©2015

Mark Thomas Duggan

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SOULS OF THE BEHEADED: CONTESTED MARTYRDOM IN ENGLAND, 1649-1665

By

MARK THOMAS DUGGAN

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in History

Written under the direction of

Alastair Bellany

And approved by

_____

_____

_____

_____

New Brunswick, New Jersey

OCTOBER, 2015

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Souls of the Beheaded: Contested Martyrdom in England, 1649-1665

By MARK THOMAS DUGGAN

Dissertation Director:

Alastair Bellany

This dissertation assesses the religious and political roles and interpretations of martyrdom in England during the years following the beheading of King Charles I, the climax of the English Revolution. It uses potential martyrs' own statements and writings as well as published commentaries on their executions to expand our understanding of how a Christian framework of martyrdom could be used to advance various causes in a period of political upheaval. In this way it emphasizes the "contested" nature of martyrdom, which was always subject to debate. Previous studies of martyrdom during the Roman period as well as during the Protestant and Catholic Reformations have emphasized the role of dying for one's beliefs in the broader development of Christianity. This project extends that field into the mid-seventeenth century, when professed Protestants of various stripes were executed for treason, an ostensibly political cause, by the evolving English State—whether Parliament, the Lord Protector, or the restored King Charles II. With a few exceptions, the condemned men were engaged in political intrigues against a particular government; but they usually characterized their deaths as

religiously motivated, at least in part, thereby turning their deaths into martyrdoms, blood sacrifices for a greater good. In this way, they seized control of the official performance of ritual punishment, transforming the State's intended message and instead defending and advancing their own causes. Their professions of faith had the further effect of sacralizing an otherwise secular cause: the structure of a civil government. The process unfolded similarly whether individuals died for the cause of the late King Charles I or in defense of the English Revolution, suggesting that the English understanding of martyrdom was adapting to political changes, as well as to the growing role of print media in disseminating political arguments. Martyrs' own performances were reappropriated after their deaths, adopted for new causes by their successors, even causes that they would likely have rejected had they still been alive.

Acknowledgments

This project began as a broad study of English martyrdom "from the Regicide to the Bloody Assizes," as the working title had put it; but this would have led to a far longer and unwieldy dissertation. As a result, half of the archival work that I originally undertook was unceremoniously lopped off with a blunt axe. Even so, the martyrs of the later years of the Restoration are the cause for my undertaking a study of martyrdom and execution in the first place. For this reason, I might start by thanking the legacies and performances of such ill-fated figures as Lord Stafford, Lord Russell, the Earl of Essex and Archbishop Oliver Plunkett. Even though they are outside the bounds of this study, my work on their lives and deaths was essential for the development of the project, and I hope to incorporate them into my future work.

Among the living, I should first thank my advisor, Alastair Bellany, whose support since my arrival as an overwhelmed Louisianan transplanted to New Jersey has been indispensable. His assistance in charting the broader themes in the myriad of martyrs' stories helped to give this project a clear focus. I also thank the other members of my committee for their assistance here and throughout my graduate career. Phyllis Mack's guidance on an early paper on a 1681 treason trial is the direct origin of my interest in martyrdom. My conversations and teaching assistantship with Peter Silver helped me to remember that the figures of this period saw themselves in a larger world than merely the North Atlantic Archipelago, even if in many ways this remains a study of England. And finally, I appreciate Gary de Krey's willingness to take this on as an outside reader; although he may not have realized it, our lunchtime conversation during his 2008 visit to LSU was a key moment in my intellectual career.

Others who have been of great assistance in this dissertation and my academic career include professors Brad Gregory, Victor Stater, Suzanne Marchand, Christine Kooi, Gaines Foster, James Stoner, Rudy Bell, Paul Hanebrink, and Jake Soll. At least as important have been my graduate colleagues, whose conversations about our work, collaboration for conferences, and extracurricular activities were necessary for the safe and sane completion of the project, particularly Jen Wilson, Raymond Dansereau, Jim Jeffers, and Christopher Gillett. I also thank my friend Brett Long for his reading of the near-final draft.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Rutgers University Library, the Seton Hall University Library, the British Library, the National Archives at Kew, the University of Glasgow Library, the archives of the British Province of the Society of Jesus, the Doctor Williams Library, and the Louisiana State University Library for their assistance in my research. I especially thank the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, whose generous grant to doctoral studies in the humanities at Rutgers in the form of dissertation completion fellowships and research funding has been essential both for my work and for the work of so many of my colleagues.

Just as a seventeenth century martyr was dually political and religious, so a twenty-first century doctoral candidate is dually academic and personal; therefore I thank my parents and siblings for their interest in each step of my academic career and their support in my decision to study history at LSU while many of my friends prepared to be doctors or engineers. I appreciate all the questions about my progress, but I appreciate even more the times that they offered encouragement without asking any questions at all.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife Sarah, whose willingness to meet for coffee in 2009 outshines even the most profound archival discovery. Our history is inextricably woven with each of our academic careers, and this project owes much to her support and flexibility. I especially appreciate her assurance that if I find myself martyred for some cause she will pen a hagiography as powerful as Mary Love did for Christopher after 1651. Sarah's help merits more gratitude than words can express, but I suspect that without her love, the pages of this dissertation would have looked quite different; perhaps they would have been blank.

Contents

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION ii
Acknowledgments iv
Introduction: Martyrs of the People 1
Chapter 1: "I desire my blood may be the last": Post-Regicidal Royalist Martyrdom 30
Chapter 2: "What sport Love's blood will make": The Martyred Minister of 1651 90
Chapter 3: "His neck that wrote it": Writing Royalism in Blood, 1651-59 166
Chapter 4: "Rebels No Saints": Deconstructing and Reconstructing the "Good Old Cause" 245
Chapter 5: "Hang'd in the Strings": The Regicides in Cheap Print and Satire 313
Chapter 6: "The Spiced Ashes of a Martyr's Name": Royalists Resurrected 379
Chapter 7: An Imprisoned Pilgrimage: Living Martyrdom in the English Revolution 414
Bibliography 444

Introduction: Martyrs of the People

During his famous execution speech in front of the Banqueting House in Whitehall on 30 January 1649, King Charles I of England and Scotland added himself to a complicated pedigree that was far longer than his Stuart family line. He had just explained how, if he had capitulated to Parliament's demands during the Civil War, he "would have given way to an Arbitrary Way, to have all Laws changed according to the power of the sword." This would have deprived his subjects of their liberties as Englishmen and placed them under the power of tyrants. For this reason, he said, he died as "the Martyr of the People," a stunningly bold proclamation.[1] In his view, even though he had been accused of tyranny himself for governing without Parliament, Charles was a martyr for his subjects' rights, fighting with his last breath against an arbitrary government: in other words, he had sacrificed himself for a political cause. Charles's martyrdom, however, like the text of his speech, remained fundamentally informed by Christian traditions and Christian beliefs about both the Church and the State. Charles explained how Parliament had restructured the Church of England according to its own whims in a way contradictory to the prescriptions of the Bible. This was, he said, a great sin; but he "pray[ed] God, with St. Stephen, that it be not laid to their Charge," quoting

---

[1] Quoted often; for example, *His Majesties speech on the scaffold at White-Hall on Tuesday last*, 1649, p. 6; taken as a pamphlet title, *The Martyr of the People or The Murder'd King*, 1649; and *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*, 1809, volume 4, column 1139; hereafter *State Trials* 4.1139, etc. It should be noted that although Charles defended his subjects' liberty, he stressed that "their Liberty and Freedom, consists in having government…not for having share in government," and also that "a subject and a sovereign are clean different things"; ibid. On the other hand, he was delivering this speech in part because of Pride's Purge: the full Long Parliament would never have voted to try him for treason, so an "arbitrary" selection, the Rump, was killing him and his kingdoms together.

the Christian protomartyr's statement of forgiveness in the Acts of the Apostles.[2] By dying, the King went, in his words, "from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown," meaning the crown of martyrdom, which would unite him to Christ and the saints of the early Church.[3] The King's allusions to St. Stephen and the martyr's heavenly reward were deeply rooted in the Christian martyrological tradition; his insistence that he died for "liberty" and "the people," however, was new. Charles I had fashioned his execution for treason as a religio-political event, and in doing so he helped to recast English martyrdom's long history for a revolutionary age.

From its earliest origins, English Christianity had been shaped by those prepared to die for Christ, including laymen, kings, and clergy. Alban of Roman Britain, King Edmund of East Anglia, and Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Beckett were celebrated examples of martyrs from English Christianity's first thousand years. The shrines and churches built for their veneration became important holy sites in the medieval Christian landscape. This early English martyrology was expanded—or supplanted, since many of the shrines were destroyed during the Reformation—in the sixteenth century by a new Protestant canon of martyrs. They were immortalized most comprehensively by John Foxe, whose "Book of Martyrs" presented an updated martyrology for a more godly English church, linking the persecutions of the Roman Empire to those of the Marian counter-reformation.[4] Foxe's Protestant martyrology was immediately joined by an

---

[2] *State Trials* 4.1138.
[3] Ibid, 4.1140.
[4] Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* helped to define post-Reformation English Christianity almost as much as the vernacular Bible, but it is striking that most of the men addressed in this study invoked Christ, Stephen, and King Charles I more often than they mentioned the martyrs of ancient Rome or Mary Tudor. The *Acts and Monuments*, republished throughout early modern English history, was, in the words of the most important recent study of Foxe, "at once a book of didactic advice on how to live a Christian life, a book of

English Catholic one, in which men like Thomas More and Edmund Campion filled the column of those who had remained loyal to Rome during the sixteenth century and whose pious deaths encouraged other Catholics to keep the faith despite persecution. This "renaissance of Christian martyrdom," as one scholar calls it, was provoked by the Reformation and was central to the evolving confessional experience and identities of Protestants and Catholics throughout sixteenth-century Europe.[5] This renaissance had a late phase in England in the seventeenth century, when martyrdom became a central feature of an extended period of religiously-fueled political crises lasting from the late 1630s to the early 1660s, and again reigniting in the late 1670s and early 1680s. The persistence of martyrdom is a symptom both of a "Long British Reformation," in which the nature of the Church remained thoroughly contested, and of the entwining of those religious and ecclesiastical struggles with political battles over the location of sovereignty in, and the constitutional structure of, the British state.

The deep entangling of these struggles meant that the martyrs made during the English Revolution (1640-1660) assumed a new, hybrid form: while these men died for "a cause," they blended the religious and the political in their motivations and their final performances, and they were commemorated and contested in both sacred and secular terms. The old Elizabethan settlement, which for a time had permitted "Puritans" and "Anglicans" to coexist at Roman Catholics' expense,[6] had certainly failed by 1645, when

---

spiritual consolation for troubled souls, a history of the Church in its many facets, a history of England, and an exegesis of the Apocalypse unfolding through the history of the world"; Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 229.

[5] Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake* (Cambridge, Mass., 1999), p. 124.

[6] These categories, of course, were malleable; see Peter Lake, A*nglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988).

the ceremonialist William Laud joined Beckett and Thomas Cranmer as occupants of the See of Canterbury who would die for their interpretations of the Christian Church in England.[7] But it is telling that the royalist protomartyr, as claimed by Restoration martyrologists and Charles I, was not a clergyman but rather a politician and a soldier: Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, executed for treason in 1641. Strafford's scaffold performance may have been pious in tone, but his alleged treason against the Kingdom despite his loyalty to the King was at heart a political matter. Strafford, like all the other men upheld as martyrs during the English Revolution, can be placed along a spectrum, ranging from those for whom specifically religious concerns were secondary to political commitments, to those who believed and insisted that they were being persecuted for their religious beliefs in the same way that Protestants had suffered under Mary Tudor. In all these cases, the overarching claims to martyrdom relied on a Christian framework; but these claims merged and even blurred the religious and political components of the martyr's cause in complex and fascinating ways.

Christian martyrdom always had a political element, even in the Roman period, when Christians were officially targeted not for their beliefs as such but rather for their refusal to fulfill Roman civic duties; but when Tertullian wrote in the second century that *semen est sanguis Christianorum,* or "the blood of Christians is seed," often rendered colloquially as "the seed of the Church," he did not mean that it would sprout into an

---

[7] Of Becket, Cranmer, and Laud, Cranmer was the most "religious" martyr since he was burned for heresy; but all three were targeted at least partly for political reasons. Becket's murder by agents of Henry II was instigated by a power struggle between church and state, though admittedly that struggle dealt with the Church's spiritual authority. Laud was executed for treason, but he was mostly hated for his liturgical reforms of the previous decade.

earthly paradise.[8] In mid-seventeenth century England, the blurring of the religious and the political marked a noticeable change. Martyrs themselves recognized and admitted that their causes had a dual nature—and in most cases, so did their persecutors. The agreement by persecutor and persecuted that these martyrological causes dealt with earthly matters, rather than purely one's salvation, suggests that there was a subtle form of secularization accompanying these otherwise Christian martyrological performances. As Brad Gregory argues, "Depending on circumstances, Christians acting for religious reasons could be socially and politically disruptive in Europe into the eighteenth century and beyond. But in the centuries-long, back-and-forth struggle for the public exercise of power between secular and ecclesiastical authorities, the former had won a monopoly."[9] Early modern martyrs thus operated within a religious landscape that was increasingly defined by the State, a tendency that began in England at least with the 1534 Act of Supremacy, if not before. During the English Revolution, Christian martyrdom was employed by English political actors and propagandists to achieve temporal as well as

---

[8] Tertullian, *Apology*, tr. T. R. Glover (London, 1931), chapter 50, pp. 226-227, Latin and English; the context is: "Torture us, rack us, condemn us, crush us; your cruelty only proves our innocence. That is why God suffers us to suffer all this…But nothing whatever is accomplished by your cruelties, each more exquisite than the last. It is the bait that wins men for our school. We multiply whenever we are mown down by you; the blood of Christians is seed. Many among you preach the endurance of pain and of death…yet their words never find so many disciples as the Christians win, who teach by deeds." This implies that a Church would grow on earth, but it is important to remember that the divine remained distinctly present both for adherents of the early church and for early modern reformers. Brad Gregory observes that for martyrs of the Reformation, the Roman persecutions appeared to be happening again: "Tertullian's dictum looked irrefutable: persecution had intensified, martyrs now numbered in the hundreds rather than the dozens, and yet Protestantism, especially Calvinism, was growing"; *Salvation at Stake*, p. 172. Tertullian remained current during the English Revolution, with his *Apology* appearing in print both in topical excerpts and in full; e.g., *A True Christian Subject Under an Heathen Prince: or Tertullians Plea for Allegeance*, 1642; and *Tertullians Apology, or Defence of the Christians, against the Accusations of the Gentiles*, tr. H.B., 1655.

[9] Brad S. Gregory, *The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012), p. 153.

eternal ends. The blood of these new martyrs would be the seed for reformation, revolution, and even restoration of a fallen monarchy.

II

The title of this study contains a pair of loaded phrases. The "souls of the beheaded" refers to Revelation 20:4, in which John writes that he "saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." John's several visions of martyrs, together with the stoning of Stephen, are among the most important sources for early martyrological images and continued to be invoked throughout the seventeenth century. Two of the most avowedly religious martyrs of the period, Christopher Love in 1651 and John Cook in 1660, referred to the Revelation verse in their last speeches. Other martyrs of the English Revolution were less overtly biblical in their discourse, but they retained deep and, in most cases, sincere interest in the fates of their own souls. Even those who made the fewest references to Christianity besides what was culturally expected would have agreed with the basic point of John's vision: they died for their refusal to worship "the beast," whether that meant a form of government, a version of Christianity, or both. While this dissertation tentatively argues that a secularizing process was underway, it remains difficult to claim that by the early 1660s England's politics had become particularly secular in a modern sense. Even the least overtly religious martyrs' actions were steeped in Christian language and symbols.

They presented themselves as having committed the alleged treasons for which they died for the sake of their own souls and the soul of the collective nation.

This leads to the second basic component of this study: contestation. "Contested martyrdom" is almost a redundancy because martyrdom is inherently contestable, but the phrase describes the arguments between and about martyrs and their narratives in England during the Long Reformation. This contest was manifold. As one recent study puts it, "depending on one's viewpoint, a particular martyr may appear as a victim or as an aggressor, or indeed both."[10] The state condemned an individual for a crime, usually treason, arguing through the execution that the individual deserved death and urging witnesses to remain loyal to the State and the Church in the future. The condemned potentially became a martyr, rather than merely a traitor, by contesting the charges against him and announcing through a last speech and other media that not only was he innocent but also that others should take up his cause after his death. Even when a martyr's cause was not distinctly religious, the discourse around the martyrdom followed this basic model. The initial contest at the scaffold between the condemner and the condemned usually developed into a broader debate conducted through print and circulated manuscripts. These publicly contested claims about martyrs and martyrdoms had an unusual intensity in the mid-seventeenth century thanks to the dynamics of a revolutionary public sphere. An extensively contested martyrdom in this period involved not only the martyr's own words and the initial commentaries by critics and supporters, but also the eventual construction of retrospective martyrologies that assembled the full

---

[10] Dominic Janes and Alex Houen, "Introduction," in *Martyrdom and Terrorism: Pre-Modern to Contemporary Perspectives*, Janes and Houen, eds. (Oxford, 2014), p. 6. Along these lines, they further describe martyrdom as "a culturally contestable state" that pertains to Christianity, Islam, and modern secular politics; p. 10.

body of written material defending a particular martyr's cause, or catalogued such collections for several martyrs. These intense written contests either to claim or to debunk martyrdom demonstrate how valuable the charismatic martyr could be to the sacralizing, unifying, or promoting of a religio-political cause. If supporters of a cause or a regime permitted their enemies to become uncontested martyrs, this could severely undermine their own legitimacy.

Although the role of print was relatively new, written contestation had been a component of martyrdom since the first years of the Christian Church. Luke's account of Stephen established a basic paradigm of guiltlessness, defense of Truth, and forgiveness of persecutors; but by the second century, martyrs relied on extended networks of writers to sustain individual stories. Even the boldest martyr "had only limited control over what would be understood and remembered by those who lived on. In the long run, it was in the retelling that a martyr's story could reach the widest possible audience and could be crafted as a vessel for communicating a compelling message of spiritual power." A Christian apologist like Tertullian could "guide and amplify his audience's senses to ensure that the 'right' moral was drawn from the martyr's suffering."[11] Hagiographers and martyrologists thus had immense control over narratives. But we must also remember the monumental power of an individual martyr's death. Seventeenth-century witnesses were often impressed by martyrs' performances, even if they disagreed with particular causes. As much as possible, then, this study will attempt to combine analysis of the martyr's actual self-presentation on the scaffold—at least when it can be known—with analysis of the myriad ways in which that self-presentation could be represented,

---

[11] Kate Cooper, "Martyrdom, Memory, and the 'Media Event': Visionary Writing and Christian Apology in Second-Century Christianity," in Janes and Houen, *Martyrdom and Terrorism*, p. 38.

critiqued, or distorted in written accounts. Though there remains a metaphysical possibility that one could be a martyr for a cause without anyone knowing about it, martyrdom in practice is an intrinsically public event: therefore the core evidence for this study consists of martyrs' public performances and the publicly circulated representations and counter-representations of those performances.

The centrality of contestation means that this study will often utilize the clunky but useful phrase "potential martyr" to describe many of its subjects. This phrase indicates that while an individual may have willingly died for a cause, not all witnesses recognized that cause as legitimate. Certain sets of behaviors, words, and images gave an individual the potential to be recognized as a martyr; but that potential could always be contested, and if one failed to garner support, then that martyr's story as it pertained to that cause was, at least to the public, dead. It is not the task of this project to evaluate the case for martyrdom of any individual but rather to assess how these men—and the dead in this period were men, though their apologists included important women—presented themselves as martyrs, and how other writers manipulated the stories to fit a particular narrative. This dissertation is therefore on one level a study of martyrs; but on another, it is a study of *stories about martyrs*, which could vary widely. The two are not unrelated—stories were derived from actual performances, witnessed by crowds and reported immediately by spoken and printed word. But all involved parties recognized the underlying polemical power of martyrdom to advance a cause. A proponent of a cause could not let a good martyr go to waste, just as an opponent could not let a martyr stand without counter-argument. At the most dynamic level, this would pit martyrs against one another, upholding one side's martyrology as proof of the other side's villainy.

The potentiality of martyrdom—and the stakes of particular contests over particular martyrs or sets of martyrs—also changed according to radically shifting and often bewildering political circumstances, such as the existential assault on the Commonwealth in 1651, which hardened official attitudes to potential royalist martyrs, or the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, which required a radical reassessment of the recent past. Propagandists resumed and transformed certain narratives about martyrs at different points in time, rewriting and enhancing old martyrologies to serve short-term political goals. Potential martyrs professed to die for timeless truths, but martyrologies rarely remained stable. Writers usually presented a tidy story, but these stories often remade political memory to suit the needs of the present, omitting details or entire cases that circumstances had made inconvenient.

III

This dissertation contributes to and draws on four primary areas of scholarship. First, it is a study of a late phase of early modern Christian martyrdom, itself a subfield of the history of the Reformation and religion more generally. Second, and closely related, it is a study of political execution, a historiography that has perhaps lost its cutting edge but remains crucial to understanding the power dynamics of early modern Europe. Third, it deals with the early modern English public sphere, especially in the realms of print and representations of authority. Finally, at its heart it is a study of English political culture and participation at a dangerous and tumultuous time, focusing in particular, but not exclusively, on the question of royalism, a subject that has recently been restored as a serious subject for historians of the English Revolution.

The study's conceptual framework for analyzing seventeenth century English martyrdom draws on a number of recent studies, but the most important is Brad Gregory's groundbreaking work on sixteenth-century martyrdom, *Salvation at Stake*. Gregory's analysis underpins this study in several key ways: through its emphasis on the sincerity of religious belief in the early modern period; through its comparative approach to martyrdom as a cross-confessional phenomenon in which different kinds of Christians died with equal passion for disparate interpretations of theology; and through its emphasis on both the shared conception of the martyr and the contests to grant the palm of martyrdom to specific individuals: "'Martyr' was an essentially interpretive category, inextricable from one's religious commitment. Used collectively in this study, the term 'martyr' designates generically those recognized as such by *some* group."[12] The same inclusive definition will be used here. In the cases I explore, martyrdom was cross-confessional and cross-partisan: Royalists, Parliamentarians, Presbyterians, and Fifth Monarchists agreed on what martyrdom was *supposed* to be; they disagreed on who met the requirements in the religio-political environment of the English Revolution.

Gregory and other recent scholars have also stressed the importance of precursors and models to the making of martyrdom; as Susannah Monta has noted, "martyrs studied the behavior of others and in some cases rehearsed how they would speak and act in their final moments."[13] Potential martyrs in the mid-seventeenth century revolution similarly modeled their performances on those of their predecessors, with the royalists condemned between 1649 and 1651 specifically referring to Charles I's death, reverencing the

---

[12] Gregory, *Salvation at Stake*, p. 5; emphasis in original.
[13] Susannah Brietz Monta, "Rendering unto Caesar: The Rhetorics of Divided Loyalties in Tudor England," in Janes and Houen, pp. 64-65. See also Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005).

implements of his execution that would shortly be used for their own, and presenting themselves as confident in the virtue of their cause. When ten regicides were executed in 1660, they behaved in ways that would have reminded witnesses of Christ's passion narrative. In all these cases, witnesses expected certain things from potential martyrs, and those condemned to die knew how to behave to advance their causes effectively.

Furthermore, Gregory and other scholars have argued that the facts of a martyr's death were rarely contested: rival accounts would document essentially identical actions and words, but gloss them in radically different ways. As Monta notes, "In cases where material written by diametrically opposed authors about the same execution survives, martyrologists and their opponents differ primarily not about what was said or done but rather about how to interpret the events they record."[14] This remained the case in the seventeenth century, and we will see some particularly important examples below, especially in the long published accounts of the regicides' performances in 1660. In the same vein, Peter Lake and Michael Questier write, "On both sides of the confessional divide the capacity of the felon to face death with equanimity, sure of his or her repentance and therefore assured of Christ's intercession and hence of salvation, was considered an infallible test…This invested the smallest outward gesture on the gallows with a heightened spiritual significance, a fact which both sides tried to exploit to their own polemical advantage."[15] Polemicists admitted that potential martyrs behaved bravely, but they sought alternative explanations for the men's confidence. The Devil or strong drink could make someone appear calm and godly; alcohol could hide the felon's

---

[14] Monta, "Rendering unto Caesar," p. 63.
[15] Peter Lake and Michael Questier, "Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England," *Past and Present* 153 (Nov. 1996), p. 75.

terror, while Satan could manipulate the semblance of Christian martyrdom for his own evil purposes.[16]

Gregory also argues that religious belief in the early modern period must be taken seriously on its own terms, and that it was this genuine belief that made the faithful willing to die, cognizant of their predecessors in the early Church and joyful at the opportunity to become martyrs themselves and thus lead witnesses to Christ.[17] This study also takes seriously the religious beliefs of its subjects and the fact of their willingness to die; their last speeches included prayers for their souls and a sincere concern for God's will for England. But the types of Christian martyr that Gregory studies usually made little reference to achieving a better temporal life or, as in Charles's case, to saving subjects from the arbitrary rule of the sword. My goal then is to explore the willingness to die for beliefs that were simultaneously religious and political. For most Englishmen, political aims remained intertwined with their religious beliefs, in the same way that the broader political struggle across three kingdoms was intertwined with the efforts by various forms of Protestantism (as well as a residual Catholicism) to foster a more holy church. The martyrology of the Civil Wars and Interregnum was shaped by these complex confessionalized politics and politicized religiosity.

---

[16] In arguing that martyrs were not suicidal, Gregory makes a related point: "Even hostile controversialists typically understood false martyrs to be obstinate, not suicidal. They had stubbornly clung to their wicked views, not wantonly thrown away their lives." *Salvation at Stake*, p. 105.

[17] Ibid, pp. 99-105. Willingness did not always require actually dying, however; several eventual royalist martyrs attempted to escape, including Charles I himself, only resigning themselves to death after their recapture. In another case, the Elizabethan Jesuit and would-be martyr John Gerard escaped the Tower of London and reached the continent; he claimed that he "had no thought of escape" but "had only looked to the Lord Jesus…to give me the strength and courage I still needed to journey the rest of my hard way to the mountain of the Lord," an allusion to the hill of Golgotha. Yet when the opportunity arose to descend from his tower window by rope without endangering anyone else, he took it; John Gerard, *The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest*, tr. Philip Caraman (New York, 1952; reprinted 2012), p. 163.

While Brad Gregory's approach, adjusted to suit a slightly later and in some ways different context, has influenced this dissertation extensively, I also engage with other scholarly perspectives on martyrdom. Approaching the subject from a literary background, Alice Dailey argues that "the martyr is a retrospectively constructed figure created in and through literature"; and although Dailey's interpretation conflates martyr with martyrology, her claim that "conventional historiographic studies miss the constitutive pressure that form asserts over historical events" is nevertheless worth remembering, particularly since the present study will rely heavily on the subtextual codification of speech and behavior in the theater of execution.[18] But it is a stretch to say that potential martyrs always conformed to those codes, or to claim that adhering to such codes made martyrs insincere. As Monta writes, "Evidence of preparation for martyrdom need not indicate pathology or insincerity but rather may reveal an awareness of martyrdom's rhetorics, of the ways in which a martyr's behavior might persuade and confirm to co-religionists, present and future, that the martyr died for truth."[19] Potential martyrs professed at their last moments, not retrospectively through martyrologists, that they were martyrs in life and death. Rather like the proverbial tree falling in the forest, they appear to have believed that even if no human heard them, they would make a sound audible to God. Furthermore, while sources are limited, these were public events, and there was pressure to provide accurate accounts. Dailey is correct, however, that the martyrological *cause* was a literary construction, a result of the "interplay between blood and narrative, between the action of persecution and an always-mediating literary structure"; and the posthumous contest frequently went in directions that martyrs never

---

[18] Alice Dailey, *The English Martyr from Reformation to Revolution* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2012), p. 5.
[19] Monta, "Rendering unto Caesar," p. 65.

would have expected.[20] Dailey concludes her study with the Regicide, rightly identifying Charles I's performance as a turning point. Through *Eikon Basilike*, the King "relocates the sacred from exterior to interior—from God and the Word to his own conscience, which becomes sacralized through his death."[21] Nevertheless, her argument that Charles essentially died for conscience, making "the individual a locus of sacred authority…whose denial constitutes sin," is inconsistent with subsequent royalist martyrs' appropriation of Charles's death as a new model for England and, I argue, with Charles's own depiction of his relationship between himself and his subjects.[22] Rather than promoting free conscience, the royalist martyrologies after 1660 endorsed one cause: that of restoring and defending the monarchy while minimizing dissent.

There is a great deal of martyrological continuity between the English Revolution and earlier periods, and in some ways the cases I explore represent an aftershock of the "renaissance of martyrdom" that Gregory identifies. But I hope to contribute also to a line of argument in the historiography of specifically English martyrdom that has stressed its gradually increasing politicization over time. This historiography argues that the shift from heresy to treason charges later in the sixteenth century led the English to view religious dissent in a different light than their contemporaries on the continent did; indeed, while Hugh Peters was called "blasphemous" for using Psalm 149 as a defense of the Regicide, neither he nor anyone else in this period was charged with heresy. Thomas S. Freeman argues that the sixteenth-century combination of a state church with Catholic and Protestant dissenters, as well as seemingly endless changes in the ecclesiastical

---

[20] Dailey, pp. 2-3.
[21] Ibid, p. 8.
[22] Ibid, p. 225.

preferences of the Crown, created a unique environment for an especially wide variety of martyrs.[23] In the seventeenth century, English martyrdom became increasingly politicized while maintaining clear religious attributes.[24] Freeman charts this process in broad strokes over the long term from the Reformation to the more fully politicized examples of the later seventeenth century, such as Lord Russell, the Whig martyr of 1683. My goal is to flesh out a crucial phase in this history through a comprehensive study of martyrdom during the English Revolution that will complicate, as well as complement, Freeman's account of broad shifts in thinking by offering deeper descriptions of specific cases in the rapidly changing political circumstances of the Commonwealth, Protectorate, and early Restoration. Charting martyrs and martyrologies through this period permits a fuller understanding of how these men grappled with the political and religious implications of their causes and their deaths. Attention to individual cases reveals that the transitions Freeman identifies were neither simple nor instantaneous; men like the Presbyterian Christopher Love and the Fifth Monarchist regicide Thomas Harrison, potential martyrs for radically different causes, were each troubled by political characterizations of their deaths and attempted to remind witnesses that the real focus was Christ, not themselves and not earthly politics. Their self-assessment may not have been always accurate, but they saw the political ramifications of their deaths as a distraction from the more important pursuits of eternal salvation and religious truth.

---

[23] Thomas S. Freeman, "Over their Dead Bodies: Concepts of Martyrdom in Late Medieval and Early Modern England," in *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700*, eds. Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 1.
[24] Freeman, "'*Imitatio Christi* with a Vengeance': The Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early Modern England," in Freeman and Mayer, pp. 61-65.

Martyrs in this period were typically condemned by the state.[25] The tropes of Christian martyrdom relied heavily on Christ's Passion narrative, which included a trial, interrogation by religious and secular authorities, and a then-standard form of capital punishment.[26] Even the impromptu stoning of Stephen was conducted according to Jewish law. As a phenomenon, then, martyrdom must be understood partly within the context of law, execution, and the spectacular expression and contestation of political power. The martyr's defense of his cause through his suffering could transform the spectacle of execution into something rather different from what was intended by his punishers, but that suffering could not be separated from the theatre of the scaffold any more than Christ's sufferings could be separated from the Cross or the hill of Golgotha. The historiography of execution has passed through a series of phases, each of which informs this project in its way. The foundational text remains Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, which argues that the theatre of public execution provided a stage on which the state expressed and recharged its own power.[27]

---

[25] With notable exception; the Commonwealth ambassadors Anthony Ascham and Isaac Dorislaus were murdered abroad by Royalist agents, and later, Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey was murdered in 1678 and proclaimed a Whig martyr. The Earl of Essex probably almost certainly committed suicide in 1683, but his supporters claimed that he was murdered, permitting him to be called a martyr as well. See, for example, Alan Marshall, "To Make a Martyr: The Popish Plot and Protestant Propaganda," *History Today* (March 1997), pp. 39-45.

[26] Martin Hengel notes that even though crucifixion was applied throughout the Roman Empire as its most extreme form of punishment, usually for slaves and foreign rebels, it was rarely discussed in Roman literature because it was also considered distasteful, even offensive to Roman sensibilities; "but in this very offence it revealed itself as the centre of the gospel." Through the crucifixion of Christ, "God identified himself with the extreme of human wretchedness, which Jesus endured as a representative of us all, in order to bring us to the freedom of the children of God"; Hengel, *Crucifixion in the ancient world and the folly of the message of the cross*, tr. John Bowden (Philadelphia, 1977), p. 89. The telling of martyrs' stories, like the early Christian emphasis on the Cross to a Roman public, was meant to provoke for the sake of spiritual benefit. Martyrs saw themselves as imitating Christ through their own sufferings, and thereby drawing themselves and their witnesses closer to God as well.

[27] While the primary concern was the expression of state power, authorities still recognized that suffering could benefit the soul: "God [would] not fail to take such a martyrdom into account, providing it is borne

The most important work linking a post-Foucaultian approach to execution to the study of early modern English martyrdom is that of Peter Lake and Michael Questier. While their study is confined to Catholics targeted by the Elizabethan regime, the dynamics they explore are similar to the intra-Protestant rivalries of the English Revolution:

> [T]he catholic victims of state power were also agents, the initiating subjects of a struggle for the control of some of the central ideological, rhetorical and material weapons mobilized by the state against them. The aura of spiritual power and personal charisma that attended the last dying speech and the gallows conversion, together with the complexities and contradictions inherent in the ascribed identity of the catholic 'traitor', opened spaces for catholic agency and speech at the very centre of the persecutory state that was supposedly crushing catholic treachery into silence and oblivion.[28]

Catholic martyrs in Elizabethan England linked their performances to a collective understanding of Christian suffering, thereby subverting the state's intended symbols toward their own religio-political ends. Their deaths counterintuitively transformed them into victors, rising from punishment like Christ to eternal life in Heaven. As Tertullian put it, "So we have conquered, when we are killed; we escape when we are

---

with resignation"; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, tr. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1977), p. 46. Foucault's arguments have been unavoidable and generally compelling for scholars of English execution in recent decades. Using Foucault's interpretation of state power demonstrated by public execution, J. A. Sharpe assessed the dying performances of common criminals in England, who ordinarily admitted their guilt from the scaffold and reminded witnesses to learn from their suffering that crime could not pay; J. A. Sharpe, "'Last Dying Speeches': Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England," *Past and Present* 107 (May 1985), pp. 144-167. Alternatively, Thomas W. Laqueur examined how the public could also seize an execution through disruption, recasting it as they chose in a carnival atmosphere and thereby undermining the intentions of the state; Thomas W. Laqueur, "Crowds, carnival and the state in English executions, 1604-1868," in *The First Modern Society*, eds. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 305-355.

[28] Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002), p. 230.

condemned."[29] This process of spectacular subversion is at the heart of this project, which includes multiple examples of men calling the ladder at the gallows "Jacob's Ladder," or saying that the block used at beheadings was like a step to God, or rejoicing that imprisonment was an opportunity for extended prayer. Through the reappropriation of the execution's "liturgy of torture" and the symbols of state authority, martyrdom could sustain a rival cause and challenge that authority.[30] Condemned royalists in the 1640s and 1650s as well as defenders of the "good old cause" at the Restoration were each granted a unique platform from which they could proclaim both their own personal innocence of treason as well as the validity of their causes, which usually suggested, albeit subtly, the need for popular rebellion against the punishing regime. Their performances were didactic, demonstrating for witnesses not merely how to die but how to live, and encouraging an active response by survivors. The framework of Christian martyrdom gave the condemned an opportunity to transform their victimhood into agency, and their loss into victory, at the same time that it returned them to God.

By studying martyrdom and execution, this project also analyzes the intersection of private religious belief with a developing public sphere. Scenes of execution were fundamentally public, as Lake and Questier observe, making them "highly charged, dangerously liminal, even potentially unstable occasions" composed of "religiously

---

[29] Tertullian, *Apology*, p. 223.

[30] Foucault, p. 49. Similarly, Andrea McKenzie finds "no necessary contradiction between J. A. Sharpe's contention that early modern men and women 'clearly read the theatre of punishment in religious terms' and V. A. C. Gatrell's characterization of the brave or game death as a strategy 'to cope with the pain and shame of scaffold death'"; she argues that "the gallows performances and last dying speeches of game criminals are most intelligible when read within the context of a religious, rather than a secular discourse." Andrea McKenzie, "Martyrs in Low Life? Dying 'Game' in Augustan England," *Journal of British Studies* 42:2 (April 2003), pp. 169-70; see also V. A. C. Gatrell's study of later execution, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People 1770-1868* (Oxford, 1994).

motivated factions or groups (as well as hack writers and printers) all attempting to enlist the considerable *frisson* of popular interest that surrounded these events for their own ideological and material benefit."[31] Execution was not the only way to achieve these polemical ends, of course, since the goals of the state "could be served just as well by public apostasy, submission to royal authority and consequent pardon as by the appalling theatre of punishment enacted at the gallows."[32] The Elizabethan Catholic martyrs were therefore the products of what Lake, writing with Steve Pincus, has dubbed the post-Reformation public sphere, an "arena for discussion of both religious and nonreligious issues" that reached its maturity during Elizabeth's reign.[33] The martyrdoms in this study were the products of a public sphere that had been thoroughly transformed by the experience of revolution to the point that the regular printing and widespread dissemination of literature had allowed politics to become a genuinely public affair. Many of the individual technologies and genres that permitted this to happen had already been in place decades earlier, but "the intensity, speed, and sheer volume of popular and public political discussion" during the 1640s and 1650s was "completely unprecedented."[34] Jason Peacey argues that this intensity facilitated "the emergence of something resembling an integrated national political culture, involving processes that were shared even if they were not experienced in a uniform way."[35] The rise in attention to political events at every social level and in every parish coincided with the political

---

[31] Lake and Questier, "Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows," p. 104.
[32] Ibid, p. 72.
[33] Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 45:2 (April 2006), p. 276.
[34] Ibid, p. 280.
[35] Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 21; see also Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, UK, 2004).

developments that had made martyrdom once again a useful tool in polemic. Martyrs and commentators on martyrs participated in a new type of public sphere.

For this reason, this project situates revolutionary martyrdom and execution within both the "high" political culture studied in Kevin Sharpe's work on representations of power, and the low political culture of "grub street," studied by print historians like Jason Peacey.[36] The martyrological debates of the mid-seventeenth century were conducted extensively through printed media, even if the physical performance at the scaffold remained the authoritative "version" of a person's death. We thus need to pay attention to the mechanics of the print culture that processed and mediated the event, as well as to the types of communication networks that political actors utilized and to the range of literature that had become more widely available. The mechanics of this public political engagement are important for this study, since they permitted discussions of martyrdom to occur with greater complexity than they had at earlier moments in the Long Reformation. As we shall see, contestations of martyrdom were shaped and sustained by the increased volume and variety of material available to readers, the expanding size of that readership, the increasingly partisan nature of print culture including the political aims of individual printers, the role of censorship in endorsing certain texts while attempting to eliminate others, and the extensive dialogue among texts, meant to attack or defend arguments posed previously.[37] Of particular interest is the development of

---

[36] Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven, 2010), and *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, 2013).
[37] Peacey argues that the period of the English Revolution saw rapidly increasing access to and understanding of printed literature, partly because "a lot could be read for very little," but also because "strikingly high literacy levels significantly underestimate the ability to read, and overlook the fact that it was more important to live within a literate environment, where there were 'bridges' to literacy, than to possess specific skills." Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, p. 57.

periodicals such as newsbooks, which provided weekly reports on executions within the context of all the political and military developments of recent days.[38] Martyrs and stories about martyrs circulated according to the parameters of this new and complicated world.

The public sphere of the English Revolution only functioned when people used it, however, and this study demonstrates that political regimes did not always exploit the tools of enhanced publicity to their best advantage. As will be most evident in the first chapter, the Commonwealth's early response to the martyrological claims about Charles I and other royalist victims was inadequate. The new regime was caught off guard by the widespread publication of *Eikon Basilike*, most likely written by Bishop of Worcester John Gauden, but presented in 1649 as if the King had written it himself. Its presentation of the King's piety and its defense of him as "the Martyr of the People" were essential for the construction of his cause. Several historians, most notably Kevin Sharpe, have argued that the Commonwealth's delay in countering "the King's Book" ceded tremendous posthumous authority to the King, and this project extends this story by analyzing how the republican regimes responded differently to potential martyrs at different times, at first allowing royalists' statements to stand unchallenged and only later rebutting them more extensively.[39] The delayed response in 1649 permitted the first royalists condemned after the Regicide to become an imitation of Charles in miniature, reinforcing his more sympathetic attributes. While less dramatic, the restored monarchy's treatment of the ten condemned regicides' last speeches in and after 1660 demonstrates a similar hesitancy.

---

[38] Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Oxford, 1996).
[39] Sharpe, *Image Wars*, pp. 391-426 and 453-461; see also Jason Peacey, "Reporting a Revolution: a failed propaganda campaign," in Peacey, ed., *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (London, 2001). For a more literary interpretation, see Dailey, *The English Martyr from Reformation to Revolution*, especially ch. 6, "Beyond Typology: King Charles and the Martyrdom of Conscience." More generally, see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003).

As we will see in the fourth chapter, they were first published with a hagiographical gloss, and then reprinted with damning royalist commentaries; but in 1664, the printers of the original version were tried for libel, with the Court condemning the speeches for inciting rebellion. The restored regime, like the Commonwealth, wavered in its response to martyrs' dying performances.

Finally, this study makes a number of contributions to the study of English political culture through its analysis of the evolving royalist martyrology and its relationship to the Restoration, as well as its analysis of the attempt by parliamentarians to uphold their "Good Old Cause" through their own martyrology. It is, in part, a study of royalists and their polemical interactions with their enemies at both their lowest and highest points in their fortunes. As such, it treats the period 1649-1665 as a coherent, interconnected whole, connecting the process of Restoration in the early 1660s with the events of the revolutionary decade that preceded it. It also attempts to contribute to the recent historiographical interest in royalism. The subject was mostly neglected for decades after David Underdown's classic, and still authoritative, 1960 study of the rebellions against Cromwell. [40] More recently, Jason McElligott and David L. Smith have heralded a renewal of scholarship on royalism, most directly through two essay collections concerning the Civil Wars and the Interregnum. The subject, they argue, was consigned to a historiographical ghetto for decades, largely because historians of the English Revolution found royalism "distinctly unfashionable" when compared to the

---

[40] David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660* (New Haven, 1960). Underdown was the first to admit that his study was limited in its scope, though he would contribute further to our understanding of popular royalist thought in *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1985).

Parliamentarians and their alleged modernity.[41] Furthermore, Royalists during the Interregnum have attracted even less attention than those of the 1640s. Historians of both Marxist and earlier Whiggish schools, McElligott and Smith argue, had treated 1650s royalists as embittered antagonists, inhibiting England's quest for true liberty; it had not seemed worthwhile to study reactionary royalists when one could study such appealingly "modern" countercultural radicals like the Ranters and Diggers. Not even the revisionists of the 1980s and 1990s addressed royalism, considering it sufficiently covered or, paradoxically, unimportant in pursuing their own goals of correcting the Whiggish and Marxist narratives that preceded them.[42]

This long neglect of royalism has now ended, and several key studies have appeared since 2000. These works contribute to our understanding of the roles royalists played in the political debates of both the Civil Wars and the Interregnum. Geoffrey Smith's two volumes on royalist activity in England and in exile portray royalists not as an elite band but rather as a broad movement, encompassing members of all social classes who had a wide variety of motivations for supporting the King, including religious, material, and personal allegiances. Jerome de Groot has also written on the development of royalist identity, which similarly relies on a much broader section of English society than the stereotypical sword-waving Cavalier, although such men

---

[41] Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, eds., *Royalists and royalism during the Interregnum*, Manchester, 2010, p. 2. They make a similar argument in the introduction to the preceding volume, *Royalists and royalism during the English Civil Wars*, Cambridge, 2007. Their independent work of course contributes to the trend, but these essay collections have defined the themes of this reopened field.

[42] McElligott and Smith also warn against a tendency among Atlantic World historians of the Interregnum to resume old Whiggish interpretations of a "high road to independence," downplaying royalism in America even though several colonies rebelled against the new regime; *Interregnum*, p. 11.

certainly existed and could be just as willing to die as martyrs as anyone else.[43] Regarding the memory of the royalist experience, Mark Stoyle has researched the experience of common royalist veterans, many of whom were permanently disabled, in the decades following the Restoration.[44] While work remains to be done to develop a full and fair portrait of royalism between 1640 and 1660, these pioneering studies have provided a much more detailed likeness than the broad, flawed strokes that had hidden royalism's intricacies for so long.

This project contributes to this new work in a number of ways. The study of royalist martyrdom helps us to understand the nature of and connections between royalist religion and personal piety, and reveals the intertwining of intense loyalty to the king with intense loyalty to the established Church: these men specifically claimed that by serving the King, they also served God. The cult of the royalist martyrs reveals how varieties of royalist identity were transformed through interactions with Parliamentarians, Presbyterians, and one another in the constantly changing landscape of the English Revolution. By looking at the different ways in which royalists behaved on the scaffold, we can explore the topic of "Cavalier" masculinity, whose styles ranged from the flamboyant to the somber. Their comments on their alleged treasons also teach us about modes of resistance to the revolutionary regime and about the centrality of political memory to the making and sustaining of royalism through both the experience of defeat and the experience of a triumphant Restoration. On this point, royalist treatment of vanquished enemies also permits a unique perspective on the "Good Old Cause," broadly

---

[43] Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile* (New York, 2004) and *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies* (Burlington, 2011); Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (London, 2004).
[44] Mark Stoyle, "'Memories of the Maimed': The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730," *History* 88 (April 2003), pp. 204-226.

understood: while royalist propagandists after 1660 tended to treat all the regicides as members of a unified band, ignoring the ideological differences among them, royalists themselves differed in their attitudes on how best to restore the kingdom, with some favoring conciliation and others demanding blood retribution.

IV

The organization of this dissertation is primarily chronological. The first and third chapters cover what might be considered the "canonical" royalist martyrs of the Interregnum, subdivided into two periods by the catastrophic royalist defeat at Worcester in 1651. The first period included famous figures like Lord Capel, whose royalist piety encapsulated many of the tropes of Cavaliers of the previous decade. It also included less well-known royalists like Browne Bushell, a royalist officer executed in London in 1651 and noted for his bravery at the scaffold. Dying in the first two and a half years after the Regicide, these men were targeted at a time when the Commonwealth still seemed to be on shaky ground. After Worcester, the nature of the royalist threat to the Commonwealth changed, as the cause was on the run or exiled on the Continent. There was a lull between 1651 and 1654, during which there were no cases that could be taken up by royalist martyrologists after the Restoration because the royalists were at their lowest point, in terms of capability, in two decades. Furthermore, the structure of England's government changed with the abandonment of Parliament and the institution of the Protectorate. Beginning in 1654, a series of failed royalist rebellions attempted to overthrow Cromwell's Protectorate, occasionally targeting the aging general himself. Men like John Penruddock and his fellow rebels in 1655 would be executed near the provincial sites of

their risings. Others, like Church of England minister John Hewitt, would have widely visible executions in London. The first and third chapters, then, deal with closely related figures who were separated more by time and circumstance than by ideology; they would all be upheld in royalist literature after 1660.

The second chapter deals with an important exception: the trial and execution of Christopher Love, a Presbyterian minister who had famously defended the Parliamentarian cause during the 1640s. By 1651, however, he and other Presbyterians had condemned the Regicide and aligned themselves with the Crown, particularly because Charles II had taken the Engagement and seemed poised to favor a Presbyterian settlement in England similar to that in Scotland, which Love had long admired. Love's case was debated extensively in the press, and his wife Mary later wrote a biography defending her husband. Love's case will illustrate best the contingent nature of royalist political allegiances, and how this could result in erstwhile-Parliamentarians betraying their former cause for a new one. In the long term, Love's martyrdom would perplex royalists; he had made too many statements against the Crown to rehabilitate himself fully by dying a martyr's death. Love was devoted to Presbyterianism rather than to monarchy itself, and he likely would have protested when Restoration martyrologists diluted his statements, making him a generically pious royalist instead of a godly Presbyterian.

The fourth and fifth chapters are closely related to one another and address the limited but decisive Restoration revenge. These analyze how the ten regicides executed in October 1660 attempted to portray themselves as martyrs for the "Good Old Cause," even though by 1660 they espoused diverse versions of it, with some turning to a Cromwellian

godly Protestantism, others to Republicanism, and still others to Fifth Monarchism. These vocally unrepentant regicides generally behaved, just as the royalists had, according to the expected criteria of Christian martyrdom in seventeenth century England. They invoked many of the same scriptural sources and behaved in much the same way, even though the restored monarchy set their executions in different locations to convey a different message. Chapter 4 considers the large-scale publications about these executions, which appeared in several versions in 1660 and 1661. Chapter 5 addresses the more diverse range of satires and other short polemical texts that undercut the regicides' performances. An important part of this chapter is the deconstruction of not merely the ten regicides of October 1660 but also the three posthumous "executions" of January 1661, when the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, and William Ireton were exhumed, hanged, and beheaded at Tyburn on the anniversary of Charles I's execution. This act and the related publications inverted these supposed heroes, placing them below the ground in hell, rather than entombed among kings.

The sixth chapter returns to the royalist martyrs, as they were re-presented through martyrologies published after the Restoration. Their martyrological memories shifted with changing political circumstances. Restoration apologists homogenized royalist martyrs in much the same way that they had homogenized the regicides, treating them as men worthy of emulation by England in direct contrast to those who were executed in 1660. The restored monarchy revised memories, replacing exile and oppression with a new narrative of triumph and revenge. As noted above, the unique treatment of Christopher Love embodies the lingering debate between "true" royalists and those who did not conform to the triumphalist definition of a friend of the King.

Nevertheless, the power of Love's public performance sustained his memory even while his Presbyterianism was consigned to an apologetic footnote. The hardline Cavalier response was not as temperate as the King's wishes for the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, which forgave most former parliamentarians, imprisoned some dozens, and executed only ten. The development of an ostensibly canonical royalist martyrdom—and canonical status was granted by the authors, not by the Crown—mirrored the political controversies that developed in Charles II's royal honeymoon, as the Clarendon codes sought to ensure that England was unquestionably unified, both religiously and politically.

Finally, the concluding chapter considers a different kind of source, one that never became public even as sections of it seem to have intentionally imitated published texts: the enormous commonplace book of Sir John Gibson, a royalist officer imprisoned for politically induced debt from 1653 to 1661. In his book, he proclaimed that a prisoner and a martyr were the same, a provocative statement. Through his book, it is possible to see how even an outlier who does not seem to have been targeted for his political or religious beliefs (despite his presumptions otherwise) and who had no risk of facing execution still internalized the public discourse of royalist martyrdom and the spiritual power of suffering. Gibson's "pilgrimage," as he described his imprisonment, spans the full chronology of this project, beginning with his soldiering in the 1640s and concluding with his release in 1661. Gibson's prison writings are an extended meditation on suffering and death, as well as the meaning of salvation, the love of God, and the persistent power of the royalist message. Gibson's piety complicates our understanding of martyrs for "the Cavalier."

Chapter 1: "I desire my blood may be the last": Post-Regicidal Royalist Martyrdom

The looming memory of the Regicide characterized the development of English martyrdom between 1649 and mid-1651, with that broader category dominated by those royalists executed by Parliament in and around London. The few exceptions, whether Parliamentarians assassinated by Royalists or radicals executed by the army, were overshadowed and outnumbered by the Crown's supporters simply because of the dynamics of power. Executed army radicals made a small but significant category, fostering in their own way the new regime's reputation for bloodthirstiness; but the most spectacular performances were still royalist because they were more closely linked to the Regicide, fresh in the nation's memory. Most importantly, they were more public.[1] The potential royalist martyrs, who would be resurrected through a victorious series of pamphlets at the Restoration, used their scaffold performances to link their deaths to one another and to King Charles I, to Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, and occasionally even to the more divisive figure of Archbishop Laud. In doing so they constructed a "Royal Martyrology" in the public mind long before the pamphlets bearing that title and codifying the catalogue appeared. Even though these men did not always

---

[1] Notable examples include Levellers in the army tried for mutiny by courts-martial, such as Robert Lockyer, who was memorialized in *The Army's Martyr*, 1649, and other publications. Also relevant are the murders of Parliamentarian ambassadors Isaac Dorislaus in the Netherlands and Anthony Ascham in Spain. These murders were recast as just reward for anti-Royalism by John Vicars in *Dagon Demolished*, 1660, p. 10; though published in 1660 it was penned nearer to 1651. Non-royalist potential martyrs like Lockyer fall outside the scope of this chapter. It will also exclude the Marquess of Montrose, who was executed in Edinburgh and upheld later as a royalist martyr in his own right. These figures remained important as examples of Parliamentarian oppression and merit closer attention in future studies; the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Pragmaticus* noted that "innocency is no more a protection for Levellers than Cavaliers, nor for honest John Lilburn and his partners, then it was for his late incomparable Majesty, and Capell"; May 8-15, 1649, p. 27.

use the word "martyr," they behaved in a way that fit the usual definition by denying guilt of their alleged crimes and insisting that they died for a cause, in their case that of defending the King and the English people against an unjust oppressor. As such they pointed to Charles I's own martyrdom as a unifying precedent through which all of England, even those who had abandoned the Crown at some point during the 1640s, could be cleansed and reunited. The first royalist martyrs encouraged others to learn from their example: the lesson was not that Royalism must be punished, as the Rump Parliament intended, but rather that England must resist Parliamentarian oppression and speedily restore Charles II, as Charles I himself had urged from the scaffold.

This is particularly evident in one trope that several of the early royalist martyrs used: the desire that each would be the "last blood" poured out for the cause. Ending bloodshed required a political settlement that, they argued, benefited from God's blessing. These men were not traitors, they said. They were loyal servants of the King and of God, which were codependent allegiances in their understanding of kingship. Therefore sacrificing blood for the King served God's desire for peace by drawing popular support for royalism. For example, the Duke of Hamilton wished that his blood would be the last spilled on 9 March 1649. Captain Browne Bushell said the same thing on 29 March 1651, and others used similar phrases in the interim.[2] In these first years

---

[2] Hamilton said that for the kingdom to find peace, "I wish that this blood of mine may be the last that is drawn." Similarly, Holland prayed a few minutes later that for the happiness of the nation "the bloud which is here spilt, may be even the last which may fall among us." Two years later, Bushell said, "I desire my bloud may be the last that is to be shed upon this account"; *The several Speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridg, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, Upon the Scaffold Immediately before their Execution*, 1649, pp. 11 and 20; *The Speech and Confession of Capt. Brown-Bushel, at the place of Execution on Saturday, under the Scaffold on Tower-Hill*, 1651, p. 4. It is possible that Bushell's reference to "this account" meant the official crime of his execution, i.e., the surrender of Scarborough Castle to

after the Regicide, the reference to "last blood" would become almost a catchphrase, symbolizing future peace, reestablished under the monarchy. Charles himself had famously proclaimed that he was the "martyr of the people" in his own scaffold speech, giving his life for the sake of others. In all these cases, the potential martyrs hoped that their examples would lead others to restore the monarchy. They also believed that restoration was reasonably possible in a short period of time. "Last blood" was a rhetorical tool, as surely Hamilton did not think that the two men slated to follow him to the scaffold would somehow be spared; but the statement demonstrates how Christian beliefs about salvation were closely linked to temporal beliefs about what was best for England. Bloodshed, they implied, would persist until the English people toppled the Rump's tyrannical rule. For these potential royalist martyrs, their blood would be the seed of a restored Church of England and of a peaceful kingdom, with Charles II commanding both.

This chapter will track the development of the royalist martyrology in these first years, considering both how individuals differed in their self-presentations and re-presentations in the press as well as how they actively aligned themselves with the same royalist cause, anticipating with great hope their own heavenly salvation as well as a temporal, monarchist salvation for those who remained on earth. The potential royalist martyrs saw their deaths as their last personal battles in defense of royalism, but they were aware of the need for public self-sacrifice to advance the cause. They were mostly former soldiers, and their executions were a direct extension of the British civil wars. The only true civilian was Henry Hide, a cousin of the royalist politician and eventual Earl of

---

Crown forces in 1643; but the rest of his speech indicates a broader concern with the royalist cause as a whole.

Clarendon Edward Hyde; he was a diplomat for the exiled court, and his activities in Turkey undermined the Rump's status as a legitimate government. Royalist hagiographers would acknowledge these men's differences in social background and inconsistent loyalties during life while emphasizing their shared cause of self-sacrificial death, which they expressed through similar words and behavior, consciously utilizing the tropes of royalist allegiance. For example, Lord Capel and Captain Bushell, representing vastly different social groups, each asked whether the block and axe for their executions had been used for their late king. Each recognized these objects as powerful symbols of continuity, revered them through acts of veneration, and encouraged witnesses to do the same. Similarly, some of the potential martyrs invoked either their direct predecessors or their waiting companions at the block as fellow sufferers. They joined a twofold fraternity, past and present, uniting Christ and crown.[3]

As discussed in the introduction, the theme of this project is contested martyrdom: each of these men was deemed an enemy by the state, while they contrarily proclaimed that their beliefs were true. Nevertheless, in these early cases there was surprisingly little contestation by Parliament after the fact. This would radically change with the trial of Christopher Love in the summer of 1651, but at first the High Court of Justice and the Rump Parliament hoped that the trials and spectacular executions would speak for themselves. The Court argued its causes—the legitimate authority of the Rump and the

---

[3] Notably, these cases transcend the traditional social classes, demonstrating how royalists great and mean were equally willing to give their lives for the king. "Popular royalism" was until recently a largely ignored category, with most preference given to famous leaders like John Penruddock (see chapter 3), as in David Underdown's *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660* (New Haven, 1960). More recently, Lloyd Bowen has studied how popular royalists remained consciously distinct from Levellers and other opponents of the new regime, even as they all sought to discredit it; "Seditious speech and popular royalism, 1649-60," in McElligott and Smith, *Royalists and royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 44-66.

necessity of the Regicide—implicitly through convictions for treason and public beheadings, both of them profound statements of power. But there is little evidence of a persistent posthumous campaign to reinforce the official message intended by these punishments, and reports of trials and executions before mid-1651 were straightforwardly factual. Failure to respond may simply mean that the Rump assumed that its case was already clear and required no further support, but Royalist counter-propaganda circulated relatively freely. The potential martyrs' last speeches were bereft of commentary, even when printed by licensed publishers, effectively giving the condemned the last word. A dying speech was a privileged text. This had the unintended consequence of allowing passionate royalist polemic to dominate the press while Commonwealth propagandists delayed their responses to these royalist publications, especially *Eikon Basilike,* for months. Martyrs after the decisive Royalist defeat at Worcester were more consistently rebutted, partly because their conspiracies against an otherwise settled Commonwealth were inherently harder to justify than fighting for the royalist army during the civil wars; but the Rump's apologists had also learned the propagandistic necessity of arguing against the royalist line. Even then, dying men received a certain respect in print.[4]

Even though these first Interregnum martyrs' protestations overshadowed official narratives, the actual trials and licensed trial accounts remained powerful forms of propaganda in their own right, conveying the new regime's authority to exact justice. There were also courts martial for mutiny, usually reserved for Levellers or other

---

[4] See below, Henry Hide in particular; there were two published versions of his speech, with the longer professing to be copied with great care, but this invited a sympathetic interpretation of his performance, ensuring that his own narrative, unquestioned in the pamphlet, would dominate the discussion. From the opposing side, see also chapter 4, in which the executed regicides' speeches of 1660 were printed in full with critical royalist commentary, encouraging readers to judge them by their dastardly lives but still offering their words and courageous performances for public consideration.

