Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, Trans. R. Hurley (London: Penguin Books, 1979), pp. 10-49.

‘political nation’.¹⁶ His work differed from that of earlier historians in that he highlighted the unprecedented nature of this action, describing it as ‘a new technique of appeal to the people’.¹⁷ Hill asserted that the pamphlet literature had introduced ideas ‘of every political colour’ and ‘every subject under the sun’ to a wider public and, in doing so, had awoken the political consciousness of the people, thereby aiding the revolutionary changes which he believed to have taken place.¹⁸ In order to reinforce his argument Hill set out to demonstrate the possible extent of the readership by attempting to quantify the outpourings of the press.¹⁹ Similarly, Hill argued that the pamphleteers consciously adopted a direct, conversational style, in order to appeal to ‘a new public, of insatiable curiosity’ who lacked the educational, ‘intellectual and cultural standards’ of the pre-existing readership.²⁰

While Marxist historians, like Hill, encouraged their colleagues to have a broader view of history than that which had been advocated by scholars like Ranke, their work did tend to focus on the moments when ‘the masses engaged in overt political activity’.²¹ From the 1960s onwards, scholars who had been influenced by Marxist approaches and the idea of studying ‘history from below’ began to explore wider aspects of mid-seventeenth-century society by drawing upon other disciplines, such as literary studies and anthropology.²² These approaches were to bring the pamphlet literature into even sharper focus as texts that were worthy of study in their own right.

In his book *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660* (1961) Joseph Frank noted how earlier historians, like Gardiner, had used the newsbooks merely to ‘corroborate the details of history’.²³ In contrast to this approach, Frank set out to trace the development of the newspaper genre during the 1640s and 1650s in order to better understand ‘the cultural and political patterns’ of the seventeenth century.²⁴ His close analysis of the style, form and content of each prominent newsbook in the 1640s led him to

¹⁶ C. Hill, *The English Revolution, 1640* (London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., 1940, 1959 edition), pp. 6, 41; and C. Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Nelson, 1961, 1964 edition), p. 125.

¹⁷ C. Hill, *The English Revolution, 1640* (London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., 1940, 1959 edition), pp. 6, 41.

¹⁸ Hill, *Century of Revolution*, p. 174.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 174.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p. 183.

²¹ J. Sharpe, ‘History from Below’ in P. Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), p. 27.

²² J. Sharpe, ‘History from Below’ in P. Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), pp. 27, 31, 32, 34-37. See also, Burke, *What is Cultural History?*, p. 18.

²³ J. Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660* (Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961), p. v.

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. v.

notice the subtleties of the pamphlet wars in detail, especially the railing contest between the court journal, *Mercurius Aulicus*, and the rival parliamentary newsbook, *Mercurius Britanicus*.²⁵ Frank also explored the circulation of the newsbooks in order to further assert that by the 1640s '[t]he newspaper had ... become an important force in moulding public opinion, as well as a source of profit to the publishers'.²⁶ He claimed that publishers had realised that they could influence public opinion through their representations of the news, and Frank noted how, in the later years of the conflict 'scurrilous verse' and 'smutty innuendo' were put to political purposes in order to reinforce ideological arguments.²⁷ His work therefore acknowledged the diversity of an individual genre that had previously been grouped alongside ballads, pamphlets and broadsides under the catch-all heading of 'pamphlets' or 'papers', and demonstrated that the newsbooks warranted academic scrutiny in their own right.

The study of newsbooks was further advanced in 1969 when P. W. Thomas published a book on the political and literary career of Sir John Berkenhead, who had been one of the editors of the court newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*. Thomas drew on Frank's earlier study but aimed to provide 'the most thoroughgoing analysis of a single newsbook of the period yet undertaken'.²⁸ Thomas argued that, because *Aulicus* was sponsored by the court, '[a] high value' must have been placed 'on its effect on public opinion and loyalist morale'.²⁹ Thomas aimed to show that *Aulicus* was a sophisticated and influential propaganda weapon which promoted the party line.³⁰ This led him to analyse the themes and imagery used by the newsbook's editors. Thomas admitted that Berkenhead's style 'ranged from light-hearted flippancy, through stern mockery, to downright indecency', but provided only a few examples.³¹ While he noted that such stories were quoted for political reasons, such as raising morale, his work lacked a deeper analysis as to why particular themes were used. Yet Thomas's research does demonstrate how attitudes to the wartime tracts were changing. For instance, Thomas stressed that the 'measurement of *Aulicus*' accuracy does not exhaust its possible claims as an historical document'. Instead he

²⁵ Ibid, pp. 49-51.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 57.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 192.

²⁸ P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. viii.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 29.

³⁰ Ibid, pp. 86, 91-2.

³¹ Ibid, pp. 92-3.

asserted that '[i]ts opinions are equally if not more important'.³²

While Frank and Thomas had been more overly concerned with the form and style of the newsbooks, Hill continued to investigate the place of the pamphlet literature in shaping and disseminating revolutionary ideas. In *The World Turned Upside Down* (1972) Hill argued that the collapse of censorship and the social and political upheaval of the conflict enabled the ideas of the lower social orders to find their way into print. This led Hill to emphasise the importance of the printed literature in allowing historians to retrace the thoughts of this particular social group, an opportunity which, he stressed, was rare in the historical record.³³ Hill built on his earlier work in a later book *Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (1985). In this volume Hill emphasised that, the collapse of censorship had caused a change in writing style, as both the 'Royalist and Parliamentary journalists soon realised that arguments must be spiced with wit and raillery, not to say scurrility, if they were to sell'.³⁴ While Hill noted the open use of insult as a form of establishing and simplifying political arguments, this was not a theme which he explored in depth.³⁵ His ultimate aim was to demonstrate how the literature of the seventeenth century had awoken the political consciousness of the people and aided the revolutionary changes which he believed to have taken place.³⁶

In order to further explore the 'the printed influences at work on the non-gentle reader before 1700', Margaret Spufford turned to examine the cheap 'small books' which were hawked around the country by chapbook men.³⁷ Her study, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (1981) demonstrated that cheap print had indeed been written for, and read by, a broader swathe of the population than had been previously thought: a conclusion which had obvious implications for the role of literature of a similar quality that was published during the Civil Wars. Yet, even as late as 1981, Spufford expressed some reluctance to discuss the coarse humour of the seventeenth-century ballads, describing it as 'frequently of the dung-hill variety', and therefore 'practically unquotable, even by a woman writing now' as

³² Ibid, p. 66.

³³ C. Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1972, 1973 edition), p. 14-15.

³⁴ C. Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, vol. 1: Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth Century England* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Ltd., 1985), p. 81.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 86.

³⁶ Hill, *Century of Revolution*, p. 174.

³⁷ M. Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1981), p. xviii. See also D. Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1980) which tends to overlook the poorer reader.

‘the subject comes up against a twentieth-century taboo’.³⁸ Therefore, while Spufford’s work examined a diverse range of cheap print in the seventeenth century, she did not investigate the particular cultural themes that were used by the authors.

A similar interest in popular attitudes can be seen in Joyce Lee Malcolm’s study of royalist allegiance, entitled *Caesar’s Due* (1983). Malcolm was the first scholar to analyse the form and scope of the royalist propaganda in depth in order to better understand ‘the popular attitude towards the King and his cause’. To this end Malcolm devoted considerable space to examining a wide range of sources – she lists ‘diaries, letters, pamphlets, government and military records, ballads and battle cries’ – in order to see whether different media were used to make diverse social groups aware of the political struggles gripping the nation.³⁹ Through studying these sources Malcolm recognised the ways in which propaganda was consciously used to win minds. In particular she analysed the different themes that were utilised by the royalist propagandists, including the use of sexual slander to attack the parliamentarians’ self-constructed godly image, by painting them in a hypocritical light.⁴⁰ She even included a quote from a royalist pamphlet which described the Parliamentarians as ‘Citie Oxen’, but like so many scholars before her, she did not explore the gendered implications of this insult in any depth.⁴¹ Despite a frustrating lack of adequate footnoting, which makes some of her more arresting claims hard to confirm, Malcolm’s book was the broadest and most detailed study of the royalist wartime propaganda of its time. While the use of gendered language in these sources still remained largely unexplored, by the mid-1980s the political role of the printed literature was beginning to be widely appreciated by historians.⁴²

By the mid-1980s historians clearly felt more at ease with studying popular literature, despite the references to ‘sex, farting and excrement’ that it often contained.⁴³ This led Bernard Capp (1985) to begin to notice how political messages were simplified for the masses by focussing on the ‘personal dramas’ of key players.⁴⁴ Similarly, in his hugely

³⁸ Ibid, pp. 62, 184.

³⁹ J. L. Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), pp. 1, 3.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 144.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 158.

⁴² A. Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), p. xxv and R. Cust, ‘News and Politics in Early-Seventeenth Century England’, *P&P* 112: 1 (1986), pp. 60-90, reproduced in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 240.

⁴³ B. Capp, ‘Popular Literature’ in B. Reay (ed.) *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1988 edition), p. 217.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 217.

influential book *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (1985), which drew upon the work of the cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz, David Underdown took the first steps in exploring the ways in which contemporaries made use of ‘recognizable cultural codes’ in order ‘to provoke or ridicule their enemies’ and to assert their political allegiances during the civil conflict.⁴⁵ As ‘a striking example of popular symbolic action’ Underdown recounted the actions of a butcher’s wife of South Molton in Devon who ‘came running with her lap full of ram’s horns to throw’ at the Earl of Bath when he came to read out the Commission of Array for the king. Horns would have been understood by contemporaries as a symbol of cuckoldry; Underdown therefore explained that, through her actions, the woman was asserting her view that the ‘Cavaliers were courtiers, and thus by definition cuckolds’.⁴⁶ In making such a connection, Underdown was building upon the work of feminist colleagues, like Joan Scott. Underdown had taken the first steps in suggesting that gendered symbols were being consciously used for a definite political purpose – but he was not to develop this insight for some years to come. Underdown went on to explore the ‘role of gender as a central political metaphor’ in the Ford Lecture series which he delivered at Oxford in January and February 1992.⁴⁷ His later work in this area will be examined below.

As this section has demonstrated, throughout the twentieth century, Marxist thought and social history have led historians to become increasingly interested in ‘ordinary’ people who have left fewer marks on the historical record. This led historians to turn to study the newsbooks and printed literature of the Civil Wars with a new vigour, in order to explore whether ‘the masses’ had taken an interest in the war. Ideas and approaches from other disciplines, like cultural anthropology, allowed historians to move further down this path by opening up new ways in which to explore the lives and attitudes of the poorer elements of society.⁴⁸ Moreover, as has been noted above in relation to the work of Underdown, the feminist movement was beginning to influence social and cultural historians and to add a further dimension to their work. The next section will examine the developments in women’s history in order to see how these new approaches and ideas further affected the study of the pamphlet literature of the Civil Wars.

⁴⁵ Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, p. 177.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 178.

⁴⁷ S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky, ‘Introduction’ in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 4.

⁴⁸ Burke, *What is Cultural History?*, p. 39.

Part 1.3 – Language, Gender and Power: The Emergence of Gendered Readings of the Wartime Pamphlets

As the previous section has demonstrated, the 1960s saw social historians turn to a wider range of sources and approaches in order to attempt to study the powerless, and it was within this climate of change that the feminist movement began to find its voice in academia.⁴⁹ Prior to the 1960s, a small number of scholars such as Ellen A. M'Arthur (1909), Alice Clark (1919) and Ethyn M. Williams (1929) had taken the first tentative steps in studying women as active historical agents in the early modern period, yet, as they were researching a field that was largely untouched, their histories tended to be largely descriptive or tended to focus on the lives of exceptional women who had left an obvious mark on the historical record.⁵⁰ By the mid-1970s historians of women, such as Gerda Lerner and Natalie Zemon Davies, were beginning to realise that it was not enough to study women's contributions at particular historical moments. In order to prevent women's history from being sidelined as a sub-discipline that merely added detail to the existing historical picture, they argued that historians of women needed to relate their work to the broader discipline.⁵¹ In a key article published in 1976 Natalie Zemon Davis called for a broader approach that included 'the history of both women and men'. Davis asserted that such a 'study of the sexes should help promote a rethinking of some of the central issues faced by historians', such as 'power, [and] social structure'. 'Our goal', Davis claimed, 'is to discover the range in sex roles and in sexual symbolism in different societies and periods, to find out what meaning they had and how they functioned to maintain the social order or to promote its change'.⁵² Feminist scholars were beginning to see the link between the social construction of 'sex roles' and the operation of power within society. This approach drew feminist historians towards language in order to see how femininity had been defined in the past and how its definitions were related to maintaining patriarchal power.

As early as 1972 Patricia Higgins applied these new approaches to the civil war

⁴⁹ J. Alberti, *Gender and the Historian* (London: Longman, 2002), p. 13.

⁵⁰ E. M'Arthur, 'Women Petitioners and the Long Parliament', *EHR* 24: 96 (October 1909), pp. 698-709; A. Clark *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1919, 1982 edition); and E. M. Williams, 'Women Preachers in the Civil War', *JMH* 1: 4 (December 1929), pp. 561-569.

⁵¹ G. Lerner, 'Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges', *Feminist Studies* 3: 1/2 (Autumn 1975), pp. 7-8; and N. Zemon Davis, "'Women's History' in Transition: The European Case", *Feminist Studies* 3: 3/4 (Spring – Summer 1976), pp. 83-4.

⁵² Zemon Davis, "'Women's History' in Transition", pp. 89-90. Gerda Lerner was grappling with similar conceptual problems, see Lerner, 'Placing Women in History', pp. 8, 10, 12; and G. Lerner, 'The Majority finds its past', *Current History* 70:416 (May 1976), pp. 194-6.

period when she explored the representation of women in the wartime pamphlet literature when they took on a more traditionally 'masculine' role as petitioners to Parliament. She noted how contemporaries described women who behaved in this way as having a 'masculine spirit'.⁵³ Equally, when men's actions were deemed to be insufficiently masculine, they were likened to women, or 'Billingsgate wenches' in the words of one pamphleteer. Therefore, Higgins noted, the pamphleteers' choice of language was 'coloured very largely by their preconceptions of the nature of women and of their true place in society, as well as by partisanship'.⁵⁴ However, it was not only the words of pamphleteers which reaffirmed the traditional gender roles in this time of social upheaval: Higgins went on to analyse how the female petitioners often presented their own actions in a way that reasserted patriarchal ideas of womanhood by emphasising their frailty and humility.⁵⁵ Yet, despite noting how language was used by contemporaries to reaffirm traditional notions of gender difference, the main thrust of Higgins's argument was to contrast the meek words of the female petitioners, with what she saw as their assertive actions and demands.⁵⁶

A year later, Phyllis Mack published an article on 'Women as Prophets during the English Civil War', which, like Higgins' work, focussed on the 'cage of symbols and stereotypes that conditioned the liberty of women' during the English Civil War.⁵⁷ This was a theme which was further explored in Antonia Fraser's *The Weaker Vessel*, first published in 1984. However, Fraser's approach differed from that of Mack or Higgins as, rather than focussing on a single group of women, like the female prophets or petitioners, Fraser turned to consider how the conflict affected women in every walk of life. Fraser explored how women had been able to manipulate constructs of womanhood to their advantage when it was necessary.⁵⁸ Higgins, Mack and Fraser all explored how the Civil War forced or encouraged women to take on a wider range of public roles, but they also noted that this meant that the women concerned had had to navigate through or manipulate the existing constructs of womanhood in order to legitimise their actions in a patriarchal society.

⁵³ P. Higgins, 'The Reaction of women, with special reference to women petitioners' in B. Manning (ed.), *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War* (London: Edwin Arnold, 1973), p. 179.

⁵⁴ Ibid, pp. 180-2.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 210.

⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 222.

⁵⁷ P. Mack, 'Women as Prophets during the English Civil War', *Feminist Studies* 8: 1 (1982), p. 20.

⁵⁸ A. Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Women's Lot in Seventeenth Century England* (London: Methuen, 1985), esp. pp. 183-203.

The analysis undertaken by Higgins, Mack and Fraser was part of a wider turn to women's history which helped to spark a realisation that 'sex roles' were largely constructed by society rather than determined by biology.⁵⁹ In a groundbreaking article, published in 1986, Joan Scott argued that the work of post-structural theorists like Michel Foucault could help historians to explore how gender was constructed and how its construction was related to power relationships within society. Scott argued that cultural symbols are used to 'evoke multiple (and often contradictory) representations' of gender and that it was the historian's task to question which symbolic representations were invoked at a particular moment and why. Scott also called for historians to uncover '[n]ormative concepts'. For instance, she argued that the binary opposition of 'man' and 'woman' that has been repeatedly expressed in scientific thought, while presented to us as a consensus, is really the product of one discourse silencing other possibilities that do not fit into this binary view. Scott concluded her article by offering several brief case studies that highlighted just how central gender was to the organisation of social relationships and the workings of power.⁶⁰ For instance, she demonstrated that throughout time and in various societies, 'emergent rulers have legitimized ... ruling power as masculine' while 'enemies, outsiders, subversives [and] weakness' was classed 'as feminine'. Equally, Scott asserted that support for war has been mobilised by appealing to gender 'norms' that emphasised man's need to defend 'vulnerable' women and children. 'Gender is one of the recurrent references by which political power has been conceived, legitimated, and criticized', Scott averred. Yet, she also noted that '[t]o vindicate political power, the reference must seem ... outside human construction, part of the natural or divine order'. In that way, Scott argued 'the binary opposition and the social process of gender relationships both become part of the meaning of power itself', therefore 'to question or alter any aspect threatens the entire system'.⁶¹ As we will see in later chapters, in civil-war England, both the royalists and the parliamentarians reinforced their party's claim to political power by exploiting deep-seated beliefs about gender in order to make their party's claim to power seem unquestionable, or in Scott's words: 'part of the natural or divine order'.

Scott was drawing upon the highly influential work of the French theorist and historian of structures of thought, Michel Foucault. Central to his work is the idea that

⁵⁹ K. Canning, 'Feminist history after the linguistic turn: historicizing discourse and experience', *Signs* 19:2 (Winter 1994), p. 370.

⁶⁰ J. W. Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *AHR* 91: 5 (December 1986), pp. 1067-70

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1072-73

‘discourses’, or bodies of language practice, were not simply an expression of a given culture, but instead they simultaneously ‘construct ... the objects of which they speak’.⁶² Therefore, Foucault argued, discourses needed to be studied in depth in order to uncover the principles that underlined them and which organised what could be thought and said at any given time.⁶³ Foucault argued that history ‘tells of a constant struggle between different powers which try to impose their own ‘will to truth’’. In the phrase ‘will to truth’, Foucault was referring to the ‘repressive and permissive procedures that determine how knowledge is applied, distributed, valued and rejected’.⁶⁴ Foucault rejected the idea of power as simply ‘repressive’ as too ‘negative’. ‘What makes power ... accepted’, he explained, ‘is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, ... forms knowledge, produces discourse’.⁶⁵ It is this particular idea of power which had such resonance for gender historians in the 1980s, and which has been equally valuable for the study of the political use of gendered themes within civil war polemical literature that will be explored within the present dissertation.

Part 1.4 – Beyond the ‘Linguistic Turn’: the Birth of ‘New’ Cultural History

As can be seen, then, post-structuralist thought has been hugely influential in the field of gender studies, in making scholars more attuned to the role of language in gender construction and to the ways in which power operated through discourse. The shift to studying language, dubbed the ‘linguistic turn’, also had a profound impact upon other sub-disciplines of history, as historians began to realise that the language of texts could be studied to reveal ‘the categories through which reality was perceived’ by contemporaries.⁶⁶ Led by scholars such as John Pocock and Quentin Skinner, who argued that ‘the beliefs and attitudes of an age are encoded’ within its language, Kevin Sharpe argued in his book *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (1989) that the ‘linguistic turn’ had resulted in the emancipation of intellectual history from the ‘great texts’ of the elites. Instead the scholars of intellectual history were interested in studying ‘the ‘vocabularies of the past revealed in all discourse – letters, sermons and plays, as well as pamphlets and political

⁶² Burke, *What is Cultural History?*, p. 76.

⁶³ M. Foucault, ‘The Order of Discourse’ in R. Young (ed.) *Untying the Text: a Post-Structuralist Reader* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. 52, 62.

⁶⁴ M. Hughes-Warrington, *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 96.

⁶⁵ M. Foucault, ‘Truth and Power’ in P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader* (Hamondsworth: Penguin, 1984), pp. 60-1. See also, M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*, R. Hurley (Trans.) (London: Penguin Books, 1979), pp. 72-73.

⁶⁶ Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, p. 183; see also Anon, ‘History and Language’, *HWJ* (1980), pp. 1-2; and S. Gunn, *History and Cultural Theory* (London: Pearson Longman, 2006), p. 21.

treatises'.⁶⁷ Sharpe called for a similar broadening of sources for political history to include a variety of aspects of culture, for instance, religious ritual, games or pastimes, in order to explore how political ideas were viewed, internalised and reinterpreted in society at large.⁶⁸

The shift amongst historians to a 'language-led approach' to the study of culture – dubbed 'new' cultural history – coincided with the new historicism and cultural materialism movements in the English disciplines of the U.S.A. and U.K. respectively.⁶⁹ Rather than studying the 'timeless', 'classical' elements of the literary text in a vacuum, the 'history, politics, and context were reinstated at the centre of the literary-critical agenda'.⁷⁰ These new theoretical ideas and approaches, which blurred the boundaries between English and History, coupled with the developments in gender studies, led to a number of trail-blazing studies which cast fresh light upon the gendered references within the pamphlet literature of the English Civil Wars. For example, in 1990 a collection of essays was published by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn on the subject of the representation of the human body in the renaissance.⁷¹ In an essay contained within this volume, Tamsyn Williams set out to examine how the body had been represented in the 'Polemical Prints of the English Revolution'. By recovering the 'contexts' of the texts, Williams set out to examine images that had previously been dismissed as crude and 'poverty-stricken' in their meaning.⁷² In doing so, she provided a fascinating glimpse of how the pamphleteers had manipulated the news. Her study focussed on the woodcut images found in many wartime pamphlets, which, she argued, invoked 'emotive' and 'easily accessible' stereotypes that even 'barely literate people could understand' and which were therefore just as important as prose in shaping public opinion.⁷³ She went on to systematically analyse the various themes that were invoked in the woodcuts, and was one of the first to note the exploitation of 'strongly-held attitudes to gender' for propaganda purposes, both in the woodcuts and in the pamphlets' broader content.⁷⁴ For example, she noted that the long hair of the Cavaliers

⁶⁷ K. Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London: Printer Publishers Ltd., 1989), p. 4.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 32-68.

⁶⁹ Tosh, *The Pursuit of History*, p. 184.

⁷⁰ P. Barry, *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 33.

⁷¹ L. Gent and N. Llewellyn, 'Introduction' in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (eds.) *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 2, 6.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁷³ T. Williams, "'Magnetic Figures': Polemical Prints of the English Revolution," in *Renaissance Bodies*, p. 96.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

made them prone to ‘accusations of beastliness and femininity’, but, because this was not central to her thesis, she did not explore the implications of portraying the Cavaliers in this way.⁷⁵

A more detailed study of the relationship between ‘satirical sexual slander and political theory and polemic’ in the pamphlets of the mid-seventeenth century was undertaken by Susan Wiseman in an article entitled “‘Adam, the Father of all Flesh’: Porno-political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and after the English Civil War’ (1992). Wiseman argued that both ‘scurrilous polemic’ and texts of political theory should in fact ‘be seen as part of a continuum of political discourses using a range of rhetorical persuasive techniques’.⁷⁶ She demonstrated that sexual satire was used by the pamphleteers ‘to signal the situation of political crisis’ that had been caused by ‘the breakdown of agreement in the masculinist ordering of society’.⁷⁷ Wiseman argued that, as femininity was seen by contemporaries as the ‘other’ against which masculinity was defined, women had ‘come to represent the danger of a disappropriation of masculine power’. Wiseman therefore asserted that republican writers, like Henry Neville, had sought to demonstrate that disunity among men had called traditional patriarchal structures of power into question, which, in turn, had had profound effects on the ordering of the remainder of society, including the status of women.⁷⁸ Thus Wiseman demonstrated how gender had been used by the wartime writers to allude to broader issues of political and social disorder.

Like Williams and Wiseman, Bernard Capp’s *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578-1653* (1994) looked at the tactics which had been employed by the pamphleteer, John Taylor, to construct a polemical narrative.⁷⁹ Capp’s close analysis of Taylor’s works led him to note the use of gendered themes in both Taylor’s pamphlets and royalist ‘popular war propaganda’ as a whole. Capp commented on the sexual smears that Taylor used to belittle the parliamentarians and argued that by using the ‘caricature of the roundhead as a hen-pecked husband’ or portraying the ‘enemy as a cuckold’, he was simply utilising ‘traditional popular humour’ to ridicule the parliamentarians.⁸⁰ Like Williams, Capp noted the use of gendered language to appeal to a ‘popular’ audience, but, like her, he did not

⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 93.

⁷⁶ S. Wiseman, “‘Adam, the Father of all Flesh’: Porno-Political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and After the English Civil War’ in James Holstun (ed.) *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1992), pp. 134-35.

⁷⁷ Ibid, pp. 146-8.

⁷⁸ Ibid, pp. 145-6.

⁷⁹ B. Capp, *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578-1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 163.

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 183.

explore whether its usage might have had deeper political meanings. Instead, Capp concluded that the main outcome of Taylor's work was to 'boost royalist morale'.⁸¹

Apart from Susan Wiseman, perhaps the most influential historian in exploring the intersection of politics and gender during the 1640s was David Underdown. As we have seen, in his earlier book, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, Underdown had begun to note that the people of lower social standing used cultural symbols as a way of asserting their political allegiance in the conflict. However, it was not until the mid-1990s that Underdown began to explore the references to gender and sexual insult that littered the civil war tracts. In an article entitled 'The language of popular politics in the English Revolution' (1995), Underdown focussed his attentions on John Crouch's newsbook *The Man in the Moon*, which was a cheap publication brimming with popularist language and conservative images.⁸² Underdown demonstrated that one of the ways in which Crouch had highlighted the parliamentarians' alleged inversion of the traditional moral order was by utilising gendered language. For instance, Crouch frequently derided the prominent parliamentarian, Sir Thomas Fairfax, as 'Tom Ladle' or 'his Ladleship'. These insults referred to the skimmington ritual that was used to publicly shame a disorderly couple. A ladle – an implement with domestic and therefore feminine undertones – was often used to enact or symbolise the beating of an 'unmanly' husband. As Underdown explained, Crouch's method of attack had been carefully chosen: contemporaries believed that the social hierarchy within the family was an analogy for the hierarchies within the state, therefore disruption in one would lead to chaos in the other. By portraying Fairfax as unable to perform his manly duties in the household and keep patriarchal control over his wife, Crouch had highlighted Fairfax's complete lack of 'right to authority in the state'.⁸³ Underdown explained that Crouch had constantly resorted to 'sexual imagery and slander', because '[t]his was the metaphorical language which his readers would have used when they thought about politics'.⁸⁴ Underdown therefore demonstrated that seemingly trivial gendered insults often had deeper political connotations.

Underdown went on to explore the use of gendered language in *A Freeborn People*, published a year later. In this book Underdown argued that, by using images of the ordered household as an analogy for order within the state, contemporaries had 'ensured that

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 177.

⁸² D. Underdown, 'The Language of Popular Politics in the English Revolution', pp. 110 and 114.

⁸³ Ibid, pp. 119-120.

⁸⁴ Ibid, p. 121.

political debate was often conducted in language that made plentiful use of gendered metaphors'.⁸⁵ Contemporaries had believed that male authority was legitimate and normal, and therefore, in contrast, female authority was considered unnatural and chaotic.⁸⁶ As contemporaries had understood the correct ordering of society in these gendered terms, Underdown asserted, it was hardly surprising that they had drawn upon these vocabularies in order to explain the perceived chaos of the civil wars.⁸⁷ Underdown further explored Crouch's *Man in the Moon*, and asserted that Crouch's uses of gendered insults 'were part of the popular language of his time, and they articulated a value-system which he shared with his readers'. Crouch was, in Underdown's words,

consciously transmitting a conception of society and politics which ... [upheld] ... the authority of England's pre-war rulers, using a vocabulary and a system of symbols that came naturally both to him and to the plebeian public he was addressing.⁸⁸

Underdown's observation is a shrewd one: Crouch was attempting to make sense of the world from within a value-system which he subscribed to himself.⁸⁹

The pioneering nature of Underdown's work on the intersection of early modern gender, culture and politics can be seen in an essay collection, entitled *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (1995), which was dedicated to him. In the introduction to this book the editors, Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky, asserted that patriarchal political theory had gendered the state, by linking relationships within the family with the mechanisms of state. This led them to remark that political thought in the early modern period 'was so imbued with gender that it is difficult to imagine how historians could have overlooked it'.⁹⁰ Equally, they noted that '[i]f political debate through the early modern period was gendered' then the reverse was also true: 'debates about gender in the period were politicized. The behaviour of individuals in society was never without political implications; and the obsession with proper behaviour reflects its importance in an ordered society'.⁹¹ Building on Underdown's own work they aimed to show how '[g]enres as different as painting, newsbooks and published pamphlets' or 'verse

⁸⁵ Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, p. 15.

⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 15.

⁸⁷ Ibid, pp. 15-18.

⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 109.

⁸⁹ Ibid, pp. 110-111.

⁹⁰ Amussen and Kishlansky, 'Introduction', p. 10.

⁹¹ Ibid, p. 11.

and broadsides' described 'political events or proffer[ed] political points of view'.⁹²

Susan Amussen's own contribution in this collection is of particular relevance as the title of her essay shows, for she set out to explore 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Cultural Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England'. Just as Higgins, Mack and Fraser had examined contemporary constructions of womanhood, in this essay Amussen explored the ways in which early modern manhood had been constructed and reconstructed through various media, including the pamphlet literature of the seventeenth century.⁹³ Amussen noted that scholars had been slow to note the 'social construction of manhood' because 'the attributes of men, as of any dominant group, are naturalized, while those of subordinate groups [like women] are made deviant'.⁹⁴ Moreover she noted that conflicting definitions of manhood often existed for different social, religious or economic purposes; therefore the notion of being a 'real' man often excluded a large number of men.⁹⁵ Like Higgins, Amussen emphasised the role that language had played in shaping gender roles in the period. Equally she noted how gender was central to understanding the way that power was maintained in early modern patriarchal society.

If historians were beginning to appreciate the political purpose of the sexual slander and gendered language of the wartime pamphleteers, the work of Joad Raymond was casting further light on the newsbook genre. In his influential book *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (1996), Raymond drew on anthropological thought, postmodern ideas regarding language and meaning, and new historicist approaches, in order to explore in detail the relationship between the appearance of the newsbook and the origins of the Civil War.⁹⁶ Like Frank before him, Raymond provided a close analysis of the diverse styles of the newsbooks, which led him to comment on the 'obscene' language that was employed by certain writers. Yet Raymond had little to say on this subject, and instead centred his discussion on the changing style of the newsbooks, for example, observing the conscious decision to use conversational language in order to involve the reader in the 'ideological conflict', or to use rhyming couplets and woodcut

⁹² Ibid, p. 12.

⁹³ S. D. Amussen, 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Culture Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 215.

⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 214.

⁹⁵ Ibid, pp. 218-222.

⁹⁶ J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996), introduction.

images to appeal to the illiterate.⁹⁷ With this said, Raymond did begin to explore the use of gendered language when he came to analyse John Crouch's royalist newsbook, *The Man in the Moon*. Like Underdown, Raymond focussed on how Crouch had utilised popularist imagery for political ends.⁹⁸ He argued that Crouch 'relied heavily on figures of inversion' to demonstrate that the parliamentarians were turning the world upside down by fighting against the figurehead of authority.⁹⁹ However, while Raymond noted the various themes, including gender inversion, that were used by Crouch, he did not explore the wider significance of these themes in depth, instead, like others before him, Raymond simply concluded by saying that *The Man in the Moon* represented 'an accessible, unsophisticated commentary on politics'.¹⁰⁰

As can be seen then, by the 1980s and 1990s four theoretical and methodological approaches (gender theory, the linguistic turn, new historicism and 'new' cultural history) had begun to open up not only the various forms of the pamphlet literature, but also the different cultural themes – including gender – that the authors and editors employed. In an article published in 2004 Jason McElligott continued to fuse studies of gender, language and politics in order to argue that the sexual libelling of prominent parliamentarians by the royalist pamphleteers should not be dismissed as trivial. Focussing on a group of royalist polemicists who were active from 1647 until the 1650s, he argued that they consciously chose to use certain themes as 'part of an ambitious rhetorical strategy' which manipulated 'cultural stereotypes in order to denigrate the Parliamentarians' carefully constructed self-image'.¹⁰¹ Moreover, McElligott presented a yet more sophisticated picture of royalist polemic: drawing on the work of earlier scholars like Lois Potter,¹⁰² McElligott argued that, after the capture of the king in 1646, the royalists had consciously altered their polemical approach in an effort to appeal 'more to the heart than the head'. He claimed that the royalist polemicists had recognised that they needed to distance themselves from the absolutism which had so damaged the king's public reputation in the earlier 1640s. Therefore, he argued, '[t]he newsbooks' complete avoidance of learned, academic, or philosophical arguments should in fact be seen as evidence for the sophistication of [the

⁹⁷ Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 151, 153-168, chapter 1, esp. p. 28.

⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 72.

⁹⁹ Ibid, pp. 180-1.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, p. 181.

¹⁰¹ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 75.

¹⁰² L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 13.

royalist] propaganda effort'.¹⁰³ McElligott described the royalist newsbooks as 'sophisticated tools that consciously deployed commonplace cultural and political symbols' in order to appeal to a broad readership. He contrasted this with the ideological and intellectual arguments found in parliamentary polemic which aimed to legitimise their actions against the king.¹⁰⁴ While work remains to be done on the parliamentary writers' use of cultural symbols in the later period, McElligott is right to notice the broadening of royalist polemic in 1647 onwards and the increased use of sexual satire.

In the same year, Jerome de Groot examined the gendered themes of the royalist writers in still closer detail in an article entitled 'Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women'. Like McElligott he argued that the royalist pamphleteers had used beliefs about gender to highlight the Parliament's subversive attempts to overturn the social order. De Groot asserted that the royalists had viewed their 'national identity' as being 'gender-based and centred upon male hierarchies and the king himself'. Therefore, de Groot argued that, in royalist eyes, '[p]art and parcel of [the parliamentarians'] challenge to hierarchy and normality was a monstrous blurring of gender roles'.¹⁰⁵ De Groot therefore argued that the stories of the transgressive, 'manlike' actions of parliamentary women found in *Mercurius Aulicus* had a highly political message, in that they had demonstrated 'the emasculating consequences of the lack of patriarchal structures'.¹⁰⁶ Rather than taking such stories at face value, de Groot echoed the work of previous scholars like Underdown, and argued that they were political ploys which had utilised a gender framework that would have been widely understood. De Groot stressed that gendered language or sexual satire had been used to make reference to underlying patriarchal beliefs which had connected the gender order with the social order. Therefore, he concluded, gendered language had had powerful political implications.

While McElligott's and de Groot's work provided much-needed detail to the existing picture of the use of gendered language in the print culture of the Civil Wars, both of these studies focussed on royalist polemic. A study was still needed that compared the usage of gendered language by the pamphleteers and newsbook writers of both sides, throughout the 1640s. Diane Purkiss's *Literature, Gender and Politics during the English*

¹⁰³ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', pp. 81-2.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, pp. 80-1.

¹⁰⁵ J. de Groot, 'Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women', in J. Daybell (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 195, 197.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p. 195.

Civil War (2005) – the most lengthy and detailed study of this subject to date – has taken a step towards filling this gap. Central to Purkiss's book was the idea that the conflict had made 'masculinity and its definition newly visible by making them open to contestation'. Purkiss went on to assert that 'the nature and legitimation of masculine power' was made 'a principal political issue' during the 1640s.¹⁰⁷ In attempting to understand the repeated references to gender throughout the wartime literature, Purkiss stated that it would be too easy to assume that 'the content of such works' can be classed as 'rational ideas' – as political advertisements for one or other party, for instance. Instead she turned to psychoanalytical theory in order to argue that the psychological pressures of war that were faced by men meant that not even terms like 'honour and violence' – concepts that have been considered to be masculine 'constants' by historians – came 'through ... the Civil War years unchanged, or unquestioned'.¹⁰⁸ The chaos of war, Purkiss argued, led men to attempt to reassert their manhood in ways that were not traditionally seen to be manly. As an example she cited the violence that had allegedly been committed against a young mother in Cornwall by a group of royalists.¹⁰⁹

Yet Purkiss's lack of engagement with the political agenda of the tracts makes her conclusions somewhat unconvincing at times. With reference to the incident at Lostwithiel in Cornwall, for example, Purkiss claims that the royalist soldiers had attacked the young mother because they saw themselves as being '*too* like her', for while she was tainted with the blood of childbirth, they had the blood of the battlefield on their hands. Purkiss asserts that, by throwing her into the river they were 'symbolically cleansing' both the woman and themselves, thereby reasserting their manhood. Leaving aside the somewhat perplexing claim that the royalists would have attempted to purify themselves through 'ducking' the woman, Purkiss's analysis fails to note that all of the tracts which she has cited in connection with this event were written by parliamentary pamphleteers.¹¹⁰ Given that the Parliament's main field army had suffered a crushing defeat at Lostwithiel, the account of royalist cruelty might well have been an attempt on the part of the Roundhead writers to retain the moral high ground by portraying their enemies as the epitome of anti-patriarchal, unchristian manhood: through their alleged behaviour the Cavaliers showed themselves to

¹⁰⁷ D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 233-4.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, pp. 2-3, 233-34.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, esp. introduction and pp. 229-232.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, esp. introduction and pp. 229-232.

be unreasonable, lacking in self-control and excessively violent towards those who should have been afforded patriarchal protection. As we will see over the following chapters, the pamphleteers of both sides repeatedly made such claims about their opponents throughout the conflict. Moreover, throughout the Civil War each side claimed that the other had committed acts of atrocities against the most defenceless members of society, like women, children and the elderly.¹¹¹ There is, then, some doubt as to whether the incident to which Purkiss refers actually took place. If it did, it is surely problematic to attempt to analyse the psychological motives of a group of men through the claims that were made against them by their political opponents. In other words, the literature does not provide such an unproblematic window into the early modern psyche as is suggested by Purkiss's analysis.

As well as arguing that the references to gender within the tracts betrayed the psychological pressures of the conflict, Purkiss also argued that beliefs about gender were used to legitimate one party's claim to power by associating that party with manly characteristics; while simultaneously invalidating the supporters of the other side by emasculating them. As an example she demonstrated how the parliamentary writers had increasingly portrayed the king as weak and effeminate and argued that the parliamentarians had used this emasculated image of Charles to question his suitability for the throne.¹¹² Purkiss also offered some fascinating insights into the ways in which each side constructed manhood. She noted that central to the constructions of manhood of both sides was the belief that manhood was a balance between assertiveness and self-control. Hardly surprisingly, in view of the bloodshed that had gripped the land, both sides had viewed – what Purkiss terms – '[e]xcessive masculinity' as a negative characteristic, which had 'a curious tendency to tip over into problematic femininity through tropes of loss of control'. Purkiss explained that, '[b]ecause masculinity is always about mastery, even masculine failures of mastery are unmasculine'.¹¹³ She also highlighted the intriguing possibility of a connection between different constructs of manhood and social status. When referring to Charles she claimed that 'many of the aspects of Charles' image which sometimes looked effeminate were chosen because they spoke of elevated social class'.¹¹⁴ Here Purkiss pointed out how other identities, like social standing, had overlapped with

¹¹¹ G. Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 60-66; and B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 28, 137-38.

¹¹² Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, pp. 100-4.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 136; for images of Charles see chapter 4; for images of Cromwell see chapter 5.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

gender identities.

Purkiss is right to remind us of the pressures that men faced as combatants during a time of widespread civil conflict: it is hoped that the present dissertation will complement her study by examining the political motives behind the pamphleteers' use of gendered language. As will be seen over the following chapters and as has been argued in more recent monographs by Jason Peacey and Jason McElligott, the wartime pamphleteers were not only attempting to make sense of the unsettling events as they unfolded before their eyes, but, at times, they were writing with very deliberate political intentions.¹¹⁵ Therefore the references to gender within the wartime tracts should not only be understood as a reassertion of the gender framework at a time when it was perceived to be threatened by the disorder of war or by the actions of a rival male political group. Instead, the pamphleteers' repeated references to gender should also be seen as rational, political messages in their own right.

Part 1.5 - Sexuality and Social Order

Finally, as much of the invective that was printed by the wartime pamphleteers of both sides took the form of sexual insult, it is also necessary to examine the research that has been undertaken on contemporary understandings of sexuality in order to examine how knowledge about the body was used to order people's lives and support the patriarchal social order. An exploration of alternative sexualities during the Civil War would no doubt be highly illuminating, but unfortunately – because of the size of the subject – this is work that the current thesis is not able to undertake.

Scholarly work on the subject of sexuality in early modern England began as early as 1959 when the social historian, Keith Thomas, set out to explore the history of the sexual double standard. Thomas defined this concept as 'the view that unchastity, in the sense of sexual relations before marriage or outside of marriage' was a 'mild and pardonable offense' for a man (that is, if it was considered an offense at all) whereas for a woman the same behaviour was 'a matter of the utmost gravity'.¹¹⁶ Once Thomas had established the ubiquity of the double standard in the early modern period, he went on to explore religious attempts to promote chastity in both men and women, attempts which he claimed grew

¹¹⁵ J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 1, 11, 19, 51; McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', pp. 80-2; and J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2007), pp. 103-4.

¹¹⁶ K. Thomas, 'The double standard' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20: 2 (April 1959), p. 195.

stronger with the Reformation. Thomas also argued that criticisms of the double standard emerged around the seventeenth century when, among the middling sorts, there arose 'a new and heightened emphasis upon the values of family life' which censured 'any aristocratic or libertine conduct which would be likely to jeopardize domestic security'. Thomas asserted that this was 'a middle-class morality, which the rich despise[d] and the poor ... [could not] afford'. This led him to claim that the double standard was 'not to be found in all levels of English society with the same intensity'. 'In particular', he noted, it was 'much less marked in the lower classes' because of their crowded living conditions.¹¹⁷ Thomas concluded this groundbreaking article by considering the rationale behind the double standard. He asserted that, men desire 'absolute property in women', and it is from 'this prime insistence on woman's chastity' that 'most of the other social restrictions upon her conduct' has emerged. That same insistence, he concluded, had resulted 'not only in two separate codes of conduct, but in a highly exaggerated view of the innate differences between the two sexes themselves'.¹¹⁸

Lawrence Stone's seminal text *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, published in 1977, made further attempts to explore both elite and 'plebeian' attitudes to sexuality. Like Thomas, Stone noted the existence of the double standard within the aristocracy and gentry and claimed that this was because women were considered to be the sexual property of men in order to ensure the legitimacy of any heirs and therefore the safe transfer of property within the family. Stone went on to explore the importance of 'honour' for this social group, and noted that the term had differing meanings for men and women. He defined male honour as being, above all, centred on considered truthful, whereas female honour was solely about chastity; although, Stone did note that a married man's reputation could be 'severely damaged' if he was considered to be a 'cuckold'. A cuckold was a man who was unable to sexually satisfy his wife, and whose wife therefore sought sexual gratification from another man. The term 'cuckold' was therefore a slur on both the target's 'virility and his capacity to rule his own household'. Within the upper ranks of society such a man would also be thought unfit for public office.¹¹⁹ Accusations of sexual misconduct were therefore an effective way of challenging the social worth of another man.

If the double standard was relatively prevalent amongst the aristocracy and gentry,

¹¹⁷ Ibid, pp. 203-206.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, pp. 207-216.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, pp. 315-316.

Stone argued that pre-marital sex was treated far more leniently amongst the lower orders so long as the community knew that marriage would quickly follow. Drawing upon anthropological writers, Stone argued that '[p]re-marital chastity is a bargaining chip in the marriage game, to be set off against male property and status rights'. Based on this premise, Stone argued that 'virginity was not important' to the poor because they were 'without property or status'. Despite this laxer attitude to pre-marital sexuality amongst the lower social orders, Stone also noted a decline in 'pre-marital and extra-marital sexual activity from the sixteenth to the early seventeenth century' and argued that this was largely due to the influence of Puritanism.¹²⁰ Indeed, Stone claimed that the church had had a key role in formulating contemporary opinion about acceptable sexual behaviour. Stone argued that the church considered '[s]ensuality itself, the lust of the flesh' to be 'evil': a husband and wife should have sexual relations for procreation, not for mere pleasure alone. Stone linked this religious attitude to sexual intercourse to the view of women that was based upon the book of Genesis. Women were marked as the descendents of Eve who were thought to be prone to 'fickleness and ... sexual arousal'. They were therefore viewed, 'as a constant threat to the monogamous nuclear family'.¹²¹

Geoffrey Quaife directly responded to a number of Stone's arguments in his book *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives* (1979). Quaife's own study of ecclesiastical and secular courts in Somerset led him to note how few references there were to God when the lower orders spoke of their sexual behaviour.¹²² Instead, Quaife claimed that the ways in which the people upheld the moral reputation of their community demonstrated how they shared cultural assumptions, which meant that certain behaviour aroused widespread suspicion of sexual immorality.¹²³ Yet, Quaife then went on to argue that there were three competing sexual norms within village communities: respectable women were bound by their fathers or husbands to Christian ideas of morality, that is, to be virgins until marriage and then chaste within marriage. Men on the other hand 'had almost complete sexual freedom provided it did not impinge on the property rights of other men'. Finally, Quaife identified a third sexual norm that he termed 'amoralism' which he claimed existed amongst the majority of the very poor. Among this group Quaife argued that pre-marital

¹²⁰ L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage* (London: Penguin, 1979), pp. 382-401.

¹²¹ Ibid, pp. 303-309, 311-315.

¹²² G. R. Quaife, *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), p. 244.

¹²³ Ibid, pp. 178, 38-54.

intercourse was seen as a perfectly acceptable beginning to marital intercourse.¹²⁴

More recently Martin Ingram has, in turn, rightly questioned Quaife's picture of three competing sexual norms within early modern communities. Ingram disagreed with the idea that Christian values had not filtered down to the masses and claimed that Quaife's argument was based on the 'dubious assumption' that 'the relentless thrust of the libido could not possibly be contained within the patterns of late marriage ... and monogamy ... and that various forms of extramarital sexuality must therefore have been widespread'.¹²⁵ Ingram turned to popular shaming rituals and the language of defamation in order to better examine 'popular attitudes to illicit sexuality'.¹²⁶ This led him to assert that such accusations demonstrate that among the poorer elements of the community there was 'a degree of popular intolerance of blatant immorality'.¹²⁷ Ingram's assertion is supported by the numerous accusations of sexual impropriety and immorality which can be found in many of the wartime tracts during the 1640s, for sexual insults of this nature would have lost their force if they had been insignificant to a large swathe of the population. Ingram went on to argue that women were 'more sensitive, and probably more subject, to sexual slander' because 'fornication and adultery were more seriously regarded in the female than in the male' and because such behaviour went against the male definition of womanhood which 'conventionally assigned passive, dependent, home-based roles to women'. In contrast, male reputation centred on integrity in business dealings, social rank and truthfulness. But, as well as noting these differing definitions of male and female reputation, Ingram also cautioned against pushing the double standard too far. Considerable numbers of men were sensitive to sexual slander: indeed, Ingram argued that 'cuckoldry is the 'male counterpart of 'whore' according to the logic of the double standard'.¹²⁸ Ingram, then, pointed to a consensus in contemporary views of sexual morality, regardless of social standing. This consensus was largely due to the importance that was placed upon the household as the most fundamental unit in the social order. Ingram pointed to the contemporary belief that 'royal and patriarchal authority were mutually validating reflections or natural manifestations of a divinely ordered hierarchy'. In light of these ideas, extra-marital sexual activity was considered to be odious to God and

¹²⁴ Ibid, pp. 14, 178-183.

¹²⁵ M. Ingram, *Church courts, sex and marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 160-61.

¹²⁶ Ibid, p. 163.

¹²⁷ Ibid, pp. 164-65.

¹²⁸ Ibid, pp. 303-313.

also damaging to the social order of the commonwealth.¹²⁹ As will be demonstrated over the following chapters, it was the moral and social implications of sexual misconduct which made accusations of this nature so damaging to a person's reputation, but also to the justness of an army's cause.

Susan Amussen went on to explore the interrelationship between gender and social hierarchies in the early modern period in her book, *An Ordered Society* (1988). Beginning with the notion that the most fundamental unit of social order was the household, Amussen argued that it fell to men to maintain order within the household, which would, in turn, ensure the broader social order. Amussen therefore demonstrated how the insults that were levelled against men had social implications, for instance '[m]en complained of being called thieves, drunkards and blasphemers, as well as of critical assaults on their social position'. Even sexual insults like 'cuckold' or 'fornicator' were used to show how a man threatened either household order or the broader social structure.¹³⁰ Amussen also considered how the term 'credit' bound together moral and economic worth, creating 'high expectations for local elites in early modern England' by making them responsible for 'governing and caring for their inferiors' in both their household and the local community.¹³¹ Amussen had noted how patriarchal ideology made the gender order and the social order mutually supportive. It also made men primarily responsible for the preservation of the social order.

In order to better understand the social implications of contemporary beliefs about sexuality, Thomas Laqueur turned to examine contemporary understandings of the body and how these understandings had changed over time in order to serve cultural ends. Laqueur advanced the concept of the 'one-sex' body: an idea that had originated with the ancient medical and philosophical writers, Galen and Aristotle, and which stated that the male and female genitals were anatomically the same. Contemporaries argued that it was women's lack of humoral heat which meant that she did not have the strength to push her genitals outwards, leaving them inverted within her body. Medical arguments of women's inherent weakness stemmed from this premise.¹³² However, Laqueur argued that the concept of the one-sex body, while justifying women's weakness, also made many male

¹²⁹ Ibid, p. 125.

¹³⁰ S. Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 102-104.

¹³¹ Ibid, pp. 152-155.

¹³² T. Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 52-61, 63, 114-144.

contemporaries anxious. As he explains, an ‘open body in which sexual differences were matters of degree rather than kind confronted a world of real men and women and of the clear juridical, social, and cultural distinctions between them’. Because contemporaries believed that sexual difference did not define gender, there was a real concern that women and men could change sex if they did not display the correct gendered behaviour. For instance, Laqueur argued that social commentators were particularly concerned that male courtiers would become effeminate because of their adherence to court fashions and their continual socialising with women.¹³³ According to Laqueur, because the body had no marker of sexuality itself, a ‘penis was thus a status symbol rather than a sign of some other deeply rooted ontological essence’ or, what he terms, ‘*real sex*’.¹³⁴ A great emphasis was therefore placed upon men and women conforming to gendered codes of behaviour and dress, and contemporaries expressed concern when these boundaries were purposefully blurred.

In the mid-1990s, an edited collection was published by Roy Porter and Mikulás Teich which set out to further ‘investigate the shaping of sexual knowledge’ through language and discourse.¹³⁵ Within this volume, Patricia Crawford’s article, entitled ‘Sexual knowledge in England, 1500-1750’, demonstrated how the ideas which early modern physicians referred to as ‘knowledge’, could ‘be analysed as an ideology which functioned as a means of reinforcing social distinctions and the differences between men and women’. Crawford pointed to a ‘range of ideas about sexuality’. Beginning with medical and theological knowledge, she demonstrated how the church promoted ‘heterosexual, genital’ sex, that should be ‘confined to marriage’ where it would promote the happiness and affection of the union.¹³⁶ These ideas were influenced by medical opinion which claimed that regular sexual intercourse (within marriage) was essential for the good health of both men and women.¹³⁷ Once Crawford had explored theological and medical discourses surrounding sexuality, she then turned to examine popular knowledge. She noted that women had to be guarded or modest in their speech about sexual matters in order to protect their reputations. Men were freer to speak about sexual matters, but their speech

¹³³ Ibid, pp. 122-125.

¹³⁴ Ibid, pp. 124, 239, 134-135.

¹³⁵ ‘Introduction’ in R. Porter and M. Teich (eds.) *Sexual Knowledge and Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 7.

¹³⁶ P. Crawford, ‘Sexual Knowledge in England, 1500-1750’ in R. Porter and M. Teich (eds.) *Sexual Knowledge and Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 82-90.

¹³⁷ Ibid, pp. 85-89.

demonstrated their anxieties about women's supposedly insatiable sexual appetites and their abilities to bewitch men or weaken their virility through sexual intercourse.¹³⁸

The disparity between elite medical opinion and popular sexual knowledge was further explored by Laura Gowing. Examining the language of sexual insult, Gowing argued that the one-sex body was a 'rhetorical' model that functioned as 'a tool for physiological investigation and demonstration'. Gowing went on to assert that 'there is little evidence' that the 'one-sex' body 'shaped popular perceptions'. To support this assertion she argued that, when insulting one another, men and women stressed sexual difference rather than similarity. 'Sexual insult belonged to a culture that perceived women's virtue, honour, and reputation through their sexuality, men's through a much wider range of values' Gowing explained. This was because of the importance that early modern society placed upon the family: if a woman was unfaithful it had far more damaging implications for familial order because it had the potential to introduce a bastard into the family. Gowing then went on to explore how '[s]exual honour was overwhelmingly a female concern'. She demonstrated that a woman's chastity was thought to be inferred from her behaviour. For instance, a woman who continuously babbled, who used 'falsifying cosmetics' or who behaved in a disreputable way ran the risk of being branded as a 'whore'. Despite the arguments of conduct book writers that men and women were both culpable for illicit sex, Gowing pointed to the evidence from defamation cases which suggested that, in reality, it was usually the woman who was held culpable: male promiscuity frequently went unpunished. To further illustrate this point, Gowing remarked that there was no way of calling a man a 'whore' or of condemning his promiscuity. Even men who were described as 'cuckolds' had their reputations tarnished 'through the sexuality of their wives'. Gowing therefore argued that, 'only women's sexual misconduct damage[d] the household honour'.¹³⁹

Gowing's contentious argument that the honour of a household solely rested on the wife's sexual reputation began to be questioned by Elizabeth Foyster in her contribution to a special edition of *The Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, published in 1996. In this article Foyster argued that, regardless of their social status, men were only considered 'worthy of honour if they could demonstrate control over their wives, children and

¹³⁸ Ibid, pp. 92-100.

¹³⁹ L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 2-4, 61-86, 106-108, 114, 132.

servants'. In order to 'achieve that power or control' men were encouraged to display their greater physical strength and reason: two characteristics which she claimed distinguished men from women. Foyster went on to demonstrate how a husband's excessive violence towards his wife could end up threatening rather than enforcing his patriarchal authority within his family. Extreme male violence was considered to be a problem because it created disorder and could even jeopardise 'a husband's claim to manhood' because it highlighted his lack of reason.¹⁴⁰ Given the necessity of male violence during a time of war, this dissertation will explore the fine line between reasonable expressions of strength, and behaviour that was deemed to be excessively violent and, therefore, unmanly.

In a book-length study of *Manhood in Early Modern England*, Foyster went on to argue that, central to contemporary notions of manhood, was the idea that a man had to maintain control over the women in his household, thereby demonstrating his superior capacities for reason and strength. Foyster claimed that, in the eyes of contemporaries, it was a husband's '[l]oss of sexual control [which] was at the heart' of disorder within his household. Such a belief meant that men were most eager to defend their sexual reputation, for, 'without the basis of a worthy sexual reputation, all other claims to social status were severely weakened'. She therefore concluded that it 'was gender, and not social class, which frequently set the benchmark of expectations for male behaviour.' Foyster went on to explore male contemporary attitudes to illicit sex. She demonstrated that, while evidence can be found of young men boasting of their pre-marital sexual experience within their male friendship groups, they also became fearful when their boasts reached the ears of the woman in question's father or, indeed, their own father or master. Having demonstrated that illicit sexual relations 'could clearly bear much relevance to a man's reputation', Foyster then went on to demonstrate how 'discrediting a man sexually could be seen by rivals as an effective means to threaten his public position'. Without a worthy sexual reputation, 'no claim to status or prestige within his community could be sustained'. Foyster concluded by asserting that 'it was always' considered to be 'the man who was at fault for the breakdown in familial order'.¹⁴¹

The importance that early modern men placed upon their sexual reputations was also illustrated by Bernard Capp in an article published in 1999. Taking as his subjects the

¹⁴⁰ E. Foyster, 'Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 215-219, 221.

¹⁴¹ E. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 29-30, 39, 41-44, 118, 121, 138.

middling sorts and 'honest poor', Capp began by noting the complex and 'sometimes contradictory' nature of male sexual culture at this time. Capp also explored the boasts of young men in largely male environments, such as the alehouse, however, Capp also noticed that older, married men who behaved in similar ways were 'often viewed with repugnance'. This led Capp to note that '[m]ale sexual values were related to age, and to marital and social status'. Capp was rightly critical of Gowing's claims that 'sexual defamation of men related to their wives' behaviour, not their own', and instead asserted that men frequently expressed concern that they would be punished for their promiscuity. Even more suggestively, Capp cited examples of wayward husbands who recognised that, if their wives discovered their sexual transgressions, then they risked losing their moral authority in their households. Capp concluded by asserting that, for 'respectable householders ... sexual reputation played an important part in maintaining moral, social and domestic position'.¹⁴²

Most recently, Alexandra Shepard has argued that male and female reputations have appeared to be 'incommensurable' because historians have explored slander by utilising church court records. As a case could only be heard in the church courts if a spiritual crime was alleged to have been committed, 'which overwhelmingly concerned sexual morality', Shepard argued that 'the terms in which reputation was contested' in the church courts would be influenced by 'this legal context'. For her own study, Shepard turned to the Cambridge University court records, because their jurisdiction covered both temporal and spiritual crimes. She therefore argued that, the 'slander litigation entered in this forum' was 'more representative of the broader foundations of reputation in early modern England than that heard separately in either the ecclesiastical or the common law courts'.¹⁴³ Based on this evidence, Shepard noted that only half of the insults against women were concerned with chastity; in contrast, almost a third of the slander directed at University men and a fifth of that directed at townsmen concerned sexual misconduct. Shepard concluded that there was 'considerable overlap between men and women's concerns about sexual honesty', although she also noted that the seriousness with which a man's sexual misconduct was viewed depended upon his age and social standing within the community. Shepard argued that, 'powerful counter-codes of male sexual prowess and bravado' circulated within society and were in 'uneasy tension' with 'the codes of celibacy established by official

¹⁴² B. Capp, 'The double standard revisited: plebeian women and male sexual reputation in early modern England', *Past and Present* 162 (1999), pp. 70-74, 98.

¹⁴³ A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 155-156.

regulations and moralists'. These codes of sexual prowess gained currency amongst certain men, for instance those who were too young to receive the patriarchal privileges and status that accompanied setting up one's own household.¹⁴⁴ Shepard concluded by noting that, '[s]everal codes of sexual conduct appear to have operated simultaneously amongst early modern men and women'.¹⁴⁵ Over the following chapters it will become apparent that the wartime pamphleteers recognised only too well the damaging affects of sexual insult for the reputations of both men and women. Moreover, given the contemporary belief that a man's reputation was a clear indicator of his ability to hold a position of responsibility within society, sexual slander also had clear political implications during a time of Civil War, when political power was being contested by two rival male groups.

This chapter has shown how the gendered language and sexual insult which was so all-pervading in the wartime tracts first came to be noticed and tentatively explored by scholars. It has shown that initially historians were quick to distance themselves from the scurrilous remarks and bawdy humour of the pamphlets, which demonstrated only too well that they had been written for a popular audience. It was the gradual erosion of certain social taboos during the nineteenth century which opened up the pamphlets for academic study. Yet, during the same period, the claim that History should be about nation-building and politics meant that historians who followed in Ranke's footsteps tended to focus in on the political importance of the pamphlets. It was not until the turn of the twentieth century that historians began to examine in any detail the role that the printed literature had played in politicising the wider nation; while the advent of 'history from below' and social history meant that the popular appeal of the printed literature was its most intriguing feature.

Perhaps the most significant development, however, was brought about by feminism, women's history and the later development of gender history. Through the study of femininity and masculinity in different historical periods, historians began to appreciate how power operated through social constructions of gender. By the 1990s new approaches to the study of gender, language and the intersection of politics and culture had filtered into the wider History discipline with far-reaching consequences for the study of the tracts of

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, pp. 160-167, 121, 172. See also M. E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 304-305.

¹⁴⁵ Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 172-73.

the English Civil Wars. Similarly, the work of social historians and gender historians has done much to illuminate the history of attitudes to, and knowledge about, sexuality: thereby enabling scholars like Gowing, Capp and Foyster to appreciate the important social implications behind sexual insult. The scholars whose work has been discussed in the preceding pages have made a vital contribution in beginning to explore how gendered language and sexual insult were put to political ends by the wartime pamphleteers. However, much of this work has been piecemeal, and has concentrated on individual authors or newsbooks. A much more thorough analysis of the pamphlet literature is therefore needed, as there are a number of pressing questions which remain to be explored. How and why did the pamphleteers make use of gender, for example? Was gendered language and sexual insult used differently by the polemical writers of each side? And how did the use of gender stereotypes develop over the course of the war? These are the central questions that the present thesis will explore.

Chapter II:
'Womanish' Cavaliers:¹ The Use of Gendered Language by
Parliamentarian Pamphleteers, 1642-46

In order to fully understand the meaning of the wartime pamphleteers' repeated references to gender, we must first examine the beliefs about manhood and womanhood which were generally held in the years before the outbreak of the conflict. In order to justify the patriarchal hierarchy, contemporaries referred to the supposed humoral composition of the body and stated that a man's hotter and drier humours made him more inclined to be mentally, physically and morally strong. In contrast, the *Homily on Marriage* referred to 'the woman' as 'a weak creature, not endued with like strength and constancy of mind'.² While women were believed to be ruled by their passions, men's greater mental strength was thought to make them better able to order their own persons, which in turn justified their position to govern others, whether in the household or in the wider commonwealth.³ As Edmund Tilney explained, men were more suited to govern, because this was a role that required '*capacitie to comprehend, [and] wisdom to understand ... all which are commonly in a man, but in a woman verye rare*'.⁴ 'Reason' was therefore seen as an important characteristic which separated men from women and which made men more fit to hold positions of power.⁵ Indeed, in order to be considered worthy of a position of responsibility – whether over a considerable estate or a single household – men were expected to demonstrate continually their greater capacity for self-mastery and reason. As the conduct book writers John Dod and Robert Clever explained, it would be 'impossible

¹ E.10[10], *The souldiers language. Or, A discourse between two souldiers* (NPP: 26 September* 1644), unpaginated

² 'An Homily of the State of Matrimony', in *Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1802), p. 427; E. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), p. 30; J. Eales, *Women in Early Modern England 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press Ltd., 1998), p. 3.

³ E. Foyster, 'Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), p. 215; Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 30; and A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 70.

⁴ STC/ 1609:05, E. Tilney, *A Briefe and Pleasant Discourse of Duties in Marriage, Called the Flower of Friendshippe* (NPP: 1571), unpaginated (my italics).

⁵ A. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 69, 70, 76, 112; S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 34; Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 29-30; and Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, passim, esp. 9.

for a man to understand how to govern the common-wealth, that doth not know to rule his own house, or order his own person'. They went on to assert that 'he that knoweth not to govern, deserveth not to reign'.⁶

In stressing particular characteristics, Alexandra Shepard has argued that conduct book writers, like Dod and Clever, were not concerned that men 'were failing to be men *per se*, but that they were failing to be men *on the right terms*'. Conduct book writers advanced definitions of 'manhood in broadly patriarchal terms of discretion, reason, moderation, self-sufficiency, strength, self-control, and honest respectability'. In other words, it was thought necessary for manhood to coincide 'with the patriarchal agenda for an ordered society'.⁷ For instance, men were considered to be physically stronger than women and, at certain moments, violence was considered an acceptable way for a man to reassert his manhood when it was called into question.⁸ Yet, contemporaries recognised that male violence could also be problematic when it was uncontrolled; as the contemporary William Drake wrote in his commonplace book, 'Fallen man was a wild beast' who was 'more dangerous than any other creature because [he was] possessed of depraved reason'.⁹ Men were considered to have a greater capacity for reason than a woman, therefore their failure to be self-disciplined was viewed as a more serious transgression.¹⁰ As Elizabeth Foyster and Diane Purkiss has argued, '[v]iolence only reinforced male identity when it could be seen as controlled'. 'Outside those parameters', violence was considered to be a failure of patriarchal manhood.¹¹ In a similar way, men were encouraged to temper their lusts because it was believed that immoderate sexual intercourse could weaken a man and lead to sterility.¹² Drawing on their understanding of the humoral body, medical writers claimed that the loss of heat which a man suffered during ejaculation left him weaker, whereas

⁶ STC / 1790:06, J. Dod and R. Clever, *A Godly Forme of Household Government: for the ordering of private families, according to the direction of God's Word* (London: 1612). See also Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 4.

⁷ Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 9-10.

⁸ Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 30-1. See also Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, chapter 5, esp. pp. 87-94, 131-33.

⁹ Cited in K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 209.

¹⁰ Foyster, 'Male honour, social control and wife beating', pp. 215-24. It was this reasoning that made men accountable for the transgressions of their dependents; see Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 33; and B. Reay, *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1998), p. 6.

¹¹ D. Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity' in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), p. 232; see also Foyster, 'Male honour, social control and wife beating', pp. 215-24.

¹² Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. 12, 46-56; M. Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 50; Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 20; and Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 74.

sexual intercourse made a woman healthier because of the hot humours she received from her male partner.¹³

In order to fulfil their patriarchal roles within society, then, men had to constantly prove that they were reasonable, moderate, self-sufficient, and physically and emotionally strong.¹⁴ If a man failed to behave in these ways he risked damaging his honour or reputation. In early modern England a person's reputation within their community was extremely important, for it affected their social status and therefore their livelihood.¹⁵ While a good reputation was important to all men, 'its attributes varied according to rank and position'. For instance, elite men adhered 'to a specific code of honour' which 'set them apart from their inferiors'.¹⁶ In contrast, men of lower social standing were more likely to refer to their reputation, credit, or even simply their 'good name'.¹⁷ Elizabeth Foyster has argued that gentry honour codes emphasised that '[a]bove all else, men ... were only held worthy of honour if they could demonstrate control over their wives, children and servants. Hence honour was a concept which was vital to the upholding of male power'.¹⁸ Indeed, it was almost certainly the case that, as gentlemen and noblemen were greater beneficiaries of patriarchy because of their higher position within the patriarchal social structure,¹⁹ that this also meant that any failure on their part to behave appropriately might have been seen as more damaging to the patriarchal system, for it had the potential to not only bring disorder to one household, but to the wider community. Fletcher argues that honour was 'the concept through which the gentry attempted to live out their manhood in relation to their destined patriarchal role'.²⁰ Strict honour codes therefore ensured that the privileged position of the elite was protected by creating mutual bonds of deference and obligation which strengthened the social fabric, but which also delineated the power of elite

¹³ Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 12.

¹⁴ Fletcher, Breitenburg and Foyster all argue that manhood needed to be continually asserted: see Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 402; Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities*, p. 1; and Foyster, *Manhood*, esp. p. 55.

¹⁵ Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 7; Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 215; Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 103; and Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, p. 226.

¹⁶ F. Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), p. 201. For a comparison of contemporary definitions of female honour and male honour see Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, pp. 2, 107, 110, 129. See also S. D. Amussen, 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Culture Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, pp. 213-227.

¹⁷ Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. 126-153; and Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 32-33.

¹⁸ Foyster, 'Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England', p. 215.

¹⁹ Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 4, 246-47.

²⁰ Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 152.

men.²¹ After all, contemporaries recognised that honour was ‘an externally bestowed quality which depended on the good opinion of one’s peers’.²²

A man’s ability to order his household was also considered central to his good reputation or credit amongst men of lower social standing.²³ Foyster claims that it was a man’s ability to keep sexual control of his wife that was central to his reputation. ‘In their bid for power’, she argued, ‘men in the seventeenth century constructed a language of honour which rewarded those who attained sexual control over women, and could be employed to insult those who challenged or undermined male authority’. Therefore, to call a man a ‘cuckold’, was one of the most damaging ways to insult a man, as this suggested that he had lost control of his wife by being unable to satisfy her sexually. Implicitly, through his failure, such a man offered a challenge to the patriarchal system, and so it fell to the wider community to shame the disorderly couple and to reassert the gender order. Foyster asserts that without a worthy sexual reputation ‘all other claims to social status were severely weakened’.²⁴ While Foyster argues that a man’s ability to control his wife through regular sexual intercourse was central to his reputation, Susan Amussen asserts that a man’s position within the social order was dependent upon a ‘complex combination of sexual behaviour, familial relations and relations with their neighbours’. For instance, to call a man a thief or a drunk had implications for his social position within the community as well as his ability to provide for his family.²⁵ Similarly, Shepard’s work on early modern notions of ‘credit’ has shown that married men were expected to be ‘diligent providers’ for their families, regardless of whether this was a realistic notion. A man who failed in this role faced disapproval from the community because he was seen to have ‘abnegated’ his responsibilities in this regard. Shepard’s study of debtors’ litigation records has highlighted how contemporaries viewed a man who ‘diverted resources from the household economy’ as ‘dishonest, negligent and unseemly’. By failing to behave appropriately and uphold the patriarchal order by providing for his dependents, he ‘lost his credit and economic standing and was excluded from the relations of trust which both bound communities and accorded status and agency’.²⁶ A man’s honour or good

²¹ J. Greene Marston, ‘Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England’ in *JBS* xiii (1973-4), pp. 27-36.

²² *Ibid*, p. 25.

²³ Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, p. 225.

²⁴ Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 39, 55, 66, 103-146, 161, 210.

²⁵ Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, pp. 102-3.

²⁶ A. Shepard, ‘Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640’, *P&P* 167 (May 2000), pp. 83-85.

reputation, then, was dependent upon his behaviour within his family but also his actions within the wider community – for instance, how he earned money or interacted with his neighbours. As Faramarz Dabhoiwala has argued, ‘ideas about honour and reputation themselves overlapped with ... other patterns of thought’ like ‘religious standards, notions of social order, and the like’. This meant that ‘in everyday practice their expression was often mixed up with elements from a much wider conceptual vocabulary’.²⁷

As will be seen over the following chapters, the pamphleteers often spoke about the allegedly disreputable behaviour of their opponents in a way that implied that, in their eyes, if a man behaved dishonourably then he automatically called into question his place in the patriarchal social order. The remainder of this chapter will explore the ways in which parliamentary pamphleteers made use of the beliefs about gender that have been briefly outlined over the previous pages. It will consider how the parliamentary writers went about constructing gender identities and whether their use of gendered language can be linked to their political leanings, or to the events of the conflict. It will also explore how, at times, the parliamentary pamphleteers’ use of gendered discourse overlapped with vocabularies of honour, but also with Christian ideas of morality and notions of civility in order to make their claims about the royalists more damaging.

At first glance, the parliamentary pamphleteers’ attempts to undermine the manhood of the royalists through the use of gendered language appear to be paradoxical. On the one hand the parliamentary pamphleteers implied that the royalists’ unrestrained aggression and lust demonstrated their *unwillingness* to control their own behaviour in order to perform their parts as men in upholding the social order. On the other hand, the parliamentary pamphleteers depicted the royalists as effeminate and weak, which, in turn, suggested that they were *unable* to fulfil their patriarchal roles within society. In the present chapter, these two apparently oppositional views of the royalists will be explored further, to see whether they are as contradictory as they initially appear to be. But before we turn to consider how the pamphleteers used language to ridicule the royalists, we must first explore how the Roundhead pamphleteers and newsmen used the medium of print to construct and encourage certain ‘manly’ characteristics that they considered essential for their own men to display in order to be successful soldiers. To this end they praised men

²⁷ F. Dabhoiwala, ‘The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England’, *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), p. 202.

who demonstrated bravery, courage and resolution in the face of the enemy, just as they derided men who acted with cowardice, fear or weakness.

Part 1.1 – ‘Quit yourselves like men’:²⁸ Constructing Manhood

In late 1641 the people of England looked to the future with a growing sense of unease. Reports of atrocities from the Thirty Years war on the continent and from the Irish Uprising in 1641 had already made their way back to England where they were circulated in printed tracts. Contemporaries now feared that England would become the stage for further horrors.²⁹ Behind these fears lay the contemporary belief that male violence, when left unchecked, could swiftly descend into bestial barbarity.³⁰ The pamphleteers of both sides therefore recognised that they needed to encourage their own men to show violence to the enemy, but simultaneously, that this violence needed to be controlled. Barbara Donagan has demonstrated that one of the ways in which male behaviour was directed was through the use of honour codes.³¹ But the pamphleteers and news-writers played just as important a role in this regard by addressing the men of their own side and encouraging them to display certain characteristics whilst simultaneously belittling others. In particular the pamphleteers applauded their own men when they behaved with self-restraint, honour, bravery, courage and valour in times of battle and the way in which these qualities were written about reinforced the notion that if the men in question wanted to be counted as ‘true’ men (that is, men who upheld the patriarchal social order) then they needed to display these ‘manly’ characteristics. The sheer number of gendered references within the parliamentary printed literature suggests that this was a primary concern for the Roundhead writers of the 1640s. Indeed, one parliamentary pamphleteer openly declared that an account of a particular episode had been included because it was ‘thought necessary for the encouragement of the Souldiers of the Parliament’.³² This chapter will now turn to explore the characteristics that parliament’s male supporters were encouraged to display in order to ensure success on the battlefield, but also in order to be counted as ‘men’.

²⁸ E.65[29], *Severall Letters of Great Importance, and Good Successe* (London: 23 August* 1643), p. 7.

²⁹ M. Braddick, *God’s Fury, England’s Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Allen Lane, 2008), p. 197.

³⁰ Purkiss, ‘Dismembering and Remembering’, pp. 226, 232.

³¹ B. Donagan, ‘Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War’, *P&P* 18 (February 1988), esp. p. 73; and B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), esp. chapters 7-8.

³² E.114[25], *A True and Perfect Relation of the first and Victorious Skirmish between the army* (London: 27 August 1642), p. 6.

As ballads were frequently used in the early modern period in order to drum up support in times of war, it seems reasonable to begin our enquiry by turning to examine the presence of gender constructs in the only call-up ballad that has survived from the opening months of the conflict.³³ Entitled *The Prentices Resolution*, the primary message of the ballad was one of encouragement to the Parliamentary soldiers that they should ‘not be afraid to fight’. Moreover, the burden was surely designed to stir up the male listeners and create a shared sense of community in the cause, with its proud declaration that:

Wee’le march with Essex,
downe with the Cavaleers now boyes.

Through the use of the pronoun ‘we’, the balladeer not only drew the listener into supporting the Parliamentary cause, but equally the author demonstrated the behaviour that was expected of the Parliamentary soldiers.³⁴ Indeed, subtle references can be found throughout the ballad which reinforced the idea that particular forms of behaviour were peculiar to manhood. For instance, the balladeer asserted that the soldiers would fight their opponents ‘with manly blowes’.³⁵

Similar gendered descriptions of parliamentary behaviour can be found in the Roundhead prose pamphlets that were printed during the summer of 1642 in order to praise individual men or regiments for their conduct. For example, it was claimed that the ‘stout and resolute’ conduct of the parliamentary troops under the command of one ‘Master Stroud’ in Somersetshire had enabled them to win a victory despite being heavily outnumbered, thus demonstrating to other men, that if they behaved bravely, there was hope that they could carry out similar deeds.³⁶ The parliamentary pamphleteers were also

³³ A. McShane-Jones, ‘Rime and Reason.’ *The Political World of the English Broadside Ballad, 1640-1689* (Phd. Thesis, University of Warwick, November 2004), p. 126

³⁴ N. Würzbach, *The Rise of the Street Ballad 1550-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 79.

³⁵ Wing / A3587A, R. White, *The Prentices resolution, or, Who have made a promise to spend their best blood for the glory of the King and the Parliaments good* (London). The Wing catalogue lists this ballad as being printed in 1650, however, as there is no date on the ballad itself, and as the ballad talks about following the Earl of Essex in order to fight for the King and Parliament this date is surely incorrect. Given the first line’s encouragement to the men to ‘Rowse up your drooping spirits’ I would suggest that this ballad was written instead at some point in 1643, when events seemed to be going in the king’s favour.

³⁶ E.112[12], *More Later and Truer Newes from Somersetshire, Boston, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire* (London: 16 August 1642), unpaginated. See also E.116[30], John Hamblet*, *A Famous and Joyfull Victory Obtained by the Earl of Stamfords Forces neere Stratford in Northampton-shire* (NPP: 10 September 1642),

swift to praise their men for behaving with such courage that they seemed to have an utter disregard for their own lives. Numerous references to this sort of behaviour can be found in the pamphlets produced during the opening months of the war. For example, in September 1642, a pamphleteer describing the taking of Southsea Castle, near Portsmouth praised the parliamentary troops for behaving ‘courageously, with as undaunted spirits as ever men went’, claiming that they were resolved to ‘die before the Gates, rather than to retreat’.³⁷

As well as subtly reinforcing the belief that qualities like bravery and steadfastness were considered essential for a man to display, at certain times the Roundhead writers openly reminded Parliament’s soldiers of their patriarchal duties as men. Many of these references can be found in the pamphlets and newsbooks that were printed in the late summer and early autumn of 1642, before the war had broken out. During this time the parliamentary writers were clearly attempting to recruit men to the parliamentary cause and were also trying to mould the inexperienced men into effective soldiers. For example, at the beginning of August, one anonymous author cautioned the male reader that, ‘no War can be more destructive to you, and all that is yours, then your owne Cowardise, if it should so far fright you from your constancy, faith and gratitude, as to make you desert this Parliament’. Thus the author tried to make Parliament’s soldiers fear the consequences of their own inappropriate behaviour more than they would fear the royalist army. The same parliamentary pamphleteer also emphasised the connection between reputable manhood and godliness, by urging the parliamentary men to act ‘with the manly alacrity of Christians’.³⁸ In doing so, this particular pamphleteer was reinforcing the legitimacy of the Parliament’s cause in both patriarchal and religious terms.³⁹ At the end of the month another Roundhead broadside further conflated the discourses of religion and gender by averring that, ‘Gods and the Parliaments enemies are stout and courageous, where they are

unpaginated; and E.115[7], *A Perfect Diurnall of the Proceedings in Hartford-shire* (NPP: 1 September 1642), p. 2.

³⁷ E.116[21], *The taking of the castle of Portsmouth* (London: 9 September 1642), pp. 4-5. See also E.118[16], *Several propositions propounded, by his Excellencie, the Earl of Essex, to the cavaleees [sic], neere Darby-shire* (NPP: 21 September 1642), unpaginated; and E.240[23], *The Latest remarkable truths, (not before printed) from Chester, Worcester, Devon, Somerset, Yorke and Lanchaster [sic] counties, as also from Scotland* (London: 4 October 1642), unpaginated.

³⁸ 669.f.6[57], *Truths from Leicester and Nottingham [sic]* (London: 1 August 1642), pp. 11, 14-15.

³⁹ Donagan, *War in England*, p. 16.

feared, and not opposed; but feeble and cowardly where manfully withstood. Then be courageous, oh England' the writer urged, 'let us labour and pray for courage'.⁴⁰

Further attempts by the parliamentary writers to openly cultivate certain characteristics within their male supporters can be found in a number of newsbooks and pamphlets published in August 1643. It is tempting to see the renewed encouragement of the parliamentary forces in the light of recent military events, as Sir William Waller had just suffered a crushing defeat at Roundway Down in Wiltshire on 13 July, and a few weeks later the royalists successfully stormed Bristol, a port of vital strategic importance. One anonymous pamphleteer attempted to encourage Parliament's male supporters at this time by declaring that the war needed a 'deep engagement'. '[W]ee should banish all thoughts of declining' the author continued, and reject 'the thoughts of safety elsewhere, to womanize our spirits'.⁴¹ Other writers urged the parliamentary forces to 'put yourselves in battell array, and quit your selves like men'.⁴² The parliamentary writer, William Prynne even suggested that 'cowards who basely fled or refused to bear Arms' should be punished by being forced to stand for three days 'in the open Market place, clad in womans apparell'. Prynne added that in ancient times this was considered 'a punishment farre worse then death it self'.⁴³ Through gendered language, these authors all reinforced the idea that if a man refused to fight then he called his manhood into question. The suggestion that such shaming punishments should be carried out surely underlined how subversive the coward's behaviour was deemed to be. One writer declared that the inhabitants of the city of Bristol had 'double cause to bewail' for not only would they have to suffer the 'Cavaliers Lordly Tiranny over them' but they would also have to face 'their own effeminate cowardice' for allowing the town to be taken in the first place.⁴⁴ In direct contrast, the parliamentary inhabitants of Exeter were described in another newsbook as having 'most manfully defended the siege' of the town.⁴⁵

In September 1643 another anonymous author assured his readers that the 'insolencies' of the Cavaliers, which he had just related, 'will inflame your zeale, and set

⁴⁰ 669.f.6[75], *Remarkable passages from Nottingham, Lichfield, Leicester, and Cambridge* (London: 1 September 1642).

⁴¹ E.65[12], *A Case of Conscience, Concerning Flying in Times of Trouble* (London: 16 August 1643), p. 9.

⁴² E.65[29], *Severall Letters of Great Importance, and Good Successe* (London: 23 August* 1643), p. 7.

⁴³ E.248[4], W. Prynne, *The Fourth Part of The Sovereigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes* (London: 28 August* 1643), p. 35.

⁴⁴ E.65[8], *Certaine Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome* (7-14 August 1643), p. 230.

⁴⁵ E.65[11], *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* (8-15 August 1643), p. 234.

you all on fire *manfully* to fight the Lords battell'.⁴⁶ It will be noted that the reader was not given the option to choose his response, if he was to be considered a Christian man then his zeal would be inflamed by the atrocities that had been allegedly committed by the Cavaliers. The author went on to urge the parliamentary army to 'bring into subjection those abominable imaginations and ungodly courses of men': in parliamentary eyes the royalists needed to be brought into 'subjection' if order was to be restored.⁴⁷ These examples all demonstrate how the language of war was infused with gendered significance at this time so as to clearly show men what was expected of them. Equally, if they fell short of this expectation the men in question knew there would be consequences which would have powerful implications for their reputations and even for their manhood.

By the end of 1643 the king appeared to have the upper hand, but the entry of the Scots into the war in January 1644 caused the conflict to begin to turn in Parliament's favour in the north. Bitter fighting continued to rage across the county in 1644 which saw twists and turns in the fortunes of both sides. It is hardly surprising then, to find renewed efforts among the authors of verse broadsides and songs to address and encourage the parliamentary soldiers. For instance, William Starbuck's *Spiritual Song of Comfort*, published in March 1644, began by encouraging the Parliament's soldiers to follow their Captains 'into the field' and urged the men, 'unto our foes let us not yeeld'. The verses of Starbuck's song contained instructions to the soldiers similar to those found in the official rules of war produced by Parliament; for example, the soldiers were given directions such as, 'The wedge of Gold let us not covet', 'Come let us stand upon our watch', 'and let us not forget to pray'.⁴⁸ By encouraging the parliamentary soldiers to obey the rules of war and to be bound by God's laws, Starbuck was asserting the justness of the Parliament's cause.⁴⁹

A few months later another anonymous author of a verse broadside listed even more clearly the qualities that were considered necessary for a soldier to possess. Thus the versifier wrote:

⁴⁶ E.1206[2], *The Power of Love* (London: 19 September* 1643), p. 40 (my italics).

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 40.

⁴⁸ 669.f.8[47], W. Starbuck, *A spirituall song of comfort* (London: 15 March* 1644). For the official ordinances of martial discipline see, Wing / 1743:03, *Lawes and ordinances of warre* (London: 1642); E.109[38], *Camp discipline, or, The souldiers duty* (London: 10 August 1642); and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 141-163.

⁴⁹ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 128-129; Braddick, *God's Fury*, p. 286.

Plucke up thy courage, thou shalt prosper well

...

For shame lift up the head; be valiant, stout,

...

Let not base feare possesse thy valiant heart,

Nor daunt thy courage.

The writer continued by listing some of the qualities that the soldiers should repress, declaring:

Let not our Spirits be possest with slumber,

Let not base cowardize our senses cumber.⁵⁰

Both the *Spiritual Song of Comfort* and *Londons Complaint* offered clear guidance to Parliament's male supporters as to how they should behave in order to be victorious in battle but also in order to be counted as 'men' – as can be seen in the admonishment that the male listeners should lift up their heads 'for shame'. They needed to be unyielding, courageous, 'valiant', 'stout', active for the cause, brave and godly but they also needed to be mindful of more practical considerations, like the rules of war and their responsibilities within the army.

In contrast to these broadsides, such explicit attempts to instil the qualities of manliness within Parliament's soldiers were found less frequently within the prose pamphlets and newsbooks as the war went on. Instead countless tracts praised the parliamentary soldiers, claiming, for instance, that that they were 'full of spirit, and no waies fearing, but expecting the approach of the enemy'.⁵¹ Another newsbook from the autumn of 1644 extolled the parliamentary soldiers as those who 'daily doe as bravely as men can do'.⁵² Even when the parliamentary infantry was abandoned by its commanders and cavalry in Cornwall in September 1644, and was forced to surrender to the royalist army *en masse*, the pamphleteers attempted to turn the subsequent defeat into a polemical

⁵⁰ 669.f.10[7], *Londons complaint and lamentation, Oxford should keep in subjugation sweet Charlemaine, our sovereign King* (London*: 21 May* 1644). See also 669.f.10[5], *The two incomparable generalissimo's [sic] of the world* (NPP: 1644).

⁵¹ E.4[32], *The True Informer* (3-10 August 1644), p. 310.

⁵² E.8[11], *The Parliament Scout* (29 August-5 September 1644), p. 501.

victory. In what was surely an attempt to save face, several tracts commended the courage of the parliamentary foot, while *Mercurius Britanicus* asserted that the parliamentary infantry, led by Skippon, ‘behaved themselves with such gallantnesse, that they much quelled the enemies courage’.⁵³

Similar examples can be found in 1645, after the New Model Army proved itself victorious in the field and the tide began to turn against the king. Thus a parliamentary preacher, one Thomas Case, praised the ‘men of War’ of the New Model Army, and claimed that their victories made their enemies unable to ‘finde their hands’ to fight.⁵⁴ Various tracts commended the New Model for its ‘Piety and Valour’,⁵⁵ once again reinforcing the link between godliness and military success that was so central to the manly image that the parliamentary presses promoted.⁵⁶ Such an image was also essential in order for the parliamentary pamphleteers to justify their military actions in religious terms; by doing so, Donagan argues, they were attempting to place their actions ‘in the tradition of just and holy wars’.⁵⁷ This can surely be explained by the Parliament’s challenge to the authority of the crown: many parliamentarians justified their actions in taking up arms against their monarch because their loyalty to God outweighed their duties to his erring representative on earth.

Contemporary beliefs about the physical, mental and moral differences between men and women meant that, throughout the conflict, certain characteristics that were considered essential for military success were also portrayed as vital components of manhood. This connection meant that if a soldier behaved inappropriately on the battlefield, then he not only jeopardised the parliamentary cause, but more significantly he reduced his own worth in society, by demonstrating that he was unable to fulfil his appropriate patriarchal roles. Moreover, while Donagan has convincingly argued that media like plays, militia drills, and news from the continental wars would have meant that contemporaries from varied social backgrounds had a basic knowledge of the rules of war

⁵³ E.8[3], *Mercurius Britanicus* (26 August–2 September 1644), p. 384. For further examples see, E.8[30], *Mercurius Civicus* (5–11 September 1644), p. 641; E.10[16], *The Scottish Dove* (27 September 1644), p. 381; and E.256[1], *A Diary, or, An Exact Journall Faithfully Communicating the Most Remarkable Proceedings in Both Houses of Parliament* (5–13 September 1644), p. 125.

⁵⁴ E.297[15], T. Case, *A sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster* (London: 22 August 1645), pp. 21–22.

⁵⁵ E.297[12], *The Moderate Intelligencer* (14–21 August 1645), p. 197; and E.297[15], Case, *A sermon Preached*, pp. 20–22.

⁵⁶ E.295[4], *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* (29 July–5 August 1645), p. 881.

⁵⁷ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 16, 20.

and what was expected of men during times of conflict, it is equally true that many of the Parliament's soldiers would have had little experience of actual fighting.⁵⁸ Therefore, throughout the conflict, the pamphleteers promoted a positive image of martial manhood, and aimed to instil this in Parliament's male supporters. Equally, when the parliamentary cause seemed threatened, the pamphleteers and newsbook writers urged their men on, reminding them of their manly duties, or even openly reprimanding them when they jeopardised the cause by falling short of the patriarchal definition of manhood.

Yet, while political motives clearly lurk behind the pamphleteers' more overt references to gender, it should also be remembered that the pamphleteers were writing from within the gender framework. Therefore the more subtle gendered descriptions of the 'manly blowes' of the parliamentary army might also be a reflection of the pamphleteers' own deeply entrenched attitudes towards gender.⁵⁹ While this is a particularly difficult point to prove, because it is almost impossible to find clear evidence of the authors' individual motives for writing, it is an important point to bear in mind when studying the seventeenth-century pamphlet material. The next section will explore how the parliamentary writers used the behaviour of the royalists to demonstrate the negative consequences when men behaved inappropriately. Implicitly the parliamentary pamphleteers were suggesting that, if the parliamentary soldiers behaved in similar ways, it would leave their own armies weak and open to attack.

Part 2.1 – 'The just contempt of understanding men':⁶⁰ Parliamentary Depictions of Royalist Unmanliness

As well as contributing to the war effort by encouraging their own men to display certain characteristics that affirmed their claim to patriarchal power, the parliamentary polemicists simultaneously undermined the martial ability and political legitimacy of the royalists by claiming that their behaviour did not fit into the patriarchal construct of manhood that was promoted by the parliamentarians. In order to portray their opponents as anti-patriarchal, the parliamentary writers drew upon two pre-existing stereotypes that would have been widely recognised by contemporaries of all social backgrounds. Firstly, they built upon the pre-existing fears and suspicions of mercenary soldiers that were already circulating and which had been further fuelled by tales of atrocities from the Thirty

⁵⁸ Ibid, pp. 25-40.

⁵⁹ Wing / A3587A, White, *The Prentices resolution*.

⁶⁰ E.109[7], *A Description of the Round-head and rattle-head* (London: 5 August* 1642), p. 6.

Years War. To this end the parliamentary writers claimed that the Cavaliers' lack of self-restraint made them excessively violent and lustful.⁶¹ This parliamentary stereotype of the unrestrained Cavalier overlapped with contemporary notions of civility in order to demonstrate how the royalists were unable to use their reason 'to conquer the bestial and present an image that was mannered and ordered'.⁶² Such unrestrained men were a danger to the most fundamental laws of English society and, therefore, presented a threat to the social order.⁶³

The second theme that the parliamentarians used to reiterate the unmanliness of the Cavaliers had its origins in popular perceptions of the debauched, effeminate courtier which had circulated long before the outbreak of Civil War. Writers of conduct books and advice manuals, like Baldassarre Castiglione, had long cautioned that men who attended court were at a greater risk of becoming 'softe and womanishe', because of their frequent contact with women and their adherence to court fashions, like curling their hair.⁶⁴ Rather than fulfilling their roles within their localities, courtiers were often seen as men of pleasure who were overly preoccupied with '[p]ompous vanities, to waste away and consume money'.⁶⁵

Worse still, when dissolute courtiers did show an interest in their duties outside court, the projects which they became involved in, such as fen-draining or commercial monopolies, often sparked protests from the common people that their ancient rights were being encroached upon by men who were intent on lining their own pockets rather than acting for the 'public good'.⁶⁶ Martin Ingram and Helen Pierce's work on the treatment of the monopolists during the early 1620s highlights how these individuals were considered to have behaved in a way that was anti-patriarchal, and thus, unmanly. For example, in 1621 Sir Francis Mitchell was forced to ride 'from Westminster to London with his face to the Horse-tail' as a punishment for his involvement in the abuse of lucrative monopolies. The similarities of this punishment to a charivari or skimmington ritual would have been obvious to contemporaries for such rituals were used in communities around the country to

⁶¹ D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 142; B. Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', *P&P* 18 (February 1988), pp. 72-3; L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 118; and Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering', p. 225.

⁶² Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 36.

⁶³ Donagan, *War in England*, p. 129.

⁶⁴ STC / 311:06, B. Castiglione, *The Courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilio* (London: 1561), unpaginated.

⁶⁵ George Roberts (ed.) *The Diary of Walter Yonge* (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 98. See also, R. Cust, 'Honour, Rhetoric and Political Culture: The Earl of Huntingdon and his Enemies' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 93.

⁶⁶ Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, pp. 107-113.

shame a disorderly couple.⁶⁷ That the Parliament chose a punishment that had such clear gender connotations, further underlined the belief that in serving their own interests rather than acting for the good of the commonwealth, these men had failed to perform their appropriate patriarchal roles. Pierce notes the similarities in the ways in which the monopolists of the early 1620s were represented and the ways in which the parliamentary pamphleteers depicted the royalists in the 1640s.⁶⁸ Both groups were portrayed as having failed in their patriarchal duties, and were therefore denied any claim to patriarchal power. The next section of this chapter will show how this theme was developed by the parliamentary pamphleteers during the English Civil War itself, and how the various facets of the parliamentarians' unmanly image of the Cavaliers evolved over time. It will demonstrate that when these various strands were combined they formed a highly damaging image of the royalists as unfit to hold patriarchal power. We will begin by examining how this polemical theme was used in the opening year of the war.

Part 2.2 – 1642: The Gathering Clouds of War

As relations between the king and parliament began to break down, it was relatively easy for the parliamentary writers to use the nation's fears of the mercenary soldier for their own party's ends. As early as January 1642 pro-parliamentarian newsbooks described the armed guards who accompanied Charles to the House of Commons in order to arrest the five members as 'bloody-minded souldiers'.⁶⁹ Underdown argues that, by the spring of 1642, 'fear of Cavalier swordsmen had spread far throughout the countryside, stimulated by exaggerated rumours of the London violence, and by the sight of the King's aristocratic guards at York'.⁷⁰ Certainly the parliamentary writers began to develop this line of polemical attack during the late summer and early autumn of 1642 as both sides began to raise armed forces. Thus an August edition of *A Perfect Diurnall* reported how the

⁶⁷ M. Ingram, 'Ridings, Rough Music and Mocking Rhymes in Early Modern England', *P&P* 105: 1 (November 1984), pp. 91-93; H. Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 78, 88, 91-93; and Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, p. 110.

⁶⁸ Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, p. 94.

⁶⁹ E.181[31], *A True Relation of the Unpareleld Breach of Parliament, by his Maiesty* (London: 1642), p. 2. See also E.133[10], *Petitions against Bishops and their Votes in Parliament* (London: 1642); E.145[21], *A Collection of Severall Speeches, Messages, and Answers of the Kings Majestie, to both Houses of Parliament* (London: 1642); E.131[16], *Matters of Note made known to all True Protestants* (London: 1642); and 669.f.3[32], *A Declaration of the House of Commons, Touching a Late Breach of their Priviledges* (London: 1642).

⁷⁰ Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, p. 142. See also I. Roy, 'Royalist Reputations: The Cavalier Ideal and the Reality' in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 97.

Cavaliers had ‘murdered some, and much abused others’ in Northamptonshire who would not submit to the Commission of Array.⁷¹ Another newsbook added that the Cavaliers had ‘pistold one man, for saying he was for the King and Parliament, and kild another for speaking on his part that was slaine, and shot divers more in the Towne’.⁷² By the middle of August the parliamentary newsbooks and pamphlets were referring to the king’s men as the ‘bloud-thirsty Cavaliers’,⁷³ the ‘leering cavilling Antagonists’,⁷⁴ or the ‘cruell Cavaleers’,⁷⁵ whose ‘acts of mercy’ even equated to ‘crueltie’.⁷⁶ The pamphleteers claimed that the Cavaliers were eager to fight for the king because they enjoyed committing mindless violence and shedding blood.⁷⁷ For instance, when rallying his besieged men at Sherborne Castle, the royalist commander Lord Paulet was said by one pamphleteer to have encouraged his men to kill ‘men, women, and children, without mercie’.⁷⁸ Thus the author not only suggested that the royalists had an insatiable appetite for killing, but also that these characteristics were highly valued and encouraged by certain royalist officers.

That the victims of these stories tended to be women made the excessive violence of the Royalist soldiers even more unacceptable, for it reinforced how their behaviour went against the grain of the patriarchal social order; women were thought to be the ‘weaker vessels’ whom reputable English men were supposed to stand up for and protect.⁷⁹ In September one newsbook reported that, in Leicester, the ‘barbarous Cavaliers’ had ‘murdered an honest women ... by shooting her with a brace of bullets through the back

⁷¹ E.202[37], *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament* (8-15 August 1642), pp. 2-3.

⁷² E.112[15], *Some speciall and considerable passages from London, Westminster, Portsmouth, Warwick, Coventry, and other places* (London: 9-16 August 1642), pp. 2, 7.

⁷³ E.114[28], *Annotations upon the late protestation: or, A true character of an affectionate minde to King and Parliament* (NPP: 27 August 1642), p. 11. See also E.110[6], *A true relation of the barbarous crueltie of divers of the bloody caveleers* (London: 11 August* 1642), unpaginated.

⁷⁴ E.112[7], *The Earle of Essex his desires to the Parliament* (London: 15 August 1642), p. 1.

⁷⁵ E.114[15], *Newes from the citie of Norwich* (London: 26 August 1642), p. 6.

⁷⁶ E.113[18], *Speciall Passages from divers parts of this Kingdome* (16-23 August 1642), p. 14.

⁷⁷ This view is expressed in E.109[21], *A New Discovey [sic] of a Designe of the French* (London: 6 August 1642), p. 4. See also 669.f.6[59], *A Letter to the Kindome [sic] of England* (London: 3 August 1642).

⁷⁸ E.119[5], *The latest remarkable truths from Worcester, Chester etc.* (London: 29 September* 1642), p. 6 and title page.

⁷⁹ Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, chapter 1, esp. p. 33; Purkiss, ‘Dismembering and Remembering’, pp. 226, 232, 234; Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 211; and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 162-65. For a discussion of contemporary attitudes to male violence against women see Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. 199-200 and Amussen, ‘The Part of a Christian Man’, p. 219; Foyster, ‘Male honour, social control and wife beating’, pp. 215-24; G. Walker, ‘Rereading Rape and Sexual Violence in Early Modern England’, *Gender and History* 10:1 (April 1998), pp. 1-25; and G. Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 51-55, 60-66.

and belly, whereupon she immediately dyed, being great with childe'.⁸⁰ While the diurnals or newsbooks reported the Cavaliers' alleged cruelties in a dispassionate tone, the occasional pamphlets used far more emotive language and provided graphic details. For example, a pamphlet recounting news from the siege of Portsmouth related how a 'yong woman [there] ... being great with child', was stopped from leaving the town by one of the 'Chichester men', who 'said to her that he would not have her go, because if the Town should be so put to it, as to want victuals, then that in her belly would eat as sweet as a yong sucking pig'.⁸¹ As Garthine Walker has argued, assaults on pregnant women were considered to be 'particularly heinous' because it was thought to be 'tantamount to attempting abortion'. Pregnant women were thought to be extremely vulnerable to attack because the maternal instinct to protect the unborn child was believed to render a woman unable 'to do any violence or wrong'. Such an attack also spurned the father of the child; it was thought to disrupt his authority over his household as well as damaging 'hitherto healthy bodies and productive household economies'.⁸² Such stories showed the danger of manhood unleashed: for every honest man's patriarchal property was at stake, including his wife and dependents.⁸³ The pamphleteers were trying to encourage support for the parliamentary cause by stressing that it was every man's duty to protect the vulnerable from such 'barbarous', 'ravinous beasts' as the Cavaliers.⁸⁴ This particular pamphleteer went on to comment ominously that, 'we may guesse that they are inclinable to shew as much mercie as the Rebels in Ireland'.⁸⁵ Tales of the atrocities that had allegedly been committed by the Catholics against the Protestants during the Irish rebellion of 1641 had slowly filtered into England where they had spread like wildfire; likening the Cavaliers to

⁸⁰ E.118 [10], *Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places* (13-20 September 1642), p. 41. See also E.121 [31] *Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places* (4-11 October 1642), p. 70.

⁸¹ E.112[35], *The Copy of a Letter Presented by a Member of the Commons House of Parliament* (London: 19 August 1642), pp. 6-7. See also E.115[22], *An Abstract of some Letters sent from Dorchester, to some Friends in London* (London: 6 September* 1642), p. 4.

⁸² Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order*, pp. 60-62.

⁸³ A. Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1984), pp. 10, 147-8; and Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 47.

⁸⁴ E.121[41], *A Continuation of Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages from Both Houses of Parliament* (8-12 October 1642), unpaginated.

⁸⁵ E.112[35], *The Copy of a Letter Presented by a Member of the Commons House of Parliament* (London: 19 August 1642), pp. 6-7.

the Catholic Irish ‘rebels’ would therefore have been highly damaging to the king’s cause as it suggested that his men would be just as cruel to innocent civilians.⁸⁶

In the weeks before the first battle of the Civil War at Edgehill, the pamphleteers continued to encourage support for the parliamentary cause by claiming that both the leading Cavaliers and their common soldiers were quite prepared to ‘make a prey of people’ in order to ‘quench their greed or lusts’. In what was surely an attempt to rally the Londoners to the parliamentary cause, the anonymous pamphleteer asserted that the ‘insatiable Cavalliers’ were coming ‘to strip you out of all you have’. ‘Who would not therefore assume a manly courage to oppose their fierce attempts’ the writer asked, and went on to declare, ‘If you hold anything deare unto you, your wives, children or estates, quit yourselves now (most valiant Londoners) [and] stand with magnanimous resolutions’.⁸⁷ Thus the pamphleteer highlighted the disparity between the parliamentarians and the royalists by emphasising how Parliament’s male supporters were fulfilling the correct patriarchal social roles by taking up arms to protect their dependents, whereas the royalist males desired only to prey upon them.

But the parliamentary writers were also quick to demonstrate that there was another side to this threatening, bloody image of the Cavalier, which was surely designed to give comfort to the parliamentary soldiers. As the parliamentary army prepared to meet the royalists on the battlefield, so the writers began to argue that the Cavaliers’ violent passions displayed a loss of self-control which often resulted in weakness.⁸⁸ For instance, in early October, a pamphlet which recounted news from Hereford related how the Cavaliers had threatened to level the town, but had eventually failed to kill anyone at all despite shooting ‘most furiously against the said City’. As if the royalists had not proved their martial ineptitude sufficiently, the pamphleteer then went on to describe the ‘base cowardize’ of the ‘*Malignant Cavaleers*’ who ‘soon betook themselves to flight’ when the

⁸⁶ A. Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1981), pp. 200-202. The royalists were repeatedly likened to the Irish ‘rebels’ throughout the autumn of 1642, see for instance, E.119[3], *A True Relation of His Majesties coming to the Town of Shrewsbury* (London: 29 September 1642), p. 7; E.123[25], *Anti-Cavalierisme, or, Truth Pleading as well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this Present War* (London: 21 October 1642), title page; and E.124[16], *The Kings Resolution concerning his coming from Banbury to London* (London: 25 October 1642).

⁸⁷ E.123[19], *A Declaration of the Kings Resolution, to bring up his Armie to the Citie of London* (London: 20 October* 1642), pp. 5, 8. See also E.112[7], *The Earle of Essex his Desires to the Parliament* (London: 15 August 1642), p. 5.

⁸⁸ For example, see E.126[36], *A Wonderfull and Strange Miracle or Gods just Vengeance Against the Cavaliers* (London: 9 November 1642), pp. 1-3.

parliamentarian Earl of Stamford came to relieve the town.⁸⁹ Thus the pamphleteer demonstrated that, while the Cavaliers might have had an outwardly threatening appearance, their inherent cowardice was soon betrayed through their actions, and as bravery was such an important component of manhood at this time, so the cowardice of the Cavaliers was a signifier of their unmanliness.

Over the late summer and early autumn of 1642, other parliamentarian writers claimed, with obvious disdain, that it was the royalists' courtly practices and fashions which had called their manliness into question. Such a view can be clearly seen in one occasional pamphlet, printed in early August 1642, which described the 'Roaring Cavalier' as 'a thing ... *like a man*', who 'Makes a neat congue,⁹⁰ dances well, and sweares: / And weares his Mistresse pendant in his eares'. As well as wearing women's jewellery, the writer was also alluding to the contemporary belief that if a man spent too much time in the presence of women, he ran the risk of becoming effeminate.⁹¹ This belief emerges later on in the verse, when the Cavalier is made to brag how the ladies of the court 'will vow there's none / At Court, a man of parts, but he alone'. This claim speaks of virility, but the author goes on to show that the Cavalier's excessive lust has left him weak and diseased, for he notes that, 'Part of their noses to the femall kinde / As pledges of their love, are left behind', thus suggesting that while the royalist might brag of his sexual exploits, his actions had left him with syphilis: he had been literally unmanned by his contact with women.⁹² Therefore just as a man had to be careful to control his aggression, he also had to control his lusts in order to avoid being weakened in this way. The author of this particular verse finished by returning to the notion of the Cavalier as worthless and contemptible once his rich clothes and possessions had been taken from him, for he declares, 'Strip off his ragges,

⁸⁹ E.124[4], *Exceeding Joyfull Newes from the Earl of Stamford, the Lord Wharton, and the Lord Kymbolton* (NPP: 22 October 1642), unpaginated. See also E.117[13], *Exceeding Joyfull Newes from His Excellence the Earle of Essex* (London: 15 September 1642), pp. 4-5.

⁹⁰ (My italics). It is almost certain that this is a misspelling of the word 'congé', which the *OED* defines as either a ceremonious leave-taking, or as a bow, given when greeting or bidding someone farewell. Either way, the author was emphasising that the Cavaliers were members of the social elite. That congées formed a part of court ceremonies can be seen from Kevin Sharpe's description of Charles' reformation of the court, see his *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 210-235, esp. p. 218.

⁹¹ T. Laqueur, *Making Sex, Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (London: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 123, 125; Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities*, p. 55; and Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 56.

⁹² For a discussion of how in 'the culture of medieval and early modern Europe damaging noses signalled sin, specifically sexual sin, and dishonour' see Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, pp. 80, 90, 103-104.

and the poore thing is then / The just contempt of *understanding men*'.⁹³ This final line suggests that the Cavalier's love of women, fashion, and dancing denied him from being considered a 'true' man (as defined by the parliamentarians), as he was not displaying the necessary 'reason' that was considered central to patriarchal manhood.

As both sides recruited their armies over the summer of 1642 and war began to seem inevitable, one parliamentary pamphleteer painted a contemptuous picture of a company of royalists on their way to the king's headquarters at York. The author of this pamphlet claimed to have come across a party of royalist cavalry commanders, who were all 'richly deckd with long shag hair, reaching down to their heels'. After a close escape from these men, the writer then came across a company of royalist foot, 'the Rank and File consisting of Men and Women' which he asserted, 'was to me a greater assault then the first'. The presence of both men and women in this royalist regiment suggested the gender disorder which the Roundheads believed to exist amongst the royalists. The author went on to note that a 'Serjeants, wife' was the 'Captain of the company' and remarked that her 'hair was of that large length, it was carried up by sixteen boyes, every boy having sixe more to carry up theirs'. While this paints a ridiculous image, the underlying proposition that women fought and held positions of command in the royalist army was highly subversive. Equally, it suggested that the gender lines were being blurred within the royalist ranks, partly because of the Cavalier commanders' foppish fashions which seemed, to this author, more womanly than manly. The ceremonious procession of boys holding each other's hair, as well as that of the female captain, also ridiculed the pomp and ceremony of the court, which was held to be overly extravagant by many on the Parliament's side.⁹⁴

The pamphlet ended with the troop of foot retiring to the alehouse, where the parliamentary spectator, ensuring that he was 'secure in another room', watched the troop perform 'their detestible and lascivious *Exercise*, in which they imitated the Postures of the Musket'. As if the innuendo was not obvious enough, what follows is a bawdy list of exercises, where the reader must imagine that 'the Whore was the Musquet and Match, the Pimpe the Rest, and the Cabaleiro [Cavalier] the Souldier'. This ensured that the postures that followed on from these instructions were extremely sexually suggestive. Moreover,

⁹³ E.109[7], *A Description of the Round-head and rattle-head* (London: 5 August* 1642), p. 6; see also Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, p. 145.

⁹⁴ Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, pp. 115, 127-29.

the Royalists' commander was described as an 'ugly shag-hair'd black fellow, with a flat nose and a black Plaister on the face', suggesting that even their officer – who again is described as either having long hair, or wearing a periwig – was riddled with sexually-transmitted disease.⁹⁵ The author ended by declaring that he marched home to London 'with few Feares', thus making the underlying message of this pamphlet obvious: men who admitted women into their army, who emulated women in their dress, and who were more interested in copulation than in training to be soldiers, would be an easy force to beat.⁹⁶

Part 2.3 – 1643: The Conflict Deepens

The failure to settle the war in a single pitched-battle during late 1642 meant that the pamphleteers continued to encourage support for the parliamentary cause over the winter of 1642-3 by relating the alarming consequences should the parliamentarians lose their resolve. To this end, one anonymous author declared that the Cavaliers had 'neither respect of kindred, friends or acquaintance that should any whit moderate the rapacity of their hands, or licentiousnesse of their appetites'. The author went on to remark that should they enter London 'neither your wives or beauteous daughters should escape their violent lusts'.⁹⁷ These attempts to renew popular zeal for the parliamentary cause may be understood in the light of the peace petitions that were circulating in the capital during December 1642 and early January 1643, for another pamphlet claimed that the protests for peace were part of a royalist plot to seize the capital and divide up its wealth.⁹⁸ The pamphleteer claimed that the Cavaliers planned to murder all of Parliament's male supporters; the king's followers were made to boast that once this had been achieved, they would no longer be commanded by their whores, but instead the 'spruce Citizens Wives and daughters should satisfie the lust both of them and us'.⁹⁹ Thus the Roundhead pamphleteers stirred up the men of London to support the parliamentary cause, and suggested that if they did not, the consequences for their families and, therefore, for the wider social order, would be disastrous.

⁹⁵ Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, pp. 80, 90, 103-104; and D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 140.

⁹⁶ E.117[16], *Nocturnall Occurrences or, Deeds of Darknesse: Committed, by the Cavaleers in their Rendevous* (London: 16 September* 1642), unpaginated.

⁹⁷ E.85[35], *Look About You* (London: 21 January 1643), p. 7.

⁹⁸ For a discussion of the peace protests see S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893), vol. I, pp. 74-83.

⁹⁹ E.245[24], *The Malignants Conventicle: or, A Learned Speech spoken by M. Web, a Citizen, to the rest of his Society* (London: 28 January* 1643), pp. 2-3.

Yet, as well as portraying their enemies in a menacing light, the pamphleteers also recounted many instances where the Cavaliers' supposedly lustful behaviour had led to their own confounding, thereby reinforcing the idea that the royalists' aggressive, anti-patriarchal and, therefore, unmanly behaviour made them no match for the manly parliamentarians. A pamphlet relating news from Newark best illustrates this point. The town was of some strategic value as it secured a crossing of the Trent River and had only recently been occupied by the royalists in December 1642. The pamphlet, printed a month later, may therefore have been written in an attempt to counter the loss of the town. The pamphleteer began by claiming that a group of Cavaliers had met in an alehouse in Newark where they had planned to attack 'a little Village' nearby and 'ravish all the pretty maids' there. Yet, upon arriving they saw 'a very handsome nut-brown Lasse', and all thoughts of capturing the 'Towne' were forgotten. The pamphleteer related how 'about twenty of the Cavaliers' followed her into a house 'expecting that they had gotten a prize'. But the Cavaliers had unwittingly walked into an ambush, for 'when they were come into the Hall [of the house], they found above forty good stout fellowes that were ready provided for them'. The pamphleteer remarked how the royalists were 'cudgelled ... [so] soundly, that they were not able neither to go nor stand, so that they had little list afterwards to wenching'. This choice of words suggests that the Cavaliers were given so sound a beating that they were unable to walk, let alone 'wench'; but, equally the author could have been using the word 'stand' to imply the Cavaliers' ability to have an erection, thus implying that the townsmen had so soundly beaten the royalists as to have robbed them of their sexual ability. As if to make this point more explicit, upon hearing their comrades inside cry out, the remaining royalists, who had not followed the woman into the house, 'ran all away, fearing they were betrayed'.¹⁰⁰ In relating this story, the author had demonstrated the consequences that might follow should a body of troops become preoccupied with drinking and wenching, rather than keeping appropriate discipline and military objectives in mind. What is more, by claiming that the remaining royalists chose to run away, rather than to come to their comrades' aid, the author was suggesting that the Cavaliers were all bravado when it came to affronting women, but cowardly when the time came to fight.

As well as suggesting that the Cavaliers had been undone by their lusts, the anonymous author of *The Malignants Conventicle* went on to reiterate the Cavaliers'

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, pp. 4-5.

weakness by claiming that a group of royalist soldiers had been beaten by a party of countrywomen. Once again, the incident took place at a village near Newark, where, the pamphleteer claimed, a woman and her maid were in a dairy when they saw a group of Cavaliers approaching. The two women immediately ran into the town to raise the alarm, and the Cavaliers, finding the dairy empty, ‘filled their bellies so full that they could scarce go’. Meanwhile the women had found that there were no men nearby to help them so they returned to the dairy with forty other townswomen. By this time, most of the Cavaliers had left, but the pamphleteer asserts that there were ‘two or three of them together untrussing in a ditch, who lay as close as they could for feare the women should spy them’. However, he went on, the ‘Buttermilk and Whay did so work on them [the Cavaliers], that they were so troubled by the squirt, that the women traced them by the smell, and so met with most of them, for they were not able to fly fast before them’. These Cavaliers presented a sorry sight: caught defecating in a ditch, hiding from women armed only with ‘Spits, [and] Forks’.¹⁰¹ It is perhaps telling that this incident was said to have taken place in a dairy as this was a traditionally feminine workplace, therefore the women’s actions in defending it did not usurp male power.¹⁰² Equally the author legitimised the women’s assertive actions, by demonstrating that their men folk were unable to help, and that it was therefore left to the women to uphold the moral order and drive away the plundering Cavaliers.¹⁰³

The parliamentary writers further emphasised the Cavaliers’ lack of manliness and self-mastery by portraying them as verging on the obsessive when it came to their own outward appearance. For instance, a broadside from January 1643 linked the stereotype of the dissolute, unrestrained Cavalier, who was preoccupied with ‘whoredome, loosenesse, idlenesse, and ease’, with the foppish image of the Cavalier by referring to his ‘crisping, curling, poudring, frizzling haire’.¹⁰⁴ Another author denounced the Cavaliers’ ‘foolish pride, and wanton wearing of love-lockes and unseemly haire, (I had almost said periwig[s])’.¹⁰⁵ The mention of the ‘periwig’ would at once have alerted the reader to the fact that this was an allusion to the king’s courtiers. Periwigs were then very fashionable at

¹⁰¹ Ibid, pp. 5.

¹⁰² Fraser, *Weaker Vessel*, pp. 147-48; and Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 307.

¹⁰³ For a further example of how the Cavaliers’ disorderly behaviour allegedly allowed them to be beaten by women see E.87[9], *A Remonstrance of Londons Occurrences in a Brief, Real, and Ingenius Demonstration of all Particulars* (NPP: 31 January* 1643), unpaginated.

¹⁰⁴ 669.f.6[103], *First, Great Britaines confession* (NPP: 7 January* 1643).

¹⁰⁵ E.85[23], *Twenty Lookes over all the Round-heads that ever Lived in the World* (NPP: 19 January* 1643), unpaginated.

court and were only worn by ‘gentlemen of leisure’ because of their initial purchasing cost and the need for continual, expensive maintenance.¹⁰⁶ This pamphlet also contained a brief catalogue of all the groups who had been referred to as ‘roundheads’ in the past. It is interesting then, that it contains a section on ‘Feminish Round heads’, or as the author explains, men who shaved off their beards ‘and made their faces smooth like women, and let their haire grow round their heads in its full length, wherein they gloried, contending with women who should bee the most absolute feminine Round-head’. Again, the Cavaliers’ stereotypically long hair was used to suggest their unmanliness. Indeed, in this sentence the men in question are depicted as vying with women as to who should be counted the most womanly. The parliamentarians heartily disliked the derisive nickname of ‘Roundheads’, and it is clear that the author was trying to turn the soubriquet on the royalists by showing that the parliamentarians’ enemies could more legitimately be referred to as ‘Roundheads’ than they could.¹⁰⁷ The author ended by repeating the distinction between ‘the shaggehead Cavalliers wearing all long haire, and the Citizens of London cutting their haire short round about their heads’.¹⁰⁸

In the summer of 1643 the pamphleteers’ accusations about the Cavaliers’ anti-patriarchal behaviour and unmanliness became more pointed on all counts. This was perhaps because the men of both sides had by now experienced hard fighting, but could also be explained by the decisive victories of the king’s forces in the north, at Adwalton Moor (30 June) and in the west, at Roundway Down (13 July). Towards the end of the summer, the author of one anonymous parliamentary pamphlet entitled *Englands Third Alarm to Warre* referred to the king’s supporters as ‘English Monsters’, rather than men. Indeed, the royalists’ violent behaviour led the author to assert that they ‘have not so much Logicke (Reason I meane) then has a Dog: nor any more (good) Conscience, then has a Beast’.¹⁰⁹ Similarly, another anonymous author referred to the king’s supporters as ‘English Monsters ... [and] Beasts in the shape of men’.¹¹⁰ These writers were claiming that the royalists could no longer be seen as ‘men’, because they had failed to display the necessary manly qualities of reason, restraint or conscience. Instead, their violent actions left them little better than beasts. The author of *Englands Third Alarm to Warre* made it

¹⁰⁶ J. Arnold, *Perukes and Periwigs* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1970), pp. 19, 23.

¹⁰⁷ For a discussion of parliamentary objections to the label ‘Roundhead’ see W. Lamont and S. Oldfield, *Politics, Religion and Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Aldine Press, 1975), pp. 100-115.

¹⁰⁸ E.85[23], *Twenty Lookes over all the Round-heads*, unpaginated.

¹⁰⁹ E.63[9], *Englands Third Alarm to Warre* (London: 3 August* 1643), letter to reader, unpaginated.

¹¹⁰ E.250[2], *The Late Covenant Asserted* (NPP: 14 August* 1643), p. 15.

quite clear that, because '[a] man is as his will is', then the royalists only had themselves to blame for their unnatural transformation.¹¹¹ If a man gave in to his lust or anger, as the Cavaliers were reported to do in so many accounts, then he became little better than an animal. Contemporaries would have considered such a transformation to be particularly unnatural because the male body had been made first, in God's image, and was therefore considered the more 'perfect' being.¹¹²

The fact that similarly emotive language is found in a newsbook of September 1643 suggests that attitudes were beginning to harden. This particular work denounced the 'perfidious cruelty of these Cavaliers' who have acted '*contrary to the law of Armes, Nature and Humanity*' and who 'therefore deserve severe retaliation'.¹¹³ The Roundhead writers sought to convince their readership that the royalists should not be treated as fellow civilised men because their unreasonable and uncontrolled actions had demonstrated, not only their failure to uphold the patriarchal social hierarchy, but also their unwillingness to abide by the most basic laws that governed humanity.¹¹⁴ It therefore legitimised the need for harsher measures against the royalists at a time when the war seemed to be turning in the king's favour.

One area where the royalists were making steady gains throughout the summer of 1643 was Yorkshire. It was surely a desire to counter the victories of the Earl of Newcastle's army against the parliamentary forces under the Fairfaxes that caused one pamphleteer to admit that, while the 'Popish Army in Yorkshire' was 'very great' and 'numerous', it was also considered 'not potent' because 'it is made and piece[d] up of so many violenced men'.¹¹⁵ Here the pamphleteer was making the important point, which contemporaries would certainly have recognised, that violent men were hard to control, no matter how numerous they were. It is no coincidence that this pamphlet was printed just as Newcastle's men had fallen back from their march into Lincolnshire in order to besiege the Fairfaxes at Hull.¹¹⁶ The pamphleteer was attempting to undermine the military

¹¹¹ E.63[9], *Englands Third Alarm to Warre*, p. 3.

¹¹² See for instance, STC (2nd ed.) / 6062, H. Crooke, *The Mikrokosmographia: A description of the Body of Man* (London: 1615), pp. 3-4.

¹¹³ E.68[3], *Certaine Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome* (18-25 September 1643), p. 276 (my italics).

¹¹⁴ Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp. 73-94; and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 136-138.

¹¹⁵ E.250[6], *The Reformed Malignants. Or, a Discourse upon the Present State of our Affaires* (London: 4 September 1643), p. 5.

¹¹⁶ P. Young and R. Holmes, *The English Civil War: A Military history of the three Civil Wars, 1642-1651* (Kent: Eyre Methuen Limited, 1974), p. 153-4.

capabilities of Newcastle's men at the very moment when they looked most threatening to the Parliament's northern forces.

Part 2.4 – 1644: Victory and Defeat

The entry of the Scots into the war on the side of Parliament in January 1644 meant that royalist hopes that the Marquis of Newcastle's victorious forces would be able to march south were dashed. Meanwhile, in the Thames Valley, the combined forces of the Earl of Essex and Sir William Waller set out in May to put pressure on Oxford. As the parliamentary armies went on the offensive, the parliamentary polemicists began to make even more vociferous claims about the Cavaliers' supposed lack of self-restraint, morality and regard for God's and society's laws. For instance, in early 1644 *Mercurius Britanicus* claimed that the Cavaliers were so sexually depraved as to want to copulate with anything: 'you shall have them *sinning* with the very beasts of the field shortly' the editors remarked, 'and keeping Mares for *breeding* Cavaliers on'.¹¹⁷ Later in the year an element of threatening aggression was added to this picture of the royalists by claiming that, in the West Country, the Cavaliers 'deflower wives and maides in so *bestiall a manner*, that divers of them [the women] have lately died by their violence'.¹¹⁸

As well as claiming that the royalists were either unable, or unwilling, to control their lusts, the pamphleteers portrayed the royalists' alleged barbarity towards unarmed civilians as further proof of their unsuitability for patriarchal power. Not only did the royalists' failure to ensure the protection of 'the weak and innocent' demonstrate their violation of the rules of war and their failure to adhere to Christian morality codes, but it also went against a man's patriarchal responsibility to care for those weaker than himself.¹¹⁹ Yet, while claims about the royalists' unprovoked cruelty towards unarmed civilians were made *ad infinitum*, the pamphleteers' were also careful to show that, when it came to facing the Parliament's forces, the royalists' bravado quickly faded to reveal their cowardice and unwillingness to fight. For instance, after Rupert's defeat at Marston Moor on 2 July, one newsbook recounted how the prince's horse were quartered in the 'counties of Chester, Flint, Denbigh and Montgomery' where they terrorised the country committing 'unparaleld cruelties'. Yet, despite their aggressive actions towards the local people, the

¹¹⁷ E.80[9], *Mercurius Britanicus* (28 December 1643-4 January 1644), p. 146.

¹¹⁸ E.4[13], *Mercurius Britanicus* (29 July-5 August 1644), p. 363 (my italics).

¹¹⁹ Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp. 72-7. See also Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering', p. 234.

author added that ‘none of their courages’ would bring them over the hills to meet with the Parliamentarians.¹²⁰

As well as claiming that the royalists showed little regard for society’s laws, the law of arms or the patriarchal property of other men, other anonymous parliamentary writers suggested that the Cavaliers were unwilling to live up to the patriarchal ideal by emphasising their tendency to ‘Drinke, Roare, and Sweare’: actions which suggested an evident lack of restraint in consumption, behaviour and language.¹²¹ For instance, one newsbook related how the Governor of ‘Bostock’ and other Oxford commanders had met together within a short distance of the garrison one Saturday night where ‘they drunke so many healths to the King’ to various other prominent royalists, and to ‘their Mistresses ... that they were fain to sleep all the Lords day following’.¹²² As well as stressing the royalists’ excessive consumption of food and drink, which was in direct contrast to their role as providers for their families, it will be noted that the pamphleteer also made these royalists openly boast about their mistresses, thus further demonstrating their contempt for the social order.¹²³ This report also reiterated the belief that a man’s failure to master himself would lead to weakness: for the royalists ended up sleeping throughout the following day, rather than performing their military duties. The fact that the day in question was a Sunday further highlighted the royalist officers’ shirking of their spiritual duties, as well as their patriarchal responsibilities, for they were too hung-over to ensure that the soldiers under their command attended prayers.

Other parliamentary writers highlighted the consequences of the royalists’ supposed inability to conform to the patriarchal definitions of manhood, by reporting on the supposedly inappropriate behaviour of their wives. For instance, a pamphlet of August 1644 mocked the Earl of Derby saying he is ‘King in Man, not of Man’. The author then went on to remark that ‘the Grey Mare’s the better horse, which makes her ware [wear] the Breeches, and her Strange Lord a Wooden Dagger’.¹²⁴ Here the Parliamentary writer was making reference to the Countess of Derby’s brave defence of Lathom House from February to May 1644.¹²⁵ The pamphleteer was mocking the earl’s martial ability by

¹²⁰ E.254[22], *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament* (16-23 August 1644), unpaginated.

¹²¹ E.4[24], *The Cavaliers Bible, or a squadron of XXXVI* (NPP: 7 August* 1644), unpaginated.

¹²² E.254[22], *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament* (16-23 August 1644), unpaginated.

¹²³ Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, pp. 128-9.

¹²⁴ E.7[9], *The Parliaments Kalender of Black Saints* (London: 24 August 1644), p. 6.

¹²⁵ Fraser, *Weaker Vessel*, pp. 185-89; and A. Plowden, *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), pp. 96-107.

claiming that the Countess had proved herself the better soldier, leaving him with a wooden sword, the kind of weapon which a child would have played with. The pamphleteer used the Countess of Derby's actions to unman her husband, and made a play on where the Earl's lands were in order to suggest that he might have authority on the Isle of Man, but his actions had shown that he could not be counted as a man. By choosing to emphasise the Countess's bravery in a way that undermined the manliness of her husband, the author was surely attempting to draw attention away from the humiliating truth that the parliamentary forces had failed to take Lathom.