Parliamentarians who had become too radical, including those who demanded their payment ahead of schedule. Mutiny, however, was not necessarily treason, the crime for which Royalist officers were tried. Mutineers were tried by and within the army, while royalist "traitors," besides a few tried by regional assizes, faced the High Court of Justice in Westminster Hall, a court that had been invented to try Charles. Army firing squads lacked the spectacle of the traditional beheading or hanging, drawing, and quartering before a crowd. The use of the High Court for the three lords executed in March 1649 ensured that the destruction of the royal cause would have nearly the same grandiosity that had accompanied the trial of the King himself. Show trials at Westminster were by their nature impressive.[5] Setting aside legal questions over the High Court's redefinition of treason, the Rump and the Court demonstrated unshakable *de facto* power by punishing alleged traitors. This was despite demands like those of the Duke of Hamilton and Colonel John Morris to be tried by court-martial as soldiers or imprisoned indefinitely as prisoners of war.[6] It was also despite the fact that most of these men were arrested before the Regicide, which occasionally forced the Court to reach far back to demonstrate some type of treason. Browne Bushell, for example, was captured in 1648 for piracy, privateering for the King's interests in the North Sea; but he was tried and executed in 1651 for surrendering Scarborough Castle and defecting to the King's army

---

[5] Even if the printed response to royalist martyrs was insufficient, Rumpers knew the importance of public spectacles to convey power as well as a republican ideal. Cromwell's victorious entries into the city after battles were one effective means; see Sean Kelsey, *Inventing Republic: The political culture of the English Commonwealth 1649-1653* (Stanford, 1997), especially chapter 2, "Spectacle."

[6] Morris even offered to pay the court to provide him with armed guards rather than be clapped in irons, invoking the dignity of a soldier; *An Exact Relation of the Tryall & Examination of John Morris*, 1649, p. 5. Morris, like all traitors, was officially tried according to the Treason Act 1351, 25 Ed. III; but he noted the absurdity that he was essentially being tried for defending kingship before it was made illegal, making him a prisoner from an opposing army, rather than a subject of the Rump's self-proclaimed Commonwealth. Ibid, p. 1, and *State Trials* 4.1250.

back in 1643, after his brief service in the Parliamentarian army. Such contortions demonstrate the Rump's need to establish its own legitimacy: these had to be better than *mere* show trials. The rule of law and the punishment of treason were essential for the new regime to gain respect and loyalty in the Commonwealth. In the long term, however, royalist re-presentations of these trials would provide alternate interpretations of the initial spectacle.

Kevin Sharpe has argued that the Parliamentarian response to *Eikon Basilike* was hesitant and delayed so long that it permitted a royalist narrative to dominate the debate over the King's execution.[7] This also appears to be the case for those men executed in 1649, shortly after the Regicide. Thanks in large part to *Eikon Basilike*'s success, a pro-royalist narrative took hold within days, weeks before the first ancillary martyrs would follow Charles's example. Since the first cases still dealt with pre-regicidal crimes, the new martyrs repeated Charles's original argument that the High Court of Justice was illegal. This would change later in 1651, when Charles II's invasion from the north and the Presbyterians' partial defection became serious threats to Parliament's authority; the royalists executed that year drew a more consistent rebuttal. The Eusebius Andrewes plot of 1650 already hinted at the increased fears of royalist conspiracy, indicating that the Rump was combating a new threat in Charles II, not merely repeating its overthrow of

---

[7] Kevin Sharpe, *Image Wars* (New Haven, 2010), p. 400. Substantial rebuttals of *Eikon Basilike* included *Eikon Alethine* and John Milton's *Eikonoklastes*, but these were published in August and October—months after not only the Regicide but also the executions of the three lords. Sharpe argues that "everything the republic did, or said, was enacted and uttered in the shadow of the deceased Charles I," an inescapable force that hindered the young republic's articulations of itself; ibid, p. 453. The Independent minister John Price also lamented that the licensers had granted a "liberal imprimatur" in permitting far too many royalist books to be published freely, such as *Eikon Basilike*; quoted in Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 157. See also Jason Peacey, "Reporting a Revolution: a failed propaganda campaign," in Peacey, ed., *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (London, 2001). Price would later warn Christopher Love of the power of the Parliamentarian press to undercut martyrs; see chapter 2.

Charles I. But this was not yet the case in the spring of 1649, and Parliament's propaganda improvements were still limited before Worcester, permitting the martyrs' speeches to appear in print as miniature versions of *Eikon Basilike*, unchallenged by alternative interpretations.[8]

The royalists' cause was simple: England had to return to Christ by restoring His Anointed, King Charles II, thereby restoring the health of the entire community. They were martyrs for restoration. This need had been clear since the beginning of the civil wars, as discord in the kingdom was the result of a disease in the body politic and the hand of the Devil himself.[9] Critics of the Regicide saw the events of 30 January 1649 as the ultimate national sin, which could only be purged by a return to the monarchy and sound Christian principles which, despite what it said, Parliament had wholly rejected. While many, if not most, Parliamentarians during the 1640s had presumed that they were merely fighting to save the King from his evil counsellors, this claim was difficult to

---

[8] One important apologist was the Presbyterian Clement Walker, whose third volume of his *History of Independency*, entitled *The High Court of Justice, or Cromwell's New Slaughter-House in England* (1651), condemned the illegality of many of these trials; far more than a surreptitiously printed pamphlet, this was an entire book, in fact the third of a series, challenging the authority of the new regime to punish what it called rebellion. It professed to have "arraigned, convicted, and condemned" the new regime, a legal characterization, for its "usurpation, treason, tyranny, theft, and murder"; frontispiece.

[9] In his study of the tangible power of the Devil in England, Nathan Johnstone argues, "The Civil War, then, gave an entirely unprecedented tangibility to the workings of Satan within the commonwealth, as the concept of diabolic subversion was used to come to terms with the breakdown of government…Like narratives of crime, demonisation during the Civil War involved far more complex processes than those of only functionalist projection. The force of the concept of diabolic subversion lay in its ability to encourage an engagement with the complexities of the conflict…It demanded that action be taken"; *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 248-49. Johnstone argues that each side saw itself as fighting Satan's influences during the civil wars. At times the Devil even appeared to accompany the war's protagonists, which itself became a useful image for polemicists; see Mark Stoyle, *The Black Legend of Prince Rupert' Dog: Witchcraft and Propaganda during the English Civil War* (Exeter, 2011). The idea persisted after the Restoration, as in William Winstanley's *Loyall Martyrology* (1665), which opens by quoting 1 Samuel 15:23, "Rebellion is as the Sin of Witch-craft," a verse popular since the sixteenth century; few noted the irony that in the verse, Samuel was warning King Saul after his rebellion against God's authority by performing unlawful sacrifices.

defend once Charles was beheaded, even if "treason" had been redefined as an act against the Kingdom, and then the Commonwealth, rather than against the King himself. But royalists insisted at their trials that the Kingdom could not be abolished, regardless of what acts Parliament claimed to have passed. Virtue, they claimed, had been criminalized. The King had to return. Treason trials and executions became arenas in which both sides waged this constitutional debate. The martyrs of the Commonwealth were restorative in that their deaths were interpreted by both sides in different ways as purging England of some stain, whether of the memory of monarchical abuse or of the sin of king-killing. The contest of martyrdom after the Regicide was about the nature of that sin.

The remainder of this chapter will deal with a variety of individuals in a series of public executions, mostly in London and mostly by the authority of the Rump Parliament and the High Court of Justice. These cases are addressed chronologically: first, the Lords Hamilton, Holland, and Capel in London in March 1649 for waging war against the Kingdom of England the year before; second, Colonel John Morris and Michael Blackborne in York in August 1649, for retaking Pontefract Castle in Charles II's name; third, Colonel Eusebius Andrewes in London in August 1650, for conspiracy; and fourth, two unrelated cases in London in March 1651, the diplomat Sir Henry Hide for representing Charles II in Turkey and Captain Browne Bushell for privateering in the North Sea. Each of these men would be revived in print as royalist martyrs in 1660.[10]

---

[10] After 1660, these martyrs were reassembled in various media to defend the restored monarchy, usually published anonymously, often illustrated, and occasionally omitting one or another. Notable examples include the book *England's Black Tribunal* (1660); the broadsheet *The Royal Martyrs* (1660); the broadsheet *The State Martyrologie* (1660); the book *Royall and Loyall Blood* (1662); and William Winstanley's *The Loyall Martyrologie* (1665); see chapter 6.

Except for Hide, they were soldiers; and except for Morris and Andrewes, their crimes predated the Regicide. Through these executions, the Rump argued that one who connived against it was a traitor, especially if he appealed to royal authority. This means that, while most of these potential martyrs would describe their own deaths in deeply religious terms, consciously following the example of Charles I, they were also political martyrs, dying for a particular vision of England and its government. The key characteristics of martyrological activity between January 1649 and September 1651 were England's blood-guilt for the regicide, the lineage of martyrs from Charles to the present, and the hope that Charles II would regain control through plots and invasions. For individuals, the emphasis could vary; but there was usually evidence of all these themes.

The sources for this chapter are mostly printed, consisting of officially licensed trial accounts; independently published copies of last speeches; and, for the three lords of 1649, anonymously authored elegies. The literature produced in response to the three lords is closely related to concurrently printed literature about the Regicide, and sometimes an account of the King's trial was combined with the trials of the lords in a single volume. Elegies linked the King to the lords in the same way, especially Capel, who was praised as his most loyal disciple. The publishing history in this period is ambiguous, as the infamous forty-nine editions of *Eikon Basilike* demonstrate. Licensing was virtually meaningless until the Rump established firmer control of presses. Elegies were usually printed without an identified publisher, probably because they questioned the legitimacy of the executions. Trial narratives were usually licensed by either the Rump or the High Court of Justice; but the accounts read as transcripts with minimal

commentary, not as state-sponsored propaganda, although these are hardly exclusive categories. Later executions, in 1650 and 1651, had a more consistent response, with publishers usually named on the frontispiece and employed by the government. These were still not aggressively polemical, even if they conveyed a more official tone. Many of the publishers had previously worked for either side in the wars but at this point needed financial security and were willing to print for anyone who would pay.[11] As it had been even before the civil wars, the "last dying speech" was a lucrative genre for printers, to the point that Andrewes's words were later reprinted fraudulently as that of the Earl of Derby to beat competitors to the market (see chapter 3). Woodcuts depicting a standard beheading accompanied multiple speeches, not unlike the "file photo" of modern media. In these cases, the propaganda war was driven at least as much by simple economics. Newsbooks, on the other hand, usually had a clear political leaning, even if a particular story was apparently neutral. This variety of sources did not always appear for a specific case, but taken together they tell the story of Interregnum martyrdom.

I

"Three Renowned Worthies": The Lords of March, 1649

Although they had all been in prison since 1648, the Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Holland, and Lord Capel did not face trial until after the Regicide because the King's own proceedings at the swiftly convened High Court of Justice had consumed the young Commonwealth's attention. The three had been captured separately during the second civil war, with Holland falling into the army's hands first after his ill-fated and last-

---

[11] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 65.

minute attempt to return to the King's service in July. He had repeatedly changed sides throughout the previous decade; but in 1648 he favored a treaty between Crown and Parliament, a moderate position until the war resumed, at which point he raised a cavalry unit to support the Crown. The Scottish Duke of Hamilton, whose political history was complicated but never Parliamentarian, surrendered in August with his Engager army shortly after his defeat at the Battle of Preston, which was effectively the end of the war. Capel, not always a soldier but always loyal to the Crown, surrendered a few days later, ending the summer-long siege at Colchester, which after Preston had no hope of reinforcement. Each had negotiated articles of surrender that they believed would preserve their lives, but the terms were ignored at their trials by the High Court of Justice in February 1649. Whatever their past experiences, the three were united in their suffering while the memory of their beheaded king's travails remained fresh. Their executions for treason before Westminster Hall on 9 March 1649, just a half-mile and six weeks from the more famous execution up the street at the Banqueting House, would be the first case of post-regicidal contested martyrdom, the first blood in the accelerating debate over *Eikon Basilike* and the king's death. Charles's memory guided the three men's behavior in deeply tangible ways, but it also shaped how London publications would characterize their executions. Through the Regicide, the Royalist martyrological tradition had already begun, and those who followed would join a rapidly growing brotherhood.

These first three Interregnum martyrs were all noblemen and died the same morning, which invited homogenization of otherwise disparate individuals. They were not close companions during the civil wars, they were captured separately with varying

reputations for loyalty before 1648, and they behaved differently in their turns on the scaffold. Hamilton was also tried separately from Holland and Capel under his subsidiary English title "Earl of Cambridge" for leading the invasion from Scotland in July 1648.[12] Only the briefest analyses treated the three as if they were the same, simply by omitting the differences. Most narratives dealt with all three executions; but by contrast, the elegies published in the following weeks and months drew on their varied performances to memorialize each in a different light. Capel soon became the hero of the group because of his gallant behavior at the scaffold and his less complicated personal history of loyalty to the Crown. Hamilton received less praise from royalists, partly because he was a Scot, but also because his political maneuvers during the 1640s were difficult to decipher and possibly driven by self-interest.[13] Finally, Holland's history of periodic disloyalty, which unlike Hamilton had included outright Parliamentarianism, led to characterizations as a begrudgingly repentant sinner rather than a stalwart friend of the King.

Only the unifying effects of the Restoration would ensure that their names routinely appeared literally on the same page, when it was easier to treat them as a tableau within a broader narrative that eliminated inconvenient details that complicated the appearance of unanimity. Even in 1649, however, the mere act of dying on the same stage encouraged witnesses to view them as co-sufferers for the royalist cause. Beginning

---

[12] *State Trials*, 4.1155.

[13] Though imprisoned by the Crown in the mid-1640s, Hamilton was one of the King's most important representatives in Scotland at the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 and was essential in working with the Scottish Engagers in 1648 to assemble the army that would ultimately fail at Preston. Though it was reported that he was working for his own best interests, by 1648 he had regained Charles's trust; Hilary L. Rubinstein, *Captain Luckless* (Totowa, NJ, 1976), p. 218. Similarly, James Heath included Hamilton in his Restoration martyrology but omitted his speech "not only because of another Nation, though a Peer of this, but because, it is in question, whether he suffered not for obeying the commands of the Scotch Parliament and Kirk, who sent him as General in that Expedition, and that the Kings Interest was but collateral"; *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors*, 1663, p. 229.

at the scaffold, then, the development of a royalist martyrology would parallel the Christian martyrology of the early Church. Martyrdom can group people together under the same banner to eliminate differences among them, much in the way that saints in heaven would be purged of their sins in the collective body of Christ, wearing, in John's vision, the same white robes. In a similar way, the three royalist martyrs of March 1649 could join as one despite past sins and denials of Charles as their earthly savior. They prefigured England's—and perhaps Britain's—desired unity through what true believers saw as their greatest action: the pouring out of their own blood to share a message of salvation for England, namely, repent and believe in the Monarch. Parliament may have attempted to break this message by executing them at Westminster Hall, the symbol of its own authority, as a logical sequel to the Regicide's deeply symbolic setting at the Banqueting House. Nevertheless, hagiographers treated the executions as further evidence of England's moral collapse. The spectacle of a triple beheading overcame the variations in the three performances and gave credence to fears that the world was turning upside down: if first the king and then his loyal nobles faced the block, who would be next?

In terms of personnel, the trials of the three lords were a direct successor to the trial of the King, whose exceptional High Court of Justice was quickly reconvened. This fed perceptions that the lords died for the King's cause. Formal proceedings against Hamilton, Holland, and Capel, along with the Earl of Norwich and Sir John Owen, whose lives were spared, began on Friday, 9 February—just ten days after the Regicide.[14] John

---

[14] Owen had earlier said that it would be a great honor to be beheaded alongside such noble men, but his petition fared better than theirs; Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, 1888 edition, vol. IV, p. 503 (book XI, paragraph 257).

Bradshaw, who had been the Lord President at the King's trial, presided again.[15] William Steele, who should have led the prosecution against the King but was forced to step down due to illness, had recovered sufficiently in the interim to argue these cases. The trials in Westminster Hall were only slightly less spectacular than the royal precedent and comparable to other famous state trials of the Civil War, like those of Strafford and Laud.

In the published trial narratives, last speeches, and elegies, the death of Charles always provided meaning for the executions of Hamilton, Holland, and Capel. The traditions of martyrdom, with successive martyrs witnessing to the same divine truth, shaped the debates concerning the nature of Charles's death and the legitimacy of Parliament's power. But despite their eventual homogenization, the three lords, while linked together, were not always treated as a balanced triumvirate. In some cases, only Capel was hailed as a martyr in his own right, while the others had to purge their sins and return to the path of virtue in their final hours. The primary sources for the three lords' martyrological achievements are the published accounts of their trials, copies of their last speeches, and a variety of elegies, including some for Capel and Charles together. Most extant publications were either straightforwardly neutral or openly hagiographical. The executions fed claims that Parliament was unnecessarily brutal, already at a height since the regicide. One elegy asks, "Suffic'd it not your thirst (ye hell-fir'd soules) / T' have drunke the dregs of wrath in your Kings gore? / But must ye quaffe damnations healths in bowles / Of our Peeres blod, t'intoxicate ye more?"[16] Parliament appeared bloodthirsty

---

[15] Bradshaw was one of the three who were posthumously executed in January 1661; see chapter 5.

[16] *An Elogie, and Epitaph, Consecrated to the ever Sacred Memory of that most Illustrious, and Incomparable Monarch, Charles […] Together with an Elogy and Epitaph upon the truely lamented death of that Excellent patterne of perfect Magnanimity, Virtue, Valour, and Loyalty, Arthur Lord Capell*, 1649, p. 7.

and vindictive, demanding more heads for its demonic collection. This hindered its efforts to establish its legitimacy, especially since one of its key claims about Charles had been that he dragged his country through a long, bloody war and then provoked its resumption in 1648.

Anticipating this frequently repeated accusation, the three condemned men used their executions to recast or reaffirm their legacies as servants of king and country, positioning their lives and deaths as arguments against Parliament's legitimacy. To oversimplify a bit, but also to reflect the distinctions drawn in the press at the time, the three lords can be categorized as follows. Holland was a repeated turncoat who, fortunately for his soul, managed to die for the right side despite living for all others. His death gave Charles's sacrifice a salvific character, augmenting his position as a new Christ for his people. Hamilton, meanwhile, was a Scot, which made his death confusing for the English observer and overall the most complicated. His years as one of the King's most important Scottish advisers, his attempted retirement in 1646 after his release from royal imprisonment, and his dismal defeat at Preston invited criticism. Lord Capel, however, whose military and political services were less extensive but whose devotion was beyond reproach, was universally praised as the true companion of Charles in life and death. Some authors mentioned the other two lords as lesser exemplars of dying for the right cause. Others treated Capel as the lone unquestioned martyr, or appended an elegy to Capel after a more important elegy to Charles, ignoring the others altogether.

These characterizations drew on preexisting reputations but relied heavily on the three men's behavior on the scaffold, which reached a wide audience through straightforward printed accounts. Pamphlets noted that Hamilton and Holland spoke

publicly and prayed silently at great length, approximately an hour each, which could have given the appearance of hesitancy or fear, though that would depend on what they actually said. Capel, on the other hand, spoke briefly and confidently, with just fifteen minutes passing between his first appearance and the fall of the axe.[17] Even in a period in which long speeches and sermons were common, there was value in brevity. Capel's readiness, his Cavalier performance, and his strong words about the meaning of the day gave royalist pamphleteers excellent material with which to work. Although no pamphleteer rejected the others, Capel was the least ambiguous hero in the mix and received the most praise.

The first category of publications through which the lords could potentially attain the status of martyr were the trial and execution accounts, most versions of which included their last speeches, the single most important document in the construction of a martyr. Sometimes the speeches were published individually, as was common for notable criminals in the seventeenth century. Often these would be sold at future executions, linking a new execution to an earlier one in a loose narrative; but more often for the three lords, they were published together, presenting their several deaths as a unified event. The physical and temporal proximity of their deaths to that of King Charles ensured that their memories joined the common cause; but there remained important distinctions among them because of their background and their actual performances.

Hamilton was the most noticeably different, even by his own design. He argued that even though he was a longtime royalist, as a Scot he should be held as a prisoner of war, not tried by an English court for alleged crimes over which it had no jurisdiction.

---

[17] *The manner of the Beheading of Duke Hambleton, the Earle of Holland, and the Lord Capell*, 1649, passim.

Additionally, he, like Holland and Capel, argued that he had been granted quarter as part of the terms of surrender, thereby exempting him from prosecution.[18] There are two key publications exclusively about Hamilton. The first is a summary of the prosecution's case, including the texts of the arguments, written by prosecutor William Steele himself. In effect, this serves as an excerpt from Hamilton's trial, separate from the others, emphasizing by its existence how different he was from the other two. In the text, Hamilton and the court agreed that his case was unique because of his foreign status but differed over whether this mattered in passing judgment, as he was serving Charles I, King of England and of Scotland, in English matters. Though the High Court of Justice referred to him as the Earl of Cambridge to legitimize its jurisdiction, Hamilton insisted that this subsidiary title was improper because he was captured in battle while fighting for the Kingdom of Scotland, whose king had just been executed by a foreign country, making his Scottish title apply exclusively. He was merely fulfilling oaths that he could not break without punishment. The court rejected all these points because from its perspective "Cambridge" had been in service of the English crown.[19] This is, however, the only substantial defense of the Court's decisions published in 1649, and it was not an original response, merely a reproduction of portions of the trial transcripts, which were already in print.

The second document exclusively about Hamilton came from royalists. It is allegedly a copy of a paper given to his servants, distinct from but related to his scaffold speech, and printed by the royalist publisher Samuel Browne, a key figure in the exiled

---

[18] *Sate Trials*, 4.1155.
[19] William Steele, *Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridge his Case, Spoken to, and argued on the behalf of the Commonwealth, Before the High Court of Justice*, London, 1649.

English press at The Hague.[20] Its provenance is unclear, but it is royalist in its intentions. Hamilton presents his case to a select group, but he also acknowledges that it "may perhaps be thought necessary to be published as the last testimony of my loyaltie to my King, for whom I now dye, and of my affection to my Countrey, for the pursuance of whose pious, and loyall Commands, I am now to suffer."[21] Hamilton was aware that through print he could advance his cause after death. In these words Hamilton contests the High Court's decision that he was a traitor. Not only were his country's commands true; they were also "pious," implying duty and religious faithfulness. The only way to save his life would have been to reject that piety. His paper is peppered with such references, linking Christian faith to monarchical loyalty. He writes that his faith is "Orthodox…of the true reformed Protestant Religion, as it is professed in the Church of Scotland," which by this point likely meant the Solemn League and Covenant, which he took some years before as part of his efforts to ensure Scotland's support of its king.[22] In this vein, he defends the King against religious attacks, since he "never harboured thought of Countenancing Popery in any of his Dominions, otherwise then was allowed by the Lawes of England," an ambiguous position that might permit Laudian reforms as well. He admits that he was sorry that Strafford was executed in 1641 under Parliamentarian pressure; but he also states that he had nothing to do with the decision, true but less resounding than Charles or Capel's remorseful declarations of blood guilt for the late earl. Hoping that Charles II may yet be restored, Hamilton prays for him as "the unquestionable King by right of all his Fathers Kingdomes," a poignant pluralization for

---

[20] Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 119.
[21] *A true Copie of a Paper delivered by the Duke of Hamilton to some of his Servantes, at St James that morning before he suffred, in the presence of Doctor Sibbald*, The Hague, 1649, p. 1.
[22] Ibid.

this multinational noble.[23] Finally he concludes in the usual manner of a martyr, forgiving his murderers though their High Court was "erected…to destroy my Master" and admitting that though he was guilty of many sins, he had committed none of those for which he was condemned to die.[24] It is not clear why this document about Hamilton appeared, but it is evidence of communication between exiled royalists on the Continent and those who remained in London. The letter does not draw any contrasts with his companions. It is a standard martyrological defense, confined to one case: the King always served his people; Hamilton died for the King; the executions of Strafford, the King, and Hamilton were all unjust; and Charles II must one day, by the grace of God, be restored to his throne. The letter challenged the Court's verdict and, by implication, the entire legitimacy of the Rump Parliament.

The differences between the three men are most evident in the published accounts of their scaffold performances. The most substantial documents here were printed by Peter Cole, a prolific publisher during the Commonwealth and Protectorate who was both investigated by the Council of State for publishing about the King's trial and also appointed by the Council to help search for illegal books.[25] Twice he published the three lords' speeches together, once as a thorough, standalone account of their executions and again within an even longer account of the trial and death of the King, linking these new executions to the regicide in print as they had already been linked in the calendar and the

---

[23] Ibid, p. 2.
[24] Ibid, p. 4.
[25] Cole also published some of the pamphlets about Henry Hide and Christopher Love; see below, and chapter 2.

geography of Westminster.[26] A third account, much shorter and illustrated on the frontispiece with a generic woodcut of an execution, was licensed by Theodore Jennings and printed for Robert Ibbitson, whose publishing habits suggest a more radical leaning.[27] This version provided the essential details and summaries of each speech and would likely have been the most widely distributed, since as a small octavo pamphlet it required one sheet of paper. None of these versions show an apparent bias and simply report the facts. But pamphlets without commentary might unintentionally privilege the martyrs' self-representations over anything the Rump would have said.

Though the three lords were executed on the same morning, and all before the main gate of Westminster Hall, they were not lined up together; rather, each came in turn, took as much time as he required (the sheriffs were patient and respectful), and then was beheaded by axe at the block, followed by some pause until the next was led to the scaffold. In some ways their final actions appeared similar. It was a sunny morning. People watched from the surrounding windows and rooftops, and the scaffolds for spectators were crowded to the point that some collapsed. Each man was accompanied by a few servants and ministers. Hamilton and Holland had personal chaplains who gave spiritual instruction. Capel notably did not, but he said that he had received his own instruction privately, minutes earlier. All three wore white caps to keep their hair out of the way of the axe, as was the custom; and all three indicated that they were prepared for

---

[26] The texts of the speeches and narratives of the executions were identical in each of Cole's publications, with the only difference being the pagination and layout to fit within the larger volume. All citations hereafter will come from the standalone copy, *The several Speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridg, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, Upon the Scaffold Immediately before their Execution, on Friday the 9. of March*, London, 1649; cf. *King Charls his trial at the High Court of Justice … Together with the Several Speeches of Duke Hamilton, the Earl of Holland, and the Lord Capel,* London, 1649.
[27] *The Manner of the Beheading*. Jennings would become an important licenser, working frequently for John Bradshaw; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 156-58.

the final blow by extending both their arms, as Charles had. All three displayed an almost comical awkwardness and frankness when making sure that they were correctly positioned at the block. Their bodies were removed promptly, and their heads were resewn by a doctor in a nearby house.[28] This was all similar to Charles's execution six weeks before. We must be careful not to conflate Charles's performance with general seventeenth century practice, as public executions followed certain rubrics; but it is likely that the three lords, who referred to the late king in their speeches, were aware of these visual and behavioral similarities.

The several Speeches, Peter Cole's account, provides the most comprehensive narrative of the day. It refers to the Duke of Hamilton as the Earl of Cambridge, as prescribed by the High Court. His spiritual advisor, Dr. Sibbald, preaches to him personally about preparing to enter the Promised Land. Hamilton repeats his trial defense that, though he always loved England as much as his own country, he acted on order of Scotland's Parliament and therefore could not be judged unless as a prisoner of war.[29] To this he adds, "I wish the Kingdoms happinesse, I wish its peace; and truly Sir, I wish that this blood of mine may be the last that is drawn: and howsoever I may perhaps have some reluctancie with my self as to the matter of my suffering, for my fact, yet I freely forgive all; Sir, I carry no rancour along with me to my grave."[30] In one sense this is a typical martyr's speech, accepting death and forgiving his persecutors. But he also makes a jab at Parliament, since it was the reason that his blood was spilled. The only sure way to avoid

---

[28] *The Manner of the Beheading, passim.*
[29] *The several Speeches*, p. 8.
[30] Ibid, p. 11.

further bloodshed by a bloodthirsty "commonwealth" and to reestablish peace and happiness in the kingdom would be to restore the young Charles to his throne.

Hamilton's exchanges with Dr. Sibbald are useful in interpreting his behavior because Hamilton is always in control of the discussion, conveying confidence in his salvation, even without the minister's assurances. When the minister warns him that the sun will be in his face during his speech, Hamilton replies, "No Sir, it will not burn it. I hope I shall see a brighter Sun then this, Sir, very speedily."[31] Such optimism characterizes Hamilton's reflection on his faith, which he says is "such as hath been profest in the Land," a religion "that's right, that's sure, and that comes from God."[32] Which land is unclear, but we can presume that he means Scotland, or else an island united under the Presbyterianism that he had lately come to accept.[33] Hamilton stresses that he was a great sinner in need of God's forgiveness, but he contends that he is innocent of treason. He is concerned about clearing his name of accusations that he had betrayed Charles I, aware that he had once disappointed him. He reminds observers that since Charles was dead, Hamilton's words "cannot be thought flattery" but rather an exposition of "Truth…which we shall gain by forever."[34] Hamilton's use of "forever" has added meaning as the solemn profession of a dying man in the theater of execution. He then prays and receives final counsel from Sibbald. Hamilton remains optimistic regarding England's future. It may not save him from his Scottish background, but he presents himself as a man in control of his own behavior, even if other men controlled his

---

[31] Ibid, p. 8.
[32] Ibid, p. 9.
[33] He had written to the clergy of Lancaster before the Battle of Preston that he came to "settl[e] Presbyterian government according to the Covenant"; quoted in Rubinstein, *Captain Luckless*, p. 201.
[34] *The several Speeches*, p. 10.

body. His soul and his public memory would each be redeemed through these final moments.

Holland, however, given his inconsistent support for the King's cause, appears less sure of salvation, or at least requires more conversation about it with his chaplain, Mr. Bolton, who often takes the lead. This contrasts with Hamilton, whose chaplain was primarily there for general encouragement. Holland appears frustrated, lashing out at onlookers, requiring Bolton to quiet his temper. Holland protests that he was innocent and had never "offended so much the State, and the Kingdome, and the Parliament, [but] I have had an extream vanity in serving them very extraordinarily."[35] This is a noble boast for having served the best interests of his country, even if that was called treason by the new state. It is framed in a less positive manner, however, than his companions' defenses. Some of his words echoed Hamilton's and were more typical of a martyr's speech, such as when he prays "for the happinesse of this State, of this Nation, that the blood which is here spilt, may be even the last which may fall among us," adding that he will gladly die if it can somehow provide such peace; for "a State…built upon blood is a foundation for the most part that doth not prosper."[36] While he is willing to die for a greater cause, he remains pessimistic. He certainly seems not to be meditating on the assurances of Tertullian. Rather than sowing seeds for an eventual restoration, the late bloodshed will bring all to ruin. He also does not specifically condemn the regicide. He prays generally "that God would blesse this Kingdome, this Nation, this State; that he

---

[35] Ibid, p. 18. In Clarendon's view, Holland "took more care to be thought a good friend to parliaments than a good servant to his master, and was thought to say too little of his having failed so much in his duty to him, which most good men believed to be the source from whence his present calamity sprung"; *History of the Rebellion*, volume IV, p. 508 (book XI, paragraph 263).
[36] *The Several Speeches*, p. 20.

would settle it in a way agreeable to what this Kingdome hath been happily governed under; by a King, by the Lords, by the Commons…and I pray God the change of it bring not rather a prejudice, a disorder, and a confusion, then the contrary." This is a traditional settlement, and he acknowledges that returning to it would be a struggle worth enduring. But when he adds that his country's affairs "are in such a condition as (I conceive) no body can make a judgement of them," he misses an opportunity to pass his own judgment on the Regicide.[37] All is topsy-turvy and beyond understanding, he says. Typically a martyr retains great hope in God, grateful that he has the opportunity to die for his beliefs. Holland is more troubled.

This characterization in *The several Speeches* compromises Holland's appearance as a Royalist martyr. The several accounts agree that Holland was melancholy, not joyful, on the scaffold. He broods about his condition, which is atypical of a potential martyr. His personal history, which he admits had "not been agreeable to my breeding," may be the explanation of his actions. He had been guaranteed that his life would be spared if he surrendered, which the High Court of Justice had chosen to ignore. Hamilton and Capel had arranged similar terms, but they made only passing reference to their surrender at the scaffold. By contrast, during his meandering speech, Holland suddenly points to a soldier nearby and says, "This honest man took me prisoner. You little thought I should have beene brought to this, when I delivered my selfe to you upon conditions." Although he is not accusing this "honest man," Holland is frustrated by his misfortune, brought about by dishonest men. Bolton attempts to shift Holland's focus, worried that the earl is neither humble nor forgiving: "My Lord, throw your self into the Armes of mercy, and say, there

---

[37] Ibid, p. 19.

I will Anchor, and there will I die."[38] Holland mellows under his minister's influence. Bolton reminds him of the meaning of a good Christian death, and they have an extended public conversation about God's mercy. On the subject of death, Holland finally speaks of the King with cautious reflection: "It is not long since the King my Master passed in the same manner; and truly I hope that his purposes and intentions were such, as a man may not be ashamed, not only to follow him, in the way that was taken with him, but likewise not ashamed of his purposes, if God had given him life."[39] Holland's use of "hope" probably means that he was confident that this was true, but it also conveys a hesitancy that the others avoided. Even so, he links himself and his memory to the King, his "Master," who "passed in the same manner." Another difference for Holland from his companions comes in his final moment. When the executioner does not appear to notice that he has extended his arms, the usual sign of readiness, he is forced to say "now, now," at which point the axe suddenly drops, and he is finished. No existing commentaries called this a sign of Holland's inferiority, and it is certainly not a botched execution, like the grisly deaths with multiple axe blows of Lord Russell in 1683 or the Duke of Monmouth in 1685; but it is not clean. Even judging from his words alone, Holland did not provide the best material for the hagiographer and appeared rarely in elegies or, indeed, in martyrologies after 1660. Holland may have been just as worthy as his companions, but his public performance limited his later characterization.

Capel, meanwhile, appears the most similar to Charles and the most cavalier in his behavior, in both his unapologetic royalism as well as his carefree attitude at the

---

[38] Ibid, p. 32.
[39] Ibid, p. 24.

scaffold.[40] While Charles had been subdued, however, Capel is more flamboyant. The accounts are filled with descriptions of his gestures and showy behavior, and his performance is notable for its combination of the brash tropes of the royalist Cavalier with more traditional martyrological piety. He apologizes that he voted for the condemnation of Strafford in 1641, the same crime that Charles confessed was the source of all his troubles at the scaffold and in *Eikon Basilike*.[41] This implicitly condemns the parliament that is now condemning him, claiming that his only fault was in ever acquiescing to its demands years earlier. The two published accounts agree in substance, but *The Manner of the Beheading* provides more performative details, especially notable because it was printed for non-royalist Robert Ibbitson. Capel's behavior is brash and brave, jaunty and judicious, showing no "sence of death approaching" as he walks out "with his hat cockt and his cloak thrown under one arm, outfacing death with a great deal of carelessnesse." He is on the scaffold for just fifteen minutes and delivers his speech "with much earnestnesse, as if a Minister had been in a Pulpit rather than like a man dying."[42] Capel ascends the scaffold without his chaplain, having already conferred in private, which conveys an image of conviction and assurance of salvation. This is the expected behavior of a martyr: one should pray, but perhaps not pray too much, lest it suggest doubt. But it is also emblematic of the cocksure Cavalier. Capel proclaims that

---

[40] Ann Hughes has described Capel's execution performance as an example of royalist masculinity, which is a useful characterization of his bold behavior. However, according to his own words, his ultimate cause was the defense of the King; even if he was consciously modeling an ideal of masculine virtue, it was still because the meaning of that virtue derived from service to an anointed leader; Hughes, *Gender in the English Revolution* (New York, 2012), pp. 122-23. His almost playful behavior can also be compared to Andrea McKenzie's discussion of "dying game," but his devotion to the Crown in the context of 1649 trumps other conventions and dominates his actual performance; "Martyrs in Low Life? Dying 'Game' in Augustan England," *Journal of British Studies* 42:2 (April 2003).
[41] *The Severall Speeches*, p. 39; cf. *Eikon Basilike* (1649), ch. 2; numerous editions.
[42] *The Manner of the Beheading*, pp. 5-6

not only is he a Christian, and therefore praying for the forgiveness of his persecutors, but also that he is a Protestant and follower of the Thirty-Nine Articles, an implicit rejection of the present settlement of church and state.[43] Unlike Hamilton's recent alliance with the Scottish Presbyterians, Capel's religion is avowedly Anglican to the end. After repenting for his vote to condemn Strafford, he speaks of the two kings with more adulation than his companions had: "There was not a more virtuous, and more sufficient Prince known in the world, then our gracious King Charls that dyed last: God Almighty preserve our King that now is, his Son; God send him more fortunate and longer days; God Almighty so assist him, that he may exceed both the vertues and sufficiencies of his Father."[44] Capel knows the new king's qualities, he says, because he spent time with the young prince during the war, and he now prays that "God restore him to this Kingdom, and Unite the Kingdoms one unto another, and send a great happiness both to you and to him, that he may long live and Reign among you, and that that Family may Reign till thy Kingdom come."[45] This prayer for the eternal restoration of the Stuart monarchy and the happiness of the English people makes Capel the most complete example thus far of a "restorative martyr"—he seeks total restoration of "happiness," broadly understood, for all England, even upholding the Church of England establishment. He prays passionately for peace: "God Almighty stench, stench, stench this issue of blood; this will not do the business, God Almighty finde out another way to do it."[46] After this exhortation, Capel becomes silent and approaches the block. It was later said during the 1660 trial of the regicides that he had asked the executioner whether the block and axe were those used at

---

[43] *The Severall Speeches*, p. 37.
[44] Ibid, p. 39.
[45] Ibid, p. 40.
[46] Ibid, p. 42.

his king's death. The executioner affirmed that it was, so Capel kissed the axe and knelt.[47] The beheading proceeded without incident. His performance was memorable for its brevity and its conviction, assuring his place in the "Royal Martyrology," not simply because of the facts but specifically because of his presentation. Of the three men, Capel would appear most often in other media, and his memory would continue to be upheld as an example of loyalty and bravery, both in 1660 and even at his own son's infamous suicide in 1683.[48]

Taken together, the lords' scaffold performances served as a direct successor to the Regicide six weeks earlier, but the differences among them were crucial for how each would be remembered in the rapidly expanding "Royal Martyrology." They fulfilled certain martyrological expectations. Each invoked the King and his death as a common cause, stressing the importance of restoring the monarchy. Each reminded the audience that the present government was unjust and dishonest. Each repented of past sins while denying the supposed crimes for which they had been condemned. Because of the differences in their performances, however, Capel would receive the most praise in royalist propaganda, even as all three were cited as examples of dying for the cause. This was most evident in the elegies that appeared throughout 1649.

---

[47] According to the testimony of Mr. Cox; Hineage Finch, *An Exact and most Impartial Accompt Of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to Law) of Twenty Nine Regicides*, 1660, p. 236.
[48] Capel's son Arthur, the Earl of Essex, was found with his throat cut, apparently by his own hand with a nearby razor, in the Tower of London after his arrest for complicity in the 1683 Rye House Plot. It is surely no coincidence that an elegy appeared for Capel at the same time as a mock-elegy for Essex, calling the suicidal son "a Martyr to thy Doubts and Fears" who executed himself rather than wait for infamous axe-man "Jack Catch [to do] the Business"; *An Elegie on the Earl of Essex: Who Cut his own Throat in the Tower*, 1683. By contrast, Capel was a "Fire-prooft Martyr," dying "not with excess of Pain, but Joy"; *An Elegy upon that Renowned Hero and Cavalier, the Lord Capel*, 1683.

The elegy is a distinct genre, but it draws on other literature, such as the execution speeches we have just analyzed. As Andrea Brady explains, "Elegies, like funeral orations, combined persuasions against grief with warnings derived from the model of the deceased and the necessity of their deaths."[49] When the elegized person was also a potential martyr, then the warnings had political and religious significance. In those elegies that mentioned all three lords, each of their performances taught witnesses how best to follow Christ and serve the new king in different ways, deriving from their unique backgrounds. Capel's positive message invited more thorough elegies with fewer apologies. Neither Holland nor Hamilton were memorialized individually but rather mentioned secondarily in elegies otherwise devoted to Capel and the King. Capel was presented as a model of loyalty and stainless devotion to both Christ and Charles. This interpretation was contestable: Parliament did not want its traitors turned into martyrs. The first polemical shots were fired by royalists, however, and the state failed to reinforce its own characterization. As Brady notes, "radical reinterpretations of the same scenes prove the impossibility of maintaining that conformity…The affective energies of loss and anger which the funeral, effigy or procession managed became, in fact, more dangerous when they had to coalesce around the scaffold."[50] In executing these three men, the Rump relinquished its power over them to the public. The elegies of the three lords, which are the primary commentaries in this particular case (though not in subsequent cases in this project), are essential to the contestation and creation of martyrdom shortly after the regicide.

---

[49] Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2006), p. 13.
[50] Ibid, p. 89.

Only one printed elegy expressly dealt with all three men, calling them "three Renowned Worthies" in the title and published anonymously "in the first yeare of rebellious liberty, and democraticall tyranny," a damning annotation—yet this was published openly in London, essentially daring the new regime to challenge it. It laments that the world is upside down, with men dead and "poore Widowes comfortlesse abroad," a wandering that illustrates the disruption of the natural order and also recalls the exiled Henrietta Maria. It claims that these nobles were killed "like sheep," which links them to Christ, the Lamb of God, led to the slaughter, and by the "Court of Injustice," a telling pun that recurs throughout royalist polemic. It addresses the three in the order in which they appeared on the scaffold, building to the climactic Capel. It refers to Hamilton generically as one of "immortal fame" who unjustly suffered for loyalty. The elegist concludes these few lines with "Of him (because a Scot) I'le say no more," a dismissal that the writer does not explain. Next Holland is described as occasionally disloyal, but "His actions at the last, did prove him t'be a lover of his Kings Posterity." He can be lauded for dying on the correct side, but he is unworthy of any more praise. Finally Capel, the only one to have an epitaph in the title ("ever to be honoured"), is the true hero. He is "mourning on Megiddons plaine" for his King Josiah, who had purified the nation of idolatry only to be slain by Pharaoh's army. This is likely an intended comparison to Charles's efforts, from a Laudian perspective, to rejuvenate the Church of England. The elegist claims that Capel, "by Gods permission, may sit in Judgment and send to perdition" all the judges and prosecutors of the King and the three lords.[51] In this

---

[51] *A Mournfull Elegy upon the three Renowned Worthies,* single page, 1649. "Philomusus" would imply that the writer was a friend of the muse, i.e., a professional poet. Josiah's death at "Megiddon" (i.e., Megiddo) occurs in 2 Kings 23:29-30. "Three Worthies" is almost certainly an allusion to Shadrach,

way Capel will gain the revenge that he did not seek in his last speech, but as long as the desire does not come from Capel himself he can still be a martyr for royalism. Notably it is he, not Charles, who will be the judge.

Another short collection of elegies also mentioned all three lords, but it too was primarily a memorial for Charles and Capel, with the other two mentioned almost as afterthoughts. The frontispiece, which identifies the author by the pseudonym "F. H. Philomusus," emphasizes Charles first, "together with an Elogy" for Capel. It refers to Hamilton and Holland as "his Noble Fellow-sufferers" who will receive "some streames of remembrance" within the pamphlet, small compared to the river that the others enjoy. Here Charles provides Capel with an understanding of the cause and how to die for righteousness. Capel then passes it to the others, almost as if they could not have known how to be martyrs without his guidance, even though his was the final execution. Charles is the "sacred martyr," inheriting "a heavenly Kingdome" through his martyrdom. Charles's blood will "be our Sacrifice of peace," an almost Eucharistic image.[52] The next elegy, for Capel, laments that the "hell-fir'd soules" who killed the King must now "quaffe damnations healths in bowles of our Peeres blood."[53] This stresses the overturned order, repeatedly mentioning that the nobility themselves are under attack. Capel, the "Renowned Martyr," may now rest, having "sacrific'd thy well-spent life for God and King"; and his wife and children may "Joy to contemplate on thy honour'd story."[54] The other two lords make a brief appearance in the third to last stanza, since they have

---

Meshach, and Abednego, the three young men in the fiery furnace of Daniel 1-3, but the elegy itself does not refer to this.

[52] *An Elogie, and Epitaph, Consecrated to the ever Saccred Memory of that most Illustrious, and Incomparable Monarch…with an Elogy and Epitaph upon…Arthur Lord Capell*, 1649, p. 5.

[53] Ibid, p. 7.

[54] Ibid, p. 10.

"purified the staine of their disloyalty" by pouring out their own blood; but they are legitimized by accompanying Capel: "For one true Martyr in that three fold cause May render three brave exits their applause." This suggests that Capel is the sole "true martyr," but all have become models of how to live and die for "Religion, King, [and] Lawes."[55] These partnered elegies present a hierarchy of martyrdom, with Charles leading and others following. Their loyalty varies in quality, but they each gain salvation by dying for the cause. Capel, however, is the mediator between his companions and the King, elevating their merely "brave exits" through his "true" martyrdom.

Other published elegies do not mention Hamilton or Holland at all, presumably for the same reasons that minimized their appearance elsewhere. The elegies rarely discuss Capel on his own, however, usually placing him securely at Charles's side. Drawing on the King and his baron's execution speeches, these elegies cite one crucial sin for the two men: the 1641 betrayal of Strafford. The elegies on Capel recall Strafford's own words, thereby constructing a linear narrative of royalist martyrdom. While Capel did not denigrate his companions' memories in any way, he took better care to craft a positive narrative through his own performance, and the tone of the elegies is largely a result of the manner of his death as a final act in a lifetime of loyal devotion.

The Capel elegies consistently uphold his bravery, both in battle and at the scaffold, and his imitation of King Charles in life and in death. Not all of these call him a martyr explicitly, but all use martyrological language to describe the cause for which he died and his allegiance to the royalist protomartyr, Charles I. One claims that "though the Sun be set" there is no darkness because the night sky has been brightened by Capel's

---

[55] Ibid, p. 9.

"star-beaming influence," which is "heighthn'd by thy Fall, and dost now shine / with doubled lustre, since thy last Decline."[56] This is similar in principle to the famous frontispiece to *Eikon Basilike*, in which a tree with weighted branches grows taller than one without encumbrances. Despite his defeat, or fall, he is now even greater. This elegy describes Capel's performance, his "last Act" on the "Scaffold turn'd a Stage," as his "solemn Coronation, since / The Yard's thy Pallace, and a glorious Prince / thy President, Who after him art hurl'd / to meet thy Soveraigne in another World."[57] More than ever, Capel's actions are theatrical, transforming something simple—the scaffold, or Westminster palace yard—into a stage, or the palace itself, whereby he can fulfill his role. Though he survived the sword in battle, he now meets the block like Charles, using it as a step to heaven, where he will serve Charles as he did on earth. Another elegist writes of Charles , a "Glorious Martyr," that "no blood, e're since our Saviour dy'd, / so loud as this to heaven for justice cry'd."[58] Charles is the most pitiable victim since Christ. The companion elegy begins as Capel did, by acknowledging his guilt and doing public penance for the death of Strafford. This imitates Capel's speech and reinforces Capel's self-presentation as a follower of the King. The elegist intends the reader to make this connection:

He durst his Soveraign on the Scaffold own,
And thrice proclaim his Right unto the Crown;
And tell how great his royal Vertues were,
a Truth (Heaven knows) his people seldom hear.
And what he there profest, he durst make good,

---

[56] *Obsequies on That Unexemplar Champion of Chivalrie and perfect Patern of true Prowesse, Arthur, Lord Capell*, single sheet.
[57] Ibid.
[58] *Two Elegeis* [sic]. *The One on His late Majestie. The Other on Arthur Lord Capel*, pp. 3, 5.

And (like a glorious Martyr) seal with blood.[59]

Capel is a martyr because he dies for his faith and loyalty, becoming the voice crying out in the wilderness, who will profess the "truth…his people seldom hear." The elegist praises him for repeatedly defending the King's right to rule at the moment of his own death. He died as he had lived, encouraging all Englishmen to support the royal cause. This pamphlet also provides a fascinating example of the melding of political and religious motivations with precedents in the longer history of Christian martyrdom. In an allusion to Tertullian, the elegy to Charles, the "Glorious Martyr," compares the crucified Christ to the assassinated Caesar, establishing a precedent for lawful monarchs whose realms survive despite their murder by treacherous subjects:

Yet never King more resolutely stood
To Regal Rights, and seal'd them with his blood:
Nor ever King such a Foundation layd
For a Sons greatness, since Kings first were made.
Christ who knew best what was for's Churches good,
Steep'd the first seeds, from whence it sprung in blood.
'Twas Caesars blood, shed on th' imperial Seat,
Made young Augustus, Caesar, and so great.
May our young King as wisely build upon
This bloody ground-work and Foundation,
As young Augustus did on Caesars blood.
May glorious triumphs prove his title good.[60]

The young king, therefore, must build on the blood of his father, just as Augustus had built on that of Julius Caesar and, more importantly, as the Church had built on the seeds of Christ's blood. The elegy prays that "Brutus…and all Rebels" may be "proscribed" to

---

[59] Ibid, p. 7.
[60] Ibid, p. 3.

death, as befits traitors.[61] The connection between Christ and secular Rome mirror the religio-political nature of royalist piety. Charles provides the "bloody ground-work" for an earthly kingdom, just as the Church grew from those "first seeds," which Christ Himself had fertilized with His own blood. Charles II's "glorious triumphs" would prove his merits as a king and reestablish his father's line. By alluding to Tertullian, the elegist links the indestructability of the faith of the early Church to a specific political and military campaign. The general concept of a restoration growing from Charles I's loss is a typical royalist approach, evident in *Eikon Basilike* itself; but its use of Christian tropes to uphold a temporal, even classical, project is striking. Caesar receives more attention than Christ.

Other elegies from 1649 were collected in larger volumes otherwise devoted to Charles, such as *Vaticinium Votivum* and John Quarles's *Regale Lectum Miseriae*, each of which focus on the injustice of the regicide and the tribulations that it caused.[62] The theme is the same as those addressed above. Capel was a loyal follower of King Charles, and if observers can follow his example they will serve the new king well. Each elegy is rooted in Capel's behavior at the scaffold, by which his martyrological qualifications are judged. By placing these elegies within larger works on Charles, the royalist writers establish a common cause with multiple victims, each of whom English readers should follow.

Throughout all these elegies, last speeches, and commentaries, the central figure remained the King, whose death gave meaning to the deaths of his followers. The

---

[61] Ibid; cf. Brutus's punishment in Dante's *Inferno*.
[62] John Quarles, *Regale Lectum Miseriae: or, A Kingly Bed of Miserie*, 1649; George Wither, *Vaticinium Votivum: or, Palaemon's Prophetick Prayer…with several Elegies*, 1649.

Regicide served as point of unification for all royalists, regardless of 1640s fragmentations. Where the three men were great, it was for their support of Charles. Where they were less so, it was for their failure to provide adequate support at crucial moments. Yet each found salvation—earthly and heavenly—by returning to him at the last moment, making him a salvific, Christ-like figure, who had proved his virtues by his own martyrdom and through whom Scotsmen, Englishmen, the devout, the wavering, the subdued, and the flamboyant could all be united. True royalism, like the early Church, would spring from the blood of its martyrs, with more prepared to live and die for the monarchy at its hour of need and draw greater support among the living. Such was the hope, at least; and until the cataclysm of Worcester, it seemed possible, with more martyrs following the three lords, and far more working for the cause in London and throughout the countryside. The popular reaction against the regicide provided some respite, and there were fewer high-profile royalist martyrs for some time after March 1649. The army did execute several soldiers by courts martial for mutiny during these months, but they lacked the ideological consistency that royalist martyrdom provided. At a point where the Rump's support was dangerously factional and even waning, with Presbyterians drifting away, Independents mutinying, and many members of Parliament purged in December 1648, the defeated royalists had a common cause. They were not fully united, as there remained much debate among royalists over how to restore the monarchy, which disillusioned Parliamentarians would make good allies, and whether to entreat with the Scots; but the three lords, despite their differences, could be joined in observers' minds to the recent memory of the King, cruelly murdered by the present government.

As examples of "contested martyrdom," the three lords' causes were unusually straightforward. There was little published criticism, yet far more elegies to the King were in circulation than even those to the three lords that we have considered. The volume of royalist publications might be surprising if it were not for the famous success of *Eikon Basilike* weeks before. Royalist presses in London and exiled to the continent were prepared to construct a positive narrative; with inadequate licensing, the books that were most likely to sell would make it to print. All of these executions were lucratively sensational for publishers. The categories were almost misleadingly simple, thanks to the polarizing effect of the regicide: if one opposed it, then one would oppose the lords' executions, too, since their "treason" would be groundless if the regicide were illegitimate. Their crime was raising arms for the King, which until very recently was the opposite of treason. Furthermore, the one with the simplest history, Capel, was the least contestable martyr, while the one with the most baggage received the least praise. In cases of contested martyrdom, "no contest" is itself a significant claim, ceding the floor to the opposing party. But the Rump Parliament and the High Court of Justice would target royalists again for their alleged crimes. The men in the next section consciously followed the three lords, invoking them as they had invoked Charles, extending the narrative of parliamentarian injustice and reasserting the royalist cause through fresh performances. Blood other than Capel's would have to be the last.

II

"The mite of a loyal subject": lesser cases, 1649-51

Unlike the royalist conspirators of the Protectorate, whom we will consider in chapter 3, the potential martyrs of the early Commonwealth were a direct extension of the

civil wars themselves, which in the traditional numbering—first from 1642 to 1646, second in 1648, and third in 1650 and 1651—were yet incomplete. 1649 was a watershed because of the Regicide, but even Charles was a martyr of the second civil war, executed after Pride's Purge in retribution for the royal court's secret political maneuverings. He was predeceased in 1648 by his supporters Lucas and Lisle, who with Strafford and Laud form a prologue to royalist martyrdom, a point reiterated in published martyrologies after 1660.[63] But Charles and the three lords became guiding examples in death even more than in life because their spectacular London executions provided the best evidence of parliamentarian injustice and became a unifying rallying cry for royalists. Whatever royalist faction one might have been in, beheading the King was incomprehensible.

Yet the reckoning was incomplete: royalist officers and agents remained in prison or would soon be captured. For some of them, "treason" meant supporting the King in 1648, and they had been in custody ever since. Others were arrested in new incidents that developed amidst the tensions caused by the brewing third civil war. These men—John Morris, Michael Blackborne, Eusebius Andrewes, Browne Bushell, and the diplomat Henry Hide—presented themselves as loyal subjects of the King and invoked him with familiarity, keeping the cause alive and reminding witnesses that Charles II deserved their allegiance, even more so because of the Rump's bloodlust. These were distinctly "common" royalists. Some had commanded men in the royal army, but none were of especially lofty status. They were prepared, however, to give what little they had—their

---

[63] Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle were executed according to martial law by order of Sir Thomas Fairfax after the siege of Colchester in August 1648, seen at the time as an uncharacteristically vengeful act; Andrew Hopper, *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 85-89; also Barbara Donagan, "Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason in the English Civil War," *American Historical Review* 99:4 (1994), pp. 1158-59.

"widow's mites," to use Browne Bushell's allusion—for the sake of the King, making their sacrifice all the greater because their lives were all that they had to give. Hide and Bushell especially revered the execution block as a holy, royal relic. They referred to the King as if he were their general in the field while they continued to fight the civil war at trial and at the scaffold. The three lords did not use this language as consistently; they were soldiers, but their service was characterized by their status as peers. As such they were praised in elegy, a genre that was not used for these minor cases. The homogenizing force of execution, however, would interweave popular with noble royalism. In sharing this death for the cause—and in a curious twist, most of these men were beheaded, a punishment previously reserved for the nobility—the five men discussed in this section argued that serving the King was the right behavior for people of all backgrounds. According to them, they were living and dying proof that Charles had been the martyr of the people—all people, regardless of past sins or social status.

Morris and Blackborne were first, executed on 20 August 1649 by the York Assizes for seizing Pontefract Castle in the King's name the previous spring. Initially a royalist officer, Morris had changed sides in 1644 but was not proud of it. In Clarendon's view, "he had heartily detested himself for having quitted the King's service, and had resolved to take some seasonable opportunity to wipe off that blemish by a service that would redeem him."[64] In changing sides yet again in 1648, he "would procure his pardon from the King for his rebellion," a political redemption with potentially Christological undertones.[65] Retaking Pontefract would purge Morris of the sin of disloyalty. In 1648 the King lived and his forces might have won, in which case he would have known that

---

[64] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, vol. IV, p. 397.
[65] Ibid, p. 400.

Morris had returned to his side. When Morris was tried six months after the Regicide, circumstances had changed; but his allegiances had stabilized.

Morris said at his execution that he owed his sense of honor to the model of Lord Strafford, in whose household he had been raised.[66] Strafford was an important figure in the memory of northern royalists, especially for those who had known him personally; he was their proto-martyr, long before Charles I.[67] At his trial, Morris made a compelling legal argument, questioning the jurisdiction of martial law and the meaning of treason in a kingless state. Like the lords in March, Morris argued that his court had no jurisdiction over this alleged crime because, ultimately, the King was the supreme authority. He claimed that, as a soldier, he should be tried by court-martial, even suggesting that Thomas Fairfax preside; and indeed several other courts-martial had proceeded in 1649, but for mutiny over payments, not defection to the Crown. Morris also claimed, like others, that he could not be guilty of treason because he had fought for the King, not against him; but this model of treason had been damaged by Strafford's case in 1641, was transformed by the High Court of Justice in January 1649, and finally was redefined formally by Act of Parliament in May. Knowing this, Morris insisted that, since his "treason" against the Commonwealth began in 1648, kingship was only formally abolished on 17 March 1649, and he surrendered Pontefract a few days later, he could not be judged according to the new law.[68]

---

[66] *An Exact Relation of the Tryall & Examination of John Morris, Governour of Pontefract-Castle,* 1649, p. 7; also *State Trials* 4.1265, which includes this text with Clarendon's account as an extended footnote.
[67] Sir John Gibson, a Yorkshire royalist imprisoned throughout the 1650s and who had worked with Strafford before the war, similarly idolized his lord and former patron; see chapter 7.
[68] Morris insisted that "since the abolishing of Regall power" he had "not medled with any thing against the Parliament"; *An Exact Relation of the Tryall,* p. 3.

Morris's performance at trial and scaffold was bold, presenting like Capel some Cavalier tropes. In the trial account, when Morris asks to read his royal commission to defend Pontefract, Lord Puleston, the judge at the York Assizes, replies, "Sir, it will doe you no good, you may as well shew a Commission from the Pope, all is one," a comparison demonstrative of the legal status of kingship at this point.[69] Instead Morris antagonizes Puleston and discredits the Assizes as much as possible. He stresses his military background, repeatedly calling the King his commander in arms. He asks that the sheriff not put him or Blackborne in chains, offering instead to pay for a hundred armed guards himself: "This is not only a disgrace to me, but in general to all Soldiers, which doth more trouble me then the losse of my life"; but the Sheriff responds, "Sir, Irons are the safest guards."[70] Here Morris's military honor is his greatest asset. When he is convicted, his tone shifts and he becomes meditative, speaking like a martyr despite Puleston's order of silence: "If I must suffer, I receive it with all alacrity and cheerfulnesse, and I thanke God I shall dye for a good cause, and the testimony of a good Conscience, for which had I as many lives as there are Stars in the Firmanent, I would sacrifice them all for the same."[71] Morris characterizes his and Blackborne's impending deaths as a sacrifice for Royalism and a defense of their good consciences, knowing that they are serving a cause greater than mere self-interest. He is not concerned for his own life, he says, "for (I thanke my God) I am prepared, and very willing to part with this lump of clay."[72] Death does not frighten him, as he knows that he will die for the noble cause of the Crown. He does not use the word "martyr," but through his willingness to

---

[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid, p. 5.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid, p. 3.

die for his cause and his conscience, the sentiment is the same, even though he does not refer to his faith here in any detail.

His very last words at the trial, which he appears to have shouted dramatically as he and Blackborne were dragged off in chains, still leave his specific motivations ambiguously balanced between royalism-as-philosophy and militarism-as-honor: "I beseech God blesse King Charles, and fight for all those that fight for him!"[73] This nevertheless anticipates a partial turn toward faith in his final hours. At the execution a week later, Morris is more explicitly religious, describing his suffering as a just punishment for his sins but not for the crime of which he was accused. He takes comfort in Christ's "dolours and pains," which he proclaims far exceeded his own, because they have atoned for his sins.[74] On its own, this would be a typical sentiment for a condemned criminal; but Morris links his faith to his royalism, saying, "if I had a thousand lives I would willingly lay them down for the cause of my King the Lords Anointed; the Scripture commands us to feare God and honour the King."[75] His political and military decisions of the previous two years, he suggests, were simply the practice of his faith. He concludes his speech with a joyful prayer, proclaiming, "Welcome blessed hour, the period of my Pilgrimage…and the heaven of my hopes." He explicitly rejects the Devil and commits his soul to Christ, his "faithfull Redeemer." He concludes by exchanging the temporal for the eternal: "I utterly loath all earthly comforts, and I entirely long for

---

[73] According to the trial transcript, which gives few contextual details, Morris said this immediately after the apparently frustrated Puleston ordered, "Sheriffe, Gaoler, take them away, or Ile take you away"; ibid, p. 6. Earlier in the trial, Puleston had warned Morris that if he overstepped his bounds, he woud "give you such a blow as will strike off your head"; ibid, p. 2.

[74] The execution account is in the same pamphlet but with new pagination, introduced by the subtitle *The Confession of Collonel John Morris and some passages betwixt the prison and place of Execution*; p. 1.

[75] Ibid, p. 2.

thy coming, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly, Lord Jesus receive my Spirit."[76] Blackborne is comparatively quiet at trial and at the scaffold, but he merits mention as Morris's companion.[77] Perhaps it was deference to a senior officer, whether chosen or merely expected, that hushed him. In his few words he notes that, though he is "not a gentleman by birth, my Parents are of an honest quality and condition." But he still professes his loyalty to the exiled Charles II and prays that God may receive him that day, typical of most execution speeches.[78] Morris's behavior was almost lightheartedly antagonistic but took a martyrological and spiritual turn at the scaffold, which was consistent with other accounts of "dying game"; this does not mean that his religious beliefs were insincere, but the foremost element of his cause was the Crown, justified by his faith. He appeared less in the press than some of the other potential martyrs of this period, perhaps because he was tried in Yorkshire; but a trial account was published anonymously, and his martyrological performance left little for Parliament's apologists, such as they were, to exploit. One either accepted or rejected the appropriateness of his punishment. He persistently defended divine right monarchy, arguing that he fought for "the Lord's anointed," and he welcomed death for the cause while praying for the coming of Christ. After their speeches, the two men were hanged; they were sentenced to be drawn and quartered, but the grislier elements of the execution were omitted.[79]

---

[76] Ibid, p. 3.
[77] Morris and Blackborne had escaped together, only to be recaptured after ten days. The extent of their friendship beyond this is unclear; Donagan, "Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason," pp. 1160-61.
[78] *The Confession of Collonel John Morris*, p. 4. Notably, the speech of Blackbourne is included only in sparse summary in *State Trials.*
[79] This was not mentioned in 1649 accounts but appears in Heath, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, p. 246.

Morris was one of the few of these cases to receive much attention in London newsbooks besides a brief notice, but that attention came in *Mercurius Elencticus*, a royalist paper. It is more overtly biased than the pamphlet account of his execution and paints the new regime as bloodthirsty and tyrannical. Each issue of *Mercurius Elencticus* begins with a poem, and the one concerning Morris includes the following stanza about the Independents' stranglehold on the government: "Next, they the People Subjugate, / To their Pernicious Will: / Blot out the Lawes; erect a State / With Power to Curb and Kill."[80] Morris becomes the chief evidence of Parliament's illegal but overwhelming power of life and death. Much of the issue deals with recent violence, which has been used "to quiet…some of the Royall Partie the last weeke," including some unnamed men who had been "most barbarously Murthered" at Tyburn. Morris, executed at York, joins them as a visceral example of the new regime's increasing barbarity. The author laments that at trial he was "so Chain'd and Mannacled" that he was "utterly disabled," channeling Morris's statements of military honor. The trial also demonstrates the absurdity of charging a man with treason when his "crime" was merely following the King's orders. Parliament's redefinition of treason is ignored. The issue repeats information from the published trial text, but it expands upon Morris's own words to condemn the Assizes and the entire post-regicidal regime. There are some unique details in this account, however, which reiterate the cruelty of the state. When Morris is instructed that Charles II is but a subject of the Commonwealth, Morris slyly concurs, "I believe no lesse; Your purpose is to Murder us, and so you would doe Him, if you had

---

[80] *Mercurius Elencticus*, August 20-27 1649, p. 137.

Him."[81] The power to govern is merely the power to kill. This issue went to press before news of his execution reached London from York, but the following week the paper reports that Morris and Blackborne have since been "most barbarously Murthered." It argues that his death was more "destructive to the Cause they boast" than his life had been. His death, as for any martyr, is a victory. He says that he had never "found greater comfort in all my life then now I doe that I must die for serving my King faithfully."[82] Morris appeared in London publications as a martyr, drawing sympathy for him as a stalwart victim who died for his cause. Other extant newspapers from this period did not address Morris. The only discussion of him in circulation besides a basic narrative was a condemnation of his trial.

A year later, the Rump's apologists were increasingly aware of the need to reclaim dominance in the propaganda war. The beheading of Colonel Eusebius Andrewes at Tower Hill on 22 August 1650 attracted significantly more attention than Morris, likely because of the highly visible location as well as the more elaborate nature of his treason. Where Morris had been arrested for straightforward military reasons as a defector (albeit from two armies), Andrewes was a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, a royalist officer, and finally a conspirator to assist Charles II in retaking England. Conspiracies require networks, and they also risk enveloping those who were peripherally involved. They require more premeditation than simply following orders. These can overlap, of course, and Andrewes had been a soldier; but this was not his crime. The question for Andrewes was whether there was a mature conspiracy to begin with, since in retrospect the entire affair appears to have been a vague plot that was subsequently expanded by

---

[81] Ibid, pp. 142-43.
[82] *Mercurius Elencticus*, August 27-September 3, p. 146.

Parliamentarian entrapment of men with known royalist sympathies. Even so, had Andrewes denied his royalism, he would have abandoned his cause, which meant more to him in the end than his own life. Andrewes, who had fled to the Netherlands after the second civil war but returned to London in 1649, foreshadowed a new wave of royalist martyrs who were directing an underground movement rather than engaging in open warfare.[83] The evidence of an elaborate plot was weak, and critics submitted a petition to Parliament arguing that the High Court had denied Magna Carta in trying Andrewes without a jury. Nevertheless, Andrewes was involved in the growing network of royalists who vowed to assist Charles II's return to England, an association that he did not deny.[84]

The evidence against him was convoluted, consisting of long testimonies of who spoke to whom, about what, and under which circumstances. Andrewes called the plot a "pretended design" enhanced by Parliamentarian agents but admitted that there had been vague plans to resume a surely doomed wartime strategy of taking the Isle of Ely as a first step towards restoration.[85] His last speech was more important than his trial for making his case as a martyr because the trial was not published until 1660, with a triumphant royalist martyrological bent. Only an account of his execution seems to have

---

[83] David Underdown goes so far as to call Andrewes the "first victim" of the High Court of Justice, at least of an increasingly active campaign against the royalist underground; *Royalist Conspiracy in England*, p. 36. While not evidence, it is still noteworthy that the nineteenth century *State Trials* begins a new volume with Andrewes, whose alleged crimes postdated the Regicide, beginning a new narrative for the Interregnum. The anthology conveniently omits the 1651 outliers Henry Hide and Browne Bushell altogether.

[84] *To the Right Honourable, the Commons of England Assembled in Parliament: The humble Petition of divers well-affected people* [etc], 1650. Clement Walker also included a discussion of the legal criticisms of Andrewes's trial in *Cromwell's New Slaughterhouse*, pp. 63-71. The key point for each was the lack of jury trial, as well as the implication that Andrewes was led into the plot by a Parliamentarian agent, perhaps an unfair entrapment. John Gell, who was also accused of involvement, published his own account as *The true Case of the state of Sir John Gell, Prisoner in the Tower*, 1650, which includes a letter, signed by Andrewes, claiming that Gell was not the person that the conspirators were meant to contact, "to prevent the hurt intended to the innocent," p. 9.

[85] *State Trials* 5.3-4.

appeared in 1650, but it was still compelling evidence in his favor. The publisher, John Clowes, was no royalist and appears to have been properly licensed; but once again, without a distinct critical commentary, Andrewes appears on paper as an unchallenged hero and martyr. He prays publicly for his "accusers, or rather, betrayers," pitying them because "they have committed Judas his crime"; but he gives them, he says, "Peters tears, that by Peters repentance they may escape Judas his punishment."[86] Andrewes offers his own life in hopes that it will assist his betrayers in achieving salvation. Like Capel and also Browne Bushell, he kisses the block and the axe; but they did not comment on it, simply letting their actions speak for themselves. Andrewes directly addresses the tools of execution as symbolic of his salvation, proclaiming, "I hope there is no more but this block between me and Heaven."[87] Then, referring to the speech that he was about to deliver, he says, "I hope I shall neither tire in my way, nor go out of it."[88] He calls it an "honour" for which he "owe[d] thankfulness" that he was permitted "to die a death…answerable to my birth and qualifications," meaning beheading rather than drawing and quartering, which had officially been his sentence.[89] But his strongest martyrological statement is the wish that, with the help of "the wings of your prayers," he will soon be in heaven and "see my Saviour, my gallant Master the King of England, & another Mr. whom I much honoured, my Lord Capel; hoping this day to see Christ in the

---

[86] *The Last Speech of Col. Eusebius Andrews, sometimes a Lawyer of Lincolns-Inne, at the time of his Execution* [etc], 1650, p. 2; this was reproduced in *State Trials*, 5.37-42, though the quotation about Peter's tears is inexplicably truncated.
[87] *The Last Speech of Col. Eusebius Andrews*, p. 1.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid, p. 3. The reasons are unclear but few if any were drawn and quartered during the 1650s, though it remained the prescribed punishment for treason. Andrewes's sentence was only reprieved by Act of Parliament, granting a personal request; Margaret Toynbee, "The Andrew Family of Daventry," part II, *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 3:4, p. 160.

presence of the Father, the King in the presence of him, my Lord Capel in the presence of them all; and myself there to rejoyce with all other Saints and Angels for evermore."[90] The reference to Capel was the only detail in the very brief notice of his execution in *Mercurius Politicus*, which described him as having "used all his Art to Act the Lord Capell."[91] Andrewes made it clear to his witnesses that he believed that he would enjoy excellent company after death.

Many executed criminals spoke of their desire to go to God and admitted that they had committed some sin, for which they were being justly punished, even if it was not the crime of which they were accused. Andrewes sets himself apart from them by tying his death to his preceding martyrs. By describing a heavenly hierarchy—Father, Son, and Charles and Capel—Andrewes places himself in the company of saints, defying accusations of treason. He does not say "martyr," but he does say "saint," which is just as powerful. This description of the heavenly kingdom is a necessary trope of Christian martyrological speech. The new martyr derives inspiration and legitimacy from his predecessors. Royalists invoked the King for obvious reasons, but additional human and divine models enhanced one's cause. Morris had invoked Strafford because of a personal connection, and Andrewes similarly draws his own professional genealogy: he had served as Capel's secretary in the civil wars and it was only by chance that he escaped while Capel was captured in 1648.[92] He also asked that he be buried as near to Archbishop

---

[90] Ibid.
[91] *Mercurius Politicus*, August 22-29, 1650, p. 182.
[92] Toynbee, p. 155; Toynbee writes that Andrewes had probably worked for Capel only through 1646, but suggests that Capel's involvement in the start of the second civil war probably drew Andrewes back out of his law practice. See also P. R. Newman, *Royalist officers in England and Wales, 1642-1660: a biographical dictionary* (New York, 1981), p. 3; Newman lists 1579 as Andrewes's birth year, but this may confuse two members of the family.

Laud as possible, in All Hallows Barking, a request that was granted.[93] His belief that he would join his predecessors in heaven just as he was joining them at the block and in the grave invited others to recognize him as part of a fraternity of martyrs and, indeed, the communion of saints. The King was always the obvious choice; but where there was another personal connection, it could take precedence. Andrewes's case is unusual because the exact nature of his treason remains ambiguous in the historical record, and he may simply have been a convenient example for Parliament to make; but in being tried, he becomes as important as Parliament chooses to make him. He therefore presents himself as a martyr, defiant yet prayerful and hopeful of eternal life for himself and his cause.

The final two cases of this early wave of royalist martyrdom came in March 1651 amidst increasing military and political tensions. Young Charles Stuart had been crowned King of Scots and was massing an army in his northern kingdom while arranging surreptitiously for support in England. This represented an existential threat to the Commonwealth, and the Rump could not tolerate conspiracy or sedition. Sir Henry Hide and Captain Browne Bushell do not appear to have known one another, but as royalists beheaded weeks apart in London they were often linked in Restoration martyrologies. The 1651 publisher of their last speeches used the same woodcut to illustrate each, with slight changes to the contents of the "speech bubble," almost like a modern file photograph in a newspaper. Each of their speeches was reported by one "G.H.," who would also report on the execution of Christopher Love sixth months later, again using the same woodcut. Despite this semblance of homogenization, which was likely a product

---

[93] Toynbee, pp. 160-61.

of print economics more than ideology, the cases were dissimilar. Hide was unusual as a diplomatic traitor, while Bushell was a soldier and privateer. The causes of their execution and the likely symbolic geography of Hide's beheading at the Royal Exchange (called the "Old Exchange" in 1651) are important reminders that Parliament prosecuted royalists for various reasons. These two cases were omitted from Howell's *State Trials*, even though they were treason trials and were discussed in the contemporary press. They were, however, included in royalist martyrologies in 1660; and their behavior certainly fits the model of royalist martyrdom.

Sir Henry Hide, a cousin of Edward Hyde but never described as such in 1651,[94] was a traitor by economic diplomacy, which the details of his execution made evident. Apparently absent from England for many years, he was captured in Turkey by Parliamentarian agents and sent back to London on board the *Dragon*. He was executed on 4 March 1651 for conspiring to help the exiled Stuart court to conduct trade in the Mediterranean.[95] John Vicars, the Presbyterian poet and occasional historian, noted that Hide was sent by Charles Stuart "to destroy the Trade of the Turkie Company, and the Parliaments Interest" throughout the Ottoman Empire, and also "to seize upon our Merchants goods, for the use of the King of Scotland."[96] He was sentenced specifically to

---

[94] James Heath mistakenly calls him the future Earl of Clarendon's brother in *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors*, pp. 294-99; see chapter 6. Hide, or Hyde, was son of Lawrence Hyde, brother of Edward Hyde's father, also named Henry; according to his epitaph he was "baptized to suffer the envied martyrdom of Charles 1st (in resemblance)" and therefore kissed the axe; James Harris, *Copies of the Epitaphs in Salisbury Cathedral, Cloisters, and Cemetery* (London, 1825), pp. 8-9.
[95] *The Speech and Confession of Sir Henry Hide*, 1651, p. 2.
[96] John Vicars, *A Brief Review of the most material Parliamentary Proceedings of this Present Parliament, and their Armies, in their Civil and Martial Affairs,* 1653, second pagination, p. 18. Vicars's writings would later be published in 1660 to support the Crown, though he was a Presbyterian more than a Royalist. *A Brief Review*, a chronicle, was not overtly political.

be beheaded in front of the Exchange, near to what is now the Bank of England.[97] Although the record is silent on the question, this was probably intended as a symbolic location. The Exchange was a less common execution site, and Hide was one of few men reported to have been beheaded there during the 1650s.[98] The other notable London traitors of 1651, Bushel and Love, were executed at Tower Hill. The Exchange would have reminded witnesses that Hide's treason was not an attack on Parliament as much as an attack on its economic interests and, by extension, its sovereignty. Hide asked on the scaffold whether he should face the Exchange or Poultry Street; the sheriff replied, "You may stand which way you will [to speak], but that way you must lie," as he pointed toward the Exchange, making it the last thing Hide would have seen before his death. This physical arrangement was crucial for Parliament's argument-by-death to succeed. The setting indicated that one could not undercut the new regime's right to trade on equal terms with foreign states, unbothered by a renegade government in exile.[99]

Hide's case, given the international intrigue involved, attracted considerable attention and inspired two published accounts of his death. This was unusual, particularly

---

[97] *The Speech and Confession of Sir Henry Hide*, p. 2.

[98] There was one notable mock execution there—the statue of Charles I in front of the Royal Exchange was famously beheaded in 1649; Kelsey, *Inventing Republic*, p. 86. A few other less famous executions did occur there, at least one in 1650 and another in 1658, described briefly in William Winstanley's collection *The loyall Martyrology* (1665), pp. 22 and 27. If Hide's execution at the Exchange was intended to refer to the mercantile nature of his crimes, then it serves as evidence for the economic component of the English Revolution, an important element alongside politics and religion; see Steve Pincus, "Neither Machiavellian Moment nor Possessive Individualism: Commercial Society and the Defenders of the English Commonwealth," *The American Historical Review* 103:3 (June 1998), pp. 705-736.

[99] *Mercurius Politicus* reported on the trial and execution together, repeating details of the official charge and noting that working against the Parliament's interests abroad was the same as committing treason within England; there was little other commentary, however, besides the note that the account was meant "to satisfie the world…of the honour and equity of the high Court in their proceedings." *Mercurius Politicus*, February 27-March 6, pp. 634-35.

for someone who lacked the fame of Charles or the three lords.[100] The first account professed to be a transcription from shorthand by John Hinde and provides more details. The shorter account by G.H. provides the stock beheading woodcut, notes that the head moved three times after being severed (a grim but sensational detail that Hinde omitted), and finally provides a truncated version of the last speech, similar in substance but different in wording, possibly composed from memory or notes. It could have been published simply because the Hinde version was too long for some buyers; the G.H. copy omits the extended discussion of Hide's diplomatic work with the Grand Seigneur in Constantinople to focus on the more immediately sensational elements of the execution. There are minor discrepancies between them, but whether Hide gave three pounds or four to his executioner is probably irrelevant. The two agree on crucial details. Hide kisses the axe, defends himself against accusations, and insists that whatever he did in Turkey, it was with England's best interests at heart.

In each version, there is little doubt that Hide wishes to be seen as a stalwart royalist and faithful Christian. The G.H. copy has him saying, "I come hither…to sacrifice my life for my obedience and loyalty to my Master the King, for whose sake, I was ever willing to adventure both life and fortunes."[101] This may be a paraphrase, as the exact words never appear in the Hinde copy. He laments that it is now "a Sin to be Loyal" and professes that, in his long faithfulness to his religion, "I have thought it a

---

[100] *A true copy of Sir Henry Hide's Speech on the Scaffold*, 1651. This was transcribed by John Hinde and published by Peter Cole, who also published pamphlets on other royalist executions; Cole was not a royalist but Hinde's occasional commentary is neutral or even sympathetic. Hinde prefaces the text with a disclaimer: "I could not with honesty alter a word; and therefore have tyed my self to his own Expressions, that I may neither abuse the World, or the dying man, or my self," p. 3. Again, last words were a privileged category.

[101] *Speech and Confession*, p. 3.

great part of the service due from me to Almighty God, to serve the King."[102] He insists that he only did "what I was commanded by my Master, that is the most pious, and most Just Prince in all the World."[103] His profession of faith appears sincere and he is grateful for the opportunity to die as a martyr, noting that Christ "hath in Mercy honored me, with a suffering for his Name."[104] Hide wanted witnesses to know that he died for the truth, and that his service to the Crown also served God.

Hide's last performance must have been entertaining and memorable as execution speeches went. He was unusually animated, for which he even apologized, noting that he was "not acquainted with the Forms here of England" after being abroad for so long.[105] The published narrative and depiction of Hide is lighthearted despite the serious crimes involved. Hinde asserts that he respects Hide and merely wishes to provide an honest account, but the details make Hide appear sympathetic. He is accompanied by a minister, a Doctor Hide, whose relationship to Sir Henry, if any, is unclear. He mentions that because of some infirmity he requires assistance in kneeling at the block. And he admits that his time away had made him more comfortable speaking Italian, which he wished he could have spoken at his trial.[106] Much of his speech is devoted to his history as a merchant and a diplomat, insisting that all his actions were basically guided by principles of trade, as well as the dictates of his faith that he ought to serve the King. His particular service was to be an internuncio to the Sultan. He insists that he never sought to undercut the work of the Turkey Company (more commonly known as the Levant Company),

---

[102] Whether he meant Charles I, Charles II, or both is not clear; he served both, in theory, and the reference to "the King" in 1651 would imply the exiled Charles Stuart. *A true Copy*, p. 8.
[103] Ibid, p. 12.
[104] Ibid, p. 6.
[105] Ibid, p. 4.
[106] Ibid, p. 6.

which represented Parliament; but if Hide's allegiance was to the exiled king, his negotiations would inevitably have hindered Parliament's efforts. His performance is notable for its show, best illustrated by its recorded eight cap-doffings at points that Hide considered solemn; but the most significant point in his performance comes at the end. He says when he goes to kneel, "It is unworthy for me to put my Head where my Masters was"; so a scarf was spread over the block, a striking demonstration of pious respect for a royal relic.[107] Finally he cries out "Lord Jesus receive my soul"—G.H. calls this an earnest plea—and the axe falls.[108] Through his beheading, Hide was able to draw a line between himself and the Regicide, by then more than two years removed. Hide was not well-known before his trial, but his performance ensured that he would be remembered in 1660. He was not as easy to fit into a clear martyrological narrative, as his service was so different from that of most royalist martyrs; but with his words and his actions, he encouraged witnesses to remember him as a sincere and brave man, quite prepared to die for his cause. In kissing the axe and covering the block with a handkerchief, he also demonstrated a profound royalist piety, honoring the relics of the Regicide. This was more than simply treating the block as a step to Heaven; this was a direct invocation of the Royal Martyr as a saint.

Captain Browne Bushell, despite having the same woodcut as Hide in the G.H. pamphlets, was executed three weeks later at Tower Hill, ending a circuitous life that had seen him support both sides during the war. For this reason, as well as his repeated self-characterizations as a soldier, his performance is reminiscent of that of John Morris. Bushell had been imprisoned since 1648, when his ship was taken by Parliament for

---

[107] Ibid, p. 14; also described in *Speech and Confession*, p. 6
[108] *Speech and Confession*, p. 6.

piracy; but he was not executed until 29 March 1651.[109] The charge of treason, however, was for changing sides to support the royalists—again, like Morris—but back in 1643, when he surrendered Scarborough Castle to his cousin, Sir Hugh Cholmley, who had deserted the Parliamentarian cause himself. Bushell's trial in 1651 indicates the heightened military threat that the Commonwealth faced in the months before the Battle of Worcester. In his speech, he apologizes, not for abandoning Parliament but rather for supporting it, however briefly. He says that he is "heartily sorry, that ever I drew my Sword for such Masters; And (truly) had I as many lives, as I have haires upon my head, I should freely and willingly adventure them all for my second Master the King," at whose name he removes his hat, a detail that seems to have been reported more often in March 1651 than ever before.[110] He repeats the gesture when he says that he hopes "to receive a Crown of glory…from the most great God."[111] These actions link the Crown to Christ. Bushell asks the executioner, "Is this the Block and Ax which my late Royal Master received the fatal blow from?" The executioner says that it was, and Bushell, smiling, responds, "I bless my God that hath brought me hither this day." After removing his cloak, he gives the executioner twenty shillings, "the mite of a loyal subject," and kneels, accepting his death with apparent satisfaction, ensuring that he too would be recognized and remembered as a royalist martyr.[112]

---

[109] Jack Binns, "Captain Browne Bushell: North Sea adventurer and pirate," *Northern History* 27 (1991), pp. 90-105.
[110] *The Speech and Confession of Capt. Brown-Bushel, at the place of Execution on Saturday, under the Scaffold on Tower-Hill*, 1651, p. 4. Interestingly, the title claims to provide a confession, even though Bushell does not intend his listeners to view him as guilty of any real crime; perhaps the word was used because it was standard practice, or perhaps it implies something more akin to a "profession," in the sense of "Edward the Confessor."
[111] Ibid, p. 5.
[112] Ibid, p. 6.

Bushell, the last case of this early period, demonstrates a great consistency of thought in his behavior and self-portrayal. In venerating the relics of the King, he links himself to all his predecessors in dying for royalism. In praying for his own salvation, he ensures that his death has religious as well as political significance. Such a performance could be disastrous for Parliament's propaganda, but a publisher could not easily misrepresent a widely witnessed incident like an execution. So for the first time since 1649, a potential royalist martyr's printed last speech had a postscript from a Rump apologist, however hesitant:

> The manner of this Gentleman at his departing, will cause many (especially those of his own fraternity) to eternize his Name; but it is disputable, whether conscience or courage, arm'd him with this Resolution: Let us look back into former Ages, and we shal find many the like presidents; for the Greeks and Medes being at war one with the other, the Grecians took a courage and oath, protesting, that each particular man would rather change his life into death, then their Lawes for the Persians. So whether out of envy to this present Government, or love to the precedent, wrought most in the heart of this man, I leave it for the charity of those that read these his dying words to judge.[113]

The commentator admits that other royalists will find many sources of encouragement in Bushell's performance; but even so, in 1651, Parliament's propagandists were beginning to take a more active role in undermining Royalist martyrs. Unlike those of his predecessors, Bushell's performance is subtly criticized as being the product of courage, not conscience; but the cited precedent is not, for example, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in Exodus, but rather a war between two pagan nations, neither of whom is presented as more admirable than the other. The criticism did not tell readers how to interpret Bushell's death, specifically leaving that judgment to the "charity" of readers.

---

[113] Ibid.

The brief notice in *Mercurius Politicus* similarly noted that he "was resolute after the garb and humor of his party," a gently backhanded criticism.[114] Bushell would appear in the royal martyrologies of the Restoration, and he was more outspoken than Holland or even Morris had been about his shifting allegiances, remorsefully condemning his early Parliamentarianism as a regrettable mistake rooted in ignorance of the cause, but speedily repaired through his cousin's virtuous influence early in the war.

Browne Bushell is also notable because he was tried for his actions in the first civil war, captured during campaigns in the second, and executed during the third. Since his trial was long delayed compared with Andrewes or the three lords, and since the publication of his speech suggests changing tactics by Parliament's apologists in contesting martyrdom, he spans the complicated chronology of the civil wars and the early years of the Commonwealth. He provides an appropriate conclusion to this first phase of royalist martyrdom and is something of a throwback to the earlier cases, contrasting with the shift towards crushing conspiracies in 1650 and 1651. Bushell was a privateer, not a plotter, and his actions were transparent. He changed sides early in the war, which was not uncommon, and he was anything but embarrassed by his royalism at his death. Also like his martyrological antecedents, he proclaimed on the scaffold, "I desire my bloud may be the last that is to be shed upon this account."[115] This desire was as applicable as ever, since Bushell and anyone paying attention to late events knew that war was speedily returning. Rather than a call to witnesses to muster around their rightful king, here the reference to last blood was a plea to everyone to find some way to avoid

---

[114] *Mercurius Politicus*, March 27-April 3 1651, p. 691; it is unclear, but "garb and humour" might rever to Bushell's more overtly "Cavalier" behavior and history.
[115] *The Speech and Confession of Capt. Brown-Bushel*, p. 4.

renewed war. Bushell's prayer was heartfelt, but it was increasingly clear to royalists that the only way to restore Charles II would be on the battlefield.

In these varied cases, there are some common themes that will continue to be relevant in the remainder of this study. Martyrs for any cause are largely defined by their performances first and the commentaries upon them second. If a martyr behaved in a memorable or emblematic way, it limited the ability of parliamentarian critics to reassert the trial's argument that he was a traitor. This relied on martyrological precedent. Charles provided a model, but the various cases become more than the sum of their parts, creating a narrative of parliamentarian oppression, entrapment, and vindictiveness, killing men for legitimate military action and for upholding virtue. The martyrs actively constructed this narrative through their sufferings. The more clearly they demonstrated their cases, and the more personal connections they could establish among fellow royalists, the more they would be revered by their successors. Hamilton and Holland were not heroes for Morris and Andrewes, but Strafford and Capel were. Everyone could invoke Christ and Charles, with their sufferings for the Truth reassuring less famous followers. This is not merely how to become a martyr: this is how to construct a martyrology. Even though full royalist collections were not published until 1660, and more names would be added by then, we already see a developing cause with the potential for a diverse membership. One of the key apologists for the potential martyrs was Clement Walker, the Presbyterian author of *Cromwell's New Slaughterhouse*, who criticized Parliament for abuse of power and rejection of Magna Carta when it executed Eusebius Andrewes. The break between the Presbyterians and Parliament would soon become the greatest categorical realignment of the later civil wars.

The tone of royalist martyrdom was also shifting, even as the royalist cause was presented as unchanged. This was partly the result of political and military contingencies, but ideological motivations had become more complex as well. As the propaganda war became more important, martyrs would be more hotly contested, with new groups sending sheep to "Cromwell's slaughterhouse." Most notable was the singular Presbyterian royalist martyr, onetime parliamentarian apologist, and constant minister Christopher Love, whose prolonged trial and delayed execution in the summer of 1651 would spawn an intense debate over his merits as a martyr and the legitimacy of the Commonwealth. Though his Presbyterianism would always keep him in a class by himself, Love still represents the growing category of royalist conspirator instead of royalist soldier, which after the Battle of Worcester in September would become the more common path to royalist martyrdom. Worcester was a turning point for royalism for the same reasons that it was a turning point for Parliament's solidification of control. It changed the focus of royalist action from laying the groundwork of invasion to inciting popular rebellion, a plan far less likely to succeed. But future martyrs' blood would still be treated as the seed of restoration. Royalism simply moved deeper underground, and secrecy became more than ever the rule. And while loyalty to the King would still characterize those later insurrectionists' final performances just as much as it did for Capel, Andrewes, or Bushell, now the King was always an active Charles II, not the saintly memory of Charles I. The two went together, but it was the defiant claim that the King was very much alive, rather than the elegiac lamentation that the King was dead, that would drive royalist martyrs to be happy in their own deaths.

Chapter 2: "What sport Love's blood will make": The Martyred Minister of 1651

This chapter will analyze the case of Christopher Love, a uniquely controversial occasional member of the royal martyrology whose complicated circumstances made him immensely famous but also limited his traction among the most stalwart royalists. It will be helpful first to chart what he was not. The first wave of potential royalist martyrdom, which we addressed in the previous chapter, was dominated by military figures with strong devotions to the King. Their devotion was informed by a Christian worldview that fundamentally and unapologetically joined service to the Crown with service to Christ. The next major phase of royalist martyrdom, after Love but more importantly after the Battle of Worcester, consisted of royalist plotters and rebels who applied that model to a changing political environment until the death of Oliver Cromwell in September 1658, which dramatically changed royalist strategies. The men in each period usually had some military background and hoped that their deaths would inspire others to restore Charles II to his thrones in their stead. They disputed the validity of the courts that tried them and proclaimed that they died for the cause of restoring the monarchy and some version of the established Church. All these martyrs were contested in theory, with those after Worcester receiving an increasingly consistent condemnation by Commonwealth and Protectorate apologists. The terms of the contests were straightforward: the new regime and these men's executions by it were either legitimate or not. These were "traditional" royalists, overall, sharing certain tropes and consciously joining a fraternity of martyrs for the Crown.

In August 1651, however, an unlikely royalist martyr appeared in starkly different circumstances, and he merits a chapter on his own. The Presbyterian minister-turned-royalist Christopher Love, his unusually long trial and imprisonment, and his dramatic scaffold denunciation of his critics while upholding himself as a martyr became an early modern media sensation.[1] He is one of the few subjects of this dissertation to apply the term "martyr" to himself; most were proclaimed as such posthumously by their supporters but avoided making so direct a statement themselves.[2] Love may have died for plotting to assist the exiled Charles II, who in 1651 was engineering an invasion of England from Scotland; but Love's motivations were Presbyterian more than they were royalist, setting him apart from even some of his co-conspirators. He was willing to embrace the Crown only because the Crown had recently embraced the Scottish Presbyterians by taking the Solemn League and Covenant and promising a Presbyterian settlement in England, a short-lived plan that would be consigned to oblivion by the royalists' defeat at Worcester.[3] Until September, however, that defeat was far from

---

[1] Jason Peacey refers to the fallout from Love's execution as a "media circus"; *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 200.

[2] This of course placed him in the company of his erstwhile enemy Charles I. Love proclaimed from the scaffold, "I am a Martyr too, I speak it without vanity"; *A True and exact Copie of Mr Love's Speech and Prayer, immediately before his Death*, 1651, p. 7. The full speech was reprinted in *Mr. Love's Case* and also in *State Trials*; but the speech will usually be cited from this version for clarity. According to Mary Love, he also said in prison that he was going "to be everlastingly martyred unto my Redeemer"; *Life of Christopher Love*, Doctor Williams Library 12.50.4 (21), p. 128; hereafter, *Life*. This text is paginated as a printed book and normally will be cited according to the DWL numeration, but the prefatory first four leaves are unnumbered and will be cited by lowercase roman numerals. A partial copy is in the British Library; Sloane MSS 3945.

Love has figured into histories of the Civil Wars and Commonwealth, but he has not yet been taken up as a subject on his own, with the exception of a hagiographical assessment written for a modern Protestant audience; Don Kistler, *A Spectacle Unto God: The Life and Death of Christopher Love* (Morgan, PA, 1994). Kistler has also collected Love's sermons, again published specifically for a religious audience.

[3] For more on the Presbyterians and the Covenant, see Elliot Vernon, "The Quarrel of the Covenant: the London Presbyterians and the Regicide," in *The regicides and the execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey, pp. 202-224.

certain, and the Commonwealth regime could not risk ceding its own legitimacy to a foreign monarchy, even though many supporters of the Commonwealth were sympathetic to the Covenant in principle. The Rump faced an unusually dangerous rebel in Love, who had been enamoured by Scotch Presbyterianism for a decade. His stalwart support of Parliament as a charismatic preacher had helped them to secure their power after the first civil war. If he had changed sides now because of his religious convictions, then others might, too, making Love a potential rallying point for disaffected Presbyterians, whom the Rump could not afford to lose. Commentaries against him argued that he had betrayed his own religious convictions by turning against his former friends. As long as he remained unrepentant, Christopher Love had to die.

Love left far more words than his predecessors or followers in the royalist canon because he was able to respond extensively to his critics in writing from the Tower of London. Many of his private dialogues in prison were also recorded by his wife, Mary, in a never-published manuscript biography. Although Love claimed that he had always been faithful to the same essential Truth, with so many of his writings in circulation it was easy for critics to find points to challenge. He was vulnerable to accusations of self-contradiction because of his fame as a Parliamentarian apologist before 1649. His notorious Uxbridge sermon from 1645, which was republished the year of his death, had suggested that King Charles I might have to be removed. His subsequent rejection of his old allies in 1651 made him a symbol of the factionalism that threatened to destroy the fledgling Commonwealth from within while an invading foreign army threatened to destroy it from without. His complicated history made some royalists ignore him altogether when composing their various “royal martyrologies” after the Restoration;

Uxbridge in particular was often considered unforgivable, since it was cited in defense of the regicide even while Love attempted to distance himself from such a radical interpretation.[4] A close study of his own words and behavior suggests that while he was a willing martyr, he did not wish to die for Charles II. The context of his execution was essentially political, but he recast his death as a purely religious martyrdom. With a hotly debated cause in a tense political environment, even by the standards of the English Revolution, Love was the quintessential contested martyr.

I

In the late spring of 1651, when Charles II's forces were already gathering in Scotland and London buzzed with the apparent escalation of a third civil war, Parliament's agents exposed Christopher Love's involvement in a vague plot to funnel resources from the capital to the Crown.[5] The conspirators reportedly met at Love's house; corresponded with Scottish agents, Charles II, and Queen Henrietta Maria; and financially assisted both exiled royalists and Scottish Covenanters. According to the court, this had begun in 1649 to encourage Charles II to take the Covenant and agree to a Presbyterian settlement in England similar to that in Scotland. Though the plot details were not as sensational as later conspiracies to incite rebellion or assassinate Cromwell, these were nevertheless serious charges. Communicating with the exiled king and sending money to royalists undermined the Commonwealth's legitimacy. And even when

---

[4] As we will see in chapter 6, royalists avoided Love because of his Presbyterianism after 1660, or else avoided details and treated him as generically virtuous. One pamphlet would even cite his death as divine retribution for his history as a "firebrand of Rebellion"; J. T., *The Traytors Perspective-glass*, 1662, p. 22.
[5] The captured royalist Thomas Coke revealed the plot under duress; Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 243.

he denied the charges, Love freely admitted that he, like many Parliamentarians throughout the past decade, sympathized with the Covenanters as natural allies to England's true Protestants.

At his trial, Love denied any wrongdoing, dubiously claiming that what people may have said or written in his home—the substance of the extensive testimony against him—was beyond his control. After his conviction, however, he cautiously admitted that he had been engaged in a conspiracy, but to save the country, not to destroy it. Crucially, he claimed that this, like all his decisions, relied on his well-formed Christian conscience, which his wife later described as the best guide in service of the King—not a typical royalist argument.[6] Love represents the movement by Presbyterians away from the increasingly radicalized Independents and toward the exiled Royalists, a trend that began with the Scottish Engagers in 1647 and was reinforced by the Regicide, which Love saw as too extreme a solution to the King's transgressions.[7] This was a pragmatic political move motivated by religious concerns: Love was willing to work with Charles II on Presbyterian terms for the good of the nation. Love would never have defended the Thirty-Nine Articles at his execution, as Capel had done. He had been imprisoned shortly before the first civil war for preaching against Laudian ceremonialism and had even appeared more radical than most Presbyterians, defending the concept of removing the King in the 1645 Uxbridge sermon, though the mechanics of such a removal were not discussed. Love's former advocacy for Parliament, and his avowedly religious

---

[6] *Life*, p. i, r-v.

[7] This does not mean that the Presbyterians were united in opposing the Commonwealth. At Love's trial, his prosecutor, Edmond Prideaux, disputed Judge Richard Keble's reference to a "Presbyterian party" as (by 1651) entirely anti-Parliamentarian, claiming that among them "are conscientious persons, and pious and godly men"; *State Trials*, 5.77. Later, Keble himself admitted that Presbyterianism "would tend to the peace of this nation," even if connections to Scotland or the Covenant would not; ibid, 5.171.

motivations for abandoning it, made his dissent a threat to the Commonwealth's integrity. His removal was intended to send a warning to his supporters, but it was also coupled with an offer of mercy if he confessed to treason. This was an olive branch from the Rump to the Presbyterians, promising that if they would support the Commonwealth against the combined Scottish and Royalist forces, they would retain an important role in England's future. The potential Presbyterian abandonment of the Parliamentarian cause, coupled with the transformation of erstwhile Scottish allies into enemies of the Commonwealth marching under Charles Stuart's banner, terrified the young regime, which could not assume that it would win the brewing third civil war. A rupture among Presbyterians was an existential threat. Had Love capitulated, the combined column of English and Scottish Presbyterians could have averted open war and returned peacefully to a godly Protestant union encompassing all of Britain. For his part, Love rejected this offer, believing that it would betray his cause and his God. He intended his martyrdom as a public statement that Parliament need no longer be followed by faithful English Christians, which was the worst possible scenario for the Rump.

From Love's perspective, he was merely following the religious beliefs he had known since his conversion to Christ after a sinful youth. In 1645, Love had warned that the royalists could not be managed through negotiations because the Crown was deceitful; armed resistance was necessary. In 1651, circumstances, but not Love's Christianity, had changed, requiring him to adopt a new political agenda to remain faithful to the Gospel. The contingent nature of the growing third civil war was a significant part of why Love was executed when he was, in August, almost six weeks after his conviction. This delay was largely because of the petitioning campaign that his

wife and friends undertook to spare his life, and Parliament entertained it more than most specifically because it feared making him a martyr. But the threat to the new regime from without was too great to tolerate conspiracies from within. Despite popular support for Parliament's military victories, the royalist response to the Regicide and subsequent executions had ensured that a portion of popular opinion would remain skeptical of the lengths that the Commonwealth took to establish itself.[8] At the same time, however, Presbyterian warnings about "Cromwell's slaughter-house" demonstrated that the new regime was not in complete control over the English people's sentiments—or the press.[9] Cromwell sought when possible a policy of mercy to repair the perception of violence in the Commonwealth; but he did not yet control the government in 1651, and the more radical set within Parliament appealed to him to let the petitions pass.[10]

With war threatening, the Rump Parliament once again demonstrated its authority through the High Court of Justice, which by 1651 had far outlived its *ad hoc* creation for the trial of the King. It needed popular support for the war, or others could follow Love's example and help the royalists. As Austin Woolrych argues, military engagements do change the course of history.[11] But perhaps even more important is that people believe

---

[8] Personal opinion remains, as always, difficult to ascertain; but the Commonwealth portrayed itself and its military victories as worthy of popular praise, and the Battle of Worcester would be followed by extensive public demonstrations of joy at Cromwell's return to London; Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic*, pp. 72-73.
[9] E.g., Clement Walker, *The High Court of Justice, or Cromwell's New Slaughter-House in England* (1651).
[10] Worden, *The Rump Parliament*, p. 246. In Clarendon's partisan view, Cromwell sought to limit the Presbyterian influence and saw Love as a suitable example; *History of the Rebellion*, 1888, vol. 5, p. 221.
[11] Woolrych writes of the first civil war, though the theme is persistent throughout his book: "Parliament's superiority in resources is unquestionable, but wars are commonly won in the field, and the English Civil War was no exception"; *Britain in Revolution*, p. 292. Woolrych takes this approach again when considering the potential threat posed by the Scots at Worcester and throughout the third civil war, though he complains that rather than being a true civil war it "was essentially a war between the Scots…and the

that they do, thereby giving wars and battles and their potential destruction a heavy influence on perspective, especially after suffering a decade of civil war. Until the final defeat of Charles II at Worcester, the Commonwealth could fail if it paid insufficient attention to preventing insurrection. Love's plot could undo all the progress made since 1642. The fear of defeat was a key motivator for the Rump in its decisions about how to deal with specific royalists who caused trouble, just as the chance of victory encouraged royalists to try again. Cromwell may have tended toward mercy after 1653, but the Rump showed little in the first years after the regicide.[12] For this reason, the Rump failed to create true consensus but rather begrudging and critical toleration of its existence as the new status quo, as well as an important minority opposition. The response to Love's trial and execution demonstrates that failure, but it also demonstrates that the Rump's apologists were increasingly aware of the need to respond to its critics.

Furthermore, the symbolic role of Love's prosecution was to settle what had become a divisive Presbyterian problem. With Love as a central leader, they had previously supported the Parliament in its fight against the King and his "evil counsellors." Love's trial was a clear statement by the Rump and the High Court of Justice that insurrection would not be tolerated, but it is interesting that he and John Gibbons, his companion, were the only men executed for this particular conspiracy. Many other Presbyterian ministers had been arrested, but their lives were spared when they confessed publicly to their crimes; some of them even testified, begrudgingly,

---

English Commmonwealth," p. 496; however the Love case would suggest that even if Scotland was the focus, the Commonwealth government perceived support for the Scots within England as a real threat.

[12] Rather than create a martyr, Cromwell even tried to help elderly Catholic priest John Southworth avoid execution in 1654 until Southworth himself insisted that he was the same priest who had been banished decades earlier, essentially daring the Protectorate to kill him for his ministry; he was hanged, drawn, and quartered, despite the general avoidance of that full punishment in this period.

against Love. Love, on the other hand, symbolized the betrayal of the parliamentarian cause by one of its most famous supporters. His death was a last resort. Love could have saved his own life through a confession, possibly reuniting the two camps. He chose not to because it would have required him to betray his beliefs. For this reason, while it is not inaccurate to consider him a "Presbyterian royalist," it is better to consider him a potential martyr for Presbyterianism itself. His words at his trial and execution were markedly different from those of more conventional royalists. He rarely spoke of the King directly, choosing instead to discuss Christianity in general and the immorality of his age. The Regicide was but one example of England's spiritual collapse.[13]

By the time that Christopher Love approached the block on 22 August 1651, the memories of the regicide had become more abstract, less a profound event that was re-created in the deaths of his closest followers and more an experience that shaped the context of the Commonwealth as a whole. According to Love, the nation's moral failings could only be purged by restoring godly Christianity and protecting Presbyterian ministers. He was the best example of the good Christian's plight, as he wrote in a long pamphlet published during his six week imprisonment: "Since the days of Queen Mary, there hath been no Protestant Minister so unchristianly dealt withal, as I have been, and

---

[13] This reading draws on Blair Worden's discussion of Love, which argues that Love had widespread support, not only among Presbyterians: "If rumpers were appalled by Love's methods, many of them must have regarded his aims as less reprehensible. He and his fellow conspirators had planned not a return to unbridled royalism, but the restoration of the Long Parliament as it had been before the purge, and negotiations with Charles II on the lines followed at Newport in 1648. This was a programme with which many rumpers were likely to sympathise." Cromwell followed the more vindictive advice of Sir Henry Vane, but Robert Hammond had suggested that mercy for Love "may be a means to unite the hearts of all good men," as long as he agreed to support the Rump—a likely explanation for why his execution was delayed so long while the petitions were considered; quoted in *The Rump Parliament*, pp. 246-47.

received such hard measure."[14] Such statements condemned the moral authority that the Commonwealth government claimed. It would be an oversimplification to presume that the conventional royalists were political martyrs while Love was a religious one, as these categories were not so exclusive; as we have seen, the first royalist martyrs saw their deaths as acts of piety and loyalty, expressions of faithful service to Christ and His Anointed. But Love struck a different tone. In his view, the cause of godly Presbyterianism had remained the same since his first arrest in 1642. If it was beneficial to the Christian nation to assist an earthly king to return, then one should do so; but he avoided the divine trappings that most royalists invested in the Crown itself.

This chapter employs a variety of sources to explore how Christopher Love, more than any of his contemporary sufferers for a cause, is the quintessential example of a thoroughly contested martyr in a growing public sphere. His case generated intense public debate. The nature of this debate still relied on the actual performance of the supposed martyr at the scaffold, as in the previous chapter. The difference was that Love attracted extensive criticism before and after his death and, because of the petition delay, could respond to his critics in print, not just in his execution speech. In some ways this is an accident of history: none of the previous examples had such a delay between trial and execution, though some had been imprisoned for years. More importantly, though, Love was already famous and determined to construct his own cause, dedicated to preaching the Gospel at each opportunity. As some pamphlets described it, his last speech would be a "funeral sermon," exhorting listeners to return to the faith. Love's defiant trial

---

[14] Christopher Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love, since my Tryall before, and Condemnation by, the High Court of Justice*, 1651, p. 42; this title may be a misprint for "Mr," but it may also be an unusual use of the first person (especially in conjunction with "my Tryall") and a further example of Love's intentional self-fashioning.

performance demanded response, and the six week reprieve permitted his determined critics to articulate a complex rebuttal. Love's frustration with what he saw as consistent misrepresentation had the unintended result of making him appear *less* sympathetic at his execution, prompting further attacks in the press, including a methodical deconstruction of his entire last speech in the anonymous pamphlet *Mr. Love's Case*. Then his supporters, most notably his wife, reconstructed his posthumous reputation to ensure that he would be remembered as a martyr after all. Unlike the concise consistency of people like Capel or Bushell, Love's verbosity presented contradictions. He left sermons and other texts from a career that had coincided with one of England's most tumultuous decades to be parsed and reinterpreted. This created a messy narrative, jeopardizing the clarity of his cause, which would require consistent reinforcement by his hagiographers after death.

The remainder of this chapter will chart the development of that cause both thematically and chronologically. Far more than the previous examples, Love's case prompted extensive dialogue between different groups. Mary Love's manuscript biography followed and was the most comprehensive defense of Christopher Love's memory; but it responded to earlier publications and, aside from informative references, will be analyzed later in this chapter. The first contestation of Love's martyrdom occurred in published dialogue, which developed in a loose pattern: first, his trial, which was summarized in the newsbook *Mercurius Politicus* and later published in full; second, petitions to Parliament by his wife, his friends, and Love himself, which also appeared in print; third, criticisms of those petitions and his own words at trial; fourth, Love's responses to his critics, including his execution speech itself; fifth, copies of his private

correspondence from prison, including letters to Mary, which were published after his death; sixth, an extended rebuttal of his execution speech, published within a lengthy volume entitled *Mr. Love's Case* in September 1651; and seventh, Mary Love's biography, composed at an undetermined later date, never printed, but with an unknown circulation in manuscript. These categories often refer to one another. At times the analysis will skip several steps backward to invoke an earlier publication or incident, most notably in Love's response from the scaffold to John Price, whose ostensibly good-faith letter to Love in prison had incurred his ire, and who would ultimately publish the letter to defend himself after Love's death. Each of these texts contributes to the contestation and ultimate creation of Christopher Love as a Presbyterian martyr first and a royalist martyr second. Any contradictions are discounted by Mary, who describes him as an obvious martyr, to the point of citing miraculous coincidences with his death and prophesies of the future as proof that he rested in the bosom of Christ. We will cautiously proceed by alternating between the two camps to facilitate our understanding of who was responding to what. This will demonstrate how rapidly Love's martyrdom was contested and which components of his narrative were most controversial to whom.

II

Born in Wales in 1618, Love had spent his youth in "carding and diceing" but gave his life to Christ while still in his teens through the guidance of a minister.[15] After his religious studies, he lived with the family of London sheriff John Warner as a private chaplain, where he met their ward Mary, whom he would eventually marry. He was still a

---

[15] *Life*, pp. 1-2.

young preacher, newly ordained and in his late twenties, at the time of the Uxbridge sermon. After his 1651 conviction, he cited his youth as an excuse if he had ever spoken rashly in the past.[16] Even so, he and his wife claimed that he had been steadfast in his beliefs since his conversion. Few men managed to suffer for both Parliament and the Crown; but according to Mary, Christopher was just such a person, and neither of them saw any contradiction. The world had changed, but his faithfulness to Christ had not. In the introduction to the biography, Mary Love writes that "none know better how to love their King, even to the death then they who best know how to love their God and a good conscience."[17] A more typical royalist might have claimed that loving the King would show one how to love one's conscience, but Love followed a higher authority. This was Love's claim throughout 1651: he had always followed his conscience, which had shown him how to love the King and serve the good of the nation. At one time, that love required him to join the opposition; by 1651, it required him to provide material aid to the crown. Since Mary Love is introducing her husband's entire life, and not merely his last days, it is reasonable to assume that this passage applies to its entirety. An early episode makes this broad claim especially interesting.

Love's first arrest was in 1642 for anti-Laudian preaching in Newcastle during his return from Scotland, where he had sought ordination by the Covenanters rather than submit to the popish affectations of the Church of England. The only reason he was not ordained, according to Mary, was that he would have had to remain in Scotland, while his true vocation was London. Although he left the northern kingdom, this was an early sign

---

[16] Christopher Love, *A Vindication of Mr. Christopher Love, from Divers scandalous reproaches cast upon him by the Malignant party*, 1651, p. 1.
[17] *Life*, p. i, r-v.

of Love's sympathy for the Covenanters, which would resurface as an underlying motivation for conspiracy in 1651. The imprisonment at Newcastle was relatively short-lived and more overtly religious than his arrest in 1651, despite his own claims; but each provided a cause for Christian suffering and an opportunity to grow closer to God and lead others to Him. Mary couched his arrest for liturgical dissent in spiritual terms, since he suffered "Imprisonments and Bonds which in all ages hath attended the powerfull preaching of the word."[18] Love's suffering fell within the eternal struggle to present the Truth to those who would silence it. He was a prophet in the Old Testament tradition. He did not mention Newcastle at his execution; but it was important enough for Mary to cite as a formative moment, even though it was for what would appear at first to be a wildly different cause. In the first case he suffered for resisting the King's decrees, while in the second he died for trying to restore the King. Christopher Love appears to be a man of contradictions unless we take him at his word: each of his decisions was in what he took to be the best interests of the nation at a particular moment, and serving the common good also served Christ.

Though Love did not apparently regret his anti-Laudianism, even to a traditional royalist this need not deny him the crown of martyrdom: according to Christian interpretations, one had to die perfectly, not live perfectly. For Restoration royalist martyrologists, even the Earl of Holland was good enough to be mentioned; and Love's wayward past, if properly repented, could easily be expunged by dying for Christ, Crown, and Church. The problem is that Love was not so clearly a "royalist" martyr. He did call for restoration of the monarchy in general; but in his personal letters, his published

---

[18] *Life*, p. 36.

defenses and vindications, his last speech, and his biography, he made few references to Charles I or Charles II. He primarily defended himself against accusations of duplicity, as these damaged his spiritual credibility and, by extension, his audiences' souls.[19] Similarly, Mary wrote of the Newcastle incident that Love was right to oppose ceremonialism in the Church, "which in those Evening times were then in use but…those Shadows have dispersed before the Sun, God grant that our abuse of light may not cause them to appeare again."[20] He remained an anti-Laudian. He would never have asked to be buried near the archbishop, as Eusebius Andrewes had. His martyrdom sought "restoration" of England's soul, as well as of its king, but only on Presbyterian terms. In Love's view, his martyrdom was more like the sufferings of the Old Testament prophets than those of the late royalists.

Although Love was fundamentally different from his preceding martyrs because he had never been much of a royalist sympathizer in the first place, much less a soldier, the formula for his creation as a martyr was the same. His final performance and its ambiguities in light of his history posed problems for royalists and parliamentarians alike. Bushell had apologized for his early service to the Parliamentarians, but Love did no such thing. This made it easy for observers to call him inconsistent, despite his protests to the contrary. Love's greatest martyrological hurdle was not his sudden support for Charles Stuart and the Covenant, which would have found support in some quarters and provided

---

[19] Clarendon concludes that Love was a poor imitation of a royalist martyr, even though he behaved bravely on the scaffold. The characterization is partisan but interesting nonetheless: "This poor man who had been guilty of as much treason against the King from the beginning of the rebellion as the pulpit could contain, was so much without remorse for any wickedness of that kind that he had committed, that he was jealous of nothing so much as of being suspected to repent, or that he was brought to suffer for his affection to the King." *History of the Rebellion*, vol. IV, pp. 221-22. Judging from Love's actual behavior, this is not far from the mark.

[20] *Life*, p. 37.

a clear cause, but rather the Uxbridge sermon, republished in 1651 as *England's Distemper*, which he had delivered during treaty negotiations between Parliament and the King. A product of his time as Parliament's chaplain, it was the key evidence against his cause because it made his newfound royalist allegiance appear insincere. He was not simply a common soldier who changed sides during the war. He had been a passionate supporter of the Roundheads, a published apologist for their goals, and a fierce critic of the King. How could he now support the reinstatement of monarchical rule? In his mind, it was possible because the monarchy now favored Presbyterianism; but to Parliamentarians and especially Independents, this made him a traitor to the cause. Love was a famous public figure. His sermons, including that at Uxbridge, were widely published long before anyone suspected he would be executed, much less help the Stuarts. His preexisting reputation as a sincere minister would assist his own martyrological narrative after death, just as it had given the Rump such cause for concern during his life.[21]

Love's attitudes in the Uxbridge sermon were consistent with the causes of his 1642 arrest. In the sermon he warned against a treaty with the Royalists because they would not support peace and could not uphold Christian truth, as their history during the previous years demonstrated. For example, the Laudian reforms had resulted in Catholics being "cherisht, countenanced, and kept from the stroke of the Law," even as they pursued their "externall and pompous manner of worship" and ignored the "inward and

---

[21] Mary Love wrote that her husband was in high demand as a preacher and had gained the affections of the Scots during his attempt to be ordained there; *Life*, p. 36 and *passim*.

spiritual."[22] Much of the sermon criticized Catholicism to attack Royalists, who had tolerated "creeping popery" within the Church of England. This was why Love sought Scottish orders and postponed his ordination until after the Church was fractured by war.[23] While Love's words at Uxbridge were not quite as severe as some royalists claimed—he did not directly demand regicide—he did warn Parliament that "men who lie under the guilt of much innocent blood, are not meet persons to be at peace with, till all the guilt of blood be expiated and avenged, either by the sword of Law, or law of the Sword."[24] This was not too many steps from advocating the slaughter of all royalists. He accused them of "carry[ing] blood and revenge in their hearts against us" and "drink[ing] an health to our damnation" even as they feigned a treaty with Parliament. Such men, he claimed, would never make peace, as this would be to "reconcile Heaven and Hell," a categorical impossibility.[25] However, in 1649 he joined other Presbyterian clergy in denouncing the regicide and argued in print with Independent minister John Price that the Presbyterians had never approved it, even in 1645.[26] Price retorted with Love's own words on the "sword of Law or law of the Sword."[27] Price used *England's Distemper* to argue that the Regicide was just and necessary, but this appropriated Love for a new

---

[22] Christopher Love, *England's Distemper*, as reprinted in 1651; p. 18. The 1645 and 1651 editions are identical. The frontispiece for each includes Psalm 120, verse 7: "I am for Peace, but when I speak they are for War."

[23] His actual ordination was just a few months before the Uxbridge sermon, by a Presbyterian, at Windsor; *Life*, pp. 36 and 51.

[24] *England's Distemper*, p. 37.

[25] Ibid, p. 42. Attorney General Prideaux quoted and rejected this at Love's trial; see below.

[26] One such pamphlet was *A vindication of the ministers of the Gospel in, and about London, from the unjust aspersions cast upon their former actings for the Parliament, as if they had promoted the bringing of the King to capitall punishment*, 1649; Love was one of nearly sixty signatories.

[27] John Price, *Clerico-classicum, or, The clergi-allarum to a third war*, 1649, frontispiece. Love's rebuttal was *A Modest and Clear Vindication of the Serious Representation, and late Vindication of the Ministers of London, from the Scandalous Aspersions of John Price*, 1649. Price, an Independent minister usually styled "Citizen of London," was a frequent commentator on Commonwealth politics.

cause: the Uxbridge sermon had referred to the bloodshed of the first civil war, while Price referred to the second. By 1651, Love had come to believe that not only was the Regicide wrong; Charles II had to be restored. In his defense, he had claimed in 1645 that for the two sides to agree, "they must grow better, or we must wax worse."[28] Perhaps each had happened. The Royalists were treating with the Presbyterians, while the Rump and the Independents lay under the "guilt of much blood" themselves. Since they controlled the sword of law, Love turned the law of the sword against them. This was the essence of his treason.

Love may have been motivated by his faith, but his alleged crime was overtly political in its effects and intentions. His legal defense was similar to other royalist responses: he asserted that his action may have been "a transgression of their Lawes, but [it was] no transgression of any command of God."[29] He had followed his conscience, and it did not matter what an unjust government said. Though Love spoke little of the monarchy in 1651, Mary wrote that her husband "was one whose heart was set by prayer and all lawful means for the Restauration of our blessed Soveraigne to the throne of his Father, often desiring that God would return his banished, and for this end he was willing to goe to the stake to make way for his Coming to the Crowne."[30] The qualifying word is "lawful," and Love was forced to argue that he broke no *valid* laws. For example, he wrote from prison, in response to accusations that he had confessed to his own guilt in his petitions to the Court:

---

[28] *England's Distemper*, p. 42.
[29] Christopher Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love*, p. 4.
[30] *Life*, p. 86; this may be a retroactive attempt to portray Love as a friend of the Crown.

> I did not in my Petition justifie the acts upon which I was condemned to be righteous; nor the Court to be legall: I do publickly protest against the former to be most unrighteous, unmercifull, and severe Lawes, as Draco's written in blood; and have before the High Court protested against the latter, that they were not a legall Court of judicature to judge me for my life.[31]

There were many more elements to this debate, since assumptions about a law's legitimacy relied on assumptions about Christianity's role in the English state. Who would have the dominant role in the governance of the Church: Presbyterians or Independents? And who would have the dominant role in the governance of the nation: Parliament or King? These debates predated the regicide, but Love's trial was an opportunity to continue the religio-political argument. His refusal to endorse the more radical elements of the English Revolution, like republicanism and a church without a presbytery, left him with no choice but to challenge the Commonwealth. In his mind, he had sought the best way to apply Christianity within a particular context at each point in his life. His legalism, however, drew accusations of casuistry and mental reservation, compelling some to apply the dreaded label "Jesuitical."[32] By this reasoning, his critics claimed, he cloaked a mission of political intrigue with the pretense of religion.

---

[31] Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication*, p. 4.

[32] Even Justice Keble warned Love that upheavals within Christendom are always led by *supposed* ministers of God, itself an example of how the bravery of potential martyrs was dismissed by their enemies as ill-intentioned: "Orators among the Heathen have been the greatest Incendiaries, and those orators in Christendome that do not set their judgements upon right ends, they are the most unworthy men in Christendome…[they] have called themselves Ministers of Jesus Christ, as the Jesuits of Jesus…Therefore it is not your Office can excuse you," *State Trials*, 5.172. Late in the trial, Keble suggested that those who behave like Love "are no better than Jesuits in reality, though not in name…I will tell you who did the like in the very words almost that you did, and that was father Garnet," ibid, 5.246; Henry Garnet was executed after the Gunpowder Plot. Similarly, a pamphleteer called his "ends" and "means…resignedly Jesuiticall," referring to the nature of his conspiracy; *A Gagg to Love's Advocate, Or, An Assertion of the Justice of the Parlament in the Execution of Mr. Love*, 1649, p. 4.