The Court Mercurie, a parliamentary newsbook which frequently employed scurrilous language and gendered attacks, used a similar approach to undermine the manliness of Lord Capel. On 10 August 1644 the newsbook claimed to bring news from court that 'it is disputable there whether the Lord *Capell* or his Lady is the greater Politician, for shee advertiseth his Lordship to be wise, sit still and doe nothing, but his Lordship would doe something but dares not'. Again the wife of a prominent royalist was seen to be dominating her husband, and while Capel may have disagreed with her, he was not man enough to go against her wishes. What is more, Lady Capel's actions were described in sexually suggestive language, for the pamphleteer added that she hoped that 'Peace and the L. of *Canterbury* would bring in foure things againe to please Ladies, as *Masques, Playes, Revellings*, and other pretty *Night-workes*'.¹²⁶ In these words, we see a clear hint that the Lady Capel was cuckolding her husband, which would have had severe implications for his manliness, and therefore for his ability as a successful military commander.¹²⁷

While the war in the north was going in Parliament's favour with the defeat of the royalist forces at Marston Moor on 2 July 1644, in the midlands and in the west the Cavaliers were fighting back. Days before Marston Moor the king had beaten Sir William Waller's army at Cropredy Bridge and from here he marched to engage the Earl of Essex's forces in the far south-west. The threat which the royalist forces now posed to the Parliament's main field army might well explain why one pamphleteer took the image of the unrestrained Cavalier even further by claiming that the king's men behaved in excessively violent ways towards each other. Thus a newsbook containing news from Cornwall related how a newly married gentleman had been sent to 'Buckonock

¹²⁶ E.6[30], *The Court Mercurie* (10-21 August 1644), unpaginated.

¹²⁷ Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 115.

[Boconnoc]' by the king, and had taken his wife with him because he could not bear to leave her behind. However, the author claimed that on the road they had met with a company of six royalist troopers, who had made the gentleman watch as they proceeded to 'ravish her bodie from her Husband, and her honour from her bodie'.¹²⁸ The author of this newsbook was demonstrating that the royalists were perfectly prepared to direct their lust and aggression against each other, as well as against the Roundheads, once again displaying the disorderly consequences of their lack of self-restraint.

There is also perhaps an implicit disapproval of the actions of the gentleman: the fact that he was described as being 'newly married' offers a whisper of a suggestion that his love or lust for his new wife had interfered with his reason.¹²⁹ That war was a considered to be a man's domain can be seen in the remarks of one parliamentary balladeer who had asserted in 1642-43 that, 'To goe with this renowned Earle [of Essex], / Each Lad hath vow'd to leave his Girle'.¹³⁰ The implicit message was that men who were more mindful of their women would be an easy force to beat. In a similar vein, the excessive violence shown by the Cavaliers who were alluded to in the report of September 1643 was being used to suggest that their ranks would be weakened by dissension and quarrels, which would affect their ability to be successful soldiers.¹³¹ It is surely no coincidence that such a message was being propagated by this Roundhead pamphleteer at a time when the royalist armies looked increasingly threatening to the parliamentary cause.

After the Earl of Essex's infantry had been forced to surrender to the royalists at Lostwithiel in Cornwall in early September, there is evidence to suggest that the London pamphleteers attempted to bolster the morale of the Parliament's supporters by continuing to emphasise the Cavaliers' effeminacy. For instance, in a satirical dialogue, which was printed at the end of September, one supposed Cavalier, named Jeffery, bemoaned the fact that the Captains in the royalist army 'behave them so womanish, that tis probable they were born under *Venus*, not *Mars*'. He went on to assert, 'I think a Fan in the hand will better become them than a Feather in the Cap'. Again, effeminacy was linked with other

¹²⁸ E.8[5], *The London Post* (3 September 1644), p. 3. The pamphleteer's choice of language clearly illustrates the patriarchal notion that a wife was considered to be her husband's property.

¹²⁹ For a discussion of how men were expected to show self-restraint even when it came to love, see Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 56-58.

¹³⁰ Wing / A3587A, White, *The Prentices resolution*.

¹³¹ See for example, E.10[10], *The souldiers language. Or, A discourse between two souldiers* (NPP: 26 September* 1644), unpaginated. In this mock-dialogue between two Cavaliers, one greeted the other by swearing 'God damne me' and threatened that 'Ile run my Rapier thorow thee, if thou stand vexing me thus'.

‘womanly’ attributes, such as a preoccupation with clothing and other frivolities.¹³² Such men, Jeffery scoffed, can be distinguished ‘[b]y their Scarfs, not by their scars, skill, or courage’. There is even a suggestion that such men dressed as women in order to avoid having to fight. Thus Jeffery complains of ‘a *wise* Captain that had got on a maids peticoat instead of armour of proof, in the time of the battell, when his Souldiers were fighting to shelter himself from the violence of the enemy’. This was a subversive image indeed, suggesting that a royalist Captain would dress as a maid, and allow his own men to protect him, rather than play his part as a man on the battlefield. What was more, ‘Jeffery’ was shown to begrudgingly recognise the wisdom of such a move, as it ensured the Captain did not have to risk his life. When out of danger, the Captain was said to ‘brag of his valour’, and again reference was made to the gallant uniform of the commanders, whose ‘peacock-like’ dress did not portray their worth as soldiers, but was purely for display, like a peacock’s feathers.¹³³ These words suggest that the events of the war had led the Roundhead pamphleteers to make more acerbic polemical attacks on the royalists in an attempt to bolster parliamentary morale and to harden the resolve of their men after their defeat in the west.

Another instance of alleged royalist cross-dressing can be found in a newsbook of September 1644 which suggested that an unnamed ‘Irish Lord’ had dressed up as a woman in order to disguise himself and avoid detection. What is more, the author related how, ‘the Lord’ so suited the disguise that he might even have been mistaken for a woman, ‘and ... courted too for a handsome Lady’. The Parliamentary pamphleteers had long striven to suggest that the Cavaliers’ allegedly passionate and irrational behaviour was closer to that of women than it was to that of men; by donning female apparel this particular individual was shown to have made the final transformation into womanhood. The fact that the man in question was described as a lord made his behaviour even more subversive for it thus threatened both the social and gender orders. The author even alluded to how the gender order could be corrected, by suggesting that this ‘handsome Lady’ might be courted, thus leading to the reassertion of patriarchal order.¹³⁴ These claims about the gender disorder of the royalists were being made at a time when the Committee of Both Kingdoms was

¹³² Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. 21-22, 70; Amussen, ‘The Part of a Christian Man’, p. 215; and O. Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe volume 1, 1500-1800* (London: Fontana Press, 1997), p. 46.

¹³³ E.10[10], *The souldiers language*, unpaginated (my italics).

¹³⁴ E.256[7], *A diary, or, An Exact Journall faithfully Communicating the most remarkable Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament* (13-19 September 1644), p. 134.

becoming increasingly alarmed about the eastward movement of the king's army towards London, which would eventually culminate in the second battle of Newbury on 26 October. The indecisive outcome of this battle ensured that the war would drag on into the following year.

Part 2.5 – 1645-1646: The Triumph of the New Model Army

If the parliamentary writers had repeatedly stressed the royalists' allegedly effeminate and anti-patriarchal behaviour when their cause seemed under threat, they were able to make further claims about the supposed patriarchal failings of their opponents in the wake of the crushing royalist defeats at Naseby in June and Langport in July 1645 at the hands of the New Model Army. Indeed, the massacre of female camp-followers which took place in the wake of the battle of Naseby suggests that, by this final stage of the war, the immoral and effeminate image of the stereotypical Cavalier was well-established within parliamentary consciousness. After the battle, the women in question had fled from the royalist field-camp but had quickly been overtaken by the parliamentary cavalry. The parliamentarians had 'cut and slashed' at the women, killing 'at least a hundred', while many others had had their faces slashed.¹³⁵ Violence towards female civilians was castigated in the rules of war of both sides, but, rather than disapproving of their troopers' actions, the parliamentary pamphleteers justified the violence towards the women by dismissing them as the royalists' 'whores'.¹³⁶

The defeats at Naseby and Langport saw the destruction of the main royalist field army and the foiling of the king's plans to launch a fresh counteroffensive in the south-west. The royalists' position now began to look increasingly desperate; indeed Malcolm Wanklyn and Frank Jones have justly observed that, '[l]ong before the king's return to Oxford on 28 August, the Great Civil War was to all intents and purposes over'. The defeat of the Earl of Montrose's Scottish royalist army at Philiphaugh in September only completed the bleak picture as Charles had hoped to use Montrose's forces to improve his fortunes in England.¹³⁷ The royalist defeats were mirrored in the pamphlet literature where the image of the disorderly and weak Cavalier became more prominent. For instance, in

¹³⁵ For a more detailed discussion of the motives of the parliamentary pamphleteers see, M. Stoye, 'The Road to Farndon Field: Explaining the Massacre of the Royalist Women at Naseby', *EHR* cxxiii: 503 (August 2008), pp. 895-923, esp. pp. 895-6.

¹³⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 895-923.

¹³⁷ M. Wanklyn and F. Jones, *A Military History of the English Civil War* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005), pp. 259-60.

late July the Parliamentary newsbook *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament* directly linked the Royalists' rage with their military decline, for the author wrote that the 'Malignant blood boyles within them, and burnes like fire, consumes their very guts, and thus languishing they pine away, and have no hopes at all left'.¹³⁸ Such a description invoked the belief of the humoral body, and suggests that the overly violent Cavalier was seen to be weak, not because he was lacking hot and dry humours, but because he had failed to control them to the point that they had consumed him.¹³⁹

But according to the parliamentary writers, it was not only uncontrolled rage that had weakened the Cavaliers. Several newsbooks suggested that excessive drinking had affected the royalists' martial ability.¹⁴⁰ Thus one editor accused a regiment of royalists of having 'drunke so hard' that they were 'dead drunk', and unable to defend themselves when one 'Major Christopher Ennis ... fell into their quarters with a small party of horse ... and killed and wounded many'. That it was the Cavaliers' unrestrained behaviour which had ultimately led to their weakness was stressed again as the author commented that 'they were not able to look up nor do any thing' to defend themselves. Instead the author described the Cavaliers as 'all ill armed, and discouraged, and full of feares'.¹⁴¹ As Diane Purkiss has argued the 'deliquescence of the drunkard, who loses masculine control over his body and its functions' would have been commonly seen as a 'sign ... of effeminacy'.¹⁴² Another newsbook explained that the royalists 'drinke themselves drunk in healths to [King Charles]' because 'this is all the way they have to comfort themselves, except some lye ... of some pretended victory'.¹⁴³ Other writers alleged that the Cavaliers' excessive carnal appetites had affected their martial ability. Such a claim was made in an edition of *Perfect occurrences of Parliament* from August 1645, which recounted how a troop of parliamentarians had come across one of Colonel Hasting's royalist officers 'in bed with a wench about one a clocke in the afternoone' in a village within a mile of the

¹³⁸ E.262[36], *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament* (25 July-1 August 1645), unpaginated.

¹³⁹ For another example, see, E.344[6], *Mans wrath and Gods praise. Or, A thanks-giving sermon* (London: 9 July* 1646), p. 20.

¹⁴⁰ See E.264[9], *Perfect occurrences of Parliament* (29 August-4 September 1645), unpaginated; E.298[21], *The true informer* (30 August 1645), p. 151.

¹⁴¹ E.264[9], *Perfect occurrences of Parliament* (29 August-4 September 1645), unpaginated.

¹⁴² Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, pp. 127-29.

¹⁴³ E.262[46], *Perfect passages of each dayes proceedings in Parliament* (13-20 August 1645), p. 338. For a discussion of the royalist culture of drinking see, A. McShane Jones, 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689'; A. Smyth, 'It were far better be a Toad, or a Serpant, then a Drunkard': Writing About Drunkenness'; and M. Keblusek, 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Exile Experience, 1642-1660' all in A. Smyth (ed.) *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004).

royalist garrison at Ashby de la Zouch. The meaning of such an account would have been obvious: rather than attending to his post, this officer had been in bed with a woman, and this momentary weakness had enabled him to be easily captured.¹⁴⁴

Other writers attempted to court popular opinion by providing details of the tyrannical violence which the royalists supposedly used to terrorise the inhabitants of the areas where they still held sway. One of the pamphleteers' motives for doing so was made clear by the editor of the newsbook *Mercurius Civicus* when it smirked that 'if any of the Kings side deserves to be lookt upon as a favourer of the Parliaments proceedings' it was Colonel Goring, 'for his cruelties are such, that the Country seeing the difference between his usage and Sir Thomas Fairfax's, do generally rise up against him'.¹⁴⁵ Regardless of the reality, the supposed cruelties that Goring and his men inflicted upon innocent civilians were reported on in order to undermine his military strength. Similarly, after the royalists briefly invaded the Eastern Association at the end of August and plundered a number of villages in Huntingdon, including Godmanchester, it was reported in one pamphlet that the Cavaliers had tormented a 73 year old man who was unable to pay the princely sum of £300 that was demanded of him. The Cavaliers were said to have hung the man up by his heels and 'put lighted Match behind his eares, to his cheeks, and to his privities, which brought the old man almost senselesse'.¹⁴⁶ The claim that the Cavaliers had tortured this man by disfiguring his genitals, was perhaps intended to show that the Cavaliers' had such a disregard for the patriarchal social order that they were willing to literally destroy another man's manhood. It also drew on the image of the 'tyrannical' mercenary soldier that was already established in the minds of contemporaries.¹⁴⁷ In order to further undermine the legitimacy of the king's cause, this particular pamphleteer also suggested that the royalists' violent behaviour was unchristian.¹⁴⁸ To this end, the pamphleteer claimed that the inhabitants of Godmanchester 'swear now [that the Cavaliers] are more like devils that come out of hell, *then any sort of men*' because of their excessively violent behaviour.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ E.262[44], *Perfect Occurrences of Parliament, and Chief Collections of Letters* (8-15 August 1645), unpaginated.

¹⁴⁵ E.298[15], *Mercurius Civicus* (21-28 August 1645), p. 1045. See also E.264[2], *A Diary, or, An Exact Journall Faithfully Communicating the Most Remarkable Proceedings in Both Houses of Parliament* (21-28 August 1645), p. 5.

¹⁴⁶ E.298[26], *The Royall Entertainment of the King, by the Royalists of Huntington* (London: 1 September* 1645), pp. 5-6 (my italics); and Wanklyn and Jones, *A Military History of the English Civil War*, p. 258.

¹⁴⁷ Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering', p. 225.

¹⁴⁸ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 16, 28, 128-129, 136-138.

¹⁴⁹ E.298[26], *The Royall Entertainment of the King*, pp. 5-6 (my italics).

As was explicitly stated by *Mercurius Civicus* in relation to Goring, accounts of unprovoked royalist violence towards unarmed civilians were publicised in order to shock the reader and to encourage support for Parliament – but these stories also reiterated how the king's men continually failed to fulfil their patriarchal responsibilities and Christian duties to protect those weaker than themselves.

As a succession of royalist garrisons fell or surrendered during the winter of 1645-6, so parliamentary writers continued to regale their readers with tales of the Cavaliers' unmanliness and cowardice in the face of defeat. For example, after Newark capitulated to the Parliamentarians on 6 May 1646, *Mercurius Civicus* made the erroneous claim that the garrison had surrendered a day earlier than had been agreed because of the fear of 'the Ladies and Gentlemen' of the town. Indeed, to further emphasise that such fearful actions were considered unmanly, the editors asserted that the 'Gentlemen' in question 'were of a more female constitution'.¹⁵⁰

Part 3.1 – Conclusion

The representations of the aggressive and lustful Cavalier and the effeminate Cavalier may at first sight appear to be poles apart, but, as this discussion has shown, they were clearly used for the same ends – to highlight the unrestrained and disorderly nature of the Cavaliers. This, in turn, highlighted the royalists' inability to fulfil their appropriate patriarchal roles in society and thus to be considered as 'men' by the parliamentary pamphleteers and their readers. The royalists' supposed lack of self-restraint, the parliamentary writers argued, led them to be irrational and unreasonable in their behaviour and driven by their passions. Such behaviour had major implications for the Cavaliers' military potency as it suggested that they were preoccupied with plunder, women and drink rather than with fighting the parliamentarians. At the same time their supposedly violent natures made them very hard to govern as a military force. As the conflict became bitter over the final years, many pamphleteers took this argument a stage further by asserting that they were barbaric, or even unchristian, in order to further undermine the justness of the king's cause. It was therefore left to the parliamentary soldiers to reassert control over these rebellious men, who seemed hell-bent on destroying the social order rather than upholding it. Likewise, the effeminate image of the Cavaliers

¹⁵⁰ E.337[21], *Mercurius Civicus* (7-14 May 1646), p. 2238.

was used to stress their weakness and ineptitude as soldiers – to the point that even milkmaids could give them a sound beating.

Central to these two depictions was the idea that the Cavaliers were threatening the existing social order through their failure, or unwillingness, to perform their correct roles as men. As the gender order and the social order were believed to be intrinsically interconnected, by attacking the royalists' manliness, the pamphleteers undermined their right to power. Moreover by portraying the Cavaliers as effeminate, the pamphleteers suggested that the king's male followers had renounced their own manliness and the power which this had afforded them. This had left a power void, and it is tempting to see the pamphleteers' preoccupation with the assertive actions of certain royalist women, like the Countess of Derby, as an attempt to demonstrate the consequences of this lack of male control. In this light, the repeated calls by the parliamentary writers for their own soldiers to 'act like men', may have been an attempt to authorise the Parliament's claim to political power, by showing how it aimed to restore stability to both the gender order and the social structure. Moreover, the Roundhead pamphleteers and newsbook writers' depictions of the inherent weakness of the Cavaliers was designed to convince their readers that, as long as the parliamentarians behaved in the appropriately manly ways, the royalists would be easily beaten.

That the parliamentary pamphleteers should chose to continually represent their enemies in ways that emphasised their aristocratic status deserves further consideration. Amussen has convincingly argued that contemporaries considered apparel to be vital because it signified a person's social status.¹⁵¹ It is therefore intriguing to find certain parliamentary writers so frequently describing the rich clothing of the Cavaliers in a negative and effeminate light for it suggests that wealth, when it was spent on luxurious dress, was not respected by particular elements within the parliamentary party, because it suggested that the wearer was intent on serving him or herself, rather than acting for the good of the commonwealth. Given the comments of William Prynne, it is tempting to see these negative views of courtly fashions as originating from parliamentary writers of a more zealously Protestant mindset. As we have seen, in contrast to their view of royalist men as self-seeking and effeminate, the parliamentary pamphleteers went to great lengths

¹⁵¹ Amussen, 'The Part of a Christian Man', p. 215.

to emphasise the patriarchal manhood of their own men who, they claimed, always acted for the good of the wider society.

It is perhaps not surprising that one of the ways in which the London pamphleteers supported their actions was by making reference to the gender hierarchy: for while the royalists could use the social hierarchy to substantiate their cause, in taking up arms against their king the parliamentarians had to find other ways in which to justify their actions. The gender hierarchy, which was perceived to be so intrinsic to the social order, therefore provided a legitimate discourse through which to challenge the authority of the royalists without calling the inherent structure of society into question. A consequence of the parliamentarians' political use of the gender hierarchy was that, within the Roundhead ranks a greater emphasis was placed upon a man's ability to display the necessary attributes of patriarchal manhood, than was placed upon his wealth and social status. Such a distinction can be seen in Lucy Hutchinson's description of her husband John: for she was keen to stress her husband's mastery of certain gentlemanly pursuits, like 'fencing', 'musick' and 'greate judgement in paintings'. Yet, when she came to speak of his clothing she asserted that 'he left off early the wearing of aniething that was costly, yett' Lucy averred, 'in his plainest negligent habitt [he] appear'd very much a gentleman'. Equally, she asserted that her husband had 'a very fine thickset head of hair', but also took care to emphasise that while he 'kept it clean' he did so 'without any affectation'.¹⁵² Hutchinson was taking care to emphasise that while her husband's carriage and dress clearly demonstrated his social status as a gentleman, his behaviour also showed him to be a man who was not interested in excessive displays of wealth: instead his social worth was reinforced by his adherence to the patriarchal construct of manhood that was promoted by the parliamentarians.

The next chapter will examine the parliamentarian pamphleteers' treatment of three key royalist figures – Charles I, Queen Henrietta Maria and Prince Rupert – in order to explore in greater detail how the polemicists drew upon gender beliefs in order to construct an unfavourable image of their opponents. It will further explore the connection between the gender framework and the social hierarchy by considering the extent to which the unique social status of the king and queen was reflected in their treatment in the tracts. It will consider how, as attitudes began to harden against Charles during the course of the

¹⁵² N. H. Keeble (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, with a fragment of autobiography* (London: Everyman, 1995), pp. 19, 87.

war, the king began to be increasingly spoken of as a fellow man, rather than as a divine monarch, and will explore the implications of this linguistic shift. The chapter will also consider how the pamphleteers set about defusing the threatening, martial reputation of Prince Rupert by demonstrating his patriarchal failings and will show how Rupert was depicted as a deflowerer of virgins and a slayer of ‘Innocents’ in an attempt to undermine his claim to patriarchal authority.¹⁵³ Finally the chapter will consider the various ways in which the parliamentary writers tailored their gendered attacks in order to suit the specific personalities of their targets.

¹⁵³ E.9[9], *A nest of perfidious vipers: or, The second part of the Parliaments kalender of black saints* (London: 21 September 1644), p. 6.

Chapter III:

Representations of Royalist Personalities in Parliamentary Pamphlet Literature

Gendered language was not only used to belittle the enemy in general terms, it was also used to pass far more specific judgment on the personal actions of certain key royalist figures. This chapter will begin by exploring how the relationship between Charles I and his wife, Queen Henrietta Maria, was portrayed by parliamentary polemicists during the conflict and will show how their behaviour was increasingly described by their enemies in relation to beliefs about gender and appropriate household order. We will consider whether the tactics that were used against Charles and Henrietta Maria were the same as had been used against the royalist army in general; or whether the couple's royal status meant that the pamphleteers had to subtly alter tack. While the actions of the king and queen may be said to have played into the hands of the parliamentary pamphleteers, Roundhead polemicists were forced to adopt a different approach when it came to writing about Charles I's nephew, Prince Rupert, who was the leader of the royalist cavalry forces. The second part of this chapter will explore how the pamphleteers adapted their polemical message in order to undermine the bravery and martial potency that Rupert frequently demonstrated in the field.

Part 1.1 – 'The Queene of Troubles' and her 'weak-backed Lord':¹ Representations of Queen Henrietta Maria and King Charles I in Parliamentary Print Culture

In the *Eikon Basilike*, supposedly written by Charles I himself, the king wrote of the public treatment of his wife, Queen Henrietta Maria, in a somewhat plaintive tone, claiming that 'few are so malicious as to hate Her for Her self. The fault is that She is my Wife'.² In this line Charles probably underestimated the hatred that was felt towards the queen because of her perceived influence over him, yet his words also show that he was aware that the parliamentary pamphleteers' libels of Henrietta Maria were specifically designed to criticise him as well. Despite Charles's words, previous biographers and historians of Henrietta have said little about the constant negative attention that the queen received from

¹ E.68[5], *Mercurius Britanicus* (19-26 September 1643), p. 36; and E.10[14], *John Booker, A rope treble-twisted, for John Tayler the water-poet* (London: 27 September 1644), pp. 4-6.

² Wing / 2170:03, *Eikon basilike* (NPP: 1649), p. 38.

the parliamentary pamphleteers.³ In her recent book Michelle White sets out to remedy this by examining various representations of Henrietta in parliamentary print culture and asking whether the image portrayed by the authors bore any resemblance to the reality of Henrietta's actions. White notes that 'one issue repeatedly commented upon was the undue influence Henrietta allegedly had over Charles'. The pamphleteers claimed that Henrietta stood in the way of peace between king and parliament and that her real goal was to bring the country back to Roman Catholicism. As White observes, the reality was unimportant, what mattered to the polemicists was that the queen 'could be successfully *portrayed*' in this way.⁴ This chapter will concentrate on the many ways in which beliefs about gender were used by the pamphleteers against the royal couple. As White has noted, the pamphleteers sought to 'exaggerate the extent of her [Henrietta's] powers in domestic, political, religious, and military matters, to such a degree that she could be characterized as an overly assertive woman who overstepped her proper role as queen consort, and her proper gender station'. Nor was this all, for such a portrayal of the queen had even more damning implications for her husband because 'Charles's perceived inability to control his wife would call into question both his patriarchal and monarchical authority'.⁵

The present chapter seeks to build upon White's insights by utilising a broader range of sources in order to explore in greater detail the ways in which beliefs about gender were used to undermine popular confidence in Charles's ability to rule. While White focuses predominantly upon Henrietta Maria, this discussion will examine how the relations between the king and queen were exploited by the parliamentary writers. It will explore how the pamphleteers took every opportunity to claim that the queen's energetic activity on her husband's behalf went against the grain of early modern notions of womanhood, and it will examine how such accusations were used to imply that Charles was unfit to rule in the commonwealth, because he had allowed his wife to dominate him. It will also examine how these attacks developed as the war unfolded. The chapter will argue that, during the early years of the war, the pamphleteers highlighted the queen's illegitimate power by repeatedly recounting the subversive consequences of allowing a queen-consort to enter into the male domain of politics and war. Yet, by late 1643 the pamphleteers had

³ For instance, see C. Oman, *Henrietta Maria* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1936); A. Plowden, *Henrietta Maria: Charles I's Indomitable Queen* (Stroud: Sutton, 2001); and M. White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 97-104.

⁴ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 178.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 106, 138.

begun to tentatively draw out the implications of Henrietta's unruly actions by suggesting that the king was at fault for allowing his wife to behave in this way, and criticisms of Charles increased still further in the following year. We may begin by examining how Henrietta's initial journey to the continent to purchase weapons and supplies was exploited by the parliamentary polemicists.

Part 1.2 – 1642: A Role in the War

Henrietta Maria's role in the Civil War began in earnest on 23 February 1642 when she left England and set sail for the Netherlands. Henrietta had wanted to leave the capital for many months because public opinion was strongly set against her. This was partly because Henrietta had been implicated in the Army Plots to save Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and in the Irish Uprising of the previous year. There was also a broader concern that she was attempting to use her influence over Charles in order to bring the nation back to Rome. Charles, for his part, feared that his wife would be impeached by the House of Commons, just as Strafford had been in 1641, and was therefore anxious to see her out of harm's way.⁶ Officially, it was claimed that Henrietta was escorting her daughter, Mary to meet her husband, the Prince of Orange. Yet safely hidden in her baggage the queen carried a substantial number of the crown jewels and her own jewellery which she intended to pawn in order to purchase money and supplies for the army that her husband was planning to mobilise against the Parliament.⁷ During the summer and autumn of 1642 Henrietta sent a total of six shipments of arms and supplies back to England: four arrived safely in royalist hands.⁸

In London the pamphleteers kept the queen constantly in the public eye; speculating when she would return to England, and reporting on her actions on the continent.⁹ While some pamphleteers provided a relatively non-judgemental account of the queen's actions,

⁶ Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 112-5, 118-120; and Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 149-161. For the claim that Henrietta was involved in the Irish Uprising see, W. H. Coates (ed.) *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 351.

⁷ Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 123-24; E. Hamilton, *Henrietta Maria* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1976), pp. 185-188; and A. Plowden, *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), p. 10.

⁸ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 66.

⁹ See for instance, E.200[60], *A learned speech spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, upon his departure from Northampton to Worcester* (NPP: 27 September 1642), p. 5; E.116[26], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (5-9 September 1642), p. 2; E.239[18], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (5-12 September 1642), p. 4; E.240[2], *England's memorable accidents* (12-19 September 1642), p. 16; and E.240[8], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (16-21 September 1642), p. 6.

by suggesting that she was merely obeying her husband, at least one writer presented her in a far more sinister light.¹⁰ This individual reported that several letters to the queen had been captured and that amongst these letters had been one written by one ‘Master Elliot’ who was ‘with the King at *Yorke*’. Elliot, the pamphleteer claimed, had written to Henrietta because there was a concern that ‘the King would incline to his Parliament, and hearken to an accommodation for peace’. According to the pamphleteer, Elliot therefore expressed the hope that ‘her Majesty would write to the King to confirme his Resolution, to maintaine the cause hee hath undertaken’.¹¹ At the beginning of the war the parliamentary pamphleteers often claimed that the king had been duped by evil counsellors; this pamphleteer was taking that argument a stage further by suggesting that the evil counsellors in question were using the queen’s influence over Charles in order to control the king and pursue their own ends. Later in the autumn another newsbook claimed that letters had been intercepted from the queen which demonstrated that, while Charles was reluctant to use force against his subjects, she was ready to take more decisive military action by sending soldiers to her husband.¹² As the troops in question had already been captured when this letter was intercepted at Yarmouth, the parliamentarians could afford to print the aggressive words of the queen, as the threat had already been neutralised.

The parliamentary pamphleteers also sought to vilify and deride Henrietta’s efforts to raise arms and men by hinting that her methods were morally suspect. Thus, one newsbook reported that, after the queen had received a list of commanders from the Prince of Orange, she had ‘pricked the names of such *as shee liked of*, who are since discharged of their service there, and ready to come for England’.¹³ This account of Henrietta’s actions drew on contemporary beliefs about the inherent moral weakness of womanhood.¹⁴ The pamphleteers’ accounts of Henrietta’s actions therefore demonstrated the disorderly consequences that followed when a woman was allowed to interfere in matters that were

¹⁰ E.112[19], *The joyfuller newes from Hull that ever came to London* (London: 17 August 1642), esp. pp. 2, 5-6.

¹¹ E.109[35], *Some speciall passages from London, Westminster, Yorke Hull, Ireland and other partes* (1-9 August 1642), p. 3.

¹² E.121[31], *Speciall passages and certain informations from severall places* (4-11 October 1642), p. 66.

¹³ E.202[31], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (1-8 August 1642), p. 7. See also, E.121[11], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (5 -8 October 1642), p. 5 [sic]; and E.109[31], *An Extract of letters, wherein is related, certaine remarkable passages from Yorke & Hull* (London: 9 August 1642), p. 2.

¹⁴ L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 3; and S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 71. For contemporary examples see E.722[2], *A Brief Anatomie of Women* (London: 1653), p. 1; and Wing / F2443, T. Fuller, *The Holy State* (Cambridge: 1642), p. 366.

deemed to be above her sex. Instead of choosing men for their military ability, the pamphleteer hinted suggestively, she had allowed her sexual appetite to interfere with the task. As Anthony Fletcher has observed, women who became involved in the ‘public sphere’ were often accused of sexual immorality.¹⁵ Suggestions of the Queen’s alleged promiscuity would only become more explicit in parliamentary ephemeral literature as the war continued.

Part 1.3 – 1643: The ‘omnipotent over-ruling power of the Queen’¹⁶

During the early months of 1643, parliamentary pamphleteers went further than they had done before to present Henrietta Maria as one of those who had been foremost in persuading the king to declare war upon his Parliament. Thus one pamphleteer emphasised that it was through the queen’s pawning of certain jewels on the continent that ‘the sinews of war was [sic] provided’.¹⁷ One of the most daring attacks on the queen was launched by Henry Parker in his pamphlet *The Contra-replicant, his complaint to His Majestie*. In this work, which Thomason acquired at the end of January, Parker repeatedly described the queen as the lynchpin of the royalist cause, as it was through her, he claimed, that the Pope had been able to influence the king and to stir up war in the kingdom. ‘The Queen has now attained to a great heighth [sic] of power as formidable as she is to us’ Parker wrote, ‘some think that shee has an absolute unlimitable power over the Kings sword and scepter; which if it bee so, no end of our feares and calamities can be’.¹⁸ There is no doubt that parliamentarians viewed Henrietta Maria with suspicion and fear because she was a Catholic. Behind this fear lay the contemporary belief that wives were particularly adept at converting their husbands to their own religion.¹⁹ Parker even made a subtle allusion to the sexual power that the queen might possess over the king when he referred to the king’s ‘sword and scepter’. Contemporaries would have recognised the phallic symbolism in both of these words.²⁰ However, behind this belief about Henrietta and Charles lies a more

¹⁵ A. Fletcher, *Gender, sex and subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 8; and J. de Groot, ‘Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women’ in J. Daybell (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 195-6.

¹⁶ E.248[4], W. Prynne, *The fourth part of The soveraigne power of parliaments and kingdoms* (London: 28 August* 1643), p. 34.

¹⁷ E.245[1], *An answer to mis-led Doctor Fearne* (London*: 10 January* 1643), p. 30.

¹⁸ E.87[5], H. Parker*, *The contra-replicant, his complaint to His Maiestie* (London: 31 January* 1643), p. 10.

¹⁹ E. Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and court entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 89-90, 106.

²⁰ G. Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature* (London: Athlone Press, 1994), vol. III, pp. 1201, 1351.

dangerous implication, one that Parker was not ready to voice in early 1643 but which would emerge in parliamentary polemical literature later in the war: that it was the king who was at fault for allowing his wife to wield such power over him.²¹

While Henrietta Maria prepared to return to England, the parliamentary writers continued to highlight the queen's personal involvement in the war which, they were careful to emphasise was inappropriate behaviour for a woman to undertake. To this end, reports were circulated in several newsbooks at the beginning of January that Colonel Goring had landed at Newcastle and that he 'hath brought with him a Standard from the *Queene*, which is to be advanced in the head of the Lord of Newcastles Army, the which is now called the Catholike Army'.²² Several weeks before this news was printed, a letter had been received from Rotterdam by one Mr. Blackston and then read out in the House of Lords, which reported that 'Her Majesty's Standard' was being readied 'to be sent for Newcastle'.²³ It is impossible to be sure that the information related by this correspondent was accurate, but it may well be that Henrietta's standard did indeed fly at the head of the northern army. The editor of *England's Memorable Accidents* even went so far as to describe the royalist northern army as '*her Catholique Army*', thereby giving the queen definite ownership and possibly command over these forces, despite her sex.²⁴ This description also reinforced the militant Catholic threat which the queen was thought to pose to Protestant England.

Printed attacks upon the Queen became more vicious and personal as she became 'more visibly active in the war' in the north after her arrival at Bridlington, in Yorkshire, on 22 February 1643.²⁵ Carola Oman and Michelle White have convincingly demonstrated that Henrietta was a highly prominent figure in Newcastle's army. For instance, Oman notes how Henrietta later recalled that during this period she 'always rode on horseback at the head of the fine army she was bringing to her husband'.²⁶ Indeed during March and early April such was the parliamentary pamphleteers' focus on the queen, that the Earl of

²¹ A similar, although admittedly less critical, opinion of the queen was voiced in another newsbook at the end of January 1643, see E.88[20], *The kingdomes weekly intelligencer* (31 January-7 February 1643), pp. 44, 46.

²² E.84[1], *Speciall passages and certain informations from severall places* (27 December 1642-3 January 1643), p. 274. See also E.84[4], *The kingdomes weekly intelligencer* (27 December 1642-3 January 1643), p. 3; and E.244[34], *England's memorable accidents* (26 December 1642-2 January 1643), p. 135.

²³ *LJ*, vol. V (16 December 1642), pp. 493-496.

²⁴ E.244[34], *England's memorable accidents* (26 December 1642-2 January 1643), p. 135 (my italics).

²⁵ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 136. See also Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 139-143; Plowden, *Woman All on Fire*, p. 26; and Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 179.

²⁶ M. Petitot (ed.) *Memoires de Madame de Motteville* (Paris: 1824) cited in Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 149. See also White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 78.

Newcastle's role as the army's commander was all but eclipsed.²⁷ For instance, at the end of March the *Perfect Diurnall* claimed that a letter had been intercepted, wherein Henrietta wrote that 'she hath a strong Army ... and that she intends suddainely to advance' southwards.²⁸ Similarly, in early April one newsbook referred to the northern forces as 'her Jesuiticall and Popish army'.²⁹ With Henrietta's fresh supplies of arms and ammunition, Newcastle's strong hold over the north-east must have looked extremely threatening. By claiming that it was, in fact, Henrietta Maria who was the commander of these forces, the pamphleteers may have been trying to minimise the royalist threat, as well as implicitly criticising the king for handing over military power to a woman.

Yet, intriguingly, depictions of the queen's role in Newcastle's army shifted during mid-April to May in order to serve the parliamentarians' polemical ends. When reports began to reach London that the royalist and parliamentary forces in the north-east were preparing for battle, the writers began to downplay the queen's role in the northern royalist army. For instance, one newsbook reported that if the Earl of Newcastle 'should have the victory he intended to march with *his* Army with the Queene to the King'. The editor added that he hoped 'to see my Lord of *Newcastle* and his popish army to be put to the worst'.³⁰ It is tempting to see this change of emphasis in the light of the events of the war: after the parliamentary defeats at Seacroft Moor (30 March) and Ancaster Heath (11 April), to claim that the army was led by a woman would have made the growing threat of the northern royalist army even more humiliating and emasculating for the parliamentarians. The pamphleteers' shifting approaches to the subject of Henrietta Maria as a military commander during the spring of 1643 highlights how willing they were to manipulate the news for their own polemical ends.

Pamphlet attacks upon Henrietta Maria increased after letters from the king to the queen were printed which discussed certain new appointments. The letters provided the newsbooks with ample opportunity to claim 'that the King referreth all affaires to the

²⁷ For instance see E.96[2], *Speciall passages and certain informations from severall places* (4-11 April 1643), p. 289; E.96[4], *The kingdomes weekly intelligencer* (4-11 April 1643), p. 117; and E.94[29], *Certaine informations from severall parts of the kingdome* (27 March-3 April 1643), p. 88.

²⁸ E.247[18], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (27 March-3 April 1643), unpaginated.

²⁹ E.96[2], *Speciall passages and certain informations from severall places* (4-11 April 1643), p. 289; E.96[4], *The kingdomes weekly intelligencer* (4-11 April 1643), p. 117; and E.94[29], *Certaine informations from severall parts of the kingdome* (27 March-3 April 1643), p. 88.

³⁰ E.100[25], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (27 April-4 May 1643), unpaginated (my italics). See also E.100[19], *The kingdomes weekly intelligencer* (25 April-2 May 1643), p. 128.

Queene, and is directed by her Counsell and advice'.³¹ Indeed, by interpreting the letters in such a way as to claim that Charles was referring 'all affaires' to the queen, the editor was implicitly criticising Charles for his supposed failure to rule independently. Yet, the fact that the queen was impeached by Parliament some eighteen days later suggests that there were still elements within the houses who wanted to maintain the pleasant fiction that if the king was separated from the influence of his evil counsellors – and Henrietta was included within this category – then he would be more open to negotiation with his Parliament.³² The debates surrounding the impeachment were reported in many parliamentary newsbooks. For instance *The Perfect Diurnall* recorded that Henrietta had been impeached for 'her ayding and assisting the present Warre' but also for 'her actuall performances with her Popish Army in the North'.³³ As White has argued – and as these examples demonstrate – pamphlet attacks upon Henrietta were 'not simply a convenient way to side-step criticizing Charles', for implicit in the assertion that Henrietta had become too powerful was the suggestion that her husband should have reigned her in.³⁴

The effect of Henrietta Maria's impeachment was soon seen in the Roundhead polemical literature. Up until to this point many pamphleteers had been careful in the language they had used to discuss the queen's involvement in the war, but after this ruling, their attacks became more overt. Equally, criticism of the queen may have become more pointed and personal because July had seen the king and queen reunited at Kington. As White argues, this presented problems for the parliamentary writers as there would be fewer opportunities for the parliamentarians to intercept their letters.³⁵ Equally, though, if contemporaries believed that Henrietta's influence stemmed from her sexual power over Charles, then the reunion of the couple gave Henrietta greater opportunities to influence her husband and pursue her own Catholic agenda. Such a belief about the queen's influence over Charles was clearly expressed in William Prynne's book *Romes Master-peece*, which Thomason acquired in August 1643. In this work, Prynne declared that the Pope had succeeded in placing many Catholics in the king's 'Closet, Bedchamber, if not Bed', thereby suggesting that Henrietta could use her intimate relationship with the king to Rome's advantage. In another discourse, printed at the end of August, Prynne again

³¹ E.101[24], *Certaine informations from severall parts of the kingdome* (8-15 May 1643), pp. 131-2. See also, E.103[8], *The kingdome weekly intelligencer* (16-23 May 1643), pp. 158, 137 [sic], 160.

³² *CJ*, vol. III (23 May 1643), pp. 98-99.

³³ E.249[10], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (22-29 May 1643), unpaginated.

³⁴ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 58.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 136.

alluded to the patriarchal disorder which the parliamentarians' claimed was rife within royalist quarters by referring to 'the omnipotent over-ruling power of the Queen' who was 'the Head of that partie ... with the King, and his Councell'.³⁶ A month later, in his book *The Popish Royall Favourite*, Prynne asserted that, just as the Catholics believed that 'all things are subject to the command of [the Virgin] Mary, even God himselfe', so the Catholics were attempting to assign a similar worldly authority to Henrietta Maria: they wanted the queen to be 'of greatest Authority in the Kingdome'.³⁷

William Prynne was by no means alone in expressing concern about the queen's supposed power over Charles, for similar views were echoed in other publications over the months that followed Henrietta Maria's impeachment and the couple's reunion. In particular, the parliamentary newsbook *Mercurius Britannicus* from its very inception was vituperative in its attacks upon the queen. In response to royalist concerns about the stability of the gender order in parliamentary territory, *Britannicus* replied by sarcastically noting that, 'if the Ladies and Gentlewomen medle too much with publicke, it is either in imitation, or duty to her Majestie'.³⁸ Towards the end of the same month, *Britannicus* responded to *Aulicus*' claims that some of the women in London had been given legislative power, by asserting that 'some of your Ladies have a *Soveraigne power*'. '[I]f ours compel their own Sex' *Britannicus* continued, 'yours *compell* another Sex, which is not so naturall'. To make his point explicit *Britannicus* added, 'we know who can rule her husband at Oxford' and pondered, 'whether this be the year of the Kings raigne or the Queens'.³⁹ In a later edition the newsbook pointed to Henrietta's involvement in the conflict by referring to her as 'the Queene of Troubles'.⁴⁰

During this period similar sentiments were echoed in occasional tracts. Indeed the author of one such pamphlet, printed in the autumn of 1643, asserted that the queen had already achieved absolute power over the king and the counsel, remarking that:

I am sure she hath disposed of places in Court and Commonwealth, as appears by his Majesties owne Letters; and I am sure she sent those answers from *Yorke* which came from the King to the Parliament [during?] the last treaty, I know it, I tell you

³⁶ E.248[4], W. Prynne, *The fourth part of The soveraigne power of parliaments and kingdoms* (London: 1 August 1643), p. 34.

³⁷ E.251[9], W. Prynne, *The Popish royall favourite* (London: 11 September* 1643), pp. 56, 59.

³⁸ E.67[8], *Mercurius Britannicus* (5-12 September 1643), p. 17.

³⁹ E.69[19], *Mercurius Britannicus* (26 September-3 October 1643), pp. 41-2.

⁴⁰ E.68[5], *Mercurius Britannicus* (19-26 September 1643), p. 36.

we are merely fooled and deluded, and the Queene is the very president of the Councell Table.⁴¹

It seems highly likely that the queen's impeachment by the House of Commons would have led the parliamentary pamphleteers to feel that they had greater freedom to criticise her. But it is also necessary to consider the impact of the events of the war in order to more fully understand the increasingly overt criticisms of the queen that were printed by the London presses at this time. By the end of 1643, the balance of military power appeared to be shifting in the royalists' favour: certainly the king had proved himself stronger than his parliamentary opponents had supposed. In the west the royalists had won victories at Lansdown and Roundway Down and had successfully taken Bristol in July. In the north-east Newcastle's army had inflicted significant losses upon the parliamentary northern forces, while in the midlands the king's army had secured victories at Hopton Heath in March, at Ripple Field in April and at Chalgrove Field in June. In the summer it looked entirely feasible that a combined royalist force would march upon London, and this may explain the frantic assertions that it was Henrietta Maria who ruled at Oxford, not only dominating the king and his counsel, but also aiming at the overthrow of English society and religion.⁴² Such a claim was surely designed to steel the parliament's male supporters against their supposedly weak and unmanly opponents.

The pamphlets and newsbooks certainly mirrored this shift, as they became more openly critical of Charles in the summer and autumn of 1643. For instance, in mid-August one anonymous writer emphasised Henrietta's unwomanly behaviour by asserting that, 'Wee vow and covenant ... to take-up Armes now against King, [and] Queene, both (for shee is more masculine at this worke) setting themselves against God, and the power of godlinesse'.⁴³ By using these words the author simultaneously criticised the king, for the suggestion that Henrietta was 'more masculine' in this work than her husband was, implied that it was Charles's unmanliness that had enabled Henrietta to usurp his patriarchal position. Equally, the author's bold claim that both Charles and Henrietta had set themselves 'against God' further undermined the justness of the king's cause.

Mercurius Britanicus also began to tentatively suggest that the blame for the war

⁴¹ E.250[6], *The reformed malignants* (London: 4 September 1643), p. 3.

⁴² C. V. Wedgwood, *The King's War, 1641-1647* (London: Collins, 1958), pp. 253-5.

⁴³ E.250[2], *The late covenant asserted* (NPP: 14 August* 1643), p. 5.

should be laid at the feet of both Henrietta *and* Charles. For instance, at the end of 1643 the newsbook declared that, ‘this Kingdome is wofully ruined by a ... *Conjugall Conspiracie*, by a Plot in *Matrimonie*’. Through such a claim the newsbook hinted that the woes of the kingdom stemmed from the gender disorder within the royal marriage: Henrietta was domineering over her husband, but, equally, Charles had failed to check her.⁴⁴ In a purposefully vague manner, *Britanicus* resorted to the language of syntax to further emphasise Henrietta’s disorderly conduct. The newsbook remarked that as ‘for Genders, Henretta is of the Masculine, though Maria be of the Feminine’.⁴⁵ The newsbook was using the queen’s name, which sounded both masculine – Henry – and feminine – Mary – to highlight the fact that the queen, despite her sex, was behaving in a way that was more fitting for a man.⁴⁶

Another lengthy tract offered an exasperated criticism of the king, expostulating that, ‘[t]he soule of the King cleaves in love to her, even her, who bends all her power against the LORD CHRIST and his Kingdoms’. Later in the same publication, the author offered another challenge to the king’s authority. Resorting to a similar use of language and grammar, the author explained that, ‘if the King degenerate, and prove *Feminine*, uxorious, and womanish, as a man may be’ some believed that as ‘the Subject is an *Adjective*, hee must degenerate too, for he must be of the same *gender* with his Substantive’. The writer ended by declaring that, ‘[a]ll this is good Grammar, but the worst *Logicke* that ever I read’ and went on to explain that there is no reason that ‘the Subject, who *God has made a man*...should be *Adjective*, [or] wholly at the dispose and will of his Prince’.⁴⁷ Thus the writer argued that, because the king had become enthralled to his Catholic wife, it did not mean that the men of the nation had to follow in his folly, particularly as God had made them men, and therefore capable of independent, rational thought. Later in the book, the anonymous writer made his point even clearer when he asserted that ‘the King is not the *higher power* (to be obeyed), he is a Man, and may doe,

⁴⁴ E.80[9], *Mercurius Britanicus* (28 December 1643–4 January 1644), p. 148.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 148.

⁴⁶ Shortly after Charles and Henrietta Maria’s marriage it was decided that the queen would be prayed for as ‘Princess Henry’, as her French name was apparently too difficult for the English to pronounce. However, despite being advised against it, because of the unpopular memory of Mary I, Charles ruled that she should be referred to as ‘Queen Mary’. Thus, *Britanicus*’ word-play was more subtle than it first appears. See Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 39; and White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 146.

⁴⁷ Italics on the phrase, ‘*God has made a man*’ are my own. For a discussion of the ‘reduction of the issues of the war to issues of language’ see J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 224.

and does much wrong, for there is a Malignity in man, even in the best of men'.⁴⁸ Another occasional pamphlet argued along similar lines that, 'Kings are not Gods, but men, and subject to mens infirmities'.⁴⁹ The pamphleteers were beginning to (tentatively) recognise that Charles had some degree of culpability for the war, as he had failed to exercise appropriate control over his unruly wife and had therefore called his own manhood into question. As the conduct-book writer William Whately asserted, it was God who had made man in his own image, and had ruled that man would be the 'head' of his wife, as Christ was the head of the church. '[I]t is a sinne for a man to come lower, than God hath set him', Whately continued, 'every man is bound to maintaine himselfe in that place, in which his Maker hath set him'.⁵⁰ But this was not all, for the pamphleteers were beginning to suggest that Charles' uxoriousness had caused him to renounce his religion and return to Rome.

Part 1.4 – 1644: '[I]t had beene better for him that he had Conquer'd himselfe'⁵¹: Questioning the Manliness of the King

If Henrietta's intimate involvement in the war had called Charles's manliness into question, the king's virility was further eroded by parliamentary claims that the queen was unfaithful to her husband. During the seventeenth century it was common for women who behaved in more assertive ways, or who 'gadded about' without their husbands, to be branded as women of ill-repute because they presented a challenge to patriarchy by operating outside patriarchal control.⁵² Given Henrietta Maria's active role in the war, it was hardly surprising that the parliamentary pamphleteers should have made this claim about her. It was the queen's loyal courtier, Henry Jermyn, who was the parliamentary pamphleteers' primary target on this score and his continual presence beside the queen, or in her service, gave the pamphleteers ample opportunity to suggest that their relationship went beyond the bounds of propriety.⁵³ While *Britanicus* had started to make subtle allusions to the improper intimacy of the queen and Jermyn in the previous year,⁵⁴ these

⁴⁸ E.63[9], *Englands third alarm to warre* (London: 3 August* 1643), pp. 21, 25.

⁴⁹ E.63[20], *The plotts revealed and the Parliament vindicated* (London: 4 August* 1643), p. 12.

⁵⁰ STC / 1369:04, W. Whately, *A Bride-Bush* (London: 1623), pp. 97-8.

⁵¹ E.7[30], *The great eclipse of the sun, or Charles his waine over-clouded* (NPP: 30 August 1644), p. 8.

⁵² Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. 8, 16, 115, 120; Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, pp. 61, 79-80; O. Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe vol 1., 1500-1800* (London: Fontana Press, 1997), pp. 27, 37, 46; and de Groot, 'Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women', pp. 195-6.

⁵³ Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, p. 169.

⁵⁴ See for example, E.67[26], *Mercurius Britanicus* (12-19 September 1643), p. 25.

claims were more explicitly voiced by *Britanicus* in 1644 and began to be expressed in other publications as well.

By the spring of 1644 Henrietta Maria was heavily pregnant: it was therefore decided that she should leave Oxford and make her way into the West Country in order to take shipping for France.⁵⁵ Travelling with the queen for her protection was Henry Jermyn, a fact that did not escape the notice of the parliamentary writers. *The Court Mercurie*, for example, provided a scurrilous relation of the queen's conduct with Jermyn on her journey through Cornwall in the summer of 1644. The newsbook claimed that, '[w]e have private Information of [Jermyn's] ... Courtly behaviour to the Queene' and assured the reader that '(this is no Newes, but an Observation of truth)'. The newsbook went on to relate that the queen was being carried in a litter because of her ill health following the birth of her daughter, but, the pamphleteer claimed salaciously, because the carriage 'deprived her of the sight of him [Jermyn]', the queen had ordered for the 'Windowes on every side of the Litter to be *thrown carelesly open*' despite the advice of her 'Doctors and Physicians' to the contrary. The newsbook went on to report how 'upon every stop (as she made many) the Courtiers officious hand appeared to support her weake body' when she alighted from the litter and that 'she was pleased (contrary to the directions of the Physicians) to walke on foot, [because] his Arme ... warranted her health more then all the Probatums of the most skill'd Physicians'. The claim that the queen 'conceives' Jermyn's arm to be '*as mighty as the strongest Pillar of this Land*', further implied that she considered the courtier to be on a par with the king.⁵⁶

The insinuation that the queen was sexually involved with a number of her courtiers continued to be made over the late summer of 1644. For instance, in one of its issues, *Britanicus* described Henry Jermyn, George Digby 'and the other' as '*Queen-catchers*'.⁵⁷ Similarly, *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* claimed that 'young Harry, the Earle' was with the queen in Paris and included the bawdy description of him as 'Her Majesties Jockey, *Alias, Master of the Horse, or Rider* if you please'.⁵⁸ But perhaps the most explicit attacks upon Henrietta Maria's chastity – and therefore, upon the

⁵⁵ White, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 129, 132.

⁵⁶ E.2[25], *The court mercurie* (10-20 July 1644), unpaginated (my italics).

⁵⁷ The phrase 'Queen-catchers' is strikingly similar to the term 'cony-catcher'. As the word 'cony' was often used to denote the female genitals, so 'cony-catching' was a term for whoring. See F. Rubenstein, *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and their Significance* (Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1984), pp. 297-302.

⁵⁸ E.4[1], *A continuation of certain speciall and remarkable passages informed to the Parliament* (24 July-1 August 1644), p. 4; see also E.6[30], *The court mercurie* (10-21 August 1644), unpaginated.

king's ability to keep patriarchal order in his household – were written by the astrologer-turned pamphleteer, John Booker in the autumn of 1644.⁵⁹ Booker claimed that accusations of the queen's infidelity with Jermyn had been made prior to the outbreak of war by 'her owne Courtiers and Parasites'.⁶⁰ To further illustrate the queen's sexual dishonesty, Booker went on to accuse her of encouraging 'baudy Songs' to be sung at court, which were 'not fit for a womans eares; which if any of that Sex can delight in, a man may guesse at the Constitution without Calculating her Nativity'. As contemporaries believed that 'promiscuity can reasonably be inferred from disrespectable behaviour' to claim that Henrietta Maria enjoyed such 'beastly' songs was to imply that she was unchaste.⁶¹

More daring still, John Booker included a poorly written poem in his pamphlet, entitled 'Jermyn's Sonnet'. Yet, rather than being a love-poem composed by Jermyn to woo the queen, the poem quickly showed itself to be written from the female lover's perspective. Given the accusations that Booker had made only a few lines previously about Henrietta and Jermyn, the reader was supposed to recognise that this female lover was the queen. By placing the queen in the dominant courtship role normally undertaken by the man, Booker further emphasised the queen's subversive behaviour. The 'sonnet' went on to emphasise the sexually demanding character of the queen by making her command that men should 'stand to make Elixir',

For us Madams that cry Quick-Sir,
Or you'll bare on't; because we then
Shall find no difference in Men.

Booker made the queen assert that if one man was not able to sexually please her, then she, and 'Madams' like her, would simply turn to other men until they were satisfied. The poem then went on to present an ambiguous, but subversive image of a figure who may well have been intended to represent Charles himself, for the author made Henrietta declare:

That since my Lord has a weake backe,

⁵⁹ B. Capp, 'John Booker' in *DNB*.

⁶⁰ This was also noted by contemporaries earlier in the 1640s: see for instance, Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 169; Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 152; and White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 49.

⁶¹ Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, p. 86.

...

T'will put us all into a rage,
And make us take our Groomes, by stealth,
To breed base blood ith' commonwealth.

In these lines, Booker was causing his representation of Henrietta to assert that Charles did not have the sexual stamina to please her, and that this has led her to have affairs with her courtiers, Jermyn being only one of them. What is more, the author drew out the far-reaching consequences of this affair as it cast doubt over the legitimacy of the king's children. The 'Sonnet' ended by making Henrietta assert that such grooms and courtiers should be allowed to 'stand,

To keepe the Gentry of the Land
In able plight, that they may serve,
As men of the more solid Nerve,
And strenuously goe thorow [through] stitch⁶²
Without a Lever at the breech.⁶³

What seems to be implied in these lines is that gentlemen, like Jermyn, should be allowed to have their way with socially superior women, in order to allow the husbands of such women to appear 'As men of the more solid Nerve'. In this manner, the husbands might have the appearance of sexually pleasing their wives – 'strenuously' performing their sexual rights as husbands – despite the fact that they are 'Without a Lever [penis] at the breech'. The pamphleteer's suggestion that Henrietta had replaced Charles with her socially inferior 'Groomes' suggested that the social order was descending into chaos. What was more, the author was also claiming that the queen's supposed cuckolding of the king would have implications for the entire gender order as it would encourage women elsewhere to behave in a similar way. Booker therefore used every pre-existing polemical tactic to libel the queen: he highlighted her unladylike behaviour in support of the royalist war effort, he demonstrated how this public behaviour had left her chastity in question, and

⁶² The *OED* defines the term 'through-stitch' as 'to perform something thoroughly, carry it out completely and effectually'.

⁶³ E.10[14], J. Booker, *A rope treble-twisted, for John Tayler the water-poet* (London: 27 September 1644), pp. 4-6.

by doing so, he simultaneously questioned Charles' manliness and ability to rule because he had failed to check his unruly wife. By exploiting beliefs about gender and social order, Booker made reference to these political ideas in a language that would have made the negative consequences of the queen's actions obvious to all. Moreover, the fact that Booker felt bold enough to attach his name to a tract which coupled such barbed invectives against the queen, with such suggestive attacks upon Charles' virility suggests that by the end of September 1644, attitudes had begun to harden against the king.

As well as suggesting that the queen was sexually promiscuous, the parliamentary pamphleteers continued to assert that she dominated both her husband and his court. In the early spring *Britanicus* launched its most cutting attacks yet upon the 'lords and Gentlemen' of the court who, it was claimed, '*pretend to State affairs, and yet*' were 'so infatuated, so led about by the Apron strings, [that] they dare do nothing, Vote nothing, Act nothing' without first knowing 'if it be her Majesties pleasure'.⁶⁴ In mid-July another edition of the newsbook remarked that 'some say she is the man, and Raignes'.⁶⁵ Another short-lived newsbook made the implications of the queen's assertive actions more explicit by likening it to a domestic situation to which every reader could relate. Thus the pamphleteer asked, 'What is most preposterous and dishonourable to a Politick Government?' and provided the reply, 'As to a domestick, when the wife wears the breeches'.⁶⁶ To state so explicitly that gender relations were disordered within the royal household was a daring claim to make, for such an assertion made it quite obvious that the king was accountable for his wife's domineering behaviour – just as was the case when the household in question was an ordinary domestic household.

The political implications of such gender disorder within the royal household were drawn out in lurid detail in the anonymous pamphlet *The great eclipse of the sun*, published in August 1644. The author likened Charles to the sun, and claimed that he had been 'Over-clouded, by the evill *Influences* of the Moon [Henrietta Maria]'. By using the language of the moon and sun the pamphleteer highlighted how unnatural the queen's behaviour was. The author went on to assert that Henrietta could use her sexuality, or 'night discourses', to influence the king.⁶⁷ As White has noted, '[i]n their reports, Parliamentary papers skilfully fused together Henrietta's political prominence, sexual

⁶⁴ E.39[5], *Mercurius Britanicus* (18-25 March 1644), p. 219 (my italics).

⁶⁵ E.2[31], *Mercurius Britanicus* (15-22 July 1644), pp. 345, 347.

⁶⁶ E.8[17], *A new mercury, called Mercurius Problematicus* (London: 9 September* 1644), unpaginated.

⁶⁷ E.7[30], *The great eclipse of the sun, or Charles his waine over-clouded* (NPP: 30 August 1644), pp. 1-6.

‘power’, and religious persuasion to reinforce the idea that she had degraded and defiled the crown’.⁶⁸

But this was not all, for the author went much further than simply laying blame at Henrietta’s door, instead making it quite obvious that the king was, in fact, more culpable for allowing his queen to dominate him. Not only does the title page contain a woodcut which depicts the king dispassionately holding a sword while a city burns and his subjects lie dead on the ground (see appendix 1, figure 1), but the pamphleteer goes on to state that the war had broken out partly because of the king’s failure to behave as a man. ‘[I]t had beene better for him that he had Conquer’d himselfe’ the writer asserted, ‘Conquer’d his own passion, subdu’d his affection to Poperie and subjected himselfe to reason’. Instead of doing these things, Charles had behaved in an unmanly way: he had let his romantic feelings for his wife rule him, thus leaving him with ‘no Light... [or] reason’.⁶⁹ As Mark Breitenberg has shown, contemporaries believed that men were particularly at risk of behaving effeminately when they were courting a woman, as love-sickness could lead them to behave irrationally and become dominated by their emotions.⁷⁰ Yet, as White has noted, ‘not only did [this polemical theme] call into question Charles’ manhood, it also opened up the whole issue of Charles’s competence as a ruler’.⁷¹ In the opening months of the war, such an explicit attack upon the king, through the actions of the queen, would have been unthinkable; by 1644 clearly attitudes had hardened, at least among some elements of the population, to such a degree as to allow these ideas to be set down and printed for a wider audience.

The outpouring of invective against Henrietta Maria in the months that followed her departure for France in 1644 can be better understood if we consider the atmosphere in which the pamphleteers were writing. The year 1644 started well for the parliamentarians, as the Scottish army marched into England and thus prevented the northern royalist army, under Newcastle, from continuing to push further south. While Prince Rupert’s relief of York was hailed as a royalist triumph, the battle of Marston Moor in July saw the entire northern royalist field army routed by the parliamentary forces. Yet, the royalist victories over Waller at Cropredy Bridge in June and over Essex’s field army at Lostwithiel in

⁶⁸ White, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 144-5.

⁶⁹ E.7[30], *The great eclipse of the sun*, p. 8.

⁷⁰ M. Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), esp. pp. 55, 67.

⁷¹ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 141.

September had rebalanced the scales of war in favour of the king: if the queen was to be successful in recruiting further foreign troops on the continent, then her actions might be enough to tip those scales in the king's favour.⁷²

The comments of certain pamphleteers and news-writers support the argument that the parliamentarians' were concerned that the queen would be successful in recruiting further support for her husband's cause. For instance, an occasional pamphlet asserted that Henrietta Maria should be called to account for the part she had played in the Civil War, but also expressed fear that she was still capable of further destruction. To this end, the pamphleteer questioned, '[W]ho went to the Broakers [sic] with the Jewells of the Crowne...who bought *Pocket pistolls*, barrells of Powder, and many such pretty toyes to destroy the Protestants? was it Queen *Mary*?' the pamphleteer asked, 'the very same who is gone into *France* to doe the like?'.⁷³ Other newsbooks reported on the queen's activities in disparaging tones in an attempt to show that 'wee need not feare the worst of her Malice'.⁷⁴ In the opening months of the war, the parliamentary pamphleteers had ensured that the queen's role in sending supplies to the king had been well publicised, as it was another way of portraying her as a 'principal Agent' of the war.⁷⁵ Yet, now that Henrietta had returned to the continent, there was every chance that she would be able to drum up yet more support for the royalist cause and it was surely this uncertainty that was, in part, behind these renewed polemical attacks.

Part 1.5 – 1645: 'A Prince seduced out of his proper sphear':⁷⁶ The Impact of the Battle of Naseby

If opinion was divided in the parliamentary quarters during 1644 as to how much the king could be held accountable for the Civil War, by mid-1645 disillusionment with Charles was becoming much deeper and more pronounced. The Parliament had spent the winter of 1644-45 remodelling its army into a national force which was placed under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax, with overall strategy devised by the Committee of Both Kingdoms.

⁷² P. Young and R. Holmes, *The English Civil War: A Military history of the three Civil Wars, 1642-1651* (Kent: Eyre Methuen Limited, 1974), p. 204; M. Wanklyn and F. Jones, *A Military History of the English Civil War* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005), p. 160; and White, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 129, 132.

⁷³ E.9[9], *A nest of perfidious vipers: or, The second part of the Parliaments kalender of black saints* (London: 21 September 1644), p. 8.

⁷⁴ E.6[3], *The court mercurie* (3-10 August 1644), unpaginated; see also E.7[3] *Mercurius Civicus* (15-22 August 1644), p. 619.

⁷⁵ E.10[14], Booker, *A rope treble-twisted, for John Tayler the water-poet*, pp. 4-6.

⁷⁶ E.292[27], *The Kings cabinet opened: or, Certain packets of secret letters & papers, written with the Kings own hand, and taken in his cabinet at Nasby-Field, June 14. 1645* (London: 14 July* 1645), letter to the reader.

The contentious task of remodelling the army had meant that the spring campaign began slowly for the parliamentarians, leaving the king's army relatively unopposed to take to the field on 8 May. In the king's absence Fairfax was ordered to besiege Oxford, but in response to the king's capture of Leicester on 29 May, the Committee finally gave Fairfax the authority to engage the king if a favourable situation presented itself.⁷⁷ The two armies clashed at Naseby on 14 June but the parliamentarians' superior numbers, particularly in cavalry, eventually forced the king's horse to withdraw, leaving the 'flower of the King's infantry' to surrender to the New Model. Young and Holmes conclude that the battle was therefore 'more than the end of an army: it was, for all practical purposes, the end of a reign'.⁷⁸ But, as well as striking a terrible blow to the king in the loss of vast numbers of his infantry, the battle also led to the capture of the king's cabinet of private correspondence, which was discovered when the parliamentarians plundered the royalist baggage train.⁷⁹

The king's letters were sent to Parliament where it was decided that they would be officially published. The resulting pamphlet, *The Kings Cabinet Opened* was entered into the Stationer's Company Register on 9 July.⁸⁰ As we have seen, this was not the first time that Parliament had published Charles's private correspondence.⁸¹ However, the sheer number of letters that were reproduced in *The King's Cabinet Opened*, their damning content, and the presence of a series of 'annotations', which drew out their true significance, made this by far the most effective exploitation of the king's captured letters to date. Many historians have stressed the vital importance of the publication of the king's personal correspondence. Glenn Foard asserts that the letters were of 'dramatic propaganda value'.⁸² Diane Purkiss even suggests that the *Kings Cabinet Opened* was 'perhaps the most influential publication in the history of the conflict'.⁸³ As White has argued, the 'king's own letters' were used to reiterate that the king was 'unmanly, weak, [and]

⁷⁷ G. Foard, *Naseby: The Decisive Campaign* (Whitstable: Pryor, 1995), pp. 53-161.

⁷⁸ Young and Holmes, *The English Civil War*, pp. 239-250;

⁷⁹ Foard, *Naseby*, pp. 53-250.

⁸⁰ H. R. Plomer (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers from 1640-1718*, cited in White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 164. See also, J. Peacey, *Politicians and pamphleteers: propaganda during the English civil wars and interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 54-5. Peacey notes that the pamphlet was authored by Henry Parker and John Sandler; both were 'eminent pamphleteers'.

⁸¹ See for instance, E.102[6], *The proceedings in the late treaty of peace* (London: 17 May* 1643), pp. 74-76, 83.

⁸² Foard, *Naseby*, p. 319.

⁸³ D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005), p. 72. See also Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 201.

submissive before his wife'. The letters gave the parliamentary polemicists' concrete evidence to suggest that 'the royal court' was 'a house in patriarchal disorder, an image that clearly undercut the language of monarchical authority'.⁸⁴ The significance of this event was also noted by contemporaries. For instance, Lucy Hutchinson claimed that as well as uncovering Charles's deceitfulness, the letters also demonstrated that the king had 'given himself up to be governed by the queen in all affairs'.⁸⁵

The parliamentary pamphleteers were further able to emphasise the queen's unwomanly conduct by including some of her correspondence in *The Kings Cabinet*. In particular, the editors of the pamphlet included a letter written in June 1643 in which the queen described herself as the '*She-majesty* Generalissima' of the forces she was bringing to her husband.⁸⁶ This title has, in turn, been reproduced countless times by later historians as proof that Henrietta Maria had whole-heartedly embraced her martial role.⁸⁷ But, as well as describing herself as a female Generalissimo, it is also worth taking a moment to consider the queen's curious reference to herself as the 'she-majesty'. Such a phrase was commonly used, by the pamphleteers of both sides, in order to highlight occasions when a woman's actions were thought to be inappropriate for her gender. For instance, the parliamentary pamphleteers made claims that the king's army contained 'She-Cavaliers', while the royalists asserted that, within parliamentary territory, various 'She-Committees' had sprung into existence and 'She-Preachers' were permitted to offer religious instruction.⁸⁸ It is therefore somewhat perplexing that the queen should have chosen to refer to herself in this way. The original letter still survives in the Parliamentary Archives and makes it clear that Henrietta had described herself as 'sa she majeste generallissime' (see appendix 1, figure 2).⁸⁹ As the letter is written in French it is intriguing that the queen should have included the single English word 'she' in her text. Ultimately, we will never know why Henrietta Maria chose to include this phrase; her decision to do so may simply

⁸⁴ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 151.

⁸⁵ N. H. Keeble (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, with a fragment of autobiography* (London: Everyman, 1995), p. 200.

⁸⁶ E.292[27], *The Kings cabinet opened*, p. 33 (my italics).

⁸⁷ See for instance, *The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, M. A. E. Green (ed.) (London: Richard Bentley, 1857), pp. 222-3; Oman, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 149; Plowden, *Women All on Fire*, p. 29; Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 186; and White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 84.

⁸⁸ E.288[13], XXXVI. *Several religions, held and maintained by the Cavaliers* (London: 13 June* 1645), unpaginated; and E.67[7], *Mercurius Aulicus* (2 September 1643), pp. 471-2. For references to 'She-Preachers' see, A. Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1984), pp. 275-76.

⁸⁹ HL/PO/JO/10/183 f. 5, first letter. I am grateful to Dr. Jason Peacey and to Dr. Michelle White for discussing the possible whereabouts of the original letter with me.

betray her awkward understanding of English.⁹⁰ What is clear is that the parliamentary pamphleteers made much of the queen's choice of words, claiming that it was further proof of how her behaviour went against the grain of early modern notions of womanhood.

In the 'annotation' section of *The Kings Cabinet*, the authors drew out the significance of the content of the various letters, for instance, they claimed that 'the Kings Counsels are wholly managed by the Queen', even 'though she be of the weaker sexe, borne an Alien, [and] bred up in the contrary Religion'. '[N]othing great or small is transacted without her privity and consent' the authors continued and added that, the 'Queens Counsels are as powerfull as commands'.⁹¹ This has led White to claim that, in the annotations, 'much more condemnation was laid upon Henrietta'.⁹² Yet, such a focus is in danger of losing sight of the fact that criticism of Henrietta's unwomanly behaviour were intrinsically connected to Charles' reputation as a ruler, both in the household, and, on a broader scale, in the commonwealth. Moreover, it should also be noted that, while the pamphlet spends only a page and a half criticising the queen and her divisive role in the war, the remaining eleven pages utterly condemned the behaviour of the king.

Previously the majority of parliamentary pamphleteers had argued that it was the queen who had bullied Charles into declaring war; instead the authors of *The Kings Cabinet* asserted that the 'King doth yet in many things *surpasse* the Queene for acts of hostility', and added that Charles covered his actions 'over with deeper and darker secrecy'. The authors supported this assertion by drawing out examples from the letters: '*He* pawnes the Jewels of the Crown ... *He* presses the Queen beyond her own fiery propension, [and] ... furnishes her with dextrous policies, and arguments to worke upon the Ministers of State in France'.⁹³ In other words, the captured letters presented the disconcerting truth that it had been the king who had instigated the conflict: he had not been led astray by the queen and other 'evil advisors'.⁹⁴ The annotators went on to show that the king's actions, as exposed in his private letters, were, at times, in direct opposition to the promises that he had made in earlier declarations. Charles's behaviour seemed entirely duplicitous, and the annotators urged the readers 'to look both forward and backward' for now that they had seen 'the dimation [dimension] of the Kings minde by his secret Letters', they should 'turne about a

⁹⁰ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 21.

⁹¹ E.292[27], *The Kings cabinet opened*, p. 43.

⁹² White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 166.

⁹³ *Ibid*, pp. 44-5 (my italics).

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 45.

while and looke upon the same in his publike Declarations'.⁹⁵ 'He in shew seekes Treaties' the pamphleteers went on 'and wins upon the People by that shew, yet chuseth such Commissioners, and bindes them up with such instructions, that all accommodation is impossible'.⁹⁶ These were remarkably severe criticisms to make against the king in public, but they were not empty accusations: Charles' duplicity was written in his own hand. As White has noted, the contents of the letters 'were everything for which a parliamentary propagandist could have hoped'.⁹⁷ The letters were therefore put to thorough use by the parliamentarian pamphleteers, and continued to be quoted by them well into the following year, as will be discussed below.⁹⁸

The impact of the publication of the king's letters was considerable: certainly the newsbooks and pamphlets published after this date were much more overtly critical of the king. For instance, *Britanicus* claimed that, if Parliament's male supporters felt that their patriarchal rights and liberties were being encroached on by a prince who was under the subversive influence of a woman, and to use *Britanicus*' words, was therefore 'irrecoverably lost',⁹⁹ it was their manly duty to oppose such a king. The newsbook remarked that it 'were ridiculous in a private man, much more a *King*, to submit to the will of his Wife upon every *trifle*'. *Britanicus* continued by asserting, '[n]ow let all men consider what a necessity lies upon this Nation, in defence of their own safety, and of their Religion, when no Affaires ... are transacted, but according to the will and pleasure of the Queen'.¹⁰⁰ If a man failed in his male role as head of the household by allowing his wife to dominate him, then contemporaries knew that it was the responsibility of the broader community to shame the disorderly couple and restore the gender order.¹⁰¹ It seems that the parliamentarian pamphleteers were following this argument through to its logical conclusion: by highlighting the supposed disordering of gender roles within the royal household, the pamphleteers were suggesting that the king was failing in his duties, both as

⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 49.

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 46.

⁹⁷ White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 166.

⁹⁸ Lois Potter has shown that several London clergymen gave public addresses on the subject, thus making the contents of the letters more widely available for an illiterate audience. See L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 60. See also E.292[29], *Three speeches spoken at a common-hall* (London: 14 July* 1645); and White, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 167.

⁹⁹ E.294[29], *Mercurius Britanicus* (28 July-4 August 1645), p. 825.

¹⁰⁰ E.293[15], *Mercurius Britanicus* (14-21 July 1645), p. 814.

¹⁰¹ E. Foyster, *Manhood in early modern England: honour, sex and marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 4-5, 115-6.

a husband and as their prince. Thus it can be seen how the discourses of gender, patriarchy and anti-Catholicism were being used to delegitimize the king's right to power and legitimise the Parliamentarians' actions against the crown.¹⁰²

The assertion that Charles had failed to exercise the appropriate control over his wife was also made in parliamentary occasional pamphlets. For instance, one anonymous pamphleteer echoed the language that had been found in the royal couple's letters and lamented, 'I know not how the Protestant Religion can be well maintained when the Papists are favoured, and when the King is constant to the Queenes *grounds*, and documents'.¹⁰³ Similar tacit condemnation of the king was made in the newsbooks; for instance, an edition of *The Scottish Dove* criticised Charles by declaring that 'though we are willing to be loyall subjects to him, yet cannot bear that he should be so to a woman, and her Popish Priests'.¹⁰⁴

Other parliamentary pamphleteers continued to emphasise the Queen's unnatural power over Charles. To this end, one anonymous verse-pamphlet described Henrietta as a 'whore' whose 'Fornications' had 'bewicht his [Charles'] royall brest'.¹⁰⁵ Another went even further by urging the king 'not onely to leave, but also to loath the paps of that inchanting Sorceress'.¹⁰⁶ By using such terms, the pamphleteers were not only reiterating the sexual power that Henrietta was thought to have over Charles, but they were also adopting the language of witchcraft in order to emphasise the unnaturalness of Henrietta's feminine power. It is tempting to understand these references in the light of the witchcraft trials that had gripped East Anglia in the summer and autumn of 1645.¹⁰⁷ A number of tracts were published that related details from the trials, therefore enabling the events within this particular locality to reach a far broader audience.¹⁰⁸ The sudden presence of a large number of 'witches' in one region, including a small number who had supposedly confessed to using their powers in order to support the royalist cause, would have made the

¹⁰² See also E.304[3], W. Beech, *More sulphure for Basing: or, God will fearfully annoy and make quick riddance of his implacable enemies, surely, sorely, suddenly* (London: 6 October* 1645), p. 24.

¹⁰³ E.298[8], *The malignants lamentation* (NPP: July 1645*), p. 9.

¹⁰⁴ E.296[4], *The Scottish dove* (1st-8th August 1645), p. 744.

¹⁰⁵ E.1242[1], G. Wither, *Vox pacifica* (London: 1 August* 1645), p. 26.

¹⁰⁶ E.296[28], E. Gilbert, *The prelatial Cavalier catechized, and the Protestant souldier encouraged* (London: 16 August* 1645), p. 9.

¹⁰⁷ M. Gaskill, *Witchfinders: a seventeenth-century English tragedy* (London: John Murray, 2006).

¹⁰⁸ See for instance, E.296[35] *A true and exact relation of the severall informations, examinations, and confessions of the late witches, arraigned and executed in the county of Essex* (London: 19 August* 1645: London).

depiction of Henrietta as a witch all the more believable and frightening.¹⁰⁹

Part 1.6 – 1646: Defeat and Surrender

By the end of 1645 the royalist cause was visibly faltering and by 1646 the king's military fate was sealed. The shifting content of the pamphlets and newsbooks reflected the royalists' impending defeat. It is noticeable that the parliamentary pamphleteers and newsbook writers passed far fewer comments upon the king and queen in 1646 in comparison to the earlier years of the conflict. With the king's surrender to the Scots in May, perhaps the polemical writers recognised that attacks upon the royal couple were no longer necessary. But equally, many pamphleteers and hack-writers would have been reluctant openly to criticise the king in such gendered terms because they did not know the future; presumably they were waiting to see whether the king, once removed from his 'evil advisers' could be made to see the error of his past ways and be restored to power.

Despite the earlier punishment over the 'Hue and Cry' that *Mercurius Britanicus* had raised against the king on 4 August 1645, *Britanicus* was the only newsbook to continue to criticise the king and queen.¹¹⁰ Thus in one edition of April-May 1646 *Britanicus* again blamed Henrietta Maria for the present state of the kingdom and accused her of failing to behave in an appropriately wife-like manner. The newsbook spoke directly to the queen and asked her to '[t]hink but as a wife, what a passe ye have brought the husband to'. *Britanicus* went on to claim that Henrietta Maria failed to have the proper respect for her husband and special reference was made to *Britanicus*' favourite theme – that of the letters captured at Naseby. Upon hearing that the king had allowed his correspondence to be taken, *Britanicus* claimed, the queen was said to have remarked, that 'he carried his Pack about like a Pedlar'.¹¹¹ Contemporary conduct-book writers, like William Whately, stated that the husband should be like the image of God to his wife. Therefore, they claimed, 'a womans words [must] be ordered towards her husband' because, the power given to a husband, 'is Gods originally, and his by Gods appointment'.¹¹² That Henrietta Maria was alleged to have spoken so irreverently, not only of her husband, but of her king, would therefore have still further highlighted her unruliness

¹⁰⁹ Gaskill, *Witchfinders*, pp. 147-150. Prince Rupert, Charles' nephew, was also portrayed as a witch in certain pamphlets, see for instance, E.245[33] *Observations Upon Prince Rupert's White Dog, Called Boy* (London: 1643), unpaginated.

¹¹⁰ Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 298.

¹¹¹ E.335[14], *Mercurius Britanicus* (27 April-4 May 1646), pp. 1095, 1098-9.

¹¹² STC / 1369:04, Whately, *A Bride-Bush*, pp. 195, 201-204.

and disobedience.

After news reached London of Charles' unceremonious departure from Oxford, *Britanicus* also criticised the king for leaving his supporters to fend for themselves, jeering at the fact that the king had 'shifted away privately in the habit of a *Serving-man*'. In a later line *Britanicus* could not resist adding that this was 'a deserved posture for all Princes that endeavour to make their *subjects slaves* by the sword'.¹¹³ Even greater liberties were taken when it came to the queen's reputation, perhaps because she had already been impeached by the House of Commons and so there was less of a threat of retribution from those in power.¹¹⁴ For instance, in May *Britanicus* referred to her courtier, Henry Jermyn, as 'prime Secretary to the Supreme Smock'. A smock was an undergarment that was worn by women, thus *Britanicus*' description of Henrietta further underscored the point that the Queen had behaved in ways which were considered inappropriate for the 'weaker sex'.¹¹⁵ *Britanicus* was also reiterating the supposedly improper relationship between the queen and Jermyn by using a woman's undergarment to describe the queen, thereby suggesting the intimacy of their relationship. Thus it can be seen that through a deft choice of language, the editors had successfully in one phrase alluded to a number of polemical themes that were already circulating widely at this time.

Part 1.7 – Conclusion

The evidence presented above has certainly supported Charles I's rueful comment that Henrietta Maria would not have been so publicly libelled if she had not been his wife. In the early stages of the war, Henrietta Maria – the foreign, Catholic, plotting wife – was portrayed as one of Charles' 'evil counsellors', whose undue influence upon the king had led him to declare war upon his Parliament and whose ultimate aim was to bring England back into the Roman Catholic fold. This, in turn, allowed Parliament to claim that they had declared war upon the king, in order to rescue him from the clutches of his 'evil advisers' and in order to preserve the Protestant religion. Henrietta's own behaviour on the continent in gathering arms and troops for the royalist cause, and in the north of England as titular head of Newcastle's army, did little to allay these fears, or disprove the claims of the parliamentary polemical literature. Yet, as the war continued a more critical image of

¹¹³ E.335[14], *Mercurius Britanicus* (27 April-4 May 1646), pp. 1095-6, 1098-9.

¹¹⁴ Plowden, *Henrietta Maria*, p. 182. See for instance, E.337[9], *Mercurius Britanicus* (4 -11 May 1646), p. 1104; and E.337[24], *Mercurius Britanicus* (11-18 May 1646), p. 1116.

¹¹⁵ G. Walker, *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 54.

Charles began to be voiced: from late 1643 onwards the king was often criticised for allowing his wife to dominate him and lead him down the path to war. By 1645 certain writers were arguing that Charles's 'weak, uxorious, untrustworthy, and incompetent' behaviour meant that he did not deserve their allegiance, instead he had forfeited his power.¹¹⁶ As White has argued, 'however abhorrent it was for Charles's enemies to see the queen apparently wield such great influence, even more repugnant was the idea that Charles had let this evil woman become so powerful'. Parliamentary depictions of Charles as too weak to fulfil his correct patriarchal and monarchical roles therefore 'gave legitimacy to the parliamentary rebellion'.¹¹⁷ As *Britanicus* asserted, it was up to the men who supported the Parliament to rebalance the situation: 'let all men consider what a necessity lies upon this Nation, in defence of their own safety', the newsbook remarked, 'when no Affaires ... are transacted, but according to the will and pleasure of the Queen'.¹¹⁸ What was more, through describing the king as 'a Man ... [who] may doe, and does much wrong' the pamphleteers were able to question Charles' ability to govern, without calling the institution of monarchy, or the patriarchal social order, into question.¹¹⁹

Part 2.1 – 'A loose and wilde Gentleman':¹²⁰ Parliamentary Representations of Prince Rupert

Despite having to tread carefully because of the social status of the king, the parliamentary pamphleteers had found it relatively easy to claim that Charles was failing in his patriarchal manly duties within his own household because of the evidence that seemed to support such a claim. They found it much harder to make credible charges of cowardice and effeminacy against Charles I's nephew, Prince Rupert, the king's chief cavalry commander. But this had less to do with Rupert's social status, and more to do with Rupert's actions: he quickly established his reputation as a daring leader and regularly showed such bravery and strength of character that claims of effeminacy and cowardice would have been unbelievable. The second part of this chapter will explore how parliamentary writers responded to Rupert's martial reputation. In order to understand the relative speed with which the London pamphleteers began to slander Prince Rupert in their broadsides, pamphlets and newsbooks, it is first necessary to consider who Rupert was

¹¹⁶ White, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 149.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-170.

¹¹⁸ E.293[15], *Mercurius Britanicus* (14-21 July 1645), p. 814.

¹¹⁹ E.63[9], *Englands third alarm to warre* (London: 3 August* 1643), pp. 21, 25.

¹²⁰ E.240[5], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (12-19 September 1642), p. 4.

and what was generally known about him in England before the war broke out. This section will then go on to explore how the parliamentary pamphleteers constructed a negative image of Prince Rupert, using the familiar gendered themes, in order to further the Parliament's cause.

Prince Rupert was the son of Frederick V, Elector Palatine of the Rhine, and Elizabeth Stuart, the sister of Charles I. Rupert had been encouraged from an early age to become a soldier in order that he might one day help to restore his family to their Palatinate lands after the Holy Roman Emperor had forcefully ejected them in 1619. To this end, at the tender age of thirteen, Rupert began his military career at the siege of Rheinberg. Two years later, in 1635, he had served as a volunteer in the lifeguard of the Prince of Orange and fought against Catholic Spain in the southern Netherlands. In 1637 Rupert had rejoined the Dutch forces and participated in the siege of the fortified town of Breda, on the Dutch frontier. Rupert's final involvement in the military conflicts of the Thirty Years War was a vain attempt to regain the Palatinate capital of Heidelberg in the autumn of 1638. This aborted attempt had resulted in his capture and subsequent imprisonment for three years in the Castle of Linz, on the river Danube.¹²¹ It was Charles I who had secured his nephew's release from prison, and he had soon called in the favour. On 12 July 1642 Rupert was officially offered the commission of General of Horse in the army that Charles was raising.¹²² This was a high-ranking position which ensured that he was to be a key player in the subsequent conflict. But while Rupert had seen active military service on the continent, he had rarely been in a position of command. This has led historians like John Barratt and Ronald Hutton to argue that the commission was given to Rupert as an act of courtesy – as he was the oldest male relative of the King – rather than because he was especially experienced.¹²³

Part 2.2 – 1642: Reviling Prince Rupert

The parliamentary pamphleteers were quick to attack the young prince. It is possible that they were concerned that Rupert might prove a popular figure amongst the people; he was,

¹²¹ M. Ashley, *Rupert of the Rhine* (Oxford: Purnell Book Services Ltd., 1976), pp. 7-17; F. Kitson, *Prince Rupert: Portrait of a Soldier* (London: Constable 1994), pp. 16-69.

¹²² Ashley, *Rupert of the Rhine*, p. 17.

¹²³ This is a point of contention amongst his biographers. Ashley claims that, by the age of 23 Rupert was a highly proficient soldier, see Ashley, *Rupert of the Rhine*, esp. pp. 7, 13 and 17. However, Hutton and Barratt both argue that the roles that Rupert had played in warfare on the continent were relatively minimal, see R. Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort 1642-1646*, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 129; J. Barratt, *Cavaliers. The Royalist Army at War 1642-1646* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000), p. 23; and C. Spencer, *Prince Rupert: The Last Cavalier* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2007), p. 55.

after all, the son of the much-loved Elizabeth Stuart and he had fought for the Protestant cause on the continent.¹²⁴ As General of the king's Horse moreover, he held one of the most important positions within the royalist army and was thus an obvious figure to assail.¹²⁵ Indeed, from the moment that Rupert landed in Newcastle on 20 August his progress was being warily noted by the London newsbook writers.¹²⁶

It was Rupert's 'foreign' military practices which first drew him to the attention of the parliamentary writers. Shortly after the king's standard had been raised, the London pamphlets began to claim that Rupert and his Cavaliers committed all manner of spoil and plunder on innocent civilians around the country.¹²⁷ By the autumn the pamphleteers were frequently accusing Rupert of instigating the violence.¹²⁸ For instance, it was claimed that in 'Warwickshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, Worcestershire, Cheshire and other parts of this Kingdome' Rupert had not only encouraged the 'pillaging and robbing [of] many Gentlemen of worth' but the 'hanging up their servants at their masters doores because they would not discover their masters'.¹²⁹ Contemporaries believed that it was an officer's responsibility to ensure that his troopers upheld the rules of war, which protected civilians from 'unlawfull Violence or Outrage'.¹³⁰ By claiming that Rupert encouraged his men to behave in a cruel and violent way, rather than punishing them for such behaviour, the pamphleteer was claiming that the prince flouted the rules of war. But more fundamentally, the pamphleteer was also asserting that Rupert promoted behaviour that was anti-patriarchal: not only did he encourage his men to attack the weaker members of society but he also persuaded servants to break faith with their masters. Similar claims were made by *A Perfect Diurnall*, which described Rupert as 'a loose and wilde Gentleman', and accused him of committing 'divers rapes and ravishing in Leicester-shire and other places

¹²⁴ Rupert had also already visited England in 1636-7, see Kitson, *Prince Rupert*, pp. 48-50.

¹²⁵ Spencer, *Prince Rupert*, p. 55.

¹²⁶ See, for example, E.114[23], *Certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (22-26 August 1642); and Spencer, *Prince Rupert*, p. 58.

¹²⁷ See, for example, E.202[42], *An exact and true diurnall of the proceedings in Parliament* (29 August-5 September 1642), p. 8.

¹²⁸ 669.f.6[75], *Remarkable passages from Nottingham, Lichfield, Leicester, and Cambridge* (London: 1 September 1642). Similar sentiments, framed in slightly less emotive language, were found in the newsbook E.116[8], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (30 August-6 September 1642), p. 3.

¹²⁹ E.240[4], *A paerfect [sic] diurnall of the proceedigns [sic] in Parliament* (12-19 September 1642), p. 8.

¹³⁰ B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 166; and E.112[22], *Two proclamations by the King* (York: 27 August* 1642), pp. 5-6. See also E.109[2], *Exceeding welcome newes from Beverley. Or, York-shires love to London* (London: 4 August 1642).

where he hath been'.¹³¹ As well as reiterating his unwillingness to uphold the rules of war and the laws of society, Rupert's excessively violent and lustful behaviour demonstrated his inability to control his own passions and, as men were believed to have a greater capacity for self-control, it therefore emphasised Rupert's unmanliness.¹³² Equally, such accounts of attacks upon patriarchal dependents were also designed to outrage male readers, and to encourage them to fight for the Parliament in order to protect their families and the wider social fabric from such unrestrained men.

During the late summer and early autumn of 1642 Rupert's army was entirely unproven and this allowed the parliamentary pamphleteers to attempt to tar the prince with the brush of cowardice. The parliamentary writers claimed that, while Rupert offered unrestrained violence to unarmed civilians, he was much less eager to fight the parliamentary forces. Thus one pamphlet claimed that if the Earl of Essex was to meet with Rupert 'it is conceived that the great Challenger Prince Robert [sic] will play least in [the] fight; for he knows it is not firing of houses that will there serve his turne, which is the way wherein he shews his greatest valour'.¹³³ The opening of hostilities saw the pamphleteers continue to assert that Prince Rupert was a coward, despite evidence to the contrary. To this end one pamphleteer, describing the 'great and bloody skirmish' at Powick Bridge, attempted to undermine Rupert's bravery and success in routing the parliamentary advanced guard, by claiming that the prince and his men, 'Ranne quite away ... not daring to stay the comming of our Army the next morning'.¹³⁴ The pamphleteers were using every weapon available in their ink-horn arsenals to undermine the martial reputation of the king's General of Horse.

After the inconclusive battle of Edgehill, rather than dwelling on the effectiveness of Rupert's cavalry charge, certain parliamentary newsbooks focussed on the supposed lack of discipline which had led Rupert's horse to attack the parliamentary baggage train rather than to regroup and return to the field. To this end, *England's Memorable Accidents*

¹³¹ E.240[5], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (12-19 September 1642), p. 4.

¹³² STC / 1790:06, J. Dod and R. Clever, *A Godly Forme of Household Government* (London: 1612), unpaginated; B. Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', *P&P* 18 (February 1988), pp. 72-94; M. Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 67; and E. Foyster, *Manhood in the Making*, p. 211.

¹³³ E.200[59], *Prince Robert his speech to the Earle of Essex the morning before hee marched forth with his forces* (London: 19 September 1642). See also E.202[42], *An exact and true diurnall of the proceedings in Parliament* (29 August-5 September 1642), p. 8; and E.118[4], *The Welchmans declaration* (NPP: 19 September* 1642).

¹³⁴ E.119[21], *A perfect and true relation of the great and bloody skirmish, fought before the city of Worcester, upon Friday, Septemb. 23* (London: 3 October 1642), p. 5.

claimed that ‘Count Robert with his Horse, ... slew the wagoners and women and Children’, but that he had been ‘forced to leave ... because the London Lads fell upon him, and gave him store of hot bullets’. Thus the author of this newsbook reasserted the image of Rupert as wildly aggressive, but also as easily driven away when met by the parliament’s soldiers.¹³⁵ The occasional pamphlets were even more damning of the prince’s behaviour during the first pitched battle of the conflict: one pamphleteer remarked somewhat sarcastically, that, ‘Prince *Rupert* was so wise as not to come neare much danger, but in stead of fighting, spent his time in pillaging our Noble mens Waggons behinde our Army’.¹³⁶ Thus the author further undermined Rupert’s martial reputation, by making no mention of his role in the battle and instead suggesting that he preferred to plunder in safety.

Part 2.3 – 1643: Unrestrained, Unreasonable and Unmanly

Descriptions of Prince Rupert’s supposedly unrestrained violence towards the civilian population continued to pepper the newsbooks and pamphlets during early 1643. For instance, *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* responded to Rupert’s successful capture of Cirencester by claiming that, upon taking the town, the Prince had ‘put one Minister, with his wife and children to the sword, and two Families more’. The newsbook claimed that Rupert and his Cavaliers had killed the defenceless townspeople ‘in cold blood’, and contrasted this behaviour with the clemency of the parliamentary commander Sir Thomas Fairfax when he had taken Leeds. While Fairfax was shown to have behaved in an appropriately patriarchal way by protecting the unarmed civilians, the claim that Rupert and his men had killed the inhabitants of Cirencester ‘in cold blood’ was designed to emphasise how Rupert was a danger to the patriarchal social order.

As well as utilising established polemical themes, the spring of 1643 also saw the parliamentary pamphleteers adopt a slightly different tack. As Rupert set out to enlarge the royalist territory to the north-east of Oxford, several pamphlets were published in

¹³⁵ E.240[49] *England’s memorable accidents* (24-31 October 1642), pp. 62, 54[sic]. The view of the prince as excessively violent towards those who could not fight back was further reiterated in this pamphlet when the author claimed that Rupert had ‘most inhumanely slaine’ the two hundred wounded soldiers that the Earl of Essex had quartered at Kinton. See also E.240[48] *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (24-31 October 1642), p. 5; and 669.f.6[85] *A most true and succinct relation of the late battell neere Kinton in Warwick-shire* (London: 3 November 1642).

¹³⁶ E.124[33] *Speciall newes from the army at Warwicke since the fight* (London: 29 October 1642), unpaginated. Similar accusations continued to be made about the Prince in the aftermath of the battle, see E.128[33], G. H., *Abingtons and Alisburies present miseries* (London: 1 November 1642*), p. 6; and E.127[2], *Horrible newes from Colebrooke, declaring the cruelty of prince Robert in plundering the said towne* (London: 11 November 1642).

London which asserted that Rupert had sexual relationships with his pets, both of whom, it was claimed, had at one time been women.¹³⁷ The tracts in this series were especially scandalous in their content, for instance, assertions were made that Rupert's dog, Boy, 'salutes and kisseth the Prince, as close as any Christian woman would; and the Prince salutes and kisseth him back again as savorily, as he would ... any Court-Lady'. The pamphleteer continued by asserting that Boy and the Prince 'lye perpetually in one bed, sometimes the Prince upon the Dog, and sometimes the Dog upon the Prince' and speculated, 'what this may in time produce, none but the close Committee can tell'.¹³⁸

The pamphlets discussing Rupert's 'she-monkey' contained even more explicit language to undermine the prince's reputation by associating him with a sexually vociferous and promiscuous creature. In contemporary parlance the word 'monkey' was synonymous with the female genitals, thus even claiming that Rupert had a 'she-monkey' was a way of implying that he was a debauchee. But, to drive this point home, the pamphleteer related the disorderly sexual behaviour of the she-monkey. For instance, the pamphleteer claimed that, 'she could never keep her legs together, but would throw them abroad in such an obscene manner, that many of the Cavaleers' could come and 'easily enter her maiden Fort'. While the she-monkey was said to lay 'her self so open to the view of the world', her master was said to have more 'policy', implying that Rupert kept his debauchery well hidden.¹³⁹ Later in the pamphlet, an unnamed 'cavalier' – perhaps intended to represent Prince Rupert himself – was said to have fallen in love with the monkey. The author could not resist another lewd pun to further emphasise the Cavalier's lasciviousness and so remarked that he 'most especially doated upon her Monkey'.¹⁴⁰

Yet, the pamphlet went on to show that the Cavalier was unmanned by his own lust, for the morning after the wedding night, he was described as being 'so wondrous weak, as if he had lost all the bloud in his body'. Contemporaries believed that, when a man ejaculated he expelled some of the heat that was so central to his manliness, therefore,

¹³⁷ E.92[13], *The Parliaments Unspotted-Bitch: In Answer to Prince Roberts Dog called Boy, and his Malignant She-Monkey* (London: 8 March* 1643), unpaginated; Wing / 2433:20, T. B., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye* (London: 1643), unpaginated; E.245[33], T. B., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye* (London: 2 February* 1643), unpaginated; and E.93[9], *The humerous tricks and conceits of Prince Roberts malignant she-monkey, discovered to the world before her marriage* (NPP: 1643), unpaginated.

¹³⁸ Wing / 2433:20, B. T., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye*; and E.245[33], B. T., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye*.

¹³⁹ E.93[9], *The humerous tricks and conceits of Prince Roberts malignant she-monkey*.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

while women were strengthened by sexual intercourse because their wet and cold bodies benefited from this heat, men were weakened by the sexual act.¹⁴¹ The pamphleteer even made a direct link between the weakness of the ‘Cavalier’ after his wedding night and his martial effectiveness, by making him assert that he was ‘worse beaten ... then ever he was when he was beaten at Warwick, or any other Town from whence the Cavaleers were repulsed’.¹⁴² Once emasculated by his wife’s sexual appetite and therefore unable to sexually please her any further, the ‘Cavalier’ became the epitome of unmanliness, for the pamphlet relates how the she-monkey filled her bed with another man. To make the point obvious, the ‘Cavalier’ was made to admit that ‘she hath turned a Cavaleer into a Cuckold’ and went on to exclaim, ‘I am horne mad’.¹⁴³

A second pamphlet made the meaning of this story even more obvious by explaining that ‘prince Ruperts Monkey doth ... figuratively signifie’, by ‘all her postures’, ‘the picture of a loose wanton, who is often figuratively called a Monkey’. The author further emphasised Rupert’s promiscuity by asserting that the prince ‘doth *stand* well affected’ to whores, ‘and though a souldier, he doth love the soft embraces of a faire laid[y?]’.¹⁴⁴ ‘[C]ertaine it is that the Prince doth love this Monkey exceedingly’ the author continued, and claimed that the monkey ‘tempts the Prince by her lascivious gestures, to thinke oftner on a woman than he would do’. The author was trying to suggest that he had evidence of Rupert’s affections for one particular woman. To drive this point home, the prince was described as ‘effeminate’, and ‘forward enough in expressions of love as wel as valour’.¹⁴⁵

By choosing to use Prince Rupert’s pets to suggest his licentiousness, the pamphleteers may well have been seizing the opportunity to slur Rupert’s honour in two respects: not only was his lust uncontrolled, leading him to be weakened, emasculated and finally cuckolded; but by suggesting that he had intercourse with his animals the pamphleteers may have been emphasising the supposed connection between foreignness

¹⁴¹ Breitenburg, *Anxious Masculinities*, p. 50; see also Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 11-12; R. B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society, The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London: Longman, 1998), p. 61; and Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England*, pp. 56, 76.

¹⁴² E.93[9], *The humerous tricks and conceits of Prince Roberts malignant she-monkey*.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ (My italics). The pamphleteer was using a pun to assert that Rupert was both aroused by whores, but also that he made use of such women in order to slake his lusts.

¹⁴⁵ E.90[25], *An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey, a great Delinquent* (NPP: 25 February* 1643), unpaginated.

and deviant sexual practices.¹⁴⁶ The parliamentary writers might also have chosen this line of attack because they had no other evidence to suggest that the prince was a debauchee. For example, one pamphleteer asserted that Rupert ‘dare[s] stand for the feminine cause, and hath plundered some Ladies cabynits as wel as Countrey towns’.¹⁴⁷ However the fact that no evidence is given to support this general assertion suggests that the parliamentarians desperately wanted to paint Rupert in this light in order to undermine both his martial effectiveness and his claim to patriarchal manhood, but that they simply had no evidence with which to do so.

As well as claiming that Rupert lacked the ability to control his lust, through the spring of 1643 the pamphleteers also continued to report on his supposed excessive violence towards the civilian population. Indeed, it is tempting to explain the outpouring of hatred against Rupert in this year, as a reaction to the prominent part that he played in the royalist victories of 1643. In April Rupert successfully secured the royalist route from Oxford to the north by taking the towns of Birmingham and Lichfield. In response to these victories, Rupert was denounced as ‘the bloody prince’, who not only committed violence, but who also, it was claimed, boasted of his evil actions and therefore ‘set forth the unreasonableness of it’. The author of the pamphlet in which these claims appeared continued by reasserting Rupert’s wildness, declaring that, ‘if men are not restrained by an over-ruling power, they run into all manner of wickedness as the Horse runeth into the battell’.¹⁴⁸ The pamphleteer was reiterating the idea that a man, who allowed his passions to rage unchecked, not only demonstrated his lack of reason, but also led himself into ruin. The connection with Rupert’s distinctive and deadly cavalry charge, which scattered the enemy’s ranks but which proved hard to reorder and bring back to the field, reiterated the contemporary belief that a lack of self-discipline would lead to weakness.¹⁴⁹ A year later Rupert’s successful storming of Birmingham was bitterly remembered by the parliamentary writers. For instance, one pamphleteer related how Rupert had ‘not only plundered and ransacked the Towne, but at his going away, he caused unmanly a great part

¹⁴⁶ M. Stoye, *Soldiers and Strangers, An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 99.

¹⁴⁷ E.90[25], *An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey*.

¹⁴⁸ E.99[14], I. W., *The bloody prince, or A declaration of the most cruell practices of Prince Rupert* (London: 22 April* 1643), pp. 2-4; see also E.96[9], *A true relation of Prince Ruperts barbarous cruelty against the towne of Brumingham [sic]* (London: 12 April 1643).

¹⁴⁹ Kitson, *Prince Rupert*, pp. 99-100.

of the Towne to be set on fire and burned to the ground'.¹⁵⁰ In this phrase the contemporary view can be seen, that such excessive violence, when used against an enemy who had already been subdued, was considered to be unmanly.

By the end of July Prince Rupert was marching south-west to help secure the West Country for the king. The subsequent surrender of Bristol to the prince on 26 July caused the parliamentary pamphleteers to launch a fresh offensive after news reached London that Rupert's forces had broken the conditions of the surrender by attacking the unarmed parliamentarians as they marched out of the town. The London pamphleteers were quick to claim 'that during this plundering and pillaging of the Kings Forces, Prince Rubert [sic], and Prince Maurice sate [sat] triumphantly on their Horses, rejoicing at it, without restraining them'.¹⁵¹ The suggestion that Prince Rupert would not only break the articles of surrender, but would take perverse pleasure in such disorder and violence, reiterated how unsuitable he was for a position of patriarchal responsibility in the kingdom.¹⁵² As well as being unrestrained by codes of honour (deemed central to elite manhood), Rupert's alleged actions at the surrender of Bristol, also reiterated the idea that he only behaved with such aggression and assertiveness when he was faced with a weaker enemy – the parliamentarians were, after all, unarmed.¹⁵³ Such violent behaviour would have been recognised as contrary to the laws of God and of nature. Barbara Donagan has argued that the latter demanded that a man behave with 'justice [and] righteousness' and, in the context of war, 'it required that faith be kept, and that soldiers abstain from gratuitous acts of cruelty'. The flouting of these laws was considered 'indefensible'. Seen in this light, Rupert's actions not only demonstrated his patriarchal failings, but on a deeper level the pamphleteer was alluding to Rupert's supposedly barbarous and irreligious nature.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰ E.4[25], *An Apologie and vindication (from all false and malignant aspersions) for his excellencie, the right honourable, and most noble, Robert D'Evreux, Earle of Essex* (London: 8 August* 1644), p. 13; and I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), pp. 168-89.

¹⁵¹ E.63[11], *Mercurius Civicus* (27 July-3 August 1643), pp. 74-6. See also E.63[14], *A weekly accompt of certain special and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (27 July-3 August 1643), p. 8; and E.64[7], *Certaine informations from severall parts of the kingdome* (31 July-7 August 1643), p. 222.

¹⁵² See also E.69[25], *A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (29 September-6 October 1643), p. 7.

¹⁵³ On the subject of honour, see J. Greene Marston, 'Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England' *JBS* XIII(1973-4), pp. 21-43; Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp 76-7, 80-82; Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, p. 152; Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 32; B. Donagan, 'The web of honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ* 44: 2 (2001), p. 372; and Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649*, pp. 137-8, 167, 227-230.

¹⁵⁴ Donagan, *War in England*, p. 137.

Part 2.4 – 1644: Shattering Armies and Reputations: the Impact of Marston Moor

Rupert's honour took yet another beating in the parliamentary pamphlets after news reached the capital of the Prince's capture of Bolton on 28 May 1644. As the royalists themselves admitted, Rupert's men had put a third of the garrison to the sword when the town was eventually taken.¹⁵⁵ An anonymous parliamentary pamphlet which related in graphic detail the 'bloody and barbarous massacre at Bolton', claimed that 'the principall stain of all this their cruelty' was Prince Rupert's own 'ignoble, nay base killing of valiant Captain *Bootle* after quarter was given'.¹⁵⁶ Such disregard for the rules of war would have had grave implications for Rupert's honour. Indeed, the fact that Rupert's actions were considered 'the principall stain' of the royalists' alleged cruelty, despite the fact that the preceding pages of the pamphlet had recounted in excruciating detail the brutality that had allegedly been inflicted upon the civilian inhabitants, emphasised how transgressive his behaviour was deemed to have been by this pamphleteer.¹⁵⁷

While depictions of Rupert's cruelty abounded in the London publications during the summer of 1644, the prince's shattering defeat at the battle of Marston Moor on 2 July 1644 resulted in a sudden change of emphasis.¹⁵⁸ The parliamentary writers saw Rupert's threatening reputation dashed and seized on their opportunity with both hands. *Mercurius Britanicus*, for example, jeered that Marston Moor had cost Rupert his credit.¹⁵⁹ Another pamphlet even claimed that the Prince had been reduced to hiding in a bean field so as to avoid capture, a cowardly action that would have further undermined his claim to honourable manhood.¹⁶⁰ The *Diary* contained a particularly full account of the aftermath of the battle, and depicted Rupert as coming from the battlefield 'covered with blood like a Butcher'. Both Rupert and the Earl of Newcastle were described as full of 'shame and sorrow' in that they had been so badly beaten, and were said to have admitted that they had been 'deceived in one anothers strength'. The depiction of Rupert as a blood-stained

¹⁵⁵ E.53[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (15 June 1644), p. 1020.

¹⁵⁶ E.7[1], *An Exact relation of the Bloody and Barbarous Massacre at Bolton* (London: 22 August 1644), p. 4.

¹⁵⁷ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 137-8, 162-65, 227-230. In fact Rupert's actions at Bolton were still being remembered several months later: see E.4[7], *The Scottish dove* (26 July-2 August 1644), p. 330.

¹⁵⁸ For instance, see E.2[24], *Ruperts Sumpter and Private Cabinet Rifled* (London: 20 July* 1644), unpaginated; E.6[27], *A peece of ordnance invented by a Jesuite* (NPP: 20 August* 1644), p. 6; and E.7[30], *The great eclipse of the sun, or Charles his waine over-clouded* (NPP: 30 August 1644), p. 4.

¹⁵⁹ E.298[24], *Mercurius Britanicus* (25 August-1 September 1645), p. 852. See also E.4[23], *The weekly account* (31 July-7 August 1644), p. 236.

¹⁶⁰ E.2[24], *Ruperts Sumpter and Private Cabinet Rifled*; E.9[9], *A nest of perfidious vipers: or, The second part of the Parliaments kalender of black saints* (London: 21 September 1644), p. 6; and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 227-230.

butcher would have added to his violent image, but equally, the claim that Rupert had appeared stronger than he actually was, reinforced the idea that such unreasonable violence led ultimately to defeat.¹⁶¹ Both the royalists and the parliamentarians were keen to stress that, on the battlefield, aggression needed to be well governed if victory was to be achieved. When faced with the horrors of the battlefield, a man who let his emotions control him would either overstretch himself, or would be overcome with fear: either way he would soon be routed.¹⁶²

After Marston Moor Rupert set about rallying what was left of his cavalymen and eventually fell back on Chester. While some parliamentary newsbooks reported that Rupert was forming a new army, other tracts claimed that he was taking his ease in the town in order to further paint the prince as effeminate, debauched and anti-patriarchal.¹⁶³ Thus, the *Perfect Diurnall* reported that ‘he solaceth himselfe of such delights as best suite with his luxurious appetite’. The newsbook added to this unmanly view of the prince by claiming that ‘he dares not stir into the Countrey’ because of the presence of Sir William Brereton at Nantwich.¹⁶⁴ Indeed when Brereton’s forces came closer, the newsbook claimed that Rupert, ‘being busie with his Beares’ let Governor Colonel Marrow face the enemy alone, an act which resulted in Marrow’s death.¹⁶⁵ Stories such as these were surely designed to defuse Rupert’s once terrifying military reputation.

Similar assertions of Rupert’s cowardice and unmanliness were expressed within the parliamentarians’ occasional pamphlets. For instance, one anonymous tract cautioned the prince that those ‘Actions which now in *England* you so eagerly prosecute, tend extremely to your dishonour and weakning’.¹⁶⁶ Another satirical pamphlet, purporting to be a Catholic petition to Prince Rupert, offered guidance to the Prince, but every piece of advice emphasised how Rupert was failing to behave as contemporaries believed a man should in times of war. For example, the petitioners cautioned him to ‘play the man when

¹⁶¹ E. Foyster, ‘Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England’, *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 215-24.

¹⁶² D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 42.

¹⁶³ See for instance, E.4[23], *The weekly account* (31 July-7 August 1644), p. 236; E.4[29], *The Parliament scout* (1-8 August 1644), p. 473; and E.3[3], *The Scottish dove* (2-9 August 1644).

¹⁶⁴ E.254[20], *A perfect diurnall of some passages in Parliament* (12-19 August 1644), p. 434. See also E.254[21], *A diary, or, An exact journall faithfully communicating the most remarkable proceedings in both houses of Parliament* (15-22 August 1644), p. 100; E.6[16], *The Parliament scout* (8-15 August 1644), p. 483; and E.6[26], *Mercurius Britanicus* (12-19 August 1644), p. 368.

¹⁶⁵ E.254[26], *A perfect diurnall of some passages in Parliament* (26 August-2 September 1644), p. 450.

¹⁶⁶ E.6[4], *A copie of a letter sent to the most illustrious and high borne Prince Rupert by the grace of God Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Bavaria, &c.* (London: 12 August 1644), pp. 1-6.

thou art in the battell, and the thiefe when thy leisure will serve thee'. It is perhaps significant that Rupert is said to only 'play' the man on the battlefield, a choice of words which suggests that his actions as a thief robbed him of any claim to patriarchal manhood in the eyes of the pamphleteer. The author completed the picture of Rupert's supposed unmanliness by declining to offer advice to the Prince on the subject of 'your souldiers meddling with women'. Instead the petitioners were made to state that, 'wee altogether leave that to your Highnesse owne disposure' because, the pamphlet explained, 'none knowing better than your selfe how to order your men [in?] affaires of flesh and blood'.¹⁶⁷ Such a suggestion added to the picture that Rupert and his royalist troopers were wilfully failing in their patriarchal roles because, rather than upholding the social order, by protecting those who could not protect themselves, Rupert was depicted as preying on the weak and encouraging his men to do the same. This theme was further emphasised in another occasional tract, with the added claim that Rupert was aiming to seize the crown from Charles, and then, the pamphleteer claimed, he would have 'Pimps instead of Preachers [and] wenches for thy Privie Councillers'.¹⁶⁸ Thus this writer suggested that Rupert's inability to act his part as a man, called into question whether he was capable of successfully filling any position of authority, for the pamphleteer alleged that his lascivious, chaotic behaviour would breed further social disorder.

Part 2.5 – 1645: 'Branded for a coward':¹⁶⁹ Prince Rupert's declining Role in the War

As the war began to turn in the Parliament's favour, the parliamentary pamphleteers took every chance to paint Prince Rupert as a coward. Such an opportunity presented itself after the royalist defeat at Naseby in June, where one pamphleteer claimed that, 'Prince Rupert, whom we thought to be so couragious, and so valiant, did spurre his horse as quicke as any of the rest'.¹⁷⁰ While the defeat at Naseby was a significant blow to the royalist cause, the most damaging assault upon Rupert's honour came at the end of August when Rupert was besieged at Bristol and surrounded by a parliamentary army, with little hope of relief.

Throughout the siege, which lasted from 21 August to 11 September, reports of Prince Rupert's wild cruelty poured from the London presses in order to highlight his

¹⁶⁷ E.4[4], *The Catholikes petition to Prince Rupert* (NPP: 1 August 1644), pp. 4-5. For further claims of Rupert's licentiousness see E.4[24], *The Cavaliers Bible, or a squadron of XXXVI* (NPP: 7 August* 1644), unpaginated.

¹⁶⁸ E.9[9], *A nest of perfidious vipers*, pp. 5-6.

¹⁶⁹ E.264[17], *Perfect occurrences of Parliament, and chief collections of letters* (12-19 September 1645), unpaginated.

¹⁷⁰ E.298[8], *The malignants lamentation* (NPP: July 1645*), p. 13.

failure to uphold the patriarchal social order. To this end, *Mercurius Civicus* reported that the women had come to Rupert with their children, bemoaning the fact that food was scarce, but that the prince had disregarded their complaints. Instead, *Civicus* reported that the prince avowed ‘that he would hold the Town and cared not though the mother should eate the children, and the husbands their wives before he would deliver it’.¹⁷¹ Such a frank disregard for the plights of the townspeople again highlighted how Rupert had, allegedly, failed in his manly duties to care for the weaker members of society.¹⁷² It also graphically highlighted the social disorder that the prince was supposed to have encouraged. Other newsbook writers claimed that Rupert’s situation in Bristol was hopeless and that this was causing the prince to lose his mind. One newsbook remarked that, in Bristol, ‘Rupert tyrannizes like a distracted Bedlam’,¹⁷³ while the *Perfect Passages* asserted that the prince ‘is so distracted, that hee walks up and downe in such discontent, that it is thought he begins to be crackt-brain’d’.¹⁷⁴ *The Perfect Occurrences* related that Rupert had burned parts of the city, ‘for madnesse that Sir Thomas Fairfax will not let him get out’.¹⁷⁵ As self-control and the ability to reason were considered central components of manhood, for Rupert to behave as though he had gone mad would have further undermined his claim to patriarchal manhood and therefore to patriarchal power.¹⁷⁶

Nor did Prince Rupert’s surrender of Bristol silence the pamphleteers and newsbook writers. *The Parliaments Post* mockingly questioned whether Rupert had ‘at once abandoned Bristoll with his honour?’¹⁷⁷ *The Perfect Occurrences of Parliament* delighted in the fact that Rupert had gone ‘away [from Bristol] branded for a coward’, and added with barely suppressed glee, that ‘(if he scapes with his life) [he] will hardly be ever trusted to lead an Army into the field against us any more’.¹⁷⁸ Other newsbooks recounted with similar pleasure that even the ‘Malignants [that is, royalists] both in the City and Countrey’

¹⁷¹ E.300[19], *Mercurius Civicus* (4-11 September 1645), p. 1059.

¹⁷² Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 137, 162-65. See also A. Shepard, ‘Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640’, *P&P* 167 (May 2000), p. 83.

¹⁷³ E.298[28], *Heads of some notes of the citie scout* (2 September 1645), p. 6.

¹⁷⁴ E.264[11], *Perfect passages of each dayes proceedings in Parliament* (3-10 September 1645), p. 386.

¹⁷⁵ E.264[3], *Perfect occurrences of Parliament, and chief collections of letters* (22-29 August 1645), unpaginated. See also E.298[2*], *The Scottish dove* (15-23 August 1645); E.298[2], *Mercurius Veridicus* (16-23 August 1645), p. 174; and E.298[5], *Mercurius Britannicus* (18-25 August 1645), p. 848.

¹⁷⁶ E. Foyster, ‘Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England’, *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), p. 215; Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 29-30, 41; and Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, p. 70.

¹⁷⁷ E.301[15], *The Parliaments post* (9-16 September 1645), p. 2.

¹⁷⁸ E.264[17], *Perfect occurrences of Parliament, and chief collections of letters* (12-19 September 1645), unpaginated.

had denounced Rupert as a ‘coward’.¹⁷⁹ Rupert was emasculated further by another newsbook which claimed that the Prince had surrendered Bristol because he ‘gave too much eare to some tender Ladies who were deare unto him, and were much affrighted at the apprehension of the danger wherein they were’. The author concluded by saying that the tide was turning, for in the past Rupert had ‘broken all accords, and sowed so much dissention’ but now he was ‘so indulgent to the bonds of love’.¹⁸⁰ Rupert’s biographers have suggested that in the aftermath of Naseby the prince had a love affair with Mary Stuart, Duchess of Richmond, the wife of a close friend at court.¹⁸¹ It may be that it was this affair that was the reality behind the speculation of the newsbooks. Either way, the suggestion that Rupert had allowed the ‘weaker sex’ to talk him into surrendering Bristol rather than fighting it out, only added to his shame by suggesting that he had allowed himself to become effeminate.

The defence of Bristol was Rupert’s last major piece of service during the Civil War, for Charles I, disgusted with his nephew after the surrender of the town, dismissed the prince from his service. By 16 October Rupert had sought out his uncle in Newark and demanded a court-martial to clear his name. While under investigation, Rupert was to play no further part in his uncle’s cause; because of this little mention is made of Rupert in parliamentary literature after this date. The prince, who had been so hated and feared, had finally ceased to be a threat: the parliamentary writers therefore put their pens to other uses. Rupert was at last reconciled to the king in December 1645 after no evidence had been found to suggest that he was part of a conspiracy to overthrow Charles, but as Kitson notes, ‘Rupert was not restored to any of his commands, for the simple reason that there was nothing left to command’. After the fall of Oxford in May 1646, Rupert and his brother Maurice left the country and returned to the continent.¹⁸²

Part 2.6 – Conclusion

One of the most prominent themes, then, that was used by the parliamentary pamphleteers to attack Prince Rupert was the claim that he was unwilling to perform his part as a man. In fact, through detailed depictions of his unrestrained behaviour, the pamphleteers showed

¹⁷⁹ E.302[11], *Heads of some notes of the citie scout* (22 September 1645), p. 3; see also E.304[2], *Mercurius Britanicus* (29 September-6 October 1645), p. 892.

¹⁸⁰ E.302[22], *The Parliaments post* (16-23 September 1645), p. 5. See also E.301[17], *The weekly account* (10-17 September 1645), unpaginated; and E.264[16], *A diary* (11-18 September 1645), p. 6.

¹⁸¹ E. Warburton, *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers* (London: 1849), vol. II, p. 45; Ashley, *Rupert of the Rhine*, p. 111; and Kitson, *Prince Rupert*, pp. 32, 161-2.

¹⁸² Kitson, *Prince Rupert*, p. 263-6,

that Rupert was hell-bent on pulling the social order apart, rather than upholding it. Equally, the image of Rupert as 'loose and wilde' was used to suggest his lack of discipline and misplaced belief in his own strength, which, the pamphleteers averred, would ultimately lead to martial weakness. These claims were surely designed to give solace to the parliamentary army. Similarly, the many accounts which were published of Rupert's alleged acts of violence against women and children – in other words, against the groups which contemporaries would have considered as other men's patriarchal property – might well have encouraged many men to enlist in the Parliament's army in order to safeguard their own families from such a reprobate. Therefore by claiming that Prince Rupert lacked many of the key qualities of a true, patriarchal man, such as self-restraint, honour, and later in the conflict, even bravery, the pamphleteers hoped to rob him of any claim to patriarchal power and therefore of any claim to political or military legitimacy.

Chapter IV:
'Cuckold Captains':¹ The Use of Gendered Language by Royalist Pamphleteers, 1642-46

In the introduction to their recent book on *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* Jason McElligott and David Smith note that royalist print culture has received far less scholarly attention than the printed literature produced by the parliamentarians.² Previous scholars have often dismissed royalist propaganda as out-of-touch and ineffective; this overly simplistic image is slowly changing due to the stimulating work of scholars like Bernard Capp, David Underdown, Jason McElligott, and Jerome de Groot – all of whom have noted the sophisticated employment of cultural symbols, like gender, in the royalist propaganda of the late 1640s.³ This chapter seeks to build on these insights by exploring how royalist polemicists made reference to gender in the earlier years of the first Civil War. But first it will be helpful to summarise what is known about royalist printing and about the contribution which it made to the royalist war effort.

Charles I's actions in setting up a printing press in York in March 1642, and later in Shrewsbury in September 1642, have often been cited by both literary scholars and historians as proof that the king recognised the role of the printing press and the 'power of propaganda' in 'presenting his case to the nation'.⁴ Initially, the king summoned the royal printer Robert Barker to set up a press at York, but Joyce Malcolm reports that 'other printers soon followed'.⁵ Laurence Hansan has calculated that during the months of March

¹ E.251[5], *Insigma civicas, or, the anti-royalists described in their kinds and colours* (NPP: 1 October* 1643), p. 1.

² J. McElligott and D. L. Smith, 'Introduction: rethinking royalists and royalism' in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 1, 10-11.

³ B. Capp, *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578-1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); D. Underdown, 'The Language of Popular Politics in the English Revolution' in A. Vos (ed.), *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance* (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995), pp. 107-132; J. McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel: Royalist Propaganda in the 1640s', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), pp. 75-100; and J. de Groot, 'Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women' in J. Daybell (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 194-210.

⁴ P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 28-9. See also J. L. Malcolm, *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), p. 124; and L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 7.

⁵ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 125.

to September 1642, 74 items were printed at York and the press of one Stephen Bulkley remained operational there until the town surrendered to the parliamentary and Scottish forces in July 1644.⁶ When Charles left York in the late summer of 1642 and journeyed south, he took his remaining printers with him. Travelling in the King's baggage train, they would have reached Shrewsbury by 20 September where they were housed in Charlton Hall.⁷ It seems certain that Barker was one of the printers to follow the king, for the majority of tracts which have a Shrewsbury imprint also bear his name and were printed 'by the Assignes of John Bill'.⁸ According to Hansan 95 separate works were produced in Shrewsbury before the press was moved to Bristol in August 1643 after that city had been captured by the royalists.⁹ Hansan's account is supported by what may well be the last surviving tract to have been printed in Shrewsbury. The content of this work suggests that it would have had to have been published after 26 August 1643 as it makes reference to the surrender of Bristol to the royalists.¹⁰ Yet, Hansan's picture is complicated by the earliest surviving work bearing a Bristol imprint, for it dates from early January 1643 and, if the title page is accurate, was also printed by Barker and Bill.¹¹ This may suggest that the king had more than one press operating in the south-west at this time although this does not explain how Barker and Bill were able to publish in two places simultaneously. Thomas argues that before Bristol fell to the parliamentarians in September 1645 the press was moved once more, this time to Exeter.¹² The survival of a limited number of works bearing an Exeter imprint and printed, once again, by Barker and Bill, suggests that the press had moved to this city by mid-August 1645.¹³ Despite the scant information available, Thomas

⁶ L. Hansan, 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury, 1642-3', *The Library* 4th Series, 23 (1943), p. 130; and Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 125.

⁷ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 125.

⁸ See, for instance, Wing / 2663:06, *A just and true remonstrance of His Majesties mines-royall in the principality of Wales* (Shrewsbury: 1642).

⁹ Hansan, 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury', p. 130. See also W. H. Allnutt, 'The King's Printer at Shrewsbury, 1642-3', *The Library* 1 (1900), pp. 360-1; and Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 51.

¹⁰ Wing / 2456:19, *His Majesties Declaration to all his loving subjects, after his victories over the Lord Fairfax in the north, and Sir William Waller in the West, and the taking of Bristoll by His Majesties forces* (Shrewsbury: 1643).

¹¹ Wing / A4053, *The Association, agreement, and protestation of the counties of Cornwall, and Devon January 5, 1643* (Bristol: 5 January 1643).

¹² Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 125. Thomas records that Thomason wrote on the front cover of his copy of *Certain Prayers to be used in his Majesties Armies and Garrisons* that it had been printed in Exeter, see Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 51.

¹³ See for instance, E.296[25], *Certain prayers fitted to severall occasions* (Exeter: 14 August* 1645). *The Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding* records that on 18 April 1646 one John Bill begged to compound and listed as part of his personal estate two printing presses, which, after the reduction of Exeter, were sold for £20 to Francis Eglesfield a well-known London printer. See Hansan, 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury', pp. 130-1.

claims that 'contemporary comments' suggest that the provincial presses were 'far more active than the scarcity of surviving imprints suggests', although more work on the output of the provincial presses is sorely needed in order to test this assertion.¹⁴

Throughout the first Civil War, the royalists' most prolific presses were located at their headquarters in Oxford.¹⁵ F. Madan has calculated that between 1641 and 1650 the Oxford press published around 520 works.¹⁶ The printers operated from Oriel College; significantly, this was the same building in which the Privy Council met suggesting that the printers were kept well-informed.¹⁷ Lois Potter has shown that royalist pamphlets were also reprinted in London where printers and booksellers often produced both parliamentary and royalist pamphlets, thus ensuring that they would not fall foul of authority. Potter focuses on Richard Royston, a London-based printer who, she argues, openly and officially published royalist tracts during the first Civil War. However, she also stresses the risks that Royston took in doing so, claiming that he was imprisoned several times for printing during the 1640s.¹⁸

Potter and Malcolm both argue that, because Charles set up his own presses, employing only those writers and printers whom he had himself appointed, he exercised a large degree of control over what was published.¹⁹ However, as Jason Peacey has noted, 'the degree to which' the activity of the presses at Oxford was 'controlled is more often assumed than demonstrated'.²⁰ While additional research in this area is no doubt needed, Potter and Malcolm are right to assert that Charles made use of leading ballad writers, poets, and other skilful authors and wits,²¹ while eloquent advisors, such as Sir Edward Hyde and Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, wrote many of the king's declarations to Parliament.²² As Ann Hughes has observed, these declarations and propositions were 'as much propaganda efforts as genuine negotiation'.²³ Thomas argues that Parliament tried to

¹⁴ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 51.