III

Love's trial was very long for its time, requiring six nonconsecutive days spanning two weeks, from 20 June to 5 July; his execution was then delayed until 22 August.[33] The trial was followed by the much shorter trial of coconspirator John Gibbons. Other conspirators confessed and were released, but Gibbons refused to submit to the Rump's authority and praised Love's example from the scaffold. The two men's trials were published separately, with Gibbons's appearing as a pamphlet and Love's as a comparatively massive book.[34] Mary Love commented on the trial only in passing, offering general criticisms and referring to the High Court of "Injustice," a frequent anti-Rump slur.[35] Several other plotters were released after retracting statements against Parliament's authority, an action that Love was not prepared to take. Most of the plotters became the primary witnesses against him, usually under duress; some refused to swear and were fined for contempt.

The trial itself was an essential part of Love's contested martyrdom, but its length made it difficult to use as a polemical tool. Shorter pamphlets debated his cause, often taking his words at trial out of context to defame him. The stay of execution from July to

---

[33] *The Whole Triall of Mr. Love, before the High Court of Justice in Westminster Hall*, 1652; this text is 129 pages long with a small typeface, an enormous text for a trial account but based, of course, on a long trial. By comparison, the combined account of King Charles's trial and the three lords' executions, published in 1650 by Peter Cole, is 136 pages with far fewer words per page. While this hardly means that Love's trial was more significant than that of the King, its length and its diversity of witnesses indicates that it was crucially important for England in the summer before Worcester. For citation ease, we will use *State Trials*, which reproduces this text (and others) in full.

[34] The relationship between Love and Gibbons is a glaring lacuna. Gibbons, who was executed second, referred to Love in his execution speech (see below); but Love did not anticipate the favor, and Mary never mentions him. He was named as a coconspirator at Love's trial; but perhaps because he was kept at Newgate while Love was at the Tower, even though both were beheaded at Tower Hill, there is little evidence of close friendship.

[35] *Life*, p. 104.

August was crucial for his cause because it required him to suffer an unusual ordeal, different from a trial or an execution and more like Christ's temptation in the desert, a comparison that his apologists would exploit.[36] But it also allowed him to continue to influence his public perception by rebutting criticisms in print and meeting with his wife in the Tower. This ensured that Love would have substantial evidence in his cause's favor, as we will see below in the tender conversations between husband and wife; but his opportunity to write was a double-edged sword. He had to rebut his critics if he was to be remembered as a martyr rather than a traitor, but he also had to respond carefully. A quick execution could save a martyr's cause, but a long walk to the scaffold gave many opportunities to fall.

At trial, Love attempted to present himself as a sympathetic martyr to the point of overselling his case by verbosity. He was both obstinate and clever in his defense, but he frustrated the Court through long-winded speeches and tireless demands. He received an unusual level of accommodation but still insisted that, compared to other famous traitors, he was being mistreated. He questioned the validity of his charge and demanded legal representation on each day of the trial, usually denied in treason cases. Even so, he convinced the Court to devote an entire extra day (the fifth) to several additional counselors' analyses of the wording of the charge to determine whether it included misprision of treason in addition to treason, and if so, whether either had been proved. This was shrewd legalism, even hair-splitting; but it was less severe than rejecting the court's authority outright, which opened Love to accusations that he had recognized the

---

[36] Mary Love describes the delay as a "merciless reprieve," even though her own petitions caused it: "And now this weary traveler longed for nothing more than his harbour of rest, but yet was driven back by the cross winds of a merciless reprieve, for a month, in which time he suffered the wrack from temptations from Enemies and solicitations from friends"; *Life*, p. 116.

government's legitimacy and accidentally admitted to guilt under the law. This separated him from traditional royalists, who even after Love denied their courts' jurisdiction.

On the first day, Love stalled, refusing to plead and irritating his judge, Richard Keble, whose patience would be tested throughout the trial. Love came with a text prepared, which began with the same words that he would use at his execution, paraphrasing Paul's letter to the Corinthians: "I am this day made a spectacle to God, angels, and men…a grief to many that are Godly, and a laughing-stock to the wicked, and a gazing-stock to all; yet, blessed be God, not a terror to myself."[37] Love, Keble, and Attorney General Edmund Prideaux debated whether Love's speech on suffering had any direct bearing on the case. Love irked Keble and Prideaux further by citing their treatment of John Lilburne in his 1649 treason trial as a precedent for giving greater leeway to a defendant.[38] Love was ultimately permitted to read part of his speech, but with frequent interruptions by Prideaux who believed he was hijacking the proceedings. His martyrological campaign had begun. He claimed that his own actions—even as he was conducting them—were intentional imitations of Christ. Explaining his refusal to plead, Love said, "I could urge the cause of Jesus Christ, who, when he was accused before a judicatory, answered not a word." The increasingly frustrated Keble interjected, "You are out," to which Love responded, "When Christ was accused in a civil business to be a mover of sedition (as now I am), they asked him, Whether he was king of the Jews?

---

[37] *State Trials* 5.48-49; compare with his last speech, *State Trials* 5.252. At the trial he begins twice because of Keble's interruption. The full verse is "For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles at last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men"; 1 Corinthians 4:9.

[38] Prideaux even claimed that Love was receiving counsel in the Tower from Lilburne himself; *State Trials*, 5.53.

And he answered not a word."[39] This continued for some time, with many nitpicking questions by Love about the specifics of his charge. Keble again interjected, "You would evade things with mental reservations, and say and unsay at the bar, as high as any Jesuit can do."[40] Love finally pled not guilty, but not before incurring the fury of the court. His intent may have been to present himself as a passive victim in the imitation of Christ; but where Jesus was silent, Love arrived with a treatise.[41]

The specific charges dealt with connections to Scottish Covenanters and arrangements to support them financially when they were pressuring Charles II to take the Covenant the previous winter. This was important for Love's martyrological defense, if not his legal one: he only sought to encourage the best Christian settlement for both countries.[42] Charles's taking of the Covenant was at least as political as it was religious, of course; whatever the young king's religious views were, judging from hindsight they do not appear to have been especially Presbyterian. But Love saw this as a religious move, making his support for "Charles Stuart" a spiritual act defending Christianity in post-revolutionary England. The court argued otherwise. According to the Attorney General, the plot began in 1648 as an extension of the Engagement between Charles I and the Scots in 1647 and had persisted ever since. Prideaux argued that this was "not one or

---

[39] Ibid, 5.53.

[40] Ibid, 5.61; later Keble would say, when Love protested that the witnesses would not provide justice, "You shall have Justice as well as ever any jesuit had"; 5.76. Given the history of Jesuits' treatment by the English state, this cannot have been much comfort, nor was it the sort of company Love would have desired.

[41] It could be asked whether Love's attitude was meant to ensure that he would become a martyr, but the detailed legal questions and subsequent petitioning campaign limit such an interpretation. There is no evidence challenging Love's essential sincerity here. He was a trained orator, defending himself as could.

[42] According to Major Alford, a witness at Love's trial, "the Prince" was "inclinable...to take the Covenant and to cast off the Cavaliering Party." This was not a traditional endorsement of royalism but rather a requirement that the royalists change their own vision of England's ecclesiastical settlement; *State Trials*, 5.89. The key was sending money to "Charles Stuart; ibid, 5.95.

ten treasons, but…a mystery of treasons, woven together during the space of two years, under the notion of religion."[43] For the Rump, Love's was using his conscience, his ministry, and his Presbyterianism as an excuse for political rebellion. In reality, however, each of these perspectives was partly correct. His actions were political inasmuch as they challenged the authority of the Commonwealth by restoring a severely restricted Charles II who had accepted the Scottish Covenant. But from Love's perspective, this was merely because his faith demanded it of him, just as much as it had demanded that he criticize Charles I in 1645: various secular authorities had denied true Christianity at key moments.[44]

Love maintained his aura of suffering for Christianity, but he grounded his case in legal technicalities and the alleged dishonesty of the court. He protested that witnesses against him had been paid to testify after confessing under duress, or that their lives were threatened, or both. For example, he demanded of one witness, Major Adams: "Ask him whether he was not threatened with death, and promised favour in case he would bring in evidence against me," to which Adams replied, as did all the others, "I cannot say I was threatened with death to that end."[45] Refusing to accept this, Love demanded that a Major Cobbett be called to testify that he had given the money to Adams; when Cobbett denied it, Love denounced him: "Sir, this man is a Tobiah and a Sanballat," a loaded reference to the Book of Nehemiah.[46] Love's interrogation of Cobbett was either harsh or insightful,

---

[43] Ibid, 5.67.
[44] Witnesses testified that Love had encouraged prayer and fasting for the reparation of the sins of the nation, and Prideaux (but not the witnesses) suggested that this must have included praying for the success of the Treaty of Breda, politicizing and profaning his prayers; *State Trials*, 5.83.
[45] Ibid, 5.111.
[46] If there was any doubt, this outburst is excellent proof that a scripture scholar was on trial. Sanballat the Horonite and his servant Tobiah first mocked Nehemiah for rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem and then

depending on now-unknowable facts. He insisted that Cobbett lied to cover his bribery when he explained that "commiserating [Adams], as being a prisoner, I lent him ten pounds; but for no consideration that he should betray Mr. Love, or any man. I paid the money to his wife."[47] This infuriated Love, who presumed that compassionately giving money to Adams's wife—while Adams was in prison and could not directly receive the loan—was proof of bribery. It is difficult to know who was right, though the prosecution's failure to respond to this challenge raises suspicion. Perhaps the world opposed Love, and he was alone, friendless, on the stand. The dispute is odd: like Adams, Love had a wife who was working to provide for her husband's security; but to imitate the "man of sorrows," who was "despised, rejected of men," Love had to appear to be very much alone.

Even so, Love did have friends. Some witnesses refused to testify, such as Jackson, another Presbyterian minister, who said, "I look upon this man as a man very precious in God's sight; and, my lord, I fear I should have an hell in my conscience unto my dying day, if I should speak any thing that should be circumstantially prejudicial to his life." Prideaux was furious: "My Lord, these go beyond Jesuits: The Jesuits will swear with a reservation, and these will not swear at all." Several witnesses were fined £500 for

---

attempted to frame him for plotting rebellion against the Persian king Artaxerxes, even though he worked with the king's support. Nehemiah replied, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down: why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?" He denied any conspiracy and completed the reconstruction of the city walls, even as Sanballat's hired man attempted to trick him into violating the law of Moses by hiding within the temple to save his own life. Nehemiah recognized that this was done "that they might have matter for an evil report, that they might reproach me." Love likely drew parallels between the entire passage and his treatment, as well as his belief in his divinely appointed mission to rebuild his kingdom for an accommodating king; Nehemiah 6:3 and 6:13.

[47] *State Trials*, 5. 112.

contempt.[48] This had two effects. First, it made the Presbyterians appear uncooperative, feeding slanders that they were essentially "Protestant Jesuits."[49] Second, it damaged Love's legal standing, as it discredited him with the court and irritated Keble. Though the court did adjourn from 21 to 25 June to permit Love more time to prepare his own defense, his overall reliability was damaged by his friends' hesitancy to testify. Silence implied their guilt as well as Love's, even if their stated reason was that they did not want Love's death on their consciences.

Love's frustration was understandable, given that his life was at stake; it was acceptable for a martyr to defend his life as long he did not compromise his beliefs. He seems to have been aware of his hotheadedness and apologized to the court, insisting that his behavior "was no malignant design" and that he was "as a dumb man before you" in legal matters.[50] He usually attempted to appear respectful, even if the words or actions of certain witnesses angered him. At the end of his verbose defense, which was simply another speech with no witnesses, he apologized to the court, begging that "however I may be judged to be a man of a turbulent and unquiet spirit, yet those who know me in my relations, will not say so of me."[51] Surely the pressure of a trial might bring out the worst in a man, but Love's petulance and the trial itself each persisted for too long to

---

[48] Ibid, 5.132, 134.

[49] This accusation would be cast at Presbyterians throughout the Restoration, though by a very different government; for example, Stephen College, the treasonous "Protestant Joiner," in 1681.

[50] *State Trials*, 5.163-4.

[51] Ibid, 5.165; Love's defense spans thirty columns of constant monologue in *State Trials*, but he did refer to specific elements of the testimonies against him. His opening words are key: "My lord, I shall not trouble your lordship and the Court, to bring in at present any Witnesses to testify any thing that might invalidate that testimony that some have brought in against me; I love not to protract time: but I should betray my own innocency, should I by my silence lie under all that charge and obloquy which is cast upon me." It is difficult to see how this did not "protract time," but Love believed that it was necessary; ibid, 5.136.

simply fade from memory. The enormous amount of literary material produced during those two weeks gave Love's critics many opportunities for attack. As Prideaux said in his response to Love's defense, "You have heard him say much, and it had been much better for him if he had said less…I do find the old proverb commonly true, 'In multitude of words there wanteth not evil.'"[52] Keble, too, thought that Love had protested too much, employing rhetoric instead of evidence. Love's attempt to rebut Prideaux's rebuttal—almost unthinkable at this point—was quickly halted. Keble explained, "You spent the last day only in making comments and collections; yet that you might have some liberty of discourse, we sat here patiently two hours; and did hear that which we ought not, nor you ought to have spoken."[53] Love's fate was sealed, but several more sessions before his conviction—the court hoped—would ensure that the public appreciated the gravity of his many contradictions.

The first contradiction was Love's former support of Parliament. Prideaux referred to this in his closing arguments: "It is a grief to this Court, to myself, and all that are well-wishers to the public, that any man that hath been a friend to the Parliament, that hath gone along with them, acted for them, suffered for them, done as he hath done, that this man should be called to public justice."[54] Yet this background only increased the gravity of his crimes. Love, Prideaux argued, had betrayed his own: "Truly, that Mr. Love should do this, it is (I think) an aggravation; and not an aggravation upon the Court

---

[52] Ibid, 5.166. Surprisingly, Love did not exploit one of Prideaux's statements at the trial, essentially a paraphrase of Caiphas in the Gospel of John, which would have had the unintended result of further making Love appear to be in the place of Christ: "It is better that one man than a state should parish"; 5.171.
[53] Ibid, 5.203.
[54] Ibid, 5.198.

or State, that they should prosecute where a man is prosecuting them."[55] To punish those who have attacked the state is the only honest choice. To support this conclusion, in a moment of courtroom drama, Prideaux presented a copy of Love's Uxbridge sermon, quoting Love's own words on the Commonwealth's proper treatment of its enemies. In response to Love's claim in *England's Distemper* that the two sides could not reunite until "they must grow better or we worse," Prideaux insists that "there is little hope" of this happening at present, given their recent engagement in plots.[56] The royalists were behaving just as badly as they had during the treaty negotiations of 1645. Love had also said that "the sparing of offenders hath made many worse," and that "The Lord heals a land by cutting off those distempered members that endanger the health of a land," like Achan in the Book of Joshua, who was stoned to death for keeping spoils for himself at Jericho—a misstep that caused the Israelites to lose a key battle.[57] Love, then, had become the thing that he despised, a "distempered member" of the nation who would turn family against family and bring God's wrath upon the people.

Despite the apparent conclusion to the trial on the fourth day, Love still managed to prolong it to analyze the exact wording of his charge, hoping that he might be found

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid, 5.201; Prideaux's citations are similar to those in John Price's pamphlet.

[57] This would have had special significance during the heightened military threat of 1651. The reference also invited parallels between Achan's keeping of spoils and Love's clinging to the idea of monarchy when it and all its trappings were supposed to have been destroyed. At different points Prideaux and Keble each referred to Achan, who had kept gold and silver despite God's warning that all of Jericho, its inhabitants, and its property were to be destroyed except for Rahab and her household. Achan was stoned by his own people, but only after he notably confessed his crimes to Joshua when confronted because he recognized that his sins had incurred the wrath of God, leading to their defeat at Ai and almost causing the destruction of the nation. Keble paraphrased this passage during the opening arguments, when he urged Love to enter a plea: "We have been calling upon God to direct us and you, and all good people, that justice may be done; and you would glorify God rather than Man, if you would confess, knowing what was done in that great sin of Achan"; *State Trials*, 5.49. Cf. Joshua 7:19, "My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto him."

not guilty on some technicality. Keble permitted the diversion begrudgingly. Love still asked for counsel, even as Keble adjourned the court, presuming that the trial might be extended yet again. On the sixth day, Love was convicted almost as soon as the court reconvened. Love insisted that he read a statement, which Keble forbade, having made too many accommodations throughout the trial. Nevertheless, Love was able to call out once more before being taken away: "But a word, my lord, and it is this, in the words of the Apostle: 'I have received the Sentence of death in myself, that should not trust in myself, but in God, which raiseth the dead.' And, my lord, though you have condemned me, yet this I can say, that neither God nor my own conscience doth condemn me."[58] With those words, apparently resigning himself finally to his fate (though his petitions would soon prove otherwise), Love began the next phase of his personal campaign to make sure that he would be remembered not as a traitor but as a martyr. According to Love, he followed the Old Testament prophets, the martyred Apostles, and Christ himself. He would die for trying to rebuild the kingdoms of both England and Israel.

IV

Love's aura of suffering was exaggerated by design, but in a manner that invited accusations of affectation. His closest supporters would have seen him as a martyr regardless of what happened at his trial, and vacillating Presbyterians may have been drawn by his boldness; but he could not have won many new friends from stalwart Parliamentarians through his behavior. Where traditional royalists like Capel had been obstinate but dignified, Love appeared frustrated. His self-made martyrdom risked

---

[58] *State Trials*, 5.251. The quotation is from Paul, 2 Corinthians 1:9.

becoming an artificial construction, casting doubt on his own integrity. The trial lasted six grueling days because of Love's maneuverings; and while his sentence appeared preordained, Love manipulated the perception of his trial's legality and tried to find some way to win on technicalities. This need not diminish Love's sincerity. In Christian tradition, martyrs only die when there is no recourse; Love had to make sure that there was no way to save his life while remaining faithful to his beliefs. Perhaps it would have been better for his posthumous reputation if he had been executed straightaway, much as Prideaux said it would have been better if he had spoken less; but Mary and other supporters petitioned both the Rump and Cromwell for a pardon. The effort is understandable. The Loves had several children, with another on the way; Mary reminded everyone that her unborn child deserved a father. Yet the petitions also gave Love opportunities to trip on his walk to the scaffold, even though some were submitted by third parties. By demanding clemency, Love and his supporters admitted some degree of guilt, recasting his defense. Love may not have been fully innocent under the law, the petitions claimed; but he remained innocent to God.

Unlike exoneration, a pardon forgives the guilty. Some petitions admitted that Love had committed great crimes but asked Parliament to relent since mercy was a virtue and he would be leaving a wife and children. For example, one petition, published as a pamphlet by unnamed friends, admits that Love had been "destructive to the Common-wealth"; but the harm he did "to his own Relations" was far greater. It asks Parliament to "be merciful, as our Heavenly Father is merciful," not for Love's sake "or any service he hath formerly done" but rather "in regard unto his own Relations…pious well-meaning

people, full of grief for his sad condition."[59] This drew on Love's personal circumstances, appealing to Christian charity to protect a threatened family.[60]

Similarly, another pamphlet, authored by "G.L." and serving as a companion to the petitions, flatters Parliament in a public appeal for mercy, "as ye are in the place of God, and may not improperly be called gods."[61] Rather than stress Love's family, this pamphlet draws on the political division that plagued the Commonwealth since the Regicide. It acknowledges that Love was guilty and admits that his plot would have been devastating had it succeeded; but it minimizes the level of Love's "treasonable intent" by claiming that, in communicating with the King of Scotland, he was only trying to protect Scotland from popery, which would help England indirectly. He did not seek to reunite England to Scotland under a king.[62] This unorthodox angle admits that Love had communicated with the King of Scotland, which he had cautiously denied at trial.[63] The pamphlet appeals to pragmatism, claiming that a pardon would serve the Commonwealth's best interests by mending the fraction of the former Independent-

---

[59] *The Humble Petition of Many Cordial Friends…in behalf of Mr. Christopher Love*, 11 July 1651, pp. 2-3. If actually printed on the 11th, then it was a day before the originally scheduled execution on July 12, which of course was delayed while the petitions were considered. Sometimes the petitions were published at the same time that they were submitted; others appeared later. See Peacey, chapter 8, "Print and petitioning," in *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution.*

[60] Ann Hughes has analyzed how women supporting a variety of causes, including the Levellers as well as Quakers, used petitions as well as man; while these were characterized by the actual political arguments at least as much as their status as women, they did invoke their status as wives and mothers as a distinct perspective on, for example, Charles I's tyranny. Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution*, pp. 54-61; see also Hughes, "Gender and politics in Leveller literature," in *Political culture and cultural politics in early modern England*, eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester, 1995), pp. 162-188.

[61] G. L., *Love's Advocate, or Certain Arguments tendred to the serious Consideration of all that truly fear God*, 1651, sig. A2v.

[62] Ibid, p. 5.

[63] See *State Trials*, 5.137, where he admits that letters to or from Scotland might have been read in his house but not by or for him; 5.138, where he explicitly denies having collected money for the King or for Scotland; and 5.152, when he claims that a Mr. Sterks, whom one witness called a "Scotch agent," could not have been such because he had been in England for fourteen years.

Presbyterian alliance. First it warns that the enemies of the state would actually rejoice at Love's execution: "By shewing mercy to him, you will utterly disappoint the hopes and expectations of your as well as his adversaries; for indeed many are his utter enemies for your sakes, who you gratifie exceedingly if you suffer him to dy, and who gape greedily after his blood, and would as willingly have yours also if opportunity served."[64] Second, and more importantly, it suggests that clemency would encourage "the Presbyterian and Independent Ministry petitioning together…[who] do weekly meet to seek God for a happy reconciliation of the difference between them, which is the greatest advantage the enemy hath upon us."[65] Pardoning Love would foment unity amongst England's diverging sects, a unity that the Commonwealth desperately needed, whereas killing him would simply appease enemies of Protestantism. According to this logic, true English Christians must band together at this moment of external threats. Rather than risk alienating the once reliably Parliamentarian Presbyterians, the regime should spare Love as a sign of goodwill. Finally, G.L. casuistically suggests that Love's guilt was subject to mitigating circumstances: "[H]e that offends through a misguided opinion in matter of Church estate, and he that sets himself point blank against God, his cause, and people; (although I justifie neither) yet there is much difference between them."[66] Love should not have conspired with the Scots, but he meant well. This might have been an attractive compromise, and indeed the Rump still needed Presbyterian support to repair a divided house; but as Prideaux stressed at the trial, Love's own sermons explained why his death was necessary.

---

[64] *Love's Advocate*, p. 6.
[65] Ibid, p. 7.
[66] Ibid, p. 11.

Mary Love repeatedly petitioned the Rump and General Cromwell on her husband's behalf, though according to her biography Christopher thought this endeavor was unnecessary. From a martyrological standpoint, it was also risky. Petitions from third parties could be pragmatic or overtly political without damaging Love's reputation too much, but he and his wife had to present a unified voice. Love could not appear to be fearful of death, hence Mary's efforts to describe her appeal as for her and her children's sakes rather than for Love himself. Her four published petitions to Cromwell, who was in Scotland fighting the very war that Love was accused of instigating, escalated in their radical suggestions. Mary first asked for a general pardon for the sake of her unborn child. Second, she suggested banishment to Europe, presumably with the entire family. Third, she proposed a stay of execution until the baby was born, to preserve mother and child from stress. Finally, in a remarkably unorthodox suggestion, she asked that Love "be sent to endeavour the conversion of the poor Indians" as part of the Commonwealth's general goal of "propagating the Gospel in New-England."[67] This was imaginative, to say the least, as it does not appear to have been a common resort of Parliament to send disgraced ministers to America as missionaries (although transportation was a normal enough punishment). The requests were denied. Several weeks after Love's death, Mary delivered their baby prematurely, reportedly because of her family's upheaval. Later, in the biography, she would describe the petition process as her own mission, since Love himself preferred to be a martyr and "was not at all dismay'd" when he learned that he must die.[68] She is careful to note this in the biography because it was risky to present Love as seeking his own gain, especially when his critics had accused him of supporting

---

[67] *Love's Name Lives: or, A Publication of diverse Petitions*, etc, 1651, pp. 1-3; quote p. 3.
[68] *Life*, pp. 113-14.

the Crown for personal advancement in the first place; but given his efforts at trial to spare himself, and his own petitions which, intriguingly, were only reprinted by critics, it can be asked whether Love fought to spare his life more than Mary Love admitted.[69] The petitions were an interesting defensive tactic. They acknowledged that Love broke the laws of Parliament, though they did not address whether those laws were valid; and they argued that Love's life was worth saving for his family's sake, not his own. This defense opened Love to further criticisms that he had accepted Parliament as a legitimate government, an accusation that he would have to address in his last speech. The petitions thus created more inconsistencies in Love's self-characterization.

Responding to the petitions as well as to Love's trial, his critics asked whether he really served God as much as he claimed, suggesting that by engaging in rebellion he had now corrupted his own message. They dredged the Uxbridge sermon for evidence that he was engrossed in worldly affairs and held himself to different standards than he expected of other men. Love claimed that it his critics were attempting to sully his otherwise spotless reputation, since the Uxbridge sermon had not been controversial in 1645 besides upsetting Royalists; "If a man's good name be as a precious Oyntment, there will not be wanting many Flyes (to carry about flying Reports) to corrupt it."[70] But if Love appeared to have sought earthly gain, even if it was not strictly for himself, his entire

---

[69] Love's own petitions were printed in *Mr. Love's Case*, a collection of documents printed later in 1651; see below.

[70] Love, *A Vindication of Mr. Christopher Love from diverse Scandalous Reproaches cast upon him by the Malignant Party*, p. 1. According to the frontispiece, Love wrote this himself before his death; but parts of the text, including the quotation on flies and ointment, are copied directly from Love's introduction to the Uxbridge sermon as printed in 1645 and 1651. The original material also deals with Uxbridge, demonstrating the importance of the sermon for Love's long-term reputation. While it may be true that the men of Windsor and Uxbridge did not drive Love out of town, as some claimed, it is misleading of him to suggest that there was no controversy, as he was placed under house arrest for some time after delivering the sermon, albeit to appease the royalists.

defense could fall apart. Nathaniel Burt posed this question in a pamphlet dated July 7, 1651, responding to both the Uxbridge sermon and the trial. Burt argues that Love's recent behavior "proves not your mission from Christ, or your Brethrens, or your works to be spirituall, but carnall, or literall, or both: It is not others report hath corrupted your name, but the flies of your own Practises," which had "preacht another Gospel."[71] Love's actions are in and of this world, not the hereafter. Further challenging Love, who had compared himself to Jeremiah, Burt writes that he was better compared to the false prophet who opposed Jeremiah: "I feare you, as many also of your Brethren, have impudently belied the Lord, as Hananiah did…when he contradicteth Jeremiah the true Prophet." Burt continues that Love will hear the same words that Jeremiah told to Hananiah: "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will cast thee from off the earth: this year thou shalt die, because thou hast spoken rebelliously against the Lord."[72] Love's death was the result of God's judgment on his political rebellion. Finally Burt stresses that "Christ & his Apostles never commanded war & avengement: and these doe, and say, they are Christs Ministers."[73] In this characterization, Love encouraged Englishmen to disobey Christ by fomenting war between England and Scotland, who should have supported one another as godly neighbors ought (though Love said that he sought the same thing). This short pamphlet argues the key points that Love had to rebut: that he was not encouraging proper service of Christ, and that the entire Presbyterian wing of the English ministry was encouraging violence against the establishment. The Uxbridge sermon was invoked at Love's trial, as we have seen; but there it had been accepted as a valid point that Love

---

[71] Nathaniel Burt, *An Individual Letter to every man that calls himselfe a Minister of Jesus Christ*, 1651, p. 7.
[72] Ibid; Jeremiah 28.
[73] Burt, p. 8.

himself had failed to uphold. Here it is criticized as a reflection of Love's misguided mission, arguing that in encouraging violence Love had betrayed his own ministry in Christ's service and prevented further reform of the Church of England. Burt does not endorse the Commonwealth itself but rather challenges Love's strategy, warning that it serves neither God nor the faithful.

Love and his petitioners also attracted criticism for their insinuation that Parliament had shown insufficient mercy. John Hall's *A Gagg for Love's Advocate* attacks G.L.'s *Love's Advocate* and reassures readers that Parliament and the Council of State had already found the proper balance between justice and mercy.[74] This is a Rump-endorsed pamphlet, emblazoned with the Arms of the Commonwealth on the frontispiece. *Gagg* argues that Parliament ought to be defended; Love has not defended Parliament; and therefore, Love must die. It is not a response to Love's words or petitions but rather the argument for clemency that *Love's Advocate* had made. Hall is aware of posterity and audience, too, wishing that if his pamphlet should "chance to survive, future ages might know that this age produced some men heroically virtuous, and others that did paie them their due adoration."[75] He assumes that Love was indisputably guilty and reiterates how disastrous such a plot, and any contact with Charles Stuart, would have been for the Commonwealth. The plotters and their means "were so resignedly Jesuiticall" that they could not be tolerated by any court.[76] This emphasizes the justice of the law, attempting to keep the discussion grounded in the facts rather than stray into questions over the legitimacy of the Republic or the plight of Love's children.

---

[74] Peacey identifies J.H., noting that he was in Parliament's employment as a propagandist; *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 199.
[75] J. H., *A Gagg for Love's Advocate*, A2v.
[76] Ibid, p. 4.

Similarly, the anonymous uthor of *A Just Balance*, published in July 1651, argues through a series of rhetorical questions that treason is simply unpardonable, regardless of circumstances. For example, he asks "Whether M. Love's pretence to the Office and Calling of a Minister…be any reasonable or Christian ground why he should be exempted from suffering death," ostensibly as an open question for thoughtful consideration. But he reminds the reader that ministers can be excommunicated and even "delivered up to Satan."[77] This echoes Keble's reasoning that the Jesuits were known for arguing well but were hardly men to be imitated.[78] The author challenges the petitioners, asking whether "stiling M. Love their Dear Brother" will "condemn themselves as brethren in the same iniquity with him?"[79] This passage sets the words "Dear Brother" apart with a blackletter typeface, possibly intended as mockery. It suggests that Love's comrades are equally guilty and implies that they deserve the same punishment. Finally, stressing the extent to which the Presbyterian Royalist community has been misled, he warns that "Concupiscence is never more like unto a Bear robbed of her whelps, then when she hath Conscience for her Second."[80] In other words, the Presbyterians' drift toward evil has been compounded by the belief that their consciences justified it; yet this will leave them and the entire commonwealth in a far worse position, having left God behind. Love and the Presbyterians have been misled by their dissatisfaction with the Commonwealth into endorsing sin for goodness's sake, which has broken the formerly

---

[77] *A Just Balance: Or, Some Considerable Queries about Mr. Love's Case, Tryal, & Sentence*, 1651, p. 7. *Balance* was printed for Giles Calvert, one of an official "consortium" of publishers; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 121-22.
[78] *State Trials*, 5.172.
[79] *A Just Balance*, p. 16.
[80] Ibid, p. 17.

strong alliance that had sustained the Parliamentarian cause. Love's rebellion is a personal betrayal with broad ramifications.

V

The petitions failed, but the resulting six week stay of execution permitted Love to rebut his critics. This mostly helped his reputation, but it also invited further attack. Love's most significant pamphlet was essentially a preliminary, and extended, version of his last speech. The book deals with his legal case from a religious perspective, again explaining how regardless of the law he was innocent to God, thereby making him a martyr. The frontispiece quotes Jeremiah 26:14-15, where the prophet says, "Know ye for certain, that if ye put Me to death, ye shall surely bring innocent blood upon your selves, and upon this City, and upon the Inhabitants thereof."[81] Love situates himself as an Old Testament prophet rejected by his own people. Volleying the accusation that he was Jesuitical, he writes of the Rump, "All that I shall say touching the men in present Power, they have gotten Power into their hands by policy, exercise it by cruelty, and they will lose it with ignominy. As it was said of Boniface, he entred the Popedome like a Fox, reigned like a Lyon, but dyed like a Dog."[82] If the government was behaving like a pack of papists, then it was fair to turn to the apparent Covenanter Charles II. While it seems a stretch to imply that Charles was not trying to regain power through "policy," Love still considers this settlement the best spiritual path for England and the Presbyterians. It is

---

[81] Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love*, frontispiece. This book is distinct from the shorter *Vindication of Mr. Christopher Love*.

[82] Ibid, unnumbered first page; he would repeat this in his execution speech. The quotation refers to Boniface VIII, who had imprisoned his predecessor, Celestine V, after his abdication in 1294; Boniface apparently committed suicide and was infamously consigned by Dante to the eighth circle of hell with the simoniacs.

permissible to break the Rump's laws, for "I am assured that what they count Sin is Duty and what they judge Treason is Loyalty."[83] He argues against Parliament's very legitimacy because they took power through temporal mechanisms and have enshrined sin. He does not discuss the regicide at length, but he alludes to it as a source of Parliament's blood guilt.

The Commonwealth also helped England's enemies, particularly by fighting Scotland, who should be a natural ally. A war against Protestant brethren must be a "joy to the Pope…Had the Conclave of Rome plotted together, they could not wish a more happy and hopefull designe…than to see the Protestant party in England and Scotland ruining one another."[84] Therefore it is the established government, Love argues, not he, that is destroying the nation and bringing in Popery. Again we see the theme of the Covenant's natural affinity to English Presbyterianism. Furthermore, by persecuting him and other faithful Presbyterians, Parliament is attacking the very foundation of Christian practice in England: "since the days of Queen Mary, there hath been no Protestant Minister so unchristianly dealt withal, as I have been, and received such hard measure."[85] Love lists all the injustices he has lately suffered, blaming them on a vindictive government while praying that God may forgive his enemies. This is a significant tonal shift from his behavior at his trial, where he at least attempted to appear humble before the court, cautiously respecting its jurisdiction even as he interrupted its proceedings. Now he condemns the court's actions and the government's motivations, arguing that

---

[83] Ibid, p. 5.
[84] Ibid, p. 34.
[85] Ibid, p. 42.

each is undermining Protestantism. He resents how he has been treated and fears for England's future.

Love's friends, including co-conspirators and his wife, wrote to him in prison, encouraging him to trust in God and to remember that he was a martyr for Christ. The letters were mostly apolitical. The pamphlet *Love's Name Lives*, published after his death, presents first the petitions to Parliament by Mary Love, which we have seen above, and then several private letters. First, Mr. Jaquel, who swore on his buttons rather than a bible at the trial, encourages Love to remain steadfast in his faith since the nation could be inspired by his suffering and asks that Love remember him well to God.[86] Using his own unwilling but damaging testimony as a reference, Jaquel suggests a parallel between Love and Christ, hoping that "through the strength of Christ, and the supplie for your prayers, I shall be better fortified for the time to come, as Peter was after his fall."[87] Christ provides salvation, but by comparing his own failure to the denial of Peter, Jaquel places Love in Christ's position. Similarly, William Drake, who had been a Laudian and was therefore a surprising friend and co-conspirator, wrote to Love throughout the summer of 1651 and claimed that as an impending martyr he could offer powerful prayers for those left behind. He suggests in a letter dated June 17, shortly before the trial, that Love might be "the Proto-Confessour or Proto-Martyr" and prayes that "the Lord inable you by grace, to bear the honour, as well as the burthen."[88] It is not clear how Love would be a protomartyr, since Stephen, Strafford, or Charles I would have been more obvious examples. However, in being the first Presbyterian to die for monarchy,

---

[86] *State Trials*, 5.113-14; he at first refused to swear and then did so "on his buttons," which presumably means over his heart, as an inventive compromise; what good it did Love is unclear, since he still testified.
[87] *Love's Name Lives*, p. 5.
[88] Ibid, p. 6.

Love could carry the royalist gospel to a new congregation. Drake expanded this theme in a letter dated July 12, just before Love's originally scheduled execution, by writing, "God is now but in his old method, to make the blood of the Martyrs the seed of his Church."[89] By Drake's reasoning, Love was a martyr for the faith in the mold of the early Christians, persecuted by a brutal heathen state. Finally, a letter from Mr. Robinson in August, three days before Love's execution, joyfully summarizes the meaning of Christian suffering. First he refers to the impending execution as Love's "wedding day," a point echoed by Love's words to Mary in prison, where he had told her that he would "goe up Tower hill as cheerfully to be ever lastingly martyred unto my Redeemer as I went to Giles Church to be marryed unto thee."[90] Robinson assures Love, "If your death, and this kinde of death, were not most for the glorie of God, and the benefit of the Church, I am confident, God would have saved you from this hour."[91] Taken together, all these letters from Love's companions portray Love not as a political hero or even a royalist but simply a good Christian. Though they were published after Love's death, if genuine then they were the texts that he was reading, along with the Bible, in the days before his execution. Their themes reappear in his speech and in his private words to Mary. The letters and biography show how Love fashioned his martyrological cause through faith and through dialogue with friends.

As for other potential martyrs, Love's last speech was the most important single action in constructing and contesting his case for posterity. The speech was primarily a statement of faith, explaining how he had been persecuted for his religion and rejecting

---

[89] Ibid, p. 7.
[90] Ibid, p. 8; *Life*, p. 128.
[91] *Love's Name Lives*, p. 9.

those who accused him of compromising his faith by meddling in politics. Instead, he situated himself within the long scope of salvation history. Several printers published the speech or a summary of it alongside accounts of his execution.[92] Some of these included a shorter account of John Gibbons's death; Love ascended the scaffold at four in the afternoon on 22 August, and Gibbons followed an hour later. Love claims to be a martyr in the beginning of his speech, comparing himself to Rowland Taylor, a Protestant martyr from the reign of Queen Mary. Taylor, he says, had described a "lesser way" that he had rejected, preferring to take "but two steps between me and Glory," which for Love was "lying down upon the Block" by which he would "ascend upon a Throne."[93] He compares this ascent to the journey of Moses: "Methinks I hear God say to me as he did to Moses, Go up to Mount Nebo and die there: So to me, Go up to Tower-Hill, and die there."[94] He then turns to the New Testament, observing that he is about to die in the same way "as two famous Preachers of the Gospel were…John the Baptist, and Paul the Apostle, they were both beheaded."[95] He then invokes St. John's vision of the martyrs:

> I read in Rev. 20.4 the Saints were beheaded for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus: But herein is the disadvantage which I lie under in the thoughts of many; they judge that I suffer not for the Word of God, or for Conscience, but for medling with State-matters. To this I shall briefly say, That it is an old guise of the devil, to impute the Cause of Gods peoples sufferings, to be

---

[92] The deeply spiritual nature of his last words, as opposed to the polemical published rebuttals, is embodied in the title of one of the copies, which described the speech as a "sermon"; *Mr. Love His Funeral Sermon, preached By himself on the Scaffold on Tower Hill, in the hearing of many thousand people, on Friday the two and twentieth day of this instant August*, 1651. This copy was not a complete text but rather a summary, likely published by one of his sympathizers.

[93] The very first lines were almost identical to those he used at his trial, which borrowed from 1 Corinthians: "Beloved Christians, I am made this day a spectacle unto God, Angels and Men: and among Men I am made a grief to the Godly, a laughingstock to the wicked, and a gazingstock to all; yet blessed be my God, not a terror to my self." *A True and exact Copie of Mr Love's Speech and Prayer*, p. 1.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid.

> contrivements against the State, when in truth it is their Religion and Conscience they are persecuted for: The Rulers of Israel would have put Jeremy to death upon a Civil account, though indeed it was only the truth of his Prophecy that made the Rulers angry with him.[96]

This is Love's central defense. He like the saints in Revelation is "beheaded for the Word of God," but his critics retort that he dies "for medling with State-matters." This accusation, he says, is inspired by the Devil. Love will die like Jeremiah for true prophecies against faithless rulers who had accused him of politicking merely as an excuse. His final minutes are an opportunity to spread God's word. He says that he is "changing a Pulpit for a Scaffold," but it will be the "best Pulpit that ever I preached in" since it will permit him to "bring more glory to God by this one Speech" than he ever had during his years in God's service.[97] His speech and execution are an extension of his ministry, conducted on the scaffold, seizing control of the state's message and making himself a martyr, not a traitor, and certainly not overly involved with secular politics. He places his death within the annals of salvation history: he imitates Moses, John the Baptist, and the martyrs of the Marian counter-reformation. Love knew that he was operating in a religio-political context, but he wanted witnesses to know that it was his and their salvation that concerned him most.

Love still makes some overtures in his own favor, particularly to clear his name "as a dying man" of any accusation that he had endorsed regicide in 1645; but he frames even this political self-defense as deeply religious.[98] Fulfilling his role as England's prophet, he speaks jeremiads to London: "Thy glory is flying away like a bird…This city

---

[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid, p. 4.

is the receptacle of all errors." Before long the remaining Presbyterian ministers will disappear and "Arminians, Anabaptists, nay Jesuites are likely to supply their rooms": the city will be overrun by heresy and schism while it rejects its faithful clergy.[99] Approaching his conclusion, he states that he has fulfilled his vocation, and that dying for it is a great joy:

> [T]hough the Office be trodden upon and disgraced, yet it is my glory that I die a despised Minister; I had rather be a Preacher in a Pulpit, then a Prince upon a Throne; I had rather be an Instrument to bring souls to Heaven, then to have all the Nations bring in Tribute to me: I am not only a Christian and a Preacher, but whatever men may judge, I am a Martyr too, I speak it without vanity; would I have renounced my covenant, and debaucht my conscience, and ventured my soul, there might have been hopes of saving my life, that I should not have come to this place; but blessed be my God I have made the best choice, I have chosen affliction rather then sin, and therefore welcome Scaffold, and welcome Axe, and welcome Block, and welcome Death, and welcome All, because it will send me to my Fathers House."[100]

Enduring suffering at his death is better than living in sin, as such a death will send him directly to heaven, he says, even "before you will be at your own houses." Nor is the suffering especially difficult: "I have formerly had more fear in the drawing of a tooth, then now I have at the cutting off my head."[101] This is classic martyrological language, even excessively so. Besides Charles, the "martyr of the people," the more traditional royalists avoided granting themselves the title so directly. But as we have seen, Love's friends told him in the preceding weeks that he would be a martyr for God, and he

---

[99] Ibid, p. 5.
[100] Ibid, p. 7.
[101] Ibid.

believed that he was. Accounts did not report whether he kissed the block, but he still named the instruments of execution as the path to the "heavenly Jerusalem."[102]

Love is clear in his speech about his and his opponents' positions: why some say he dies (politics); why he actually dies (true Christianity); and what may come in the future if Christians do not take care to fight evil (Jesuits). Yet what is missing? Other than a claim that he never endorsed regicide, there is no reference to monarchy, no mention of Charles II, and no broad claim about the state besides its persecution of faithful ministers. Therefore while Love died, as even he admitted, for being too friendly with royalists, he reframed his tale of suffering as a spiritual battle against Satan. His professed martyrdom was for being a faithful Christian, rejected like Jeremiah or Christ Himself by his own people. He did not portray himself as a companion of Charles I, nor did he expect to join him shortly. By Love's telling, the Rump was jockeying for political power while Love led souls to Christ, just as he always had.

After Love's execution, John Gibbons followed him to the scaffold. He merits brief mention because his experience augmented Love's self-defense and created the impression that Love belonged to a movement. Gibbons's three-day trial began on 18 July, during Love's extended imprisonment, and was similar in substance and personnel. Witnesses testified that Gibbons was at Love's house when the conspirators wrote to Scottish agents. He, like Love, demanded counsel, which was repeatedly denied. In his closing arguments, Gibbons proclaimed that he was "innocent at the Bar of the Lord Jesus Christ, where I shall have free liberty to speak."[103] The otherwise neutral transcript of the trial is framed by a prefatory address to the reader and a postscript by the

---

[102] Ibid, p. 8.
[103] *The Triall of Mr. John Gibbons, In Westminster-Hall, before the High-Court of Justice*, 1652, p. 18.

anonymous publisher. The preface claims that the transcript is assembled from Gibbons's "own scattered Papers" and demonstrates both "the meeknesse, cheerfulnesse, and constancy of the Innocent" and also "the malice, iniquity, and obstinacy of the cruel Persecutors."[104] The postscript is critical of Keble and Prideaux in particular, noting that Gibbons suffered the "scorn and provocations" of the Attorney General. It claims that "very few, or none, are satisfied" by the testimonies against him.[105] Biblical verses on the frontispiece reiterate that Gibbons's fate is unjust. One from Habakkuk asks why a witness to this travesty would "holdest thy tongue, when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he," while one from Ecclesiastes asserts that "There is a just man that perisheth in his righteousnesse, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickednesse."[106] Gibbons is presented as the righteous man who refused to name others to save himself, "for he had rather die, then be a means to a scandal, or hazard any good man."[107] The pamphlet concludes with a separate letter, ostensibly written by Gibbons, telling of his attempted escape from Newgate. He had been tricked by his gaolers into paying them to help him to escape, an ordeal that left Gibbons disaffected with humanity. Though he forgives the men, he laments that their actions made him "more willing to leave the world, blessed be God, I am going from such a Generation."[108] This strange episode draws sympathy, showing how badly Gibbons had been treated.

---

[104] Ibid, p. 2.
[105] Ibid, p. 20.
[106] Ibid, frontispiece.
[107] Ibid, p. 9.
[108] Ibid, p. 22.

Another pamphlet, published by Thomas Cook, contains Gibbons's speech, which was omitted from the trial account. In it, Gibbons styles himself as a successor to Love, discussing scripture and the state of true Christianity in England. He too invokes Paul: "I am brought here to the Stage, where I am made a spectacle to God, to Angels, and to Men; an object of pity and compassion to my friends, where they see before their eyes a man…in the flower of his youth cut off as an untimely fruit."[109] He compares himself to the Three Young Men in the book of Daniel, trusting that he will be "received to God" from the fiery furnace. He proclaims his willingness to die for the Truth with words similar to Love's:

> It is Gods ordinary way, and if it be, Christians should not shun any extremity, if it bring them to Jesus Christ; and therefore I bless God, I come to this Scaffold, to this place, with as much willingness as ever Bridegroom did to receive his Bride: I know the passage of bloud is but short, and the way to the Crown; though my head be severed from my body, yet my soul to all eternity shall be joined to the Lord Jesus Christ.[110]

He protests little and is grateful that he goes to God. He prays "that the present Power and Court that is set up, have done themselves no more hurt then they have done me"; and indeed his hurt is not great, as he has only been sent to his savior, where he hopes that all men may join him one day.[111] He reminds the crowd that "in the time of afflictions a good Conscience will stand you in more stead, and more comfort, then a thousand worlds."[112] They must remain true to the faith, even though they may be offered worldly recompense for betraying it. He claims that he has been declared an enemy of the state by

---

[109] *The Perfect Speech of Mr. John Gibbons, as it was Delivered by Himself on the Scaffold at Tower-Hill*, 1651, p. 1
[110] Ibid.
[111] Ibid, pp. 1-2.
[112] Ibid, p. 4.

the Court, just as Christ had been by the Jews to Pilate to avoid unrest and satisfy his superiors. His witnesses must reject this self-serving tendency, Gibbons argues, and be prepared, as he is, to "let these old broached Heresies go, and draw their sword for Christ."[113] For this reason, he "would not leave this Scaffold to enjoy all the pleasures that this World can give, I would not change my condition with them; not with my Witnesses, not with my Judges."[114] According to Gibbons, his soul would go to God no matter what punishment his body received. He joins himself to Love, claiming that "whatsoever is written concerning me, or the blessed servant of God who is gone before me, and now singing Halelujahs to all eternity, this days work will be written in heaven, it will be written by the Lord Jesus: Suffering for God and Religion, confident I am you will find it so."[115] He assures the crowd of his sincerity: "Let the word of a dying man prevail."[116] Finally, kneeling in prayer, he asks that God "rebuke Satan" and help him to "die sincerely as a Christian, that I may willingly lie down on the Block, as I would to lie down on a Feather-bed after I am weary."[117] Death is a comfort to a martyr. The speech repeatedly addresses his belief in God and warns listeners that they must fight evil, especially when it is disguised as goodness. Gibbons proclaims himself to be a martyr for true Christianity. Like Love, he makes few references to English politics, other than noting that the people were in danger of following Antichrist. He praises his companion, assuring the crowd that both of them will be united in heaven. Gibbons is usually treated as a footnote to Love's sensational trial, which is understandable given the comparative

---

[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid, p. 5.
[115] Ibid, p. 7.
[116] Ibid, p. 9.
[117] Ibid, p. 11.

dearth of sources and Love's prominence during the civil wars; but as a potential martyr, he seems to have performed at least as convincingly as his more famous predecessor on the scaffold.

VI

Here we will turn to Love's posthumous critics, but to introduce them we must briefly return to his execution speech. Not all elements of it were positive, and several points were especially controversial. The importance of the last speech as a "moment of truth," not only for the condemned man but also for supporters, opponents, and casual observers, is evident in the kerfuffle that arose surrounding a letter that John Price sent to Love the night before his originally scheduled execution date of July 15. Love wished to dispel the accusations cast by all his enemies, insisting that "though my Body will soon rot under ground…my Name will not rot above it." Without naming Price, Love dismissed an "insulting Letter," made even more insulting by its timing so near to his death, and cited it as a foreshadowing of the "Calumnies" that were "more likely to be after I am dead and gone." While the letter had, according to Love, claimed that "there should be something publisht against me to my shame," he urged listeners "not to beleeve reproaches cast upon a dead man."[118] Price later admitted to having written the upsetting letter and printed it in his own defense, under the dubious title *The Wounds of a Friend*.[119] If Price's account is honest, then it is possible that Love was overreacting; but their past disputations may have heightened Love's sensitivities.

---

[118] Love, *A True and Exact Copie*, p. 2.

[119] The title is slightly misleading, as in the letter itself, Price admitted that their relationship had often been rocky; if anything the letter was an offer to bury the hatchet: "As I abhor to salute you with the Kisses of an

In his introduction to the letter itself, Price claims that he had only written to Love as a friend of eleven years and out of the "plainness and singleness of my heart and spirit…for the spiritual peace and advantage of his soul."[120] He wishes that in his own death God would provide him "as faithful a friend…as I did desire to approve my self to Mr Love."[121] He is troubled that Love appeared to have been "captivated with that secret, close, and dangerous lust and sin of popularity"; if he was mesmerized by his audience, he could not respond honestly to his opponents.[122] This captivation would have been further clouded, Price asserts, by the "mighty concourse of people to…hear his last Scaffold Oration."[123] He encourages Love to remember his "Breeding" and "Education," with the marginal insertion that had so offended the recipient: "You may presume the world will be informed of these things in print when you are dead and gone."[124] "These things," meaning Love's distinguished background, would suggest to thoughtful witnesses and readers that Love's abandonment of Parliament for the Royalists was insincere, possibly driven by aggrandizing ambition. Price does not threaten, as Love had claimed, that he will publish anything, unless in the slyest implication; rather, he suggests that the truth will come out on its own, as always happens in a world of constant polemical print debate. Love's scaffold victory will be a short one, lasting only until the rebuttals appear. Similarly, the author of the critical *Mr. Love's Case* claims that Love mischaracterized Price's affectionate support as an insulting attack, which prompted him

---

enemy, so I judg it unseasonable to afflict you with the Wounds of a friend"; John Price, *The Wounds of a Friend; or, A Letter, Mentioned by Mr. Love upon the Scaffold*, p. 6.
[120] Ibid, p. 4.
[121] Ibid, p. 8.
[122] Ibid, p. 5.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid, p. 7.

to misbehave at the scaffold. He writes, "The Letter he speaks of, not having the least touch or savor of any insultation, nor threatning any thing to be published to his shame after his death…was grave and sober, full of love and respects to him, as an unpartial perusal of it will inform any man."[125] Price fears that Love would uphold himself as a hero to the benefit of beguiling conspirators. He alleges that there were many in Love's company who sought "to make him a meer Calf, or Heifer, a Victim to their cause, though happily instructing him in that black art of double-dealing."[126] Love was put up to his fate by royalists, who tricked him into supporting restoration so that they could advance their own dark designs.

Price's criticisms are both religious and political. He warns Love that his conspiracy with Scottish agents has produced "a new bloody War, a War between Saints, a War against Saints."[127] Love was the cause of these divisions, even though he himself had lamented them, claiming that they would please Rome. Finally, Price sternly warns Love that he had duped himself so badly that he was no longer a faithful Christian, putting his soul at risk:

> An ill cause, yea and an ill conscience may be slily palliated with many good prayers, Scripture phrases, and a zealous shew of a very tender conscience, and to dye stoutly in such a cause, may be reputed martyrdom amongst men, and just punishment with God; it may have a shew of pure Christianism with man, but it is pure Atheism with God; the more close, secret and spiritual any sin is, the more dangerous and noxious it is unto the sinner.[128]

Of course, if Love was already convinced that he was a martyr, he may not have been well disposed to receive such advice in a positive light. The implication that he had

---

[125] *Mr. Love's Case*, p. 42.
[126] *The Wounds of a Friend*, p. 7.
[127] Ibid, p. 6.
[128] Ibid, pp. 7-8.

cloaked his atheism with "Christianism" cannot have been appreciated. Though Love's reference to this letter in his speech was brief, it still provided Price with an opportunity to cast him as petty, short-tempered, and self-promotional, proving the letter's warnings. Importantly, the two had sparred in print before; they were hardly friends of eleven years. We have only Price's word, and there is no way to know whether the letter as presented is genuine; but in this pamphlet, he is sorry that he upset Love and merely wishes to correct the public record.

Unlike with earlier potential martyrs, Love's opponents knew that his cause had to be consistently criticized after his death. Plans for a large funeral were quashed by the Council of State, which instructed the Lord Mayor that it was not "fit that he who was such a notorious traitor while he lived, and died an ignominious death for the same, should have so solemn a burial."[129] Love was a traitor, and even though his head was not posted anywhere he did not merit any honors. The most substantial printed response to Love's final arguments was a section of "Animadversions" within *Mr Love's Case*, a sixty-seven page book published by the prolific Peter Cole in September 1651 and presented as the essential documents of the Love affair.[130] It contains a faithful reprinting of Love's own petitions to Parliament, distinct from those of his wife but similar in content; an account from his perspective of his limited involvement in the supposed plot, distinct from the various "Vindication" books and pamphlets; and his full execution

---

[129] Merchant Tailor's Hall was closed until after the private funeral to ensure that there was no demonstration; *State Papers*, 25 August 1651, I. 96, p. 426.

[130] This date is supported by an advertisement in the September 11-18 issue of *Mercurius Politicus*, which lists the new release of extensive "animadversions" but not the book itself. The extent of a printer's influence on content remains difficult to determine, and the writer of this text is anonymous; but given the frequent references to Love as "Judas" in this text, it is a curious accident of history that Peter Cole hanged himself from his warehouse rafters in 1665. Whether it was culpable suicide was unclear; "Peter Cole," DNB.

speech, divided into thirty-one sections. The divisions are unique to this book. The section numbers correspond with the ensuing animadversions on the speech, which form the remainder of the text. These are a point by point rebuttal. To debunk Love's insistence that the words of a dying man cannot be questioned, the author cites an anecdote that a witness "having heard the said Speech, brake out in these or the like words: 'Lord have mercy upon us, what shall we say, or do, when men will (or dare) tell lies at their death.'"[131] In other words, Love was no martyr but rather made the claim, his final deception, for temporal and polemical purposes. His claim that he will join the sainted martyrs of Revelation is a "confidence…in the face onely, and not in the heart; or if in the heart, yet without any substantial or sufficient ground for the raising of it."[132] The author accuses Love of being a vindictive and fraudulent martyr, admitting that he may have said these things but questioning his honesty. He attacks Love by saying that "one of the worst of the Heathen Emperours died with these words in his mouth"; claiming to meet God through the block was not the same as doing it.[133] Love's temporal aims rely on his self-misrepresentation: "Master Love must the rather be a Martyr, that so his Judges may be persecutors. Their defamation to the people, is an Oar upon which he plyes hard on all occasions."[134] His martyrdom is a ploy that relies on attacking the innocent.

Love's performance was not about his own soul—and according to this author, Love bordered on atheism, a difficult claim to defend—but was rather about defaming the

---

[131] *Mr. Love's Case*, p. 39.
[132] Ibid, p. 33.
[133] Ibid, p. 64; the reference is to Vespasian, whose recorded last words (as quoted here) were *ut puto, deus fio*: "I suppose that I am becoming a god."
[134] Ibid.

government, undercutting its authority, and restoring monarchy, which a reasonable observer should recall was a source of oppression and false religion.[135] This critic presumes that one would accept Parliament's authority, and he ignores the Regicide altogether. He also stoops to the *ad hominem* attack, claiming that Love was "without natural affection" because he had not prayed for or even mentioned his wife and children at the scaffold. Mary Love took great offense at this slander, which she interpreted as an insult to her entire family, and rebutted it with many examples of spousal and paternal affection in her biography.[136] While the author raises valid points about Love's guilt under the law, this tactic presumes that observers would support the law in time and would probably not have convinced anyone who was already disposed to support Love. More traditional royalists would not have accepted the government's authority, and Presbyterians would not have appreciated the insinuation that their beloved minister was an atheist. The intended audience seems to be anyone who supported Parliament but might have been swayed by Love's performance, namely, godly Parliamentarians who had misgivings about the Independents or the Rump itself. Because he was an ambiguous figure, the Rump's apologists had to expend far more energy discrediting him than they did for more traditional royalists: his break with the Parliamentarians was symbolic of an existential threat to the Commonwealth posed by an Anglo-Scottish, Presbyterian-Royalist alliance. Nevertheless, eventually a sanitized royalist version of Love's and his

---

[135] The author raises atheism in a modified form of apophasis, since Love himself had warned that atheism threatened England under the Commonwealth: "I shall not charge Mr. Love himself with *Atheism*; but those words spoken by him to the Sheriff, the occasion considered, *Sir, I shall look God in the Face with what I say*, have no enmity at all in them against that horrid impiety," Ibid, p. 50; in other words, to be so bold as to "look God in the face" implied mockery, not belief.

[136] Ibid, p. 33; *Life*, p. 130. Mary identifies the author as "that great Apostate T.B." but refuses to write his name, asserting that her husband's "name shines and is precious tho' he be underground whilest this mans name is rotting and perishing above ground."

wife's writings would become the more typical narrative, and accusations like those in *Mr. Love's Case* would fall to the side.

Though they were not as significant as Love's own words, stories of the supernatural and of Love's ability to prophesy also defended his status as a martyr both immediately after his death and in the decades and even centuries that followed. His sanctity was demonstrated by his reputation as a prophet that became much more elaborate in the eighteenth century, when it was claimed that Love had predicted the Restoration, the London fire, and even the French Revolution.[137] But in 1651 there were a few unusual occurrences that supporters cited to prove his godliness and, therefore, his status as a martyr. First, the co-incidence with apparently supernatural phenomena, such as disastrous weather, might be proof of his worthiness, an expression of divine displeasure at his premature end. In the most famous precedent, the Crucifixion as narrated by the synoptic gospels was followed by an earthquake and the opening of tombs.[138] In the seventeenth century there was great interest in weather as evidence of God's judgment, though it was difficult to discern whether they signified sorrow or angry approval.[139] In Love's case, there was such an event in the hours following his execution,

---

[137] Obviously it falls well beyond the purview of this study, but *The Strange and Wonderful Predictions of Mr. Christopher Love* went through several editions between 1760 and the 1790s, with those after 1794 adding the French Revolution to his predictions; London and Boston, various dates, also published as *Prophecies of the Reverend Christopher Love.*

[138] The rending of the temple veil, an earthquake, the bursting open of tombs, and the wanderings of the dead all appear in Matthew, with briefer descriptions in the others; Matthew 27:51-53, Mark 15:38, and Luke 23:45.