¹⁵ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 49. Thomas has found one copy of *Mercurius Aulicus* which has three different title pages. He claims that this demonstrates that it was printed by two different printers at Oxford, and also another in London. See also Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 7.

¹⁶ F. F. Madan, 'Some Curiosities of the Oxford Press', *The Library* 1 (1889), p. 160.

¹⁷ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 125-6.

¹⁸ Potter, *Secret Rites*, pp. 6-12.

¹⁹ Lois Potter even goes so far as to say that licensing at Oxford was under tighter control than it had been under Laud's censorship mechanisms; see Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 8; and Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 142.

²⁰ J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 124.

²¹ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 128, 145.

²² R. Ashton, *The English Civil War, 1603-1649* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), pp. 162-3, 176.

²³ A. Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), p. 176.

exert the same degree of control over the London presses, but in practice failed to achieve this because of the well-established nature of the London printing trade.²⁴

It would seem that Charles recognised the need to disseminate his propaganda widely and through as many different channels as possible. Malcolm's broad study of royalist propaganda makes use of a diverse range of texts in order to demonstrate that the 'literate sector of the community was deluged with polemical pamphlets, newspapers, declarations and counter-declarations, while slogans, jibes, military banners, ballads and sermons pinpointed for the unlettered the goals and identity of each party'.²⁵ As Potter and Thomas have shown, a smuggling network existed which enabled royalist tracts to be carried into the capital and distributed.²⁶ Royalist clergymen were encouraged to preach sermons using copies of *Mercurius Aulicus*, while the king also used messengers to send printed materials into the countryside, and ordered local officials to distribute copies of royalist propaganda.²⁷ Malcolm therefore argues that the king's 'creation and control of an elaborate publishing network' during the war 'testified to his mastery of the medium'.²⁸

Malcolm apart, most of the scholars who have explored royalist print culture have centred their research on royalist newsbooks. Particular attention has been paid to the royalists' main propaganda organ, the court journal *Mercurius Aulicus*. A total of 118 editions of *Aulicus* were printed between January 1643 and September 1645.²⁹ The newsbook was written at Oxford, and its close connections with, and sponsorship by the royal court, ensured that the news which it contained was accurate and often more up to date (certainly throughout 1643) than the news which was found in the London newsbooks.³⁰ Aside from its news content, perhaps *Aulicus*' most notable feature was its witty, railing style, which has been accurately described by Joseph Frank as 'a concoction of facts and propaganda intended to puff up the royalists and shrivel the adherents of Parliament'.³¹ The parliamentarians had been producing newsbooks in London since November 1641, but both Frank and Raymond note that these early serials tended to be

²⁴ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 48. For a brief discussion of Parliamentary attempts at censorship see Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 4.

²⁵ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 124.

²⁶ Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 8; and Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 54.

²⁷ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 52-5

²⁸ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 124.

²⁹ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', p. 76.

³⁰ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 42-4; Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, p. 141; and B. Worden, "'Wit in a Roundhead': the Dilemma of Marchamont Nedham", in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 305.

³¹ J. Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660* (Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 34.

cautious in tone, no doubt because of the uncertain political climate.³² In direct contrast to the previously published newsbooks, Raymond observes that *Aulicus* 'prose was distinguished by an elevated style, and pointed, calculated, and snobbish satirical criticism of its enemies'.³³ The newsbook was published by a team of authors, including Peter Heylyn (a Laudian divine), George Digby (one of the King's secretaries of state), and John Berkenhead.³⁴ However, a number of contemporary comments, including notes in several wartime newsbooks which were produced in the capital, support Thomas' assertion that '[i]n most eyes 'Berkenhead' was virtually synonymous with *Mercurius Aulicus*'.³⁵ Indeed, Heylyn's 'memoranda' shows that by the end of September 1643, he had given up his role as principle editor of *Aulicus*, noting that Berkenhead 'had of late so interlaced his expressions and intelligence that I could hardly call it mine'.³⁶ As Berkenhead's control over the newsbook grew in 1643, Raymond notes that the newsbook's tone became more 'barbed and aggressive'. This, in turn, put many London newsbooks on the 'defensive' and encouraged them 'to respond directly to *Aulicus*'.³⁷

Mercurius Aulicus is of particular interest to the present thesis because, as Frank and Thomas both note, Berkenhead was 'more adept than his [London] competitors in the use of innuendo and smear'.³⁸ Frank argues persuasively that while the London newsbooks 'were presenting the news in a relatively full and straightforward manner, even with a few embellishments', these writers 'were not in [Berkenhead's] class as shrewd propagandists'.³⁹ Moreover, as both Frank and Raymond argue, *Aulicus* is also of interest because its success encouraged the parliamentary writers to imitate its style and tone in their own newsbooks, causing 'an increasingly overt display of anti-Royalism' to emerge in the London publications.⁴⁰ Indeed, as Thomas notes, the existence of a number of oppositional pamphlets, specifically addressing or refuting *Aulicus* suggests that the

³² Ibid, pp. 21-28; and J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996), p. 25.

³³ Raymond, *Invention*, p. 26.

³⁴ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 34-5; and Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 26-7.

³⁵ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 30; E.294[29], *Mercurius Britannicus* (28 July-4 August 1645), p. 826; and E.303[19], *Mercurius Britannicus* (22-29 September 1645), p. 881.

³⁶ J. Rouse Bloxom (ed.) *Memorial of Bishop Waynflete* (London: J. Russelk Smith, 1851), pp. xxiii-xxiv.

³⁷ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 26, 28, 150.

³⁸ Frank, *Beginnings of the English Newspaper*, p. 38; and Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 35.

³⁹ Frank, *Beginnings of the English Newspaper* p. 37.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 37-8; and Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 27-8.

parliamentarians were concerned with the affect that the newsbook was having on parliamentary morale.⁴¹

Yet, some questions have been raised as to just how effective the royalist propagandists were. In his study of John Berkenhead, Thomas has claimed that the royalist writers' enclosed life within the court at Oxford caused them to be out-of-touch with the public that they were trying to convince, while their 'attachment to the ideals of aristocratic culture was dangerously inclined to degenerate into cliquishness'.⁴² Similarly Malcolm has asserted that the writers that Charles appointed did not represent 'the more moderate views held by the great majority of royalists, let alone the average Englishman'.⁴³ Admittedly, Malcolm concedes that she has based this assertion upon a reading of royalist writings produced by clerical authors, and that this group of men would have perhaps felt most strongly about challenges to Charles's crown and the Church of England's practices and hierarchy.⁴⁴ Yet, she is equally damning when she comes to discuss newsbooks and ballads: publications which were supposedly aimed at a wider social group. Malcolm argues that *Aulicus's* lofty, arrogant style could, in fact, have alienated large swathes of the population, while the tone of royalist ballads was 'often unfortunate' and 'occasionally quite detrimental to their object' of appealing to the 'commoners as well as the gentry'.⁴⁵ Indeed, Malcolm has gone so far as to say that 'the message' which the royalist propaganda 'was employed to broadcast was often inept, if not self-defeating'.⁴⁶

There is, however, a growing body of evidence to the contrary. Bernard Capp's ground-breaking study of the royalist polemicist, John Taylor, demonstrated how Taylor presented a favourable image of Royalism to a popular audience. Capp argued that Taylor did address specific, complex political issues, thus demonstrating that the royalists did print propaganda which deliberately appealed to a more popular audience.⁴⁷ In a similar vein, John Morrill and John Walter have argued that, because of growing fears of social anarchy during the 1640s, the king's propagandists had an easier task because Charles stood for the established social order; it was the Parliament which could be seen as attempting to subvert

⁴¹ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 61.

⁴² Ibid, pp. 128, x.

⁴³ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 133-4, 142.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 140.

⁴⁵ Ibid, pp. 128, 147.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 124.

⁴⁷ Capp, *John Taylor*, p. 172.

the natural order of society by challenging the authority of the king.⁴⁸ Indeed, much of the most recent research on this subject – which has largely focussed on the royalist propaganda of the later 1640s – has stressed the way in which royalist writers made sophisticated use of cultural symbols in order to undermine the Parliament's authority.⁴⁹ Jason McElligott has gone so far as to claim that, during the later 1640s, the royalist newsbooks 'consciously deployed commonplace cultural and political symbols, references, and allusions to create a complex but deliberately anti-intellectual critique of their Puritan enemies'. In direct contrast to Malcolm, who labels the royalist polemicists as 'elitist', McElligott argued that 'their aim was to cut with the grain of popular culture and to appeal to the everyday experiences, tacit knowledge, gut conservatism, and fears of their readers'.⁵⁰ It therefore seems that the traditional view of royalist polemic as inept and poorly directed needs to be re-examined: especially when it comes to the earlier years of the first Civil War which few previous historians have examined.

This chapter, then, will not only provide a better understanding of the role which printed propaganda played in the royalist war effort; but will also demonstrate how the polemicists of the later 1640s were developing the use of cultural references, like gender, that had been used in the propaganda of the early 1640s. The discussion will begin by examining the image of manhood which the royalists sought to propagate among their own men in order to encourage traits like bravery and strength, but deride cowardice and inconstancy. It will then go on to explore how royalist writers illustrated the parliamentarians' supposed failure to behave like 'men', as defined in patriarchal terms. Each of these sections will proceed chronologically in order to explore how the events of the war affected the various gendered themes which the royalist propagandists employed.

Part 1.1 – 'A Perfect Souldier is a Perfect Man':⁵¹ Constructing Manhood

Like the parliamentary pamphleteers, the royalist writers attempted to control their own supporters by praising positive martial actions in a way that would encourage other male supporters of the king to behave similarly. Thus, one tract, relating news from Somerset in

⁴⁸ J. Morrill and J. Walter, 'Order and Disorder in the English Revolution' in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 318; and McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', pp. 81-2.

⁴⁹ For example, see Underdown, 'The Language of Popular Politics', pp. 107-132; David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Raymond, *Invention*, pp. 180-2; and McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', pp. 75-100.

⁵⁰ McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel', pp. 80-1.

⁵¹ E.114[4], *The Christian souldier. Or, Preparation for battaile* (London: 24 August* 1642), p. 4.

August 1642, lauded the men in question as ‘brave Cavaleers, who thought it more glory to die Honourably, then to purchase a life by a cowardly flight’. Despite finding themselves outnumbered, it was claimed that these men had made such effective use of the terrain that they ‘so distracted’ the parliamentarians that they ‘knew not which way to flie, some throwing downe their armes and running into Corners, others fled, some ran into the Corne to hide themselves’.⁵² Thus the writer demonstrated the positive consequences which followed when men behaved bravely and obeyed the orders of their commanders, for even when they were outnumbered, they still managed to be victorious. Another pamphlet from early September related how the Cavaliers near Nottingham had ‘made solemne vowes ... to die in the cause’ and ‘daily incite[d]’ the parliamentarians ‘to give Battaile’. It dismissed the parliamentarians as ‘London Boyes’, and threatened to make them ‘retire faster home then they came thither, if they dare shew them their faces’.⁵³ The pamphleteer therefore directly contrasted the brave royalist ‘men’, who were eager to fight to the death if necessary, with the parliamentary ‘Boyes’, who did not dare to meet the royalists in battle. If the king’s male supporters wished to be counted as ‘men’ the writer indicated, then it was quite obvious what kind of behaviour was expected of them.

In the early autumn of 1642, as both armies marched into the field and the outbreak of war on a national scale looked increasingly imminent, Francis Quarles, a ‘literary apologist for Charles I’, published his work, *Observations Concerning Princes and States*.⁵⁴ In this text Quarles offered stirring words of comfort to ‘every Souldier’, that he should ‘arme his mind with hopes, and put on *courage*: Whatsoever dysaster [sic] fals’ he continued, ‘let not his heart sinke’. Quarles also addressed the commanders of the army, for instance he urged the ‘Conquerour’ to keep ‘himsel[e] and [his] Souldiers *temperate*’, rather than allowing them to indulge in pleasures. ‘Pleasures brings *effeminacy*’ Quarles cautioned, ‘and Effeminacy fore-runnes *ruine*’. Quarles concluded by asserting that, ‘[s]uch Conquests without blood or sweat, sufficiently revenge them selves upon the heads of their intemperate Conquerours’.⁵⁵ In this line Quarles was alluding to the belief that self-control was a central component of patriarchal manhood. If the soldiers allowed

⁵² E.112[33], *A true and exact relation of all the proceedings of Marquesse Hartford, Lord Pawlet, Lord Seymour, Lord Coventry, Sir Ralph Hopton, and other His Maiesties commissioners in the publishing of the commission of array in his Maiesties county of Somerset* (London: 19 August* 1642), unpaginated.

⁵³ E.116[35], *Quotidian occurrences in and about London, and in other places of this kingdome of England* (London?: 12 September* 1642), p. 5.

⁵⁴ K. J. Höltgen, ‘Francis Quarles’ in *DNB*.

⁵⁵ E.116[36], F. Quarles, *Observations Concerning Princes and States, Upon Peace and Warre* (12 September* 1642), pp. 12, 15.

themselves to be conquered by their own passions, then they risked becoming effeminate and weak. Such ‘intemperate’ men would therefore be beaten through their own behaviour, not by any action of the enemy.⁵⁶ Quarles’ warning was grounded in the idea, based on an ‘amalgam’ of Judaeo-Christian thought, Stoicism and asceticism, that ‘Fallen man was corrupt, his higher faculties or reason constantly under threat from the lusts of the flesh’.⁵⁷ There was a certain degree of overlap, then, between manhood ideals, Christian morality and other secular, philosophical codes of conduct. All of these codes could be employed to govern the behaviour of men on the battlefield if the men in question wanted to be thought of as ‘reasonable [and] moral’.⁵⁸

Men also had to be seen to obey the international and ‘largely customary’ rules of war that were learnt within the army, as well as upholding the ‘articles and ordinances of war’, set down by the commanders of each army.⁵⁹ It is surely this reasoning that lies behind a later observation made by Quarles which directly addressed the commanders of the army. Quarles asserted that ‘[i]f thou canst not execute as freely as thou commandest, command no more then what thou mayst as freely execute’. ‘It is a foule blemish in Sovereignty’, he concluded, ‘when the will *roares*, and the Power *whispers*’. To Quarles, it was obviously crucial that the soldiers respected and had confidence in the ability of their commanders: a man who barked orders, but was not a good soldier himself, would quickly be considered unworthy of his position of responsibility. Yet, by asserting that an ineffective commander would not have the strength or authority to govern his troops, Quarles’ language further illustrates how the rules of war and codes of manhood were interconnected and mutually supporting.

Quarles was also preoccupied with encouraging the men to demonstrate an appropriate level of aggression, but was careful to emphasise that this aggression had to be tightly controlled so as to be appropriately channelled, against the enemy, for example, rather than against the civilian population. Thus he cautioned, that ‘Where *Order* and *Fury* are wel acquainted, the warre prospers, and the souldiers end no lesse men, then they begun; *Order* takes spirit of *Fury*; and *Fury* takes rules of *Order*’. But, Quarles went on to

⁵⁶ E. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 29-31, 55-58.

⁵⁷ M. Ingram, ‘Sexual Manners: The Other Face of Civility in Early Modern England’ in *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*, P. Burke, B. Harrison, and P. Slack (eds.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 89.

⁵⁸ B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 129.

⁵⁹ Ibid, pp. 128-129; M. Braddick, *God’s Fury, England’s Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Allen Lane, 2008), p. 286.

caution, '[i]n the absence of *Order*, *Fury* runs her owne way; and, being an unthrift of her owne strength, failes in the first Assault, and cravens: And such, beginning more then men, end lesse then Women'.⁶⁰ Thus men had to be careful not to give into their aggression, or 'fury', lest they become a slave to their passions. During the seventeenth century men were supposed to control their emotions and remain rational at all times; failure to do this made them more like women, who were believed to be passionate, emotional and irrational.⁶¹ Thus, in this pamphlet Quarles offered advice to soldiers, commanders, captains, generals and princes and laid out the duties that they should undertake during times of peace and war.

It was not only Francis Quarles who openly addressed the soldiers and commanders of the royalist armies in order to demonstrate the behaviour that was expected of them, for the king also made direct appeals to his male supporters urging them to play their parts as men. Charles I recognised that, whilst the strong, aggressive elements of manhood needed to be encouraged during wartime, royalist propaganda also needed to make it clear that unnecessary violence would not be tolerated. For instance, in late August 1642 the king issued two proclamations which ordered his troopers to 'commit no Rapine upon the People', nor should they 'commit any unlawfull Violence or Outrage'.⁶² Similarly, in a speech reportedly given by the king to the officers and captains gathered around his tent before the battle of Edgehill in 1642, he urged them 'with your swords declare what courage and fidelity is within you'.⁶³ In a speech to his soldiers, given before the same battle, the king cautioned his men somewhat more candidly that 'ye are all designed for the slaughter if you do not manfully behave your selves in this Battell'. He urged them to counter the 'reproachfull signification' that the term 'Cavalier' had been given by the enemy by showing 'your selves therefore now couragious Cavaliers, and beat backe all opprobrious speeches and aspersions cast upon you by the Enemy. Let them know and discern that for your king you dare adventure your selves, and for the eternall reward of a just acquired honour'.⁶⁴ In another reproduction of a speech, reportedly given by the king

⁶⁰ E.116[36], Quarles, *Observations*, pp. 12, 15, 22.

⁶¹ A. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 60-78; O. Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe volume 1, 1500-1800* (London: Fontana Press, 1997), p. 334, 480; and S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 18-71.

⁶² E.112[22], *Two proclamations by the King* (York: 27 August* 1642), pp. 5-6. See also E.109[2], *Exceeding welcome newes from Beverley. Or, York-shires love to London* (London: 4 August 1642).

⁶³ E.200[67], *Three speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (London: 31 October* 1642), p. 3.

⁶⁴ E.200[68], *Three speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (NPP: 1642), pp. 4-5.

to his ‘whole army, immediately before the Battell [of Edgehill]’, Charles declared ‘your king bids you all be courageous, and heaven make you victorious’.⁶⁵ Whether these speeches were actually delivered by the king in person, or simply produced as printed propaganda, these phrases still demonstrate how words were used to ‘produce in you all [the reader, as well as the gathered army] a nobly mounted anger’. Even the phrase, ‘nobly mounted anger’ reiterates that such violent action was only condoned when it was deployed with discipline and for a just cause, the king was not encouraging his men to run riot.⁶⁶

Charles was even more specific when he addressed his army at Southam in Warwickshire in October. The king, speaking to ‘all his souldiers’, ordered them to ‘avoid vaine and rash swearing, excessive drinking and effeminacy (by some esteemed the property of a souldier) but’, the king cautioned, ‘the shame and corruption of a good Christian’.⁶⁷ Through such a phrase, Charles may have been ordering his soldiers to take care not to appear ‘physically weak’; but given the tone of the sentence, it is more likely that the king was ordering his men not to be overly ‘devoted to women’ or wenching, when they should have been fighting.⁶⁸ Barbara Donagan argues that during the civil war, both the Parliament and the king promoted codes of honour in order to ensure that England would not become the victim of ‘men released from the restraints that protected society from laps[ing] into barbarism and cruelty’.⁶⁹ In this pamphlet, the king was asserting what was deemed acceptable behaviour for a soldier. Charles was cautioning his men lest they become disorderly and lustful, traits that would harm their military effectiveness. As we have seen, in times of war, it was considered crucial that men showed the appropriate degree of self-restraint. Yet, this was not all, by emphasising the ordered conduct of his troops, and also by urging them to be ‘good Christians’, Charles was drawing upon religious and cultural discourses which reinforced the justness of his cause.⁷⁰

As the war spilled into 1643, the royalist pamphleteers continued to praise their men when they behaved with courage on the battlefield. When recounting the royalists’ attack

⁶⁵ E.200[69], *Three Speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (NPP: 1642), p. 8. This pamphlet is incomplete in the Thomason collection, however as it has been grouped with the previous two pamphlets, E.200[67 and 68] it has therefore been assumed that the speech was delivered before the battle of Edgehill.

⁶⁶ E.200[68], *Three speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty*, pp. 4-5; and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 128-29.

⁶⁷ E.124[19], *His Majesties declaration and manifestation to all his souldiers, by himselfe declared in the head of his army at Southam, 10. miles on this side Coventry* (London: 21 October* 1642), p. 6.

⁶⁸ Definitions taken from the *O.E.D.*

⁶⁹ B. Donagan, ‘Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War’, *P&P* 18 (February 1988), esp. p. 73.

⁷⁰ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 127-133, 136-137.

on Cirencester in early January that year, for example, *Mercurius Aulicus* praised Prince Rupert, Lieutenant General Wilmot and Lord George Digby for being so brave and ‘hot’ in falling upon the town.⁷¹ As contemporaries believed that gender difference centred on the humoral understanding of the body, by referring to these men’s action as ‘hot’ the author was also ensuring that their actions would have been considered as manly.⁷² In the same issue of the court newsbook, the actions of Sir Ralph Hopton in securing Cornwall for the king were heralded as brave and courageous; while the royalists at Brill were said to have given the parliamentarians ‘so soure a welcome’ when they attempted to take the town at the end of January, that the parliamentarians were ‘terrified and affrighted’ and ‘came not neer enough to plant their batteries’.⁷³ As well as relating news, these stories again reinforced the way in which men were supposed to behave, either by praising the actions of the royalists themselves, or by using the blunders of the enemy to demonstrate the dangerous consequences if men behaved in an inappropriate way.

Throughout the year the royalist propagandists continued to write about the military successes of the king’s forces using language that reinforced the connection between the troops’ appropriate manly behaviour and their martial achievements. In September, for instance, *Aulicus* reported how Colonel Sir John Urry and Sergeant Major Marrow had fallen upon Essex’s forlorn hope, presumably as Parliament’s forces advanced to relieve the siege of Gloucester. The newsbook related how Urry and Marrow ‘went on so resolutely, and were so well followed by their commanded men, that the Rebels presently fell to their old discipline of running away’.⁷⁴ Thus *Aulicus* emphasised that if the rank and file obeyed their officers, they would easily achieve military success. The newsbook also stressed that the officers needed to be brave and resolute in order to lead their men to victory.⁷⁵ As well as praising the conduct of their forces, another way in which the royalist propagandists encouraged certain martial qualities was by belittling their opponents’ behaviour when it failed to live up to the behaviour that was expected of men during war. For instance, the verse-pamphlet *Insigma Civicas* jeeringly remarked that some of the parliamentarians ‘turn

⁷¹ E.246[16], *Mercurius Aulicus* (29 January-4 February 1643), p. 6.

⁷² Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination*, pp. xvii, 61-2; and Mendelson and Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England*, p. 19.

⁷³ E.246[16], *Mercurius Aulicus* (29 January 1643), pp. 1, 5.

⁷⁴ E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), p. 492. See also, E.65[13], *Mercurius Aulicus* (5 August 1643), p. 421.

⁷⁵ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 227-253.

foot-men, and ... when they come / Unto the Battell straight away doe run'.⁷⁶ By encouraging their soldiers to laugh at their opponents because they ran away, the writers implicitly underlined the unacceptability of this behaviour.

While it was relatively easy for the royalist pamphleteers to praise their male supporters when all was going well, their pens were tested when the tide of military fortune turned. July 1644 had seen the defeat of the royalist northern field army at Marston Moor and also the surrender of York.⁷⁷ Rather than dwelling on the defeat, *Aulicus* swiftly turned to reporting news from other areas where royalist troops were fighting back. Thus, at the beginning of August 1644 the court newsbook reported from the siege of Donnington Castle, near Newbury, and praised '[a]ll [of] the Garrison from the Gallant Governour to the meanest common souldier' for successfully withstanding a parliamentary attempt to take the castle. Warming to its theme, *Aulicus* lauded the men, who 'did beyond expression [act] gallantly': not only did the soldiers ply 'it extreame close without any intermission', but they also worked 'with that chearefulnesse and delight, as if every man had beene [keen] to encourage himselfe and all his fellowes'.⁷⁸ Like Parliament's male supporters, the king's male followers were not only encouraged to fight bravely in the face of danger, but to take genuine pleasure in fighting for the cause, despite the fact that their lives were at risk.

It was the unfolding events in the west which gave the royalist cause the boost which it so desperately needed in the summer of 1644. After the parliamentary defeat at Lostwithiel at the beginning of September, *Aulicus* paid tribute to the gallant actions of the 'Gentlemen of His Majesties owne Troop' who, *Aulicus* reported, were 'twice bravely led on by the noble & valiant Lord *Bernard Stuart*, to the great terrour of the Rebels'. The newsbook finished by assuring its readers that there was 'no question' that this 'caused their General *Essex* early the next day to quit his glorious Command, and in a small Boate to shift away by water'. In contrast to the brave actions of the royalist forces, *Aulicus* referred to Essex's abandonment of his troops as 'the most high inexpiable peece of cowardice that ever was committed by one who tooke on him the name of Generall'.⁷⁹ Once again, the newsbook was demonstrating the consequences of royalist bravery and

⁷⁶ E.251[5], *Insignia civicas, or, the anti-royalists described in their kinds and colours* (NPP: 1 October* 1643), p. 1.

⁷⁷ I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms 1638-1652* (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Ltd., 2007), pp. 222-223

⁷⁸ E.7[10], *Mercurius Aulicus* (3 August 1644), pp. 1106-1108.

⁷⁹ E.10[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 September 1644), p. 1151, 1154.

superior martial ability, this time stressing, by comparison, the alleged cowardice of Parliament's chief field commander because he had abandoned his men. Indeed, *Aulicus*' description of Essex as a 'coward' was doubly subversive because it also undermined the general's high rank.⁸⁰

Perhaps the most serious propaganda blow to the king came in June 1645 when his private cabinet of correspondence was captured after the battle of Naseby. Royalist defeats at Langport (in July) and Bristol (in September) only added to the bleak picture. As the war went on, and as the King's cause appeared to be waning, *Aulicus* attempted to raise the royalists' morale by continuing to report the successes of individual commanders in a way that reinforced the desirable qualities of manhood. Thus, after a skirmish at Chippenham, in Wiltshire, Major Dowet and his horse were said to have 'shewed much courage' and to have charged the enemy 'so stoutly', that they 'at last forced the Rebels thence and got the Turn-pike'.⁸¹ Elsewhere at Faulksworth, near Stilton, a 'party [of the King's men] fell upon' the parliamentarians 'with so discreet courage that they instantly routed them'. Indeed the courage of the royalist forces during this encounter was such that it supposedly discouraged a body of parliamentarian troops under one 'Capt. Poe' from even entering the fray to assist their comrades. Instead, *Aulicus* recounted with obvious glee, how these troops 'came not to fight, but [to] escape', for the royalist commander 'Generall Gerard' who was '(two miles off) saw them runne over the Lands ... to Newmarket'.⁸² Again, the message to the royalist reader would have been obvious: if the royalists fought with courage and resolution, then the parliamentarians would soon show their cowardice and inability to fight.

Far fewer royalist pamphlets and newsbooks survive for the latter months of 1645 and 1646. *Aulicus*, the newsbook which had been most concerned with relating the actions of the royalist army and its opponents, ceased to appear in September 1645. As this was the main propaganda journal of the royalist party, its absence was significant and reflected the failing war effort that culminated in the king's surrender to the Scots in May 1646. It was left to the authors of occasional pamphlets to attempt to bolster the faltering royalist cause. These Cavalier polemicists continued to praise the royalist soldiers, emphasising their bravery in the face of danger and the victories which such courage brought. In a

⁸⁰ S. Amussen, *An Ordered Society* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), p. 145.

⁸¹ E.298[23], *Mercurius Aulicus* (10-17 August 1645), p. 1700.

⁸² E.302[14], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August-7 September 1645), pp. 1725-6, 1735.

printed letter supposedly written to George Lord Digby from the siege of Hereford, for example, Sir Barnabas Scudamore, the Governor of Hereford, claimed that the ‘Officers, Gentry, ... Clergy, Citizens, and Common Souldiers, behaved themselves all gallantly upon their duty’. Scudamore continued by asserting that ‘the walls of their valiant breasts were all strongly lined with Courage and Loyalty’.⁸³ Thus, even at this late stage in the conflict, the royalist pamphleteers were still trying to play their part in the war by demonstrating the positive consequences of behaving with courage, but also with discipline.

As can be seen, then, it was during the opening months of the war that the royalist pamphleteers seemed most concerned with constructing and propagating images of how a royalist ‘man’ was supposed to behave. As was argued in chapter two, it would seem highly likely that this can be explained by the unique circumstances of the Civil War: neither side had experience of fighting their fellow countrymen. Equally, during the spring and summer of 1642 both sides were trying to drum up support and justify their actions to the country. As the fighting intensified during 1643, the editors of the court newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* continued to encourage certain manhood characteristics through their loaded descriptions of the conflict. But while the parliamentary writers of both occasional tracts and newsbooks often addressed their male readers and openly reminded them of their manly duties to protect the weak from royalist anger or lust, *Aulicus* merely described the unfolding events in its witty, railing style, ensuring that, where appropriate, royalist bravery was praised, and parliamentary cowardice was ridiculed.

An explanation for this noticeably different approach may be found if we return to John Walter and John Morrill’s argument that the king’s propagandists had the easier task. As Walter observes, ‘the political authority of the king and the domestic authority of the husband were validated both by God and nature’.⁸⁴ Therefore a ‘central prop of royal propaganda’ was that ‘[o]nly the restoration of royal authority could lead to a restoration of order’.⁸⁵ Despite Charles’ unpopular policies then, he would still have been viewed as the

⁸³ E.303[4], *A letter sent to the Right Honourable the Lord Digby, from Sir Barnabas Scudamore Governor of Hereford* (Oxford: 25 September* 1645), p. 1. See also E.303[6], *Alter Britanniae heros: or The life of the most honourable knight, Sir Henry Gage, late Governour of Oxford, epitomiz’d* (Oxford: 25 September* 1645), pp. 9-10.

⁸⁴ J. Walter, ‘The Impact on Society: A World Turned Upside Down?’ in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), p. 115.

⁸⁵ J. Morrill and J. Walter, ‘Order and Disorder in the English Revolution’ in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 318; and G. Burgess, ‘The Impact on Political Thought: Rhetorics for Troubled Times’ in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), p. 76.

linchpin of the patriarchal social order by the majority of people. Therefore, implicit in royalist propaganda was the idea that any man who supported the crown was automatically upholding the social and gender order; in other words, he was acting as contemporaries believed a man should. Thus, it may well be that the royalist pamphleteers did not feel the same need to remind their soldiers openly of the duties which the patriarchal order required that they perform.

Part 2.1 – '[T]he wiser sort hold ... Round-heads to be but ... Cuckolds':⁸⁶ Royalist Depictions of Parliamentary Unmanliness

Just like Parliament's male supporters, the king's male soldiers were encouraged by their own commanders and propagandists to behave in certain ways: they were supposed to be courageous and brave, but equally they had to show restraint and obey orders. If these were the ideal martial characteristics for the king's male soldiers to possess, then, just like the parliamentary pamphleteers, royalist writers saw the benefits of reporting those occasions when their opponents fell short of these ideals and thus revealed their weakness. And, while the parliamentary pamphleteers emphasised the effeminate dress and behaviour of the Cavaliers, throughout the late summer and autumn of 1642 the royalist pamphleteers made use of the pre-existing stereotype of the hypocritical puritan to suggest that the parliamentarians committed sexual acts under the cloak of zealous religion.⁸⁷

Part 2.2 – 1642: 'Our continuall scolding shall make them goe to the warres'⁸⁸

The stereotype of the secretly debauched puritan can be clearly seen in an anonymous royalist verse, printed in August 1642, which attacked all 'Round-heads'. The author began by declaring that a Roundhead 'would holy seeme in all mens sight / When as he truly is an Hypocrite' and went on to recount the story of a typical Roundhead's lewd behaviour with a 'holy sister, which they dearely love'. Such 'holy' women were said to hide their lasciviousness behind a mask of godliness, for the Roundhead's female consort was described as, 'Shee that loves Sermons, as shee does the rest / Still standing stiffe, that longest are the best'. The sexual suggestion in the last line of this verse reinforced the popular belief that, in reality, zealous Protestants met at conventicles for purely carnal

⁸⁶ E.240[31], *Three speeches, being such speeches as the like were never spoken in the city* (London: 9 October* 1642), pp. 4-5, 7, 8.

⁸⁷ W. Lamont and S. Oldfield, *Politics, Religion and Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Aldine Press, 1975), pp. 77-78.

⁸⁸ E.114[14], *The resolution of the women of London to the Parliament* (NPP: 26 August* 1642), unpaginated.

reasons. As if the sexual innuendo was not obvious enough, the writer later elaborated further by explaining that such a woman ‘will lie, yet swears shee hates a lyer / Except it be that man that will ly by her’.⁸⁹ Implicit in this passage is the idea that the male parliamentarians’ challenge of the existing social, religious and sexual hierarchies had caused all societal order to unravel which had, in turn, encouraged the parliamentarians’ wives to challenge their husbands’ authority. The portrayal of the parliamentarians as debauched also undermined their claims to fight for a just and godly cause.

Similar views were expressed in the verse *The Round-heads Race*, included within the pamphlet *The Distractions of our Times*, which claimed that the parliamentarians aimed to advance themselves by attacking the religious, social and political hierarchies. The final stanza introduced the familiar idea of the hypocritical puritan by claiming that once the parliamentarians had destroyed all social order then they would be able to satisfy their lusts without restraint:

But when the Change of Government
Shall set our fingers free,
Wee’l make the wanton *Sisters* stoop,
*And hey then up go we.*⁹⁰

Similar accusations of clandestine debauchery were made against the Roundheads in a royalist ‘Dittie’ directed to be sung ‘to the tune of *Old Sir Symon the King*’. For instance, in one line the claim was made that the Roundheads go ‘At night to Conventicles, / And ride like Hackney-Jade[s]’. A ‘Hackney-jade’ was a seventeenth-century colloquialism for both a post-horse and a prostitute.⁹¹

Having established the stereotype of the wanton Roundhead woman, the royalist pamphleteers inevitably went on to claim that the Roundheads were cuckolded and brow-beaten by their wives. One satirical pamphlet even claimed that the wives of the men of London had resolved, in their own words, to use their ‘tongues in such a violent manner, that our continuall scolding shall make ... [our husbands] goe to the warres’, so that they

⁸⁹ E.113[11], *A puritane set forth in his lively colours: or, K. James his description of a puritan* (London: 23 August 1642), pp. 4-5, 8.

⁹⁰ Wing / 1329:17, *The Distractions of our times* (London: 1642).

⁹¹ L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 66-7; and *OED*.

could ‘in our husbands absence, live as merrily as may be, drinke, feast, and walk abroad; and if we have a minde to it, keep and maintaine a friend, that upon occasion may doe us a pleasure’.⁹² This point was further illustrated by the inclusion of a woodcut on the title page which depicted a wife ordering her husband to ‘Go to the wars’. To further suggest the unmanliness of the husband, he was portrayed with cuckold’s horns and holding what appears to be a mirror (see appendix 1, figure 4). The suggestion that these men had only gone to war in the first place because their wives had forced them, suggested that they were unwilling to act their parts as men. Moreover the wanton actions of the London wives, as portrayed in this pamphlet, would have instantly suggested to the readers that their husbands were cuckolds: a potent symbol of unmanliness at this time.⁹³ As we have seen, a ‘cuckold’ was the contemporary term for a man who was unable to sexually please his wife and who thus encouraged her to commit adultery. Foyster argues that, during this time, an important part of being counted a ‘man’ was to have a worthy sexual reputation; to call a man a cuckold, then, was to question his manliness. It also cast a doubt over the legitimacy of his male heirs, took away his household authority, and ridiculed him before the community. Foyster concludes by asserting that the term ‘was the most shameful name a man could acquire in marriage’.⁹⁴ Significantly, the pamphlet discussed above was printed in August 1642, when the Earl of Essex was preparing to leave London at the head of the parliamentary army. The suggestion that the parliamentary soldiery needed to be scolded by their wives, in order to enlist in Essex’s army would surely have undermined the threatening image that this force would have otherwise presented to the royalists.

In the months that followed, other royalist pamphleteers continued to assert that the parliamentary army was overflowing with cuckolds, and went out of their way to ensure that their readers would not miss the significance of this claim. Contemporaries believed that, if a man could not keep his household in order, then he would be just as dysfunctional in fulfilling his manly roles in society.⁹⁵ To this end, the royalist pamphleteers often attacked the parliamentarians by commenting on their outspoken wives. For instance, a pamphlet printed in early September 1642, made one Roundhead woman appeal to ‘any Reverend Round-head that is not a Cuckold (if there be such an one)’, thereby implying

⁹² E.114[14], *The resolution of the women of London to the Parliament*.

⁹³ Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 7.

⁹⁴ Ibid, pp. 4-7, 39, 67, 106-116.

⁹⁵ Ibid, pp. 4, 39, 48, 67, 106-116. See also S. D. Amussen, ‘The Part of a Christian Man’: the Cultural Politics of manhood in early modern England’ in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 216.

that nearly all of Parliament's zealous religious supporters were being cuckolded by their outspoken wives.⁹⁶

The themes of this work were reproduced and extended in a second tract that circulated roughly a month later, in the first week of October. This pamphlet made the dire consequences of the disorderly behaviour of Parliament's male supporters more explicit by showing how that behaviour had not only encouraged the wife of a godly London citizen named Mr. Warden to speak out in public, but had even led his maid to follow suit. During his 'speech', Mr. Warden admitted that 'the wiser sort hold us Round-heads to be but zealous silly, and fooles, nay Cuckolds'. The rest of the pamphlet suggests that, because of the parliamentarians' disorderly behaviour, the whole social and gender order was unravelling, with Warden revealing his fears that his male servant, 'Jehosaphat', 'should prove a carnall Boy, and get my Daughter *Dorcas* with childe' because he has 'said prayers at a Conventicle'. This line therefore reinforced the link between zealous Protestantism, clandestine meetings and debauched behaviour, while simultaneously reiterating the idea that any true claim to godliness was undermined by such sexual misconduct.⁹⁷ Despite showing his concern about 'such a procreation', Warden does not appear to be prepared to punish either Dorcas or Jehosaphat. Instead Warden goes on to lament, that even the success of Parliament's military forces has not kept 'our wives, daughters and servants honest'. Warden bemoans the fact that 'if they will Cuckold us, no Italian locks can keep a Thiefe or enemy out of their private Boxes or long chests'. While Warden was portrayed as being unable to keep patriarchal control over his dependents, one of the other pro-parliamentarian men whom he was addressing was shown to have subverted the social order by keeping a whore. Mrs. Warden's speech was equally rebellious and disordered, as she was made to assert that women should be allowed to be 'Lord Chamberlaine, Groome of the Stoole, and Bed-chamber'. These, she claims, are 'places most fitting for women', presumably because they would give women easier access to a man's private bedchamber. Mistress Warden's circle of female listeners are all portrayed as lustful, and religious words like 'devotion' are shown to be synonymous with other sexual activities.⁹⁸ Another royalist pamphlet from October 1642 referred to the parliamentarians' 'base lascivious meetings in

⁹⁶ E.115[20], *Mrs. Wardens observations upon her husbands reverend speech in the presence of certaine gentlewomen of Ratcliffe and Wapping* (NPP: 5(?) September* 1642), esp. p. 8. The text of this tract was reproduced a month later in E.240[31], *Three speeches, being such speeches as the like were never spoken in the city* (London: 9 October* 1642).

⁹⁷ L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage* (London: Penguin, 1979), pp. 313-315.

⁹⁸ E.240[31], *Three speeches, being such speeches as the like were never spoken in the city*, pp. 4-5, 7, 8.

private Conventicles', and insulted the enemy as 'hypocriticall *Round-heads*' because they took pains to appear godly, but their actions betrayed their real, debauched natures.⁹⁹

As we have seen, contemporaries believed that a man's inability to keep patriarchal order in his household would make him unfit for his public duties in the commonwealth. Therefore it was a relatively easy step for the royalist pamphleteers to claim that the parliamentarians' alleged status as cuckolds made them inept and cowardly soldiers on the battlefield. In early October a royalist pamphlet utilised this theme in order to belittle the Earl of Essex's triumphant march from the capital: the pamphleteer reported on the 'brave sight' which the earl and his commanders made 'in their Gold and Silver' with 'large Horses, Gorgets, [and] leading Staves', but mockingly described their 'peales of shot [as] wounding the Ayre, more courigiously I verily beleeeve than if it were the enemy', nor were their coats 'stain'd with one drop of bloud'.¹⁰⁰ It was easy for these men to speak and act with bravado, he implied, when they had not yet experienced the horrors of war at first hand. This attack would surely have undermined the impression created by the numerous parliamentary pamphlets which had glorified Essex's march from London on 9 September, and which had portrayed him as the darling of the people.¹⁰¹

Royalist pamphleteers, like their parliamentary counterparts, further strengthened the image of their opponents' as 'unmanly' by portraying them as violent and cruel towards innocent civilians. For instance, after Sir John Hotham had refused entry to the king at Hull in April 1642, the royalist pamphlets began to recount stories of Hotham's cruelty to Hull's inhabitants. At the beginning of August, one pamphlet – allegedly a reprint of a speech given by the king at York – claimed that Sir John Hotham 'drownds their Land, burnes and plunders their houses, murthers, and with unheard of crueltie, torments their Persons'. What is more, the writer added that Hotham did 'this with ... much delight'. The pamphleteer was highlighting Hotham's failure to act as a man (as was defined by patriarchy): in patriarchal discourse it was a man's duty to protect those weaker than himself, not to prey upon them. In a subtle comparison of his actions with those of Hotham, Charles I himself, in a subsequent speech stressed that, for the sake of his people,

⁹⁹ E.122[22], *Sir James Cambels Clarks disaster, by making books* (London: 15 October* 1642), p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ E.240[31], *Three speeches, being such speeches as the like were never spoken in the city*, p. 3.

¹⁰¹ E.239[18], *A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament* (5-12 September 1642), p. 7. See also, E.116[25], *A declaration of the noble resolution of the Earle of Essex his Excellence* (London: 9 September* 1642), pp. 1-5; E.200[60], *A learned speech spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, upon his departure from Northampton to Worcester* (NPP: 27 September 1642), p. 2; and E.202[44], *Remarkable passages, or, A perfect diurnall of the weekly proceedings in both Houses of Parliament* (5-12 September 1642), unpaginated.

he had ‘passed over the Considerations of Honour; And notwithstanding the reproaches every day laid on me’ he had ‘laid no siege to that place [Hull]’.¹⁰² As Jerrilyn Greene Marston has observed a ‘gentleman’s honour,’ was ‘his most precious possession’, so the statement that Charles was willing to risk his own honour in order to restore order in a peaceful manner, would have suggested to the reader the depth of his love for his people and the seriousness with which he took his role as king.¹⁰³ While the royalist pamphleteers portrayed Hotham as attacking those who were weak, Charles sought to portray his own actions as those of a loving patriarch. In doing so, the king reinforced the legitimacy of his actions.

Throughout the autumn of 1642 suggestions that the parliamentary troops were excessively violent became more prominent in the royalist pamphlet literature. Several pamphlets relating news from the besieged royalists in Sherborne Castle illustrate this point well. Significantly, the pamphlets did not comment on the violence which had been used by the parliamentary besiegers in their skirmishes against the royalist garrison of the castle. Instead, the royalist tracts commented on parliamentary aggression against the royalist dead. For instance, one royalist tract observed with disgust, ‘I wish we do not know with what inhumanity, some of them have since used some of our dead’. The pamphlet, supposedly a letter written from an eye-witness, went on to elaborate on what he had seen, remarking on the ‘savagenesse’ with which ‘they have cut and hewen the Carcases of those honest men, whose loyall deaths seemes to reproach them’.¹⁰⁴ The fact that such brutal violence was supposedly offered to men who were already dead demonstrated the uncontrolled rage of the parliamentary soldiers, which in turn suggested their unmanliness. Accounts of the parliamentarians’ supposed brutality were also included within royalist pamphlets in order to suggest their opponents’ unwillingness to abide by Christian moral codes or society’s laws.¹⁰⁵ Equally, the fact that this violence was said to be directed at corpses causes the reader to question why it was not directed instead against the surviving members of the royalist garrison. It might be that the author was suggesting

¹⁰² E.109[26], *His Maiesties speech to the gentlemen of Yorkshire, on Thursday the fourth of August. 1642* (York and London: 8 August* 1642), p. 2. See also E.113[7], *True intelligence from Lincolne-shire* (London: 22 August 1642); 669.f.6[68], *To the right honorable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament* (York and London: 26 August* 1642); and E.115[18], *Exceeding good news from Nottingham, and Yorkshire*, (London: 30 September 1642), p. 3.

¹⁰³ J. Greene Marston, ‘Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England’, *JBS* XIII (1973-4), p. 22.

¹⁰⁴ E.117[12], *A most exact and true relation of the proceedings of His Majesties armie at Shelborne* (London: 15 September 1642), unpaginated.

¹⁰⁵ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 127-141.

that men who were capable of such disorderly, vicious outbursts were no match for disciplined royalist troops and therefore chose to vent their impotent rage on victims who could not fight back. Another pamphlet relating news from the siege, recounted how a royalist ‘Dorset shire Gentleman [one] Captain H: Hussey’ was captured after an unsuccessful sally from the castle. The writer, again an alleged eye-witness, recounted with horror how ‘whilst they [the parliamentarians] had him at their mercy, they most barbarously cut off his members, and then did him the favour to kill him’.¹⁰⁶ In this passage, it is unclear whether the author is referring to the unfortunate Hussey’s limbs, or to his genitals. But it may well be that this ambiguity demonstrates the sophistication of this particular pamphleteer: simply hinting that the parliamentary soldiers had behaved with such tyrannical violence as to have literally ‘unmanned’ a royalist prisoner whom they had ‘at their mercy’, was a powerful tactic, which was designed to shock the reader.

Part 2.3 – 1643: The Conflict Deepens

During the winter of 1642-3, while parliamentary and royalist forces consolidated their military positions across the country, the pamphlet wars continued to rage. Just as the parliamentary pamphleteers stressed that piety was a central component of parliamentary manhood, so the royalist writers attempted to undermine the self-professed godliness of the parliamentarians by claiming that it was merely a cloak for debauchery and lustfulness. For instance, a broadside entitled *The Oxford Riddle* accused the parliamentarians of all manner of unlawful, disorderly and debauched behaviour, drawing attention to the supposed hypocrisy of the parliamentarians by asking the reader who the people are ‘That hate the flesh, yet firke their Dames’.¹⁰⁷ Another verse broadside published in March 1643, while peace negotiations were taking place at Oxford, libelled a number of prominent military and civil parliamentary leaders by highlighting their lustful behaviour; for instance Lord Stamford was made to exclaim fearfully that if peace should come, then the townspeople of Hereford would ‘teare both me, / And all my whores in pieces’. Similarly the anonymous author made the MP John Pym boast that ‘I eate their Lordships meate by day, / And give it [to] their Wives at night’, while the MP Henry Martin complained that if peace came ‘I shall then have but three Whores, / A pox upon

¹⁰⁶ E.117[4], *The newest and truest, and most impartiall relation of all the late occurrence which hath happened at Sherbourne-Castle, and thereabouts* (NPP: 14 September 1642), p. 5.

¹⁰⁷ Wing / 1769:07, *Oxford riddle* (Oxford: 1643), p. 7. See also E.69[24], *The humble petition of the House of Commons* (NPP: 5 October 1643*) which has the *Oxford Riddle* included on the last pages.

this Peace'.¹⁰⁸ As well as rebelling against the authority of the king, the author was suggesting that the parliamentary leaders were challenging the social order further by encouraging sexual promiscuity. Not only did this undermine the parliamentarians' claims to godliness, but it also highlighted their unwillingness to perform their parts as men: it was a man's duty to uphold the patriarchal social order in both household and commonwealth, the parliamentary leadership – the author suggested – was wilfully failing on both counts.

A month later, another verse broadside entitled *The Publick Faith* used contemporary expectations of patriarchal manhood to further discredit the parliamentarians' claims to political power. The author began by claiming that the parliamentarians were allowing their support for the Parliament to disrupt their manly responsibilities in providing for their families. The author asserted that the men of London would lend money to the Parliament 'More willingly then ever you did spend / Money to buy your wives and children bread'. The broadside continued by asserting that, should the parliamentarians be fortunate enough to return home from the wars with their lives, then, rather than returning to their patriarchal roles as providers for their families, they would happily live 'upon ... [their] wives', a notion which further underlined the parliamentarian's failure to be men in the patriarchal sense. The anonymous author went on to make a subtle, but powerful connection between the parliamentarian wives' activities in business and their independence from their husbands, by asserting that: 'Their [wives'] trading will be good when fortune weares / Your colours in the caps oth' Cavaliers [sic]'. In other words, the wives trading will improve when the Cavaliers had beaten the Roundheads, because order would return to the country and the disruption of trade routes would cease. Yet, 'trading' was being used in both a commercial and a sexual sense, for in the next lines the author asserted that the Cavaliers would make '*Cuckolds*' of the parliamentarians, forcing them to wear the Cavaliers' 'horns' on their brows, 'as you *publick Faiths* do now'.¹⁰⁹ The anonymous author was making the point that the parliamentarians were so enthralled by the authority of Parliament that they had ceased to think and act for themselves and had therefore ceased to be considered patriarchal men. The suggestion that the Cavaliers would wear the parliamentarians' colours also implied that men who were cuckolded would be easy to beat. The author continued in this vein by claiming that the public faith's spell would be broken when the Londoners saw the king outside the gates of the city with his

¹⁰⁸ 669.f.6[117], *The sence of the House* (Oxford: 10 March* 1643).

¹⁰⁹ 669.f.8[2], *The publick faith* (NPP: 7 April* 1643).

army. Once the king was back on the throne and patriarchal order was necessarily restored, the author claimed that, ‘then you’l bow your heads *your horns* and all’.¹¹⁰

A similar view was expressed in the verse broadside *The City*, collected by Thomason later in the same month. The broadside repeatedly referred to Parliament’s male supporters in London as cuckolds because they had allowed themselves to be misled by the Parliament. Such deluded men, the broadside claimed, may indeed present a brave sight when they paraded in their armour ‘with your gilded Musket’, but in reality, the author continued, they were:

Trayning not for good service, but for show,
That the whole towne may see your fethers spred
Over your Hatts, as the Hornes do o’re your Head.

The mention of feathers further stressed the point that the parliamentarians’ armour and weapons were not for use, but were for display purposes only. The author continued to drum home the message by addressing the Londoners as:

Poore baffled City, but baffled by a crue
Of men, which are as arrant fooles as you,
Surely your braines can never be so dull
As not conceive this, which each empty Skull
Must needs resent, how that their onely ayme,
Is to crate your City all on flame,
... unlesse your heads be all
Hornes and no flesh, you needs must see the fall:
That threatens you.¹¹¹

Parliament’s actions in attempting to create chaos and set the city ‘all on flame’, proved them to be ‘arrant fooles’, but what was more, the Londoners had been unwise enough to allow themselves to follow and support such foolish men. The author finished by declaring that, unless the citizens of London were so unmanly as to be unable to think for themselves,

¹¹⁰ 669.f.8[2], *The publick faith*.

¹¹¹ 669.f.8[5], *The city* (Oxford: 20 April* 1643).

they must see the end to which they were heading: in other words, that all social and gender order would soon be dissolved and that this would, in turn, affect their own social positions. Thus we see how the royalist propagandists were not only utilising the existing cultural stereotype of the cuckold, but were also broadening its meaning. A cuckold was a man who was unable to control his wife through regular sexual intercourse; his failings therefore challenged the foundations of the patriarchal social order for it questioned what was considered a man's automatic right to dominance within the household and within broader society. The royalist propagandists were using the term to refer to a man whose public challenge to the king's authority had called the entire patriarchal social order into question, including his own position of authority within it: a position that his male gender afforded him.¹¹²

In the eyes of contemporaries, such unmanly and anti-patriarchal behaviour would have had obvious connotations for the parliamentary soldiers' martial reputation. Whenever the events of the war could be twisted to the parliamentarians' disadvantage, the king's penmen seized the opportunity. As an example, after the surrender of Reading to the parliamentarians on 27 April, despite the royalist garrison having possessed adequate manpower and provisions to survive a longer siege, one anonymous Cavalier versifier attempted to respond to the defeat by mocking Essex and his army. To this end he declared that, as provision, 'His Excellence had ... Rams heads', while Lord Grey was said to have had '5000. Calves-heads all in Carts' to 'nourish his men' and 'cheer up their Hearts'. The author continued by remarking that:

This made them so valiant that very day,

They had taken the Town [Reading] but for running away.¹¹³

While the pamphleteer's claim that the parliamentarians had run away was utterly false, the author did successfully connect calves horns and therefore cuckoldry, with cowardice and martial ineptitude in order to undermine the parliamentarians' military reputation. The

¹¹² For another example of this usage of 'cuckold' see, E.251[5], *Insignia civicas, or, the anti-royalists described in their kinds and colours* (NPP: 1 October* 1643), p. 4.

¹¹³ Wing / 1210:25, *New diurnall of passages more exactly drawne up then heretofore ordered to be printed and published* (Oxford: 1643), unpaginated. See also 669.f.8[23], *Londons warning-peece* (York: 23 August* 1643) which used similar gendered language to attack the military potency of the parliamentary army. For a discussion of cuckolds, horns and cuckolded men being unable to eat ram, see Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 109-112.

implication was that men who were unable to stand up to their own wives were hardly going to be a threatening military foe. The pamphlet is not precisely dated, but it seems highly likely that it was printed after the town fell to the parliamentarians. The town's proximity to Oxford meant that the loss of Reading was a particular blow to the king and it is therefore plausible that this pamphlet was written in an attempt to take some of the sting out of the defeat.¹¹⁴

As well as accusing Parliament's male supporters of anti-patriarchal conduct, the court newsbook, *Mercurius Aulicus* also began to comment on the actions of female Roundheads in order to demonstrate the dangerous consequences of such disorderly male behaviour. On August 27, for instance, *Aulicus* reported how an '*Honourable Committee of Ladies and Gentle-women*' had been formed in London and how this had encouraged another committee to be set up in Coventry along similar lines. Moreover, *Aulicus* claimed that the Coventry 'she-committee', consisting of '*Mistresse Majoresse and her legislative Gossips*', were '*so full of zeale and Reformation that they dare Commit anything*'. Indeed, when a royalist divine, one Dr. Samuel Hinton, attempted to leave the town with his possessions, the 'she-committee' refused to let him go despite the fact that he had a license to leave the town that had been obtained from a (male) parliamentary committee. *Aulicus* reported that the men who had originally granted Dr. Hinton the license met to discuss the actions of the 'she-committee', among whom was one 'Master Robert Phips' who '(knowing the insolency of a domineering wife at home) grew most hot for the Order against the women'. But, the newsbook continued, 'after sundry debates, the businesse was concluded for the good wives against the Order, by a most able Counsellour, who said, *It is no opposing them now, let us CEDERE TEMPORE*. So that if lying, perjury, cheating, false Latine, and women can prevaile any thing, woe be to the Cavaliere'. Rather than standing up to the women, the male parliamentary committee ruled in the women's favour, preferring instead to yield.¹¹⁵ *Aulicus*'s message is clear – the royalists needed to stand up to these weak and disorderly men in order to protect the social order.

The following edition of *Aulicus* continued with this gendered attack. The newsbook sneered that 'Mistresse Murford', the wife of the governor of Southampton, who was until '(the other day, a poore Seamstresse) doth now so overflow in *doctrine & use*,

¹¹⁴ I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), pp. 168-171.

¹¹⁵ E.67[7], *Mercurius Aulicus* (2 September 1643), pp. 471-2.

that the chief men of spirit do extreemly emulate her for being better gifted then they for all their calling'. The editor of *Aulicus* was making the point that, in a parliamentary town, a woman of low birth, was now not only being taken seriously by men, but was being emulated by them, as she was considered 'better gifted' than they were.¹¹⁶ Through stories such as these, *Aulicus* demonstrated that, rather than attempting to control their women, the parliamentarians appeared to be encouraging their independent activity in religious, civic and political matters, to the detriment of the social order.

Following the routing of Sir William Waller's western army at Roundway Down on 13 July, the fall of Bristol to the royalists on 26 July and the successes of the Earl of Newcastle in the north-east of England, the king's position was beginning to look increasingly strong. One reflection of the royalists' soaring morale and confidence can be seen in a satirical tract which set about demeaning the strength of the London fortifications, jeering that they were 'but *Twentifications*', and claiming that the capital's '*Bul-workes*' were better described as '*Cow-workes*, because the women made them'.¹¹⁷ In doing so, the author was surely implying that the capital might well be the king's next target, while the parliamentary armies of Waller and Essex were still scattered and demoralised. When the London defences were being raised, several parliamentary newsbooks had commented with evident approval that 'women of good fashion ... labour hard at the worke'.¹¹⁸ However, in the eyes of the royalist polemicists the fact that the London defences had been partially built by women, was yet another opportunity to suggest that the gender order had unravelled within the capital because of the failure of the parliamentarians to act like men. Yet another royalist pamphlet took this idea even further by claiming that it was 'the Women' who had 'huggd their Husbands into this Rebellion' after they had been instructed to do so by a male preacher.¹¹⁹ In doing so, this pamphlet echoed the tracts printed a year earlier in August 1642, which had claimed that it was the scolding of the parliamentary women that had forced their husbands to enrol in the Earl of Essex's army.

Aulicus further undermined the military prowess of the parliamentarians by relating stories of their supposed cowardice in the face of the royalist troops. For instance, on recounting the surrender of Exeter to the royalists on 7 September, *Aulicus* declared '[t]his

¹¹⁶ E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), p. 491.

¹¹⁷ E.65[1], *A preter-pluperfect, spick and span new nocturnall, or Mercuries weekly night-newes* (Oxford: 11 August 1643*), p. 9.

¹¹⁸ E.240[49], *England's memorable accidents* (24-31 October 1642), p. 59.

¹¹⁹ E.65[32], *A letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus: or, Londons confession but not repentance* (Oxford: 25 August 1643*), p. 13.

day we had a sufficient tast how we shal deale with the Rebels Army, when ever we can be so happy as to get it out to fight'.¹²⁰ In a subsequent edition *Aulicus* even attempted to turn a royalist setback into an opportunity to ridicule the enemy. The newsbook claimed that the parliamentarians at Gloucester 'seldome stand a charge, or look their enemies in the face, but turn their backs, and flye directly to their fellowes'.¹²¹ The king's siege of Gloucester which had lasted from 10 August to 5 September had achieved little other than allow Essex time to reform his army. If the king was to launch an attack on London he would now have to fight the Lord General's army first.

While the king's forces chased Essex's parliamentary army from Gloucester to Newbury, *Aulicus* continued to attempt to sustain royalist morale by reporting stories that would have further damaged the parliamentarian's military reputation. To this end, in September, the court newsbook related how two parliamentary troopers had tried to rob 'a poore day Labourer neere *Milbrooke* in *Hampshire*' but were instead unhorsed by the man and brought as his prisoners into Southampton. *Aulicus* was careful to emphasise that 'both the Troopers were compleatly armed, but the poore man had nothing but a prong and a good heart'. 'If therefore his Majesties Souldiers be hard put to it' the newsbook concluded gleefully, 'a troop or two of Hay-makers will be a sufficient Reserve against these valiant horse-men'.¹²²

As well as continuing to promulgate the image of the parliamentarians as both cuckolds and cowards, in 1643 the royalist pamphleteers also continued to relate stories of the parliamentarians' aggression, particularly when it was directed at women. The writers of *Aulicus* made particular use of this line of attack, for instance, by comparing the honourable manner in which the 'Noble Earle of New-castle sent the Lady Fairfax with a safe convoy to her husband, *though she had been lately fighting against the King among the Rebels in the North*', with the way in which innocent 'Gentlewomen' in the 'wretched City' of London had allegedly been 'most uncivilly and inhumanely intreated'.¹²³ The comparison is explicit; even though Lady Fairfax had been in the midst of the fighting in the north she had still been treated with courtesy by the royalist troops because of her sex –

¹²⁰ E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), p. 497.

¹²¹ E.68[4], *Mercurius Aulicus* (16 September 1643), p. 514. For a further example see E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), pp. 492.

¹²² E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), pp. 491-2.

¹²³ E.64[11], *Mercurius Aulicus*, (29 July 1643), p. 405.

the rules of war gave protection to civilians and women.¹²⁴ Therefore, as well as demonstrating how their opponents' flouted the rules of war, this story also allowed *Aulicus* to hint that it had noted the unfeminine and disorderly behaviour of Lady Fairfax. This was a theme which *Aulicus* would return to with relish as the war continued and Fairfax rose to prominence in the parliamentary army.¹²⁵ In a similar vein, another edition of *Aulicus* claimed that it had received intelligence that the Governor of Southampton 'did actually imprison three women, only for saying *They thought the King was too wise to be led by ill Counsell*'.¹²⁶ Such cruelty to the 'weaker sex' underscored the Roundhead's unmanliness, for rather than attacking the royalists, they mistreated their opponents' women.

Part 2.4 – 1644: Defeat and Victory

By the end of 1643, the king's position looked very strong, particularly as Charles had recently signed a truce with the Irish 'rebels' which had enabled reinforcements from Ireland to begin to land in England from October 1643 onwards. But the entry of the Scots into the war in January 1644 on the side of Parliament was to reset the balance, as it prevented the Earl of Newcastle's army from advancing south to attack the Parliament's Eastern Association and instead forced him to turn his attention northwards. The royalist situation in the north began to look distinctly precarious in mid-February when a parliamentary force commanded by Sir John Meldrum besieged Newark. If the town fell, the army of the Eastern Association would be able to advance north to attack Newcastle's forces.¹²⁷

In what was perhaps a bid to respond to the renewed parliamentary offensive, gendered themes were used by the royalist pamphleteers to claim that all social order was breaking down within parliamentary territory. Such was the message of one verse-pamphlet, entitled *Sampsons Foxes agreed to fire a kingdom*, which asserted:

They simply fornication think no crime,
Nor you in holie place, and holie time:

¹²⁴ Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp. 73-77; and M. Stoye, 'The Road to Farndon Field: Explaining the Massacre of the Royalist Women at Naseby', *EHR*, cxxiii: 503 (August 2008), pp. 896, 903.

¹²⁵ A. Hopper, *'Black Tom' Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 190-208.

¹²⁶ E.65[13], *Mercurius Aulicus* (5 August 1643), p. 422.

¹²⁷ M. Wanklyn and F. Jones, *Military History of the English Civil War* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005), p. 149.