[139] For example, the famous storms after Cromwell's death were taken to indicate either divine sorrow or divine condemnation of his entire life. Edmund Waller elegized the concurrence in *Upon the late storme, and of the death of His Highnesse ensuing the same*, 1658, while the satirized ghosts of John Bradshaw and Charles I discuss how a "storm and tempest of wind" carried Cromwell to hell in the anonymous *Bradshaw's Ghost being a dialogue between the said ghost, and an apparition of the late King Charles*, 1659, p. 10; see chapter 5.

which was described in a pamphlet. It suggests that this event may be an indication of divine displeasure at Love's death.[140] The pamphlet itself does not push the case very far, simply noting the coincidence; but an elegist used it to demonstrate the injustice of Love's fate, devoting one stanza to asking why there were not even more portents than did occur:

> Why did not Heaven and Earth at this agree,
> To let us know some strange Catastrophe?
> Why did the Sun move, or the Sphears not cease
> Their furious Motion, at this Saints Decease?
> Since Thunder claps, and sable mourning Skies
> Did celebrate his Funerall Obsequies.[141]

Mary Love also cited the incident, adding the element of prophecy. She writes that Love had told her in prison that "within few hours after my head is severed from my Body, God will shew some signall taken of his displeasure from heaven against the taking away of my life."[142] In a second prophecy the Presbyterian Enoch Smith or possibly Love himself predicted Smith's death during a meeting with Love in the Tower. Again, this incident was first documented in a pamphlet and later used by Mary Love to defend her husband's memory. In the pamphlet, Smith tells Love that it is God's custom to remove "from off the Earth his precious Saints and Servants, before the casting down of his

---

[140] The account of the storm, *A strange and wonderful Relation Of the Miraculous Judgements of God…the next day after Mr. Love and Mr. Gibbons were beheaded*, 1651, does not explore why God would pass judgment on Love's persecutors by killing a man six miles from London who did not appear to have caused Love's death, or to have attended the execution, or to have had any opinion on these events; it was reported that he was chopping wood when his house was struck by lightning in the storm, killing him and terrifying his family, who were hiding indoors.

[141] *In Commemoration of Mr. Christopher Love, who was beheaded on Tower-hill*, 1651[?], stanza 9.

[142] *Life*, p. 129; Mary adds that this was "manifested in a most dreadfull and terrible thundering all that night and the next day after his death and so continued till about the same time he suffered the day before, by which many persons were killed and much hurt was done, as may appeare by severall books that were then printed."

judgments; and to remove those bright Stars (whom the world are not worthy of) to a higher Orb. And truly this much I dare divine, That when you are gone, I shall not stay long after." The pamphlet notes that the "propheticks proved true," and Smith fell into a "melancholy disposition" until he could join "his brother in the presence of an innumerable Guard of Angels."[143] Love is a saint, and Smith could not take joy in a world without him. According to Mary, the prediction was accurate; but in her account it was Love who began their prophetic conversation. She frames this exchange as evidence of Love's own influence on Smith, and the mutual respect and Christian affection that they had toward one another.[144] Regardless of who actually predicted that Enoch Smith would die within a few weeks, the episode demonstrates the desire of each to return to God and their mutual unwillingness to be on earth without each other. This was a mark of sanctity for them both and, by implication, the entire Presbyterian cause.

In the longer aftermath of Love's death, the hagiography coalesced around certain points, most comprehensively described in Mary Love's biography but also discussed in more widely published media. The best short example, which demonstrates some continuity with earlier royalist martyrs, is an anonymously published elegy, drawing on his self-characterization as a prophet rejected by his people in the imitation of Christ.

---

[143] Samuel Coleman, *The Presbyterian's Remonstrance and Declaration to the People of this Nation*, 1651, p. 3. Smith's death is not described, but the frontispiece notes that he was recently buried at Saint Giles-without-Cripplegate. The pamphlet combines some of Smith's words with supportive commentary by the editor. Coleman discusses how England had chosen to serve Satan instead of Christ, but he reminds the reader that those who "suffer for the Cause of Christ" will be "thrice happy"; p. 4.

[144] In Mary's account, Love calls to Smith as he is preparing for bed the night before his execution to tell him, "I have a strong perswasion upon my spirit that it will be but a very few daies or weekes before I shall meete with thee in heaven." Smith replies, "Sir, were I but assured of that it would make my heart glad, for I shall not desire to live on Earth" after Love's death. Mary reports that Smith visited her before he became sick and told her of his conversations with Love in the Tower. She also observes the coincidence that Smith would be buried on 22 September, 1651, a month to the day after Love's death. *Life*, pp. 133-34.

There are several puns on his name, each of which point to the larger problem of prophet-killing. The writer asks whether it is "a real truth that LOVE is dead," and how "LOVE should survive when men want Charitie?"[145] It also criticizes the government, saying that these "Lambs" are now "Lions" if "Saints be at such enmity with LOVE."[146] It notes that to "slay a prophet" is a "land-destroying sin," a reference to Jeremiah and Jesus that Love himself had made; but through this murder "Herod and Pilate then were reconcil'd," implying that it may please some foreign power.[147] Those who testified against Love in exchange for bribes will "hang like Judas."[148] The writer invites tears "for this Martyrs sake; / For such indeed's our losse."[149] The elegy praises his bravery at his death, since "willingly he took his Saviours Yoak" and "laid / His Neck upon the Block, no whit dismaid." He was so steadfast that onlookers were embarrassed by their own sorrow when confronted with his joy.[150] His death was a victory, as the elegist reminds the reader that "Sampsons last fall slew more / Philistians then all his Life before."[151] These are standard comparisons, and the sort of streamlined martyrology that only an elegy can provide. The elegy relies on Love's behavior, which results in an elegy for a prophet, not for a royalist lord. Love is not an apostle of the King; he is a prophet of the God of the Old Testament and must be remembered as such.

---

[145] *In Commemoration of Mr. Christopher Love,* stanza 2.
[146] Ibid, stanza 5.
[147] Ibid, stanzas 3-4.
[148] Ibid, stanza 11.
[149] Ibid, stanza 13.
[150] Ibid, stanza 7.
[151] Ibid, stanza 8.

VII

These themes, especially the many comparisons to biblical heroes, are developed most completely in Mary Love's biography, which undertook the daunting task of rehabilitating her husband's reputation after it was so fiercely attacked after his death. When we analyze her writing alongside earlier reports of Love's words and actions, there are some tonal inconsistencies. We have seen how Love could be quick-tempered, both in his performance at trial, which he admitted, and in his scaffold response to John Price. The petitioning campaign, too, undercut his self-presentation as a martyr, because if he argued it too strongly it would imply that he was not prepared to die for his beliefs, even as he consistently claimed to suffer for them. Mary's biography, composed later, recast the narrative to put Love in a more favorable position, downplaying his involvement in the petitions and repeatedly quoting his private assurances to her that all would be well, even though he infamously did not refer to her in his last speech. Like Love's speech, the biography emphasized his role as a prophet, mostly ignoring the political circumstances of 1651. Mary Love had explanations for each apparent inconsistency, many of which were rooted in Love's interactions with the person who knew him best: Mary herself.

Despite his failure to mention her at the block, Christopher Love's relationship with his wife characterized his reputation far more than such relationships did for most potential martyrs. Few were so elaborately defended by their spouses, besides the occasional petition for either life or the restitution of property. Other examples in this study did provide fatherly advice to their children, but that was a preexisting genre in its own right. Love's posthumous publications, meanwhile, included not merely the standard trial and execution accounts, speeches, and elegies, but also the collected letters between

the couple and other personal reflections on the husband's significance to the wife's own faith. In the pamphlet *Love's Letters*, the husband supports the wife on a personal and spiritual level, instructing Mary how to follow Christ in his absence and reminding her of the glorious salvation that awaits them both. But importantly, Mary also supports Christopher, urging him to think as he rises on his execution day, "I am putting on my wedding clothes to go to be married to my Redeemer." [152] She assures him that though he loses his head he will be joined to Christ's head in heaven, and that they can both trust in God since they have served Him together. *Love's Letters*, a public defense, has obvious parallels to the unpublished biography: Mary encourages her husband to "think what thou toldest me, that it was but thy Chariot to draw thee to thy Fathers house."[153] It does not matter so much who said what to whom first, but rather that in these writings after his death—and the provenance of the published letters is uncertain, as they seem perhaps too perfect—Mary and Christopher present a united front. They essentially speak with one voice, with Mary closely at her husband's side, together defending true Christianity and his martyrological cause.

The remainder of this chapter will deal with the biography itself. It is an unusual manuscript, more than 30,000 words, extant in two copies. The first, in the Sloane collection of the British Library, is incomplete, ending midsentence roughly halfway through. The second, in Doctor Williams' Library, is probably an eighteenth century copy and apparently complete, bound within a collection of printed pamphlets, sermons,

---

[152] Christopher and Mary Love, *Love's Letters, His and Hers, to each other, a little before his death*, 1651, p. 1.

[153] Ibid; cf. *Life*, p. 137, where Love "came downe out of his Prison his Bible being in his hand with such Christian Resolution and chearfullness of Spirit to ascend by his Fiery Chariot into heaven," an allusion to Elijah.

and elegies on various ministers. None of the other subjects in the bound volume is nearly as famous as Love. Much of the formatting of the manuscript seems to be an intentional imitation of a printed text, including the pagination; "T.H.," the writer of an introduction to the manuscript, is surprised that it had not been printed. Mary Love attempts to maintain some formal distance, referring to herself in the third person when she appears in the narrative; but she injects herself frequently to illuminate or qualify a claim, with parentheticals such as "I have heard say" or "as I remember." Its composition date is uncertain, but T.H. refers to the Restoration and suggests that the text was prepared during the 1650s. For reasons unknown to him it was not published after Charles II's return, even though by then "all hearts and Eyes were taken up with the contemplation of His adorable Providence."[154]

The text could tritely be called a labor of love—Mary herself refers to it as an "unexpected Birth from a Woman," whose "Conception was (I may say) formed though I cannot say perfected."[155] Despite some wanderings and her own warnings, it is a sophisticated hagiography written by a well-educated woman who was wholly devoted to her husband and, more importantly, their common cause of propagating true Christianity. Though Mary Love styles her husband as a prophet, she becomes Christopher's prophet in turn. Her use of scripture rivals that of the beheaded minister himself. T.H. compares Christopher and Mary Love's relationship to that between Christ and John the Baptist:

> There is a mutuall testimony betweene God and his Servants. The Baptist bears witnesse to Christ John.1.29. and Christ did as much for the Baptist John.5:35. The same we have betweene these two who were one (more wayes then one) before that fatall stroke parted them; He gave her noe ordinary Character a little

---

[154] *Life*, introductory section, iii.
[155] Ibid, i.

> before his death, which lives in print visible to the World, and shee will not dye in his debt, but here in this currant piece payes him.[156]

This text and its author become the voice in the wilderness, preparing the way of the Lord. In it, Mary demonstrates that she and her husband were one: one through marriage, but also of one mind, prophets of the same truth. Christopher's public ministry "lives in print," as it had since 1651; but in this manuscript we see in new detail how he ministered to Mary, which she repays by writing the biography. She also contributes to the political argument, arguing that Love's support of Charles II was consistent with his faith. Most importantly, however, Love is a model minister, Christian, husband, and father.

Mary Love structures her husband's life along two concurrent lines. The primary one is a gradual ascent to the Cross, starting with a life of sin followed by a deep and absolute conversion to Christ. While there are many digressions in the narrative, they usually allude to Love's death, reminding the reader that his martyrdom is the purpose of the biography. The minister's turn from sin and pursuit of Presbyterian ministry are fairly straightforward. Second, and more complicated, she follows a rough scriptural trajectory, through which Love becomes the successor to the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostle Paul, and Christ Himself. She encourages readers to look to his example and "with Moses you shall find him chusing rather to suffer affliction with the People of God then to enjoy the pleasures of Sin for a season."[157] Early in the biography, she foreshadows his death as an act of biblical proportions:

> [N]o sooner was this Flower fully blown but it was gathered, and shall I call his death a dying or rather a Translation for with Enoch he walked with God … in the twinkling of an Eye he past from Earth to heaven … but whilst his soul was

---

[156] Ibid, iv.
[157] Ibid, p. 12; cf. his last speech above, when he says that he chose "affliction rather than sin."

> breathing out prayers of saints on Earth, he was carried up to sing the haleluiahs of his Redeemer with glorified Saints in heaven, where in the end of this discourse we must leave him, and indeed can nowhere leave him better then in his Saviours bosom.[158]

Love was taken up by God, or "translated," to praise Him for eternity in a glorified version of his praises on earth. It is notable that Mary does not yet describe Christopher as a martyr or even compare him to Jesus, who died before rising, but rather as Enoch, one of the first men named after the Creation, who "walked with God" and did not die.[159] Enoch prefigures the Resurrection in Christian theology, but he is unique in the Bible in this respect. When she does turn to the New Testament, it is in reference to herself, apologizing for mentioning Love's death too soon in the text, even though she considers her "short digression…excusable":

> [W]herein I seem to be at the end of his daies, before I am come to the middle of his life … did the reader but know the deep impresion his death [had] upon my heart he would not blame me tho' with Mary he findes me weeping at the Sepulchre & intermingling a line or two of his Triumphant Death with his gratious and exemplary Life. But now we shall returne & find him where we left him in the mount with God & not only with Isaac meditating but like Jacob wrestling with God in prayer.[160]

This rapid shifting between different biblical scenes is typical of the biography. Mary must leave Christ at the tomb to rejoin her husband on, perhaps, Mount Sinai. By describing herself as Magdalene, she compares Love to Christ, encouraging the reader to see him as clearly following in the steps of the Redeemer. Her descriptions of Love are as a patriarch, the embodiment of Moses, Isaac, and Jacob. Over the course of his life, she claims, Love came to appreciate the significance of suffering by following Christ: "And

---

[158] Ibid, pp. 16-17.
[159] Cf. Genesis 5:24.
[160] *Life*, p. 17.

knowing that the way to Heaven was through many tribulations he is not offended at the Cross but takes it up and as he doth not dispise it so he doth not faint under it but at last victoriously triumphed over it."[161] Presumably he did this with the help of Christ, and did not triumph over death on his own; but the comparison to Christ is important. He is overcoming death and the vilifications of the world through the act of dying, as Christ did on the Cross.

In another passage Mary links Love to even more biblical figures, rapidly turning from one to the next with only brief descriptions. It would be difficult to demonstrate her thoroughness in summary. The following breathless passage is meant as a last statement on Love's life, before shifting to an extended discussion of his death. Mary argues that Love is the successor to every virtuous figure in the Bible, even those who are not named in this exhaustive litany. Though Mary says that he is a parallel to both Old and New Testament figures, once again the gospels are mostly absent here. The point of the following passage is the amazing breadth, rather than the specific details:

> What shall I say more of him or rather what may I not say of him, surely this Line of his Life runs parralel with the Lives of all the Eminent Saints of God both in the old and new Testament, and to name but a few of many, he was a Caleb that walked with God, and a Noah of whom God said thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation, a Lott whose precious soul was continually vexed with the wickedness of the place where he lived, an Abraham a Friend of God that was strong in Faith giving glory unto God, like Jacob wrestling with God in Prayer, and prevailing, a Joseph that would rather chase Imprisonment nay death it self then to doe the least wickedness and sin against his God, a Moses that was faithfull in all Gods house, a Joshua that followed God fully, like unto Jerubbabell, of whome it is said "the Lord is with thee thou mighty man of Valour," like Sampson whose Death did more hurt unto the Enemies of God then his life could, a Samuell that mourned for Saul when he was rejected from rayning over Israell, An Elisha that would tell Ahab to his face that he had killed

---

[161] Ibid, p. 24.

> and taken possession, he was a Joash, that withstood the Achaliad's of the times in which he lived, that would have cut off all the seed Royall, a tender hearted Josiah which made a Covenant with the Lord and would rather dye then breake his Covenant with his God, a David of whome it is said that the Zeale of Gods house did Eate him up, a Solomon wise as an Angell of God, a Nehemiah whose Countenance would be sad when it went ill with the people of God, a Job that under all his afflictions never charged God foolishly, a weeping Jeremiah whose Eyes would run downe with tears night and day for the afflictions upon the Church of God, an Isaiah that would crye aloud, and not spare but would lift up his Voyce like a Trumpet to tell the house of Judah of their sins and the house of Israell of their transgressions, like Esekiell that was set as a watchman to warne the wicked to turne from their wickedness and the Righteous not to Comitt Iniquity least they dyed, and so delivered his owne soul like unto Daniell of whome it is said that there could be no fault found in him, and yet (with him) he must goe to the Den of Lyons, and with those three worthies he feared not the furnace of affliction, having with them the presence of God, with him in all his trouble he was a Habbakkuk that could rejoice in God in the worst of times, what shall I say further, he was a burning and a shining Light, as John was, a beloved Disciple that often leaned in his saviours bosome, a true Nathaniell in whose heart was noe guile, a Stephen full of the holy Ghost, a Paul in Labours more abundant then in any an Apollo mighty in the Scriptures. *Time would faile me if I should make mention of the rest of the Prophets, and Apostles with whome he hath obtained a good report* and as it was said of them soe it may be said of him that he was one of whome the world was not worthy, and therefore after that he had suffered the tryall of travel, cruell mockings, temptations, bonds, and imprisonement and death itself, he thereby helped to make up the Catalogue of the martyrs, and with them dyed in the Faith.[162]

It is rather stunning to consider that Mary was still not mentioning all those to whom she wished to compare her husband. The point is that Love is the embodiment of each righteous man who appears in the Bible, but with a heavy slant towards the Old Testament. The lineage of virtue is not unlike the genealogy of Christ in Matthew's gospel. Because this is a written text, Mary can take more liberties than Love ever did.

---

[162] Ibid, pp. 91-94; emphasis and punctuation added.

The most he could manage were some references to Jeremiah and Nehemiah, rebuilding the kingdom; but Mary can chart the entire Bible.

Mary repeatedly stresses that Love himself was piously humble and forgiving of all his persecutors. This challenges accusations in print that he had a short temper or sought "popularity." She occasionally cites specific texts, as when she counters the author of *Mr. Love's Case* by insisting that Christopher was a loving husband; but typically she refrains from direct attacks on publishers, focusing on praise of Christopher. In doing so, she transfers Love's reported anger to herself. In one fierce passage, she writes of his persecutors:

> [U]nto all their wickedness they should add theire merciless cruelty unto him that thereby they should fill up the measure of theire Sins that so God might fill out the measure of his wrath, and vengeance for ought I know have done what In them selves to provoke God to charge all that blood that hath been shed from the blood of Righteous Abell to the blood of Zacharias upon this Generation that So the wrath of God might breake forth without remedy for we never read that there was no remedy to stay the wrath of the Lord but when his Prophets were abused, and then he who is cloathed with a vesture dipped in blood, will make his Arrowes drunk with the blood of those who have dyed their Garments in the blood of his Servants the Prophets and as the blood of kings and nobles hath been righteously reckoned for, with some of those murtherers, so that precious blood of his Servants.[163]

This suggests that Love, or at least God, will soon demand blood retribution for the slaying of his faithful servant. Mary does not exactly call for it herself, but she would consider it a just punishment. Yet there is a turn here, in which Mary seems aware that her own writing may appear overly vindictive. She continues, almost backtracking:

> And here I hope I shall not be censured as if I had the least revenge upon my Spirrit For I bless God I have none, but have a great deale of pittye to them that

---

[163] Ibid, pp. 48-49.

> had none to mee, and can as earnestly beg God for mercy for them as once I begged for mercy from them Therefore I think it no part of revenge but Duty to mind them that every one of them with David may pray Lord forgive my blood Guiltiness, for notwithstanding they may find mercy from men, yet with out repentance all tho the first woe should be past yet the second will com, strong when the Lord shall deale with them.[164]

So she defends herself against any who might presume that she seeks vengeance upon her husband's persecutors. It is a duty, not a crime, to inform her audience and Love's killers that they must atone for the blood they have spilled. Indeed, she hopes that they will follow the example of King David after Uriah's death and beg God's forgiveness, which is why she devotes so much attention to "blood guiltiness":

> I am sensible of my too long stay here yet I think my self not wholy unexcusable…Truly tis not only the smartnes of the wound that makes mee to complain of the sharpnesse of the Instrument but a pasionate desire that these shall I say men slayers or rather Prophet slayers may run to the refuge of unfained repentance that the pursuers of blood may not overtake them but that through the Lord Jesus they may obtain remission of this their Blood guiltiness."[165]

She wishes, of course, that they will repent for their prophet-slaying; but there is a smug tone here, as if Mary more than they themselves know their sins and why they should pray. But perhaps it was already too late for them, as Mary later writes that "it matters not what those blacke mouths said whose tongues were set on Fire by hell and since have paid deare for their hard speeches against him."[166] Their prayers, it seems, are for naught after all. Finally she concludes these vignettes, arguing that Love's reputation now can speak for itself:

> Many more such testimonialls of his worth might be produced from other places but Judg it needless, for such was the luster of this bright Star in the firmament of

---

[164] Ibid, pp. 49-50.
[165] Ibid, p. 50.
[166] Ibid, p. 67.

> the Church that he still shines by his own and needs not a borrowed light from the hand of a mortall to shine by and Indeede all that is intended in this business is only by a weake hand to hould back the vaile that death hath drawn over him, as to our view and to let you see lights shining out of a dark place, by which tho he be dead he yett speaketh and his Praise is in the Gospell throughout all the Churches. That it is & shall be said of him as of Judah thou art he whom all thy Brethren shall praise.[167]

It is especially interesting that according to her description he seems to shine by his own light. Not even John the Baptist made that claim, though as we learned in the introduction to the biography, Mary has taken the place of the Baptist. Love here is essentially Christ reborn. And as is typical for any good martyr, the more that he was persecuted, the surer he was in following Christ's path: "here their hellish designe failed them, for the more they endeavoured to cloud him with their slanders in this Night of his affliction the more oriente did his fixed starre shine forth."[168] The structure of the biography is similar to the gospels. First we have a general account of his life and his actions, which ascends to a more detailed account of his passion. It is not clear whether Mary intended to parallel the life of Christ so explicitly, but the similarity is striking.

In the conclusion of her description of Love's trial, she describes how he remained steadfast through his sufferings, disproving his enemies' lies by his saintly behavior. In this passage he becomes a sacrificial victim:

> Thus did they thirst after his blood and hunt his soule as a Paltridge upon the Mountaines; But as he told them himself that his dead body would be but a bad morsell for their infant Comon wealth to feed on, Soe one day they will find his

---

[167] Ibid, p. 57; "though he be dead he yet speaketh" is a reference to Hebrews 11:4, which is itself a reference to Abel's blood offering to God in Genesis. Judah is of course one of the sons of Jacob, from whose tribe David and Christ would descend; "all they Brethren shall praise" is taken from Genesis 49:8.
[168] Ibid, p. 79.

> precious blood to be more bitter to them then the Wormwood and the Gall, when they must come to beg for mercie, that would show none to him.[169]

Again, the description here is Christological, almost Eucharistic: his body and his blood have been poured out for the sins of the nation, but that blood will prove poisonous to those who have betrayed him. At this point in Love's life, Mary undertook the petitioning campaign; but in the biography Love seems to regret this undertaking. As noted above, the campaign provided a number of opportunities for Love to falter, particularly regarding his angry responses to critics in print. Mary ignores these details. She does admit, however, that this presented a temptation for Love, who was sufficiently prepared for death that it was rather a punishment to delay it. He was "much troubled to thinke that when he was almost past his red sea of trouble, and as he thought upon the Borders of his Everlasting rest; that he should be driven back againe into an ocean of Tryalls and temptations."[170] It would have been better for him, perhaps, to simply be done with it. According to Mary, Love resisted all temptations; but looking at his entire case, we can wonder whether he faltered.

In a number of cases, Mary responds to specific accusations that Love was somehow unfaithful or insufficiently fond of his wife. It makes sense that Mary would take such accusations personally, and she reserves her harshest words for rebutting them. To those who said that Love had been found with a whore, she insisted that this was an Edward Love, a man of no relation, and that any who cast this slander at her husband

---

[169] Ibid, p. 108; "paltridge" is an archaic regional spelling of "partridge."

[170] Ibid, p. 117. This is yet another grand Old Testament reference; literally, Love has become the entire Hebrew nation, crossing the Red Sea only to become trapped in the desert. The comparison makes sense, as those forty years prefigured Christ's temptation for forty days.

were "bastard brood apostates."[171] She notes that this accusation had been so outlandish that it was forgotten, only to be exhumed by a man she refuses to name lest she appear vengeful—though she does refer to his initials, "H.D.", so perhaps she cannot fully forgive the offense.[172] Love had told her of this accusation, "I see that their endeavour is to bury my name before thou canst bury my Body, but said he sweetheart be not thou troubled, for God will not only wipe away all Teares from mine Eyes but he will wipe away all reproaches from my name before many daies be over."[173] Love is well aware of his wife's needs, reassuring her that God will set all right in the end, particularly as regards his threatened reputation. Mary describes herself as dismayed at her husband's plight, but he always comforts her. Shortly before his death, he asks, as in her published letters to him:

> Why art thou so troubled when thou seest me so cheerfull, and further said, is it not better for me to dy this way, whereby I shall wonderfully honour God, then by some other distemper which my weake Body in a little time must yeild to which might deprive me of my sences, that I should not be able thus to advise and speake to thee as I now do, truly said he I thinke God hath chosen the best and the easiest death for me and I pray thee to thinke and say so too.[174]

Unsurprisingly, Love is grateful that he can die at a time when he is still able to speak, permitting him to preach the gospel with his final breath. Furthermore, beheading was not a bad way to die, as execution went, and any observer would have recognized this; other martyrs had referred to it as a great mercy, knowing that drawing and quartering was

---

[171] Ibid, p. 80.
[172] She makes a similar claim when she refuses to name Love's judges, p. 108; she names them anyway on p. 112.
[173] Ibid, p 82.
[174] Ibid, p. 124.

customary. Love reassures his wife that his death will not be difficult, all the more because he knows he dies for God. He continues:

> Oh how wonderfully am I carried above the thoughts of death, and am perswaded that I shall be so unto the last having now no more feare of laying my neck upon a Block, then of laying it upon a pillar [i.e. a pillow] knowing that as soone as my head is severed from my body it shall be united unto Christ my head in heaven and I am perswaded that I shall tomorrow goe up Tower hill as cheerfully to be ever lastingly martyred unto my Redeemer as I went to Giles Church to be marryed unto thee, And through Grace I am confident that tomorrow before this time, thou wilt hear that thy husband went as chearfully to heaven as ever man did saying that he was so farr from fearing death that he longed for nothing more then that houre.[175]

From a modern standpoint it may seem odd to compare death to marriage, especially to one's own wife shortly before death; but the point is that Love is now joining his eternal spouse: Christ, the bridegroom. This model draws on biblical imagery, like the wedding feast of the Lamb in the Book of Revelation. For Love, as for any Christian martyr, death is the start of his new life with Christ, the goal of his entire earthly life. Therefore Mary should take joy in his fate, as she can know that he will be reunited with Christ as one day she will be too.

Throughout these passages, as we have seen, Mary compares her husband to a wide variety of biblical figures, often alongside one another. In her final comments on the trial, Mary manages to do this yet again, transforming his judges into biblical figures, too:

> They were not able to resist the wisdome and the spirit by which he spake but fixing their Eyes stedfastly upon him as the Councell did upon Stephen they beheld his face like an Angell of God, and as the Enemies of Christ said of him surely this is the sonne of God, so many of them were convinced this was a Servant of the most high God, and therefore after he had ended his Discourse and

---

[175] Ibid, pp. 127-8. This is almost identical to Mary's letter to him in *Love's Letters*, which raises some questions about the origins of these dialogues.

> made his defence some of them went from the Court resolving to have nothing to do with his precious blood, and others of them came that night to him and told him, that if Keble and Prideaux would then have suffered them to have proceeded to sentence, they were confident they should have brought him in not guiltye, they were so much astonished and affected with what came from him, but notwithstanding their present conviction, within a few daies (like Pharoah) they hardned their hearts againe, and resolved to pass sentence of death upon him.[176]

Love manages to be, first, Stephen (with the face of an angel); second, Christ on the cross, identified by the centurion (surely this is the son of God); and finally, the entire Hebrew nation (condemned by Pharaoh's hardened heart). Keble and Prideaux, then, are Pharaoh himself, pursuing Love to the Red Sea. There was even a time, Mary suggests, when the jury would have proclaimed her husband not guilty, impressed as it was by his passionate statements. Mary may be referring to the delay in the middle of his trial, during which Love was able to prepare a more proper defense, or to the shorter pause after that defense. She presumes that Love only did what helped his case and does not consider how his actions might have hardened the hearts of his persecutors, as a close reading of the trial narrative seems to indicate. Keble was patient with Love, permitting him to speak at length until the final day; but from his perspective the accused took advantage of that patience. Mary, of course, presents it differently.

Mary's most compelling evidence of Love's status as a martyr was not the barrage of biblical references but rather the specific descriptions of his behavior during his life, some of which we have already seen. During his imprisonment at Newcastle, he taught through his suffering how best to serve Christ:

> Here God made use of him in sowing precious seed so that his Bonds did tend to the liberty of the Church and let me say of that town as Christ said of the woman

---

[176] Ibid, p. 112.

> that poured costley ointments upon his head (that whereever that Gospell should be preached, there also that which she had done should be spoken to her praise for a memoriall of her).[177]

Once again, Love is Christ personified, anointed like Christ at Bethany by the people of Newcastle through their love and compassion for him. This was the start of his popularity among various congregations in Scotland and England. His Newcastle arrest had so inspired the local congregation that he preached "from the prison grate, whereby the Lord stirred up the hearts of the people." They were so moved that they demanded permission to enter his cell and clean it, making it "like a palace."[178] Love's popularity was not a corrupting influence, as John Price had warned; rather the eagerness of congregations to help him was another example of his imitation of Christ, who had many disciples just a week before his death. Even the night of Love's arrest, a soldier who had been a follower lamented that he wanted to refuse to participate in the arrest; but, as he told her with sorrow, "if I had they should have hanged me." Mary tells of this "that you may see by a little what great love and esteeme he had in the hearts of all."[179] Finally, in the most profound example, Love converted a man from the scaffold, which can be read as a parallel of the centurion at the foot of the cross:

> There was one among the rest that called to his Neighbour that morning, saying, come wilt goe with me to see what sport Loves blood will make upon Tower hill. But after he had seen him and heard his speech and prayer he wept bitterly to his Friend Crying out oh that I might dye for him that my blood might be shed to spare his; and he afterwards went home sadly lamenting how he had Thirsted for his blood, and was thought with some others to be a reall Convertt by his death.

---

[177] Ibid, pp. 38-39.
[178] Ibid, p. 37.
[179] Ibid, p. 48.

> This I only make mention of by the way how God honoured his death as well as his Life with the Conversion of souls.[180]

The lingering question, however, remains: was this man converted to Christ, or merely to Christopher Love? Mary treats the two as if they are the same. In any case, this represents the goal of all the martyrs we have considered so far: the conversion of souls to the cause. For more traditional royalists, this was a religious calling to aid the divinely anointed monarch. For Love, it was the rejuvenation of Presbyterian faith and practice. He preached this from the scaffold like the minister he was trained to be. Throughout his life, Mary argues, Christopher Love did not shrink from suffering for Christ. He proclaimed his willingness to die for his faith as the situation required: "I dare not boast what I shall do but if this gift be given me of God, then I shall not only be willing to be bound but to dye for the truths name and sake of the Lord Jesus."[181] As far as is temporally evident, Love fulfilled his own prophecies about his life and his death.

After Love's execution, Mary Love attempted to regain the upper hand in the debate over his death and his alleged martyrdom. According to her, he died as well as he had lived. He was a constant minister, a faithful Christian, and a martyr for God and His will on earth. Only one thing was missing in all this: the King. Mary Love's manuscript is an impressive text and an unusually elaborate hagiography. It is odd that it was not published, when so many other documents about Love were; but perhaps the avoidance of royalist politics limited its currency at the Restoration. It does connect Love to the King at one key point, claiming that he died "for the Restauration of our blessed Soveraigne to the throne of his Father," and that "for this end he was willing to goe to the

---

[180] Ibid, p. 138.
[181] Ibid, p. 52.

stake to make way for his Coming to the Crown."[182] But this is buried amongst countless meditations on Love's biblical virtues. The biography claims that to serve the King, men must "love their God and a good conscience"—a conscience that had permitted rebellion in 1645 just as much as it demanded restoration in 1651.[183] Love was not a "royalist martyr" because his career made him incapable of being one. Instead, he was an Old Testament prophet, suffering for his wayward city and his country, like Jeremiah. He represents "contested martyrdom" in its fullest sense, but as a result his story was too complicated to support a concise message for the royalist canon. Judging from his life's work, he would have been hesitant to join it.

By the end of 1651, the hopes for an imminent second coming of Charles were fading. Many royalists had been killed by the state; the Andrewes and Love plots were quashed; the attempt at a royalist-Presbyterian alliance had proved insufficient to overturn support of the Commonwealth; and the battle of Worcester was about to delay any practical hope of restoration for some time. Even so, Love's supporters ensured that he would be seen as a victim of the state, feeding the collective distaste for the Rump and contributing to its eventual dissolution by Cromwell. But the Lord Protector, who usually sought mercy when he could, would create a series of new martyrs for royalism as he continued fighting to preserve peace and stop rebellion. The maintenance of peace would be the strongest argument against royalist apologists, insisting that they were not martyrs but simply traitors, rebels against a legitimate government. However, they, like Love and their other predecessors, would continue to present themselves as martyrs for a cause that

---

[182] Ibid, p. 86.
[183] Ibid, i-ii.

was so important that it deserved the sacrifice of their lives. It is to these men that we will turn next.

Chapter 3: “His neck that wrote it”: Writing Royalism in Blood, 1651-59

After Christopher Love’s execution, only a few weeks remained before the Battle of Worcester, a crushing defeat that almost destroyed the entire royalist cause. With some cautious conjecture, it seems likely that if Charles II had been captured after the battle, the sustainability of royalism would have been in doubt. There would have been sympathizers and plots, but Charles II was a youthful leader with a deep personal investment in his own future. More importantly, royalists were invested in him too. His father’s memory as a martyr lived in him, and his supporters hoped that there would be a resurrection of their fortunes through him. As it happened, the young king barely managed his famous escape across the countryside; but it was enough. Instead of becoming a second Royal Martyr, Charles embodied the royalist cause through an exiled reign. The weeks after Worcester even saw a brief revival of cavalier heroism: several of his most important generals either died in battle or were executed afterward, beginning a new phase of royalist martyrdom. Battlefields had a certain level of romantic grandeur, which made the execution after the battle of the Earl of Derby, who proudly took the fall while Charles II fled, almost a set piece for loyalty to the Crown. The defeat, however, meant that there would be no further royalist risings for several years; and when they occurred, the Protectorate proved to be more efficient at restricting martyrological narratives than the Commonwealth had been in 1649. Martyrdom after Worcester was “contested” more aggressively, but the state had a definitive upper hand. Even so, royalists continued to use martyrdom as a propaganda tool for their cause.

This chapter will continue in the same vein as Chapter 1 in assessing how English royalist martyrdom evolved and adapted in a complex dynamic with the state. Its

determination of who "qualified" as a martyr will still rely partly on the post-Restoration lists of "Royal Martyrs." There are notable exceptions, such as the pseudo-martyr James Hind, whose name was rarely mentioned alongside Capel or Penruddock, even though he was widely known in the early 1650s. In each case, public perception by a broad audience, both in person and in print, remained crucial in the construction of individual martyrs and the collective martyrological cause. The burden of presenting oneself as a convincing and memorable martyr, however, was greatly increased because of improvements in censorship and better control of the execution scene. For some, a truncated last speech, interrupted by the authorities, would be the only defense they could make for themselves. Those with greater freedom often received more attention from apologists. Either way, a virtuous public performance would improve one's chances of being represented favorably in newsbooks and pamphlets and also of being well-remembered after 1660. Furthermore, although censorship improved after 1649, false or unfair accounts still were not tolerated. Public executions were witnessed by too many people to be grossly misrepresented, and publishers denounced others for printing forgeries or unapproved copies. A man's dying words were still important, still "his own," even if he was a critic of the state; and as such they were reproduced accurately. The most that an officially licensed printer could do was to offer extra commentary, reminding the reader that one could be brave for the wrong reasons. The Lord Protector, meanwhile, complicated matters by punishing treason with mercy. For example, he attempted to convince Parliament to spare Derby, who in 1651 was beyond his political

reach.[1] This forced royalist writers to admit, carefully, that perhaps the new regime was less a "slaughterhouse" than they had previously argued.

The essential characterization of the construction of martyrdom during this period is the increased efficiency of the Commonwealth and Protectorate in not only preventing and prosecuting treason but also in propagandizing what cases did arise. Martyrdom was still "contested"; but nothing like the exhaustive self-defenses of Christopher Love would be seen again before 1660, though the minister John Hewitt generated more controversy than most in Cromwell's final months. Speeches did circulate, and at times they were presented with cautious sympathy; but the public narrative was increasingly restricted. This is in keeping with broader trends in the government during the latter half of the 1650s. There were fewer newsbooks and fewer licenses. *Mercurius Politicus* was often the only newspaper to mention executions in this period, in large part because it was one of few still permitted to exist. It was regarded as a fair and objective serial, but it remained an official publication. Most reports came through official channels and were meant to represent the voice of the state. What was notable was not an apparent bias in the reporting but rather the rarity of specific defenses by individual martyrs or their friends. In the short term, this demonstrates how important the Battle of Worcester was in the destruction of royalist morale.[2]

After the execution of the Earl of Derby at the vengefully chosen town of Bolton, a sensation in its own right, there were several years of comparative calm, minor royalist activity, and general tightening of narrative control by the Commonwealth and

---

[1] Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution*, p. 499.
[2] Geoffrey Smith calls the "Comprehensive defeat in the battle of Worcester…merely the most dramatic manifestation of the apparent collapse of the royalist cause." *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies*, p. 158.

Protectorate. The first post-Worcester rebellion to generate royalist martyrs was not until 1654 and lacked the support and knowledge of Charles II. The leader, John Gerard, was still hailed as a royalist martyr; but his plot was an act of desperation, not calculation, and appeared haphazard in retrospect. His heroic image was improved by the bizarre happenstance of a joint execution at Tower Hill with the Portuguese ambassador's sniveling brother, a murderer with virtually no English supporters. The more systematic 1655 rebellion of John Penruddock was quashed in the provinces, and his men were deprived of a London execution, which usually generated the most attention. Exeter Castle lacked the top billing of the Tower, Charing Cross, or Tyburn Tree. The 1658 beheadings of Henry Slingsby and John Hewitt at the Tower received far more extensive coverage, which was was at least as much because their conspiracy had been uncovered in London, thereby generating more immediate interest among local readership than a provincial revolt.

All told there were relatively few treason executions during this period, and usually only the leaders of rebellions were executed while other participants were spared. Cromwell's displays of mercy heightened the significance of those executions that did proceed. After Penruddock's rising, only nine men were executed out of nearly a hundred who were tried.[3] The Protectorate essentially disbanded the standard punishment of drawing and quartering, continuing a precedent established with the beheadings of Hide, Bushell, and Love. Most traitors of the later 1650s were officially condemned to die in the traditional manner, but their sentences were commuted by Cromwell's direct order;

---

[3] Andrea Button, "Penruddock's Rising," *Southern History* 19 (1997), p. 106.

some of them thanked him directly from the scaffold.[4] At the same time, the executions and potential martyrs of the period were powerful symbols of the coalescing of the Lord Protector's authority within England, with the final executions before his death in 1658 characterized by explicit thanksgiving in the press for the protection of his life. The hindsight of 1660 casts all into confusion, but each political execution from Derby in 1651 to Hewitt in 1658 was intended to announce that whatever these men might say for themselves, they were traitors against a legitimate state, not martyrs for a cause. The new regime, both merciful and firm in its judgment, was there to stay.

Martyrdom after Worcester can be divided into two chronological categories. First we will consider how the potential martyrs immediately after Worcester attempted to be remembered for their valor. This includes the Earl of Derby, the comparatively minor Duke of Hamilton who died of his wounds, and the royalist highwayman Captain James Hind, who was imprisoned for almost a year before his execution not for treason but for robbery, undercutting the martyrological narrative he had attempted to construct. Second we will turn to the several plots that arose after 1654, which have a notably different tone because of the long duration of royalism's exile by that point. They still expressed their love of the Crown, but their circumstances were different, and they would not invoke Charles I's memory from the scaffold as much as they would address general grievances against the Protectorate. Like those between 1649 and 1651, they still linked

---

[4] For example, the official sentence of drawing, quartering, and burning of entrails was read to Henry Slingsby and John Hewett as usual in 1658, but "his Highness was graciously pleased, upon humble suit made…That the Judgment should be remitted, except the cutting off his head"; *State Trials* 5.929. This was hailed in narratives of the trial and execution as an act of great mercy, and attempted to set a precedent that would be wholly abandoned after the Restoration; while the monarchy in 1660-61 could have executed far more men than it did, the humiliation of drawing and quartering would return, with very few mercifully spared.

their cavalier royalism to Christian piety; but most of the performances were notable for their secular political emphases. They remained religious believers, but they were less likely to characterize their rebellion as a religious act. The unsurprising but important exception was the deeply religious performance of Dr. John Hewitt; but even he argued that the traditional Church settlement was necessary to protect the common rights of Englishmen, a claim reminiscent of Charles I's dying words in 1649. Though Hewitt could not have known that the Protectorate would lose its primary stabilizer with Cromwell's death just a few months later, his discussion of what England should be under Church and Crown was a fitting conclusion to the Interregnum royalist martyrology.

I

James Stanley, the Earl of Derby, who was known after his death as the "martyr earl" and even the "Great Stanley" in his Isle of Man, demonstrates how martyrdom can atone for a multitude of sins. He had always been loyal to the Crown, but his military career from the early 1640s through the weeks before Worcester was disappointingly lackluster. Most accounts of both the Battle of Worcester and the smaller Battle of Wigan Lane some days before, at which Derby's Manx forces were routed, were printed by publishers employed by Parliament or the Council of State. Robert Ibbitson, who had also published an account of the executions of 9 March 1649, printed the official account of Wigan Lane, which was straightforwardly factual but certainly presented Derby as an

enemy.[5] Derby's actual contribution at Worcester was minor, since he arrived at the battle alone and wounded; the dismayed King reportedly almost retreated.[6] Most other pamphlets concerning him were exclusively about his trial and execution, which became such a sensation that one publisher, infuriating his competitors, reprinted the speech of Eusebius Andrewes as if it were Derby's, probably to ensure that his printing was the first in circulation. Executions could still sell.

As is usual for potential martyrs, Derby's trial by court martial on 1 October 1651 provided his first public statement of his own position, which would then be supplemented—and in his case, unusually dramatically—by the theater of execution. The trial accounts published in 1651 were brief and were supplanted by longer narratives after 1660, but the several short pamphlets were either neutral reports or actively anti-royalist. The first pamphlet to appear, printed for George Horton, demeans Derby's reputation and encourages readers to support Parliament and the Commonwealth in order to "walke stedfastly in the wayes of Holiness."[7] In this way Derby's armed support of the exiled king becomes a direct rejection of God's will. The pamphlet offers a "seasonable Declaration and Remonstrance to the People" warning readers that since all will die one day, everyone should be sure to die as a "child of God."[8] The way to do this is not to take up arms against Parliament, as Derby did, but rather to fight royalism. Other pamphlets were less obviously polemical. One, published by the once-royalist printer George Wharton, provides more details from the trial itself, including Derby's stifled cry "I am

---

[5] *A Great Victory by the Blessing of God, obtained by the Parliaments Forces, against the Scots forces Commanded by the Earl of Derby on the 25 of August 1651 near Wigon in Lancashire*, 1651.
[6] *Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings*, September 1-8 1651, p. 1259.
[7] *The Charge and Articles of High-Treason exhibited against the Earl of Derby*, 1651, p. 2.
[8] Ibid, p. 3.

no traytor" during the reading of the charges.[9] Another goes into greater detail about Derby's defense, which primarily dealt with his claim that he was promised quarter when surrendering himself, which should have spared his life; but as we have seen in chapter 1, this was hardly sufficient in practice.[10] He protested that he was "not only the first Peer, but the first Man, tried by a Court Martiall after Quarter given."[11] This was true enough; though Capel and the rest were condemned after being promised quarter, they faced a civil, not martial, court. Most of the pamphlet focuses on similar legal questions. Although his defense was explained, Derby had few supporters in the press, with trial narratives either reporting mundane facts or providing generic endorsements of Parliament and the army.

Derby was captured after his escape from Worcester near Nantwich, tried at Chester, and executed at Bolton on 15 October 1651. This was partly to avoid returning him to London, but it was also payback for alleged atrocities in the area years earlier. He was accused of complicity in Prince Rupert's merciless sacking of Bolton and the murder of a parliamentarian there back in 1644. Furthermore, trying Derby by court martial situated his death as primarily a military one, undercutting the political implications of his rebellion and focusing instead on his new crime, from the new regime's perspective: participating in a large-scale mutiny. Since "Charles Stuart" had no official status in England and was simply a rogue rebel who ought to submit to Parliament, his soldiers

---

[9] *The Perfect Tryal and Confession of the Earl of Derby, at a Court-Marshall holden at Chester*, 1651, p. 2. According to Peacey, Wharton was among the leading "professional authors…who lived by their pens"; his royalism had guided his writing during the 1640s, but he was not above printing basic pamphlets about current events to earn his income. *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 316.

[10] *The Tryall and Plea of James Earle of Derby, Prisoner of War, before a Court Martiall at Chester*, 1651, p. 3.

[11] Ibid, p. 4.

were guilty of attacking the men who should have been their officers. Some accounts gave a fuller picture of Derby's significance and strategized his death by analyzing his wife's continued opposition from her outpost in the Isle of Man, which "she was appointed to keep…by her lord's command; which in duty she was bound to obey, and that therefore without his order and appointment she would not deliver it up to any."[12] Invoking the Countess also recalled Derby's history in the region during the first civil war. The Countess's reputation as a royalist hero in her own right, defending the besieged Lathom House from February to May 1644, made her husband an even greater threat. The Earl had to be executed to demoralize his supporters in Man, which by tradition is considered the last royalist stronghold to capitulate.[13] Newspapers reported that Derby might have been willing to surrender Man to broker for his life, but even doubted himself that the Countess would surrender it. According to the radical *Perfect Account*, Derby was "penitent" and would have written to his wife; "but it is thought her stomack will not digest that Pill." Indeed when Captain Young asked her to surrender she sent word that, since her husband was to be executed, "she would do the like to as many as she could light on that belonged to this Common-wealth."[14] Even the relatively moderate *Mercurius Politicus* described the Countess as "that Amazonian Lady" of Lathom House fame.[15]

---

[12] *The Perfect Tryal*, p. 6.

[13] According to one account, retold in a variety of Victorian histories of the Civil War but apparently originating in an 1823 transcription of Harleian MSS 2043, the Countess replied to the terms sent to her in 1644 by the parliamentarian Colonel Rigby, "Tell that insolent rebel, he shall have neither persons, goods, nor house. When our strength and provisions are spent, we shall find a fire more merciful than Rigby; and then, if the providence of God prevent it not, my goods and house shall burn in his sight; and myself, children, and soldiers, rather than fall into his hands will seal our religion and loyalty in the same flame"; *A Journal of the Siege of Lathom House in Lancashire*, London, 1823, p. 47. The Countess of Derby would have made an impressive martyr.

[14] *Perfect Account of the Daily Intelligence from the Armies*, October 8-15, 1651, p. 310.

[15] *Mercurius Politicus*, October 2-9, p. 1155.

Discussions of the Countess of Derby's military threats were on the surface simply reports of actual events. However, they served an important purpose in anti-royalist propaganda. The Isle of Man was one of the last hold-outs; demonstrating that the Countess was just as willing to fight as always meant that the Earl, however penitent he might appear, would have to be made an example to preserve the integrity of the Commonwealth and crush the last outposts of royalist opposition. Despite Cromwell's own objections, Derby had to die.

Derby's execution and last speech became a far greater sensation than his trial. It was recounted in several newsbooks and individual pamphlets, most of which printed the same text; but in a curious episode, the first to be printed was an outright forgery, or perhaps worse, plagiarism. We will turn to that rogue printing below, but first we should consider his actual performance. The primary contemporary account was printed by Nathaniel Brooks as *The Earle of Darby's Speech on the Scaffold*, but a virtually identical text was printed in a variety of newsbooks.[16] Longer accounts of the execution were published separately, years later, from a restored royalist perspective. According to one, Derby turned the block on the scaffold to face the Bolton church, saying, "Whilst I am here, I will look towards thy holy sanctuary, and I know that within a few minutes, I shall behold thee my God and king in thy sanctuary above."[17] This casts Derby in a pious light that was less obvious in the original accounts from 1651, which were likely trying to

---

[16] *The Earle of Darby's Speech on the Scaffold, Immediately before his Execution at Bolton in Lancashire*, 1651. Other copies appear in John Clowes's *Perfect Passages of Every Daies Intelligence*, October 17-24, 1651, p. 306; *Mercurius Politicus*, October 16-23, p. 1152; and *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, October 9-16, p. 1672.

[17] James Heath, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, 1663, p. 338 ff, and reprinted in *State Trials*, 5.310. Admittedly, it is not clear if these details were omitted in 1651 or invented after 1660; but it seems an odd passage to create from nothing, even though Heath was not always admired for his honesty.

undercut his self-representation. The Brooks and newsbook versions stress how Derby's execution at Bolton provided symbolic justice for his unpunished acts of murder during the First Civil War.[18] The scaffold reportedly included timbers from Lathom House, which was close enough to Bolton to be quite possible.[19] Parliament and the army sent a clear message to witnesses of why Derby had to die, while so many other captured royalists were forgiven.[20]

Derby responded by presenting himself as prayerful and penitent but proud of his support for the legitimate monarch. Early in his speech, which was recorded in shorthand, he prayed that "God send that you may have a King again, and Laws," at which point one of the soldiers called out, "We will neither have King, Lord, nor laws," prompting a small riot. The soldiers stopped it quickly, but someone was reported to have been killed as they rode up and down the street, which dismayed Derby. He said, "Gentlemen, it troubles me more than my own death, that others are hurt, and (I fear) die for me," and then handed the text of his speech to his servant, refusing to speak further.[21] In an abrupt closing, he said, "I thought to have said more, but I have said; I cannot say much more to you of my good will to this Town of Bolton, and I can say no more, but the Lord bless you, I forgive you all, and desire to be so given of you all, for I put my trust in Jesus

---

[18] *Mercurius Politicus*, October 16-23, p. 1151.
[19] *The Earle of Darby's Speech*, p. 3.
[20] Derby was tried with Timothy Fetherstonhaugh and John Benbow, who were executed in October in Chester and Shrewsbury, respectively; but they received almost no mention in newsbooks or pamphlets, and their speeches, if they delivered any at all, were not recorded; *State Trials*, 5.297-8. Similarly, William Winstanley's impressively inclusive martyrology of 1665 only noted that Fetherstonhaugh and Benbow were killed for their support of Derby by the "obdurate Rebells" with no further description; *The Loyall Martyrology*, 1665, p. 34.
[21] *State Trials* 5.308.

Christ."[22] Derby had managed to make his key points, however, and his lamentations about further bloodshed on his account make him appear more sympathetic, rather than the bloodthirsty companion of Prince Rupert. As if the tumult at his execution were not awkward enough, there was then a delay in providing the block, which explains why Derby notably kissed the ladder to the scaffold but not the block itself when he first arrived.[23] Derby seemed both amused and somberly troubled by this second confusion, pacing on the platform and proclaiming, "It is hard that I cannot get a Block to have my Head cut off." He rebuked the executioner, "Why do you keep me from my Saviour?"[24] Apparently everyone was on edge by this point, for after the block arrived and Derby had offered his final prayers, the executioner failed to wield the axe. Derby said, "I have given you a sign, but you have ill miss'd it."[25] Only at this point did the execution conclude. Derby's performance was less pristine than some, and the confusions at the scaffold prevented him from proclaiming his full motivations pulicly. But he still fulfilled the basic requirements for martyrdom: he refused to repent for supporting the King, he prayed that the monarchy would be restored, and he forgave his persecutors. The scuffle itself was not Derby's fault but rather a reaction to a radical remark by a soldier, which could have helped Derby's reputation since he appeared moderate by comparison. In the end, he asked that his friends remember that "he dyed like a Soldier."[26] By uniting his loyalty to the Crown to his loyalty to God, and especially by forgiving his persecutors and praying for God's blessings upon the town that had tarnished his name, Derby too

---

[22] *The Earle of Darby's Speech*, p. 5.
[23] Ibid, p. 4.
[24] Ibid, p. 6; and *State Trials* 5.310.
[25] *The Earle of Darby's Speech*, p. 6.
[26] Ibid.

managed to make himself a religio-political royalist martyr. Even if he was the subject of little hagiography during the 1650s, he had provided more than enough material for apologists of the restored monarchy to make him the "martyr earl" in the 1660s.

Derby's last speech was printed in more newsbooks than those of most royalist martyrs. Useful for informational corroboration, they are mostly consistent with one another: each uses the same text, and several attack the printer of the forged copy. Only *Mercurius Politicus* offered commentary, but it was reserved and even cautiously respectful of Derby's performance, noting that "had he kept firm to the English Interest, and not imbarked himself in that fatal family of the Stuarts, [he] might have been of great use to his Country, and retained the love of it."[27] This approach, typical of Marchamont Nedham's newsbook, shifts the blame to Charles for enticing Derby into his service, downplaying the earl's long reputation for loyalty. Otherwise, the publishers were more bothered by the first copy of the speech to appear in print, not anything that Derby himself said or did. In this peculiar episode, a copy of his speech, allegedly printed by Robert Eles, reproduced almost verbatim the last speech of Colonel Eusebius Andrewes a year before. The text makes the appropriate changes, replacing "the Colonel" with "the Earl" and "Essex" with "Bolton," but otherwise the speech is the same.[28] The printer even filled out two more pages by reprinting a portion of an unrelated sermon by Edmund Calamy, delivered on August 25 and printed shortly after, calling it Derby's funeral sermon.[29] By adapting an existing last speech and then joining it to an existing sermon,

---

[27] *Mercurius Politicus* October 16-23, p. 1152.
[28] *The True Speech Delivered on the Scaffold by James Earl of Derby*, 1651. *State Trials* inexplicably reproduces this entire document without commentary alongside the copy from James Heath's martyrology.
[29] Edmund Calamy, *The Saints Rest: or Their happy sleep in death*, 1651, printed twice, by A. Miller and George Horton.

the printer was able to present an apparently comprehensive account of Derby's execution. This was apparently the first copy printed, since most other accounts of the execution vilify the publisher and insist that their copies are correct. *Perfect Passages* defended its copy, "This is the truth of what was spoken by the Earl, there was something else published which agreed not in one sentence with this; but the contriver thereof will be punished."[30] Similarly, *Mercurius Politicus* noted, "This was the Substance of what he spake, as near as it could be taken; and therefore 'twere well some punishment were inflicted upon the Publisher of a fictitious Peece printed this week, as the Speech of the Earl of Derby; which contains not one line, that agrees in the least measure, with what he utter'd on the Scaffold."[31] There is no indication that the forgery was part of a concerted campaign either for or against Derby. It was probably an attempt to capitalize on the sensation of a high-profile execution in a distant town, which would have taken a few days to appear in the London press. More importantly, this early forgery appears to be the reason that so many copies of Derby's actual speech were in circulation, seeking to correct the record for posterity. This glut of copies had the unintended effect of allowing what Derby was able to say to reach a broad audience in the capital. For our purposes, it demonstrates the significance of famous traitors in this tense period, but it also indicates that, in essence, all royalist speeches were fairly similar; London printers could substitute one for another, and at first glance there was no cause for suspicion. The tropes and language were what readers expected.

Derby's execution was a minor sensation. His status as a martyr in the moment is difficult to establish, since there were no printed defenses of him in circulation.

---

[30] *Perfect Passages*, p. 309.
[31] *Mercurius Politicus*, p. 1154.

Winstanley would call him "the flower of English Fidelity" in 1665, but even then he was treated as part of a diverse lineup of other royalists; his significance came from joining that elite club, rather than from anything he had done individually.[32] The actual execution was haphazard at best, as was his military role in the third civil war. It seems fair to say, however, that he would have been attacked more ferociously if he had done anything less than respectable in his last days, and the scramble to print accurate copies of his speech demonstrates that a neutral account was considered important. He was the first and last peer to become a royalist martyr between March 1649 and the Restoration, significant in itself. His passing mention of the peerage was partly the cause of the scuffle at the scaffold, suggesting that his death was symbolic of the social upheaval spawned by the Revolution. Derby prayed publically for a return to former ways, but his execution, so driven by his alleged crimes years earlier, served as atonement not just for fighting at Worcester but for the collective crimes of all royalists. That Derby was one of the few chosen to make this example was unfortunate for him, but it also demonstrates the increasing willingness to spare lives. England was tiring of bloodshed.

Though Derby had some advantages because of his reputation, he was not in fact the best apologist for the royalist cause during the Worcester fallout. The most widely noted condemned royalist in these months was actually James Hind, a cavalry officer and sometime highwayman, who garnered extensive attention in the press between his capture in November 1651 and his eventual execution in 1652.[33] His inclusion here amongst royalist martyrs is nontraditional, having been executed for theft, and he was not

---

[32] Winstanley, *The Loyall Martyrology*, p. 33.

[33] The most recent scholarly discussion of Hind comes from Jerome de Groot, but within the context of prison writing, an interesting choice since the sources about him say little about prison; "Prison Writing, Writing Prison during the 1640s and 1650s," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 72:2 (2009), pp. 193-215.

mentioned in martyrologies after 1660. I argue, however, that the literature surrounding Hind and his own self-portrayal bear important hallmarks of royalist martyrdom, indicating once again that the concept influenced stalwart royalists of diverse backgrounds. He represents the non-puritan Cavalier to an extreme, speaking little about his faith but praising the royalist cause with memorable flamboyance. On the spectrum of religio-political martyrdom, he would fall strongly on the political end. Hind was the subject of many ballads and satires, even into the eighteenth century, which emphasized his charismatic trial performance as well as the entertaining stories of his highway hijinks; but he presented himself quite like a martyr for the crown, even though his colorful past made him unappealing to royalist hagiographers. Hind appears to have been a popular figure regardless of one's political opinions; but judging from his behavior at his trial and execution, and comparing him to those other royalists condemned after Worcester, it becomes clear that he saw himself as a royalist first and a highwayman second. If John Morris was a royalist martyr, then Hind might have been, too; but evidently robbing coaches was a mortal sin. Even so, Hind argued that despite his crimes he was really being punished for his support of Charles II. Like other royalists, he used his execution speech to remind witnesses that their true leader was in exile. Even though many of the pamphlets about him were mildly critical, and others were explicitly meant for entertainment, they still painted him in a friendly light, almost as if he were the last colorful cavalier and therefore admirable, if misguided.[34]

---

[34] For example, the frontispiece of *Hind's Ramble, or, The Description of his manner and course of life* (1651) assures readers that it is "A Book full of Delight, every Story affording its particular Jest." The preface "To the Reader" further calls it "fit for vacant hours"; A3-v.

Hind certainly fed his reputation as a colorful highwayman, but his behavior while in prison, during his trial, and at his eventual execution indicate that he encouraged others to recognize him as a royalist and to sympathize with his cause. His fame as a folk hero gave him a pulpit from which to preach the royalist gospel. He was the subject of many pamphlets, but several dealt more traditionally with his trial, and newsbook reports of his execution followed the established formula for trial reporting. Some reported that Hind had helped the King to escape after Worcester, though he denied it. A key report of Hind's assistance comes in the frontispiece, but not the body, of the fraudulent copy of Derby's last speech, so anything it reports is suspect and likely intended to sell extra copies.[35] Hind's confirmed actions were loyal enough. In his "declaration," in which he explained his actions during the previous years, he defended himself against accusations of highway robbery: "Neither did I ever take the worth of a peny from a poor man; but at what time soever I met with any such person, it was my constant custom, to ask, Who he was for? If he reply'd, For the King, I gave him 20 shillings: but if he answer'd, For the Parliament, I left him, as I found him."[36] This is not quite Robin Hood, but if he actually defended himself in this way, then he was eager to announce that royalism was his guiding principle. In an account of his capture at a Fleet Street barbershop in November 1651, a man from Hind's hometown of Chipping Norton saw him imprisoned at Newgate and offered his sympathies, as well as promising to convey any message home. Hind replied "that imprisonment was a comfort to him, in suffering for so good and just a cause, as adhering to the King." The man reportedly drank to Hind's health, but Hind

---

[35] *The True Speech*, frontispiece; despite the promise of a Hind story there is not any reference to him in the body of the text, though the final page does mention that the King was reported to have reached the Continent.