But wiselie to Gods glorie sanctifie
Your fornication and adulterie.
Zeale and the Spirit so work upon you then,
All at your meetings are begot new men.¹²⁸

Again, the author repeated the claim that the parliamentarians' met at conventicles for purely carnal reasons, and that terms like 'zeal' and 'spirit' had more to do with the parliamentarians' lusts than their godliness. In another line the author reiterated this point by describing the parliamentary women as 'whores of Babylon'.¹²⁹

The summer of 1644 saw reversals for both the parliamentary and royalist war-efforts. The king's forces had defeated Sir William Waller's army at Cropredy Bridge on 29 June, thereby securing the royalist head quarters at Oxford. Similarly Rupert's swift relief of York had been a further cause for celebration within the royalist camp. Yet Rupert and Newcastle's defeat at Marston Moor on 2 July at the hands of the parliamentary forces had been a heavy blow.¹³⁰ Nevertheless, the king felt strong enough to pursue the Earl of Essex's army into the south-west. The tone of the court newsbook in the wake of Marston Moor perhaps reflects the hopeful outlook of the royalists as they watched the unfolding events in the West Country. For instance, in August *Aulicus* reported on a number of skirmishes across the midlands in order to play down the military strength of the enemy. The court newsbook claimed that at Tuxford, in Nottinghamshire, the royalist forces of Colonel Eyre had driven out the Earl of Manchester's forces but added that 'eighteene of those 30. Rebels which were slaine in the Towne, received their mortall wounds in their backes'. As if the slur was not obvious enough he added 'you may easily guesse the reason'.¹³¹ The same method was used to ridicule one 'Major Layfield' who, during a skirmish with the royalists near Belvoir Castle, was reported to have been 'so wounded in the backe in three severall places, that he crept aside' until the royalists had ridden away.¹³² The implicit suggestion in these two pamphlets is that the parliamentarians had been already running away, and had therefore received their wounds on their backs. *Aulicus*'s frequent claims that the parliamentarians were cowards would

¹²⁸ E.52[6], *Sampsons foxes agreed to fire a kingdom: or, The Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a round, to put a kingdom out of square* (Oxford: 22 June* 1644), pp. 4-5.

¹²⁹ E.52[6], *Sampsons foxes agreed to fire a kingdom*, pp. 4-5.

¹³⁰ Wanklyn and Jones, *Military History of the English Civil War*, p. 190.

¹³¹ E.8[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (17 August 1644), p. 1122.

¹³² E.10[19], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August 1644), pp. 1140-1.

have undermined the Roundheads' martial reputation, and would therefore have given solace to the beleaguered royalist troops. In fact, the court newsbook repeatedly claimed that the parliamentarians tended to retreat without daring to fight back.¹³³ For instance, in mid-September *Aulicus* claimed that a party of royalists sent to relieve the besieged garrison at Basing House in Hampshire, made five parliamentary troops run away without even 'discharging one Pistoll upon the Rebels'.¹³⁴

While claiming that the parliamentary soldiery had no heart for fighting the royalist troops, the king's propagandists added to their claims that the parliamentarians were needlessly violent towards civilians by asserting that their opponents' behaviour was not only unmanly but also unchristian. For instance, *Aulicus* once accused a certain Captain 'Sandes' and his 'sacrilegious Troopers' of using 'inhumane tortures on the tender breasts of women' in order 'to force confession of their hidden goods'. In a clear attempt to undermine the Parliamentarians' reputation for godliness, the pamphleteer continued by declaring that '[i]f these, and such as they, do fight for the Reformed Religion, God deliver every good man both from them'.¹³⁵ As Barbara Donagan has noted, in order for a war to be considered 'just' and godly, the soldiers and commanders had to be seen to be upholding the laws of nature, described as 'higher' laws, that 'every man already ... [knew] in his conscience'. This account of the parliamentarians' supposedly cruel treatment of women would, therefore, have been instantly recognisable to contemporaries as contrary to the laws of nature and of God, as well as signifying the parliamentarians' unmanliness.¹³⁶ In a later edition *Aulicus* dismissed the parliamentarians as 'Master-plunderers' who were 'barbarous to Ladies' and recounted a story of how a group of 'rebels' had tried to ambush Lord Lovelace at his home. After they had failed in their design, *Aulicus* reported, 'like Barbarous Rebels they violently brought away his Lady', eventually abandoning her in the countryside 'without the least regard to her birth and quality'.¹³⁷ The parliamentarians' supposed desperation is hinted at in this story: unable to capture their real target, Lovelace himself, the soldiers allegedly unleashed their frustrations on his wife. The parliamentarians are therefore portrayed as attacking Lovelace through his patriarchal property. Indeed, *Aulicus* went on to assert that the unfortunate Lady Lovelace might also

¹³³ E.12[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (14 September 1644), p. 1157.

¹³⁴ E.12[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (14 September 1644), pp. 1159-1166.

¹³⁵ Wing / 773:21, *The Loyall Convert* (Oxford: 1644), p. 15.

¹³⁶ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 137-138.

¹³⁷ E.10[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 September 1644), p. 1144.

have been molested because she was daughter to 'the Most valiant Earle of Cleveland, who at ... [Cropredy Bridge] neare Banbury, so bruised Wallers Army, as ever since he quite forsooke King-catching'.¹³⁸ In this instance *Aulicus* had highlighted the fact that the parliamentarians had been unable to beat Lady Lovelace's father, and were unable to ambush her husband. The only thing they had been able to do was to attack her, and, in the eyes of the royalists, this would have reasserted the Roundheads' weakness, rather than being seen as any great military feat. By claiming that the parliamentarians' cruelty was unrestrained and directed against those who could not fight back, the royalist authors were continuing to undermine the parliamentarians' manliness, particularly when such acts of aggression were coupled with reports of the parliamentarians' cowardly behaviour when they had to face the royalist army.¹³⁹

Part 2.5 – 1645-1646: Railing in the Face of Defeat

During the spring of 1645, the king's forces were thrown onto the defensive.¹⁴⁰ The siege of Oxford in mid-May, followed by the parliamentarians' overwhelming victory at Naseby in June, saw the royalist press begin to falter. By June 1645 *Aulicus* was appearing only on an intermittent basis. As this newsbook was the royalists' main propaganda organ, it is hardly surprising to find that, as the year progressed, the numbers of occasional royalist pamphlets dwindled as well. But despite the royalist set-backs, Frank notes that Berkenhead did not give up the attack, resorting to divisive atrocity stories as his 'favourite weapon' and portraying 'indecisive skirmishes' as 'major Royalist victories'.¹⁴¹ Occasionally *Aulicus* even managed to recount fresh stories of parliamentary cowardice in an attempt to raise royalist morale. For instance, when Sir Marmaduke Langdale's horse came near to Huntingdon in August 1645, *Aulicus* reported that a parliamentary force drew out of the town, led by one Captain Sparrow, who *Aulicus* described as 'a new young Capitaine'. But *Aulicus* went on to relate that 'as soon as 'the wind blew', Sparrow 'returned backe as fast as possible for Things all in armour'.¹⁴² The newsbook went on to further emphasise the parliamentarians' cowardice, by reporting that they had abandoned

¹³⁸ E.10[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 September 1644), p. 1144. See also E.9[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (24 August 1644), p. 1131.

¹³⁹ E. Foyser, 'Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 215-24.

¹⁴⁰ G. Foard, *Naseby: The Decisive Campaign* (Whitstable: Pryor Publications, 1995), pp. 87-88, 91-175, 219-291.

¹⁴¹ Frank, *Beginnings of the English Newspaper*, pp. 74-5.

¹⁴² E.302[14], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August- 7 September 1645), p. 1726.

the town in such haste that they left their ammunition and other resources behind them. Similarly, when the king marched on Hereford with his flying army later that month, *Aulicus* claimed that the Scots ‘shooke their heades and ran’.¹⁴³

Aulicus was not alone in its attempts to uphold the royalist cause. August 1645 saw the birth of a short-lived royalist newsbook entitled *Mercurius Anti-Britanicus* which concentrated its fire upon the parliamentary newsbook *Mercurius Britannicus*, but which also accused the parliamentarians of debauchery and social disorder.¹⁴⁴ It claimed that the supporters of Parliament were all ‘either Broken, or breaking Citizens’ which included ‘Gentlemen of one Wife, and many Concubines; who have formerly wasted their Estates [in] no way reparable’.¹⁴⁵ In a later edition the editor mockingly expressed his surprise ‘that there is such a thing as Wedlock left at London; or any chaste enough to praise conjugall Affection’. The author went on to explain, ‘For truly, I observing the many changes which have past, have long ere this expected, that the *New State* should at length end in *Plato’s* Common-wealth; where there were no such things as Marriages: But as all to all were Husbands, so all had Wives in common’. Continuing his observations on the supposedly disorderly state of London, the author claimed ‘that this word Breeches is so stale’, because it was so often repeated in newsbooks, that ‘you shall be sure, either in Shop, or Margin, to see them hung out to sale’. The author continued by observing that breeches, when ‘applied to the wrong Sex’, ‘make women look in mans apparel’.¹⁴⁶ Laura Gowing has described breeches as ‘the traditional and proverbial signifier of male dominance’, therefore to suggest that breeches were for sale in London or that the parliamentarians would allow their women to wear breeches, implied that the parliamentarians’ lack of patriarchal control had caused the social order to completely break down in the capital.¹⁴⁷

By 1646 the fate of the royalist cause appeared to be sealed and royalist publications were dwindling in numbers. York had been captured by the parliamentarians in July 1644, causing the city’s printing press to fall silent.¹⁴⁸ Similarly, the king’s press at Exeter had been lost after the city capitulated in April 1646.¹⁴⁹ Little is known of the fate of the

¹⁴³ E.302[14], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August- 7 September 1645), p. 1734.

¹⁴⁴ Raymond, *Invention*, p. 42.

¹⁴⁵ E.294[31], *Mercurius Anti-Britanicus* (1-31 August 1645), pp. 2-3.

¹⁴⁶ E.297[17], *Mercurius Anti-Britanicus* (1-31 August 1645), p. 29.

¹⁴⁷ Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, p. 84.

¹⁴⁸ Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due*, p. 125.

¹⁴⁹ Hanson, ‘The King’s Printer at York and Shrewsbury’, pp. 130-1.

Oxford press. However, it may be assumed that, after the royalist headquarters at Oxford surrendered on 25 June 1646, the king's last provincial printing press fell into parliamentary hands. At the end of the first Civil War many royalist printers and pamphleteers moved to the capital; some melted away into obscurity, while others, like John Berkenhead, continued to write for the king.¹⁵⁰ Within little more than a year political divisions between the Independent and Presbyterian factions in Parliament would reach such a height, that public support would begin to swing back in Charles' favour, thus setting the stage for the second civil war in which propaganda would play an increasingly important role in winning hearts and minds for the royalist cause.

Part 3.1 – Conclusion

Throughout the first Civil War, the royalist pamphleteers continually demonstrated to their male supporters the sort of behaviour that was expected of them in wartime. Like his parliamentary opponents, the king was well aware of the need to keep discipline in his army, and as we have seen, in October 1642 he addressed his own officers and soldiers in order to impress upon them the behaviour that was expected of them.¹⁵¹ Later in the conflict, *Mercurius Aulicus* and other occasional pamphlets ensured that they described the various military engagements in a way that further emphasised which qualities were desirable, and were therefore described as 'manly', and which were considered shameful. For instance, the royalist propagandists argued that the Roundheads highlighted their unmanliness by venting their aggression on unarmed civilians, rather than fighting the royalist soldiers.

The royalist pamphleteers also used beliefs about gender to attack their parliamentary enemy in a language that everyone would have understood. By portraying the Parliament's male supporters as encouraging debauchery, the king's pamphleteers were not only undermining their opponents' representation of themselves as godly, they were also demonstrating their enemies' failure to uphold the patriarchal social order, as was the duty of all 'true' men. Similarly, by deriding their opponents as 'cuckolds' the king's pamphleteers questioned their opponents' abilities to keep order in their households. In

¹⁵⁰ F. A. Hyett, 'Notes on the first Bristol and Gloucestershire Printers', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* XX (1895-7), p. 44. Hyett argues that Robert Barker, the 'king's printer', followed the king to Bristol (from London via York, and Shrewsbury). He notes that after the fall of Bristol, Barker moved to London, but died soon afterwards. For information on Berkenhead see Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 126-136.

¹⁵¹ Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', esp. p. 73.

doing so they were drawing on a set of cultural assumptions that everyone would have understood: a man who could not keep order in his household was considered to be unworthy of holding responsibility outside it. He would therefore be a weak commander or a cowardly soldier.¹⁵²

What is more, the royalists' frequent resort to the abusive term 'cuckold' seems to have been linked to the parliamentarians' actions in defying the king. The royalist propagandists frequently referred to the parliamentarians as men of low birth, who were attempting to rise above their stations and usurp the authority of the monarch. The patriarchal social order dictated that the king was the head of the state, just as a man was the head of his own household. But rather than upholding the patriarchal social order, the parliamentarians were bringing the whole system into question by challenging the authority of the king. Through doing this, the parliamentarians had called their own patriarchal authority into question in their households, which had caused their wives and dependents to behave in inappropriately assertive ways. To illustrate this point the royalist pamphleteers asserted that the anti-patriarchal actions of the Parliament's male supporters had caused the social order in parliamentary territory to descend into chaos: women and mechanics were allowed to preach, marriage was completely done away with, bastardy was common practice and female committees overruled men in civic matters. This demonstrates the power and pervasiveness of the gender order: through the use of the common term, 'cuckold', the royalist pamphleteers were able to condense and communicate a complex political message about the parliamentarians' unsuitability to hold political power to a broad audience.

Yet, as well as drawing upon the well-established and widely-understood discourses of gender and patriarchal social order, at times, the royalist pamphleteers added weight to their arguments by using other overlapping religious and secular codes of conduct – like honour and civility – in order to undermine the legitimacy of Parliament's cause.¹⁵³ The pamphleteers were also keen to demonstrate that their officers and soldiers upheld the laws of God, of nature and of the nation. The soldiery had to obey the international rules of war, as well as the specific 'articles and ordinances of war', set down by the commanders of

¹⁵² Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁵³ For a discussion of the multifaceted nature of male honour see, F. Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 201-213, esp. 201-202; for a discussion of civility see, Ingram, 'Sexual Manners', pp. 87-110.

each army.¹⁵⁴ In order to do the most damage to their opponents' martial reputations and the justness of their cause, the royalist pamphleteers conflated these discourses, for instance, by portraying the parliamentarians as unmanly *and* uncivil or unchristian.

The next chapter will turn to consider how royalist pamphleteers used beliefs about gender to launch scathing attacks on three key parliamentary personalities in the first Civil War. The chapter will begin by examining how the Earl of Essex's unfortunate private life was used to ridicule him as a cuckold. It will then explore how the royalist pamphleteers sought to undermine the manhood, and therefore the leadership, of Sir William Waller, by reporting on the 'unfeminine' actions of his wife, Lady Ann Waller.

¹⁵⁴ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 128-129; Braddick, *God's Fury*, p. 286.

Chapter V:
Representations of Parliamentary Personalities in Royalist
Propaganda, 1642-46

This chapter explores how the royalist propagandists made use of beliefs about gender in order to attack the reputations and actions of the parliamentary general, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, Parliament's major-general of the west, Sir William Waller and his wife Lady Ann Waller. Did the individual circumstances of the commanders suggest alternative ways in which gender could be used to deride them, or did the pamphlet attacks upon these individuals fit into the broader gendered themes that were outlined in the previous chapter? The first section will consider how the Earl of Essex was represented in royalist tracts. It will consider how the earl's private life was exploited in an attempt to undermine his manhood, and therefore his broader abilities as a commander. The second section will consider how the royalist propagandists used the alleged actions of Lady Ann Waller in order to portray her husband, Sir William, as a cuckold, an image which, as we have seen, would have had damning implications for his martial abilities. Each section will examine how the gendered propaganda themes developed as the war unfolded, in order to map out how the propagandists adapted their approaches to fit the events.

Part 1.1 – 'A Cuckold and a Rebel': ¹ Royalist depictions of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex

On 13 July 1642 the houses of Parliament passed an ordinance that made Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, the commander of the Parliamentary forces.² Essex was to face his king on the battlefield: he was therefore to become a prime target for the 'paper-bullets' that would be fired from the royalist printing presses by the king's wits, poets and writers.³ Unfortunately for the earl, his private circumstances provided the royalist propagandists with ample material to work on: Essex had had two marriages which had both ended in scandal. His first unhappy marriage to Frances Howard had led to divorce proceedings, which saw Frances publicly accuse her husband of impotency, and the court rule in her

¹ D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 180.

² *CJ*, vol. II (12 July 1642), p. 668.

³ E.21[19], J. Taylor, *John Taylor being yet unhanged, sends greeting, to John Booker* (NPP: 1644), p. 3; Wing / N106, J. Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year 1639 to the Murder of King Charles I* (London: 1682-3), vol. II, p. 809.

favour.⁴ Frances's very public flirting with a number of men, including Prince Henry and James I's favourite, Robert Carr, Earl of Leicester, had also fuelled rumours that Essex was a cuckold. His second marriage in 1630, to Elizabeth Paulet began well but soon turned sour after Elizabeth was suspected of adultery with a family friend, Sir William Uvedale.⁵

As can be seen from the contemporary historian James Heath's description of Essex, published in his *Chronicle of the Late Intestine War* in 1676, the implications of all this for the earl's manhood were still well remembered some thirty years after his death in 1646. Heath wrote that Essex 'was an able Souldier, confest', however, he also added, 'whether so much a man, disputed' and went on to explain that, 'the reproaches of his debility that way, [were] as loud and unmannerly, as the praises of his Valour and conduct were justly due and renowned'. Heath ended by offering up an example, noting that the 'Royalists derided him with the stile of his OXCELLENCY, jeering him with his two unfortunate Marriages'.⁶ As the following discussion will show, Heath was quite right to claim that the royalist writers frequently reminded their readers of Essex's reputation as a cuckold. Yet, the picture is not quite as clear cut as Heath suggests: for at times the royalist pamphleteers seemed reluctant to single Essex out. In order to understand this apparent hesitancy, it is necessary to place the pamphlets in the context in which they were written in order to see how the royalist pamphleteers were reacting to the twists and turns of fortune as the war unfolded before their eyes.

Part 1.2 – 'The darling of the swordmen':⁷ The Earl of Essex in 1642

As Parliament recruited its army and the nation prepared for war, a wealth of material poured from the capital's printing presses exalting the Earl of Essex.⁸ Yet, apart from a lengthy proclamation that denounced Essex as a rebel, published on 9 August, the royalist presses remained surprisingly reticent on the subject of the earl until the spring of 1643.⁹

⁴ For a relation of the trial see W. Cobbett (ed.) *A Complete Collection of State Trials* (London: Hansard, 1809), vol. II, p. 814.

⁵ V. F. Snow, *Essex the Rebel: The Life of Robert Devereux, the Third Earl of Essex, 1591-1646* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), pp. 27, 41-69, 185-194; and J. Morrill, 'Robert Devereux, third earl of Essex' in *DNB*.

⁶ Wing / 1011:15, J. Heath, *A chronicle of the late intestine war in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1676), p. 124.

⁷ W. B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I 1540-1646* (London: John Murray, 1853) vol. II, p. 466.

⁸ See, for instance, E.116[25], *A declaration of the noble resolution of the Earle of Essex his Excellence* (London: 9 September* 1642); E.117[13], *Exceeding joyfull newes from His Excellence the Earle of Essex* (1642); and Wing / A3587A, *The Prentices resolution* (London: 1642/3?).

⁹ Wing / 1712:25, *By the King, a proclamation for the suppressing of the present rebellion, under the command of Robert Earle of Essex* (York: 9 August 1642); J. Rushworth, *Historical collections* (London:

As has been noted previously, until the royalist headquarters were established at Oxford, and several printing presses installed in Oriel College, the royalist propaganda effort centred on official publications from the king, or occasional satires on broader subjects such as sectarianism or the alleged hypocrisy of the puritans.¹⁰ Joad Raymond has even gone so far as to argue that ‘there was as yet no underground press, nor a significant provincial press, and hence there was no opposition press’ before January 1643. The royalist propaganda offensive began in earnest with the birth of *Mercurius Aulicus* in January 1643, therefore the paucity of tracts relating to Essex in 1642 fits into this pattern.¹¹

But intriguingly the first issue of *Aulicus* did not launch an all-out assault upon the general, as one might perhaps have expected given Essex’s status as leader of the Parliamentary army. Instead, in its early editions, *Aulicus* was far more likely to pour scorn upon commoners like the aldermen of London, than it was to attack someone of noble birth, like Essex.¹² Nor did the authors of royalist occasional pamphlets make use of gendered language in order to belittle the earl during the autumn and winter of 1642. In order to understand why the royalist writers trod so carefully during the opening months of the war, it is necessary to understand why Essex was chosen as the Parliament’s Lord General.

Essex had taken part in various land and sea campaigns throughout the 1620s, but his military reputation had largely rested on the memory of his father and namesake, who had been the beloved favourite of Elizabeth I. As Kevin Lindberg has shown, the memory of the second Earl of Essex had begun to revive in the mid-1620s, when popular writers had attempted to generate support for England’s entry into the Thirty Years War by urging Essex to mirror his father’s virtues and fight for the Protestant cause in Europe.¹³ The second earl’s rebellion and execution in 1601 were overlooked, and instead his courage and

1721-22) vol. IV, pp. 769-72; *LJ*, vol. V (11 August 1642), pp. 282-283; E.111[7] *A relation of all the passages and proceedings in Somersetshire [sic], and Bristoll, with their valiant resolution to fight for the King and Parliament* (London: 10 August 1642), p. 6; and Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 318-19.

¹⁰ J. L. Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), pp. 125-6.

¹¹ J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996), pp. 26, 28, 150.

¹² See, for example, E.244[30], *Mercurius Aulicus* (1-7 January 1643), pp. 4-5 or E.245[36], *Mercurius Aulicus* (15-21 January 1643), pp. 2-3.

¹³ K. Lindberg, “Your Father’s Perfection Shall Be Your Blemish”: The 3rd Earl of Essex and the Development of a Legend’, *Medievalia et Humanistica* 32 (2007), pp. 118-125. See also Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 35.

military prowess for the English cause were lauded. As a result, as late as 1642, his son 'commanded the confidence and respect of countless Englishmen committed to Parliament'.¹⁴

There is evidence that Essex's popularity had not gone unnoticed by the king, for in 1641, when Charles had made various concessions to attempt to placate Parliament, Essex was offered a place on the Privy Council in February, and later in July, he was made Lord Chamberlain. Indeed, after his departure from London, Charles made several attempts throughout 1642 to encourage Essex to abandon Parliament and fight for him.¹⁵ Royalist opinion of Essex can perhaps best be seen in Edward Hyde's claim that 'it had been very difficult, if not utterly impossible, for the two Houses of Parliament to have raised an army then, if the Earl of Essex had not consented to be General of that Army'.¹⁶ It would seem, then, that the royalists recognised the value of having Essex as a supporter and this might have made them reluctant to attack the earl, at least in the early months of the war. Instead, the king hoped to encourage the earl to defect to his cause.

Equally, given that one of the key themes of royalist propaganda was that the king was the protector and upholder of the established social order, some royalist pamphleteers may have been initially reluctant to belittle the earl because of his noble status.¹⁷ To ridicule Essex as an impotent cuckold in a pamphlet that would be read by gentry and commoners alike, would have seemed contrary to the king's claims, for it inverted the social order by encouraging Essex's social inferiors to deride him.¹⁸ Moreover, Essex was not only of noble birth, but as John Adamson has argued, Essex's position as Lord General of Parliament's armies was 'an office linked with protectoral or vice-regal rank'. Essex's new position made him the highest ranking peer in the House of Lords, it allowed him to stage triumphant entries into London that purposely mirrored those that had been made by

¹⁴ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 309.

¹⁵ Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, vol. II, pp. 333-35; V. F. Snow 'Essex and the Aristocratic Opposition to the Early Stuarts', *JMH* 32: 3 (September 1960), pp. 231, 233; Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 266, 287, 292, 297, 298-99; Morrill, 'Robert Devereux' in *DNB*; and B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 253.

¹⁶ E. Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The history of the rebellion and civil wars in England* (Oxford: 1702), vol. I, p. 374.

¹⁷ For primary examples see, E.75[5], P. Heylyn, *Lord have mercie upon us: or, A plaine discourse declaring that the plague of warre, which now wastes this nation, tooke its beginning in and from the Citie of London* (Oxford*: 4 November* 1643), p. 44; or E.52[2], F. Quarles, *The shepherds oracle* (Oxford*: 19 or 21 June* 1644), *passim*; E.52[6], *Sampsons foxes agreed to fire a kingdom: or, The Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a round, to put a kingdom out of square* (Oxford: 22 June* 1644), *passim*; E.7[26], *The razing of the record. Or, An order to forbid any thanksgiving for the Canterbury newes publisht by Richard Culmer* (Oxford: 3 August* 1644), p. 14; E.298[3], *A most learned and eloquent speech* (Oxford*: 25 August* 1645), p. 5.

¹⁸ S. Amussen, *An Ordered Society* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), p. 145.

the monarch in the past, and it granted him the title of ‘Excellency’.¹⁹ Adamson has argued that Charles’s repeated appeals to Essex to mediate peace between himself and Parliament suggests that ‘Essex’s claim to vice-regal status rendered him far more acceptable to Charles I as a party to negotiation than the institution of Parliament’.²⁰ Charles might therefore, have been reluctant to allow his propagandists to slander Essex because of his high place in the social hierarchy, as well as because he hoped that such a high-ranking noble could be persuaded to change sides and serve his king, because his social status – in Charles’s eyes – was dependent upon the crown.²¹

Finally, on a more practical level, Charles might have held back his pamphleteers over the winter of 1642-3 because of the peace negotiations. Initiated by the Lords after violent demonstrations for peace within the City of London, the Commons eventually agreed to open negotiations with the king on 26 December. By the end of March 1643, however, with no compromise having been reached, hostilities were resumed.²²

Part 1.3 – Twists and reversals: the campaigns of 1643

It was surely the failure to reach a peaceful settlement in the spring of 1643 which sparked the publishing of a white-letter broadside at Oxford, entitled *The Sence of the House*. This broadside made open reference to Essex’s adulterous wife and belittled the earl as a cuckold. In one stanza the royalist author made the Earl of Essex address the listener and explain why he believed there could be no peace between the king and Parliament. The versifier accused Essex of fighting for wealth:

I’le noe Peace, say’s *Essex*,
 For my Chaplin say’s ’tis sinn,
 To Loose 100.l a day,
 Just when my wife lies inn²³

¹⁹ J. S. A. Adamson, ‘The Baronial Context of the English Civil War’, *TRHS* 5th series, 40 (1990), pp. 103, 105-8.

²⁰ Ibid, pp. 109, 111; and A. Hopper, *‘Black Tom’: Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 65.

²¹ J. Greene Marston, ‘Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England’, *JBS* XIII (1973-4), pp. 21-43; K. Sharpe, ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles’, *HJ* 40: 3 (1997), pp. 643-665; and M. Kishlansky, ‘Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity’, *P&P* 189: 1 (November 2005), pp. 41-80.

²² For a detailed account of the peace negotiations in December 1642- April 1643, see S. R Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893), vol. I, pp. 74-75, 78-84, 89-96, 98-103, 108-109.

²³ 669.f.6[117], *The sence of the House* (Oxford: 10 March* 1643)

The final line was mocking Essex, for, at the beginning of the hostilities, Essex's wife, Elizabeth, Countess of Essex, had fled to Oxford. Walter Bouchier Devereux writes that it was in Oxford that Elizabeth 'became acquainted with Sir Thomas Higgons [sic], whom she subsequently married', while Snow goes even further, claiming that the Countess 'consorted' with Higgins resulting in the birth of a son 'in late December 1642'.²⁴ To support this claim Snow cites a letter written to Henry Mulliner, a tailor in Cambridge, wherein the unnamed correspondent remarked that the Earl of Rochester, despite pledging to give the king £5000 for his cause, was not able to pay him even £50. The correspondent then went on to remark that such news 'I know is as old with you as that my Lady Essex hath brought my Lord a young heir'. The writer added that '[w]hen his Majesty read the first news of it, in troth, said his Majesty, I think he is no more the father of it than I am, and, Gentlemen here I clear myself of it before you all'. The evidence seems a little inconclusive for it is not clear whether the author was referring to present events or remembering the scandal of 1636, when Elizabeth had been accused of adultery with Sir William Uvedale, bringing the paternity of her unborn child into question.²⁵ The funeral oration of Elizabeth's life, written by her second husband Sir John Higgins, sheds further light on the versifier's remarks. Higgins wrote that, after Elizabeth left London, her enemies circulated reports 'of her being with child by persons which she never saw'.²⁶ Both the letter to Mulliner and the funeral oration suggest that the Earl of Essex's martial problems were common knowledge at this time and were a popular way in which to deride either the earl or the countess. The author of *The Sence of the House* was, then, devaluing Essex's motives for waging war on the king on two counts; firstly, it gave the impression that he fought for monetary gain, secondly it suggested that some of Essex's wages would be sent to Elizabeth for her maintenance, despite the strong suggestion that she had been unfaithful to him.

The verses continued by suggesting that Essex's popularity was fickle, for while the versifier made Essex remark that 'They cry, God Blesse your Excellence' at the moment, the pamphleteer also made him acknowledge:

²⁴ Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, vol. II, p. 306; and Snow, p. 343.

²⁵ HMC, 13th report, *The Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891) Appendix part I, vol. I, p. 86. (Letter to H. Mulliner, Taylour at his house over against Magdalene College, Cambridge (7 January 1643)).

²⁶ T. Higgins, *A Funerall Oration spoken over the Grave of ye Lady Elizabeth Countess of Essex by her husband Mr. Higgins At her Interment in ye Cathedrall Church of Winchester, Sepr. 16th. 1656* printed in *Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society* (London: Charles Whittingham, 1856-7), vol. III, pp. 18-19.

But if I loose my Place,
The'le call me Rebell Popular Asse,
And Cuckold to my Face.²⁷

During the winter of 1642-3 a minority of hard-liners in London and in Parliament itself, who wanted to pursue the war with greater vigour, were beginning to voice dissatisfaction with Essex. While commanders like Sir William Waller pursued the war energetically over the winter months, Essex kept his soldiers quartered around Windsor. S. R. Gardiner claims that, even at this early stage of the war, some of the most committed parliamentarians were already beginning to cast around for an alternative general and were considering Lord Brooke, who was fighting in the midlands.²⁸ These lines may therefore be referring to these grumblings against Essex, for if he lost his position as Lord General, then, in royalist eyes, he would have been left with little but his shattered reputation. He had rebelled against his sovereign and therefore lost his noble standing; while his status as a man had already been called into question by his disastrous marriage history.

By the end of March *Aulicus* was making similar accusations about the general, although with greater subtlety. The earl's objective in the summer campaigns of 1643 was to try to capture Oxford. In a clear bid to suggest that the earl was incapable of achieving this end, *Aulicus* made a subtle reference to his alleged impotence in one of its editions printed in late March. The newsbook's editors asserted that they were refuting the claims which had been made in a London newsbook, that upon hearing of the Earl of Essex's approach toward Oxford '*the whole City was infinitely astonished, and the Ladies and Gentlewomen so affrighted, that they knew not where to bestow themselves*'. *Aulicus* countered this story by asserting that the people of Oxford, upon hearing 'such tidings', were only sorry 'that he came no neerer, and staid no longer where he was', thereby suggesting that they had been unaware of the earl's presence, and thus that the news was false. The editor of the court newsbook could not resist adding a special message from the 'Gentlewomen and Ladies', who, he claimed, 'bid mee say, they have heard too much of his excellency to be affraid of him'.²⁹ Such a remark was designed to remind the reader of

²⁷ 669.f.6[117], *The sence of the House* (Oxford: 10 March* 1643).

²⁸ Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. I, p. 98.

²⁹ E.247[26], *Mercurius Aulicus* (19-25 March 1643), pp. 151-52.

Essex's supposed impotency 'for a woman'³⁰ and would have been particularly damaging given the Countess of Essex's presence in Oxford. *Aulicus's* choice of phrase suggested that the ladies in question had had additional information about the earl.

Despite drawing fire from the royalist presses in March, Essex did not begin his move against Oxford until 13 April 1643. As his army marched westwards along the south bank of the Thames, the royalists must have watched with some trepidation. *Aulicus* immediately launched an offensive that aimed to further wound Essex's honour. The editor of the newsbook reported that, 'it was noised in the Citie, that the Earle of Essex was to leave the place of Generall unto Mr. Hampden, as one more *active*, and so by consequence more capable of the stile of Excellencie'. *Aulicus* continued by declaring that, even 'though it proved not so in the event', the news did demonstrate 'what an ill opinion the principall maintainers of this Rebellion have of the said Earle'. '[H]ow little confidence the Common Souldiers will be brought to spend their lives under the colours and command of such a Generall' *Aulicus* considered, 'of whom they have so manifested a distrust by their common talke, and whom they have so publickly exposed to contempt and scorn in abusive pictures'.³¹ Contemporary conduct books taught noblemen and gentlemen to desire honour more than life.³² To suggest that 'the principall maintainers of this *Rebellion*' were treating Essex with such contempt was surely intended to drive a wedge between them and their general; while the claim that the Parliament's own supporters were displeased with the earl's sluggishness, and were therefore calling into question whether he could perform the duties of a general, added further weight to royalist accusations of the same kind. In the same edition, *Aulicus* went on to further question the ability of Essex and his men. As the Parliamentary general prepared to move against the garrison at Reading, *Aulicus* asserted that the royalist soldiers had 'long desired to see his *Excellency*, and try the mettaile of his Souldiers', because the 'brave exploits' of Essex and his men were 'so much talked of in the weekly Pamphlets, though not heard of otherwise'.³³ Such comments were surely

³⁰ W. Cobbett, *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, (London: Hansard, 1809) vol. II, p. 814.

³¹ E.99[22], *Mercurius Aulicus* (15 April 1643), p. 185 (my italics). While I have been unable to find any mention of this incident in either the *LJ* or the *CJ*, Clarendon made repeated claims that throughout 1643 Essex was 'pressing for...vindication of his Honour from imputations, and aspersions' that had been cast upon him. See, for instance Clarendon, *History*, vol. II, pp. 245, 249. See also, Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. I, p. 180.

³² Morrill, 'Robert Devereux' in *DNB*. See also, Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 43, 73. For an example of what the conduct books had to say on the subject of honour, see STC (2nd ed.) / 17331, F. Markham, *The Booke of Honour* (London: 1625), p. 1.

³³ E.99[22], *Mercurius Aulicus* (15 April 1643), p. 191.

designed to undermine the potential threat of Essex and his soldiers by suggesting that their martial reputations had been exaggerated by the news-writers. Another verse-pamphlet remarked that the earl was moving against Reading ‘for at Oxford (they say) / His wife has made bulwarkes to drive him away’.³⁴ The pamphleteer was reminding its reader of Essex’s inability to keep patriarchal control over his wife, which, the pamphleteer claimed, had implications for his martial abilities.

Despite the royalists’ brave words, Essex’s army soon showed its metal and captured Reading on 26 April. Yet Essex was unable to follow up this victory with a move against the king’s headquarters at Oxford. His army languished at Reading; with inadequate shelter and poor provisions, his men quickly succumbed to disease.³⁵ It was not until 6 June that his soldiers were fit to march again, but the earl’s failure to advance further than the area around Thame over the summer was made much of in royalist propaganda. Essex was derided as a coward; for instance, in the wake of the battle of Chalgrove Field on 18 June, *Aulicus* related with delight how six colours had been taken, including ‘some ... of the Earle of *Essex* his owne Colours’. The newsbook related that one of these had included the words, ‘*CAVE ADSUM*’,³⁶ which ‘let us see with what a fury his *Excellency* intended to have fallen upon us’. *Aulicus* went on to contrast the menacing tone of the motto with the earl’s inactivity by remarking that this, ‘was an admirable Motto for one who never shewed his face in the battaile’.³⁷

Throughout July Essex’s army had remained stationed near Aylesbury and the royalists continued to report that Essex could do nothing but complain to the Houses as to the state of his men and to ‘beg’ for further supplies. ‘Nor can the Earle confide in those few Forces he hath’ one anonymous pamphleteer asserted, ‘for he complains ... of *the loosnesse and inconstancie of his Souldiers*’. The pamphleteer went on to explain that, ‘by *loosnesse* he meanes running away from him, and by *inconstancie* running away from before Us, when we offer to charge them’. To make such claims about the Earl’s soldiers would have cast a shadow over Essex’s own honour and abilities as a commander as it

³⁴ Wing / 1210:25, *A new diurnall of passages more exactly drawne up then heretofore ordered to be printed and published* (Oxford: 1643), unpaginated.

³⁵ G. Davies, ‘The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex, 1642-45,’ *EHR* XLII (1934), p. 39; and Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 363.

³⁶ The motto translates as ‘Beware! I am near’.

³⁷ E.59[8], *Mercurius Aulicus* (18-24 June 1643), p. 323.

showed he could not keep control over his men.³⁸ The author went on to make this point explicit by stating that ‘the Earle is troubled at those horrible outrages done to the Counties’. ‘I confesse I am glad to see Him returned to so much sense of his Honour’ the pamphleteer continued, ‘that He findes himselfe aggrieved at these desperate villanies’.³⁹ This particular pamphlet reproduced a letter which Essex had sent to the Lords, requesting that peace negotiations with the king be reopened.⁴⁰

While the royalists delighted in reporting the earl’s desire for peace, many parliamentarians saw this as further evidence of their general’s unwillingness to pursue the cause with vigour and deal the king a crushing blow.⁴¹ Seeing a further opportunity to emphasise the parliamentarians’ dissatisfaction with their general, several royalist pamphleteers related the reactions to Essex’s proposals and demonstrated how the general’s reputation was being dishonoured by Parliamentarians who were his social inferiors.⁴² For example, one royalist pamphleteer sarcastically remarked, ‘what excellent good Masters the Authours of this Rebellion have still approved themselves, that their Generall the Earle of *Essex* (whose repute in the world had cast some credit on these mens designs) should now be rewarded with so slight and cheap an estimation, as if he had been a common stander by’. While paying Essex a subtle compliment – that it was the earl’s ‘repute’ which had given credit to ‘these mens designs’ – the writer’s tone suggests that Essex should have expected no better from men who had chosen to rebel against their monarch. The pamphleteer ended by claiming that, despite the fact that Essex had ‘ventured his life and fortune in [the Parliament’s] service’, he had ‘arrived at no greater estimate in their eyes, than to be ... [considered] farre inferiour to my Ladie *Waller*’ who, the author claimed, ‘expects every houre (by participation with her Husband) to be Ladie Generall’.⁴³ By claiming that Essex was inferior to Lady Waller, the anonymous pamphleteer was further emphasising his weakness in political, social and gendered terms. The reference to Lady Waller and her husband, Sir William Waller, will be explored further below, but it should

³⁸ Essex’s own *Laws and Ordinances of Warre* stated that ‘A Captain that is careless in the Training and Governing of his Company, shall be displaced of his charge’. Wing / 1743:03, *Lawes and ordinances of warre* (London: 1642), unpaginated.

³⁹ E.64[3], *The Earle of Essex his letter to Master Speaker, July 9, 1643* (Oxford: 4 August* 1643), pp. 5-7. See also, E.59[24], *Mercurius Aulicus* (1 July 1643), pp. 340-41; and E.60[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 July 1643), p. 353.

⁴⁰ *CJ*, vol. III (10 July 1643), pp. 160-161.

⁴¹ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 372-5.

⁴² See, E.63[2], *Mercurius Aulicus* (16-22 July 1643), p. 385.

⁴³ E.64[3], *The Earle of Essex his letter to Master Speaker, July 9, 1643* (Oxford: 4 August* 1643), pp. 5-9.

be noted that, at this time, the Independents in Parliament were considering replacing Essex with Waller. Given that the royalist pamphleteers frequently asserted that Waller was ruled by his domineering wife, the author was implying that a change of general would not improve the situation for the Parliamentarians.

As Essex's authority and martial reputation was being steadily undermined by the criticisms of his enemies on his own side, the royalist writers made more daring assaults upon the general.⁴⁴ At the end of July, for example, George Thomason received a verse-pamphlet which further derided the Earl of Essex in a drinking song. In the song the royalist prisoner raised his glass and drank a health

To the Man that shall bring
The great Cuckold to th' King.⁴⁵

Such an oblique reference to the Earl of Essex demonstrates just how widely his reputation as a cuckold had spread. Similarly, after the women's peace protests at the beginning of August *Aulicus* incorrectly reported that it had been a troop of Essex's soldiers that had used force to make the women disperse and in the process had killed 'three of them'. '[F]or which', *Aulicus* retorted sarcastically, '(and some other former courtesies) that sex will ever honour him and his posterity'.⁴⁶ The newsbook's mention of 'former courtesies' towards women was surely designed to be read sardonically to further emphasise Essex's past failures to satisfy women sexually, while the reference to the earl's progeny when it had been so publicly announced by James I that Essex was impotent, was a subtle, yet pointed reminder of Essex's lack of virility. The court newsbook also demonstrated how Essex's unmanliness was linked to his failings as a military commander, which had led to his political weakness. This would have been a common chain of thought for contemporaries, for conduct books continually recorded that a man who could not rule in his own household was unfit for a place of responsibility in the commonwealth.⁴⁷ The newsbook went on to claim that Waller's new recruits '*are most of them good lusty Butchers (to knocke downe the Oxe at Kingston)*'.⁴⁸ As has been mentioned above, contemporaries would have

⁴⁴ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 375.

⁴⁵ E.62[15], *The Cambridge royallist imprisoned* (NPP: 31 July* 1643), unpaginated.

⁴⁶ E.65[26], *Mercurius Aulicus* (12 August 1643), p. 432.

⁴⁷ Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 4.

⁴⁸ E.65[26], *Mercurius Aulicus* (12 August 1643), p. 438.

instantly made the connection between horns, oxen and cuckoldry, and as Essex's army was currently quartered near London it would have been obvious who the editors of *Aulicus* were alluding to.⁴⁹ We should also note that, as suspicions over Essex's capabilities as a general grew during July and August, the members of the Merchant Taylor's Hall had petitioned Parliament that Waller should be placed at the head of a new army raised entirely by the City.⁵⁰ In one subtle sentence, then, the court newsbook had made reference to the animosity between Essex and Waller, to the fact that (in the eyes of some Londoners) Essex was unfit or unwilling to pursue the war vigorously and to the fact that some saw Waller as a suitable replacement. The editors of the newsbook also drew a link between Essex's failings as a commander and his reputation as a cuckold.

The king's siege of Gloucester in August caused the Parliament's supporters to rally round their general, raising money, supplies and men to replenish the depleted ranks of Essex's army. Gloucester was 'the last parliamentary stronghold that guarded the lower reaches of the Severn, its relief seemed essential' and the emergency resulted in a temporary closing of ranks on the Parliamentary side.⁵¹ As Essex approached with his newly raised forces, the king's forces withdrew, allowing Essex to raise the siege without any bloodshed. As a result, the earl's reputation in London swiftly recovered. On 15 September he took Cirencester. Yet, his army was low on supplies and needed to return to London swiftly before the king's army forced a battle.⁵² The speed with which Essex marched his men away from the clutches of the king's forces attracted fresh derision from the royalist press. The editors of *Aulicus* claimed that it further illustrated the cowardice of Essex and his men. Essex was described as being 'full of hopes and feares' but that 'his feare grew from an apprehension of being overtaken by His Majesties Forces' and had caused him to flee from a skirmish before Cirencester in such haste that he left some of his men behind.⁵³ As the king's forces pursued Essex's army, these accounts were no doubt

⁴⁹ Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 109; A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson, 'Introduction' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 32; S. Amussen, *An Ordered Society* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988), pp. 118, 131; and L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 102.

⁵⁰ Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. I, pp. 180-1.

⁵¹ Davies, 'The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex', p. 40.

⁵² Morrill, 'Robert Devereux' in *DNB*; Davies, 'The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex', p. 41; and Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 383-89.

⁵³ E.69[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (23 September 1643), p. 527. See also, E.68[4], *Mercurius Aulicus* (16 September 1643), p. 515.

designed to allay any fears that the royalists might have had about facing Essex and his men on the battlefield.

The Parliamentary forces clashed with the king's army at Newbury on 20 September, and, while the battle did not see the Parliamentarians deal a crushing blow to the king, Charles was forced to withdraw, leaving Essex with an open path to London. Upon his return to the capital the Venetian Ambassador recorded that the general 'moves in a halo of glory here, having recovered his reputation by relief of Gloucester, and vindicated himself with the citizens of London, who had reviled him'.⁵⁴ The royalist pamphleteers responded to Essex's revived popularity and martial image by making further allusions to his unmanliness: just two weeks after the battle, a royalist verse-pamphlet made reference to 'Essex[']s horns'.⁵⁵

Unlike Waller, Essex was not active in the field over the winter of 1643-4, a matter that brought him into dispute with the Committee of Safety.⁵⁶ *Aulicus* continued to emphasise how the general's authority was being circumscribed and disregarded, not only by the Houses of Parliament, but also by his subordinate commanders and even by the citizens of the Common Council. In one edition the newsbook wondered aloud how Essex would react to having 'his Army weeded and mangled at the Citizens pleasure'.⁵⁷ The pamphleteer, John Taylor, made his attack on Essex's supposed powerlessness even more explicit by linking it to his alleged unmanliness. In his pamphlet, Taylor included a mock recipe for a 'cordiall' that he claimed would restore the Parliament to health. The ingredients emphasised the weaknesses of the Parliamentarians: for instance, the recipe called for 'Two ounces of the shavings of his *Excellencies* Hornes, and an ounce and halfe of the fat of his black Calfe'. The explicit reference to calves and Essex's cuckold's horns would not have been missed by contemporaries, and it reaffirmed Essex's unmanliness.⁵⁸ In the same pamphlet, Taylor attempted to demonstrate that the Earl's alleged unmanliness had had implications for his abilities as a general. In a bid to undermine Essex's recent relief of Gloucester, Taylor claimed that at 'that very place ... his Excellency with his whole army run [sic] away with no lesse dishonour then he came thither with Feare'. Taylor ended by jeering that it was 'yet a question whether of his Lawrells were the best,

⁵⁴ CSP Ven., vol. 27: 1643-1647 (1926), p. 29.

⁵⁵ E.69[24], *The humble petition of the House of Commons* (Oxford: 5 October* 1643), p. 20.

⁵⁶ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 408.

⁵⁷ E.32[17], *Mercurius Aulicus* (27 January 1644), p. 796. See also E.30[1], *Mercurius Aulicus* (13 January 1644), p. 774.

⁵⁸ Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 107-112.

that of Gloucester or that of Newbury, or Edgehill, or Branceford, or Oxford, where he was *Tamed*'.⁵⁹ The implication was that none of these fights had been an overwhelming victory for the general, yet they were counted as his most successful deeds to date.

At the end of January 1644, the king approached Essex and asked him to mediate a peace. Essex rebuffed Charles, explaining that he would need to address his peace overtures to the Parliament. A month later, Essex's authority as Lord General was further undermined by the creation of the Committee of Both Kingdoms which would direct Parliament's war effort.⁶⁰ A week after *Aulicus* had reported that Essex's reply to the king had been 'full or [of] insolency & scorne',⁶¹ the newsbook described with relish the weak state to which Essex had been brought by his own party. 'But their *Generall* cannot digest this new Committee' the editors noted, 'which doubtlesse will somewhat eclypse his splendor'. Through such a choice of phrase, *Aulicus* suggested that it was Essex's pride and ambition that made him continue in rebellion against the crown. *Aulicus* went on to claim that Waller's faction had attempted to deny Essex a place on the Committee, because it had been considered 'unfitting the *Generall* should have power in it'. *Aulicus* claimed that this 'hath so incensed him [Essex], that he againe threatens to lay downe his Commission, for which (some *Members* say) they would heartily thanke him, and are as ready to accept his *Excellency* to offer'.⁶² Once again the newsbook claimed that Essex's power was being questioned by his social inferiors. Adamson has argued that Essex responded to this usurpation of his power by showing 'a lofty disregard to the new Committee's orders and remonstrations' throughout the campaigning season of 1644.⁶³ While Adamson may have gone too far in claiming that the earl demonstrated a 'lofty disregard' for the Committee, there is certainly evidence to suggest that Essex was slow to respond to the Committee's orders in the summer of 1644.

Part 1.4 – 'Tis the greatest blow that ever befell our party':⁶⁴ the campaign of 1644

In the spring of 1644, Essex and Waller were given orders to launch a united attack on Oxford. As their combined armies advanced on the royalist headquarters and began to encircle the surrounding garrisons and villages, the royalist propagandists rose to the

⁵⁹ E.29[11], J. Taylor, *Mercurius Aquaticus, or, The water-poets answer to all that hath or shall be writ by Mercurius Britanicus* (Oxford*: 18 January* 1644), unpaginated.

⁶⁰ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 412-20.

⁶¹ E.33[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (3 February 1644), p. 811.

⁶² E.35[27], *Mercurius Aulicus* (17 February 1644), p. 830.

⁶³ Adamson, 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War', pp. 110-111.

⁶⁴ J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London: John Darby, 1718), vol. V, p. 353.

occasion. For instance, in a bid to play down the loss of Reading the newsbook claimed that, after they had taken the town, the parliamentarians had left in such haste that they had 'left good store of their men dead in the streets, besides forty Prisoners, their Plunder deere paid for, though not carryed home'.⁶⁵ Later in May, the newsbook related how Essex drew his forces together upon a hill near Islip which overlooked Oxford and put on a public display of his strength that was designed to terrify the royalist inhabitants. Yet *Aulicus* reported that a royalist soldier had fired a warning shot which had killed one of the Parliamentarians and had caused the entire army to run away 'in great confusion and amazement'.⁶⁶ Similarly an occasional pamphlet by John Taylor dismissed the entirety of Parliament's main field army as 'my Lord of *Essex* Catives [Caitiffs, i.e. cowards]'.⁶⁷ Given the delicate reminders that occasionally slipped into both *Mercurius Aulicus* and other occasional pamphlets and broadsides, the royalists would not have missed the significance of a whole army obeying a notorious cuckold whose virility had been publicly questioned, as, in their eyes, this had implications for the manliness of Essex's men.

In early June the king escaped his beleaguered headquarters at Oxford and advanced north to Worcester. Despite orders from the Committee of Both Kingdoms to the contrary, Essex left Waller to pursue the king and advanced with his whole army into the west in order to relieve the besieged town of Lyme.⁶⁸ *Aulicus* suggested that Essex had chosen the easier task, thereby further questioning his bravery and abilities as a general. The newsbook recorded that, at a counsel of war held at Burford, it had been agreed that 'his Excellencie their *Generallismo*, having the greater Ordnance and the heavier carriages should march downe faire and softly into the West'. Waller, on the other hand, 'should joyne with Coll. *Massey's* forces and pursue the King' despite having 'the lighter bodies (most of his foot being very boyes) and the lesser guns'.⁶⁹ Thus *Aulicus* suggested not only that Essex had given Waller the more daunting task, but that his major-general was inadequately equipped to perform it successfully. Another royalist broadside which addressed the

⁶⁵ E.50[6], *Mercurius Aulicus* (18 May 1644), p. 986; Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. I, pp. 128-130; Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 428; and I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), pp. 168-171.

⁶⁶ E.51[7], *Mercurius Aulicus* (25 May 1644), unpaginated.

⁶⁷ E.46[13], J. Taylor, *Mad Verse, Sad Verse, Glad Verse and Bad Verse* (Oxford: 10 May* 1644), p. 6.

⁶⁸ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 431-35; and M. Wanklyn and F. Jones, *Military History of the English Civil War* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005), pp. 164-67, 191-197.

⁶⁹ E.52[7], *Mercurius Aulicus* (8 June 1644), p. 1016. See also E.2[30], *Mercurius Aulicus* (6 July 1644), p. 1063. This edition claimed that Essex was accused at Westminster of 'tasking Sir William Waller to follow His Majestie, reserving for himselfe *onely* to relieve Lyme' (my italics).

Parliamentarians, simply referred to Essex as 'your Oxe Generall', thus further highlighting his unmanliness and therefore his unsuitability for such a high position of command.⁷⁰

Despite receiving several angry letters from the Committee of Both Kingdoms, Essex continued to advance through Devon with the aim of capturing Queen Henrietta Maria and bringing Prince Maurice's forces to battle.⁷¹ While he was successful in relieving Lyme, the General quickly found himself in unfriendly country with the king's army pressing down upon him. Essex now marched his soldiers to the south coast of Cornwall, quartering his men around the small port of Fowey in order to receive aid from the Earl of Warwick's fleet. But, adverse weather conditions meant that Warwick was unable to land any supplies, and meanwhile the combined royalist forces of the king, Prince Maurice and Sir Richard Grenville surrounded the Parliamentarians.⁷² Despite his strong position, on 6 August the king wrote to Essex to persuade the General to make peace. Snow claims that, '[n]ews of these Royalist peace gestures caused grave concern in the City', for the people and the Parliament feared that their main field army would be lost.⁷³ Yet, as in January, Essex refused to treat with the king personally. Instead he evaded capture by taking a small boat to Plymouth along with his chief commanders. The Parliamentarian cavalry, under Sir William Balfour, broke through the royalist lines on 31 August, leaving Essex's infantry, under the command of Major-General Skippon, to capitulate on 2 September.⁷⁴

Essex's actions, along with his second refusal to submit to the king, drew vitriolic criticism from the royalist press. *Mercurius Aulicus* described the General as a 'high-swolne Earle', who 'hath stolne away from His Army, in the Night, to Sea, in a Cockboat'. The court newsbook went on to jeer, 'wee desire to know the reason, why the Rebels voted *To live and die with the Earle of Essex*, since the Earle of *Essex* hath declared *he will not live and die with them*'.⁷⁵ In a subsequent edition of *Aulicus* the editors passed even more damning judgement upon Essex's actions, describing it as 'the most high inexpressible peece of cowardice that ever was committed by one who tooke on him the name of *Generall*, to lead an Army of above Ten Thousand men into such miserable Necessity'. *Aulicus* went on

⁷⁰ E.52[6], *Sampsons foxes agreed to fire a kingdom: or, The Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a round, to put a kingdom out of square* (Oxford: 22 June* 1644), p. 5

⁷¹ P. Young and R. Holmes, *The English Civil War: A Military history of the three Civil Wars, 1642-1651* (Kent: Eyre Methuen Limited, 1974), p. 204.

⁷² Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 435-46; and Young and Holmes, *The English Civil War*, pp. 204-212.

⁷³ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, p. 446.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 449-451.

⁷⁵ E.10[19], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August 1644), p. 1142.

to describe how Essex had '[stolen] away in a poore little boat by night, leaving all his flocke to starve or submit to the mercy of another Army'.⁷⁶ The message that Essex sent to Skippon from Plymouth suggests that the Lord General was well aware that his actions had called his honour into question. '[B]e assured [that] no worldly thing should have made me quit so gallant men' he wrote regretfully.⁷⁷

While the Parliament tried to regroup and to re-equip the broken armies of Waller and Essex, *Aulicus* demonstrated how the news of Essex's abandonment of his troops had reached other royalist garrisons. For instance, in October the newsbook reported that after the Parliamentary siege of Donnington Castle was lifted on 18 October, the 'merry Garrison laughed aloud, (indeed they did) crying *Away, Away, A Cock-Boat! A Cock-Boat!* The Sound whereof was heard as farre as *Portsmouth*, where his *Excellency* lyes at Anchor'. The newsbook went on to promise that it would 'search out the reasons why His *Excellency* cannot stirre', while Sir William Waller, who was retreating in the face of the king's advancing army, could not be made to 'stand still' and fight.⁷⁸ Essex's courage, military abilities and reputation had been severely called into question by the events of the spring and summer campaign, not just amongst royalists, but also among the parliamentarians. Essex's opponents in the Commons attempted to move against him and exclude him from command at the Battle of Newbury on 27 October 1644. As it happened, Essex was too ill to participate and his absence from the field took away his opportunity to recover his reputation.⁷⁹

Part 1.5 – 1645: Martial Impotence

The winter of 1644-5 saw the Commons debate a new model for military administration and the Self-Denying Ordinance, which would exclude any member of the House of Commons or Lords from holding office in the Parliamentary army.⁸⁰ While these new measures were being discussed, the royalist pamphleteers continued to berate Essex for his weakness. Indeed the opening months of 1645 saw the royalist press publish the most cutting attack upon the General's manliness to date. Written by the Cavalier satirist John

⁷⁶ E.10[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 September 1644), p. 1154.

⁷⁷ Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, vol. II, p. 436.

⁷⁸ E.16[3], *Mercurius Aulicus* (12 October 1644), pp. 1195, 1202. The description of Essex as one who was unable to 'stirre' was perhaps a further allusion to his alleged impotency. I am grateful to Professor Mark Stoye for his thoughts on this point.

⁷⁹ Gentles, *The English Revolution*, p. 241; and Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, vol. II, pp. 441, 445.

⁸⁰ Snow, *Essex the Rebel*, pp. 456-457, 461-3, 466, 471-76; Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, vol. II, pp. 450-52; and Morrill, 'Robert Devereux' in *DNB*.

Cleveland, *The character of a London diurnall* provided unflattering descriptions of a number of Parliament's most prominent figures, one of whom was the Earl of Essex. On mentioning the rivalries between Waller and Essex, Cleveland used gendered language to make his attack more acerbic. Thus he claimed that Waller 'Cuckolds the Generall in his Commission' and went on to explain that, 'he stalkes with *Essex*, and shoots under his Belly, because his Oxcellery himselfe is not charged there'.⁸¹ Cleveland's remarks were extremely malicious as they explicitly mocked the Earl for his impotency, openly attacking his manhood. *The Character of a London diurnall* generated no less than four savage replies from the parliamentary presses, suggesting that the tract was considered highly damaging to the honour of Parliament's leading commanders.⁸²

Despite resigning his commission on 2 April 1645, in line with the Self-Denying Ordinance, Essex did not disappear from the royalist tracts: the memory of Lostwithiel was a favourite subject.⁸³ In July 1645 Thomason acquired a royalist pamphlet, which addressed Essex in a song. This particular tract further illuminates the royalist pamphleteers' approach to the earl. The song began with a warning to Essex not to repeat the rebellious mistakes of his father, for attempts by the subject to 'over-awe' their Prince, would, the author claimed, 'offend Divine, and Humane Law'. In this line, then, the author was further undermining Essex's martial actions by claiming that he had offended the laws of God, of the nation and of nature.⁸⁴ The author continued to weaken both the legitimacy of Essex's actions and his status, by utilising the framework of honour. The author described Essex as 'Rebellion's Generall' and wished he was mistaken, for then Essex's honour would have been cleared. But instead, the author claimed, Essex had acted 'like a Mad-man, or one that's bewicht' and had drawn his 'Army forth all in Array'. As the conduct books continually stressed the centrality of 'reason' to manliness, the versifiers description of Essex as 'mad', clearly denied him of this important 'manly' trait. The song went on to remember Lostwithiel, and the scornful answer that Essex was reported to have

⁸¹ Wing / 1148:44, J. Cleveland, *The character of a London diurnall* (NPP: 1644), p. 4. *Mercurius Britannicus* was first to mention Cleveland's pamphlet in its issue covering the dates 3-10 February 1645, thus suggesting that Cleveland's book was circulating in London by late January. See E.269[6], *Mercurius Britannicus* (3-10 February 1645).

⁸² See E.269[25], *Mercurius Britannicus* (10-17 February 1645), pp. 549-550; E.269[7], *A character of the new Oxford libeller* (London: 11 February* 1645); E.274[32], *The Oxford character of the London diurnall examined and answered* (NPP: 31 March* 1645*); and E.279[6], *The character of an Oxford-incendiary* (London*: 26 April 1645*).

⁸³ E.288[48], *Mercurius Aulicus* (25 May-8 June 1645), p. 1619. See also, E.284[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (20-27 April 1645), p. 1556.

⁸⁴ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 127-141.

given the king, which the author described as ‘a shamefull thing’. To further emphasise the dishonour which Essex had brought upon himself, the writer went on to remind his readers of the details of Essex’s ignoble escape, by jeering that:

doen the River *Foy* you ran away,
Like to a brave, and Noble Generall,
And left your men to th’worst might them befall,

The sarcastic description of Essex further emphasised that his actions had been neither brave nor noble. The author concluded the song by urging Essex to ask for the king’s pardon in order to redeem his noble status and his honour,

So shall you then a Noble Subject be,
And all good Subjects will rejoyce to see
When to your King you reconciled are.⁸⁵

That such an appeal should have been made by the royalists in 1645, to a man who was a key player in the parliamentary rebellion against the crown, and who had refused to submit to the king on several occasions, provides a neat summary of the royalist propagandists’ cautious approach to the Earl of Essex because of his perceived popularity and noble status: even at this late hour, the royalists were still appealing to the earl to be reconciled with his king. It also demonstrates how codes of honour and martial behaviour were used alongside gendered language to further weaken the legitimacy of Essex’s actions.

Part 1.6 – Conclusion

This section has demonstrated how the most explicit gendered attacks upon the Earl of Essex were found in the occasional pamphlets. Yet often these attacks simply made reference to the ‘Oxe Generall’ or ‘Essex horns’ in a way that suggested that such comments needed no further explanation. The inability of such a man to undertake a successful political or martial role in the commonwealth would have been obvious to the

⁸⁵ E.290[19], *Newes from the Kings bath* (Bristol: 1645), pp. 7-14.

reader. These attacks generally resurfaced at times when Essex's army looked particularly threatening to the royalist cause or when his ill-fated actions cried out for royalist comment.

Mercurius Aulicus did make use of gendered attacks, but tended to be far more subtle in its allusions to Essex's alleged impotence and status as a cuckold. The newsbook's reluctance to ridicule the earl outright might well stem from its role as the official journal of the royalist party.⁸⁶ To publicly question the manliness of Parliament's popular general might have done the royalist cause more harm than good. As the war progressed, *Aulicus* emphasised how the General's social inferiors in Parliament were becoming so bold as to dishonour Essex and treat him with contempt. The implication was that Essex should have expected no less from men who would rebel against their king. But the king was not willing to burn all bridges, and repeatedly attempted to woo Essex to his cause, or to persuade him to mediate a peace with Parliament. Given that a main theme of royalist propaganda was that the king was the protector of the social hierarchy: to encourage Essex's social inferiors to belittle the Earl's manhood might have seemed like a direct contradiction to the king's self-professed goals.⁸⁷ This might explain the royalist pamphleteers' reluctance to openly attack specific noblemen, like Essex. In order to further explore this reluctance, this chapter will now turn to consider the royalist polemicists' treatment of Sir William Waller and his wife, Lady Ann Waller in order to demonstrate how their status as gentry, rather than members of the nobility, afforded them less protection from the royalists' 'paper-bullets'.

Part 2.1 – 'William the Conqueror' and his 'Ladie Generall'⁸⁸: Representations of Sir William and Lady Ann Waller in Royalist propaganda, 1642-1645

Essex's pre-war reputation and famous father may have led the royalist pamphleteers to treat him with caution, yet there can be no doubt that his troubled marital history gave them ample ammunition once his popularity had begun to wane amongst the parliamentarians. The Parliament's major-general of the west, Sir William Waller presented a more complex challenge for the royalist propagandists. At the start of the war, Waller was something of an unknown quantity. In his youth he had served both in Italy and in Sir Horace Vere's relief force for the Palatinate, yet, by the time of the outbreak of the civil war in 1642,

⁸⁶ P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 29.

⁸⁷ J. Morrill and J. Walter, 'Order and Disorder in the English Revolution' in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 318.

⁸⁸ Clarendon, *History*, vol. II, p. 215 and E.64[3], *The Earle of Essex his letter to Master Speaker, July 9, 1643* (Oxford: 4 August* 1643), pp. 5-9.