[36] *The Declaration of Captain James Hind (close Prisoner in New-gate)*, 1651, p. 2.

replied by drinking to the King, which the man would not do. Hind lost his temper and said, "The Devill take all Traytors: Had I a thousand lives, and at liberty, I would adventure them all for King Charles; and pox take all Turn-coats."[37] While this falls short of forgiving one's enemies, it is clear that Hind wishes to live as a royalist, unapologetically, even if it will cost him his life. It may support his reputation for rowdiness, but that shortchanges his expressed goals. As he had lived for the king, so he would die.[38] Later, when he was told that he would surely be executed for treason, he replied, "Gods will be done…I value it not a three pence, to lose my life in so good a cause; and if it was to do again, I should do the like."[39] This is classic martyrological speech. Hind may have been a rascal, but he was clearly a rascal with a purpose. He was probably not hailed as a martyr because he was executed for real crimes, but the underlying reason that he was in custody was his royalism. If the cause makes the martyr, for Hind that cause was clearly the defense of Charles II.

Hind's trial history was complex because he was tried multiple times in multiple locations for a variety of crimes. Officially it was robbery, not royalism, that cost him his

---

[37] *The true and perfect Relation of the taking of Captain James Hind*, 1651, p. 3; printed for George Horton.

[38] This episode also illustrates the gravity of raising a glass to the exiled king. In 1651, this was sufficient by itself for one to be accused of treason; in a number of depositions from the Northern Assizes in 1650 and 1651, men were accused of making such toasts, putting their own lives at risk. In one case from February 1650, Thomas Welsh, a soldier in the Parliamentarian army, said "that there is a king and that England could never be governed aright without a king" and then "dranke an Health to the sayd king and queens prosperity," encouraging others to do the same; TNA, ASSI 45 3/2/165. In another, sworn in October 1651 but occurring the previous July, William Bewick drank to "Prince Charles, King of Scotts, and to his good successe in England and to the confusion of all his enemies," and tried to make a Mr. Stockdale do the same; when he refused, Bewick "puld of the said Stockdales hatt from his head saying it was a health that deserved to be uncovered," ASSI 45 4/1/ 13. These depositions suggest that such exchanges were common during this period, and Hind did what one would expect a royalist to do. He certainly was not ashamed of his allegiances and made no effort to hide them in prison.

[39] *The true and perfect Relation of the taking of Captain James Hind*, p. 6.

life; but this was partly because Parliament sought to avoid giving any more fame to a man with a knack for celebrity. In his indictment for treason at the Old Bailey in December 1651, he said that he wished he had had the "happy fortune" to have died at Worcester; but this is the most ideological statement recorded.[40] He did provoke the court, however, with promises to escape: "casting his head on one side, and looking as it were over the left shoulder, said; These are filthy gingling Spurs; (meaning his Irons about his legs) but I hope to have them exchang'd ere long: which expressions caused much laughture." As he was escorted on foot back to Newgate, passersby asked whether he had been sentenced yet—he had not, and instead his trial was to be moved to Oxford, where the alleged robberies occurred—and he replied, "No, no, good people, There's no hast to hang true folks."[41] Hind sought to be remembered as a true royalist and not a criminal, but his reputation as a colorful character dominated the press. Satires, exaggerated histories, and even a play were published in 1651 and 1652, treating him perhaps as a Cavalier but not as an ideologue. Perhaps Hind chose royalism because it was an outlet for his antics; it is difficult to know for certain.

He did find detractors amidst all the fame. One satire, claiming to be Hind's will, written in Newgate, discredits him and highlights his many crimes as certainly worthy of death. In this pamphlet he admits that his life has been "one continued scene of Sinne."[42] He begins with a prayer, "In the name of Mercurie (God of Theeves, Prince of Priggs, Chiefest of Cheats, Patron of Pick-pockets, Lord of Leasings, and Monarch of Mischiefe) Amen." Mocking his trial, he laments that he is "sick of that deadly Disease, called

---

[40] *The Trial of Captain James Hind on Friday Last before the Honourable Court at the Sessions in the Old-Bayley*, 1651, 4.
[41] Ibid, p. 5.
[42] *The Last Will and Testament of James Hynd, High-Way Lawyer*, 1651, p. 5.

SESSIONS." He bequeaths his "fallacies, frauds, fegaries, slights, stratagems, circumventions, assassinations, dissimulations, and ambages, to the present Gowne-men, who fight at Barriers, at the Upper Bench, Chancerie," implying that the entire legal system would benefit from his deceit.[43] The pamphlet also lists his other possessions, none of which are virtuous. For example, he leaves his "Folly, Temeritie, and Imbecillitie, to the Jadeded [sic] Presbyterians of the Age, wishing them more LOVE then hitherto they have manifested." This is surely a reference to Christopher Love, who had been executed only a few months before, mocking his cause to discredit the Presbyterians and Hind at once. He also leaves his "escapes, my Sculkes, and my Bo-peepes, to the Brethren of the Blade" and assures them that "they need not to feare Hell fire, since the most the Devill can doe (to such Roaring Boyes as they are) can but make them Roare."[44] Hind and his sword-waving Cavalier companions will end up in hell, but for one such as himself it will not be entirely unpleasant since it essentially continues what he had done during his life. Finally, he requests this epitaph for his grave:

Hynd, of Latrons Lord and Chiefe;
Hynd the strong, but courteous Thiefe:
He with whom Clavell, Cheyny, or
Luke Huttons selfe might not compare,
Here lyes buried: Let him lye,
Travailer, thou mayst passe by
Safely now, maugre his view,
With thy Purse and Money too.[45]

Here Hind is a witty and courteous thief, romanticized alongside figures like the Elizabethan highwayman Luke Hutton, who was the subject of a 1598 ballad reprinted

---

[43] Ibid, p. 1.
[44] Ibid, p. 4.
[45] Ibid, p. 6.

throughout the seventeenth century.[46] Where the satirist refers to current politics, it is in mockery, with the apparent intent of discrediting the Presbyterian cause along with the Cavaliers, each of whom had lately threatened the Commonwealth. It is telling that not even this satire is entirely negative about Hind, however; there is a glimmer of respect as well as a dig at the legal system. In the popular imagination, he was a polite and considerate man, not a violent murderer but merely a thief with strong convictions about royalism. He had potential for becoming a standard royalist martyr, not unlike Browne Bushell, perhaps; but in the environment after Worcester, his ability to make a compelling case was limited. Therefore his royalism was treated as an expression of his rambunctiousness, and not the reverse; this served to discredit royalism more generally. In his own words, however, it seems that he was a royalist before all else.

The other nobleman to be remembered as a martyr of Worcester after 1660 was William, second Duke of Hamilton, whose brother had been executed in 1649. But by dying of his wounds soon after the battle, he never had the opportunity to make an execution speech, and his status as a martyr was never more than passing reference. Hamilton serves as a useful reminder that martyrs themselves are the first constructors of their respective causes, followed by the re-presentations of observers. The only publication about Hamilton from 1651 provided a suspicious narrative of a deathbed apology for ever having raised arms against the Commonwealth of England. If genuine, it undercut the royalist message and further explains why he largely fell from the public imagination and would never attain the status of his more famous brother. According to this pamphlet, printed by Robert Wood, Hamilton "was confident his coming into

---

[46] See Luke Hutton's own pamphlet, *The Blacke Dogge of Newgate*, 1596 and reprinted in 1638; and *Luke Hutton's Lamentation*, 1598 and reprinted in 1640 and 1656.

England was contrary to the Will of God" and even wished "that he had been admonished by his Grandmother, who prophetically told his Father" that the Stuarts would be destroyed.[47] Since Hamilton would later be included, albeit with little commentary, in martyrologies published after the Restoration, this supposed deathbed conversion is questionable. If true, it seems that royalists ignored it. With little corroboration, it can be interpreted in numerous ways; but it clearly would have helped to reinforce the new regime's legitimacy if one of Charles II's leading noblemen in the field had not only been killed in battle but also had renounced his entire cause with his last words. Ultimately this demonstrates the importance of a formal, public setting for martyrdom. One can only be hailed as a hero if one performs properly, with witnesses. A battlefield death had its share of glory, but a battle fought far from London, followed by the scattering of the losing side, allowed the victors to construct whatever narrative would serve their needs. By contrast with Derby and Hind, whose public appearances provided straightforward accounts even if they were subsequently reinterpreted, Hamilton left an incomplete story and was rarely mentioned by other royalists, either before or after 1660.

II

Worcester was such a crushing blow to the royalist cause, both morally and practically, that there were relatively few attempts at rebellion against Parliament for several years, and none that came close to being effective. The first, the Gerard plot of

---

[47] *The Declaration of Duke Hamilton concerning His Engagement against England, and his coming in with the King of Scots*, 1651, p. 3. This genealogy is mistaken: it was Hamilton's mother, not grandmother, who had famously opposed his brother, not father, in his support for King Charles I. Such a mistake might have been an easy one to make for one unfamiliar with the noble lineage of the Hamilton family, but the younger brother had long been a companion of the elder in London, and his dealings between the Engagers in Scotland and the exiled Charles II were well-known.

1654, was essentially a rogue operation and was quickly quashed. The second, the Penruddock rebellion of 1655, had the shaky endorsement of the Sealed Knot, the nearest that anything came to an official royalist organization during the Interregnum. The third, the Slingsby plot of 1658, featured the execution of well-known London Anglican minister John Hewitt and would finally create a sympathetic martyr with few aggressive detractors. But the other reason that there were relatively few executions for treason between 1651 and the Restoration was that as political power became increasingly concentrated in Oliver Cromwell, the state policy towards dissent became increasingly merciful, at least by seventeenth century standards. Many royalists remained in prison or in exile during this period, but only this handful of conspirators were actually executed. This section will focus on those royalists who were executed for conspiracy and consider how they, like their predecessors, behaved like martyrs, and how contemporary responses shaped their reception in the public sphere. These figures were largely unambiguous in arguing that they died for their belief in the royal cause, a belief that required action. Their rebellion, for those who admitted it, was simply an expression of belief about the state and about God's will for the English nation.

The first subjects in this section died for the same cause; but as we will see, they were perceived differently by print sources, largely because of their disparate performances. In the spring of 1654, John Gerard, a young and well-connected royalist who had met the King in France some months before, led one of a number of ill-fated conspiracies to assault Oliver Cromwell on the road to Hampton Court. This independent operation was valiant in spirit but unlucky from the start, ultimately failing when

Cromwell unexpectedly traveled by boat.[48] The plot, which Gerard denied having led, resulted in the arrests of several members of his family and a number of co-conspirators; but only the young teacher Peter Vowell would join Gerard in dying for the plot, and they were executed in different locations. The popular perception of Gerard's treason also included the strange case of Don Pantaleon Sa, a brother of the Portuguese ambassador, who by chance had been involved in a brawl with Gerard and several others in a public market the previous November. That Gerard and Pantaleon were executed on the same scaffold and the same day is an accident of history, but one that was noted for its poetic justice—justice for Pantaleon, however, not for Gerard. In fact their juxtaposition served to improve Gerard's reputation, since Pantaleon was a Catholic and a foreigner. Even worse, his crime was murdering an innocent Englishman by mistake during the fight with Gerard's men, just days ahead of the young man's wedding and before his fiancée's eyes. Gerard's alleged treason was widely condemned but unrelated to the marketplace brawl, for which no one faulted him. This peculiar execution scene permitted witnesses to compare speeches and performances and choose to think what they wished about each after reading them again juxtaposed in the same pamphlets. But to understand why Gerard responded the way he did, we must first examine the allegations against him.

There were several trials related to the conspiracy in June 1654, as well as that of Pantaleon, delayed by diplomatic debates for months until that time. As was typical for high-profile cases, there were published trial accounts for each, usually in condensed format. These accounts were subsequently used in *State Trials*. Not all of them, however, provided simple information. The first trial was for Colonel John Ashburnham, who was

---

[48] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 97ff.

spared execution, as well as Charles Gerard, John Gerard's brother. Yet the pamphlet primarily recounts recent meteorological occurrences that were portentous of the danger that such conspiracies posed to the Lord Protector. Besides noting that these men had been examined—but with no record of the details—the pamphlet focuses on the stars:

> Thus may we see, that the Prodigies and Signes from heaven, includes as well the preservation, as the devastation of a Ruler and his people: For assuredly had this designed Conspiracy taken effect, it had been the wofulst day that ever England had beheld, for they aymed at nothing more then the involving of Us in Civil broils, and rent the Nation in pieces; as many of the Actors (now in custody) have confessed.[49]

The most important point here was that conspiracies had to be stopped because of the threat they would pose to peace, which had been enjoyed domestically since Worcester.

Later in June, John Gerard himself went to trial, along with Peter Vowell and Somerset Fox, who were the other central figures in the plot. They were tried by the High Court of Justice in Westminster Hall. This was distinctly different from Derby's trial by court martial back in 1651. Westminster Hall was inherently spectacular, and Gerard's trial accordingly received more varied coverage in print. Fox pled guilty, and as a result his life was spared and he was shipped to Barbados, another example (perhaps) of the Lord Protector's mercy.[50] Gerard and Vowel, however, refused to confess, insisted on a trial by jury, and were generally defiant towards the court.[51] Furthermore, their trial immediately followed that of Pantaleon, who had caused a minor stir of his own by

---

[49] *The Tryal of Col. Ashburnham, (Prisoner in the Tower of London) Before His Highness the Lord Protectors Council at White-Hall,"* 1654, p. 7.
[50] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, p. 102.
[51] *The Triall of Mr. John Gerhard, Mr. Peter Vowell, and Sommerset Fox, by the High Court of Justice sitting in Westminster Hall*, 1654, p. 3.

refusing to remove his hat because of his "pretended priviledge."[52] Gerard insisted that he was on trial for his life merely for speaking unknowingly to a potential conspirator, rather than conspiring himself.[53] The plot would have assassinated Cromwell on the road from Westminster to Hampton Court, a journey that he made each week. Then royalists would seize the Tower and other key points in London, presumably while raising popular support.[54] One of the witnesses even testified that this was a Catholic conspiracy, a theory that did not gain much traction.[55] John Gerard's brother Charles testified against him under duress, and he and Vowell were convicted of treason. Much of the evidence hinged on testimonies about secret meetings, as well as the question of whether John Gerard met the King in France. It was suspicious but not inherently damning. The threat of conspiracy, however, was great enough that an example had to be made. This should be interpreted in the context of the lingering memory of Worcester, even if it was removed by more than two years: what little commentary was provided on the trial focused on the upheaval that would come if Cromwell were to be killed. England had suffered enough war, and now it finally knew peace. It would be best to plod along with the government that had won, not seek to overthrow it with yet another conflict.

Vowell and Gerard did not represent a unified front in their executions, and it is not clear how well they knew each other before their arrest. It does not appear that they were close friends or longtime royalist associates. Each would be hailed as a royalist martyr, but they behaved markedly differently during and after their trial. Neither

---

[52] *The Grand Tryal in Westminster-Hall Of The Lord Ambassadors Brother from the King of Portugal*, 1654, pp. 4-5; also *Perfect Diurnall* July 3-10, p. 3663. The Don Pantaleon case is an important episode of legal history because of its contributions to how diplomatic immunity is defined.
[53] *The Triall of Mr. John Gerhard*, p. 7.
[54] Ibid, p. 5.
[55] Ibid p. 10.

confessed, but Gerard was calmer in his dealings with the court, openly forgave his brother for testifying against him, and generally was affable when speaking with his accusers. Fox was imprisoned with them at the Tower until his reprieve.[56] Though all three were condemned to be hanged together, Gerard's request that he die as a soldier was granted by Cromwell; he was beheaded at Tower Hill in the afternoon of 10 July, whereas Vowell was hanged at Charing Cross in the morning. When the two diverged in their performances, however, it did not seem to hurt the entire royalist cause as much as it boosted Gerard's immediate reputation at Vowell's expense.

Vowell said the right things to be viewed as a martyr, but his apparent bitterness undermined his own cause in some pamphlets and newsbooks. In the days before the execution, several newspaper reports discussed Vowell's increasing anger, which would culminate in an execution speech that was so negative that he was interrupted and prevented from speaking further. One newsbook reported that Vowell had refused to speak with one Mr. Bond, a minister who had been sent by the Court to provide spiritual counsel to the prisoners; Vowell said to him "such as is not fit here to relate."[57] According to another, he "was very obstinate, and would not hear any thing of Councel, or discourse from Mr. Bond, but asked if he came to torment him before his time…and his carriage was such and so obstinate and desperate, that even Mr. Gerhard himself did much blame him," while explaining that he entered the army when very young and lacked a proper education; this seems odd since Vowell was an educator himself.[58] In this account, Gerard tried to make excuses for Vowell but did not approve of his words or

---

[56] *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, July 6-13 1654, p. 3957.
[57] *The Perfect Diurnall of Several Passages and Proceedings*, July 3-10, p. 3670.
[58] *Several Proceedings of State Affaires*, July 6-13, p. 3956.

actions. Finally it was settled that Vowell would be hanged at Charing Cross, while Gerard's good behavior gained him an agreement by the Lord Protector that he would be beheaded alongside Don Pantaleon Sa, who himself was beheaded instead of hanged to appease his brother, the ambassador, and avoid an international incident. Vowell was described as having "a Roman carriage, a thing too many glory in," meaning that he was admired by the crowd for his confidence even though his cause was unworthy. In his last speech he criticized "the Court that condemned him [and] dyed in a confidence of the work to be carried on by somebody else." He was defiant, of course, but he also "declared great affection and willingness to dye, as also his confidence of going to Heaven" in exchange for his service to the exiled crown.[59] One of the standalone copies of Vowell's speech is consistent with this account in its martyrological language. In the version printed by George Horton, "taken by an ear-witness," Vowell proclaimed that he was being executed "for endeavouring to bring in my master the King, for whose Cause I am here brought to the place of execution, to suffer upon the Cross, as my blessed Lord and Saviour hath done before me."[60] He proclaimed his belief that "so soon as I have submitted my neck to the Rope, and received the fatal Turn, I shall then arrive at the Haven of Happiness."[61] He announced that he had been denied his rights according to Magna Carta, "which every free-born English-man may claim as his sole and onely birth right." This is defiant, but it is not angry. However, he then accosted his "Gentlemen souldiers" for being "deluded, misled, and blinded," at which point the sheriff interrupted

---

[59] Ibid, p. 3961.
[60] *The true and perfect Speeches of Colonel John Gerhard upon The Scaffold at Tower-hill, on Munday last, and Mr. Peter Vowel at Charing-Cross, on Munday last*, 1654, p. 4.
[61] Ibid.

him, and the execution proceeded.[62] Vowell's words, as presented here, were harsh but understandable. One might accuse him of telling another what to believe, rather than showing it; but his words and actions appear heartfelt. Others had certainly said worse before the gallows.

There was, however, a second copy of his last speech, which seems to have been printed a few days later. "Published for general satisfaction," this copy ostensibly transcribes what Vowell had written in advance. It covers a range of topics and might contradict Gerard's claim that the young man was ill-tempered because of poor education. It also deals with Vowell's religious convictions more forcefully than anything he was reported to have said. No publisher was listed on the frontispiece, and given its attacks on the Lord Protector and the entire present government, it is surprising that it managed to be circulated. In this version he begins by proclaiming that "The Souls under the Altar cry loud for vengeance…the cry is loud of those lately whose blood hath been unlawfully spilt."[63] He then declares that he is being persecuted like the primitive Christians, reminding his intended listeners that their courage "excelled the fury of the persecutors" and that, of course, "*sanguinis martirum*, was *semen ecclesiae*."[64] He accuses his countrymen of devolving into heathenism, for by "many sacrifices of humane Christian blood, our scaffolds have reek'd and smok'd…What God is he that delights in the blood of man? Baal, the god of Ekron, Beelzebub, the god of Flyes."[65] Vowell condemns the present state for sacrificing honest men at the altars of false gods. He

---

[62] Ibid, p. 5.
[63] Such invocations of "blood crying aloud for vengeance" usually refer to Cain's murder of Abel in Genesis. *The Last Speech of M. Peter Vowell, Which he intended to have delivered (had he been permitted)*, 1654, pp. 1-2.
[64] Ibid, pp. 2-3.
[65] Ibid, p. 2.

addresses the soldiers themselves, asking them how many of them have enlisted for a cause they do not understand, "driven by tyrannous oppression, poverty, or cruelty," and "left your dear wives and children" to participate in injustice. In doing so they "have had a hand in putting down the ancient true Church, and raised up in your own imaginations a new one" that can never be as grand as that of Solomon.[66] His challenge to the guards still presumes that there is hope for them: through his witness they can reject the demonic forces that have overwhelmed England. Finally he calls on all present to repent and "shake off your Bloody Protector, rescue your ancient Lawes, and call in your Royal young PRINCE, whom you have long enough wronged."[67] If Vowell did write these words, it is no surprise that he was prevented from speaking them. In substance the texts are similar, but there is a harsher tone in this copy than anything reported in the newsbooks. The pamphlet is clearly a part of the construction of Vowell's posthumous image; and while the language is strong, the subject is grave, and it presents him as a martyr for both monarchy and true Christianity. In seeking worldly ends the regime rejected God's will for His people and had to be stopped, even if many true believers must die in doing so.[68]

Gerard's execution at Tower Hill the afternoon after Vowell's was more in the standard mold of the happily defiant cavalier, not quite James Hind's eagerness but certainly consistent with royalists executed before Worcester. Not all accounts agreed with this assessment. One newsbook depicted Gerard as "much agast and his countenance

---

[66] Ibid, p. 4.
[67] Ibid, p. 5.
[68] This behavior was praised by royalists after the Restoration, with Heath noting that after words that were "too harsh for the eares of the Souldiers" he "past hence to a glorious state of Immortality"; *A New Book*, p. 369.

fell, and his spirit much flagged" when he approached the scaffold, "ready to sink down before the people, and hee spake very little." After his short speech, in which he announced his willingness to die for the King, he went to the block but "was even dead…so soon as hee lay down, before the blow was given," and was unable to give a sign.[69] Perhaps there is some truth to this narrative, but it is a distinct outlier among the several extant accounts. The newsbook was published by Robert Ibbitson, who was certainly no royalist, and who elsewhere in the issue had portrayed the imprisoned Gerard as almost repentant.[70] By contrast, according to the similarly anti-royalist *Perfect Diurnall*, Gerard's "behavior was sprightly, the substance of his discourse Cavalier-like, professing himself to be of the profession of Religion, which was established by Qu. Elizabeth, K. James, and Charles, to which family he declared his affection."[71] Similarly, the copy of his and Vowell's speeches notes that "coming to the stairs, he nimbly ran up, and smiling saluted Col. Barkstead with a cup of Sack, and then walked up and down the scaffold with an undanted spirit." He even paused to touch the block and "salute" it, too.[72] This narrative is starkly different from that in *Severall Proceedings*—there is no flagging spirit, no weakness at the block, and certainly no refusal to address the crowd.

---

[69] *Severall Procedings of State Affaires*, July 6-13, p. 3964.

[70] Ibbitson's account of the executions that day is on the sensational side, noting that several people were injured when the branches they had climbed to view the execution broke, and also describing in great detail the inefficient beheading of Don Pantaleon Sa, whose head still hung by some "sinews" that had to be cut by "a sliding of the axe." It is particularly negative toward his Catholicism, but notes that he proclaimed himself "willing to dye a Martyr, and such kind of Popish discourse" before the crowd. In theory Pantaleon could have been targeted for his Catholicism but contemporary reports overwhelmingly stressed that he was a murderer in cold blood.

[71] *Perfect Diurnall*, July 10-17 1654, p. 3672.

[72] *The true and perfect Speeches*, p. 6. This gives only a brief summary of his last speech, but it does note that after Gerard was placed in the coffin, not only did his hands appear to move but he even lifted the lid of the coffin; clearly Ibbitson was not the only publisher to include sensational elements of the scene.

Gerard appears not only "sprightly" but distinctly like a martyr in the Cavalier-Anglican style of Lord Capel.

The newsbook accounts were not the only versions of Gerard's execution. According to the introduction of *A True and Impartial Relation*, there had been no need to write more about Gerard until an unidentified pamphlet sullied his reputation, which prompted this faithful copy of his speech. The writer of the introductory material is acutely aware that he is contributing to a martyrological contest that Gerard himself had begun. The pamphlet discredits those who have written against Gerard, possibly the account in *Severall Proceedings*, though it is not named. "These are cursed beasts," the author writes, "but their horns are short; sepulchral dogs, that scrape up graves and violate the dead, and are fierce and ravenous, but yet dogs still."[73] They work to vilify Gerard and belittle his reputation as well as the entire royalist cause; but "no blots stick upon true honour," and ultimately Gerard's honor will rise above these debates.[74] If he does not, and the author is mistaken about his subject's virtues, then Gerard himself, not the writer, will be at fault: "Yet if there be a material falsehood, or a wilful flattery, may his neck that wrote it feel a viler destiny then axes or halters."[75] This is an especially visceral recognition of the connection between truth and performance in an execution, as well as an excellent depiction of martyr as author: he presents an instructional narrative that, of course, will be written down, but is important from the moment he ascends the scaffold, if not before. Gerard wrote his own story by presenting his neck for all to see, which represents his authority over his reputation. The pamphleteer, however, does not

---

[73] *A True and Impartial Relation of the Death of M. John Gerhard who was beheaded on Tower-hill*, 1654, p. 1.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid, p. 2.

appear to doubt Gerard's virtues in any way. He asks, "Why should I grieve that death which had such a living glory in it? Or dishonor that blood with feeble tears, which was shed so like the holy Martyrs? All that knew this person cannot but witness his general resolution."[76] As is typical with martyrs, his death is a "living glory" for which one should rejoice, not grieve. In this way Gerard resembles the "holy Martyrs" of the early church. During the last days of his imprisonment he received Communion with "holy sorrows and holy joys" and "wept as if he would have washed his Saviours wounds."[77] This is standard martyrological language: Gerard joins his sufferings to those of Christ, servicing him by washing the holy wounds; and as a result all witnesses should celebrate his death as a great act of virtue. According to the pamphleteer, Gerard is showing people how to live as a Christian through his death; but there were also traditional "cavalier" elements to the performance, similar to Capel and Hind. He was a Christian, but he was also "dying game."

The pamphlet analyzes his actions on the scaffold. To corroborate this account, the writer invites readers to seek out the variety of individuals who visited Gerard during his last hours, "who can gladly witness his undisturb'dness and civil cheerfulness to every one of them."[78] Rather than what "our Pamphlet-monger would have called flagging and cowardice," Gerard was "fearless and untroubled" because of the comfort of his friends and family and his faith in Christ.[79] The writer acknowledges that it will be difficult "to satisfie all curiosities, even with our blood," but there is "nothing more

---

[76] Ibid, p. 1.
[77] Ibid, p. 2.
[78] Ibid, p. 3.
[79] Ibid.

ingenious then to carry this bitter cup even, when so many misconstructions shake it."[80] The writer describes Gerard as arriving to the execution while holding his hat with "careless bravery." Nor did Gerard mock his witnesses or appear to bear any ill-will towards them. Instead he showed "a great deal both of humility and respect to the people, who generally lamented him, and prayed for him."[81] He has the respect, not the derision, of his witnesses. Unlike Gerard in *Severall Proceedings*, this Gerard—and as usual, we should recall that this is a re-presentation of his behavior—jauntily ascends the scaffold, rather like Capel, so that "many observ'd how sprightfully he seem'd to skip up the steps to it, as if he had gone to dance there rather then to dy."[82] He asked to see the axe, kissed it, and said to the minister "with a pretty glance of his eye (which was a natural loveliness in him)…This will do the Deed I warrant it."[83] He tested the block to see if it was the right size, "and was so far from sinking at the sight of it, that he almost play'd with it."[84] He noticed that his waistcoat was not clean, but said "'tis no great matter…if the heart be clean all's well enough."[85] According to this pamphlet, Gerard was not sorrowful but rather happy to give his life for his cause. His behavior—walking with purpose, kissing the axe, joking about the instruments of execution, and holding his hat with "careless bravery"—is consistent with that of other royalist martyrs who had preceded him and draws a contrast between his virtues and his persecutors' ruthlessness. Even the description of his "natural loveliness" seems to imply cavalierish good looks and a flair

---

[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid, p. 4.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid, p. 6.
[85] Ibid, pp. 5-6.

for public show. Thus far, Gerard presented himself as a martyr for a secularized royalist cause.

Though this pamphlet does not specify the reason, Gerard was presumably prevented from reading his full speech by the sheriff because Vowell had caused such a stir at Charing Cross that morning. Putting his paper away, he said that "what he would have said would come to their eys, though it must not come to their ears," meaning either that martyrs act as much as they speak, or that his undelivered speech would be published in time.[86] After proclaiming that he died for the King, and that if he had "ten thousand lives" he would still give them "thus for his service," Gerard finally turned to his faith. He professed himself a member of the Church of England and announced that through Christ, his "sins are pardoned" and his "salvation is at hand."[87] And finally he made himself the sacrificial lamb, fulfilling the imitation of Christ: "He bow'd himself to the stroak of death, with as much Christian meakness and noble courage mix'd together, as I believe was ever seen in any that had bled upon that Altar."[88] Thus Gerard still fulfills all the expectations of the royalist martyr, declaring that he suffers for supporting the King and linking that to the service of Christ; but as with some previous examples, his royalism appears to outweigh his faith as a matter of emphasis. In any event, the witnesses, according to the pamphleteer, were impressed by Gerard and saw "his fatal blow with a universal sadness and silence," which contrasted sharply with their "great and general shout, as applauding the Justice of the Portugal's death," who had died for

---

[86] Ibid, p. 4.
[87] Ibid, p. 5.
[88] Ibid, p. 6.

"bloud and ryot" rather than the service of God and King.[89] According to this pamphlet, Colonel John Gerard was a royalist saint, virtuous in his actions and faithful to death; but he remained foremost a Cavalier, even in his piety. The reference to Pantaleon is the capstone, showing that Gerard is a true, faithful Englishman, the injustice of whose suffering was made clearer by the rightful beheading of a murderer.

An underlying question about these two men's potential martyrdoms, though, is why no one undertook to write such a pamphlet for Peter Vowell, Gerard's alleged partner in crime. I suggest that this is similar to the disparity between Holland and Capel in 1649. Each of these men professed that they died in support of the Crown, and Vowell's planned speech was more compelling in its actual content; but he was somber, and possibly angry, limiting his appeal to his audience. Descriptions of Gerard as sluggish or tired, meanwhile, contradicted witnesses' impressions, compelling a supporter to defend his memory and correct the record. That record was supported in a second newsbook, which appears to have been a neutral report. Vowell's words were strong, but in a sense he took his martyrdom a step too far. Rather than speaking positively about Charles II, he challenged individual soldiers, asking whether they had abandoned their wives to fight for injustice. Vowell and Gerard would be upheld as martyrs after 1660 by writers like Heath and Winstanley; but in 1654, Gerard alone had unambiguous apologists. Vowell's undelivered last speech was printed, but the pamphlet lacks additional defenses or discussions of his character. Perhaps Vowell simply lacked the connections that the Gerard family provided. But the contemporary discussions of the

---

[89] Ibid.

two are notably disparate. Gerard behaved as a sincere, loyal, and pious cavalier; and commentators responded accordingly.

III

Less than a year later, a far more elaborate plot was led by John Penruddock, who would give the rebellion its name. It was engineered by the Sealed Knot and attempted to launch an armed insurrection with popular support throughout the country, but it only materialized in and around Salisbury.[90] While it was limited to traditional royalists, unlike the attempts to entice the Presbyterians in the early 1650s, it still involved far more persons than the Gerard plot. As a result, Penruddock's rising, although speedily quashed, yielded more executions and potential martyrs, with one important difference. Whereas Vowell and Gerard died at Charing Cross and Tower Hill, central locations with high visibility, Penruddock and Hugh Grove were executed at Exeter Castle, far from London. The large scale of the uprising still prompted considerable response in the press, but in a way it lacked the sensationalism of Gerard's assassination plans. Penruddock would be remembered as a royalist martyr, but more for what he did in the field than for how he behaved at the scaffold. However, some of the published literature was written by Penruddock himself and is similar, but not identical, to manuscripts attributed to him, including a list of his legal instructions to his fellow prisoners, and some copies of his and his companion Hugh Grove's last speeches, which are sufficiently different in wording from printed copies to have likely originated in another source. They do not,

---

[90] Underdown has addressed the complex relationship between the Knot and Penruddock's Rising in its final form. It should suffice to note that, in the end, the insurrection was on its own; *Royalist Conspiracy*, p. 157.

however, differ in substance, which along with Penruddock's apparent authorship indicates some consistency among reports about the insurrectionist's words and deeds. The result is that Penruddock rises as the most notable royalist martyr of the decade. Only Worcester rivaled his revolt; and while Charles II might have made a good royalist martyr, the shrewd colonel would suffice in 1655.

To Penruddock's credit, he sought to protect his men as much as possible, both for their own individual sakes as well as for the sake of the royalist movement. He did so by providing what was rarely granted to prisoners in treason cases: legal advice. The first reports in London of Penruddock's capture on 15 March 1655 were sparse, but they noted that he had "formal Articles made in writing, for his own advantage," which may refer to the same list of legal points in the Sloane collection of the British Library.[91] Like others we have seen, Penruddock insisted that he had been granted quarter by Colonel Unton Crokes, only to have it ignored at his trial.[92] His instructions to his fellow prisoners, which exist now as a slim bound volume, demonstrate a good knowledge of the law and the various contingencies that confront treason trials during the Interregnum. Some of the text consists of practical information. He informs his men that they could challenge a select number of jurors, some with cause and some without.[93] He advises a collective strategy, instructing each of them to accept a juror who had been challenged by another insurrectionist to confuse the prosecution.[94] He also warned them against pleading not guilty too quickly, lest they lose all chances of securing legal counsel (though the 1658

---

[91] *An Account of the taking John Penruddock, Esq, Mr. Hugh Grove, and others, at Southmolton in the County of Devon*, 1655, single sheet.
[92] Even so, Penruddock maintained his respect for Crokes as a worthy opponent; Button, "Penruddock's Rising," p. 102.
[93] Sloane MSS 18, f. 1.
[94] Ibid, f. 3.

trial of John Hewitt would imply that one should not refuse to plead for too long.)[95] Penruddock was knowledgeable of previous trials against royalists and knew what recent legislation had determined regarding the legitimacy of the Protectorate. For example, he instructed them that if they were charged with treason according to any act by the Long Parliament, they were innocent because they had attacked neither King nor Commonwealth. On the other hand, if the law had been enacted after the Long Parliament was dissolved, they were to deny the law's legitimacy.[96] He even encouraged everyone to challenge the prosecutors themselves, instructing them to ask "whether hee came voluntarily to prosecute against us," and if so to encourage the jury to "judge wether those that are come hither from London purposely have not an intencon to take our lives."[97] Finally, Penruddock encouraged them to warn the jurors that perhaps soon the Protectorate would turn on them, "for many were zealous for the present government…who have already felt…the effect of these new ordinances."[98] This cannot have seemed to be a course likely to succeed, given the precedents that Penruddock knew all too well; but his options were few. He could not deny having participated in an uprising. The only option was to challenge the legitimacy of the court and maintain his and his men's personal integrity. The reason this option remained, of course, was that Penruddock was quite willing to become a martyr, as much for his cause's sake as for his own. If he wavered, he damaged other royalists. If he remained sure, he could gain sympathizers and, eventually, effect a restoration.

---

[95] Ibid, f. 1.
[96] Ibid, f. 4.
[97] Ibid, f. 3v.
[98] Ibid, f. 6v.

The remainder of Penruddock's public martyrological construction primarily rests in his own account of his trial, published by a friend or relation, to which was appended several personal letters and Penruddock's and Hugh Grove's last speeches. The speeches also exist in a standalone print, which lacks any publication information, and a manuscript copy, which does not appear to be a direct transcription of the printed versions. Unlike Peter Vowell or some other cases, there is no apparent discrepancy between these copies besides minor differences in wording. These differences are significant enough to make a distinct text, but they all agree in substance, with the most notable difference being some interjections by the sheriff in the manuscript, which easily could have been removed from the print for space or clarity.[99] For this reason the primary copy used in this study will be the extended account of his trial, which was meant to be comprehensive and was used as the basic account in *State Trials*. It should be remembered, however, that despite its presentation, it is not an unbiased narrative: it was intended by Penruddock and his friends to vindicate himself and draw supporters to the royalist cause. It is not blatantly hagiographical, but it is hardly a Parliamentarian document.

If we take the document's word that the text is primarily written by Penruddock himself, and there is no reason to presume otherwise, then this narrative is unusually personal amongst the variety of trial and execution accounts in the seventeenth century. Rather than being a compendium of news reports, or an official account licensed by the state, this is essentially an expanded version of an execution speech that goes into far more detail than was typically permitted at the gallows. The account opens with a short

---

[99] The other versions are *The True Speeches of Collonel John Penruddock and Hugh Grove*, 1655, which was "printed to prevent false copies"; and Sloane MSS 972, ff. 17-18.

letter to his friend, in which Penruddock makes an interesting choice of words regarding his death, calling it "the day of my expiration, for I cannot call this an Execution, it being for such a cause."[100] The distinction is simultaneously dramatic and subtle: he sweepingly rejects the legality of his death because an execution would derive from a lawful judgment; but in doing so, he implies that it is worth dying for the royalist cause. He will pass from this world for it, "expiring," but it is not a just execution for crimes. Yet the word "expiration" is also surprisingly passive. This is not a self-promotional assertion of martyrdom but rather a consideration of the law, which does make sense given the extensive discussion of legal rights in the manuscript instructions to his fellow royalists.

Penruddock followed his own advice, protesting twenty-four jurors and challenging the Court's definition of treason. He repeatedly questioned the judges, protesting that "it is a hard case, if a free-born Gentleman of England cannot have the same priviledge that his inferiours have had before him."[101] He invoked precedents of lesser-born men, such as the trial of John Lilburne. He reluctantly agreed to plead not guilty, presuming that he would then be granted his "partly promised" counsel, but as soon as he pled the court withdrew the offer. Without counsel, he challenged the legality of the Protectorate. He argued that there could be no treason "against a Protectour who hath no power according to Law," which was essentially a new iteration of the old argument that treason could only be committed against the King.[102] Ultimately Penruddock appealed to the jury directly, just as he had instructed his comrades to do: "You are now judges between me and these Judges. Let not the majesty of their looks, or

---

[100] *The Trial of the honourable Colonel John Penruddock of Compton in Wiltshire, and his Speech*, 1655, p. 1.
[101] Ibid, p. 2.
[102] Ibid.

the glory of their habits, betray you to a sinne which is of a deeper dye then their scarlet; I mean that sinne, bloud, which calls to heaven for vengeance."[103] This attempt to appeal to their imagined moral qualms about condemning a man to death would not succeed, especially given that some jurors apparently had determined his guilt before the trial began.[104] After the verdict, he acknowledged that, *de facto*, "the Protectour has now the keeping the bond" which determines who would live or die, and also admitted that Cromwell had been merciful in the recent past: "When I reflect upon the favour he hath shewed to others of my condition, and the hopes I have of your intercession, methinks I feel my spirits renewed again."[105] This is a surprising twist, but by appealing kindly to Cromwell, Penruddock helps his own image; rather than an angry rebel, like Vowell, he respects the Lord Protector's *de facto* power. With that the court withdrew, delaying sentencing for some days; but ultimately Penruddock was, of course, condemned. Penruddock's performance at the trial was typical of a royalist martyr: he challenged the court's legitimacy; he insisted that he was loyal to the King and therefore innocent of treason (by then a foolish defense unless one had resigned to martyrdom); he appealed to all present for sympathy to his cause; but he also was respectful, not angry. This was his self-characterization, but other reports did not suggest otherwise.

This pamphlet included a variety of texts, such as an exchange of letters between Penruddock and his wife, Arundel. Whether or not they are authentic, they present Penruddock to the reader as a martyr, receiving the loving consolation of his wife and in turn marching bravely toward the scaffold. The appeal to the natural sympathies of the

---

[103] Ibid, p. 5.
[104] Button, "Penruddock's Rising," p. 104.
[105] Ibid.

reader contributes to Penruddock's cause. The first letter, from Arundel and dated May 3, about two weeks before the execution but just a few days before the originally appointed date, both regrets that Penruddock will die but also accepts that his death is for a greater cause. Noting that she will always feel "those tender embraces" as the "faithfull testimonies of an indulgent husband," she still wishes, understandably, that he might remain with her in reality. For this reason, she writes, "I would with my own bloud cement your dead limbs to life again, and (with reverence) think it no sin to rob heaven a little while longer of a Martyr." This wording is an excellent commentary on the bonds of marriage in the seventeenth century, particularly in the model of a mutually loyal couple supporting a cause greater than themselves, quite similar to Christopher and Mary Love. Arundel Penruddock accepts that her husband is a worthy martyr, indeed that he will be in heaven when he dies, but wishes that God might make an exception for her sake. She denies that he will die soon, choosing instead to "sacrifice the prayers of a Christian, and the groans of an afflicted wife" as long as she can still "imagine [he] shall live." Once he is dead, she says that she will "wish my own dissolution with you, that so we may go hand in hand to heaven." And finally, as a postscript, she asks that he remember to send his blessing to their children, whom he leaves behind.[106] As in Mary Love's 1651 letters, the wife of a martyr believes in her husband but cautiously laments the circumstances that have brought her family to its present state. This strategy—and it is a strategy, as this pamphlet does far more than simply correct the record—makes the martyr appear more virtuous as a loving spouse and father. This lends an aura of virtue to his other actions, including raising arms against the Protectorate. A man who cares so much for his wife

---

[106] Ibid, p. 8.

and family that he would willingly give his life for them might care similarly for the good of his country. This is an alternative model of royalist masculinity, subtly different from the flamboyant cavalier or unrepentant highwayman.

In Penruddock's response to Arundel on the facing page, he treats his wife's letter as a welcome comfort to a dying man. All the lines of her letter, he writes, are "so many threads twisted together into that of my life"; they will now "make a fit remnant for my winding-sheet," clothing him for death.[107] Penruddock affirms that "the greatest conflict…in this extremitie, was my parting with thee"; but he does not fear death because "my Saviour hath so pulled out the sting thereof, that I hope to assault it without fear."[108] He is not so bold as to proclaim certainly that he is a martyr himself, but he says that he is being lifted up "under the conduct of my Sovereign, and an Army of Martyrs, that the gates of hell cannot prevail against."[109] Like other royalist martyrs, he is not raised by Christ alone; he is also assisted by the King and those before him who died for the truth. This communion of royalist saints becomes a chorus of the faithful, fearless in the sight of death because they know that their cause is just. Finally, Penruddock returns to personal notes, reminding Arundel of previous instructions he had given regarding their children and asking that she convey his gratitude to a number of friends and relations.[110] All told, these two letters contribute to Penruddock's construction as a public martyr by allowing the reader to meet his family on a personal level, witnessing the love of a married couple and perhaps recognizing them as normal people, faithful people, who serve Christ by leading virtuous lives, even if that means raising arms against the Lord

---

[107] Ibid, p. 9.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Ibid, p. 10.

Protector. But when perusing these letters, the reader can mostly ignore that unpleasantness, focusing on the image of family life. The actual defense of Penruddock's politics would come in his last speech, which appears immediately after the letters in this pamphlet.

That speech, as noted above, appeared in several media, and they all agree in content and are nearly identical in wording. We will continue to use the comprehensive pamphlet as the cited source, but it is important to remember that the text circulated in different contexts. Penruddock himself referred to this from the scaffold: "My Tryall was publick, and my severall examinations (I believe) will be produced when I am in my grave."[111] For this reason, he did not think it necessary to recount everything that had happened to him but rather chose to speak a few words about his cause, as befits an intentional martyr. First, while ascending the scaffold, he said, "This I hope will prove to be like Jacobs ladder; though the feet of it rest on earth, yet I doubt not but the top of it reacheth to Heaven."[112] This is a trope we have seen before; the ladder to the gallows or the block was not an ascent to mockery or shame but rather to God. He then thanked the Lord Protector for permitting him to be beheaded, which alludes to his statements about Cromwell's *de facto* power at the end of his trial.[113] In the same vein, he asks the sheriff to convey his request that the Lord Protector show mercy toward his family, which ultimately did happen: a portion of his estate was returned afterwards to Arundel Penruddock.[114] This was despite his insistence moments later that he was "not ashamed

---

[111] Ibid, p. 12; This could mean that he knew his friend would publish the trial account on his behalf, or simply that trial accounts were almost always published.
[112] Ibid, p. 11.
[113] Ibid, p. 13.
[114] Ibid, p. 14.

of the cause for which I die, but rather rejoyce that I am thought worthy to suffer in the defence and cause of Gods true Church, my lawfull King, the liberty of the Subject and Priviledge of Parliaments." For this reason he begs his family not to be ashamed, for his death "is so far from pulling down my Family, that I look upon it as the raising it one story higher."[115] He takes care twice to ensure that no one would presume that he was too happy to die, noting that he had worked to save his life but only as far as was possible without violating his conscience. During the first part of the speech, before he pauses in prayer, he says that he was not "so prodigall of nature as to throw away my life" but still had used "honourable and honest means to preserve it."[116] Later, as he prepares to kneel at the block, he admits, "I suppose I might, by a lie, have saved my life: which I scorn to purchase at such a rate."[117] By remaining faithful to his principles even if it costs him his life, Penruddock makes himself a martyr. Finally, he remarks on the arbitrary rule of the present regime: "Treason is what they please, and lighteth upon whom they will…I know not to what end it may come, but I pray God my own, and my Brothers bloud that is now to die with me, may be the last upon this score."[118] Referring to himself and Hugh Grove, Penruddock prays that no more blood will pour out for England and that monarchy and just rule of law will be restored soon. As a martyr, his death will contribute to that cause, so none should be ashamed of him.

Penruddock's scaffold performance is recounted in rich detail here, more than usual for these pamphlets. It was normal to provide the text of the speech with some practical details. But this pamphlet follows each action like stage directions, linking his

---

[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid, p. 16.
[118] Ibid, p. 14.

words to certain gestures, starting with the aforementioned ascent up the ladder. Martyrological words accompany martyrological actions, right down to the removal of his outer clothes, which is inevitably compared to the Crucifixion. After proclaiming that he has elevated his own family by dying as a martyr, he begins to undress, saying "I am now stripping off my cloaths to fight a duell with death, (I conceive no other duell lawfull) but my Saviour hath pulled out the sting of this mine enemy, by making himself a sacrifice for me."[119] This recalls, implicitly, the stripping of Christ's garments at the Crucifixion. It also minimizes his suffering because Christ has already suffered for Penruddock: whatever pain he endures is linked to that of his savior. The royalist cause, seeking as it did to liberate England from its oppressors, was essentially a defense of the lives of all Englishmen. After praying aloud for the English people and especially the King, he again refers to his clothing: "As I have now put off these garments of cloth, so I hope I have put off my garments of sinne, and have put on the Robes of Christs Righteousnesse here, which will bring me to the enjoyment of his glorious Robes anon."[120] The point is the same, though the imagery is slightly different. His worldly clothes are linked to worldly sin, each of which are now to be replaced by the white robes of the Christian, like the newly baptized, or possibly those beheaded souls in Revelation 20:4. After this, he kneels, prays silently, and rises to kiss the axe. This, too, was a common gesture, and like Gerard and others, he comments on it: "I am like to have a sharp passage of it, but my Saviour hath sweetned it unto me."[121] According to the account, he gave the usual sign with his hand and was beheaded with one blow. This

---

[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid, p. 15.
[121] Ibid, p. 16.

alone, of course, was not enough for Penruddock to be remembered as a martyr. He behaved appropriately and said that he was dying for his belief in and support of the royal cause. He made sure that witnesses would know by his actions as much as his words that he lived and died for something greater than himself.

Penruddock's rising brought several other men to the block, but none gained his level of fame. This is significant, as it illustrates how in practice a martyr's cause was sustained by the living. For example, three men were hanged during the first week of May for involvement in the rebellion, along with a witch. Many others were later transported to the Caribbean. Yet only Penruddock and Hugh Grove appear in any royalist martyrology after 1660. The other men's existence demonstrates how far-reaching Penruddock's instructions to fellow prisoners were meant to be, but they are little more than a statistic in the historical record. John Kensey, a surgeon, proclaimed himself worthy of death but not for this cause, which was not even royalism as such but rather charitably treating the wounded. John Toorp seemed regretful as he prayed from the gallows. John Woodward was silent. All three were hanged for their involvement in the plot, but whatever else they said or did, it was not considered worth mentioning in the newsbooks, and their stories are mostly lost.[122]

By contrast with these three, the terse but devoted Hugh Grove was executed with Penruddock, and the association ensured that his name would be well-known. Grove was a leader of the rebellion but was less important than Penruddock among the local gentry.

---

[122] *Perfect Proceedings of State Affaires*, May 3-10, pp. 4652-3. As usual, publication history matters, and that Robert Ibbitson published this newspaper would explain why it was at best neutral and at worst blatantly negative towards the condemned men. Their lack of mention in later royalist publications could mean that they were not as valuable or committed to the cause as the rebellion's leaders; but it could also mean that they either failed to find an audience or were denied one, thereby consigning them to oblivion.

Grove's speech was short—he even began by saying, "I never was guilty of much Rhetorick, nor ever loved long Speeches in all my life, and therefore you cannot expect either of them from me now at my death." In it he reasserted his loyalty to the Crown and the traditional Church of England.[123] Even though Grove was more significant in the uprising than some, he makes little effort to tell his own story. It was his association with Penruddock on the scaffold rather than in the rebellion that gained him notoriety. As a result, Hugh Grove joined Penruddock as the only widely-known "martyrs" produced by this engagement, with the humble Grove riding Penruddock's reputation by chance. Once again, a case for martyrdom had to be constructed piece by piece.[124]

IV

The last potential royalist martyrs of the Interregnum proved to be the greatest martyrological sensation since Christopher Love, and perhaps not by accident they included a popular minister, this time an Anglican, demonstrating how a preexisting reputation can do at least as much for a martyr's cause as his immediate performance at the scaffold. Sir Henry Slingsby and Dr. John Hewitt were subject to a high-profile trial in London in the summer of 1658, at which Hewitt infamously refused to enter a plea, instantly condemning himself to the block. As martyrs, Hewitt was better known than Slingsby, though the two were usually mentioned together since they went to the block on the same day for the same conspiracy. Hewitt had been a popular Anglican minister throughout the Interregnum, preaching at St. Gregory's next to St. Paul's Cathedral. John

---

[123] *The Trial of the honourable Colonel John Penruddock*, p. 17.

[124] Heath called Grove "a somewhat antient and very grave man" and noted that "as he said little at the Bar, so he said less at the Block, but piously and fervently recommended his Soul to God"; *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, p. 402.

Evelyn frequently mentioned him in his diary, noting on several occasions that he received Communion from Hewitt's hand. Hewitt styled himself as a martyr for his faith with little reference to the King as such, but his deeply religious last speech was balanced by a discourse at his trial on English liberty. Slingsby provided a more overtly political performance at the scaffold, but this was coupled with a posthumously published collection of advice to his children, which included fatherly instructions on how to live as a good Christian. Each, therefore, styled themselves as martyrs for their royalism and their faith.

As the last men to be made into martyrs by the Protectorate, these two provide the final blood arguments of the Interregnum in favor of Restoration, a Restoration which they could not have guessed would follow in just two years. They were not the cause of the Restoration, which was instead the result of a wide variety of political forces, not least of which was the succession of the hapless Richard Cromwell to the Protectorate. But the impressive last performances of these two men following a disorganized plot serve as a fitting conclusion to the ill-fated royalist movement of the 1650s. The Restoration was not their doing, but they would soon be upheld as models of how to follow the King. Furthermore they attracted strong support in print as the mechanism of censorship began to disintegrate, making Slingsby and Hewitt excellent examples of "contested martyrs." Most importantly, they would be fresh in the memories of commentators in 1660-61, when the royalist revenge against not only Charles I's killers but also all who had condemned his supporters during the Interregnum would begin.

Several accounts of the trials of Slingsby, Hewitt, and the acquitted John Mordaunt went to press, including a description of the conspiracy, published before the

trials; a short anti-royalist pamphlet about the trials; and two extended, more neutral, accounts of the trials. The texts in these two were otherwise identical and would ultimately be subdivided and used in full as the source for *State Trials*, which will be used in lieu of the contemporary printing for citation ease. This text circulated in two distinct editions, demonstrating how important the 1658 conspiracy trials were in the public sphere. A number of specific defenses of the two also circulated, mostly in 1659, after Cromwell's death. The two men's last speeches were also printed in various editions by themselves, in addition to appearing within the trial narratives. Finally, between 1658 and 1659 a number of Hewitt's sermons were printed, sometimes as collections of his work and sometimes with other Anglican sermons. These ensured that Hewitt remained current in the public imagination. Since he was a well-known minister throughout the 1650s, his execution was a public spectacle, well-attended and widely discussed. Hewitt used Tower Hill as well as he had used the pulpit of St. Gregory's Church.

Before the trials, propaganda against the plotters circulated in London, encouraging readers to support the Lord Protector. One pamphlet lists all those to be tried on the frontispiece and proclaims that they would have "destroyed and burned the city" had they not been stopped by the "gallant mustring" of the trained bands.[125] This pamphlet, printed in blackletter (unusual for most political publications besides ballads in this period) by Thomas Vere and William Gilbertson, is a rallying cry for support, warning that if the persistent radical royalist threat is not stopped here, war will return. To make matters worse, it warns that Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and Fifth Monarchists

---

[125] *The Horrible and Bloody Conspiracy Undertaken by many Desperate Persons*, 1658, frontispiece.

are banding together as a second threat.[126] Therefore all dissent must be quashed, and these rebels must be made examples to any potential insurrectionist. Of the royalists themselves, they "have both professed and protested that they still doe and will adhere to the glorious Cause," and in achieving it they will "adventure their lives and fortunes" at whatever cost to have "the very wishes of their hearts fulfilled."[127] The point is that they are willing to become martyrs if it will serve their broad aims. The author of the pamphlet either believes or wishes others to believe that the royalist threat has not subsided. If anything it has grown more severe, in large part because the royalists have sustained their beliefs "by continuing true and faithfull to his Highnesse," who has ultimately preserved the cause through his own "prudence and valour" and even "piety."[128] The faith of a willing martyr is difficult to stop, even if it is directed toward the wrong cause. Indeed, the pamphleteer notes in his conclusion that God's providence has allowed them to discover all of the rebellions that have plagued England since 1649.[129] This pre-trial pamphlet stresses the urgency and importance of what will transpire at the High Court of Justice in the coming weeks. It exploits the fear of catastrophic war and reminds readers that royalists have been willing to become martyrs since the Regicide and are therefore stronger than their numbers alone would suggest.

The trial accounts were more straightforward, though the shorter narrative, printed for John Andrews, still opened by referring to the long history of anti-Protestant actions, beginning with the Spanish Armada. These events, the pamphleteer writes, "ought never to be forgotten," but "our own eyes will produce Examples enough," including Miles

---

[126] Ibid, pp. 8-9.
[127] Ibid, p. 6.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid, p. 10.

Sindercombe, the would-be Fifth Monarchist assassin of 1657, who despite plotting to murder the Lord Protector was at least not so bad as to bring back Charles Stuart.[130] Slingsby and Hewitt ought "to be pitied for their folly, in ruining themselves."[131] On occasion, the pamphleteer mocks the condemned men, especially Slingsby, who had defended himself as speaking of rebellion "in jeast…but it is not good jeasting with Edge-tooles."[132] That said, the writer is kind toward Hewitt regarding his execution, where he "carried himself with much courage and resolution," a description offered without qualification. The longer account would go into greater detail, and with greater neutrality; but this shorter pamphlet would have been easier to obtain and served an understated propagandist purpose.

The more extensive account of the trials and executions listed no publisher and avoided both the pathos and the warnings of *A Brief Relation*, which, along with its detail, would explain why it was selected for *State Trials*.[133] It deals with each in turn, as the trials themselves did; but the three were tried the same day, and except for Mordaunt, who was acquitted on the tiebreaking vote of Lord President Lisle, they would have all been executed the same day as well.[134] Sir Henry Slingsby, a longtime royalist officer, opened with the usual tactic: he refused to plead. He said, "I am, my lord, of an opinion

---

[130] *A Brief relation of the proceedings of the High Court of Justice, against Sir Henry Slingsby And Doctor John Hewet*, 1658, pp. 2-3.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid, p. 4.
[133] These are *The Severall Tryals of Sir Henry Slingsby Kt. John Hewit D.D. and John Mordant Esq; for High Treason in Westminster-Hall* and *The Tryals of Sir Henry Slingsby Kt. And John Hewet D.D. for High Treason in Westminster-Hall*, 1658, similar besides the omission of Mordaunt, who seems to have been omitted because he was acquitted and therefore less sensational. He was rarely mentioned in royalist martyrologies after 1660. The longer text is identical to those provided in *State Trials*, which is used here for convenience of citation.
[134] *State Trials*, 5.910.

(though you account it a paradox), that I cannot trespass against your laws, because I did not submit to them."[135] Though the argument was tenuous, he claimed that as a former member of the Commons he could not submit because he had been in prison when Parliament passed the relevant laws. This argument failed, and eventually Slingsby switched to a new tactic: he discounted the significance of his own actions, even while admitting that he had indeed spoken to others about a conspiracy. Regarding accusations that he had promised to pay men in exchange for horses for the King, Slingsby said, "This which is here spoken in seriousness, was then spoken in mirth, a mere discourse, as those that are in good fellowship may have, and what I said or did was but in jest." Even if Slingsby argued this in good faith, it is no surprise that Lord President Lisle replied, "There ought to be no good fellowship in Treason."[136] Even so, this would be the core of Slingsby's defense. In response to the witnesses, he reiterated, "I see that I am trepanned by these two fellows: They have said that seriously against me, which was spoken in mirth between us."[137] This gained him little, and may have had the unintended effect of making him appear foolish. Attorney General Prideaux, still prosecuting royalists, certainly framed the defense that way, admitting in his closing arguments that he could only "pity those gentlemen that are thus drawn into designs which I am confident will never take…for their seducers bring them to the gallows, and then laugh at them."[138]

---

[135] Ibid, 5.876.
[136] Ibid, 5.879.
[137] Ibid, 5.881.
[138] Ibid, 5.882. It should be noted that the alleged raising of horses on behalf of the exiled king was ample cause to attract the attention of the authorities, even in the provinces. For example, in depositions sworn on 30 May 1657, one Robert Anderson alleged that Matthew Vasey had promised him that "if hee would give that horse to King Charles (as hee did call him) itt would be five hundred pounds in this Informants way." Vasey also was said to have promised that each man would "bee a captaine, and that hee could have men enough under him." Vasey denied everything except that he did notice the merits of Anderson's horse; but

Unlike the pamphleteers discussed above, Prideaux actually belittled the plot, stressing that there was little chance of it ever succeeding; but it was still treason.

John Hewitt's behavior was even more irritating to his judges than Slingsby's "jest" defense. The court was at first patient with him, possibly because of his age; but after he failed to comply with repeated demands that he enter a plea, the court dismissed him. He was able to speak at some length in his own defense, however, and situated his legal position not on religious grounds but rather according to his native born rights. He said:

> "I am so highly sensible of the privileges of an Englishman, that both for the satisfaction of my own conscience, and all persons, I would not willingly give up the liberties and privileges of any English freeman to any body that demands it; I am very loth that there should be any just imputation laid upon me, that I should seek a disturbance in point of self-interest, to divide myself from the communion of those that are my fellow-freemen."

Lisle replied to this with a new interpretation of commonwealth: "You speak of common friendship; what is common friendship, but to be a friend to the public government?"[139] This exchange is the heart of Hewitt's defense, such as it was; he had a text prepared but was prevented from using it. Ultimately Hewitt believed that the trial required him to surrender his rights as an Englishman, but Lisle found that his understanding of "communion" with his fellow subjects required him to submit to the government. For disputing this, Hewitt's trial was cut short. Slingsby wrote of his regret that Hewitt did not accept the terms of the trial, but he also defended the minister as "conscientious in all

---

he was apparently sent to jail, according to a later emendation to the original deposition; ASSI 45/5/4 ff. 50-52.

[139] *State Trials*, 5.889.

his actions" to the point that he could not, in good conscience, do otherwise.[140] It is interesting that Hewitt framed his case around English rights rather than discussing his religious attachment to the Crown. He attempted to demonstrate to the court that the new regime had abandoned basic principles of English government and Common Law. Throughout his "Plea and Demurrer," which was printed separately in a pamphlet by William Prynne and also reproduced in *State Trials*, Hewitt argued that the state had developed an unfortunate habit of executing men for political reasons without clear cause. In doing so, he placed himself in the same line with Strafford and Laud, but not by themselves; they were simply part of a history of abuses dating back centuries.[141] As we will see below, however, Hewitt's final defense of himself on the scaffold would be theological.

The trials concluded with a general speech by Lisle to all of the prisoners, which was published within the extended trial account. In it, the Lord President explained the threat, religious and political, posed by royalists, domestic and abroad. This speech, framed as a rebuttal of the entire plot, undercut any attempts to turn these men into martyrs. He was respectful of Slingsby, who had once served in the House of Commons, saying, "When I consider your person; and that such a person as you are, should be instrumental in so detestable a Conspiracy…methinks you are one of the saddest Spectacles that ever I beheld."[142] This is no exoneration, but Lisle appears saddened that a previously respectable if erring subject, now considerably older than when he had first

---

[140] *A Father's Legacy. Sir Henry Slingsbey's Instructions to his Sonnes, Written a little before his Death*, 1658, p. 86.
[141] Published as *Beheaded Dr. John Hewytts Ghost Pleading, yea crying for Exemplarie Justice,* 1659; reprinted in *State Trials*, 5.903.
[142] Ibid, 5.925.

fought in the Civil Wars, would engage himself in an active rebellion against an apparently peaceful state. He compares the situation to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart in the Book of Exodus, implying that God's own signs had warned the Royalists not to oppose his chosen people: "You cannot chuse but see that the Lord fights against you, that the stars in their courses fight against you; and yet you will not see you will not confess, until destruction overtakes you."[143] The problem is even bigger than Slingsby realizes, Lisle argues, since "Charles Stuart is in confederacy with Spain…that great popish interest. Is it imaginable that an Englishman, that a protestant should assist such a confederacy?"[144] Supporting the royalist cause allied oneself with Roman Catholic states on the Continent as well as Catholic factions within England. As for Slingsby's "jest" defense, Lisle protests, "What if those Jesuited Papists that would have blown up the Parliament House upon the 5th of November, with barrels of gunpowder, had said that they had brought in those barrels in jest; what would you have thought of it?"[145] Lisle intended to connect Slingsby's rebellion with all those that had attacked the English state, most of which had been the result of some Catholic interest. In this case, since the Stuart connection to Spain has already been established, then it naturally follows that this is part of an extended struggle. Lisle's words are consistent with the pre-trial pamphlets, which had linked this rebellion to the Spanish Armada in 1588, likely as a reminder of Cromwell's Anglo-Spanish War.

After this, Lisle turned to Hewitt but admitted that he hardly knew what to say, since he was accustomed to addressing ministers "as a child speaks to his father" rather

---

[143] Ibid, 5.926.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid, 5.927.

than "as a judge speaks to a traitor."[146] With that he concluded, offering to pray for them as they went to Tyburn to be drawn and quartered—but ultimately Cromwell would again offer a show of mercy by having them beheaded at the Tower, a far more respectable punishment in the hierarchy of treason executions.[147] Lisle's speech was typical in that it stressed the serious danger posed by the royalist cause, but not all were as passionate as his. His brief address to Hewitt suggests how ministers of all stripes were seen at this point, lamenting that a man of God would turn on his country and, by extension, God himself. Hewitt felt the same way about his persecutors. In rejecting kingship nine years before, they had turned on God too.

The last speeches of Slingsby and Hewitt were published in a variety of pamphlets, including the standard trial account, which we will continue to use as the primary source. However, it is important to remember that it appeared in these other contexts, sometimes as a final chapter to a general narrative of the trials, sometimes as a single copy of a speech, and sometimes within defenses of the two men.[148] This applied more to Hewitt than Slingsby, though Slingsby would be remembered in a different kind of last word through his posthumously published fatherly advice to his son. In the longer pamphlets the two men's speeches were printed together, representing how they appeared on the scaffold at Tower Hill, with Slingsby first and Hewitt shortly after. Hewitt's sermonizing speech was published by itself, too, but Slingsby's brief performance would not have filled a pamphlet by itself.

---

[146] Ibid, 5.928.
[147] Ibid, 5.929.
[148] The key examples are *The true and exact Speech and Prayer of Doctor John Hewyit upon the Scaffold on Tower-hill*, 1658; *The Speech and Deportment of John Hewit D.D.*, 1658; and *Murther Revealed*, 1659, which will be discussed separately below.

According to these accounts, Slingsby spoke briefly and quietly, mostly addressing the sheriff rather than the crowd: "He discovered little sense of sorrow, or fear of death; but said: 'He was ready to submit,' or words to like purpose."[149] Other than this, the account provides few details. He knelt at the block; he prayed privately; he gave a sign; and the executioner fulfilled his task with one blow. This did little to promote Slingsby as a martyr. Combined with his trial performance, so focused on minimizing the scope of his actions, he did not appear as stalwart or pious as other potential martyrs, though he still earned the title in royalist literature, aided in particular by an unusual book published after his death, purportedly written by Slingsby in prison and printed by J. Grismond under the title *A Father's Legacy*. The book offered no preface by the publisher, noting only that it was written not long before Slingsby's execution. In effect it served as a substitute for his last speech, redeeming his posthumous reputation after a trial most noted by a badly managed defense. There is an unanswered question of origin here, and another of readership: while there is no reason to doubt that Slingsby wrote the book, it is unprovable that he did; and furthermore, it is unclear whether it was Slingsby's intention to have it published. Either he or Grismond must have wished non-family readers to gain from Slingsby's "legacy," which turns his fatherly advice into general suggestions for all of England. Indeed, Slingsby's book made a specific argument against the Protectorate, urging his readers, whatever their relation, to remain faithful to the royalist cause, even if it risked persecution or death.

---

[149] *State Trials*, 5.929.

Styled in the long tradition of a father's advice to his son, Slingsby's book combines basic advice with comments on justice and the meaning of his own death.[150] Slingsby writes that he wishes that his son will appreciate it, because

> Our last expressions usually retain the deepest impression; especially, being uttered by a tongue whose relation did highly indear us; and whose words are the very last he shall speak upon the earth: being within few houres to pay his debt to Nature: and stand at that Barre, and appear before that High Court of Justice, from whence no Appeal will be admitted.[151]

As usual, the last words of a dying man carry special significance, especially when they are directly conveyed by a father to a son. Slingsby compares his death to his trial, noting that he will now face his final judgment, which perhaps will go better than his earthly one. He is thankful for the experience of prison because it has provided him with an unrequested but beneficial opportunity to reflect. Like Christopher Love, whose unexpectedly extended imprisonment offered him the opportunity to explain himself in excessive detail, Slingsby discusses the meditative qualities of confinement:

> During my late privacy, occasioned by my captivity, store of vacant houres were reserved for me; the expence whereof conduced more highly to my inward benefit and advantage, then all my fore-past liberty. For before I knew not what it was to wrestle with my self, till restraint (an useful, though unwelcome Messenger) brought me to a due and exact consideration of my self; and the present condition whereto I was reduced.[152]

Imprisonment was beneficial for Slingsby in ways he did not anticipate. While this is not as strong a statement as proclaiming himself a martyr at the scaffold, or even as strong as,

---

[150] Contemporary "fatherly advice" books included Sir Walter Raleigh's *Instructions to his Son*, republished within his *Maxims of State* in 1656; Francis Osborne's *Advice to a son; or, Directions for your better conduct*, 1655; Henry Delaune's *Patrokon Doron, or, A Legacy to his Sons*, 1657; and of course James I's *Basilikon Doron*, first published in 1599 but reprinted throughout his reign. Hugh Peters wrote a similar book in 1660; see chapter 5.
[151] Slingsby, *A Father's Legacy,* pp. 6-7.
[152] Ibid, pp. 10-11.

alternatively, a full confession and heartfelt repentance, it does serve to improve his reputation in 1658 as a sincere royalist, not a malicious traitor. Slingsby, whom Winstanley would describe as "seldom out of trouble during all the time of Rebellion," appears to have had few calm moments during the previous two decades; prison provided many.[153] The most important result of this time, he writes, was his "tender reflexion upon your young and unexperienced condition," which prompted him to pen this "legacy."[154] Death would soon deprive him of the opportunity to guide his family so explicitly.

Later in the book, when he turns to actual advice, it becomes clear that his views on the royalist cause have not changed during his reflective confinement. He instructs his sons, and possibly other readers, to "submit your selves to your Superiours in all lawful things. It is an undispensable injunction: and ought by persons of each distinct quality, when they are conscientiously thereto obliged, to be religiously observed."[155] The choices of words are significant: superiors deserve submission in "lawful things" when the submitter is "conscientiously obliged." Therefore one whose conscience forbids submission, such as a stalwart royalist, could legitimately refuse to submit to some superior. Similarly, submission is not required to something that is unlawful, which could refer to the entire Protectorate. Sure enough, in his discussion of several "motives" he urges his sons to be true to their own consciences.[156] He warns them that in doing so there will be worthwhile struggles, helping them to attain eternal glory. Here the language becomes distinctly martyrological: "We cannot share in a Crown, if we have no part in the Cross. And blessed be his Name that has armed my weakness with this resolution:

---

[153] Winstanley, *The Loyall Martyrology*, p. 38.
[154] Slingsby, *A Father's Legacy*, pp. 11-12.
[155] Ibid, pp. 24-25.
[156] Ibid pp. 28-29.

preparing in me a mind no less ready to bear, then Justice was to inflict: my actions by Gods assistance shall in this approaching hour of my suffering express it."[157] The heavenly crown may allude to *Eikon Basilike*. To serve the cause more effectively and live as good Christians, his sons should "make devout books your discreet Consorts," as they "will beget in you a contempt of that (the World I mean) which detracts most from the excellency of man."[158] Worldly pursuits encompass more than supporting the illegitimate Protectorate over the divinely-instituted monarchy, but in the context of the book this implies that rejecting what diminishes "the excellency of man" will require one to embrace what augments it, namely, the Crown and the Cross. Finally, he encourages his sons to remember that they too will die one day, possibly for the same cause that now claims his life; they should not grieve too much for him, because "after a troublesome voyage encountred with many cross winds and adverse billows, I am now arriving in a safe Harbor: and I hope without touch of dishonour." His own strategy, he says, had been to make "my Coffin my Companion; that I might looke Death in the face, whensoever it should assault me."[159] If this is kept in mind, he argues, one will live better each day. This *memento mori* makes sense in a book of fatherly advice; but the context suggests that they should remember that in fighting for the good, they may also die for the good.

At this point, the text shifts to include a number of other documents, including some apparently late advice offered after his sentencing and a letter written from prison shortly before his execution. Their inclusion is clearly the work of the publisher. This section includes a warning that "there is nothing…more incurable, then what is habituate:

---

[157] Ibid, p. 38.
[158] Ibid, p. 46.
[159] Ibid, pp. 55-56.

when custome of sin takes away all sense of sin."[160] This too is broad advice; but given the context of Slingsby's last days, sin implies the betrayal of truth. Through habit one might convince oneself that, perhaps, the Protectorate is an acceptable form of government. Instead it is better to "make every day of your life a promising passage to your native Countrey," treating each moment as an opportunity to serve the virtuous advancement of the common good.[161] He reminds them to "Value Earth as it is; that when you shall pass from Earth, you may enjoy what Earth cannot afford you," meaning eternal salvation and the fullness of God's joy.[162] In the letter to a friend that follows, Slingsby protests that those who testified against him offered convincing but false evidence in such a way that he could do nothing to defend himself. As a result, he writes, "The onely Guard, then, that I stood upon, was Silence and Patience."[163] This may explain why he said so little at the scaffold: a long speech would not have convinced anyone, so it was better to face punishment bravely but tersely. Finally, an epitaph is provided of uncertain origin, which includes the following lines:

> The Hatchet acted what the Court decreed,
> Who would not for his HEAD lay down his head?
> Branches have their dependence on the Vine,
> And Subjects on their Princes, so had mine […]
> Thus sa'd I, thus I dy'd; my Faith the Wing,
> That mounts my Kingly zeal to th' Highest King.[164]

The writer of these lines makes a basic royalist martyrological argument. Slingsby has offered his own head to defend that of the King, or alternatively, offered himself as a

---

[160] Ibid, p. 67.
[161] Ibid.
[162] Ibid, p. 79.
[163] Ibid, p. 88.
[164] Ibid, pp. 95-6.

branch to ensure that the trunk will not fall. It is not merely for monarchy's sake, however, that he does this. His faith is the "wing" that carries his "Kingly zeal" to the "Highest King," presumably Christ. This is the essence of royalist martyrdom. Following such a long series of advice on how to live, it is now clear that Slingsby saw himself—or at least presented himself—as earnestly loyal to the King and the idea of kingship, and justified this belief through his faith. This book sought to ensure that Slingsby would be remembered not as a violent man who would incite war and the destruction of London, but simply as a good soldier, a good father, and a good servant of God who did not even protest his own execution because it would achieve nothing. It was better to walk forward quietly with his head held high, as the epitaph explained:

My Silence in Reply imply'd no guilt,
Words not believ'd resemble Water spilt
Upon the parched surface of the floor,
No sooner dropt, then heat dryes up the showre.
To plead for life where ears are prepossest,
Sounds but like airy Eccho's at the best.[165]

Slingsby's death, then, was calm and stately and notable for his brief performance; but his book's publication transforms its interpretation, as it potentially serves as instruction to a broader readership than one man's family.

Hewitt, meanwhile, was on the scaffold for two hours, according to some sources, interspersing his speech with prayers and speaking largely about the importance of defending true Christianity in England.[166] While this is different from Slingsby's performance, it should not be seen as undercutting the message of the laconic soldier. Hewitt's profession required both words and prayers. He prayed privately for perhaps

---

[165] Ibid, pp. 94-95.
[166] *A Brief relation of the proceedings*, p. 10.

fifteen minutes before turning to the crowd to deliver his speech.[167] As befits a member of the Anglican clergy who had spent a long life in his church's service, Hewitt's speech was not unlike a sermon. It was clear that he saw himself as a martyr and wished others to see him in this way, too, but not for his own benefit. Rather he encouraged them to recognize the truth in what he said and thereby to embrace the suppressed Church of England once again. He proclaimed that he was "a public spectacle to men and angels" and that he wished for God's mercy, since he had "come to that end that his own Son came into the world for, to bear witness to the truth; he himself said, 'For this end was I born, for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth.'"[168] Hewitt situates himself as an imitator of Christ, bearing witness to the truth through his own death. His very purpose in life was the defense of that truth, even if it meant that he would die: "I came into the world to die more immediately for the testimony of Jesus, which God hath now called me to."[169] In this sense he is more appropriately compared to John the Baptist or Paul. Either way, he died a martyr in God's service; but that service extended to Hewitt's and all Englishmen's relationships with the state. He proclaimed that living as a Christian required a certain type of government that protected the rights of its subjects. Hewitt linked Christian suffering to liberty:

> I am here beheld by those that plead for their liberties, and I hope I am pitied, because I here give up myself willingly and freely to be a state-martyr for the public good; and I had rather die many deaths myself, than betray my fellow-freemen to so many inconveniences that they might be like to suffer by being subject to the wills of them that willed me to this death.[170]

---

[167] *State Trials*, 5.930.
[168] Ibid; cf., again, 1 Corinthians 4:9.
[169] *State Trials*, 5.930.
[170] Ibid.

In a fascinating turn, Hewitt announced that he was a martyr, but not just a martyr for Christ, though his previous words make it clear that he thought he was one. He was a "state-martyr for the public good," dying for the rights and liberties of the English subject just as much as for the teachings of Christ—just like Charles I, even the pious minister was a religio-political martyr. Hewitt saw these as so closely intertwined that they could not be separated from one another. For this reason, later in the speech he turned to the universality of the Christian church, stressing that the Church of England is indeed one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. In supporting this settlement, and challenging some tenets of the radical reformation regarding "whether it was a church or no," Hewitt insisted that because of his catholicity, "I abhor all Sects, Schisms, Sedition and Tyranny in Religion."[171] In conclusion, he reiterated that as a Christian and as a clergyman he would "do as our Saviour himself did for his disciples: when he was to be taken from them, he blessed them, and ascended up to heaven."[172] Hewitt believed that he would shortly do the same. His execution proceeded after his final prayers without incident. His speech linked Christianity to English liberty. He said little of the King, other than denying that he had met with him in the Spanish Netherlands just a day after he was known to have preached at St. Gregory's. His speech was a passionate appeal to English sensibilities as well as a defense of his faith. As such, Hewitt fulfilled all the essential criteria of martyrdom, providing his apologists with a strong scaffold performance and ensuring that his reputation would add support to the royal cause. He undercut Lisle's assessment of the plot by avoiding reference to it besides a basic denial of conspiracy. The loudest characterization of Hewitt's death was Hewitt's own.

---

[171] Ibid, 5.932.
[172] Ibid, 5.933.

Hewitt's reputation as a royalist Anglican minister preceded him and contributed to his frequent appearance in print after his death, often through the publication of sermons from his long career. Hewitt announced from the scaffold that the Lord Protector "was pleased to tell me, I was like a flaming torch in the midst of a sheaf of corn: he meaning, I being a public preacher, was able to set the city on fire by sedition and combustions, and promoting designs."[173] He denied that he had exploited a bully pulpit, but by preaching traditional Church of England theology he had subverted the godly Church. John Evelyn referred to him frequently in his diary during the 1650s, adding martyrological comments later. For example, in 1653 he heard him preach at Greenwich and called him "that holy Martyr," undoubtedly a later addition.[174] Hewitt's friend and spiritual advisor on the scaffold, Dr. George Wild, would publish some of his sermons. Evelyn mentioned Wild just as often, noting once that at St. Gregory's on 30 December 1655 he "preached the funeral Sermon of Preaching" on the last day that the Anglican clergy would be able to preach or administer sacraments.[175] Despite the suppression of his ministry, Hewitt continued to preach in private settings, possibly including Exeter House near Fleet Street, which was raided on Christmas Day, 1657, by the Lord Protector's forces.[176] Evelyn noted that Hewitt had preached on 3 February 1656, "shewing through how many sad persecutions & dangers God still preserv'd his Church." Two weeks later, Evelyn received Communion from him.[177] Finally, Evelyn mentioned that Hewitt, a "holy Martyr" and "holy Man," was executed "without Law, Jury, or

---

[173] Ibid.
[174] *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer, 1955, vol. 3, p. 88.
[175] Ibid, p. 150.
[176] Ibid, pp. 203-4.
[177] Ibid, pp. 165-7.

Justice," noting that this was a "dangerous tretcherous time."[178] Evelyn is only one source, but his numerous references to sermons by Hewitt foreshadow their posthumous publication, sometimes individually and sometimes within collections of Anglican sermons and prayers. These started in August 1658 but were more widespread after 1659, when those in the various opposition camps were increasingly emboldened by the crumbling Protectorate.

While they were less specifically martyrological than Hewitt's last speech or the various hagiographies that we will consider shortly, these were meant to be read for their merits. They were printed alongside his fellow ministers' sermons, including several by Wild. They did not refer to his execution, and some of them were delivered months or years earlier; but each was printed for the spiritual benefit of readers. The inclusion of the prayers that he would say before his sermons kept him alive, in a sense, through these books. As a result, they are a form of martyrology, but not one that Hewitt's critics would necessarily have argued against. As we have seen, Lisle refused to address Hewitt directly in his closing remarks at the trial, preferring merely to acknowledge his great disappointment that a man of God would turn on the English nation. His actions as a minister were not openly challenged, even though we know that the traditional Church of England ministry found its services and sermons suppressed by the Protectorate.

One of these collections, published within a few months of his death but based on notes and summaries rather than Hewitt's autographs, includes a respectful engraving of Hewitt with a short epitaph that refers to his execution: "Unequall chance! that the same

---

[178] Ibid, pp. 214-6.

blow should give / An unripe death, yet make thee thus to live."[179] In other words, it is in his death that Hewitt truly lives, in the fullest sense. The preface notes, "The principal intent of our publishing these ensuing Sermons, is no other than Edification," since as they were previously "beneficiall to his Auditory, they may now prove no lesse successful to the intelligent Reader."[180] The purpose here is to share Hewitt's wisdom with as broad an audience as possible, not unlike the dissemination of an execution speech to share it with those who were not present. The writer then adds that it is a "pity the Works of so Famous and Eminent a Divine, should be raked up in the embers of Oblivion."[181] A second preface laments that the text, being based on notes by listeners, will fall short of hearing Hewitt's sermons in person, since they merely "give a dark representation of that glorious light, which continually, with unwearied beams did radiate the Souls of his faithful Auditory. They are but the shadows of a faithful life."[182] In a curious reference to the imperfections of reporting, the writer apologizes for any errors, since these transcriptions are "notes taken by the pen of a ready Writer, the swiftness of whose motion is able to overtake the most voluble tongue: yet thou canst not but know, that sometimes the smallest hair interposing it self will make a breach in the fullest sentence, thereby interrupting the perfect sense."[183] The point is that Hewitt's words are perfect, and any imperfection is the result of the copying, which inevitably diminishes the power of the saintly minister's preaching. The writer admits that he has put himself at risk in printing them, as he has already suffered "many calumnies" and the "reproach of

---

[179] *Nine Select Sermons Preached upon special occasions in the Parish Church of St. Gregories by St. Pauls*, 1658, printed for Henry Eversden and Thomas Rooks, frontispiece.
[180] Ibid, A3, p. 209 (pagination begins with 209 but is included irregularly during the prefaces).
[181] Ibid, A3-v.
[182] Ibid, pp. 213-14.
[183] Ibid, p. 216.

some malicious tongues" who seek to make Hewitt and the publisher "contemptible in the eyes of a deceived multitude."[184] But Hewitt's virtues must be shared with the public, whatever the cost to personal reputation. The content of the sermons in this book is fairly typical, addressing various points of theology and scripture, life and death. While the publisher intended them to be read for one's own benefit, presenting them in this fashion is also intended to revive Hewitt's reputation and ensure that his death appears grossly unjust when compared to such excellent preaching in life.

A second sermon collection specifically referred to this one, but not in praise, even though they were both meant to contribute to Hewitt's martyrological construction. The editors of this other book curiously lament that the *Nine Select Sermons* were not exact copies but rather reconstructions from private notes, which as we have seen the publishers Eversden and Rooks knew all too well; but Wild and John Barwick were concerned that somehow these would damge Hewitt's reputation and deprive his wife of income. Therefore in this book, the actual sermons were printed "not to add to the mass of any mans dolor or Internal Regret, for the violent death of the pious Author; but to prevent the fictitious Chimaera's of many crazy brains, that would shroud themselves under his name, induced to it by Avarice."[185] Those other sermons, it seems, were meant to exploit Hewitt's reputation to sell books. It is odd that there would be such concern for maintaining an authentic Hewitt brand, since each of these books enhances his reputation in the public. In the prefatory material, Wild was troubled that the other copy was printed without the consent of Mary Hewitt, who had suffered since her husband's death. In any

---

[184] Ibid, p. 215.
[185] *Repentance and Conversion, the Fabrick of Salvation: or, The Saints joy in Heaven, for the Sinners sorrow on Earth*, sig. B2.

case, these two collections demonstrate how important Hewitt's preaching was in his public reputation. His sermons also would be included in more generic collections, which cited a variety of ministers and covered a variety of subjects.[186] In those contexts, they did not directly serve his reputation but suggest instead that it had already been redeemed. As soon as 1659, it was no longer dangerous to print Hewitt's words.

Distinct from the sermons, the several published defenses of Hewitt's reputation began with a poem allegedly written by him in prison and given to a friend for dissemination. This is hard to verify, but the poem builds his cause as a martyr. The poem resembles a sermon in content, warning readers against embracing too eagerly the "vanities of this world" lest they make one excessively attached to temporal things. One is always dead, according to Hewitt, until he finds new life in Christ. Implying that his persecutors have forgotten this important component of the faith, he comments on his impending execution: "Lay not my blood unto their charge, but bless / This Land with Peace and lasting Happiness. / Welcome keen AXE thou dost no Coward try, / But cut'st my way unto Eternity."[187] This reinforces the message of Hewitt's long speech, but in a far more manageable context. Here in just a few lines on a single page, Hewitt forgives his persecutors like Stephen, asks for God's blessings upon England, and eagerly welcomes death because it will lead him to Christ in heaven. As a conclusion to what is

---

[186] For example, *Prayers of Intercession for their Use who Mourn in Secret, for the Publick Calamaties of this Nation*, 1659, which is undeniably royalist and ostensibly by Hewitt alone; and *Pulpit Sparks or Choice Forms of Prayers, By Several Reverend and Godly Divines Used by them, both before and after Sermon*, 1659, which includes many prayers by other ministers but is consistently Anglican in its scope, focusing on sacraments and including Hewitt's last prayer before his execution, which had been published with his scaffold speech.

[187] *Certain Considerations Against the Vanities of this World, and the Terrors of Death*, 1658, single sheet.

essentially a brief sermon about being mindful of the hereafter, the poem teaches the reader how to be a good Christian.

Other publications were expressly written or at least published by others. One, attributed to William Prynne, was mostly a copy of Hewitt's "Plea and Demurrer," which he had been prevented from reading at his trial. Published in March 1659, late in Richard Cromwell's brief reign, it emphasized the illegality of Hewitt's condemnation. Presumably Prynne published it to highlight flaws in the Protectorate's authority rather than to support Hewitt's theology as such.[188] Another, tellingly entitled *Murther Revealed* and published by a "true Englishman" in 1659, retold Hewitt's entire story with supporting documents, such as an elegy that had been published in the summer of 1658. The elegy was originally printed within a tombstone-shaped border, as was common for the genre. It comments not only on Hewitt's own merits but also on the controlling influences of the state. Warning the "muse" to be "wise" when reporting what happened to Hewitt, the author writes, "This Age has reaching Ears, and searching Eyes: / If thou offend'st, my Muse, be sure to borrow / The priviledge to charge it on thy sorrow."[189] In other words, lest the muse be punished for opposing the Protectorate, she should claim that death alone saddens her. The writer laments how society is crumbling under repeated bloodshed. England, described as a mother, "grieves, and hopes her griefs are understood,

---

[188] *Beheaded Dr. John Hewytts Ghost Pleading, yea crying for Exemplarie Justice against The Arbitrarie, Un-exampled Injustice of his late Judges and Executioners in the New High-Commission, or Court of Justice, sitting in Westminster Hall*, 1659; the "Plea and Demurrer" was also reproduced in *State Trials*, 5.895 ff. Prynne was not named on the frontispiece, but the text is attributed to him in the British Library catalogue and elsewhere. William Lamont's *Marginal Prynne* (London, 1963) makes no mention of this episode. More research on Prynne is necessary to determine why else he may have taken up Hewitt's cause.
[189] *An Elegie upon The most Pious and Eminent, Doctor John Hewitt*, 1658, single page, stanza III.

/ Her Children that suck'd Milk, may now suck Blood."[190] The subjects of the nation are now permitted to satisfy one another by killing each other. This demonstrates that "A Famine in Religion now grows near," which will lead to England's ruin if nothing is done to prevent it.[191] Hewitt is simply the latest just man to be destroyed by arbitrary power: "The senseless Ax, that nothing understood, / Cut off his Life, and dy'd it self in Blood."[192] Fortunately for Hewitt, he is "transplanted from this World below / Unto a glorious Mansion, in whose Quire / There is no fear of Plots, nor thoughts of Fire."[193] This, like Hewitt's poem, reinforces his scaffold message. He has gone to a better world, but this does not mean that things are going well on earth. His death demonstrates the necessity of ending religio-political bloodshed. The threat of "fire" remains for the living.

The anonymous author of *Murther Revealed* was an apologist for Hewitt's cause and a hagiographer of Hewitt himself. The text retells the story of his trial by reasserting Lisle's mistreatment of the minister. It too was published late in Richard Cromwell's tenure. The text provides a number of anecdotes that would only have been known by those with private interactions with Hewitt. In a meeting with a friend in prison, Hewitt, said, "I had this Meditation, my Lord and Master were made to carry his Crosse, and I the meanest of his Servants should be carryed to my Crosse."[194] This is a more personal reflection on dying in the imitation of Christ than anything proclaimed by Hewitt in his speech, which resembled a public sermon for listeners' benefit. Here Hewitt meditates on

---

[190] Ibid, stanza V.
[191] Ibid, stanza VI.
[192] Ibid, stanza VII.
[193] Ibid, stanza X.
[194] *Murther Revealed: Or, A Voyce from the Grave Faithfully Relating the Deplorable Death of Dr. John Hewit, Late of St. Gregories, London; with severall Queries propounded to the Consciences of his Bloody Tryers*, 1659, p. 4.

what his death means for his own soul, asking why his savior would have to carry his own cross. He laments that his own path is too easy since he has the help of friends and family (and since he would be brought in a cart to Tower Hill). Then, the afternoon before his execution, a woman walked into his chamber by mistake while he was meeting with friends, and "in a seeming mallincollinesse drew near him, and laid her hat at his Feet, saying, I can never be at quiet when the godly are to suffer."[195] This alludes, perhaps, to the women of Jerusalem meeting Christ on the road to Calvary, or Mary of Bethany's anointing of Christ's feet in John's gospel, or her listening to Jesus in Luke's gospel. In any case the martyr is imitating Christ. The account notes that Hewitt, by contrast with his protestations at trial, now "seemed so little to be moved at his Imprisonment, that as the walls confined his body, so meeknesse imprisoned his passions."[196] Hewitt is calm and prayerful, meditating on Christ as he prepares for death. The pamphlet includes a letter written to George Wild, assuring him that he forgives his persecutors and is "stedfastly resolved to sollicite termes of Reconciliation with them" if he were able to live.[197] At this point, however, he dies to preserve the lives of others, as his death in the service of a greater cause will foster a more Christian society. He explains, "I would give my life to save the soule of any of my Christian Brethren, and would be content to want some degrees of glory in Heaven, so that my very greatest Enemies might be so happy as to have some."[198] Therefore he dies for their sins. Once again, the martyr lives and dies in the imitation of Christ for the spiritual benefit of his fellow men.

---

[195] Ibid.
[196] Ibid.
[197] Ibid, p. 6; curiously, this letter interrupts the narrative of the execution.
[198] Ibid.

The book retells his execution drama with personal details that were not included in the accounts from 1658. Wild, for example, reminded Hewitt on the way to the scaffold that "he was goeing to solemnize a marriage, wherein he must look death in the face before he could come to the fruition and full injoyment of his Bride." To this, Hewitt "shewed such chearfullnesse to that work, that gave satisfaction to his friends," ensuring that they would recognize him as a martyr in his last minutes.[199] Marriage allusions were common for martyrs, as we have seen in Christopher Love's conversations with his wife. Upon the scaffold, when Hewitt saw the block, "he espyed some of the blood of his fellow-sufferer, and having a while fixt his eyes stedfastly on that object, with hands and eyes elevated" he gave himself to prayer.[200] Presumably the blood was Slingsby's, making this one of few accounts of one martyr observing the blood of another martyr so directly. Hewitt probably saw Slingsby's death as an opportunity for further reflection. This detail also reminded the reader that Hewitt was in a company of martyrs. From the viewpoint of Anglican royalism, each entered the communion of saints on that scaffold.

The remainder of *Murther Revealed* consists of the actual speech, which is identical to that in other pamphlets, and also Hewitt's audible prayers, which were omitted by them. The prayers, one before and one after the speech, were straightforward in content, thanking God for the sacrifice of Christ and asking for blessings for the people of England. Hewitt linked Christ's suffering to his own in the first prayer with another meditation, not unlike that reported earlier in the pamphlet: "What though I must drinke the bitter portion of a violent death, it is no more my God then my Redeemer tasted

---

[199] Ibid, p. 5.
[200] Ibid.

before me."[201] His sufferings cannot be too devastating because he is in good company with Christ. In the second prayer, which was Hewitt's last extended discourse before his execution, he prayed for an end to schism and heresy and that God would be merciful to the world, even though it has ignored his commands.[202] While this is presumably a heartfelt prayer, it also serves as a last reminder to witnesses to return to the Church of England and its monarchy. Hewitt's words at this point are complete, but the author closes the pamphlet with a series of general inquiries about the trial, each of which suggest that Hewitt's ordeal was a gross injustice. The final inquiry turns to Hewitt's death and ponders what its ultimate consequences for England will be. It asks:

> Whether ever any English Church-Man, preach'd and pray'd with more zeal and fervency of spirit, liv'd more conscienciously, or dy'd more undauntedly and resolutely, than Dr. Hewit? And if none exceeded him in any of these; Whether we may not expect Gods just vengeance on the Abettors and contrivers of the death of This Man so eminently accomplished for his Glory?[203]

This question is the capstone of the text. Hewitt is a martyr because he lived as a good Christian, according to a well-formed conscience. He was a prayerful man whose preaching led others to Christ. As a result, it can be expected that God will exact vengeance upon his persecutors. Possibly that will include a vindication of Hewitt's beliefs and teachings.

To grasp the underlying point of this, we should return to the titular proclamation that murder will be revealed. Hewitt's death is not a lawful execution but murder, an act of great injustice. But the text itself does not argue this point. Rather, it focuses on the small details of how he conversed with others during his imprisonment. In doing so, it

---

[201] Ibid, p. 7.
[202] Ibid, pp. 11-15.
[203] Ibid, p. 17.

presents him as a Christ-like figure, accepting his suffering with calm patience and filled with joy that he will soon meet Christ face to face. That it is "murder," and therefore martyrdom, is revealed by that joy. A traitor would have been violent, disrespectful, or unruly. This also modifies the impression that one could easily have derived from the standard account, in which Hewitt's behavior at trial is stubborn and frustrated. That is all omitted here, save for a brief discussion of unjust judges. Hewitt is a martyr because of his service of Christ; but the subtext is that to serve Christ, one must also serve the King. That essential argument remained consistent for royalists from 1649 to 1659. Circumstances and emphases may have shifted, but at the end of the Interregnum, the argument by royalist martyrs was as clear as ever. There had to be a Restoration if England were to have peace.

Each of the royalist martyrs from Derby to Hewitt made this case, whether they were soldiers, highwaymen, or ministers. They linked their political sufferings in some way to the tradition of suffering for Christ. The emphasis, however, had changed, partly because of the Protectorate's displays of mercy. Furthermore, where the royalist martyrs of the Commonwealth had frequently invoked the late king, alongside whom they had fought, those later in the decade were engaging with a new world, one in which a Lord Protector was the *de facto* authority. Aside from Hewitt and perhaps Vowell, they did not discount this fact and freely appealed to him for mercy, which he frequently granted. But if Charles I was mentioned less often as a man, he had become only increasingly important as a kind of philosopher of the union of church and state. Hewitt spoke about the Church broadly, but his characterization of its relationship to the Crown relied on his explanation of the rights of the "English freeman." Even if he was invoked less

frequently as his memory became less vivid, King Charles the Martyr was the grandfather of royalist martyrdom, embodying its complicated religio-political nature.

One might ask at this point, the end of the Interregnum, whether a definition of a "royalist martyr" is now possible. While there are key characteristics, the answer must be descriptive rather than prescriptive. As we have seen, and will continue to see develop in the Restoration revival of most of the men we have considered, there is significant variety among the types of men who would be remembered as martyrs. Not all, however, carried equal weight. James Hind was largely forgotten by his royalist companions. In his case, it seems, the complication presented by undeniable crimes made him less appealing when there were more clearly virtuous models to uphold. To be a martyr, dying in defense of the King or of kingship was, surprisingly, insufficient. One also had to embody virtue, and cavalier behavior required a balance of piety. Some might be carried upward by virtuous companions. Others might have made some missteps, like Hewitt's bungled defense; but a life of pious preaching and a death in devoted prayer would ensure that he, too, ranked high in royalist martyrologies. Charles I was the best and most obvious example, having erased his unpopularity in life with a stunningly competent self-presentation in his final hour. Underlying the memory of each of these cases was these men's usefulness in death. This does not detract from the genuine Christian belief that led to their being viewed as martyrs for Church and Crown. It does mean, however, that only those whose performances best served the royalist cause of restoration would be remembered after it was achieved. Judging from their performances, the martyrs knew this. They sought to preserve their own souls, but in so doing they were also advancing God's will on earth.

The ultimate dismantling of the Protectorate was not the result of anything the royalist martyrs did individually. If anything, Cromwell did an impressive job of providing mercy to those who sought it, at least within the context of a world in which public execution was the appropriate punishment for treason. Many sentences were commuted. Drawing and quartering remained an official punishment, but virtually everyone was spared it. Most traitors were beheaded, quickly—a dignified death. A few who failed to show respect, like Vowell, were hanged. Hind was too, but his crime was robbery, and hanging was expected. The Lord Protector returned portions of traitors' estates to their families on several occasions, most notably to John Penruddock's family. Cromwell knew that it was dangerous to create martyrs, so he avoided doing so wherever he could. For this reason, the Protectorate seemed peaceful to those in it, while rebels disrupted what had become the normal order.

However, this does not mean that Cromwell's strategy could survive without him. When a myriad of forces restored Charles II to his throne, his supporters had a ready list of names from which to build a new propaganda campaign. Soon these fallen men would be revived, restored to positions of glory, their sons granted titles, their wives granted houses. In this sense, Cromwell's martyrs were a greater threat to his authority after he was dead. At that point, the old royalist martyrs and the new martyrs for the "good old cause" would be employed like marionettes against one another, with Cromwell himself literally suspended, lifeless, from a string, and figuratively bludgeoned with the heads, bodies, words, and most importantly, memories, of those whom he had killed. With the replacement of one power for another, a new era of martyrdom was about to begin.

Chapter 4: "Rebels No Saints": Deconstructing and Reconstructing the "Good Old Cause"

From a statistical perspective, Charles II's restored monarchy was remarkably merciful toward those who had participated in what royalists were by then styling the "great rebellion." Many in England had been caught up in that rebellion passively. Many also fought actively for a misguided cause but by 1660 claimed to have seen their error. Not as many signed their names to the death warrant of King Charles I, and only some of these went to the gallows at Charing Cross, selected for its proximity to the holy ground of the Regicide. The Convention Parliament's Indemnity and Oblivion Act, passed in August 1660 and forgiving almost everyone who had fought for or otherwise supported the parliamentarian side in the civil wars, served as an essential tool of "restoration" as the returned monarchy would see it in those first months. The best path for England would be to move on, certainly not forgetting what had happened, but not obsessing over it in excessive revenge, either. This would serve the Crown by permitting it to appear to take the high road, in contrast with the allegedly bloodthirsty radicals of the 1650s. Most of the ten who were condemned, however, challenged this portrayal at their deaths and claimed to be martyrs for their "Good Old Cause." This chapter will explore how those ten men who were executed for their involvement in the Regicide styled themselves as martyrs in the public sphere according to the familiar formula, first through their behavior before and at their deaths and second through posthumous publications, assembled by supporters, in their defense. It will address both sides of the contest concurrently, because as we will see, the same basic texts were used by everyone; only the commentaries, not the accounts, differed. This will rely primarily on printed sources, supplemented

occasionally by the diary of escaped regicide Edmund Ludlow, who commented on the same publications from his continental exile.

Only ten men out of the twenty-nine who were tried in 1660 were executed in one bloody week that October, although others were imprisoned for the rest of their lives. The executions were conducted in a manner that witnesses would be sure to remember, both for the dramatic, spectacular performances of most of the men and the sheer volume of blood spilled at Charing Cross, which even caused the executioner to be sick late in the week. There were tensions in the initial efforts to establish a definitive narrative of the previous decade, which were evident in the diverse opinions on "payback" that will define this and the following chapters. As Tim Harris observes, "Restoration England was a society that desperately wanted to be able to forget its past, but which forever remained haunted by it."[1] This haunting was partly because so many had died for the Restoration, and some royalists held an understandable grudge; but Charles II attempted to invite his subjects back into the fold, rather than kill everyone who might have been hesitant to return.[2] Nevertheless, those who disapproved of the Restoration in principle maintained a dim view of both Charles II and his punishment of the regicides, as evidenced by several cases of treasonous speech recorded by the Northern Assizes, an accusation that was not uncommon in the trial records and that will serve to introduce this

---

[1] Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London, 2005), p. 46.

[2] Kevin Sharpe writes, "From the beginning of Charles's reign…the exercise of justice and a reputation for justice were problematic. Many of the old Cavaliers longed for what they, not entirely unreasonably, viewed as proper justice against traitors to and enemies of Charles I; to others that was revenge. As his declaration from Breda manifests, Charles recognized the danger such pressures presented and the need (for the stability of his kingship as well as that of the realm) to be seen as a just and merciful, rather than vengeful monarch, as a ruler who protected justice for the nation, not merely for a party. Charles's inclination to forgiveness was not just a personal attribute; it was an essential image of restored kingship." *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven, 2013), p. 173.

chapter. In a case from December 1661, Joseph Robertson of Barnet was said to have called the King "a Traytor and a rogue." Around Charles II's coronation, Walter Crompton of Sunderlandwick reportedly "clap[ped] his hand on his horse's Buttocks and [said] stand up Charles the third by the Grace of God," a colorful and telling bit of mockery. And most importantly for this study, in September 1663, Jonathan Shackleton of Bingley was accused of promising that a revolution would resurrect the old Commonwealth "Before March wind be blowne…For the King is a bloody Papist, or else he would never have given consent to the putting to death of so many honest men as he hath."[3] These were only depositions, but they indicate that for some observers, who was a martyr and who was a traitor remained a subject for debate. Even Charles's relatively mild campaign of vengeance was too much for true supporters of the Good Old Cause.

The decision to exempt certain figures from the Indemnity and Oblivion Act was driven primarily by their proud and unapologetic roles in the Regicide, but in some cases it involved the memories of the royalist martyrs of the 1650s. The destruction of the regicides coincided with the resurrection of their royalist victims. The families of John Penruddock and John Hewitt each appealed to Parliament to exempt those who had judged the two martyrs, and their sufferings also appeared in royalist propaganda as

---

[3] TNA, ASSI 45, 6/1/ 1; 6/2/17; 6/3/138. Those accused of statements against the King were sometimes drunk and professed their love for the King in their depositions. Others were Quakers or Fifth Monarchists, more likely to be involved in outright rebellion. Crompton was only accused in May 1662, a year after Charles II's English coronation of 23 April 1661. Such accusations could be highly personal and were not necessarily indicative of widespread unrest; nevertheless, the Farnley Wood Plot and others were significant bugbears for the King's cause in the North, and sixteen men were executed for treason at York on the same day in 1663. See Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1986), esp. pp. 159-206; and Andrew Hopper, "The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire," *The Historical Journal* 45:2 (June 2002), pp. 281-303.

reasons for these men to be punished.[4] In a similar vein, a satirical play on Cromwell's life had him seeing the ghost of Hewitt on his deathbed, not Charles I, since Cromwell's Protectorate alone, rather than a long list of signatures, was responsible for the beloved minister's beheading just a few months before his own death.[5] Such propaganda was powerful, but Charles II did not eliminate all dissent in the press. His propagandists, whether official or independent, produced many pamphlets rejoicing at the restoration and vilifying the experiment of the previous decade; but there were also important defenses of the ten regicides, apparently based on their performances, though at least one critic claimed that the speeches were forgeries. This is possible but unlikely. The performances were so widely seen that their critics said little besides reminding readers that the regicides' apparent bravery was provided by the Devil and did not indicate that these men were in heaven. Editors reminded readers of these men's past cruelty, but the execution performances held special status on their own. The tropes of martyrdom were so ingrained in the minds of witnesses, and the witnesses were so numerous by design, that the performances were difficult to attack directly. Instead, defenders of the Crown could only argue that king-killing was murder, no matter how ferociously the regicides insisted that they were doing the work of God. The polemical power of martyrdom, and the need for each side to contest the other's claim, was as strong as ever.

This chapter will assess how martyrdom continued to be wielded and contested as a political tool during the early Restoration, especially in the retributions against the

---

[4] Edmund Ludlow, *A Voyce from the Watch Tower*, ed. A. B. Worden (London, 1978), p. 170.

[5] Cromwell realizes in his dying moments that he will go to hell for his sins, seeing in his distemper several bodies of those he condemned "tumbling from the Gallows" and finally a "black Guard" that "were not mine, / Nor wore my Livery," presumably devils come to take him; his last words, moments later, are "Blood-Thirsty Tyrants have their place in Hell! / Thither go I"; *Cromwell's Conspiracy. A Tragy-Comedy, Relating to our latter Times*, 1660, E2 r-v.

regicides. As was typical, most of the ten men executed in the fall of 1660 protested that they were innocent of the crimes with which they were charged. Some were more outspoken than others, and the most colorful tended to be treated individually in pamphlets; but all ten appeared in several large collections of last speeches, with varied accompanying commentaries. They are excellent examples of contested martyrdom because of the thoroughly public nature of their trials and executions, as well as the significant freedom that some of them were given in their speeches at the scaffold—a freedom that was curtailed later in the week, after men like Thomas Harrison spoke too openly against the government. The first published account of the execution framed the speeches in a sympathetic narrative, forcing subsequent editors to repackage the text under headings like "Rebels no Saints," deconstructing the regicides' self-characterizations while still obliged to let the speeches stand, unaltered but framed by pejorative commentaries. Royalist propagandists had a clear agenda; but at least in the actual executions, they did not challenge facts, only interpretations. They also tended to lump all the regicides together, presuming that the Good Old Cause was always the same, despite evidence on the ladder itself that the men's interpretations of that cause varied. For example, Hugh Peters, relatively quiet in his last days, remained faithful to Cromwell, which produced a number of satires about his meetings with the Lord Protector's ghost (see chapter 5). Others were different. Harrison and the exiled Ludlow had been critical of the Protectorate on religious grounds; Thomas Scot was a critic too, but because he was a republican; and John Cooke even seemed to apologize for his hand in the Regicide.[6] Harrison's memorable performance, in which he clasped his hand to his

---

[6] Ludlow, for example, considered Cromwell's Protectorate a "usurpation"; *Voyce*, p. 149. Thomas Rugg

breast to say that his "good old cause" was alive in his heart, indicated that it was also felt on a deeply personal level. The royalist approach, however, to the extent that it can be consolidated as one approach, was to attack them all together and demonstrate that, whatever their particular statements, they were equally guilty of killing the King, a crime so horrible on its own that it overrode any need to draw distinctions about motivations for committing it.

It should be reiterated that while the original account of their executions, published in 1660 as *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges*, was accepted as factual reportage by their first royalist respondents, they remain works of Good Old Cause propaganda, however indeterminable their origins may be. The speeches were accepted wholeheartedly by Edmund Ludlow, whose sympathetic commentary on the regicides' trials and executions provides an excellent counter-assessment and one of few extensive defenses of these potential martyrs.[7] The presumed publishers, on the other hand, were later convicted of libel, although it served the Crown's interests to discredit them, however belatedly.[8] While even the charge of libel was polemical, the editor of the account of the 1664 trial further claimed that the book

> was not, as it pretends to be, a true account of the words…of dying men, but a meer Forgery and Imposture, Fathered upon those, that were Executed; but contrived by the Traytors that scaped; as deeming it their safest way, to publish the designs of the living, in the words of the dead; and the most conducing to their

---

described Cook as "pretendinge hee then wished with all his soule the Kinge had been aquited," suggesting that this was an attempt to garner mercy from the Court; *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg 1659-1661*, ed. William L. Sachse (London, 1961), p. 117.

[7] For a discussion of the provenance of Ludlow's manuscript, surely one of the most important manuscript hauls of the later twentieth century, and its differences from the later publication, see Worden's introduction to *Voyce*, especially pp. 1-39; Ludlow also copied the last speeches into his book along with the original hagiographic commentary, to which he only occasionally added his own.

[8] Maureen Bell, "Elizabeth Calvert and the 'Confederates'," *Publishing History* 32 (1992), p. 15; see also Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington, 1996), p. 156.

> Project of destroying the Present King, to perswade the Multitude into a good Opinion of the Murder of the Last."[9]

Forgery did not seem to have occured to anyone in 1660, and the editor was accusing his rivals of dishonesty. Three men were tried for seditious libel for producing the book, simply because the speeches were critical of the restored monarchy. The speeches' authenticity remains uncertain, but that they were assumed to be genuine at the time carries some weight. Furthermore, even if they were concocted by escaped regicides to advance their cause, their role as Good Old Cause propaganda is still enormously significant. The performances were important for building an anti-royalist martyrology, and royalist propagandists recognized their power and had to respond. In 1660, that response could be confined to a page by page rebuttal; but by 1664, the speeches themselves had become so dangerous that they had to be suppressed.

Despite these contextual ambiguities, this chapter, like those above, will begin with the actual executions to the extent that they can be known. The ten executions of October 1660 were the primary act of restoration revenge and fed the primary works of propaganda in 1660 and 1661. They were grisly to make a point, even more so in the hanging and decapitation of long-decomposed corpses, which we will consider in the next chapter; but these incidents were balanced by the considerable mercy of the crown in sparing so many others. The potential martyrs of this chapter were martyrs in the classical sense: men who willingly gave their lives rather than renounce their cause. A few protested that they should not have been exempted from the Act of Oblivion, attempting to distance themselves from the Regicide; but as a result they received much shorter

---

[9] *An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn…with the Tryals of Thomas Brewster, Bookseller, Simon Dover, Printer, Nathan Brooks, Bookbinder*, 1664, f. A3. John Twyn was executed for treason for the publication of an unrelated book.

entries in the execution accounts, and critics cited those cases as evidence of the entire cause's illegitimacy. Harrison and John Carew, on the other hand, were proud to have been exempted and used their scaffold performances as opportunities to construct a martyrological image for themselves and support the cause. But these executions were not only contesting the Regicide of 1649. The more pressing debate was over the value of the Restoration itself, which the obstinate regicides refused to acknowledge was necessary or legitimate. The debate was still conducted by defending and disputing their motivations a decade earlier, but circumstances had changed; therefore the following analysis will demonstrate how the contest of martyrdom in 1660 and 1661 considered the full sweep of the past two decades as evidence that these men were guilty of not merely one act of treason but, instead, fully traitorous lives that could only be put to rest through the resurrection of drawing and quartering in the public square.

I

One of the most important elements of the Restoration was the return to the rule of law as it had existed before the Interregnum. Of course, the Commonwealth and Protectorate had maintained their versions of English law; but overthrowing the King was unavoidably radical. Even Monck's decision to recall the surviving members of the Long Parliament who had been expelled in Pride's Purge, allowing it to dissolve itself properly and make way for the Convention Parliament, reaffirmed the continuity that the English political system was supposed to maintain. The trials of the regicides were sensational but the Crown stressed their legality, contrasting these trials with the arbitrary killings by the High Court of Justice since 1649. As a result the official accounts detailed the obstinacy

of the regicides and contrasted their refusal to accept the Restoration with the fairness and clemency of the restored regime. They were followed by the critiques of the execution performances and other triumphalist literature, as well as devastating satires on the men involved, which will mostly be addressed in the next chapter; but the trials and associated publications stressed that the rule of law had returned.

As a prologue to the trials and executions of October 1660, royalist propagandists first undertook to deconstruct those apparent Parliamentarian heroes of the preceding decade by demonstrating that divine judgment had already befallen them, making them harbingers of the more systematic judgment that would soon be dealt to the survivors. The word "royalist" is used here with caution because not all these attacks were typically royalist, but they endorsed the restoration and condemned the Regicide. Several pamphlets catalogued the misfortunes of those who had opposed the monarchy, characterizing these episodes as examples of God's retribution against those who had raised their hands against the Lord's anointed.[10] John Vicars's *Dagon Demolished* and the anonymous *A Winding-Sheet for Traytors* were each published in 1660, referred to several of the same cases, and partly used the same texts, making it difficult to tell how they were composed. Vicars had died in 1652 after a long career that began well before

---

[10] These texts are part of a distinct genre that usually stood apart from martyrological literature, but in this case the religio-political drama of the Regicide and the Interregnum invited a clear crossover. Beginning in the sixteenth century, godly Protestant literature warned that divine judgment would be exacted upon sinners during their lifetimes, including sudden and dramatic deaths; the tradition even included Foxe's descriptions of the fates of the Marian martyrs' persecutors, which itself drew on works from antiquity. Such texts were didactic, intended to inculcate virtue among Christians and unite people of diverse backgrounds in awe of God; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), especially chapter 2, "'The Theatre of Gods Judgements': Sudden Deaths and Providential Punishments," pp. 65-115.

the Civil Wars and had included anti-royalist polemics during the 1640s.[11] The provenance of *Dagon Demolished* is unclear; but its prologue explains that the text had existed, unprinted, throughout the Protectorate. If this is true, then the more comprehensive *Winding-Sheet* probably borrowed from it. *Dagon Demolished* only includes cases from before 1652, which would support the prefatory explanation. The examples these pamphlets cite, as read in 1660, prefigured the impending punishments of those who were still living. They were often less famous supporters of the Regicide, with a few exceptions, stressing that God's judgment applied to all the King's enemies, even if the King forgave some of them. These cases, the writers argued, demonstrated God's disapproval of the Regicide. The actors would have been prosecuted were they still living, as is evident in the "judicial" tone maintained throughout the pamphlets.

Winding-Sheet was timelier and less millenarian than *Dagon Demolished* and described those enemies of the Crown who committed suicide as "self-executions," a carefully chosen phrase, similar in its tone to others that we will consider later in which the pillow of Bradshaw's death bed is described as his "block."[12] The pamphlet begins by listing all who were imprisoned in the Tower for treason in 1660, pending their trials, and provides a poem, purporting to be the "confession of some of the just Judges" of the King and his supporters. They admit that "Our King we murdered," but "the Work's not done," as they then proceeded to kill Holland, Capel, Hamilton, Derby, Montrose, Gerard,

---

[11] Most notably, *A Looking-Glasse for Malignants: or, Gods hand against God-haters* (1643), wherein most of the "malignants" had either betrayed Parliament or else caused harm to a godly minister.
[12] *A Winding-Sheet for Traytors*, 1660, frontispiece; *Bradshaw's Ghost; a Poem: or, A Dialogue between John Bradshaw, Ferry-man Charon, Oliver Cromwel, Francis Ravilliack, and Ignatius Loyola*, 1660, p. 1; see chapter 5.

Bushel, Love, Vowel, Slingsby, and Hewitt, who is specified as a "martyrd Saint."[13] There is an interesting factual error, as the "judges" claim to have "drawn hang'd and quarter'd" these men. It would soon be the punishment, however, for the regicides themselves, which "they" acknowledge in the conclusion of the poem. The author's commentary follows, calling the regicides "king-killing Basilisks" and "weeping Crocodiles" for not only killing their King but also forcing his family into exile, seizing his property, oppressing his subjects, and even "destroying his Deer." He laments that under the Protectorate, the new regime continued to pursue the King's supporters, especially in response to Penruddock's rising, demanding further blood to reaffirm its right by conquest to control England.[14] This is the usual argument. Killing Charles I destroyed England's commonwealth. While Charles had pursued the best interests of his people, Parliament had sought the best interests of itself alone. Here the two pamphlets begin to overlap, recounting the deaths of men who died in some way after opposing the King or one of his supporters. *Winding-Sheet* concludes by suggesting that the imprisoned men would soon "fall into the same Exemplary Terrors, Judgements, and Self-Executions" if they failed to repent for their sins.[15] Each death was a divine judgment and reminded witnesses what would befall those who betrayed the King.

John Vicars's pamphlet was meant as a warning to those who had taken the Engagement in 1650; it was likely written between 1650 and 1652, the year of his death, and had a distinctly Presbyterian perspective. This is important for interpreting the text, but its publication date complicates that interpretation: the intended readership in 1660

---

[13] *Winding-Sheet*, p. 4.
[14] Ibid, p. 5.
[15] Ibid.

would have been different from Vicars's readership before 1652. It was printed for Edward Thomas, who claimed in the preface to have received it from a friend of Vicars. Thomas published it "that God may have the Glory, and that all true Christian Protestants may Receive some benefit by it."[16] The pamphlet begins by printing the text of the Engagement itself, which had required Englishmen to swear an oath to be faithful to the Commonwealth. The author compares the penalties for refusing the oath to those proscribed by "Antichristian Romanists."[17] He claims that the Rump had "set up this Dagon by Gods Ark…in opposition to the Nationall Covenant," making the Engagement a false idol. The reference to the Covenant also strikes a Presbyterian, rather than classically Royalist, angle, which becomes more evident when the enemies of Christopher Love are punished alongside the enemies of the Crown. Vicars cites twenty cases of divine retribution against Engagers. The text is not typical of royalist propaganda but rather represents the brief alliance between royalists and Presbyterians in the early 1650s, resumed in the first months of the Restoration. The Engagement itself is a strange focus for a restoration pamphlet, but Vicars was famous enough in his day that Thomas seems to have reproduced his text. The anti-regicidal sentiments are consistent with royalist writings; and the appeal to Presbyterians represents the unity that the restored monarchy hoped to foster through actions like the unsuccessful Worcester House Declaration, which would have allowed for a balance between Episcopal and Presbyterian ecclesiastical structures and liturgical variation amongst congregations.[18]

---

[16] John Vicars, *Dagon Demolished*, 1660, p. 2.
[17] Ibid, p. 4.
[18] John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow, 2000), p. 167. Gary De Krey notes that, while Anglican loyalists and Presbyterians had united for a time in 1659-1660, they were not all "royalists"; furthermore, once sectarianism was effectively crushed, "Anglicans and

Edward Thomas, by publishing Vicars's text, was endorsing such a broad church settlement.

Here we can consider the substance of the two pamphlets together. The various accounts of deaths were not entirely identical, but *Winding-Sheet* likely drew on Vicars, sometimes using the same wording and occasionally adding further information. The more dramatic cases are worth noting. Mr. Bray, a Presbyterian minister who pulled down the King's arms in his church and vowed to make a door out of it, suddenly dropped dead; the royal arms were then used to make his coffin. A Mr. Brown lost his mind in the North Sea, wrapped himself in a white sheet, and "tumbled himself" into the ocean, an episode crudely illustrated on the frontispiece.[19] Sir Thomas Martin claimed during a hunt that instead of the deer's blood, he "had rather wash my hands in the blood of the young King of Scots"; he was thrown from his horse on his return home, fatally cracking his skull.[20] Thomas Hoyle hanged himself in his home on the first anniversary of the Regicide.[21] Mr. Midgeley, a schoolmaster, froze to death in a snowstorm and was found with his right thumb and forefinger bitten off.[22] Mr. Ashton died after being overwhelmed by lice.[23] Sir Henry Holcroft died in a fit of vomiting blood.[24] More famously, Dorislaus, Ascham, and Rainsborough were killed in the Netherlands, Spain,

---

Presbyterians discovered they feared each other as much as they feared the opponents of monarchical and parochial structures in church and state. Presbyterians hoped to preserve as much as possible of the reformation of the 1640s in the restored church; but Anglicans sought instead to return the church to its pre-1642 hierarchical orders, forms, and patterns." Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 15, 69.

[19] *Winding-Sheet*, p. 6.

[20] Ibid, p. 7.

[21] Ibid; Hoyle also lost thirteen of his children over the years, so while the date seems intentional, his depression likely had a variety of sources.

[22] *Dagon Demolished*, p. 7.

[23] Ibid, p. 8.

[24] Ibid, p. 12.

and York, respectively, by royalist agents.[25] Robert Lockyer, too, the "army's martyr," was executed for mutiny just days after spitting at the King on his way to his trial in 1649.[26] These two examples serve as a counter-martyrology, with figures who had been consided martyrs by republicans and Levellers now cast as providentially dispatched villains. Finally, and in an important contrast, a Mr. Sherman, formerly a friend and congregant of Christopher Love, rejected his minister and later collapsed, dead, in his silk shop.[27] Betraying a Presbyterian supporter of the King, then, would deliver the same justice as betraying the King himself. Vicars's original intent was to discredit the Engagement, and the pamphlet still serves this purpose; but when compared with *Winding-Sheet* and assessed in light of its publication date, *Dagon Demolished* becomes a pro-Restoration pamphlet, prefiguring the regicides' trials. Some men killed themselves, while others died suddenly after being in perfect health; but the more outlandish their deaths, the more likely they were to be the result of God's judgment. Their "self-executions" and divine retributions served as punishments when the Crown lacked earthly power. The pamphlets implied that soon such punishments would befall those who had been permitted to live until 1660.