Waller's military experience was some twenty years out of date.⁸⁹ Despite this Waller quickly rose to prominence in the Parliamentary army and made a name for himself by successfully capturing a string of towns and other strongholds for the Parliament in Hampshire, Sussex and Surrey in late 1642. Indeed, there is good deal of evidence to suggest that Waller's tactical skill and bravery was grudgingly recognised by his opponents. For instance, in August 1643 one occasional royalist pamphlet expressed doubt that Waller would ever flee the battlefield, because 'hee [Waller] shewed himselfe as forward as the foremost'.⁹⁰ Certainly such a man could not be realistically portrayed as a cowardly cuckold, so how did the royalist pamphleteers respond to the threat that Waller's bravery presented?

This is the question which the second section of the present chapter will discuss. Adopting a chronological structure, it will show how the royalist writers adapted their propaganda message in order to reflect the events of the war and will explore the two main ways in which the royalist pamphleteers sought to undermine Waller's martial reputation. First it will briefly consider the royalist claims that Waller behaved dishonourably by flouting the rules of war; second it will explore how the royalist writers alleged that the unruly actions of Waller's wife had damaged his honour and martial reputation. The royalist propagandists also claimed that Waller's disorderly household was further evidence of the illegitimacy of Parliament's claim to political power. Criticisms of the Earl of Essex crept into both the court newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* and royalist occasional pamphlets; however, because criticisms of Sir William Waller and Lady Ann Waller were largely confined to the pages of *Aulicus*, the following discussion will focus chiefly on the court newsbook. This difference is interesting in itself, particularly as *Aulicus* was the official court journal. It suggests that while the king might have had reservations about using such gendered attacks against the Earl of Essex, his writers showed less concern when it came to Sir William Waller and even less hesitancy when it came to his wife, Ann. This section also seeks to explore why this might have been the case.

⁸⁹ J. Adair, *Roundhead General: The Campaigns of Sir William Waller* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), pp. 7-8.

⁹⁰ E.65[32], *A letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus: or, Londons confession but not repentance* (Oxford*: 25 August* 1643), p. 32.

Part 2.2 – ‘William the Conqueror’: William Waller’s role in the war 1642-43

Waller appears to have had little involvement in central or local politics until he was successfully elected to a seat in the Long Parliament in May 1642. Unlike other Parliamentarian moderates, Waller was industriously active in the Parliament’s cause almost at once. For instance, in June 1642 he contributed money to help to raise a Parliamentarian army for Ireland. In July he volunteered to raise his own regiment of horse and in August he was listed as a Colonel of one of Parliament’s six cavalry regiments.⁹¹ On 4 July, despite only serving in the House of Commons for some eight weeks, he was voted as one of the founding members of the Committee of Safety, the committee to which Parliament delegated the organisation of military supplies. His biographer, John Adair, has argued that, Waller’s ‘progress in the esteem of the Lower House ... may have been at least partly inspired by an exaggerated contemporary notion of his military experience’.⁹² However, Barbara Donagan argues that Waller was swiftly appointed to a position of command because he was well-read in military theory and tactics, which, according to one contemporary, gave him a ‘great knowledge in martial affairs’.⁹³ Indeed, Donagan notes that Waller wrote a manuscript on the ‘Military discourse of the ordering of soldiers’ which, although now lost, does support her view.⁹⁴

Waller’s martial career in the Civil War began as early as August 1642. He quickly proved his worth as a commander by capturing ‘the important arsenal and port of Portsmouth’ on 7 September 1642, Farnham Castle on 1 December and Winchester on 12 December. By the end of the same month, Waller had also captured Arundel Castle and Chichester.⁹⁵ After putting his men into winter quarters, Waller returned to London where he was lauded as ‘William the Conqueror’⁹⁶ and he received public thanks from the House of Commons on 15 January 1643.⁹⁷ Yet, despite Waller’s impressive record of success at the end of 1642, he drew little fire from the royalist pamphleteers at this time. This is not surprising as, at this stage of the conflict, the royalist presses were still being established in the provinces. As was noted earlier, for the royalists, the propaganda war did not begin in earnest until the birth of the court newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* in early January 1643.

⁹¹ B. Donagan ‘Sir William Waller’ in *DNB*; and Adair, *Roundhead General*, pp. 7-8, 14, 22-3, 26-9.

⁹² Adair, *Roundhead General*, p. 29.

⁹³ Donagan, ‘Sir William Waller’ in *DNB*; and Wing / 301:10, A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London: 1692), vol. II, pp. 297-98.

⁹⁴ Donagan, ‘Sir William Waller’ in *DNB*.

⁹⁵ Donagan, ‘Sir William Waller’ in *DNB*; and Adair, *Roundhead General*, pp. 31-2, 39.

⁹⁶ Clarendon, *History*, vol. II, p. 215.

⁹⁷ *CJ*, vol. II (16 January 1643), pp. 928-930.

On 11 February Waller was appointed as Parliament's 'major-general of the west' and was given the task of countering Sir Ralph Hopton's victorious Cornish forces which were threatening Parliament's control of the region. As Adair notes, much was at stake for the parliamentarians, for, if the royalists gained a firm grip in the Severn Valley, then vital communication links between Oxford and the royalist recruiting grounds in Wales would be reinforced. Equally, the Parliamentarians feared that the royalists would be able to use the port of Bristol to land Irish troops.⁹⁸ That Waller should be given this command further demonstrated his high favour with the Parliament; it also made him an obvious target for *Aulicus*.

Initially, in an attempt to pour scorn on Waller's military successes, *Aulicus* took every available opportunity to attack the major-general's honour. For instance, after Waller had made a series of swift night marches into the west, he launched a successful assault on the royalist-held town of Malmesbury on 21 March. *Aulicus* admitted as much, but claimed that, as the defeated royalists marched out of the town, Waller broke the terms of surrender and allowed his men to plunder them.⁹⁹ This act would have been considered highly shameful as it flouted the rules of war.¹⁰⁰ Towards the end of the month *Aulicus* again made much of Waller's supposedly dishonourable behaviour to explain away the demoralising defeat of Lord Herbert's entire royalist army at Highnam on 24 March. *Aulicus* admitted that Waller's more thorough intelligence and tactical skill had forced 'the Kings Forces ... to admit a Parley', but continued by accusing Waller's men of treachery, for 'while they were upon debate of the conditions ... ; some of his men perceiving one of the out-workes to be but meanly manned, (most of the [Lord Herbert's] Souldiers being withdrawne, in confidence of some faire end by the present Parley) gave on upon the same, and wonne it; and from thence set upon the rest'.¹⁰¹

As these parliamentarian soldiers were under Waller's command, contemporary readers would have recognised that he was responsible for their actions; as Waller later recalled in his *Vindication*, 'I stood answerable with my life and honour, for any miscarriage that should fall out in the service, and ... it would be a poor plea for me to say, it was the officer's fault, when it might be justly retorted upon me as my fault that I took

⁹⁸ Adair, *Roundhead General*, pp. 51-2.

⁹⁹ E.247[26], *Mercurius Aulicus* (19-25 March 1643), pp. 148-9.

¹⁰⁰ B. Donagan, 'The web of honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ* 44: 2 (2001), pp. 371-2, 378; and Donagan, *War in England*, p. 134.

¹⁰¹ E.96[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (1 April 1643), pp. 158-9.

such officers'.¹⁰² It is clear that *Aulicus* was attempting to deflect attention away from the embarrassing royalist defeat – which saw the surrender of Herbert's infantry *en masse* and the flight of his cavalry and dragoons – and to focus the reader's attention instead on Waller's supposedly dishonourable conduct. Later on in the report, *Aulicus* twisted the events at Highnam still further in order to deflate Waller's military reputation and minimise the royalist defeat: thus the newsbook claimed that Waller 'by his perfidiousnesse and treachery [had] beaten up the Lord *Herberts* Quarters' and had then gone on to pillage Tewksbury.¹⁰³ The fact that Waller's supposed 'treachery' is not mentioned in the account of the royalist historian, Edward Hyde, suggests that *Aulicus*' claims were a calculated attempt to save face.¹⁰⁴ By accusing Waller of behaving dishonourably, *Aulicus* was attempting to damage his reputation, for not only had this been a demoralising royalist defeat, but it had also demonstrated Waller's 'professional skill and speed'.¹⁰⁵ To claim that Waller had behaved in such a dishonourable way would therefore have been a highly effective way to counter his growing military reputation. Equally, as Jerrilyn Greene Marston's work on royalist honour has shown, in the seventeenth century a 'gentleman's honour, [was] his most precious possession'.¹⁰⁶ Therefore, Waller's allegedly treacherous behaviour could also be used to undermine his claim to gentlemanly status.

By early April it was apparent that Waller's forces would soon clash with the combined forces of Prince Maurice and what was left of Lord Herbert's Welsh army. In what was surely a bid to undermine Waller's celebrated title of 'William the Conqueror', *Aulicus* reported with delight that Maurice was 'following close upon [Waller] with *his* conquering Army'.¹⁰⁷ The subsequent royalist victory at Ripple Field on 13 April was celebrated at length by *Aulicus*, perhaps betraying the extent to which the royalists had felt threatened by Waller and the extent to which Highnam had shaken royalist morale. *Aulicus* reported pointedly that 'a Letter from Sir *William Waller*' had been printed in London

¹⁰² W. Waller, *Vindication of the character and conduct of Sir William Waller* (London: 1793), pp. 14-15.

¹⁰³ E.96[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (1 April 1643), p. 162. That such an account of Waller's treachery was also designed to enrage the king's male supporters can be seen in a later line, where *Aulicus* claimed that 'the Welch-men hearing of the perfidious dealing of Waller towards their Country-men, have drawne themselves into a body, resolving that he shall finde no passage thorow their Countries; or if he doe, that he shall purchase it at a very deare rate'.

¹⁰⁴ On the contrary, Hyde passed damning judgement on Herbert's troops, declaring that the 'Guard of the River [Severn was] ... either Treacherously, or Sottishly neglected by the Lord Herbert's Forces', Clarendon, *History*, vol. II, p. 119.

¹⁰⁵ Gentles, *The English Revolution*, p. 167.

¹⁰⁶ J. Greene Marston, 'Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England', *JBS* XIII (1973-4), pp. 21-43.

¹⁰⁷ E.99[22], *Mercurius Aulicus* (15 April 1643), p. 186 (my italics).

‘wherein he makes great mention of his victories, but none of his losses’.¹⁰⁸ *Aulicus* continued to berate Waller for his inaction during the following month by using his triumphant title against him, thereby emphasising the stark contrast between his earlier successes and his present weakness. *Aulicus* answered the reports from London that ‘Sir William Waller [was] *still a Conquerour* [and] *had taken Ludlow, a great Towne in Shropshire, and was not very farre from Shrewsbury*’, by claiming that the reality was very different: and that ‘the wary Gentleman never advanced one step beyond *Hereford*, and left that too (as great a *Conquerour* as he is) as soone as he had heard that Prince *Maurice* was coming forwards’.¹⁰⁹ Waller’s crushing defeat at Roundway Down in July gave *Aulicus* another opportunity to mock ‘the gallant Conqueror’ who had been ‘forced to ‘runne away to London’ by the royalist forces.¹¹⁰

Part 2.3 – The Cost of Defeat: Summer 1643

Yet, as well as mocking Waller for his defeats, the summer of 1643 also saw the court newsbook alter its tactics: for *Aulicus* began to portray Waller’s wife, Ann, as a female preacher and termagant.¹¹¹ The newsbook’s motives for doing so were probably twofold. In the first place there may well have been some grain of truth in the accusations. In his own recollections upon his life, William Waller described Ann as ‘a religious woman’. More telling still, he noted that early in the marriage ‘there were some litle [sic] differences in our natures, and judgements (as to some particulars)’, but he also stressed that ‘within a litle [sic] while’ these differences were settled.¹¹² Perhaps the tensions evident within Waller’s remarks suggest that there might have been a kernel of truth in *Aulicus*’ accusations that Ann was an assertive and outspoken woman.

It also seems plausible to suggest that the sudden emergence of pointed attacks upon Waller and his wife during the summer of 1643 could have been due to the political situation. As we have seen, over the late spring and early summer of this year, disillusionment with the Earl of Essex had festered, and Waller had been suggested as a possible commander for a new parliamentary army. As Waller recalls in his *Vindication*, it was the Independent majority in the House of Commons who were most vocal in suggesting that he should be appointed to this new commission, whereas Essex, and the

¹⁰⁸ E.100[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (22 April 1643), pp. 201-2.

¹⁰⁹ E.104[21], *Mercurius Aulicus* (20 May 1643), p. 264.

¹¹⁰ E.64[11], *Mercurius Aulicus* (29 July 1643), p. 408.

¹¹¹ See for instance, E.64[11], *Mercurius Aulicus* (29 July 1643), p. 408.

¹¹² ‘Sir Wm. Waller’s Remarks- Experiences’, Wadham College MS, pp. 55-56.

more moderate parliamentarians, favoured a peaceful settlement with the king.¹¹³ It may also be significant that on 8-9 August 1643 a body of women came to the Houses of Parliament to petition for peace, but when the protests turned violent, it was one of Waller's troops of horse that was used to disperse the women, resulting in at least one casualty.¹¹⁴ *Aulicus*' sudden change of tack could therefore be related to these events; the newsbook could have been attempting to discredit the potential new commander of the parliamentary army whose soldiers had been used to silence the people who wanted peace. An anonymous royalist pamphlet, acquired by Thomason on 25 August, made this link evident when it reported that William Waller had been put forward by the Parliament as general for a 'new intended Army'. The pamphleteer dismissed Waller as being 'as mad as his Lady' because he would 'hold up the Rebellion, as long as he can'.¹¹⁵ Through such a comment the pamphleteer implied that William Waller had called his own male 'rationality' into question, because he wanted to continue fighting against the king. It also gave the royalist pamphleteers another opportunity to criticise Lady Waller's allegedly uncontrolled behaviour.

Equally, by asserting that Ann Waller was a preacher, *Aulicus* was not only reinforcing the Wallers' connections with the more zealous religious beliefs of the Independents, it was also tapping into the contemporary fears and suspicions which surrounded certain religious sects that had emerged in the Parliamentary quarters during the conflict. Many of these sects allowed women to speak publicly at meetings and some contemporaries, like the Presbyterian writer Thomas Edwards, were alarmed that this cultivated an unhealthy sense of independence in women that would lead to the unravelling of the social order.¹¹⁶ By portraying the wife of a leading parliamentarian in this way, *Aulicus* not only suggested that the Parliament condoned women preachers, but also delegitimised Parliament's claim to power as it demonstrated that the Parliament's failure, or unwillingness, to check such unruly female behaviour would quickly lead to social chaos.

¹¹³ See Waller, *Vindication*, p. 131, and *LJ*, vol. VI (11 July 1643), p. 127. *Mercurius Aulicus* also showed it was aware of the growing tensions between William Waller and the Earl of Essex; see for instance, E.65[13], *Mercurius Aulicus* (5 August 1643), p. 411.

¹¹⁴ A. Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984), pp. 256-7; and A. Plowden, *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998), p. 62.

¹¹⁵ E.65[32], *A letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus*, p. 32.

¹¹⁶ K. Thomas, 'Women and the Civil War Sects', *P&P* 13 (April 1958), esp. pp. 52, 55. See also Fraser, *Weaker Vessel*, p. 276.

As summer turned to autumn, *Aulicus* took every opportunity to continue to assert that Ann Waller was a preacher, in order to emphasise her subversive, independent behaviour and the negative implications that this would have on her husband's character. For instance, when the newsbook made the claim that 'Mistresse *Murford*', the wife of the governor of Southampton, 'doth now so overflow in doctrine & use, that the chief men of spirit do extreemly emulate her for being better gifted then they for all their calling' – a subject seemingly unrelated to Lady Ann Waller – *Aulicus* could not resist adding the comment, 'if she continue, ere long she will be qualified to be waiting Gentlewoman to the Lady Waller'.¹¹⁷ A week later *Aulicus* answered the Parliamentary newsbooks' accusations that the ladies of the court were '*Ladies of Vanity*' by simply replying, 'so said my Lady Waller in her last Sermon', thereby highlighting the hypocrisy of the parliamentarians by showing that Ann's excessive and unchecked vanity had caused her to think she was capable of a man's work, despite the fact that the Bible forbade women to preach in public.¹¹⁸ The repeated, passing references to Lady Waller's alleged activities as a female preacher, suggest that, by the autumn of 1643, this subversive image of Ann Waller was sufficiently well-known among *Aulicus*' readership to mean that a more detailed account was no longer required.

As well as claiming that Lady Ann's behaviour further highlighted the gender and social disorder that would follow should the Parliament win the war, *Aulicus* also dwelt upon Waller's defeats in order to dissipate any fear that the royalist soldiery might have felt as Waller set about raising another force for service in the west. *Aulicus* mocked Waller's new commission, declaring that 'he hath a mind to be once more beaten' and mockingly averred that the major-general wanted 'a second horse-race upon Run-away down'.¹¹⁹ Given the tensions within the parliamentary leadership, it is hardly surprising to find *Aulicus* in a confident mood and despite Parliament's promises of men, Waller struggled to find recruits. Moreover, in the wake of the parliamentary victory at Newbury on 20 September, Essex demanded that Waller be brought back under his command and Waller subsequently resigned his commission.

¹¹⁷ E.67[25], *Mercurius Aulicus* (9 September 1643), p. 491.

¹¹⁸ See Bible, 1 Corinthians 14, vs. 34-35. See also E.68[4], *Mercurius Aulicus* (16 September 1643), p. 518 and Fraser, *Weaker Vessel*, p. 274.

¹¹⁹ E.67[7], *Mercurius Aulicus* (2 September 1643), p. 485.

As might be expected, Waller's difficulties provided yet more fuel for *Aulicus*' propaganda attacks. The newsbook referred to Ann as 'his spirituall Lady',¹²⁰ and claimed that 'his owne deare Spouse the Lady Waller, hath tooke ... [his defeat] so to heart' that 'she dispatched her Warrant to the Court of Guard neare Tyburne commanding all whom it may concerne, to stop any Horse-men who may be suspected to have beene listed in Sir William Waller's Army'. *Aulicus* added to the claim that Lady Waller was now meddling in the war and able to give orders to guards, by avowing that the warrant had been issued by an 'Honourable She-Committee'.¹²¹ Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford note that, during the war, women in certain towns organised themselves into committees to raise money for the cause.¹²² More research is needed on this subject, but if such committees did in fact exist, then there might have been some truth in *Aulicus*' repeated claims that Lady Waller sat on a 'She-Committee'.¹²³ The newsbook went on to claim that Essex was 'pillaging' Waller's men, but added, 'how Sir *William* will digest this great affront, I shall tell you when I know his Ladies will and pleasure' thereby suggesting that Waller was ruled by his wife.¹²⁴ From the continual portrayal of Ann's behaviour as unladylike and assertive, it was but a small step to suggest that Lady Waller dominated her husband, and this was a claim that had obvious implications for Waller's manliness and suitability for public service.

Part 2.4 – An 'Utter defeat' and a 'dishonorable blow':¹²⁵ William Waller's Role in the War, 1644-1645

After trouncing the combined royalist forces of Lord Grandison and Sir Ralph Hopton at Cheriton on 29 March 1644, Waller was given orders to combine his army with Essex's field army and to bring the king to battle. Yet what followed was a series of tiring and demoralising marches around the Midlands that culminated in a battle at Cropredy Bridge on 29 June.¹²⁶ Waller described this parliamentary defeat as 'the most heavy stroke of any that did ever befall me' because he believed that it caused the more 'zealous' in

¹²⁰ E.70[8], *Mercurius Aulicus* (30 September 1643), p. 546.

¹²¹ E.71[8], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 October 1643), p. 557.

¹²² S. Mendelson and P. Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 401.

¹²³ A. Laurence, 'Women's Work and the English Civil War', *History Today* (June 1992), p. 24. Rather than denying the existence of such committees of women, *Mercurius Britanicus* instead answered *Aulicus*' accusations by declaring that 'if ours [women] compel their own Sex, yours *compell* another Sex, which is not so naturall'. E.69[19], *Mercurius Britanicus* (26 September-3 October 1643), pp. 41-2.

¹²⁴ E.71[8], *Mercurius Aulicus* (7 October 1643), pp. 556-57.

¹²⁵ Waller, *Vindication*, p. 131.

¹²⁶ Adair, *Roundhead General*, pp. 175-200.

Parliament, who had ‘moved that the command of their army might be bestow’d upon me’, to withdraw their favour.¹²⁷ Certainly, Waller’s military reputation suffered from the failure to execute a successful move against the king’s army in the summer, something the royalist pamphleteers were quick to emphasise.

Indeed, the summer of 1644 saw *Aulicus* pour out its most barbed invective yet against Waller. The newsbook now frankly suggested that the parliamentary commander had been overpowered by his independently-minded wife. For instance, in August *Aulicus* remarked that ‘the *Conquerour*’ had returned ‘to *Westminster* (for his *Lady* bid him go)’. In a later line, the royalist editors suggested that it was Ann Waller’s religion that had given her ideas above her sex, for the newsbook related how in the past, when the couple had attended Winchester church, ‘if he [Waller] offered to speake about *Doctrines* or *Uses*, her Ladyship would rebuke him, saying, *Peace Master Waller, you know your weaknesse in these things*’.¹²⁸ Such an image of a wife silencing her husband was indeed subversive, but was particularly so because the word ‘uses’ was a seventeenth-century euphemism for sexual intercourse.¹²⁹ If such a meaning is implied in this passage, then Ann Waller’s claim that her husband was weak in this area not only undermined his virility, but also demonstrated that Ann had rather more experience of sexual intercourse than was decent for such a godly married woman. To make the point inescapable *Aulicus* remarked, that ‘since which time Sir *William* hath ever gone for the *Weaker Vessell*’.¹³⁰ Contemporaries would have recognised that Waller’s failure to reproach his wife for her unruly behaviour, and thus restore his household to order, was a deeper signifier of his unmanliness, which would have had implications for his ability to command.

Waller’s failure to exercise the appropriate control over his wife was further emphasised in another edition of the newsbook, which claimed that Lady Waller had become so bold as to answer the accusations that were made against her by the male editors of *Aulicus*. In this ‘message’ *Aulicus* claimed that Ann complained that the editors ‘*have hitherto spoken unrighteously of her, for as yet (she protests) she never Preached but sayes she knows not what we may drive her to*’. Instead, the newsbook reported, Lady Waller had assured ‘us on her *Honour* that she onely interpreted some *difficulties in the Word*, which

¹²⁷ Waller, *Vindication*, p. 131.

¹²⁸ E.9[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (24 August 1644), p. 1127.

¹²⁹ G. Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature* (London: Athlone Press, 1994), vol. III, p. 1462.

¹³⁰ E.9[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (24 August 1644), p. 1127.

her Ladyship called *Undoing* hard Chapters; according to which phrase her husbands Army is almost quite *expounded*'.¹³¹ *Aulicus*' convoluted wordplay makes the meaning of this passage somewhat difficult to understand. The reference to Ann's honour, which, for a woman in the seventeenth century largely centred on her chastity,¹³² and the fact that the word is printed in italics to emphasise it, suggests that *Aulicus* was drawing attention to the fact that, in royalist eyes, Lady Waller's honour was worth little, as her publicly assertive behaviour would have already called her sexual honesty into question.¹³³ Secondly, the italicisation of the word 'Undoing' further emphasised the disorderly consequences of allowing a woman a religious role; but equally its connection with the final sentence: that Waller's army is now 'expounded' suggests that Lady Waller's meddling in matters that should have been beyond her concern as a woman, have led her husband and his army to be undone. Finally, in seventeenth-century parlance, the word 'undoing' could be used to refer to sexual intercourse, thus further suggesting Ann Waller's promiscuous and disorderly behaviour.¹³⁴

Indeed Waller's inability to act his part as a man in his own household was repeatedly emphasised by the royalist pamphleteers to draw out the far-reaching implications this had for his martial capabilities. John Cleveland emphasised the reversal of roles between the Wallers in his occasional pamphlet, *The Character of a London Diurnall* where he mockingly remarked, '[t]his is the *William*, whose Lady is the *Conqueror*'. Cleveland continued in this vein and claimed that Waller's unmanliness was linked to his military failures, for after his defeat at Roundway Down, Cleveland asserted that 'poore Sir *William* ran to his Lady for a use of consolation', thereby placing him in the sexually submissive role.¹³⁵ Similarly, at the end of August *Aulicus* further undermined Waller's manliness by claiming that, 'they at *London*' failed to provide 'the *Conquerour*' with sufficient money for his men, 'unlesse 'his *Lady* allow him some stipend out of her Lecture'. What was more, the newsbook argued that Waller's fate should provide a warning to other parliamentary commanders, who should 'Take heed ... how your wives fall to

¹³¹ E.8[20], *Mercurius Aulicus* (17 August 1644), p. 1126.

¹³² Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, esp. p. 107; G. Walker, 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England', pp. 235-245; and F Dabhoiwala, 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', pp. 201-213; both in *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996).

¹³³ Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, p. 86.

¹³⁴ A. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 93.

¹³⁵ Wing / 1148:44, J. Cleveland, *The character of a London diurnall* (NPP, 1644), p. 4.

preaching', thus implying that it was Waller's failure to control his wife's behaviour which had, in turn, damaged his reputation.¹³⁶

According to *Aulicus*, Lady Waller did not stop at preaching, for in early September the newsbook claimed that she had accompanied her husband to the siege of Basing House. What was more, the editors reported, 'such was the Souldiers longing desire to see his Wonderfull Lady (or rather to heare Her) ... that many of the Rebels for her Ladyships sake ranne out of their Trenches'. *Aulicus* went on to highlight the dangerous consequences if a woman became involved in matters of war, for it reported how the royalist garrison observed both Lady Waller's arrival 'and the Carelessnesse of those that were left' and taking advantage of this, they 'sallyed on them'. *Aulicus* continued in its habitually mocking tone, by stating that '[t]his action some may thinke uncivill, to disturbe a Lady before her Text was taken; and to say truth, it was a *Use* of such *Terroure* to her *Ladyship*, that she and her husband with their little Congregation, tooke their leave of *Basing*'.¹³⁷ *Aulicus*' description that Lady Waller was given 'a *Use* of such *Terroure*' by the royalist garrison was surely designed to place the royalists in the dominant male sexual position, thereby emphasising that control needed to be reasserted over disorderly women like Lady Waller. Such an account was designed to demonstrate that the royalists were capable of this task, whereas her husband had failed.

By Sunday 7 September news of the Earl of Essex's defeat at Lostwithiel had reached London and *Aulicus* declared that 'it was agreed by most that her Ladiship [sic] was the cause of' Waller's failure to come to the Lord General's aid.¹³⁸ That such a viewpoint was circulating in London can be seen in the reports of the Venetian Ambassador, who noted how Waller's soldiers were 'indignant at marching under the command of his wife, who being zealous in religion, [had] grown ambitious of the popular favour and predominant over her husband, [and] has usurped the general's baton'.¹³⁹ While both Adair and Donagan have noted that the Venetian Ambassadors who served during the civil war tended to be sympathetic to the royalist cause, it is intriguing that such a negative view of Lady Waller is included within the Venetian reports. It suggests either that *Aulicus*' image of Lady Waller had been successfully disseminated and internalised, or else that there was some truth in *Aulicus*' portrayal of Waller's wife and the discredit her actions

¹³⁶ E.10[19], *Mercurius Aulicus* (31 August 1644), pp. 1139, 1142.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1147.

¹³⁸ E.12[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (14 September 1644), p. 1155.

¹³⁹ *CSP Ven.*, vol. 27: 1643-1647 (1926), p. 150.

had brought to her husband. Indeed as one edition of *Aulicus* concluded, ‘Tis certaine the *Conquerour* hath beene vanquish’d by his Lady’. This particular edition even claimed that, as well as being largely responsible for his downfall, Lady Waller had also been ‘a maine cause and encourager of her husbands Rebellion’ in the first place.¹⁴⁰

To further highlight Sir William’s lack of patriarchal control over his wife, *Aulicus* portrayed Lady Waller as sexually assertive; thereby drawing upon the pre-existing notion of the hypocritical puritan examined in chapter four, who, it was claimed, used their religion as a cloak to hide their own private debauchery. To connect these two ideas, *Aulicus* related an intimate account of how Waller’s ‘religious *Spouse*’ had come ‘lately to her Knight, call’d him hastily to her, cast aside all her noting-fooles, and (with her armes upon his conquering shoulders) said aloud, O thou Man of God come kisse me!’. *Aulicus* continued by asking Ann Waller if she would ‘pardon’ the newsbook for reproducing this exchange between husband and wife, for, *Aulicus* claimed, such scandalous language was ‘onely Repition’ of what the Lady had said herself. In this way *Aulicus* demonstrated that if such words demonstrated Ann’s improper sexual appetite and dominance over her husband, then she had no one to blame but herself. To further emphasise the difference between Ann’s self-professed godliness and the character which her forward actions suggested, *Aulicus* commented that ‘such expressions will spoile her new plot for a Reformed Nunnery; where none must be admitted, but First, Such as are married; Secondly, Such as can preach: Thirdly, Such whose husbands have beene exceeding well beaten’.¹⁴¹ The last line reaffirms the idea that *Aulicus* was connecting Ann’s assertive behaviour with her husband’s waning military fortunes. In a later edition, *Aulicus* went a stage further by suggesting that Waller’s unmanliness had led him to be cuckolded by his wife. To this end *Aulicus* commented that it was ‘questioned whether the *Conquerours* owne Lady begin not to distast him, for this last week She was wondrous earnest, for Master *Henry Martin* to be Governour of *Reading*’.¹⁴² *Aulicus* was insinuating that Lady Waller’s ‘earnest’ interest in Martin was inappropriate for a married woman, particularly as Martin had a notorious reputation for licentious living.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ E.12[18], *Mercurius Aulicus* (14 September 1644), p. 1155.

¹⁴¹ E.7[10], *Mercurius Aulicus* (3 August 1644), p. 1110.

¹⁴² E.9[5], *Mercurius Aulicus* (24 August 1644), pp. 1127, 1134.

¹⁴³ J. H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941), p. 125-6; A. Hughes, ‘Gender and Politics in Leveller Literature’ in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 175; and S. Barber, ‘Henry Marten’ in *DNB*.

If *Aulicus* sought to damage Sir William Waller's honour beyond repair, it is clear that the newsbook was unsuccessful, for on 15 January 1645 the House of Commons voted him commander-in-chief of a force of 6000 horse and dragoons that was intended for service in the west: a clear statement that Parliament still had faith in Waller's abilities as a commander for its men. Yet it was not until the beginning of March 1645 that Waller's army set out to conquer its objective, and Donagan notes that Waller 'was still beset by mutinous and disorderly troops and a shortage of money'.¹⁴⁴ It would appear that this was a matter that had not gone unnoticed in the royalist camp, for in March and April, as Waller's army marched once more into the west, *Aulicus* repeatedly disparaged him for his martial weakness. For instance, in May the newsbook remarked that, '(since he went over *Cropready* Bridge) he hath beene daily beaten to peeces, (notwithstanding frequent Recruits) and not able to expresse any thing but Passive Valour'.¹⁴⁵ The term 'Passive Valour' is intriguing and might suggest that the royalists recognised that Waller's weakness was largely due to a lack of resources, rather than his own inherent cowardice. But equally this phrase could also be read as another reference to Waller's supposedly passive role within his own household, which would, in turn, call his abilities as a commander into question. The newsbook went on to claim that Waller's weakness and desperation led him to press for any advantage, even if this meant behaving in a deceitful and therefore, dishonourable manner. Thus the newsbook related from Somerset that Sir William Waller had sent a trumpet to Lord Goring '(pretending exchange of prisoners) but indeed to gaine intelligence that (if possible) he might doe somewhat to revive his drooping followers'. Similarly, in a later line *Aulicus* reported that 'the *Conquerors* Commission [had] quite expired', the newsbook remarked that 'tis strange (if duly thought on) he would keepe it so long; for either the *Members* have used him fraudulently, or he them, in the businesse of money; [because] ... so little came to his souldiers'.¹⁴⁶ In these months, *Aulicus* made little reference to Lady Ann Waller, maybe because Waller was no longer in London under her influence, however it would seem that the editors could not resist the occasional snide comment, for instance, when mention was made of Cropredy Bridge, the editors added that this was 'a place which the Lady Waller hath often preacht against'.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Donagan, 'Sir William Waller' in *DNB*.

¹⁴⁵ E.286[17], *Mercurius Aulicus* (4-11 May 1645), pp. 1582-3.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 1582-3.

¹⁴⁷ E.279[8], *Mercurius Aulicus* (6-13 April 1645), p. 1538.

By late spring the royalists' own difficulties in gathering and printing intelligence,¹⁴⁸ meant that the implications of the Self Denying Ordinance for Waller were not commented upon until the beginning of May when the newsbook reported that, Waller 'hath now at last *Conquer'd* himselfe, and given up his Commission'.¹⁴⁹ By phrasing the news in this way *Aulicus* was, once again, mockingly referring to Waller's unofficial public title of 'William the Conqueror'. Yet, it also reinforced the theme that runs throughout royalist propaganda, that as soon as the Parliament's male supporters regained their manly wits, they would see the folly of their rebellious actions. By claiming that Waller had conquered himself, the newsbook was alluding to the idea that Waller's rational mind had conquered his passions, thereby allowing him to see the error of his ways. Waller's resignation of his commission meant that little more was said of either Sir William Waller or his wife in later editions of the newsbook until it fell silent in September 1645. Waller returned to London and continued to sit on the Committee of Both Kingdoms, but his active and highly public role in the army was over.¹⁵⁰

Part 2.5 – Conclusion

In the opening months of the war, Waller's military successes and activity for the Parliamentary cause appear to have won him a somewhat grudging respect that was occasionally betrayed in *Mercurius Aulicus*. But *Aulicus*' editors swiftly realised that they needed to counter Waller's growing reputation as 'William the Conqueror'. Initially they tried to portray Waller as dishonourable and treacherous. To portray one's opponent in this way at a time when male honour was fiercely contested and considered central to a man's good name, was surely designed to rob Waller of respect and also undermined his claim to be a gentleman. Yet Waller's defeats at Ripple Field in April 1643 and at Roundway Down in July of the same year enabled *Aulicus*' editors to pounce. Not only did this defeat give the newsbook the chance to attack his martial reputation, but his return to London, coupled with his links with the pro-war Independents in the summer of 1643, made Waller even more of a prime target. That *Aulicus* turned to undermine Waller's manliness by claiming that he had failed to control his unruly wife was hardly surprising. As chapter four shows, this tactic was commonly used in royalist propaganda and it was a highly damaging claim to make, for it drew on the pre-existing belief that if a man failed to keep order in his

¹⁴⁸ *Aulicus* admits as much, see for instance: E.288[48], *Mercurius Aulicus* (25 May-8 June 1645), p. 1603.

¹⁴⁹ E.286[17], *Mercurius Aulicus* (4-11 May 1645), p. 1582.

¹⁵⁰ Adair, *Roundhead General*, p. 238.

household, he would be unfit to wield authority in the commonwealth. To this end, over the summer and autumn of 1644 *Aulicus* took great pains to show how Ann Waller's increasing involvement in the war was very much connected to Waller's waning military fortune. *Aulicus* may have been drawing upon fact when it described Ann Waller as a preacher; but even if the newsbook's claims were entirely fictional, the mere suggestion that the wife of one of Parliament's chief commanders should behave in such a wildly inappropriate way, demonstrated, in royalist eyes, the disorder that had quickly followed the Parliament's challenge to monarchical authority. As the king was the head of the patriarchal order, on which the social hierarchy was based, Parliament's challenge to his authority had brought the entire patriarchal social order into question within the parliamentary quarters. The savage nature of the attacks that were made against William Waller from the summer of 1643 onwards, are in direct contrast with the more subtle allusions that were made by the royalists to Essex's unmanliness. It would seem that while Essex's high rank and popularity protected him from the pens of the majority of royalist writers, the Wallers were not so favoured, perhaps because of the threat which Waller was perceived to be at the start of the war or perhaps because there was some grain of truth in depictions of Lady Ann Waller as a termagant.

Conclusion

Over the preceding chapters it has been argued that gendered discourse was used in a multitude of ways to contribute to both Charles I's and Parliament's war efforts. The conclusion to this thesis will begin by briefly summarising the reasons why gendered language was used by the royalist and parliamentary pamphleteers and the ways in which gendered language was put to use in the wartime tracts. Second, the chapter will explore how the gendered themes found within the wartime tracts can shed light upon the operation of patriarchy during a period when political authority was being contested between two male groups. Third, it will consider what the study of gendered language can tell us about parliamentary and royalist approaches to writing polemical literature. Fourth, the chapter will briefly explore how gendered themes were utilised and developed in the turbulent years of the later 1640s. Finally the chapter will end by identifying other related areas where further research might well be fruitful.

Throughout this dissertation it has become apparent that John Nalson's dismissive claim that the wartime pamphleteers had an 'Excellent Talent' for 'slandering' was largely accurate.¹ Yet such a claim does not mean that the tracts should be undervalued or overlooked simply because of their fallacies, their frequently satirical tone or their crude imagery. Throughout this dissertation I have shown that such insults and slander had definite political undertones and implications that stemmed from the pre-existing practice of using the analogy of the household and the relationships between husband and wife to describe the social organisation of the commonwealth and the broader relationships between men and women. As David Underdown has noted, 'political debate was often conducted in language that made plentiful use of gendered metaphors' because of the contemporary belief that an ordered household was the basis for an ordered state.² Susan Amussen has argued along similar lines that patriarchal political theory 'ensured that events within the family were never without social significance'.³ Indeed, Martin Ingram, Elizabeth Foyster and Helen Pierce have recounted instances long before the outbreak of

¹ Wing / N106, J. Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year 1639 to the Murder of King Charles I* (London: 1682-3), vol. II, p. 806-7.

² D. Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 15-18. See also S. D. Amussen and M.A. Kishlansky, 'Introduction' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, pp. 3, 10-11.

³ S. Amussen, 'Gender, Family and the Social Order, 1560-1725' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 203.

Civil War, where a man's social or political position was undermined by accusations that he was unmanly or had disregarded his patriarchal responsibilities in some way.⁴ Equally, Laura Gowing has demonstrated how the gender order was reinforced through the language of sexual insult – a language which the wartime pamphleteers plainly drew upon.⁵ Diane Purkiss and Michelle White have argued, along very similar lines, that one of the reasons why Henrietta Maria's behaviour was commented upon by the parliamentary pamphleteers at such length during the Civil War was because it was perceived to undermine the manliness and patriarchal authority of Charles I within his own household, which in turn had implications for his ability to rule the country.⁶

This dissertation has demonstrated that gendered language can be found throughout the printed polemical literature produced by both sides and that it was used on a wider scale to attack entire armies, as well as other figures of authority, like the Earl of Essex and Prince Rupert. Ultimately, through their use of gendered language, both royalist and parliamentary pamphleteers aimed to demonstrate that their opponents were unable or unwilling to perform their parts as men by upholding the patriarchal social order. In turn, this failure would have suggested their unsuitability to hold a position of wider responsibility within the commonwealth. It therefore delegitimized their opponents' claim to political power by drawing on a set of cultural assumptions that everyone would have understood. Just as it fell to the village community to reassert patriarchal order over an unmanly husband and his dominant wife, so each political party claimed that it was the duty of the men of the nation to fight for their particular cause against an enemy who threatened the social order with their anti-patriarchal behaviour. Gender was a fundamental way in which identity was constructed; gendered discourse therefore traversed boundaries of social status, religion and even politics. That both elite and common writers made use of gendered language illustrates this point, as does the fact that gendered language can be found within a variety of printed formats to ensure the message was accessible to the educated reader as well as the semi-literate or illiterate. Finally, the fact that the writers of

⁴ M. Ingram, 'Ridings, Rough Music and Mocking Rhymes in Early Modern England', *P&P* 105: 1 (November 1984), pp. 91-93; E. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999), p. 116; and H. Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 78, 88, 91-93.

⁵ L. Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), *passim*.

⁶ D. Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 72-73; and M. A. White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 166-169.

both political sides considered noticeably similar traits to be inherent to manhood and that both sides aimed to create a stereotype of their opponents that highlighted their allegedly anti-patriarchal and, therefore, unmanly behaviour, further illustrates the universality of beliefs about gender and its relation to the patriarchal social structure.

As this dissertation has shown, to support the argument that their opponents were unfit for patriarchal power and, therefore, political authority, the pamphleteers of both sides made reference to the gender framework in two ways. First, the pamphleteers took every opportunity to emphasise the appropriate patriarchal behaviour of their own male supporters, and second, they adopted certain deep-seated cultural stereotypes in order to highlight their opponents' supposed patriarchal failings. As we have seen the pamphleteers of both sides constructed manhood by describing their soldiers' actions in loaded terms. In doing so, the pamphleteers helped to reinforce the notion that certain traits, like bravery or self-discipline, were essential to manhood, when, in reality, they were central to a construction of manhood that was designed to justify and underpin the patriarchal social order. This meant that a man's failure to uphold the patriarchal social order automatically called his manhood into question and with it the social status that his gender afforded him. It was therefore in every man's interest to uphold these patriarchal views of manhood as the majority of men – including the male pamphleteers – benefitted from the patriarchal dividend, that is, power over women.⁷

Yet, while the underlying message of the pamphlets often reinforced patriarchal manhood, this might not always have been the pamphleteers' conscious aim. Instead, the inclusion of subtle gendered descriptions of the conflict – for instance, that a particular group of men had fought 'manfully' – suggests the ubiquity of gender beliefs. The pamphleteers were just as much a product of the patriarchal social order as their readers were, just as they were a part of the system of gender values that they were helping to perpetuate through their writings. As Underdown has noted, the pamphleteer John Crouch was 'using a vocabulary ... that came naturally to him and to the plebeian public he was addressing'.⁸ Thus the pamphleteers' subtle allusions to the gender framework might tell us as much about the intrinsic nature of that framework, and the pamphleteers place within it – as about their own conscious decisions to use gendered language for political ends.

⁷ R. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001 edition), p. 79.

⁸ Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, p. 109.

Instead, at times the pamphleteers might have been expressing genuine concern that the patriarchal social order was under threat from their anti-patriarchal opponents.

There are, then, striking similarities between the ways in which the pamphleteers of both sides constructed manhood. The kinds of qualities which both sides aimed to foster within their soldiery were also very similar and were designed to show their male supporters that they were expected to uphold the patriarchal social order. As Barbara Donagan has noted in her work on codes of conduct during the conflict, this is not particularly surprising, as both sides were drawn from the same culture and shared the same laws, king and country, and one could add, the same beliefs about gender norms and their intrinsic importance to the social order.⁹ In particular, both sides seemed especially concerned with educating their male supporters as to the behaviour that was expected of them in the opening months of the war and it would seem highly likely that this attitude can be explained by the unique circumstances of the Civil War. The majority of men would have had little experience of conflict: they might have read literature from the continental wars, seen the soldier's life portrayed on the stage or attended county militia drills.¹⁰ But, even if an individual had previous military experience, on neither side did the recruits have experience of fighting their fellow countrymen. Therefore in the early months of the conflict the rules of war were carefully laid down by the writers of each side in order to ensure that English society did not descend into barbarism and chaos.¹¹ The pamphleteers encouraged their men to adhere to civil codes of behaviour and use their reason to 'conquer the bestial' in order to 'present an image that was mannered and ordered'.¹² Such a discourse overlapped with the notions of patriarchal manhood that were being promoted by the pamphleteers, which emphasised – amongst other things – a man's ability to self-regulate his own passions and behaviour. The pamphleteers also demonstrated how their soldiery upheld the rules of war and standards of Christian morality in order to assert the godly and just nature of their cause. In doing so, they justified their actions in taking up arms against their fellow countrymen, but simultaneously these codes ensured that the war

⁹ B. Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', *P&P* 18 (February 1988), p. 65.

¹⁰ B. Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 33-59, 139, 145, 259.

¹¹ Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp 65-96; and Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 25-32, 73, 127.

¹² Foyster, *Manhood*, p. 36.

was fought on terms which upheld the existing social order and also facilitated reconciliation after the war was over.¹³

As well as similarities, there are also intriguing differences in the ways in which the parliamentarians and royalists used gendered language. At times, the parliamentarians constructed manhood much more overtly than their opponents. When enthusiasm for the parliamentary cause appeared to be waning, for example, the Roundhead pamphleteers openly addressed the parliamentary soldiery in order to remind them that it was incumbent upon them, as true Englishmen, to uphold the patriarchal social order. In contrast, the royalist propagandists do not appear to have felt the need to repeatedly and openly state that it was their soldiers' *duty as men* to fight for their political cause. What the royalist propagandists did repeatedly emphasise was that, as the king was the head of the patriarchal social order, it was '[o]nly the restoration of royal authority [that] could lead to a restoration of order'.¹⁴ Implicit in royalist propaganda, then, was the idea that to fight for the king was to uphold the social and gender orders, thereby automatically demonstrating one's patriarchal manhood. In contrast, the parliamentary pamphleteers clearly felt the need to justify their challenge to the king's authority and one of the ways in which they did this was to claim that the royalists threatened the patriarchal social order through their disorderly behaviour. In parliamentary eyes, control needed to be asserted over such disorderly men to ensure the stability of the patriarchal social structure, even if this meant challenging the authority of the king.

The second way in which the pamphleteers made use of gendered language was by drawing upon pre-existing cultural stereotypes that highlighted how their enemies were unfit for patriarchal power. Yet, because each side adopted and utilised different stereotypes, their different approaches provide historians with a window into how each side viewed their own cause and the actions of their opponents. As we have seen, while the parliamentarians exploited the existing images of the all-consuming mercenary soldier and the effeminate courtier, the royalist writers drew upon the stereotypes of the hypocritical puritan and the cuckold.¹⁵ Such descriptions worked on a number of levels: the portrayal

¹³ Donagan, *War in England*, pp. 137-133.

¹⁴ J. Morrill and J. Walter, 'Order and Disorder in the English Revolution' in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 318.

¹⁵ W. Lamont and S. Oldfield, *Politics, Religion and Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Aldine Press, 1975), pp. 63-75, 77-80; D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 107-113, 142; Donagan, 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', pp. 72-3; L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p.

of their opponents as either effeminate fops, or cowardly cuckolds, were designed to allay the fears of the soldiers because such unmanly men, it was claimed, were hardly expected to be effective soldiers. Yet, the more menacing stereotypes of the mercenary soldier, or the lustful puritan, were designed to show the terrible consequences should the men of each side fail to take up arms to defend their dependents and the social order. The detailed analysis of the way in which certain key figures on both sides were treated that was undertaken in chapters three and five has further demonstrated the sophistication of the pamphleteers, demonstrating the ways in which specific gendered themes were deployed at particular moments in order to ensure that the polemical attack would be as damaging as possible to their enemy's cause.

The pamphleteers' use of gendered language therefore allows us to explore the workings of mid-seventeenth-century patriarchy, as each side attempted to legitimise their own claim to patriarchal power by referring to and utilising the gender framework while simultaneously undermining their opponents' claim to patriarchal authority. Diane Purkiss has gone so far as to argue that the conflict 'made the nature and legitimisation of masculine power a principle political issue'.¹⁶ But, as both sides sought to legitimate their own actions through patriarchal discourse, it would seem that Purkiss's claim needs some refining. While it is fair to say that the 'legitimation' of 'masculine power' was not questioned within the pamphlet literature, there is some evidence to suggest that, the 'nature' of 'masculine power' did become a political issue. As Amussen has noted, during the turbulent years of the mid-seventeenth century, 'the criteria for determining status, [and] the conception of the moral superiority of the wealthy and inferiority of the poor were all called into question'.¹⁷ Yet, because of the interconnected nature of the social and gender orders one of the ways in which the parliamentarians supported their challenge of the social order was by articulating it in gendered terms. This can be seen in the parliamentary pamphlets of the 1640s, where those aspects of aristocratic manhood which demonstrated a man's good birth and elite status were repeatedly labelled as unmanly in

118; D. Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity' in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), p. 225; Foyster, *Manhood*, pp. 4-7, 39, 67, 106-116; and Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, p. 94.

¹⁶ Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, p. 234; see also M. E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 304-305.

¹⁷ Amussen, 'Gender, Family and the Social Order', p. 216.

order to undermine the social position of the king's aristocratic supporters.¹⁸ As one contemporary remarked, the royalists were men who 'take more care to *Crispe* their own perewigs, then to make the Church Glorious'.¹⁹ Indeed, while speaking more specifically of Charles I, Purkiss herself asserts that many of the aspects of the king's image that were derided as effeminate were those which had been originally designed to demonstrate his 'elevated social class'.²⁰

Purkiss claims that in opposition to this effeminate, aristocratic definition of manhood, the parliamentarians constructed 'a new image of a masculine commonwealth' which was 'grounded in the masculinity of the head of the household'.²¹ While there is certainly evidence that the parliamentary pamphleteers appealed to their soldiers by reminding them of their patriarchal duties to defend their households and uphold the social order, Purkiss has surely overstated the extent to which this was a 'new image'. We should note that the king made very similar claims and appeals to his own supporters. Moreover, the negative view of the effeminate, opulent courtier was by no means a parliamentary construct; indeed, it was a perception which had been very widespread in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²² That the king tolerated dissolute, aristocratic commanders, like George Goring, does not mean that the royalists regarded dissolute behaviour as a desirable quality for men to display in order to be considered worthy of patriarchal power, rather it says more about the importance that the king placed on the social hierarchy. In royalist eyes, a man's elite social status could negate his patriarchal failings at least to some extent, whereas, in the eyes of parliamentary pamphleteers, this does not appear to have been so. This difference in attitudes can surely be explained by the unique circumstances of the Civil War – for, as we have seen, while the royalist pamphleteers could draw upon the social hierarchy as well as the gender framework in order to encourage support for the king, the parliamentarians had to rely on other discourses in order to legitimise their challenge to the monarch's authority. This dissertation has focussed on the parliamentary pamphleteers' use of the gender framework for their political ends, but it has also shown how they made use of fears of

¹⁸ Lamont and Oldfield, *Politics, Religion and Literature*, pp. 82-3.

¹⁹ E.4[24], *The Cavaliers Bible, or a squadron of XXXVI* (NPP: 7 August* 1644), unpaginated.

²⁰ Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, p. 108.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

²² S. D. Amussen, 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Culture Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England' in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics*, p. 215; Purkiss, 'Dismembering and Remembering', p. 226; Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, p. 37; and Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, pp. 77-98, 137-38, 141-147.

Catholicism or notions of civility in order to further denigrate the king's cause or the royalist army.

Perhaps it is not too surprising to find that patriarchy was constantly upheld in the pamphlet literature of the early 1640s given the polemical messages which the tracts contained and the role which they frequently played in drumming up support for their respective causes. But as well as using printed tracts to support her argument that the legitimization of 'masculine power' was questioned during the conflict, Purkiss also makes use of personal letters and private memoirs, which were published either after the Civil War or posthumously. These private documents paint a more compelling picture of how individual men found their male identities tested by the horrors of the conflict.²³ Unlike the soldiers who faced the dangers of the battlefield, the pamphleteers were frequently analysing the events of the conflict from a relatively safe and detached position. The pamphleteers could easily write about the importance of courage in the face of death, but men who witnessed the horrifying effects of canon shot or heard the 'lamentable screeches' of their wounded comrades must have felt emotions, like fear, which were in tension with patriarchal manhood constructs.²⁴ Equally, given the public nature of the pamphlets perhaps the authors felt the pressure to conform to social norms regarding gender definitions, particularly at a time when many contemporaries were afraid that the war would cause the entire social fabric to unravel.²⁵

The need for historians to explore both the patriarchal definitions of gender, as expressed in printed works like conduct literature, and the 'expectations of manhood and womanhood' that were 'commonly held' by ordinary people, has been noted by Alexandra Shepard. Shepard's main concern is that, because the 'prescriptive literature of this period was largely written by and for a comparatively elite group of men', it was most concerned with ensuring that 'the terms of manhood ... coincided with the patriarchal agenda for an ordered society'.²⁶ Shepard therefore argues that 'it would be a mistake to collude with the

²³ Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, pp. 32-41.

²⁴ Wing / 1877:11, R. Atkyns, *The Vindication of Richard Atkyns Esquire* (London: 1669), pp. 32-33.

²⁵ J. Walter, 'The Impact on Society: A World Turned Upside Down?' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 104-122; and J. Barry, 'Literacy and Literature in Popular Culture: Reading and Writing in Historical Perspective', in T. Harris (ed.) *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850* (London: MacMillan Press, 1995), pp. 72-73.

²⁶ A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 8-10. See also, A. Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 116; Amussen, 'Gender, Family and the Social Order', p. 201 and J. Eales, *Women in Early Modern England 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press Ltd., 1998), pp. 25, 28-9.

evaluative framework of those in authority by assuming that all men measured their status in this way, and that manhood could only be achieved on these [patriarchal] terms'.²⁷ Shepard is right to call for historians to consult a wider range of sources in order to further explore how ordinary men and women constructed and asserted their own gender identities. The pamphlet literature of the Civil War is a rich source for such a study, for the conflict created a climate in which people of diverse opinions and social backgrounds could have their work printed.²⁸ It seems very probable, then, that the gender values that were alluded to by the London pamphleteers of the 1640s – and possibly by some provincial writers – provide historians with a wider and less consciously expressed view of contemporary gender beliefs than that which can be inferred from conduct literature alone. As we have seen, the wartime pamphlets often had a didactic message which supported patriarchy, or they frequently exploited values and cultural allusions that were infused with patriarchal significance. As Shepard herself notes, there is evidence that men of lower social standings did adhere to patriarchal meanings of manhood, largely because it was in their interest to uphold patriarchy because of the power it gave them over their own wives and dependents.²⁹ In addition to the printed sources that have been analysed for the present thesis, a study of how men and women asserted their gender identities in their daily lives would, no doubt, further our understanding of gender and patriarchy within the troubled 1640s. Unfortunately, such a study is beyond the scope of the present work.

As well as providing a deeper exploration of the workings of patriarchy, the exploration of the wartime pamphleteers' use of gendered language has supplied further evidence of how each side harnessed the power of the printing press for their own political cause. The research that has been undertaken for this dissertation has supported Joad Raymond and Helen Pierce's assertions that, during the conflict the parliamentary pamphleteers frequently adopted 'a [Martin] Marprelate-type wit'.³⁰ The Marprelate tracts were first printed in the late sixteenth century and were path-breaking in their use of satire

²⁷ A. Shepard, 'Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640', *P&P* 167 (May 2000), pp. 75-106, esp. 79, 106; see also M. E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 304-305.

²⁸ J. McElligott, 'The Politics of Sexual Libel: Royalist Propaganda in the 1640s', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004) p. 81; and J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 36-39, 53-54. For a discussion of the difficulties of identifying authors see, J. Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 168-171.

²⁹ Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, p. 6.

³⁰ Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, p. 139.

and plain language in order to criticise the church hierarchy and call for further religious reform.³¹ Pierce remarks that the renewed use of ‘acerbic wit and often coarse, carnivalesque or scatological humour’ during the 1640s, often seems at odds with the sombre, godly image of the zealous Protestant (or Puritan). This discrepancy has led Pierce to question whether ‘Parliament and the puritans [should] be considered as a synonymous force in this war’.³² The discrepancy between the godly self-image and the scatological, sexual humour that could be found within some parliamentary pamphlets surely points to the diversity within parliamentary ranks that would eventually lead to open divisions in the later 1640s. While the cruder images and messages in some pamphlets, such as those relating to Prince Rupert’s She-Monkey, clearly did appeal to a sufficient number of readers to encourage the printing of further material of a similar tone, there is also evidence that not all of Parliament’s supporters approved of the coarse approach of certain pamphleteers. In January 1643 for instance, Henry Parker – who had puritan leanings – argued that the king was at an ‘advantage’ because of the ‘multitude of writings’ that his authors produced. In contrast, Parker asserted that ‘those of the Parliaments side for the most part are ridiculous [, and] done by Sots ... to the disadvantage of the partie’.³³ We would do well to remember the diversity of religious, social and political outlooks that existed within the parliamentary ranks, and the fact that no single polemical writer could easily have appealed to all of these different constituencies.

The detailed study of royalist tracts that has been carried out in the present dissertation has challenged the assertions of scholars like P. W. Thomas and Joyce Malcolm that royalist propaganda was frequently elitist and therefore ineffective.³⁴ As Jason McElligott has argued for the royalist pamphleteers of the later 1640s, so I have shown that the royalist propagandists of the first Civil War made their political messages more accessible by using deep-seated beliefs about gender.³⁵ Equally, this thesis has demonstrated that the king’s penmen were more than capable of producing polemic that made use of pre-existing stereotypes, cultural allusions and literary forms in order to appeal to a far broader constituency than has been assumed in the past.

³¹ Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, pp. 27-32, 46, 204.

³² Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures*, pp. 139-140. See for instance, Oldfield and Lamont, *Politics, Religion and Literature*, pp. 100-102.

³³ E.87[5], H.Parker, *The contra-Replicant, His Complaint to his Maiestie* (London: 31 January* 1643), p. 3.

³⁴ P. W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 128, x; and J. L. Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), p. 124.

³⁵ McElligott, ‘The Politics of Sexual Libel’, pp. 80-1.

In order to further explore the impact of gendered polemical themes it will be necessary to consider how the tracts were read. While the general absence of marginalia within the surviving pamphlet literature has already been noted, at times, certain pamphleteers did assert how they *intended* their pamphlets to be read, ‘for the encouragement of the Souldiers of the Parliament’ for example, or as one writer stressed, no doubt ironically, ‘Reader, thou must not laugh here’.³⁶ But Despite the manifold difficulties, Jason Peacey has begun a study of the ways in which pamphlets were read, which has already yielded fascinating results.³⁷ Work with a gender focus would no doubt add further detail to this picture. It would be enlightening to know if different audiences read gendered insults in the same ways, for example. Did all contemporaries approve of such gendered attacks? Did officers and soldiers measure their own actions against the notions of patriarchal manhood that were implicitly and explicitly expressed in the wartime tracts? Or is there evidence to suggest that rival meanings of manhood were advocated during the civil war period? Clearly there are many fascinating questions that remain to be answered before we can fully understand not only the role that pamphleteering played in the English Civil Wars, but also the multiplicity of ways in which meanings of manhood were affected by the conflict. I hope that the present thesis has helped to sign-post the way ahead

³⁶ McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, pp. 37-9; J. Raymond, ‘Irrational, impractical and unprofitable: reading the news in seventeenth-century Britain’ in K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (eds.) *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 193; for a discussion of the methodological issues surrounding attempts to try to trace the poorer reader see Barry, ‘Literacy and Literature in Popular Culture’, pp. 69-94. For example see, E.114[25], *A True and Perfect Relation of the first and Victorious Skirmish between the army* (London: 27 August 1642), p. 6; and E.250[2], *The late covenant asserted* (NPP: 14 August* 1643), p. 15.

³⁷ J. Peacey, ‘Provincial News Junkies: the Circulation and Consumption of Civil War Pamphlets’, paper delivered at Early Modern Research Seminar, University of Reading (3 December 2008).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

i. Manuscripts:

British Library

Harleian MS 7003 (Collection of original letters from Queen Henrietta Maria to the Marquis of Newcastle, 1643-1658).

Egerton MS 2619 (Collection of original letters from Queen Henrietta Maria to Charles I, 1642-1645).

National Archives

State Papers Domestic, Charles I

SP 16/491 (Letters and Papers, December 1642- undated)

SP 16/497

SP 16/507

SP 16/503

SP 16/540

SP 16/492

SP 16/493

SP 46/80 (Letters and Papers, 1640-1643)

SP 46/190/94

SP 46/190/97

SP 46/190/102

Parliamentary Archives

HL/PO/JO/10/183 (The king's letters captured at the battle of Naseby)

Wadham College Library, Oxford

'Sir Wm. Waller's Remarks- Experiences', Wadham College MS.

ii. Printed Primary Sources:

'An Homily of the State of Matrimony', in *Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1802).

Ashton, John, *Humour, Wit, & Satire of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1883).

Calendar of State Papers Venetian, volume 27 (1643-1647).

Chappell, W. M. (ed.) *The Roxburghe Ballads* (Eight volumes, Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons, 1888).

Coates, W. H. (ed.) *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942).

W. Cobbett (ed.) *A Complete Collection of State Trials* (London: Hansard, 1809).

Fortescue, G. K. et al., *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661* (Two volumes, London: 1908), volume 1: 1640-1652.

Green, M. A. E. (ed.) *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (London: Richard Bentley, 1857).

Erskine-Hill, H., and Storey, G. (eds.) *Revolutionary prose of the English Civil War* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Keeble, N. H. (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, with a fragment of autobiography* (London: Everyman, 1995).

Journal of the House of Commons, volumes II-IV (1640-1646).

Journal of the House of Lords, volumes V-VIII (1642-1647).

Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society (London: Charles Whittingham, 1856-7), volume III.

Roberts, G. (ed.) *The Diary of Walter Yonge* (London: Camden Society, 41, 1848).

Rushworth J. (ed.) *Historical collections of private passages of state* (Eight volumes, London: 1721-22).

Waller, W., 'Recollections by General Sir William Waller' in H. Cowley (ed.) *The poetry of Anna Matilda* (London: 1788).

— *Vindication of the character and conduct of Sir William Waller* (London, 1793).

Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission

HMC, 1st report, *Manuscripts of the House of Lords*, appendix 1 (London: G. E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode, 1874)

HMC, 13th report, *The Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. I, appendix, part I (London: G. E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode, 1891).

iii. Newsbooks:

All printed in London unless otherwise stated.

A Continuation of Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages from Both Houses of Parliament.

A Diary, or, An Exact Journall Faithfully Communicating the Most Remarkable Proceedings in Both Houses of Parliament.

A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament.

An Exact and True Diurnall of the Proceedings in Parliament.

Certaine Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome.

England's Memorable Accidents.

Heads of Some Notes of the Citie Scout.

Perfect Occurrences of Parliament, and Chief Collections of Letters.

Perfect Passages of Each Dayes Proceedings in Parliament.

Mercurius Anti-Britanicus (Oxford?).

Mercurius Aulicus (Oxford).

Mercurius Britanicus.

Mercurius Civicus.

Mercurius Veridicus.

Some speciall passages from London, Westminster, Yorke Hull, Ireland and other partes.

Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places.

The Court Mercurie.

The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer.

The London Post.

The Moderate Intelligencer.

The Parliament Scout.

The Parliaments Post.

The Scottish Dove.

The True Informer.

The Weekly Account.

iv. Attributed Printed Pamphlets and Books:

Wing / 1877:11, Atkyns, R., *The Vindication of Richard Atkyns Esquire* (London: 1669).
E.304[3], Beech, W., *More sulphure for Basing: or, God will fearfully annoy and make quick riddance of his implacable enemies, surely, sorely, suddenly* (London: 6 October* 1645).

- E.336[15], Benbrigge, J., *Gods fury, Englands fire* (London: 8 May* 1646).
- E.346[13], Bond, S., *A sermon preached before the reverend Committee of divines* (London: 1646).
- E.297[16], *Ortus occidentalis: or, A dawning in the west* (London: 1645).
- E.2[22], Booker, J., *No Mercurius Aquaticus* (NPP: 19 July 1644).
- STC / 628:02, Braithwait, R., *The English Gentleman: containing sundry excellent rules, or exquisite observations* (London: 1630).
- E.1174[4], Buchanan, D.*, *A short and true relation of some main passages of things* (London: 14 September* 1645).
- E.302[13], Burton, H., *Vindiciae veritatis* (London: 22 September* 1645).
- E.360[1*], C. G., *An elegie upon the most lamented death of the Right Honourable and truly valiant, Robert Earle of Essex* (NPP: 1646?).
- E.354[1], Casaubon, M., *A discourse concerning Christ his incarnation, and exinanition [sic]* (London: 11 September* 1646).
- E.297[15], Case, T., *A sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster* (London: 22 August 1645).
- STC / 311:06, Castiglione, B., *The Courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilio* (London: 1561).
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* (Oxford: 1702-1703).
- Wing / 1148:44, Cleveland, J., *The character of a London diurnall* (NPP: 1644).
- E.358[7], Codrington, R., *The life and death, of the illustrious Robert Earle of Essex* (London: 20 October* 1646).
- STC (2nd ed.) / 6062, Crooke, H., *The Mikrokosmographia: A description of the Body of Man* (London: 1615).
- Wing / P16, D. P. P., *The six secondary causes of the spinning out of this unnaturall warre* (London: 1644).
- STC / 1790:06, Dod, J. and Clever, R., *A Godly Forme of Household Government: for the ordering of private families, according to the direction of God's Word* (London: 1612).
- E.140[5], Dogerell, O., *A brief dialogue between Zelotopit one of the daughters of a zealous Round-head, and Superstition a holy fryer* (London: 1642).
- Wing / 2482:16, Dugdale, W., *Short View of the Late Troubles in England* (Oxford: 1681).
- E.338[12], Edwards, T., *The second part of Gangraena* (London: 28 May* 1646).

- E.358[15], Evance, D., *Justa honoraria: or, Funeral rites in honor to the great memorial of my deceased master, the Right Honorable, Robert Earl of Essex* (London: 22 October* 1646?).
- E.69[15], Foster, H., *A true and exact relation of the marchings of the two regiments of the trained-bands of the city of London* (London: 2 October 1643).
- Wing / F2443, Fuller, T., *The Holy State* (Cambridge: 1642).
- E.128[33], G. H., *Abingtons and Alisburies present miseries* (London: 1 November 1642*).
- STC (2nd ed.) / 11667, Gataker, T., *Marriage Duties Briefely couched* (London: 1620).
- E.296[28], Gilbert, E., *The prelatical Cavalier catechized, and the Protestant souldier incouraged* (London: 16 August* 1645).
- E.302[27], Gibson, S., *The ruine of the authors and fomentors of civill warres* (London: 1645).
- STC (2nd ed.) / 12121, Gouge, W., *Of Domesticall Duties, Eight Treatises* (London: 1634).
- E.149[1], H. P., *Square-caps turned into round-heads: or The bishops vindication, and the Brownists conviction* (London: 1642).
- E.116[30], Hamblet*, J., *A Famous and Joyfull Victory Obtained by the Earl of Stamfords Forces neere Stratford in Northampton-shire* (NPP: 10 September 1642).
- E.303[17], Hammond, H.*, *Of sinnes of weaknesse, wilfulnesse* (Oxford*: 1645).
- Wing / H1321, Heath, J., *A Chronicle of the late intestine war in the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland* (London: 1676).
- E.75[5], Heylyn, P., *Lord have mercie upon us: or, A plaine discourse declaring that the plague of warre, which now wastes this nation, tooke its beginning in and from the Citie of London* (Oxford*: 4 November* 1643).
- E.338[11], Heyrick, R., *Queen Esthers resolves: or, A princely pattern of heaven-born resolution* (London: 1646).
- E.99[14], I. W., *The bloody prince, or A declaration of the most cruell practices of Prince Rupert* (London: 22 April* 1643).
- E.339[8], J. M., *The difference about church government ended* (London: 30 May 1646).
- E.103[13], J. P., *A spirituall snapsacke for the Parliament souldiers* (London: 24 May 1643).
- E.509[2], Lawrence, H., *Of our communion and warre with angels* (Amsterdam*: 8 May* 1646).
- E.336[14], Loyd, M., *The King found at Southwell* (London: 7 May* 1646).

- Wing / 1036:20, Marvell, A., *The rehearsal transpros'd, or, Animadversions upon a late book intituled, A preface, shewing what grounds there are of fears and jealousies of popery* (London: 1672).
- Wing / M1410, May, T., *The History of the Parliament of England* (London: 1647).
- STC (2nd ed.) / 17331, Markham, F., *The Booke of Honour* (London: 1625).
- 669.f.10[84], Mercer, W., *An elegie upon the death of the right honorable, most noble, worthily-renowned, and truly valiant lord, Robert, Earle of Essex* (London: 14 October* 1646).
- Wing / N106, Nalson, J., *An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion in the Year 1639 to the Murder of King Charles I* (Two volumes, London: 1682-3).
- Oldmixon, J., *The history of England, during the reigns of the Royal House of Stuart* (London: 1730).
- E.85[24], P. B., *A declaration against Prince Rupert* (London: 19 January* 1642 [1643]).
- E.87[5], Parker, H.*, *The contra-Replicant, His Complaint to his Maiestie* (London: 31 January* 1643).
- 669.f.10[88], Philipot, T., *Englands sorrow for the losse of their late generall* (London: 9 October* 1646).
- E.248[4], Prynne, W., *The fourth part of The soveraigne power of parliaments and kingdoms* (London: 28 August* 1643).
- E.251[9], *The Popish royall favourite* (London: 11 September* 1643).
- E.116[36], Quarles, F., *Observations Concerning Princes and States, Upon Peace and Warre* (London: 12 September* 1642).
- E.52[2], *The shepherds oracle* (Oxford*: 19 or 21 June* 1644).
- E.249[33], R. W., *The character of warre or the miseries thereof discected [sic] and laid open from scripture and experience* (London: 11 August* 1643).
- Wing / 925:03, Rogers, D., *Matrimoniall honour, or, The mutuall crowne and comfort of godly, loyall, and chaste marriage* (London: 1642).
- Rouse Bloxom, J. (ed.) *Memorial of Bishop Waynflete* (London: J. Russelk Smith, 1851)
- E.299[9], Ricraft, J., *A looking glasse for the Anabaptists and the rest of the separatists* (London: 4 September* 1645).

- E.299[1], Shute, J., *Judgement and mercy: or, The plague of frogges inflicted [and] removed* (London: 3 September* 1645).
- Wing / 369:06, Sprigg, J., *Anglia Rediviva* (London: 1647).
- STC / 1693:05, Smith, H., *A preparative to mariage* [sic] (London: 1591).
- 669.f.8[47], Starbuck, W., *A spirituall song of comfort* (London: 15 March* 1644).
- Wing / 551:05, Symmons, E., *A militarie sermon* (Oxford: 8 July 1644).
- E.245[33], T. B., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye* (London: 2 February* 1643).
- Wing / 2433:20, T. B., *Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dogge Called Boye* (London: 1643).
- E.135[33], T. J., *A medicine for the times, or, An antidote against faction* (NPP: 1641 [1642]).
- Wing / T429, T. J., *An apology for private preaching in which those formes are warranted or rather justified* (NPP: 28 June 1642).
- Wing / T467, T. J., *An honest answer to the late published apologie for private preaching* (NPP: 7 July 1642?).
- E.338[10], Taylor, F., *The danger of vowes neglected and the necessitie of reformation* (London: 27 May 1646).
- E.141[19], Taylor, J., *A full and compleat answer against the writer of a late volume set forth, entituled A tale in a tub, or, A tub lecture* (London: 1642).
- E.151[6], *Cornu-copia, or, Roome for a ram-head* (London: 1642).
- Wing / T444, *The conversion, confession, contrition, comming to himselfe, & advice, of a mis-led, ill-bred, rebellious round-head* (NPP: 1643).
- E.64[14], *Some small and simple reasons, delivered in a hollow-tree* (Oxford*: 10 August* 1643*).
- E.65[1], *A preter-pluperfect, spick and span new nocturnall or Mercuries weekly night-newes* (Oxford*: 11 August* 1643*).
- E.46[13], *Mad verse, sad verse, glad verse and bad verse* (Oxford*: 10 May* 1644).
- E.21[19], *John Taylor being yet unhangd, sends greeting, to John Booker* (NPP: 1644).
- E.29[11], *Mercurius Aquaticus, or, The water-poets answer to all that hath or shall be writ by Mercurius Britanicus* (Oxford*: 18 January* 1644).

— E.285[13], *Rebells anathematized, and anatomized* (Oxford: 25 May* 1645).

— E.300[15], *The generall complaint of the most oppressed, distressed commons of England* (Oxford*: 10 September* 1645?)

STC/ 1609:05, Tilney, E., *A Briefe and Pleasant Discourse of Duties in Marriage, Called the Flower of Friendship* (NPP: 1571).

E.337[12], Torshell, S., *The palace of justice* (London: 1646).

E.358[12], Twiss, T., *An elegy upon the unhappy losse of the noble Earle of Essex* (London: 22 October* 1646).

Wing / V313, Vicars, J., *Jehovah-Jireh* (London: 1644).

Wing / 1691:03, W. K., *The devils last legacy, or, A round-headed ironmonger made executor to Pluto* (London: 1642).

Wing (2nd ed., 1994) / W329A, Walker, C., *The History of Independency* (London: 1648).

STC / 1369:04, Whately, W., *A Bride-Bush* (London: 1623).

Wing / A3587A, White, R., *The Prentices resolution, or, Who have made a promise to spend their best blood for the glory of the King and the Parliaments good* (London: 1642-3?).

E.1242[1], Wither, G., *Vox pacifica* (London: 1 August* 1645).

Wing / 301:10, Wood, A., *Athenae Oxonienses* (Two volumes, London: 1692).

v. Anonymous Printed Pamphlets and Books (arranged chronologically):

STC / 1230:04, *The Office of Christian Parents* (Cambridge(?): 1616).

E.145[21], *A Collection of Severall Speeches, Messages, and Answers of the Kings Majestie, to both Houses of Parliament* (London: 1642).

669.f.3[32], *A Declaration of the House of Commons, Touching a Late Breach of their Priviledges* (London: 1642).

Wing / 66:15, *An Exact description of a Roundhead and a long-head shag-poll* (London: 1642).

E.181[31], *A True Relation of the Unparaleld Breach of Parliament, by his Majesty* (London: 1642).

E.151[22], *A witty answer, and vindication to a foolish pamphlet, intituled New orders new* (London: 1642?).

- E.138[11], *Grand Plutoes remonstrance, or, The Devill horn-mad at Roundheads and Brownists* (NPP: 1642).
- Wing / 1743:03, *Lawes and ordinances of warre* (London: 1642).
- E.131[16], *Matters of Note made known to all True Protestants* (London: 1642).
- E.150[27], *New orders new, agreed upon by a Parliament of Round-heads* (London: 1642).
- E.133[10], *Petitions against Bishops and their Votes in Parliament* (London: 1642).
- E.132[30], *The answer to the rattle-heads concerning their fictionate resolution of the Round-Heads* (London: 1642).
- Wing / B2979, *The Birth, life, death, will, and epitaph of Jack Puffe gentleman* (London: 1642).
- Wing / K23A, *The devils last legacy* (London: 1642).
- Wing / 1329:17, *The Distractions of our times* (London: 1642).
- Wing / A3587A, *The Prentices resolution* (London: 1642?).
- E.132[39], *The resolution of the Round-Heads* (London: 1642).
- Wing / S4858, *The speech of a cavaleere to his comrades, in answer to the wardens speech written by Agamemnon Shaglock Van Dammee* (London: 1642).
- Wing / 2663:06, *A just and true remonstrance of His Majesties mines-royall in the principality of Wales* (Shrewsbury: 1642).
- E.200[68], *Three speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (NPP: 1642).
- E.200[69], *Three Speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (NPP: 1642).
- 669.f.6[57], *Truths from Leicester and Notingham* (London: 1 August 1642).
- 669.f.6[59], *A Letter to the Kindome [sic] of England* (London: 3 August 1642).
- E.109[7], *A Description of the Round-head and rattle-head* (London: 4 August* 1642).
- E.109[2], *Exceeding welcome newes from Beverley. Or, York-shires love to London* (London: 4 August 1642).
- E.109[7], *A Description of the Round-head and rattle-head* (London: 5 August* 1642).
- E.109[21], *A New Discovey [sic] of a Designe of the French* (London: 6 August 1642).
- E.109[26], *His Majesties speech to the gentlemen of Yorkshire, on Thursday the fourth of August. 1642* (York and London: 8 August* 1642).
- E.109[31], *An Extract of letters, wherein is related, certaine remarkable passages from Yorke & Hull* (London: 9 August 1642).
- Wing / 1712:25, *By the King, a proclamation for the suppressing of the present rebellion, under the command of Robert Earle of Essex* (York: 9 August 1642).

- E.112[15], *Some speciall and considerable passages from London, Westminster, Portsmouth, Warwicke, Coventry, and other places* (London: 9-16 August 1642).
- E.111[7], *A relation of all the passages and proceedings in Somersetstire [sic], and Bristoll, with their valiant resolution to fight for the King and Parliament* (London: 10 August 1642).
- E.109[38], *Camp discipline, or, The souldiers duty* (London: 10 August 1642).
- E.110[6], *A true relation of the barbarous crueltie of divers of the bloody caveleers* (London: 11 August* 1642).
- E.110[17], *A petition from the Island of Silley, being in the west part of England* (London: 12 August 1642).
- E.112[7], *The Earle of Essex his desires to the Parliament* (London: 15 August 1642).
- E.112[12], *More Later and Truer Newes from Somersetshire, Boston, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire* (London: 16 August 1642).
- E.113[18], *Speciall Passages from divers parts of this Kingdome* (London: 16-23 August 1642).
- E.112[19], *The joyfulest newes from Hull that ever came to London* (London: 17 August 1642).
- E.112[33], *A true and exact relation of all the proceedings of Marquesse Hartford, Lord Pawlet, Lord Seymor, Lord Coventry, Sir Ralph Hopton, and other His Maiesties commissioners in the publishing of the commission of array in his Maiesties county of Somerset* (London: 19 August* 1642).
- E.112[35], *The Copy of a Letter Presented by a Member of the Commons House of Parliament* (London: 19 August 1642).
- E.113[7], *True intelligence from Lincolne-shire* (London: 22 August 1642).
- E.113[11], *A puritane set forth in his lively colours: or, K. James his description of a puritan* (London: 23 August 1642).
- E.114[4], *The Christian souldier. Or, Preparation for battaile* (London: 24 August* 1642).
- E.114[15], *Newes from the citie of Norwich* (London: 26 August 1642).
- E.114[14], *The resolution of the women of London to the Parliament* (NPP: 26 August* 1642).
- 669.f.6[68], *To the right honorable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament* (York and London: 26 August* 1642).

- E.114[28], *Annotations upon the late protestation: or, A true character of an affectionate minde to King and Parliament* (NPP: 27 August* 1642?).
- E.114[25], *A True and Perfect Relation of the first and Victorious Skirmish between the army* (London: 27 August 1642).
- E.112[22], *Two proclamations by the King* (York: 27 August* 1642).
- E.115[7], *A Perfect Diurnall of the Proceedings in Hartford-shire* (NPP: 1 September 1642).
- 669.f.6[75], *Remarkable passages from Nottingham, Lichfield, Leicester, and Cambridge* (London: 1 September 1642).
- E.115[20], *Mrs. Wardens observations upon her husbands reverend speech in the presence of certaine gentlewomen of Ratcliffe and Wapping* (NPP: 5(?) September* 1642).
- E.202[44], *Remarkable passages, or, A perfect diurnall of the weekly proceedings in both Houses of Parliament* (London: 5-12 September 1642).
- E.115[22], *An Abstract of some Letters sent from Dorchester, to some Friends in London* (London: 6 September* 1642).
- E.116[25], *A declaration of the noble resolution of the Earle of Essex his Excellence* (London: 9 September* 1642).
- E.116[21], *The taking of the castle of Portsmouth* (London: 9 September 1642).
- E.116[35], *Quotidian occurrences in and about London, and in other places of this kingdome of England* (London?: 12 September* 1642).
- E.240[4], *A paerfect [sic] diurnall of the proceedigns [sic] in Parliament* (London: 12-19 September 1642).
- E.117[4], *The newest and truest, and most unpartiall relation of all the late occurrence which hath happened at Sherbourne-Castle, and thereabouts* (NPP: 14 September 1642).
- E.117[12], *A most exact and true relation of the proceedings of His Majesties armie at Shelborne* (London: 15 September 1642).
- E.117[13], *Exceeding Joyfull Newes from His Excellence the Earle of Essex* (London: 15 September 1642).
- E.117[16], *Nocturnall Occurrences or, Deeds of Darknesse: Committed, by the Cavaleers in their Rendevous* (London: 16 September* 1642).
- E.118[4], *The Welchmans declaration* (NPP: 19 September* 1642).

- E.200[59], *Prince Robert his speech to the Earle of Essex the morning before hee marched forth with his forces* (London: 21 September 1642).
- E.118[16], *Several propositions propounded, by his Excellencie, the Earl of Essex, to the cavaleees [sic], neere Darby-shire* (NPP: 21 September 1642).
- E.200[60], *A learned speech spoken to His Excellency the Earl of Essex, upon his departure from Northampton to Worcester* (NPP: 27 September 1642).
- E.119[3], *A True Relation of His Majesties coming to the Town of Shrewsbury* (London: 29 September 1642).
- E.119[5], *The latest remarkable truths from Worcester, Chester etc.* (London: 29 September* 1642).
- E.115[18], *Exceeding good news from Nottingham, and Yorkeshire* (London: 30 September 1642).
- E.119[21], *A perfect and true relation of the great and bloudy skirmish, fought before the city of Worcester, upon Friday, Septemb. 23* (London: 3 October 1642).
- E.240[23], *The Latest remarkable truths, (not before printed) from Chester, Worcester, Devon, Somerset, Yorke and Lanchaster counties, as also from Scotland* (London: 4 October 1642).
- E.240[29], *The Lively Character of the Malignant Partie* (NPP: 7 October* 1642).
- E.240[31], *Three speeches, being such speeches as the like were never spoken in the city* (London: 9 October* 1642).
- E.122[22], *Sir James Cambels Clarks disaster, by making books* (London: 15 October* 1642).
- E.240[43], *The Debauched Cavalleer: or the English Midianite* (London: 18 October* 1642).
- E.123[19], *A Declaration of the Kings Resolution, to bring up his Armie to the Citie of London* (London: 20 October* 1642).
- E.123[25], *Anti-Cavalierisme, or, Truth Pleading as well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this Present War* (London: 21 October 1642).
- E.124[19], *His Majesties declaration and manifestation to all his souldiers, by himselfe declared in the head of his army at Southam, 10. miles on this side Coventry* (London: 21 October* 1642).
- E.124[4], *Exceeding Joyfull Newes from the Earl of Stamford, the Lord Wharton, and the Lord Kymbolton* (NPP: 22 October 1642?).

- E.124[16], *The Kings Resolution concerning his coming from Banbury to London* (London: 25 October 1642).
- E.124[33], *Speciall newes from the army at Warwicke since the fight* (London: 29 October 1642).
- E.200[67], *Three speeches made by the Kings most Excellent Majesty* (London: 31 October* 1642).
- 669.f.6[85], *A most true and succinct relation of the late battell neere Kineton in Warwickshire* (London: 3 November 1642).
- E.126[36], *A Wonderfull and Strange Miracle or Gods just Vengeance Against the Cavaliers* (London: 9 November 1642).
- E.127[2], *Horrible newes from Colebrooke, declaring the cruelty of prince Robert in plundering the said towne* (London: 11 November 1642).
- Wing / W1008, *A most worthy speech spoken by the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Warwicke in the head of his army* (London: 29 November 1642).
- E.94[6], *Cheshires successe since their pious and truly valiant collonell Sr. William Brereton barronet, came to their rescue* (NPP: 1643).
- Wing / 1210:25, *A new diurnall of passages more exactly drawne up then heretofore ordered to be printed and published* (Oxford: 1643).
- E.67[2], *A strange and terrible sight forseene in this kingdome, and city of London* (NPP: 1643).
- E.250[10], *Good newes from all quarters of the kingdome* (NPP: 1643).
- Wing / 2456:19, *His Majesties Declaration to all his loving subjects, after his victories over the Lord Fairfax in the north, and Sir William Waller in the West, and the taking of Bristoll by His Majesties forces* (Shrewsbury: 1643).
- Wing / 1769:07, *Oxford riddle* (Oxford: 1643).
- E.93[9], *The humerous tricks and conceits of Prince Roberts malignant she-monkey, discovered to the world before her marriage* (NPP: 1643?).
- E.244[35], *A moderate, and most proper reply to a declaration printed and published under His Majesties name* (London: 4 January* 1643).
- E.244[38], *A new plea for the Parliament* (London: 5 January* 1642* [1643?])
- E.84[18], *Peace, and no peace: or, a pleasant dialogue betweene Phil-eirenus, a protestant, a lover of peace. And Philo Polemus, a separatist, an incendiary of War* (NPP: 5 January* 1643).

- Wing / A4053, *The Association, agreement, and protestation of the counties of Cornwall, and Devon January 5, 1643* (Bristol: 5 January 1643).
- E.84[17], *The protestation and declaration of divers knights, esquires, gentlemen, and freeholders of the counties of Lincolne and Nottingham* (London: 5 January* 1643).
- E.84[23], *A true relation of a great victory obtained by the Right Honourable the Lord Willoughby of Parham* (London: 6 January* 1643).
- 669.f.6[103], *First, Great Britaines confession* (NPP: 7 January* 1643).
- E.245[1], *An answer to mis-led Doctor Fearne* (London*: 10 January* 1643).
- E.84[37], *The unfaithfulnesse of the cavaliers and commissioners of array in keeping their covenants* (London: 11 January 1643).
- E.245[5], *A complaint to the House of Commons* (Oxford: 12 January* 1642 [1643]).
- E.84[42], *Plaine English: or, A discourse concerning the accommodation, the Armie, the association* (NPP: 12 January* 1643).
- E.85[6], *The humble petition of divers of the knights, gentry, and other inhabitants of the county of Berkes* (London: 16 January* 1643).
- E.85[23], *Twenty Lookes over all the Round-heads that ever Lived in the World* (NPP: 19 January* 1643).
- E.85[31], *A speech delivered by the right honourable William Lord Marquesse Hartford, in the councill-chamber at Oxford* (London: 20 January 1642 [1643]).
- E.85[35], *Look About You* (London: 21 January 1643).
- E.245[15], *The Welsh-mans new almanack and prognostication for this present yeare* (London: 21 January* 1643).
- E.86[12], *A Letter sent by Mr. Henry Jarmin, now resident in Paris, to Mr. William Murrey, of His Majesties Bed-Chamber* (London: 26 January 1643).
- E.245[24], *The Malignants Conventicle: or, A Learned Speech spoken by M. Web, a Citizen, to the rest of his Society* (London: 28 January* 1643).
- E.86[31], *A letter without any superscription, intercepted in the way to London* (NPP: 28 January* 1643).
- E.86[26], *A true relation of a late victorie obtained by Sir Ralph Hopton* (Oxford: 28 January 1643).
- E.87[4], *An honest letter to a doubtfull friend* (NPP: 31 January* 1642 [1643]).
- E.87[9], *A Remonstrance of Londons Occurrences in a Brief, Real, and Ingenius Demonstration of all Particulars* (NPP: 31 January* 1643).

- E.87[11], *The character of a puritan* (NPP: 31 January* 1643).
- E.87[7], *The late famous victory obtained by Captaine Lanley a Scotshman January 29 with his troope of horse, against Colonell Aston with 3 troops* (London: 31 January* 1643).
- E.86[38], *The virgins complaint for the losse of their sweet-hearts, by these present wars* (London: 31 January 1642 [1643]).
- E.88[10], *A declaration and justification, of the Earle of Lindsey* (Oxford: 3 February* 1643).
- E.88[23], *The rider of the white horse and his army* (London: 8 February* 1643).
- E.90[22], *The master-piece of round-heads, or, An explanation and declaration of the right round-heads in deed* (NPP: 24 February* 1643).
- E.90[25], *An exact description of Prince Ruperts Malignant She-Monkey, a great Delinquent* (NPP: 25 February* 1643).
- E.92[13], *The Parliaments Unspotted-Bitch: In Answer to Prince Roberts Dog called Boy, and his Malignant She-Monkey* (London: 8 March* 1643).
- 669.f.6[117], *The sence of the House* (Oxford: 10 March* 1643).
- 669.f.8[2] *The publick faith* (NPP: 7 April* 1643).
- E.96[9], *A true relation of Prince Ruperts barbarous cruelty against the towne of Brumingham [sic]* (London: 12 April 1643).
- 669.f.8[5], *The city* (Oxford: 20 April* 1643).
- E.102[6], *The proceedings in the late treaty of peace* (London: 17 May* 1643).
- 669.f.8[9], *A vindication of Cheapside Crosse against the Roundheads* (Oxford: 24 May* 1643).
- E.63[14], *A weekly accompt of certain special and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament* (London: 27 July-3 August 1643).
- E.62[15] *The Cambridge royallist imprisoned* (NPP: 31 July* 1643).
- E.63[10], *A declaration of the proceedings of the honourable committee of the House of Commons at Merchant-Taylors Hall* (London: 3 August* 1643).
- E.63[9], *Englands Third Alarm to Warre* (London: 3 August* 1643).
- E.63[20], *The plotts revealed and the Parliament vindicated* (London: 3 August* 1643).
- E.1180[2], *The souldiers pocket* (London: 3 August* 1643).
- E.64[3], *The Earle of Essex his letter to Master Speaker, July 9, 1643* (Oxford: 4 August* 1643).

- E.63[17], *The inhumanity of the Kings prison-keeper at Oxford* (London: 4 August* 1643).
- E.63[20] *The plotts revealed and the Parliament vindicated* (London: 4 August* 1643).
- E.65[3], *An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament* (NPP: 11 August 1643).
- E.65[1], *A preter-pluperfect, spick and span new nocturnall, or Mercuries weekly night-newes* (Oxford: 11 August 1643*).
- E.64[12], *A relation made in the House of Commons* (London: 11 August* 1643).
- E.65[2], *The copie of a letter sent from Exeter, by a gentleman of quality, to a worthy friend of his dwelling in London* (London: 11 August* 1643).
- E.250[2], *The Late Covenant Asserted* (NPP: 14 August* 1643).
- E.65[12], *A Case of Conscience, Concerning Flying in Times of Trouble* (London: 16 August 1643).
- E.250[4], *Great Britains misery; with the causes and cure* (London: 21 August* 1643).
- 669.f.8[23], *Londons warning-peece* (York: 23 August* 1643).
- E.65[29], *Severall Letters of Great Importance, and Good Successe* (London: 23 August* 1643).
- E.65[32], *A letter from Mercurius Civicus to Mercurius Rusticus: or, Londons confession but not repentance* (Oxford: 25 August 1643*).
- E.70[10], *A true relation of the late expedition of His Excellency, Robert Earle of Essex, for the relief of Gloucester* (London: 26 August* 1643).
- E.250[6], *The Reformed Malignants. Or, a Discourse upon the Present State of our Affaires* (London: 4 September 1643).
- 669.f.8[24], *The kingdomes monster uncloaked from heaven* (NPP: 15 September 1643).
- 669.f.8[26], *A looking glasse for the soule* (London: 19 September 1643).
- E.1206[2], *The Power of Love* (London: 19 September* 1643).
- E.67[39], *Lancashires valley of Achor, is Englands doore of hope* (London: 23 September* 1643).
- E.69[9], *A most certain, strange, and true discovery of a witch* (NPP: 28 September* 1643).
- E.251[5], *Insignia civicas, or, the anti-royalists described in their kinds and colours* (NPP: 1 October* 1643).
- E.69[24], *The humble petition of the House of Commons* (NPP: 5 October 1643*).
- E.75[2], *A declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament* (London: 6 November 1643).

- Wing / 773:21, *The Loyall Convert* (Oxford: 1644).
- 669.f.10[5], *The two incomparable generalissimos of the world* (NPP: 1644?).
- E.47[1], *A Continuation of the True Narration of the Most Observable Passages In and About Plymouth* (London: 10 May 1644).
- 669.f.10[7], *Londons complaint and lamentation, Oxford should keep in subjugation sweet Charlemaine, our sovereigne King* (London*: 21 May* 1644).
- E.52[2], *The shepherds oracle* (Oxford*: 19 or 23 June* 1644).
- E.52[6], *Sampsons foxes agreed to fire a kingdom: or, The Jesuit, and the Puritan, met in a round, to put a kingdom out of square* (Oxford: 22 June* 1644).
- E.2[24], *Ruperts Sumpter and Private Cabinet Rifled* (London: 20 July* 1644).
- E.4[4], *The Catholikes petition to Prince Rupert* (NPP: 1 August 1644).
- E.7[26], *The razing of the record. Or, An order to forbid any thanksgiving for the Canterbury newes publisht by Richard Culmer* (Oxford: 3 August* 1644).
- E.4[24], *The Cavaliers Bible, or a squadron of XXXVI* (NPP: 7 August* 1644).
- E.4[25], *An Apologie and vindication (from all false and malignant aspersions) for his excellencie, the right honourable, and most noble, Robert D'Evreux, Earle of Essex* (London: 8 August* 1644).
- E.6[4], *A copie of a letter sent to the most illustrious and high borne Prince Rupert by the grace of God Count Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of Bavaria, &c.* (London: 12 August 1644).
- E.6[27], *A peece of ordnance invented by a Jesuite* (NPP: 20 August* 1644).
- E.7[1], *An Exact relation of the Bloody and Barbarous Massacre at Bolton* (London: 22 August 1644).
- E.7[9], *The Parliaments Kalender of Black Saints* (London: 24 August 1644).
- E.7[12], *Three great victories obtained against the Lord Ogleby and others of Prince Ruperts forces* (London: 27 August 1644).
- E.7[25], *A true relation of two great victories obtained of the enemy* (London: 30 August* 1644).
- E.7[30], *The great eclipse of the sun, or Charles his waine over-clouded* (NPP: 30 August 1644).
- E.1185[7], *A catechisme for the times* (London: 2 September* 1645).
- E.298[32], *Letters of advice touching the choice of knights and burgesses for the Parliament* (London: 3 September 1645).

- E.8[13], *A second powder-plot, discovered in his Excellency the Lord Generalls armie* (London: 5 September 1644).
- E.8[17], *A new mercury, called Mercurius Problematicus* (London: 9 September* 1644).
- E.8[18], *The Cavaliers new common-prayer booke unclasp't* (London: 9 September 1644).
- E.8[22], *The copie of a letter from the Lord Generall his quarters* (London: 9 September 1644).
- E.257[2], *The loyall convert, (according to the Oxford copy)* (London: 19 September 1644).
- E.9[9], *A nest of perfidious vipers: or, The second part of the Parliaments kalender of black saints* (London: 21 September 1644).
- E.10[4], *Letters from Sir William Brereton Sir Thomas Middleton, Sir John Meldrum, of the great victory (by Gods providence) given them, in raising the siege from before Mountgomery-castle* (London: 24 September 1644).
- E.10[10], *The souldiers language. Or, A discourse between two souldiers* (NPP: 26 September* 1644).
- E.10[27], *A true relation of the sad passages, between the two armies in the west* (London: 2 October 1644).
- E.303[9], *A discourse discovering some mysteries of our new state* (NPP: 1645?).
- C5:5[22], *A true relation of the taking of Sherborn-castle* (NPP: 1645).
- E.290[19], *Newes from the Kings bath* (Bristol: 1645).
- E.303[11], *The judgement of an old grand-jury-man of Oxford-shire* (Oxford: 1645).
- E.269[7], *A character of the new Oxford libeller* (London: 11 February* 1645).
- E.274[32], *The Oxford character of the London diurnall examined and answered* (NPP: 31 March* 1645*).
- E.279[6], *The character of an Oxford-incendiary* (London*: 26 April 1645*).
- E.288[13], XXXVI. *Several religions, held and maintained by the Cavaliers* (London: 13 June* 1645).
- E.298[8], *The Malignants Lamentation* (London: July 1645*).
- E.292[27], *The Kings cabinet opened: or, Certain packets of secret letters & papers, written with the Kings own hand, and taken in his cabinet at Nasby-Field, June 14. 1645* (London: 14 July* 1645).
- E.292[29], *Three speeches spoken at a common-hall* (London: 14 July* 1645).
- E.296[1], *A satyr, occasioned by the author's survey of a scandalous pamphlet intituled, The King's cabanet opened* (Oxford: 3 August* 1645).

- E.296[2], *Some observations upon occasion of the publishing their Majesties letters* (Oxford: 3 August* 1645).
- E.295[2], *Signes and wonders from heaven* (London: 5 August* 1645).
- E.296[10], *Mercurius Britannicus, his apologie to all well-affected people* (London: 11 August 1645).
- E.296[15], *A letter, in which the arguments of the Annotator* (Oxford*: 12 August* 1645).
- E.296[20], *Aulicus his hue and cry sent forth after Britannicus* (London: 13 August* 1645).
- E.296[35], *A true and exact relation of the severall informations, examinations, and confessions of the late witches, arraigned and executed in the county of Essex* (London: 19 August* 1645).
- E.297[10], *A key to the Kings cabinet; or Animadversions upon the three printed speeches, of Mr Lisle, Mr Tate, and Mr Browne, spoken at a common-hall in London, 3. July, 1645* (Oxford: 21 August* 1645).
- E.298[3], *A most learned and eloquent speech* (Oxford*: 25 August* 1645).
- E.298[26], *The Royall Entertainment of the King, by the Royalists of Huntington* (London: 1 September* 1645).
- 669.f.10[36], *George Lord Goring, Generall of all His Majesties Forces of Horse, that are, or shall be raised in the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, and Lieutenant-General to his Highnesse Prince Rupert of this western Army* (Exeter: 10 September 1645).
- E.1185[8], *The Anabaptists catechisme* (NPP: 11 September 1645).
- E.301[4], *Mr. Peters report from Bristol* (London: 11 September* 1645).
- E.301[5], *A true relation of the storming Bristoll* (London: 13 September 1645).
- E.302[3], *An exact relation of Prince Rupert his marching out of Bristoll* (London: 18 September 1645).
- E.301[18], *Lieutenant Generall Cromwells letter to the House of Commons, of all the particulars of taking the city of Bristoll* (London: 18 September 1645).
- E.302[7], *A speech of the Right Honourable the Earle of Louden* (London: 19 September* 1645).
- E.303[4], *A letter sent to the Right Honourable the Lord Digby, from Sir Barnabas Scudamore Governor of Hereford* (Oxford: 25 September* 1645).
- E.303[6], *Alter Britanniae heros: or The life of the most honourable knight, Sir Henry Gage, late Governour of Oxford, epitomiz'd* (Oxford: 25 September* 1645).

- E.303[5], *A more perfect and particular relation of the late great victorie in Scotland obtained over Montrosse and the rebels there* (London: 25 September 1645).
- E.303[18], *The Kings forces totally routed by the Parliaments army* (London: 29 September 1645).
- 669.f.10[94], *A funerall elegie upon the deplorable and much lamented death of the Right Honourable Robert Deveruex [sic]* (London: 1646).
- 669.f.10[85], *Englands monument of mercies* (NPP: 21 September* 1646).
- E.355[13], *An hue-and-cry after Vox Populi* (London*: 25 September* 1646).
- E.336[3], *The burthen of Issachar* (NPP: 6 May* 1646).
- E.338[4], *A sermon of consolation for all true Christians* (London: 25 May* 1646).
- E.339[6], *An alarum: To the last warning peece to London* (London: 30 May* 1646).
- E.340[3], *Signes from heaven: or Severall apparitions seene and heard in the ayre* (London: 6 June* 1646).
- E.341[6], *The copies of the Kings letter, and generall order for the surrender of all his garrisons* (London: 19 June 1646).
- E.344[6], *Mans wrath and Gods praise. Or, A thanks-giving sermon* (London: 9 July* 1646).
- E.353[2], *The last will and testament of Charing Crosse* (London*: 1 September* 1646).
- E.353[13], *A true copy of the Welch sermon preached before the two princes, Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice* (London: 7 September* 1646).
- E.353[17], *A defiance against all arbitrary usurpations or encroachments, either of the House of Lords, or any other, upon the sovereignty of the supreme House of Commons* (NPP: 9 September* 1646).
- 669.f.9[69], *An ordinance presented to the Honorable House of Commons* (London*: 10 September 1646*).
- 669.f.10[89], *A funeral monument* (NPP: 9 October* 1646).
- 669.f.10[93], *The life and death of the right honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex, the noble branch of his thrice noble father* (London: 12 October* 1646).
- E.358[9], *A briefe and compendious narrative of the renowned Robert, Earle of Essex* (London: 21 October* 1646).
- E.358[18], *A declaration concerning the miserable sufferings of the countrie, under some of the Scots forces that quarter in the north of England* (London: 24 October* 1646).
- Wing / 2170:03, *Eikon basilike* (NPP: 1649).

E.1243[3], *The papers which passed at New-Castle betwixt His Sacred Majestie and Mr Henderson* (London: 29 May* 1649).

E.722[2], *A Brief Anatomie of Women* (London: 1653).

E.1487[2], *Britania Triumphalis; a brief History of the Warres and other State-Affairs of Great Britain* (London: 28 April* 1654).

Wing / 1224:06, *Rump: or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times, By the most Eminent Wits, from Anno 1639. to Anno 1661* (London: 1662).

Secondary Literature

i. Books and Articles

Anon, 'History and Language', *HWJ* 10 (1980), pp. 1-5.

Achinstein, S., 'Women on Top in the Pamphlet Literature of the English Revolution' in L. Hutson (ed.) *Oxford Reading in Feminism: Feminism & Renaissance Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 334-365.

Adair, J., *Roundhead General: The Campaigns of Sir William Waller* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997).

Adamson, J. S. A., 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War', *TRHS* 5th series, 40 (1990), pp. 93-120.

Alberti, J., *Gender and the Historian* (London: Longman, 2002).

Allnutt, W. H., 'The King's Printer at Shrewsbury, 1642-3', *The Library* 1 (1900), pp. 355-364.

Amussen, S., 'Gender, Family and the Social Order, 1560-1725' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 196-217.

— *An Ordered Society* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988).

— 'The Part of a Christian Man': The Culture Politics of Manhood in Early Modern England' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 213-233.

— 'The Gendering of Popular Culture in Early Modern England' in T. Harris (ed.) *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850* (London: MacMillan Press, 1995), pp. 48-68.

- Amussen, S., and Kishlansky, M., 'Introduction' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 1-18.
- Arnold, J., *Perukes and Periwigs* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970).
- Ashley, M., *Rupert of the Rhine* (Oxford: Purnell Book Services Ltd., 1976).
- Ashton, R., *The English Civil War, 1603-1649* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978).
- Aylmer, G. E., *Rebellion or Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- *The Personal Rule 1629-40* (Historical Association Pamphlet, 1989).
- Barratt, J., *Cavaliers. The Royalist Army at War 1642-1646* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000).
- Barry, P., *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Barry, J., 'Literacy and Literature in Popular Culture: Reading and Writing in Historical Perspective', in T. Harris (ed.) *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850* (London: MacMillan Press, 1995), pp. 69-94.
- Bellany, A., 'Railing Rhymes Revisited: Libels, Scandals, and Early Stuart Politics', *History Compass* 5/4 (2007), pp. 1136–1179.
- Bennett, M., *The English Civil War, 1642-1649* (London and New York: Longman, 1995).
- Berg, C. and Berry, P., '“Spiritual Whoredom”: An Essay on Female Prophets in the Seventeenth Century' in F. Barker et al. (eds.) *1642: Literature and Power in the Seventeenth Century* (Colchester: University of Essex, 1981), pp. 37-54.
- Bold, A., *The Ballad* (London: Methuen, 1979).
- Bowen, L., 'Representations of Wales and the Welsh during the Civil Wars and Interregnum', *Historical Research* 77: 197 (2004), pp. 358–376.
- Bray, A., *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982, 1995 edition).
- 'Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England', *HWJ* 29 (1): 1 (1990), pp. 1-19.
- Breitenburg, M., *Anxious Masculinities in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Bridenbaugh, C., *Vexed and Troubled Englishmen 1590-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

- Burgess, G., 'The Impact on Political Thought: Rhetorics for Troubled Times' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 67-83.
- Burke, P., *What is Cultural History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).
- Burr, V., *An Introduction to Social Constructionism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- Cain, T., "'A Sad Intestine Warr'" Mildmay Fane and the Poetry of Civil Strife' in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 27-51.
- Canning, K., 'Feminist history after the linguistic turn: historicizing discourse and experience', *Signs* 19:2 (Winter 1994), pp. 368-404.
- Capp, B., 'Popular Literature' in B. Reay (ed.) *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1988), pp. 198-243.
- *The World of John Taylor the Water-Poet, 1578-1653* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- 'The double standard revisited: plebeian women and male sexual reputation in early modern England', *Past and Present* 162 (1999), pp. 70-100.
- *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family, and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Carlton, C., 'The Impact of the Fighting' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 17-31.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, R. W. and Lee, J., 'Toward a new sociology of masculinity', *Theory and Society* 14 (1985), pp. 551-604.
- Clair, C., *A Chronology of Printing* (London: Cassell, 1969).
- Clark, A., *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1919, 1982 edition).
- Clarke, E., 'The Garrisoned Muse: Women's Use of the Religious Lyric in the Civil War Period' in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 130-143.
- Clifton, R., 'The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution', *P&P* 52 (August 1971).
- Clyde, W. M., 'Parliament and the Press, 1643-7', *The Library* series 4, XIII (1933), pp. 399-424.

- 'Parliament and the Press II', *The Library* series 4, XIV (1933), pp. 39-58.
- Cogswell, T., 'The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the people in the 1620s', *JBS* 29: 3 (July 1990), pp. 187-215.
- 'Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 277-300.
- Cohn, C., 'Wars, Wimps and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War' in M. S. Kimmel and M. A. Messner (eds.) *Men's Lives* (Massachusetts: Simon and Schuster, 1995), pp. 131-143.
- Connell, R., 'Masculinity, Violence and War', in M. S. Kimmel and M. A. Messner (eds.) *Men's Lives* (Massachusetts: Simon and Schuster, 1995), pp. 125-130.
- *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001 edition).
- Coward, B., *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714* (Harlow: Longman, 2003).
- Crawford, P., 'The Challenges to Patriarchalism: How did the Revolution affect Women?' in J. Morrill (ed.) *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins and Brown, 1992), pp. 112-128.
- P. Crawford, 'Sexual Knowledge in England, 1500-1750' in R. Porter and M. Teich (eds.) *Sexual Knowledge and Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 82-100.
- Cressy, D., *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
- *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Cust, R., 'News and Politics in Early-Seventeenth Century England', *P&P* 112:1 (1986), pp. 60-90, reproduced in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), pp. 233-260.
- 'Honour, Rhetoric and Political Culture: The Earl of Huntingdon and his Enemies' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 84-111.

- Cust, R. and Hughes, A., 'Introduction: Continuities and discontinuities in the English Civil War' in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), pp. 1-31.
- Dabhoiwala, F., 'The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 201-213.
- Davies, G., 'The Battle of Edgehill', *EHR* XXXVI (1921), p. 3-44.
- 'Documents illustrating the first Civil War, 1642-45', *JMH* III (1931), pp. 64-71.
- 'The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex, 1642-45', *EHR* XLII (1934), pp. 34-54.
- *The Early Stuarts 1603-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937).
- Daybell, J., 'Introduction: Rethinking Women and Politics in Early Modern England' in J. Daybell (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 1-20.
- Devereux, W. B., *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646* (Two volumes, London: John Murray, 1853).
- Donagan, B., 'Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War', *P&P* 18 (February 1988), pp. 65-96.
- 'Understanding Providence: The Difficulties of Sir William and Lady Waller', *JEH* 39: 3 (July 1988), pp. 433-444.
- 'The web of honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ* 44: 2 (2001), pp. 365-389.
- 'Varieties of Royalism' in Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 66-88.
- *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Eales, J., *Women in Early Modern England 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press Ltd., 1998).
- Erskine-Hill, H. and Storey, G., (eds.) *Revolutionary prose of the English Civil War* (Cambridge and New York : Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Evans, R. C., 'Paradox in Poetry and Politics: Katherine Philips in the Interregnum' in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 174-185.

- Fletcher, A., *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1981).
- *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (London: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Fletcher, A., and Stevenson, J., 'Introduction' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Foard, G., *Naseby: The Decisive Campaign* (Whitstable: Pryor Publications, 1995).
- Foucault, M., *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*, R. Hurley (Trans.) (London: Penguin Books, 1979).
- 'Body/Power' in C. Gordon (ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980).
- 'The Order of Discourse' in R. Young (ed.) *Untying the Text: a Post-Structuralist Reader* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981).
- 'Truth and Power' in P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader* (Hamondsworth: Penguin, 1984).
- 'Power and Sex' in L. Kritzman (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture-Interviews and Other Writings* (New York: Routledge, 1988).
- Fox, A., *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Foyster, E., 'Male honour, social control and wife beating in late Stuart England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 215-24.
- *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (London: Longman, 1999).
- Frank, J., *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961).
- Fraser, A., *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1984).
- Friedman, A. B., *The Ballad Revival* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
- Gardiner, S. R., *History of the Great Civil War* (Four volumes, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893).

- Gaskill, M., *Witchfinders: A Seventeenth-Century English Tragedy* (London: John Murray, 2006 edition).
- Gaunt, P., *The English Civil Wars, 1642-1651* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2003).
- Gent, L. and Llewellyn, N., 'Introduction' in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (eds.) *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 1-10.
- Gentles, I., 'The Impact of the New Model Army' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 84-103.
- 'The Iconography of Revolution: England 1642-49' in I. Gentles, J. Morrill, and B. Worden (eds.) *Writers, Soldiers and Statesmen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007).
- Godwin, G. N., *The Civil War in Hampshire (1642-1645) and the story of Basing House* (London, 1882).
- Gowing, L., 'Gender and the Language of Insult in Early Modern London', *HWJ* 35 (1993), pp. 1-21.
- *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
- de Groot, Jerome, 'Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women', in J. Daybell (ed.) *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), pp. 194-210.
- Greene Marston, J., 'Gentry Honour and Royalism in Early Stuart England', *JBS* XIII (1973-4), pp. 21-43.
- Gunn, S., *History and Cultural Theory* (London: Pearson Longman, 2006).
- Hamilton, E., *Henrietta Maria* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1976).
- Hansan, L., 'The King's Printer at York and Shrewsbury, 1642-3', *The Library* 4th Series, 23 (1943), pp. 129-131.
- Hardacre, P. H., *The Royalists During the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956).
- Harris, T., 'Problematizing Popular Culture' in T. Harris (ed.) *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850* (London: MacMillan Press, 1995), pp. 1-27.

- Harvey, K. and Shepard, A., 'What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950', *JBS* 44 (April 2005), pp. 274–280.
- Hexter, J. H., *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941).
- Higgins, P., 'The Reaction of women, with special reference to women petitioners' in Brian Manning (ed.) *Politics, Religion and the English Civil War* (London: Edwin Arnold, 1973), pp. 179-222.
- Hill, C., *The English Revolution, 1640* (London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., 1940, 1959 edition).
- *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London: Nelson, 1964).
- *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1972).
- *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, vol. 1: Writing and Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Ltd., 1985).
- Hodgart, M., *The Ballads* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950).
- Hoff, J., 'Gender as Postmodern Category of Paralysis', *WHR* 3: 2 (1994), pp. 149-168.
- Holmes, C., *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- Hopper, A., *'Black Tom' Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
- Holloway, W., 'Gender Difference and the production of Subjectivity' in J. Henriques et al. (eds.) *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity* (Methuen and Co., 1984), pp. 227-263.
- Hufton, O., *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe volume 1, 1500-1800* (London: Fontana Press, 1997).
- Hughes, A., *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991).
- 'Gender and Politics in Leveller Literature' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 162-188.
- Hughes-Warrington, M., *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Holstun, J., 'Introduction' in J. Holstun (ed.) *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1992), pp. 1- 13.

- Hutton, R., *The Royalist War Effort 1642-1646* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- *Debates in Stuart History* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).
- Hyett, F. A., 'Notes on the first Bristol and Gloucestershire Printers', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* XX (1895-7), pp. 38-51.
- Ingram, M., *Church courts, sex and marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- 'Ridings, Rough Music and Mocking Rhymes in Early Modern England' *P&P* 105: 1 (November 1984), pp. 166-197.
- 'Sexual Manners: The Other Face of Civility in Early Modern England' in *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*, P. Burke, B. Harrison, and P. Slack (eds.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 87-110.
- Jenner, M., 'The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England', *P&P* 177: 1 (November 2002), pp. 84-120.
- 'Reply', *P&P* 196:1 (August 2007), pp. 273-286.
- Keblusek, M., 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Exile Experience, 1642-1660' in A. Smyth (ed.) *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 55-68.
- Kelly-Gadol, J., 'The social relations of the sexes: methodological implications of women's history', *Signs* 1: 4 (Summer, 1976), pp. 809-23.
- Kishlansky, M., 'Turning Frogs into Princes: Aesop's Fables and the Political Culture of Early Modern England' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 338-360.
- *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London: Penguin, 1996).
- 'Charles I: A Case of Mistaken Identity', *P&P* 189: 1 (November 2005), pp. 41-80.
- 'A lesson in loyalty: Charles I and the Short Parliament' in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 16-42.
- Kitson, F., *Prince Rupert: Portrait of a Soldier* (London: Constable 1994).
- Kyle, C. R., 'From Broadside to pamphlet: Print and Parliament in the Late 1620s', *The Print Culture of Parliament 1600-1800, special edition of Parliamentary History*

- (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press for The Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007), pp. 17-29.
- Lambert, S., 'The Printers and the Government: 1604-1640' in R. Myers and M. Harris (eds.) *Aspects of Printing from 1600* (Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987), pp. 1-29.
- Lamont, W., *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (London: UCL press, 1996).
- Lamont, W. and Oldfield, S., *Politics, Religion and Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Aldine Press, 1975).
- Laqueur, T., *Making Sex, Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (London: Harvard University Press, 1990).
- Laurence, A., 'Women's Work and the English Civil War', *History Today* (June 1992), pp. 20-25.
- Lerner, G., 'Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges', *Feminist Studies* 3: 1/2 (Autumn 1975), pp. 5-14.
- 'The Majority finds its past', *Current History* 70:416 (May 1976), pp. 193-231.
- Levy, F., 'The Decorum of News' in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), pp. 12-38.
- Lindberg, K., "Your Father's Perfection Shall Be Your Blemish": The 3rd Earl of Essex and the Development of a Legend', *Medievalia et Humanistica* 32 (2007), pp. 117-32.
- Love, H., *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- M'Arthur, E., 'Women Petitioners and the Long Parliament', *EHR* 24: 96 (October 1909), pp. 698-709.
- Mack, P., 'Women as Prophets during the English Civil War', *Feminist Studies* 8: 1 (1982), pp. 19-45.
- Madam, F. F., 'Some Curiosities of the Oxford Press', *The Library*, 1 (1889), pp. 154-160.
- Malcolm, J. L., *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983).
- McElligott, J., 'The Politics of Sexual Libel: Royalist Propaganda in the 1640s', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), pp. 75-81.
- *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Suffolk: Boydell, 2007).

- McElligott, J., and D.L. Smith, 'Introduction: rethinking royalists and royalism' in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 1-15.
- McShane-Jones, A., 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689' in A. Smyth (ed.) *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 69-88.
- 'The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England', *P&P* 196:1 (August 2007), pp. 253-272.
- Mendelson, S. and Crawford, P., *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Moore, A. K., 'The Literary Status of the English Popular Ballad', *Comparative Literature* 10: 1 (Winter 1958), pp. 1-20.
- Morrill, J., 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *TRHS* 5th series, 34 (1984), pp. 155-178.
- 'Textualising and Contextualising Cromwell', *HJ* 33: 3 (1990), pp. 629-639.
- 'Introduction' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 8-16.
- 'The Impact of Puritanism' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 50-66.
- *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993).
- 'The Unweariables of Mr Pym: Influence and Eloquence in the Long Parliament' in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 19-54.
- Morrill, J. and Walter, J., 'Order and Disorder in the English Revolution' in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.) *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), pp. 310-339.
- Nevitt, M., 'Women in the Business of Revolutionary News: Elizabeth Alkin, "Parliament Joan," and the Commonwealth Newsbook' in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), pp. 84-108.
- O'Connell, S., *The Popular Print in England 1550-1850* (London: British Museum Press, 1999).

- Oman, C., *Henrietta Maria* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1936).
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Peacey, J., *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
- “‘The counterfeit silly curr’: Money, Politics and the Forging of Royalist Newspapers during the English Civil War’, *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), pp. 27-57.
- ‘The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800’, *The Print Culture of Parliament 1600-1800, special edition of Parliamentary History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press for The Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007), pp. 1-16.
- ‘Print Culture and Political Lobbying during the English Civil Wars’, *The Print Culture of Parliament 1600-1800, special edition of Parliamentary History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press for The Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2007), pp. 30-48.
- Phillips, J. R., *Memoirs of the Civil War in Wales and the Marches, 1642-1649* (Two volumes, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874, 1893 edition).
- Pierce, H., *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2008).
- Plowden, A., *Women All on Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998).
- *Henrietta Maria: Charles I’s Indomitable Queen* (Stroud: Sutton, 2001).
- Porter, R. and Teich, M., ‘Introduction’ in R. Porter and M. Teich (eds.) *Sexual Knowledge and Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Potter, L., *Secret Rites and Secret Writings: Royalist Literature 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Poynting, S., ‘I doe desire to be rightly understood’: rhetorical strategies in the letters of Charles I’ in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 136-154.
- Purkiss, D., ‘Dismembering and Remembering: The English Civil War and Male Identity’ in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 220-241.

- *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Quaife, G. R., *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives* (London: Croom Helm, 1979).
- Ranke, L., *A History of England: Principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Six volumes, Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey Ltd., 1992).
- Raymond, J. (ed.), *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660* (Gloucestershire: The Windrush Press, 1993).
- *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996).
- ‘The Newspaper, Public Opinions, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century’ in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), pp. 109-140.
- *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- ‘Irrational, impractical and unprofitable: reading the news in seventeenth-century Britain’ in K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (eds.) *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 185-214.
- ‘Introduction: networks, communication, practice’ in J. Raymond (ed.) *News Networks in Seventeenth Century Britain and Europe* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-18.
- Reay, B., *Popular Cultures in England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1998).
- Reed B., S., *John Pym 1583-1643: The Statesman of the Puritan Revolution* (London: John Murray, 1940).
- Richardson, R. C., *The Debate on the English Revolution* (London: Methuen and Co., 1977).
- Roebuck, G., ‘Cavalier’ in C. J. Summers and T. Peabworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 9-26.
- Rollins, H. E., ‘XV—The Black-Letter Broadside ballad’, *PMLA* 34: 2 (1919), pp. 258-339.
- ‘Martin Parker, Ballad-Monger’, *Modern Philology* 16: 9 (January 1919), pp. 449-474.
- Roy, I., ‘Royalist Reputations: The Cavalier Ideal and the Reality’ in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 89-111.

- Rubenstein, F., *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and their Significance* (Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1984).
- Russell, C., *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).
- Scott, D., 'Counsel and Cabal in the King's Party, 1642-1646' in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 112-135.
- Scott, J. W., 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *AHR* 91: 5 (December 1986), pp. 1053-1075.
- 'Women's History' in P. Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), pp. 43-70.
- Sharpe, J., 'History from Below' in P. Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), pp. 25-42.
- Sharpe, K., 'Ideas and Politics in Early Stuart England', *History Today* 38 (January 1988), pp. 45-51.
- Sharpe, K., *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London: Pinter Publishers Ltd., 1989).
- *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1992).
- 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles', *HJ* 40: 3 (1997), pp. 643-665.
- *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).
- *Remapping early-modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Shepard, A., 'Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640', *P&P* 167 (May 2000), pp. 75-106.
- 'Just Good Friends? Same-Sex Intimacy in early modern Britain and Europe', *HWJ* 58 (2004), pp. 289-296.
- 'From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700', *JBS* 44 (April 2005), pp. 281-295.

- *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Shoemaker, R. B., *Gender in English Society, The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London: Longman, 1998).
- Simpson, C. M., *The Broadside Ballad and its Music* (New Brunswick and New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1966).
- Smith, D. L., 'The Impact on Government' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 32-49.
- Smith, N., *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994).
- Smith-Rosenberg, C., 'Writing history: language, class, and gender' in T. de Lauretis (ed.) *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies* (Hampshire and London: Macmillan, 1986, 1988 edition), pp. 31-54.
- Smuts, M., 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party' in J. McElligott and D. L. Smith (eds.) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 43-65.
- Smyth, A., 'Introduction' and 'It were far better be a Toad, or a Serpant, then a Drunkard': Writing About Drunkenness' both in A. Smyth (ed.) *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. xiii-xxv and pp. 193-210.
- Snow, V. F., 'Essex and the Aristocratic Opposition to the Early Stuarts', *JMH* 32: 3 (September 1960), pp. 224-233.
- *Essex the Rebel: The Life of Robert Devereux, the Third Earl of Essex, 1591-1646* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970).
- Spencer, C., *Prince Rupert: The Last Cavalier* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2007).
- Spufford, M., *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1981).
- Stewart, S., 'Scandals of the Ballad', *Representations* 32 (Autumn 1990), pp. 134-156.
- Stone, L., *The causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
- *The Family, Sex and Marriage* (London: Penguin, 1979).

- Stoyle, M., *Loyalty and Locality: Popular Allegiance in Devon During the English Civil War* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1994).
- *From Deliverance to Destruction* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996).
- ‘Caricaturing Cymru: Images of the Welsh in the London Press 1642-46’ in D. Dunn (ed.) *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp.162-180.
- *Soldiers and Strangers, An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).
- ‘The Road to Farndon Field: Explaining the Massacre of the Royalist Women at Naseby’, *EHR* cxxiii: 503 (August 2008), pp. 895-923.
- Summers, C. J. and Pebworth, T., ‘Introduction’ in C. J. Summers and T. Pebworth (eds.) *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination* (London: University of Missouri Press, 1999), pp. 1-8.
- Thomas, K., ‘Women and the Civil War Sects’, *P&P* 13 (April 1958), pp. 42-62.
- ‘The double standard’ *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20: 2 (April 1959), pp. 195-216.
- Thomas, P. W., *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- ‘Two Cultures? Court and Country under Charles I’ in C. S. R. Russell (ed.) *The Origins of the Civil War* (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 168-196.
- ‘The Impact on Literature’ in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 123-142.
- Tosh, J., ‘What should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth Century Britain’, *HWJ* 38 (1994), pp. 179- 202.
- *The Pursuit of History* (Harlow: Longman, 1999).
- ‘Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender’ in S. Dudink, K. Hagemann and J. Tosh (eds.) *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), pp. 41-58.
- Treadwell, M., ‘Lists of Master Printers: The Size of the London Printing Trade, 1637-1723’ in R. Myers and M. Harris (eds.) *Aspects of Printing from 1600* (Oxford Polytechnic Press, 1987), pp. 141-157.
- Trevelyan, G. M., *England under the Stuarts* (London: Methuen and co. Ltd., 1904).

- Trubowitz, R., 'Female Preachers and Male Wives: Gender and Authority in Civil War England' in J. Holstun (ed.) *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1992), pp. 112-133.
- Tubb, A., 'Mixed Messages: Royalist Newsbook Reports of Charles I's Execution and of the Leveller Uprising', *HLQ* 67: 1 (2004), pp. 59-74.
- Underdown, D., *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- 'The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England' in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.) *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 116-136.
- 'The Language of Popular Politics in the English Revolution' in A. Vos (ed.) *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance* (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995), pp. 107-132.
- *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Veevers, E., *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and court entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Walker, G., 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England', *TRHS* 6th series, 6 (1996), pp. 235-245.
- 'Rereading Rape and Sexual Violence in Early Modern England', *Gender and History* 10:1 (April 1998), pp. 1-25.
- *Crime, Gender and Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Walter, J., 'The Impact on Society: A World Turned Upside Down?' in J. Morrill (ed.) *The Impact of the English Civil War* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 104-122.
- Wanklyn, M. and Jones, F., *A Military History of the English Civil War* (Harlow, England: Pearson Longman, 2005).
- Warburton, E., *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers* (Three volumes, London: 1849).
- Wedgewood, C. V., *The King's Peace 1637-1641* (London: Collins, 1955).
- *The King's War, 1641-1647* (London: Collins, 1958).
- Weeks, J., 'Foucault for historians', *HWJ* 14 (1982), pp. 106-119.
- White, M. A., *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

- Williams, E. M., 'Women Preachers in the Civil War', *JMH* 1: 4 (December 1929), p. 564-567.
- Williams, G., *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature* (Three volumes, London: Athlone Press, 1994).
- Williams, T., "'Magnetic Figures': Polemical Prints of the English Revolution," in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (eds.) *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540-1660* (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), pp. 86-110.
- Wiesner, M. E., *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Wiseman, S., "'Adam, the Father of all Flesh": Porno-Political Rhetoric and Political Theory in and After the English Civil War' in J. Holstun (ed.) *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution* (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1992), pp. 134-156.
- 'Pamphlet Plays in the Civil War News Market: Genre, Politics, and "Context" in J. Raymond (ed.) *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1999), pp. 66-83.
- Worden, B., 'Literature and Political Censorship in Early Modern England' in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (eds.) *Too Mighty to be Free: Censorship and the Press in Britain and the Netherlands* (Zutphen: De Walburg Pers, 1987), pp. 43-62.
- "'Wit in a Roundhead': the Dilemma of Marchemont Nedham', in S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (eds.) *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 301-337.
- Wroughton, J., *A Community at War: The Civil War in Bath and North Somerset 1642-1650* (The Lansdown Press, 1992).
- Würzbach, N., *The Rise of the Street Ballad 1550-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Young, P. and Holmes, R., *The English Civil War: A Military history of the three Civil Wars, 1642-1651* (Kent: Eyre Methuen Limited, 1974).
- Zemon Davis, N., "'Women's History" in Transition: The European Case', *Feminist Studies* 3: 3/4 (Spring – Summer 1976), pp. 83-103.
- Zwicker, S. N., 'The Constitution of opinion and the pacification of reading' in K. Sharpe and S. Zwicker (eds.) *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 295-316.

ii. Unpublished Theses:

McShane-Jones, A., 'Rime and Reason.' The Political World of the English Broadside Ballad, 1640-1689 (PhD. Thesis, University of Warwick, November 2004).

iii. Unpublished Conference Papers:

Bowen, L., 'Presenting and Contesting Oxford, 1642-1646' paper delivered at St. Anne's College, Oxford (22 July 2006).

Peacey, J., 'Opening the King's Cabinet: Propaganda and Public Opinion after Naseby', paper delivered at 'New Approaches to the Battle of Naseby' Conference, (29 June 2008).

— 'Provincial News Junkies: the Circulation and Consumption of Civil War Pamphlets' paper delivered at 'Early Modern Research Seminar', University of Reading (3 December 2008).