Here we can turn to the trials and executions of the regicides themselves. The prosecutions began with twenty-nine men; though most were convicted, all but ten were reprieved. The trials spawned a great number of accounts, some long and detailed, others short summaries. The longest account was written by then-solicitor general Heneage Finch, later created Earl of Nottingham. It is a straightforward, detailed narrative,

---

[25] Ibid, p. 10.
[26] Ibid, p. 13.
[27] Ibid.

presenting the regicides as they presented themselves in court. Finch offers minimal commentary, but the court—and, as prosecutor, Finch himself—controlled the development of the trial, making the book an intentionally damning narrative. The executions would later give the men a different stage from which to make their own cases, but the trials were largely devoid of defensive soliloquys. With some caution, this study will take the Finch narrative as a factual account; but the origins of its production should not be forgotten. The book, like each trial, was intended to convince witnesses that these men were shockingly obstinate traitors who deserved death. As such, the trial and the Finch account represent the anti-martyrological side of the contest while limiting the men's opportunities to rebut that account. For his part, Ludlow, who read these texts abroad, called Finch an "anti-dated traytor, old in wickedness as well as yeares," casting him as a vengeful persecutor and dismissing the trials as propaganda. He also attacked Lord Chief Baron Orlando Bridgeman, the presiding judge, since he had served in Parliament until leaving for the King's Oxford government, making him anything but unbiased. Despite Ludlow's criticisms, Finch's book was on its face little more than a transcript.[28]

Bridgeman opened the trials with a discussion of the Edward III statute on traitors, which had remained in effect with alterations even through the 1650s. This was followed by a summary of the King's trial and its aftermath, reminding all present of the wickedness of king-killing. Then the men were arraigned. Hardress Waller was brought forth first on the correct belief that he would plead guilty, which Ludlow claimed had

---

[28] It was, however, quite a transcript, filling 287 pages. Ludlow argued that Finch had been accused of crimes by parliament two decades earlier and here was gleeful at the opportunity to "judge severall of his judges"; *Voyce*, p. 201. Later Ludlow called him "the old fornicator, and state pander"; ibid, p. 222.

been "so contrived, hoping that as one sheepe having leapt and lead the way, the rest would follow him into the sea."[29] Several tried to dispute with the court over the nature of the charge, claiming that they were guilty of only a part of the charge, complicating their pleas; others were brief, pleading "guilty" in an attempt to gain clemency or "not guilty" with some attempt at qualification. All digressions were quickly silenced, in a marked departure from the extended dialogues between the court and figures like Christopher Love a decade before. Among the more interesting episodes, Thomas Harrison, who pled "not guilty," begrudgingly agreed to say as required that he would be tried "by God and the Countrey," while disputing the concept since, as he claimed, the present government was not ordained by God. John Carew similarly began to pontificate on Christ's "Right to the Government of these Kingdoms," but he too was compelled to plead. Henry Marten protested that he was brought to the bar mistakenly, as the Act of Oblivion had spelled his name "Martin"; the Court responded that his identity was well-known, but he insisted that "all Penal Statutes ought to be understood literally." When Gilbert Millington promised that his short statement would "be pertinent enough," Finch interjected, "Impertinent enough, he means," and the prisoner pled not guilty.[30] The last two prisoners were especially obstinate. Hugh Peters famously said, "I would not for ten thousand Worlds say, I am Guilty. I am Not guilty," at which those present in the court laughed. Daniel Axtel was last; after his plea, he said that he would be tried "By twelve lawfull men, according to the Constitutions of the Law." When the Court compelled him to say "By God and the Countrey," he protested, for "That is not lawfull, God is not

---

[29] Ibid, *Voyce*, p. 209.
[30] Heneage Finch, Earl of Nottingham, *An Exact and Most Impartial Accompt of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to Law) of Twenty nine Regicides*, 1661, pp. 20-23.

locally here."[31] Despite such interruptions, the trial proceeded with Finch's remarks to the jury, in which he condemned the "not guilty" pleas: "[I]f any thing can be of a deeper Dy, then the Guilt of that Sacred Blood, wherewith they stand Polluted, me thinks, their Impudence should make them more odious, then their Treason."[32] This was the reason for the trials: their obstinacy more than their guilt, in several cases proved by their attempts to flee the country, had forced their exemption from the Act of Oblivion. The following days would be devoted to those who could not be forgiven because they had not sought forgiveness from God or the King. For the men on trial, this was the first step toward their potential martyrdom: in their defiance, they proclaimed that their cause was valid, and they were not afraid to die for it.

The trials were straightforward from a legal standpoint; most of the men had signed the death warrant in January 1649, and as long as that was still considered treason there was little else to be said. The Act of Oblivion was a mercy to the forgiven, not a dismissal of the crime. Ludlow complained that Bridgeman presumed "law books" to be "the ground from whence we must draw all our conclusions for matter of government. Whatever the word of God saith, it matters not in the oppinnion of this and such sorte of men"; but his godly arguments against the legitimacy of this restored rule of law would have carried little weight with royalists.[33] Still, the prosecution tried to demonstrate the persistent malice of the men beyond simple lawbreaking, pointing out that Harrison had encouraged his cronies to "blacken" the King's reputation through slander at his infamous trial. The spectators murmured among themselves at this disrespect, prompting

---

[31] Ibid, pp. 30-31.
[32] Ibid, p. 36.
[33] Ludlow, p. 202. The essence of Bridgeman's argument, he claimed, was merely the old adage that "The King Can Doe No Wronge," no matter what God may have decreed; p. 204.

Bridgeman to rebuke this behavior for being "more fitting for a Stage-Play, then for a Court of Justice."[34] Ludlow's criticism of the trial had a point, as it was essentially a stage play, with each figure fulfilling his expected role; there was little departure from the prescribed script, and little chance for a real defense. When the men attempted to protest the proceedings, they were silenced by the Court. Harrison did proclaim that he had only sought to serve God, and "did what I did as out of Conscience to the Lord"; but Finch stopped him, announcing that the trial would not be used as an opportunity "to make God the Authour of this damnable Treason."[35] Harrison would persist in this claim until his death, a stubbornness that commentators would criticize again in the execution accounts. To a royalist, such statements would actually do more harm to the men's cases, as they further demonstrated their pride in sin. Hugh Peters, for example, infamously preached on Psalm 149 the day before the Regicide, suggesting that God had given the English people permission to "bind their kings in chains."[36] Thomas Scot had wished his tombstone to record that he had "adjudged to death the late king," and he announced as recently as April 1659 that he "hoped he should never repent of it."[37] They did have some opportunities to speak in their own defense, and to question their witnesses, foreshadowing their final defenses before death. Testimonies primarily dealt with whether they had spoken openly about the need to execute the King, or whether they had been disrespectful to Charles I in any way during his imprisonment and trial.

In his final remarks before sentencing, Bridgeman urged the convicted men to take what time they still had to repent. He reminded them that "God Almighty is

---

[34] Finch, p. 49.
[35] Ibid, p. 50.
[36] Ibid, p. 209.
[37] Ibid, p. 86.

mercifull to those that are truly penitent, the thief upon the Crosse, and to all that are of a penitent heart; you are persons of education, do not you go on in an obstinate perverse course for shame of men."[38] Rather than insult them, Bridgeman appealed to their sense of religious virtue, which was important to most of them. He said that he gave judgment "with as unwilling a heart as you do receive it," and in an unusual turn Finch did not print the actual text of the sentencing; presumably everyone knew what it would be. Finch concluded with a brief account of the ten executions, but he omitted their speeches, since "they were made in a Crowd, and therefore not possible to be taken exactly; So it was thought fit rather to say nothing, then give an untrue account thereof: choosing rather to appear lame, then to be supported with imperfect assistances."[39] This is a curious claim. It is not clear whether Finch's book was published before the other execution accounts, but as we will see, their speeches certainly seem to have been audible. Finch's account was frank, condemnatory but not overly so; just as Bridgeman was patient and even pitied the men, so the narrative of the trial presented them without extra commentary.

Supporters of the condemned men saw this differently. Ludlow wrote that "the prophecyes must be accomplished, and the witnesses must be slayne, in order to their standing on their feete again."[40] For him, they were all killed in fulfillment of a prophecy, not unlike the crucifixion of Christ, and would be followed by a resurrection. "God will not be mocked," he wrote; "Yea when the great legislator shall come to throw downe all principallityes and powers, and set up his owne…then the treading under foote of the holy and righteous law of God, and the powring of the Saints' blood for contending for it

---

[38] Ibid, p. 284.
[39] Ibid, p. 285.
[40] Ludlow, *Voyce*, p. 213.

and witnessing to it, will not be counted a small matter." Indeed, Bridgeman and Finch soon would be "weeping over Christ whom they have peirced, and crucifyed in his members." But Ludlow still prayed "that the blood of the Lord Christ may be this sacrifice in being powred on their hearts and not on their heads, that by a timely humilliation and confession they may give glory to him, who is King of Kinges, and Lord of Hostes."[41] The regicides' vengeful judges, not the regicides, were guilty of condemning innocent men. Ludlow believed that the entire trial had been constructed to foreshadow their doom. It was not enough, he wrote, to "devoure the flesh and bones of the faithfull servants of the Lord"; they even had "the hangman in his ugly dress, with a halter in his hand" stand before the prisoners throughout the trials, a detail that Finch omitted. Such treatment failed to unnerve the men because they were "carried above the feare of death, as it is recorded of the martyrs of old…and so was this emynent servant and martyr of Christ borne up also, conquering in his spirit whilest his flesh was conquered."[42] While Finch's book endorsed the trial's intended reception, it would not change the minds of those who had already committed themselves to the other side.

The trial of the twenty-nine was the first step toward potential martyrdom for the ten who faced the gallows; but the executions themselves, and the associated narratives of their behavior in prison, would be the most important opportunities for them to construct an alternative narrative. The executions spanned a week, beginning on Saturday, 13 October and concluding on Friday, 19 October; those who were executed later in the week were formally condemned at the Old Bailey after the first executions had already occurred, sometimes on the same day, adding to the frenzied mood. Contemporary

---

[41] Ibid, p. 208.
[42] Ibid, p. 214; here he is referring to Harrison.

diarists confirmed that the week was a spectacle. Thomas Rugg, for example, who was mostly interested in Cook's and Peters's trials and executions and only briefly mentioned the others, noted that Hacker's body was spared mutilation because his brother was a committed royalist officer.[43] Rugg also noted Peters's silence at the trial, concluding his short account with "Finis Hugh Peeters."[44] John Evelyn, who lived in Greenwich, was in London itself on Thursday, 11 October during the first trials and returned to the City the following Wednesday. He mentioned in his diary that the executions were at Charing Cross so that the condemned would be "in sight of the place where they put to death their natural Prince" and be "taken in the trap they laied for others." Though he did not witness the killings, he "met their quarters mangl'd & cut & reaking as they were brought from the Gallows in baskets on the hurdle."[45] Samuel Pepys, who lived in London, went to the execution of Thomas Harrison after his acquaintance Captain Cuttance missed their appointment. A classic Pepys episode, his visit to Charing Cross was a time-killing diversion. Harrison, he observed, was "looking as cheerfully as any man could do in that condition," but "there were great shouts of joy" when his head and heart were presented to the crowd. Here he added a famous note: "Thus it was my chance to see the King beheaded at White-hall and to see the first blood shed in revenge for the blood of the King at Charing-cross."[46] Pepys did not witness all the others, but he noted who was

---

[43] *Diurnal of Thomas Rugg*, p. 116.
[44] Ibid, p. 120.
[45] *Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer (Oxford, 1955), vol. III, pp. 258-59; Evelyn erred in the diary, presuming that certain men suffered together who were actually executed on different days. Given the rapidity with which the ten men were dispatched, this is not surprising, and mangled body parts would have likely looked the same.
[46] *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (Berkeley, 1970), vol. I, p. 265; that he was meeting a man named "Cuttance" on that day is a darkly amusing coincidence. Pepys noted that he

executed or reprieved each day; when one was postponed he changed his plans to attend and instead visited his Aunt Fenners for his "morning draught."[47] On the 20th he noted that he saw several of the traitors' quarters posted at Aldersgate, "which was a sad sight to see; and a bloody week this and the last have been, there being ten hanged, drawn, and Quarterd."[48]

The most important public version of the execution narratives came in the series of books published shortly afterwards, providing the speeches with commentary ranging from minimal to extensive, depending on the intention of the authors and editors. As noted above, the speeches were presumed genuine by early royalist commentators, even if the attempt to use them as proof of martyr status was contested. The first version was assembled by anonymous supporters of the condemned. Two subsequent royalist editions, edited by "W.S.," simply annotated the first, providing systematic rebuttals of each man's performance and the original editor's arguments. At least one of these versions was in Ludlow's possession; he copied large sections from it into his memoirs, at times substituting the editor's commentary for his own. The speeches and narratives were identical in all three editions, varying only in commentary. Because of this, we can work through them concurrently, considering each man's execution and each set of commentaries in turn. First, however, it will be useful to consider the differences among them, which are most significant in their introductory materials.

---

had been "a great roundhead" as a boy, and admitted that he had said on 30 January 1649, "were I to preach upon him, my text should be: "'The memory of the wicked shall rot'"; ibid, p. 280.

[47] Ibid, p. 268.

[48] Ibid, pp. 269-70.

The first version, *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the Late King's Judges*, was edited or even composed by an anonymous apologist for the ten men.[49] The publisher was the radical Giles Calvert and his wife Elizabeth. As Maureen Bell notes, what matters more than its truthfulness is its propagandistic effectiveness.[50] Parts of the text suggest Fifth Monarchist influences, such as its particular attention to Harrison and Carew; but Harrison went first and may have genuinely been the most able to make a memorable performance, since those who followed him found their speeches limited by the Sheriff. The other two versions, expanded by W.S., offered royalist glosses on the speeches. The shorter of the two was published as *Rebels no Saints*, while the longer was published as *A compleat Collection*; each appeared in 1661, bearing nearly identical frontispieces but different illustrations.[51] Ludlow referred to W.S. as "an enemy brimful with envy and mallice" and encouraged his own reader "to take notice of the subtilty and success of our common enemy in corrupting so much, and blynding others of our party" by demeaning the martyrs of the cause and making them seem "full ripe for this reproofe."[52] Ludlow was probably right, to a point; but readers of these different versions were left with a stark dichotomy between, as one of W.S.'s titles highlights, "saints" or "rebels." The original version has the ten men behaving consistently as martyrs, going to

---

[49] *The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges*, 1660.

[50] Bell, p. 156. The Calverts had generally radical sympathies. Their earlier publications, jointly with Peter Cole, included Cooke's *King Charls his Case: or, an Appeal to all Rational Men, Concerning His Tryal at the High Court of Iustice*, 1649, and "Digger" leader Gerrard Winstanley's *The Breaking of the Day of God*, 1649.

[51] W. S., *Rebels no Saints: Or, a Collection of the Speeches, Private Passages, Letters, and Prayers of those Persons lately Executed*, 1661; and *A compleat Collection of the Lives, Speeches, Private Passages, Letters and Prayers of Those Persons lately Executed*, 1661. Note that the pagination for *Compleat Collection* changes periodically, and the printing marks are also unreliable; new pagination systems will be noted as necessary in the footnotes, as aside from obvious errors (e.g. 111 for 121, etc) there are three identifiable breaks.

[52] Ludlow, *Voyce*, p. 239.

their deaths while praising God. On the other hand, *A compleat Collection* includes, in addition to the pejorative commentaries that accompanied the speeches in *Rebels no Saints*, brief biographies of the men taken from a shorter book by George Bate, which had included others who had predeceased the Restoration.[53] In terms of the speeches themselves, however, all three books use the same texts. Before considering the speeches and commentaries, we will consider the differences in overall presentation across these editions.

The Speeches and Prayers has a sparse title page, listing the names of the men with the dates of their deaths and noting that their speeches were "faithfully and impartially collected" for printing. The names are accompanied by a verse from the letter to the Hebrews: "And by it he being dead, yet speaketh."[54] This is a loaded quotation. Taken at face value, it could be a clever commentary on the printed speeches, permitting the dead to speak. Additionally, the public display of their body parts "speaks" to an audience, conveying the message intended by the restored monarchy. But there is likely a second meaning, as the context in Hebrews is specific and illuminating: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh."[55] The last speeches of the ten condemned regicides, then, are not merely speeches; they are

---

[53] George Bate, *The Lives, Actions and Execution of The prime Actors, and principall Contrivers of that horrid Murder of our late pious and Sacred Soveraigne King Charles the first, of ever blessed memory*, 1661. Bate's text occasionally included actual execution accounts, and the reproduction of his book as commentary for *A compleat Collection* explains why that book occasionally included *two* accounts. The shorter is always from Bate while the longer is from *The Speeches and Prayers*.

[54] *Speeches and Prayers*, frontispiece. Ludlow quoted the same verse when discussing John Carew, for whom "it was then thought fit to stop his mouth as soon as possible, they not being able to withstand the spirit by which he spake"; *Voyce*, p. 226.

[55] Hebrews 11:4.

these men's offerings to God, proof of their righteousness. If we cautiously read into this, their deaths are the sacrifice; they were slain by the decidedly unrighteous Cain, the royalists, whose "gift" of Charles I was inferior to these men's collective offering. In other words, the regicides themselves would become the murdered Abel, whose "blood crieth unto [God] from the ground," demanding vengeance; perhaps the restored monarchy would soon be cast into the land of Nod.[56] This is at least akin to the message that they conveyed. In any case, the verse, like the positive emphasis on "prayers" in the title, implies that this collection was assembled by a supporter of the men and prepares the reader for a sympathetic text.

The ensuing preface is even more overtly laudatory, despite its claim that its intent was merely to "present unto thee the words of dying men." It explains:

> There hath some special reasons moved us to undertake this matter: as first, to prevent that wrong which might be done to the deceased, and more especially to the Name of God, by false and imperfect copies. Secondly, to satisfie those many in City and Countrey, who have much desired it. Thirdly, to let all see the riches of grace magnified in those servants of Christ. Fourthly, that men may see what it is to have an interest in Christ, in a dying houre, and to be faithful to his cause. And lastly, that all men may consider and know, that every mans judgement shall be from the Lord, Prov. 29.26.[57]

Ostensibly this collection exists simply to avoid unfair disparagement toward the dead; each man deserved to have his words represented accurately, and false copies insulted God Himself. Readers wanted to see the speeches because these were important cases. But the ten men were also "servants of Christ" who embodied the "riches of grace," and who demonstrated how to remain faithful to one's cause with "an interest in Christ." It

---

[56] Genesis 4:10.
[57] *Speeches and Prayers*, preface, f. 1 verso.

does not explicitly endorse the "good old cause," but "servants of Christ" are presumably worthy of emulation. The final verse from Proverbs indicates that the ten, in being condemned by men instead of by God, had suffered some injustice. The claim that they were faithful to their cause to the end is the most crucial point for establishing them as potential martyrs.

While W.S. did not refer to this preface, he challenged its interpretation by framing the men as villains. The two W. S. editions share the goal of attacking the regicides, but there are minor differences between them. *Rebels no Saints* has a tripartite illustration depicting the journey of an unnamed regicide to his fate, with the final image of quartering captioned "The Traytor Rewarded"; *A compleat Collection*, meanwhile, has a less grisly page of ten portraits of regicides, with an eleventh of Cromwell in the center. The frontispieces of these two editions set a markedly different tone from the *Speeches and Prayers*. They note that in the following "observations," the "pretended Sanctity" of the ten men will be "refuted," and the "Lives and Practices of those Unhappy and Traiterous Polititians" will be subject to "further Inspection." They are rebels, not saints; their pretense of sanctity conceals their history of evil. Unlike the *Speeches and Prayers*, with its verse from Hebrews, these editions invoke 1 Corinthians 13:3, "Though I give my Body to be burnt, and have not Charity: it profiteth nothing." Where previously they had been honest men murdered by brothers jealous of their sacrifices, here their self-sacrifice is worthless because they lack charity, the third of the theological virtues, which are discussed extensively in the surrounding verses. While the texts of the men's words and the narratives of their actions were identical in these various editions, the framework provided by these opening characterizations, as well as the further commentary that

accompanied each individual's section of the book, led readers to distinctly different understandings of the regicides' behavior and motivations.

This dichotomous characterization—essential to the contest to define the executions as either martyrdoms or justly deserved punishments for treason—continues in W.S.'s preface to the reader, dated 16 December 1660 and identical in each version. It begins by dismissing the "Old Adage" that "*de Mortuis nil nisi bene*," that one should speak kindly of the dead. Instead, the writer asserts that for those who have "Traytor in Capital Letters" inscribed on their foreheads (perhaps like the mark of Cain), "'tis a Sin to speak well where every Action gives us the Lye."[58] W.S. belittles each man in turn, detailing the villainies of their lives and arguing that bravery at the gallows did not make them martyrs. Their sin of regicide, W.S. writes, was the worst since the Crucifixion. But now these justly condemned judges of the King "endeavour in their Deaths (like so many Ravilliacks [sic]) to strengthen their deluded followers in those Damnable Principles, for which they had so justly Forfeited their Lives; pretending they were Soldiers under Christ's Banner, when they paid Devotion to the Devills Colours."[59] They are like the infamous Catholic François Ravaillac, who killed Henri IV of France and whose name was a synonym for "regicide" in seventeenth century England, and whose precedent fed beliefs that king-killing was a fundamentally Catholic, or even Jesuit, act.[60] They now present themselves as martyrs, reinforcing their followers' belief in "damnable

---

[58] *Rebels no Saints*, A3 r.
[59] Ibid, A3 r-v.
[60] Jesuits did have a reputation for approving of regicide, or at least tyrannicide, partly because they wrote about it in scholarly works and partly because at some key moments, including the Gunpowder Plot of 1603 and the Ravaillac case, they had been vaguely influential or involved in actual cases of king-killing; for more on the concept, see Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2004), chapter 13, "Tyrannicide, the Oath of Allegiance controversy, and the assassination of Henri IV," pp. 314-338.

principles" and suggesting that they fought for Christ rather than Satan. In the end, their only bequest to their followers is "Rebellion," disguised as "Conscience and Religion"; but in "Publishing to the World their pretended Innocency" in the *Speeches and Prayers*, their friends would draw more adherents to "their so Glorious a Cause."[61] W.S. explains how he has "subjoyned short Observations…where the Candid Interpreter weighing in an Equal Balance, their Black and Bloudy Lives with these last Dying Speeches, may easily find that their *Simulata Sanctitis*, was but *duplex iniquitas*."[62] In other words, when one evaluates their last performances in the context of their lives, their "pretended sanctity" will be an obvious sham, an intentional diversion. Their affectations of martyrdom merely enhance those crimes through a sacrilegious display. Finally, W.S. hopes that the potential followers of these men will now know better and "by these mens Deaths, learn some other way to Happiness, than through the Ruins of their King, and Country."[63] These are not saints and martyrs but rebels and traitors whose deaths teach witnesses how *not* to live. W.S. presents his versions, especially the longer *Compleat Collection*, as the final word on these ten men, consigning them to gallows as intended by their convictions.

These three printed accounts remain the primary sources for the behavior of these men at the scaffold for London readers in 1660 and 1661; but by working through them consecutively we see how despite royalist efforts to treat them as dying for the same cause, they actually presented themselves differently. To some extent, W.S. respected these differences, shaping his criticisms to fit the details of individual regicides' self-portrayals. Most quotations will be taken from the *Compleat Collection*, since it includes

---

[61] *Rebels no Saints*, A3 r-v.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.

all texts as well as criticisms; but the publication distinctions drawn above should be kept in mind. We will consider the ten men in turn, which is an exhaustive undertaking but is also necessary for this project to convey how diverse the Good Old Cause of the regicides actually was.

Thomas Harrison, executed on Saturday, 13 October, was the first to die, just as he had been the first to be tried. He set a strong martyrological precedent for his fellow defenders of the Good Old Cause. The physical context of his and the other executions was important, as he was not taken to Tyburn or to Tower Hill; rather, he was brought to a specially constructed gallows at Charing Cross, intentionally placed so that he could see the Banqueting House, the location of Charles I's execution in 1649, several hundred yards down the street in Whitehall.[64] Though the editors of these versions did not stress the divisions among the ten men, Harrison had long since fallen out with other central players, especially Cromwell. He had been an important figure in the trial of Charles I, signed the death warrant, and organized the King's funeral. After the Battle of Worcester in 1651, he hunted down fleeing royalists, preventing many from escaping to the Continent. His Fifth Monarchism, however, made him a political exile after the dissolution of Barebone's Parliament; and in his death he sought to advance the "Kingdom of Christ."[65] His behavior during his last days is similar to that of royalist martyrs in its tactics; he behaved as a martyr should, refusing to admit guilt and insisting that he suffered for his faith. He seems to have been aware of the power that his words

---

[64] Finch, *An Exact and Most Impartial Accompt*, p. 286. Charing Cross was an occasional execution site and had been used for Peter Vowell, but without the symbolic importance; see chapter 3.

[65] Harrison and other Fifth Monarchists, as well as Ludlow, opposed the Protectorate, calling it an illegal usurpation. B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism* (Totowa, NJ, 1972), pp. 132-33; see also Timothy G. Shilston, "Thomas Venner: Fifth Monarchist or maverick?" *Social History* 37:1 (February 2012), pp. 55-64.

would have if he appeared sure of his cause and the legitimacy of his actions. Furthermore, the narrative in the *Speeches and Prayers* was completely positive, with Harrison's exchanges with visitors in prison and with witnesses on the way to Charing Cross so obviously following the Passion narratives of the Gospels that Harrison as much as any Reformation martyr was clearly intended to be seen as acting in the imitation of Christ. His defense of the Regicide, meanwhile, enabled W.S. to paint him as a traitor.

Harrison's self-characterization in the text was persistently religious, expressing the Fifth Monarchism that he espoused. Like Christopher Love in 1651 and like some of his own companions in 1660, he compared his impending martyrdom to his wedding, reassuring his wife of the same in a message sent from Newgate. At the conclusion of his trial, he greeted the chains and shackles as they were placed on his ankles, "Welcome, welcome; Oh this is nothing to what Christ hath undergone for me," a claim he would reiterate throughout his last days and during his journey to the gallows.[66] The charwoman in Newgate related how "sure she was that he was a good man" who had "nothing but God in his mouth…And his discourse and frame of heart would melt the hardest of their hearts."[67] Harrison remained in good spirits in prison, impressing visitors with his piety and confidence. He happily spoke with ministers sent by the Court; but he refused to admit to any crime, particularly the accusations that he was "loose in family duties, and the observation of the Lords day."[68] For this charge, he called to his servant of eight years, who insisted that he was always "very zealous" in his religious duties.[69] Friends also visited him in his last days, describing him as "full of the joy of the Lord" and even

---

[66] *Compleat Collection*, p. 7.
[67] Ibid, p. 8.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid, p. 10.

"cloathed with the Spirit of the Lord" despite his apparent misfortunes.[70] Most importantly, he denied having actively sought the King's blood, which he admitted was a grave action taken by Parliament: "I have many a time sought the Lord with Tears to know if I have done amiss in it, but was rather confirmed that the thing was more of God than of men."[71] In other words, killing Charles I had required extensive prayer, which ultimately convinced Harrison that the task was God's work. There was no need to repent of any sin: if Harrison suffered for a divinely appointed task, then killing him could only make him a martyr.

In his preparations for the gallows, Harrison continued to use the platform of public execution as a pulpit from which to preach his particular version of Christianity. He said that his death would be "a great work for the Lord," and that he suffered "upon the account of Jehovah the Lord of Hosts." He praised God for marking him "worthy to be put upon this service for my Lord Christ."[72] The narrative details his journey from Newgate to Charing Cross, describing how he "parted with his wife and friends with great joy and chearfulnesse, as he did use to do when going some journey or about some service for the Lord"; he then gave his wife his bible.[73] When the guards came to take him, he "came forth immediately…running down the Stairs with a smiling countenance," indicating his eagerness to die as a martyr. At the door, he met a woman who took his hand and encouraged him, "Blessed be the great God of Hosts, that hath enabled you, and called you forth to bear your Testimony...[may God] keep you faithfull unto death, that you may receive a Crown of Life." When the guards pulled her away, Harrison protested,

---

[70] Ibid, p. 11.
[71] Ibid, p. 8.
[72] Ibid, p. 11.
[73] Ibid.

"she speaks Scripture"; but they prevented anyone else from speaking to him. He then praised God, who "hath enabled me in the power of his strength, to offer my life with satisfaction and cheerfulness in obedience to the will of God…It's a day of joy to my soul."[74] Then he was taken to a room with several "common prisoners," whom he told that it was a "sad thing" to be condemned to die while lacking God's "love and favour"; but he explained to them that his own case was different, as he knew that he would "live with Christ to all eternity…out of the exceeding riches of the Grace of God." Harrison exhorted these criminals, "Poor men! I wish you all as well as I doe my owne Soule. Oh that you did but know Christ!"[75] He instructed them to convert their lives to God and accept the mercy that Christ offered, handing them some coins from his pocket. Harrison would use his last minutes to preach the Gospel to everyone he met. He was then taken out to the sledge and tied, even helping the guard with the rope. When a weeping woman approached him, he reassured her, "Hinder me not, for I am going about a work for my Master." The entire scenario is reminiscent of Christ's Passion, with the unjustly condemned willing sufferer meeting with the women of the City, the guards, and the common criminals. Even the command "hinder me not" recalls the famous *noli me tangere*, or "touch me not," when the risen Christ meets Mary Magdalene. Any march to the scaffold has the potential for mimicking the *Via Dolorosa*, but this account stresses it in an especially obvious way, indicating that Harrison is a servant of God, not a traitor to his people, inspiring the awe of his witnesses and drawing sympathy from those he meets.

Harrison's increasingly theological statements continued to emphasize his joy in the Lord as he progressed to the gallows. He explained to the next group of witnesses,

---

[74] Ibid, p. 12.
[75] Ibid, p. 13.

"Sirs, it's easie to follow God when he makes a hedge about us…but it's hard for most to follow him in such a dispensation; and yet my Lord and Master is sweet and glorious to me now, as he was in the time of my greatest prosperity."[76] This probable reference to the book of Job is another important martyrological trope: when life becomes more difficult, it is even more important to ensure that one follows God faithfully; but when one does, it is a mark of sanctity. Even when God's hedge of protection has been cut, Harrison still sees his Savior's love. Continuing the Old Testament references, Harrison compared the rope to that which bound Isaac in the book of Genesis: "Father here is the Wood, but where is the Sacrifice…but his will be done, Death is not terrible to me; yea, it is no more to me then a Rush, I have learnt to die long ago."[77] Harrison suggested to his listeners that he was a new sacrifice to God, though the intricacies of the Abraham story are not fully evident. More importantly, he had "learnt to die" for Christ. Riding in the sledge through the Strand, he offered short announcements of his faith and purpose, seemingly in a steady stream of spontaneous observation, such as, "I…cannot be a pleaser of men," and "Good is the Lord in all his wayes"; he maintained "a sweet smiling countenance, with his eyes and hands lifted up to heaven" the entire way. In an announcement to passersby, "He called several times in the way, and spoke aloud, 'I go to suffer upon the account of the most glorious cause that ever was in the world.'" At one spot he was taunted by a bystander, "Where is your Good old Cause?" Harrison then "with a cheerfull smile clapt his hand on his brest, and said; Here it is, and I am going to seal it with my

---

[76] Ibid, p. 14; the "hedge" is likely that of Job 1:10, in which Satan asks God, "Hast not thou made an hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side?" and then suggests that the overly comfortable Job will deny God once he faces some misfortune. Harrison, like Job, contrarily responds that he will persevere even when this barrier has been removed.

[77] Ibid, pp. 14-15; the "rush" is likely a reference not to an emotional surge but rather to the brittle plant.

blood."[78] The narrative suggests that such utterances were loud enough to be heard by those present along the street, and he probably intended them to be heard: Harrison's performance extended beyond his proclamation from the gallows. Finally the sledge neared Charing Cross, and his servant assured him that "there is a Crown of Glory ready prepared for you." Harrison was overjoyed. He greeted his executioner, forgave him, and prayed that "the Lord grant that this sin may not be laid to thy charge."[79] Harrison's journey was not unlike the walk to Golgotha, except that Harrison was particularly chatty, where Christ was usually silent: the narrative has him meeting with figures along the way, conversing about salvation, and seeking to ensure that all present know why he dies. He appears as a willing, intentional martyr, using his "passion" as a platform from which to proclaim the Gospel.

The most important platform, of course, was the ladder to the gallows itself, where Harrison delivered his lengthy speech. The scene, with its ladder and noose, is another marked difference from the Interregnum executions, with their scaffold, railing, and block. This was a return to traditional treason punishments. The regicides spoke from ladders with ropes about their necks, making their deaths appear even more imminent. In his speech, Harrison proclaimed that "the Finger of God hath been pleading this Cause," reiterating that the Regicide and much of what followed, though not all, had been God's will for England. He thanked God for considering him "worthy to be so instrumentall in so glorious a work," and insisted that he hated no man but had resisted those who were "Enemies to God and his people."[80] He insisted, "I do not lay down my life by constraint,

---

[78] Ibid, p. 15.
[79] Ibid, p. 15; the prayer paraphrases that of Stephen, a common martyrological invocation.
[80] Ibid, p. 17.

but willingly," an essential qualifier for martyrdom.[81] And importantly, his death, like the rest of his life, was a constant payment of the debt owed to Christ, a minuscule offering in return for the sacrifice of the Cross: "Oh, that Christ should undergo so great sufferings & reproaches for me, & should not I be willing to lay down my life, and suffer reproaches for him that hath so loved me!"[82] His last recorded words quoted Christ, as was common even for those who died peacefully: "By God I have leaped over a Wall, By God I have run'd through a Troop, and by my God I will go through this death, and he will make it easie to me. *Now into thy hands, O Lord Jesus, I commit my spirit*."[83] As he had given all of his life to the service of God, he would now hand his soul to God for safekeeping. Harrison took care with each remark to present himself as a willing martyr for Christ. However, despite his bold presentation, it remained possible for royalists to dismiss his hagiographer's interpretation.

Each of the accounts was repackaged in W.S.'s texts, with the uncredited biography from George Bate preceding the actual narrative, and W.S.'s brief commentary following. For each case, we will consider the two commentaries concurrently, as they would have contributed to one another for readers of *A compleat Collection* regardless of the textual origin. The author describes Harrison as "a principle header of the Fifth Monarchy Professors," born to "very mean Parents" and later becoming wealthy "by the miseries of the times, and the hypocrisie of his pretended preaching."[84] This reading of Harrison's inverted social status and alleged material greed were typical royalist tropes. By this account, Harrison was a self-aggrandizing killer and self-proclaimed, unordained

---

[81] Ibid, p. 19.
[82] Ibid, p. 20.
[83] Ibid, p. 21; emphasis added.
[84] Ibid, p. 1.

minister of God. The biography discredits Harrison's martyrdom, noting that although "as he went he endeavoured to discover to the world the undauntednesse of his spirit, by the smiles of his countenance," his actual performance was unconvincing. Rather, "he betrayed in himselfe much fear by an agony of sweat, and the more than ordinary trembling and shaking of his joynts."[85] Harrison had admitted his physical unsteadiness at his execution, explaining when challenged by onlookers that though he appeared to be shaking in fear, this was the result of injuries suffered during the war, "which caused this shaking and weakness in my Nerves."[86] As originally presented, this would have been the only indication that Harrison was fearful. More damning, the author suggests that Harrison had "taken a strong Cordiall in the morning" to "bare up his spirits…to slight Death." As a result, "He was not so much thrown off the Ladder by the Executioner, but went as readily off himself," suggesting that he was foolhardy, even drunk, and perhaps suicidal, paying insufficient respect to the gravity of the occasion while benumbed by some elixir.[87] W.S.'s "observations" after the speech further explain that "To commit Villany unparallel'd, and bravely to outface Death, is the badge of a desperate Traytor, and an unhappy Christian."[88] So Harrison's attempt to appear brave in his last moments proves his treason and casts doubt on his supposedly sure faith. This presumes, of course, that his crime was an "unparalleled villainy." W.S. laments that Harrison has not repented for his deeds in any way, so that "amongst Birds of his own Feather Treason becomes

---

[85] Ibid, p. 5.
[86] Ibid, p. 18. One of the more perplexing references in his speech was his remark that he was weary and would not say much more because he had been "so hurried up and down stairs" all morning, apparently referring to the circuitous route taken in his departure from Newgate; p. 20.
[87] Ibid, p. 6.
[88] Ibid, p. 22.

meritorious, and his detestable death a glorious Martyrdome."[89] However, he explains, God cannot "be the Author of Treason," the presumption of which is an "unheard of impudence." Referring to Harrison's exchange with the woman outside Newgate, W.S. explains that "Kings are the only flowers in Gods terrestrial Garden, that wear the Inscription of *Noli me tangere*," implying that Harrison has been irreverent in his last moments, befitting one who "dies a Traytor both to God and Man." Finally W.S. mocks Harrison's comparison of his execution to marriage: "Die then Mr. Harrison…and may all the rest of thy accursed Crue dance at thy wedding."[90] This is "contested martyrdom" in its rawest sense, and most interesting because one text has been reproduced fully to facilitate a detailed rebuttal. Yet while W.S.'s invective is harsh, it remains for the reader to decide whether his criticisms are warranted by Harrison's performance: he presented himself on his last day as a man who knew why he died, arguing that all his deeds, including the Regicide, were in the service of God.

John Carew went to Charing Cross two days after Harrison, on 15 October, and the original narrative was similar: again, a Fifth Monarchist repeatedly insisted on Christ's ultimate power over all the proceedings and defended himself as a martyr, dying for having followed God's will for the nation. His goal was to lead others to his cause. The narrative begins with his capture in Cornwall. Carew's journey from Cornwall to London is dramatic, beginning with the observation that "he had a gracious presence of the Lord with him" despite the jeering crowds that met him at each stop along the way. Reportedly, onlookers shouted "Hang him Rogue" and "Pistoll him" and "Hang him up…at the next Sign-post without any further trouble." Others in the crowd noted,

---

[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.

"Look…how he doth not alter his countenance; but we believe he will tremble when he comes to the Ladder. This is the Rogue will have no King but Jesus."[91] By this account, the people of each town, especially Salisbury, had sought Carew's blood even before he went to trial, suggesting that he had been dealt with unjustly from the start. "King Jesus" refers to Fifth Monarchism; but as presented here, one might ask what is wrong with thinking of Christ as King. The author notes that these crowds were so nasty that if Carew had "not been indued with strength from on High, he could not have under-gone the wicked and barbarous Deportment and Carriage of the giddy multitude."[92] Christ enabled Carew to endure the sufferings placed upon him by the people, in turn permitting Carew to imitate Christ. Once imprisoned at London, "his joy in the Lord was such that when many came drooping in spirit to him…they went away refreshed and comforted by those many Gracious words that came out of his mouth," making him a spiritual comforter to his visitors.[93] The night before his death, and after he had learned of Harrison's death the day before, he assured his weeping friends that if they "did know and feel what joy I have and what a glorious Crown I shall receive from the hand of Christ for this work, you would not mourn but rejoice, that I am counted worthy to be a witness to this cause."[94] Carew, then, was consciously and intentionally behaving like a martyr, suffering joyfully in order to lead witnesses to the kingdom of Christ. Similarly, he repeated that the Regicide, the cause of his death, had been "of the Lord." The blood of those who are persecuted for arguing against the sanctity of English kingship, he said,

---

[91] Ibid, p. 26.
[92] Ibid, p. 27.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid.

would "make many hundreds more perswaded of the truth of it."[95] Again, his death would lead onlookers to embrace his cause. In this long discourse the night before his death, which touched on a myriad of subjects but was largely religious, he proclaimed, "The Lord will bring my bloud…to cry with the rest of the Martyrs." This would be his "crown of rejoicing, That I dye not in the Lord onely, but for the Lord."[96] Carew was confident in his cause, and he assured his friends of the same. The next day, Monday, would be his opportunity to preach to a more hostile audience.

The morning of 15 October, Carew, like Harrison, was "smiling cheerful" as he set out. He kept this appearance the whole way, "to the encouragement of the Faithfull, and admiration of Enemies."[97] Once again, the potential martyr amazed his enemies with his bravery. He assured his friends who had accompanied him to the foot of the gallows that they could continue to sustain the cause of Christ since "he now came to seal it with his Blood."[98] The ensuing speech was unusually long, even for this time, and included an extended prayer and numerous references to the Book of Revelation; the Sheriff interrupted him after some time, telling him that he should prepare himself for death. One person warned Carew that he would tire himself speaking so long; another complained, "it raines."[99] After praying again that God would welcome him to heaven, he paused to admit that speaking had become difficult, as his mouth was dry and his tongue was sticking; "But I would fain speak a little more." Even this prompted spiritual reflection, as he proclaimed, "Oh! How many are the Refreshments I have had from the presence of

---

[95] Ibid, p. 29.
[96] Ibid, p. 31.
[97] Ibid, p. 32.
[98] Ibid, p. 33.
[99] Ibid, p. 38.

my God and Father, sweet, and secret communion betwixt him and my soul to day."[100] Finally he submitted to his punishment, which the anonymous author describes merely as falling asleep. Unlike Harrison, Carew's body was spared quartering and was given to his family. His performance was intended to present himself as a martyr. He said less of the Regicide than Harrison did, preferring to discuss Christ's salvation.

W.S.'s commentaries again reflect the details of the performance, here attempting to delegitimize Carew by mentioning what he had omitted. The biography describes how Carew had "consent[ed] to the death of his owne Brother," an infamous incident during the Interregnum and indicative of his dishonor.[101] Where Harrison had been trembling in fear, Carew was flushed and "sweat so much, that his Handkerchiefe could scarcely keep the water from running down his face."[102] This was reportedly because he had "prepared himselfe by drinking three pints of Sack…but his spirits, notwithstanding thus encouraged, could not out-dare the conflict."[103] This might explain the ramblings of Carew's speech, but the commentary is polemical; other reports did not refer to any inordinate drinking on the way to Charing Cross. After the speech, W. S. compares Carew to John Felton, the 1628 assassin of the Duke of Buckingham, as well as to Ravaillac. Despite his treason, W. S. writes, "my author is pleased to stile him a Martyr…I leave the world to Judge, if my brazen faced Author deserves not almost an equal condemnation."[104] The anonymous writer, then, is almost as guilty as Carew himself; for in defending a regicide as a martyr, one must sympathize with the cause.

---

[100] Ibid, p. 42.
[101] Ibid, p. 23.
[102] Ibid, p. 24.
[103] Ibid, pp. 24-25.
[104] Ibid, p. 43.

Harrison and Carew were the first, and in some ways the most memorable of the ten condemned regicides; they set an example for those who followed, with whom they would build a new martyrology for the defenders of the Good Old Cause. Yet as we have already seen, that cause was more diverse than its monolithic terminology would suggest: Harrison and Carew did not refer to the "Fifth Monarchy" as such, but their theological and political positions had been staunchly in that category since the early 1650s. W.S. and Bate treat them simply as rebels, as if they were identical to the others, ignoring that they had broken with Cromwell and even been imprisoned by him during the Protectorate.[105] Not all of the ten would be as overtly religious in their modes of dying as these two were, and while Harrison set a precedent for the following nine, each of them was dying for his own version of a general cause. None of the others would appear alone, and their self-defenses were not always as verbose or confident. The original collection would attempt to explain away these distinctions, but to some extent the performances told their own stories. The remainder of this analysis will work through the other cases to assess how consistent the Good Old Cause really was in 1660.

The day after Carew, Tuesday, 16 October, John Cook and Hugh Peters took their turns at the ladder at Charing Cross. Cook, a jurist and well-respected in the 1640s, had been solicitor general at the trial of Charles I; and his own trial in 1660 was noted for his obvious knowledge of the law, which caused it to last longer than the others.[106] The execution narrative followed the same pattern, and W. S. bracketed it with biography and

---

[105] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 244 and 251.

[106] Unique among the condemned regicides, John Cook has received special treatment in a recent biography that might be considered a martyrology in itself, but with yet again a unique cause: "[F]airness requires a belated defence for this bravest of all barristers, who died for the highest principle of advocacy." Geoffrey Robertson, *The Tyrannicide Brief: The Story of the Man Who Sent Charles I to the Scafffold* (New York, 2005), p. 1.

commentary. Cook's performance emphasized his faith. Upon being moved from the Tower to Newgate, he said, "If the way to the new Jerusalem be thorough Newgate blessed be God for Newgate, the King of glory will set open his everlasting gate to receive me shortly, and then I shall be for ever with the Lord."[107] In these words, Cook portrayed his imprisonment as a path to heaven. He saw Paul and Silas as his predecessors, who sang "in prison for Joy, blessed be the Comforter." In words similar to those we have seen from Sir Henry Slingsby in chapter 3, he professed, "Let no good people fear a prison, for it is the only place, wanting other books to study, the book of the selfe."[108] On suffering, he said that he "would rather chuse this death then to Die of a Feavour," since he knew that when he went up the ladder he would be "out of all pains in a quarter of an hour."[109] At one point in this prison discourse, some fellow prisoner warned him that "the Jesuites suffered cheerfully and confidently"; but Cook replied, "I bless God my justification is not upon the merits of works, but alone upon grace in the bloud of Christ."[110] Unlike the Jesuits, who believed that if they behaved with an aura of confidence they would be saved, Cook knew that his faith was sufficient, as Christ had already died for his salvation. In proclaiming it, he demonstrated the application of Protestant theology to one's own life.

Several unconnected sections of the account detail the jurist's relationship with members of his family, especially his wife and daughter. As was the case with Love, Penruddock, and Slingsby, the affection toward his family invites the reader to recognize a virtuous man, not a villain of rebellion. The morning of his execution, he saw his wife,

---

[107] *A compleat Collection*, p. 47.
[108] Ibid, p. 49.
[109] Ibid, pp. 49-50.
[110] Ibid, p. 50.

whom he called "dear lamb," and urged her not to "dishonor my last Wedding-day by any trouble for me," since this day was like the parable of the wise virgins: he had to be ready and free of distraction.[111] In another exchange, he urged her not to cry but rather to imitate his own confidence in God's mercy: "My dear lamb, let us not part in a shower, God hath wiped away all tears from my eyes, blessed be the Lord."[112] In a letter to his daughter, he urged her to remember her name, "Free-love," and let it "put thee in mind of the free love of God in Christ, in giving thee to me and thy dear Mother…thou art the child of one whom God counted worthy to suffer for his sake…which will be a great Honour to thee."[113] His sufferings would be a spiritual gift to his family. He reminded Free-love to obey her mother, to "marry one that is Gratious, & a man that feareth God," and not to "do any thing against the Light of thine own Conscience."[114] Cook's reminders to his family emphasize his paternal role while reminding them that he serves God and each of them by dying for the truth. His invocation of his daughter's conscience is crucial, as it also defends his own actions, which had brought this suffering upon him and their entire family. It was better, he argues, to tolerate that suffering and focus instead on God and the Scriptures, which would be sustenance for her "more than thy appointed Food."[115]

The writer notes that as Cook progressed to Charing Cross, he continued to speak with people "with such a chearfulnesse, as was an Astonishment to the spectators."[116] He had greeted Hugh Peters earlier, "Come brother Peters, let us knock at Heaven-gates this

---

[111] Ibid, p. 52.
[112] Ibid, p. 151.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid, p. 152.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid, p. 53.

morning, God will open the dores of Eternity to us."[117] Cook might have had reason for dismay, since he was greeted in the sledge by the head of Thomas Harrison, intentionally placed so as to stare at him for the journey; but instead "he passed rejoycingly through the Streets, as one borne up by that Spirit which man could not cast down." When he reached Charing Cross, he said, "this is the easiest chariot that ever I rid in all my life."[118] Cook's speech from the ladder was typical, discussing how Christ shed His blood for mankind's sins, and other matters of faith; once again, he intended witnesses to see that he was a faithful, honest Christian. He called himself a Congregationalist and a supporter of liberty of conscience. Interestingly he acknowledged the King's authority, noting that he had "not any hard thoughts concerning him" and would instead pray "that his Throne may be upheld by truth and by mercy." Like the royalist martyrs of 1649-51, he wished that the King might permit him to be the last to die, granting clemency to the remaining condemned regicides and especially his companion Hugh Peters, who was in poor health and "not fit to dye at this time."[119] This detail was corroborated by newspaper versions, which acknowledged that he had "carried himself at his Execution (as well as at his Tryal) much better than could be expected from one that acted such a part in that horrid arraignment," noting in particular that he prayed for the King.[120] He concluded with a prayer, noting that when Elijah was taken to heaven, his spirit was passed to Elisha, "who stood up in his stead," just as happened when the Apostles followed John the Baptist in proclaiming Christ's message; thus "the lord will have profit in the death of his Children. I believe that an army of Martyrs would willingly come from heaven to suffer in such a

---

[117] Ibid, p. 52.
[118] Ibid, p. 54.
[119] Ibid, pp. 57-58
[120] *Mercurius Publicus* 42, October 11-18, 1660, p. 670.

cause as this that I am come here to suffer for."[121] In this way Cook, too, proclaimed himself a martyr.

The text then turns to letters that Cook wrote in prison, a trope that we have seen previously but the first among the ten regicides. These provide further insight for readers into Cook's mind and encourage them to join his private correspondence to his public performance, making Cook a consistent martyr even before death. The letter, addressed to a "Christian friend," resembles some of his conversations, in which he had reflected on the experience of prison. He notes that he has "never found so much internal spiritual solace, and unmixt joy and comfort" as he has in his five months of confinement, citing 2 Corinthians 1:5: "For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ." He continues, "Let never any Christian fear a Prison, it being the only place where (wanting other Books) a man may best study the Book of the knowledge of himself, having a long vacation from all businesse, but…praising God in Christ." He notes that, since no one will visit him, he cannot be Martha or Mary; but this means that his "Chamber is like the sanctum sanctorum, where wittingly none may enter but the High Priest of our Profession, the Lord Jesus."[122] Cook's cell is the Holy of Holies, containing the presence of God. Of the virtues of his cause, he reflects, "I believe there is not a saint that hath engaged with us, but will wish at the last day that he had sealed to the truth of it with his blood, if thereunto called; for I am satisfied that it is the most noble and glorious Cause that has been agitated for God and Christ since the Apostolical times."[123] This is certainly a bold claim, but it connects the cause of 1649 and

---

[121] *A compleat Collection*, p. 64.
[122] Ibid, second pagination, p. 53.
[123] Ibid, p. 55.

thereafter with the original establishment of the Church and the basic principles of Christianity. The Stuart monarchy, he explains, had perverted Christianity, for which "they will wish at the last day, that they had been Jews, Turks, or Indians"; as for England, "the shout of King Jesus to Reign in Holinesse and Righteousnesse, is among his people."[124] The reference to "King Jesus" is somewhat surprising for Cook, possibly indicating a Fifth Monarchist origin to the book.

In an extended list of relevant verses, Cook cites Revelation 20:4, in which John sees the souls of those beheaded for Christ, noting that Christ's cause is now "counted as bad as Treason"; but he assures the addressee that it does not matter when "they say behold the head, or the heart of a Traytor, when your better part is in heaven…we must be prepared for suffering, *Cruore sanctorum rigatur Ecclesiae*."[125] The letter becomes increasingly martyrological, as he prays "that we may be ready not only to be bound, but to dye for Christ, and the Vindication and Justification of his Evangelical Doctrine…and confesse with our mouth, and in our lives, and by active Martyrdome, as Brook, Ireton, Hampden, Pickering, and others, have worthily done, who are safely arrived, expecting us, and we are yet upon the waves."[126] This list of martyrs and confessors includes political and military figures like Henry Ireton, who died a decade earlier by natural causes, presumably making him a confessor; all of them are awaiting Cook and his companions in heaven. It also includes battlefield deaths as potential martyrdoms, suggesting that supporters of the Cause might continue their fight. Just as the faith is being persecuted yet again, "God would call for some of his Childrens blood, which will

---

[124] Ibid, p. 57.
[125] Ibid, pp. 59-60; the Latin is a paraphrase of Tertullian's passage about the blood of Christians.
[126] Ibid, pp. 61-62; furthermore "the most excellent, honourable, rich and fruitful confession of Christ…is to lay down our lives as the Martyrs did."

be the greater favour to them whom he shall count worthy of it, because I think this will rather be a Julian than a Neronian persecution."[127] This reference to the emperor "Julian the Apostate," a nephew of Constantine who reverted to paganism and deprived Christians of offices, accuses the Stuarts of abandoning true Christianity while implying that the persecution will be short and reversible:the Good Old Cause will persevere. Similarly, Cook notes that even "if our innocencies be not vindicated, & cleared up in this life, as Iobs, Mordecas, Iosephs, and Daniels and Susannas were yet at the revelation of the righteous judgement of God, it will appear before Men and Angels, that we are not Traytors, nor Murderers, nor Phanatiques but true Christians, and good Common-wealths men, fixt and constant to the principles of sanctity, truth, justice, and mercy, which the Parliament and Army declared and engaged for."[128] Here the spiritual reflection returns to politics, as the entire Civil War was a fight for sanctity and truth, thereby making them "true Christians." In his conclusion, he describes how he hopes to have "an affectual, if not effectual Martyrdom, for being an Advocate for my blessed Advocate and the good people of England."[129] His life and his entire legal career had been in service of Christ, and for that reason he will now die a martyr. Cook's alleged letter portrayed to readers of *The Speeches and Prayers* a sober, thoughtful, prayerful man who has reflected on his life and his actions and determined that they were all in Christ's service.

As usual, W.S. disagrees; the biography and commentary each explain how Cook had often spoken of the Regicide with regret. He had reportedly confided in a friend that he was "prickt in conscience" as "the King was a wise and a gracious Prince," but

---

[127] Ibid, p. 62.
[128] Ibid, p. 64.
[129] Ibid, p. 65.

unfortunately he had to die if Monarchy were to be abolished.[130] At this point, Cook chose to embrace that abolition wholeheartedly: "having had a finger in this innocent bloud, he was resolved to plunge himself over head and ears therein." But despite his attempt at convincing himself, he later was racked by guilt, and "even upon the Bench" would "fall into strange sighs and groans…and hath been often seen to strike his breast, which was seconded with a groan, and then followed this expression, Ah poor Charls, poor Charls!"[131] Contrary to the *Speeches and Prayers* characterization, he was "as penitent at his Death, as formerly he had expressed himself in his Life."[132] The speech, prayers, and letters of Cook were an example of treason wearing a "cloak," as the "Quaint Orator" fought "for life, under the sad pressures of a heavy charge."[133] He accuses Cook of perjury, Machiavellianism, and blasphemy in calling regicide "a pious work," proving that "Harrison's Head was the Map of his Mortality." He concludes by wishing that all traitors will be similarly punished, especially those who "adde not to their Prayers, God Save the King."[134] W.S. pays special attention to Cook's intellect, casting him as more penitent than the original version would allow; but in the end his prayers were for himself, and his version of Christianity was a distorted version of God's truths. Again, W.S. discredits the various regicides differently, depending on their specific performances: while he would lump them together as "regicides," he respected their unique behavior, tailoring his criticisms to each context in turn.

---

[130] Ibid, p. 44.
[131] Ibid, p. 45.
[132] Ibid, p. 46.
[133] Ibid, p. 77.
[134] Ibid, p. 78.

Though the narrative mostly separates the two since they were not on the ladder at the same time, Cook and Hugh Peters were executed on the same day, and Cook repeatedly prayed that Peters might be spared execution due to his ill health. Peters attracted more attention in the London press than the others, especially in satire, and we will consider him more generally in the next chapter; but here he should be addressed as one of the ten, in the context of the dueling accounts. A sermon ostensibly delivered by Peters in prison two days before his death urged those present to disregard matters of the temporal world, because what really matters is the eternal, which is beyond human understanding.[135] Providing this sermon first prepares the reader for the account's unexpected admission that Peters seemed troubled and unprepared for death, at least initially; but "surely the favour of God did at the last appear, for a little before he went forth to Execution (as many can testifie) he was well composed in his Spirit, and cheerfully said, I thank God now I can dy, I can look death in the face and not be afraid."[136] The author takes care to dismiss the frequently repeated rumor that Peters had been guilty of sexual impropriety, quoting him as swearing "that he never knew any Woman but his own Wife."[137] The narrative is unusually short, but this reflects the event. Peters was forced to sit "within the Railes at Charing-cross" and watch Cook's execution at close range; the hangman showed him the blood on his hands, taunting him, "how do you like this Mr. Peters, how do you like this work?"[138] Peters chastised the sheriff for this display, but assured all present that "God hath made it an Ordinance to me for my strengthening and encouragement," turning this provocation into an opportunity for

---

[135] Ibid, p 113.
[136] Ibid, p. 118.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid, p. 119.

spiritual reinforcement. He reportedly smiled in his last moments and said, "this is a good day, he is come that I have long looked for." But this is the extent of Peters's self-defense. The report notes that no more of his words were recorded because "his voice was low at that time, and the people uncivil"; perhaps, but this is notable, given that Peters had formerly known quite well how to engage a crowd.[139] The account is consistent with other reports that Peters's execution was different from the rest; he spoke little, was jeered by those present, and did not behave in as clear a martyrological fashion as the others had, which was disproportionately noticeable because he was a cleric known for fiery and entertaining sermons.[140] He was reported to be ill and had long been given to bouts of melancholy; but it gave the writer less material to use.

In the W.S. book, a much longer bracketing commentary than usual, befitting the infamous Peters, compensated for the short execution and suggested that he was simply mad. The Bate biography calls Peters "a man of a continued turbulent spirit…little better than frantick," who had "roved about the world, like an universal Church-man, called Jesuits," since he traveled from New England to the Netherlands and back to England.[141] The biography is skeptical of Peters's sincerity in his beliefs, suggesting that "this wicked Jesuitical Priest" had preached to the army to give the appearance of an earnest religious component to their otherwise "tyrannical domination."[142] The author rebukes Peters for abusing Psalm 149 in saying that God would help His people to "bind their Kings in

---

[139] Ibid, p. 120.
[140] By one account he was the most "unpitied" of all the men, and the crowd gave "a shout as if the people of England had acquired a Victory" when his head was held aloft; *Mercurius Publicus* 42, October 11-18, 1660, pp. 670-71. This account also noted that the execution at Charing Cross was especially fitting for Peters, since he had been the most vehement preacher in demanding that it be taken down.
[141] *A compleat Collection*, p. 79.
[142] Ibid, p. 80.

chains, and their Nobles in fetters of iron," and for misinterpreting Isaiah 14:18-21 to compare "the King of Babylon, to the King of England." Cromwell stood by during his sermons and laughed "to see this wicked Instrument of the Devils…avouch and maintain this hellish practice."[143] The biography provides its own account of the execution, noting that Peters was "discomposed both in spirit and mind" and "retained much of his former Frenetick humours" to the end. He sat in the sledge "like a Sot all the way he went, and either plucking the Straws therein, or gnawing the fingers of his gloves," coming "not like a Minister, but like some ignorant Atheist." Not knowing what to say to the crowd, he "perfectly burst forth into weeping," covered his face, prayed briefly, and was hanged. The Bate biographies always conclude with a short rhyme, most of which are generic, rejoicing that another traitor has been sent to hell; but in this case it is said to have been written by some witness of the execution. It calls the scene "the last, and best Edition / of Hugh the Author of Sedition…And now I hope it is no Sin, / To say, Rebellion took the Swing." The writer is almost gleeful that the infamous Peters gave such a poor performance. His behavior confirmed that he was a bad Christian and suggested that his entire life and career had been characterized by deep mental distress.[144] W. S.'s observations similarly note that "blowing the Bellows of Rebellion," he had "belch[ed] from an Impure throat, the loathsome vapours of Sedition." He had treated "the hand of the Devil" as if it were "the finger of the Lord" in the pulpit, from which he delivered sermons "like Stage-Plays" at which the congregation laughed at "his absurd and ridiculous Expressions." He had, however, followed closely Christ's teaching that faith was like a mustard seed, for "he devoured it with his Beef, whilst his Belly was his

---

[143] Ibid, p. 81; these details were all provided by witnesses at the regicides' trials.
[144] Ibid, p. 84.

God."[145] W.S.'s criticism of Peters for his sermons is similar to the satires that we will consider in the next chapter: where Peters had been hailed as the great preacher of the Regicide, here he becomes a glutton, a classic anti-Puritan accusation, as well as a rake, and likely an "atheist." He tricked the army into supporting regicide, and he preached to entertain, as his sermons lacked any true Christian doctrine. His life was a mad mockery of religious ministry.

The following day, Wednesday, 17 October, Thomas Scot, Gregory Clement, John Jones, and Adrian Scroop were all executed, two at a time, at Charing Cross; but in keeping with the martyrological framework of *The Speeches and Prayers*, each was addressed sequentially by W.S., permitting them to have their respective turns in proclaiming their shared cause while simultaneously deconstructing them. Scot and Clement were reported to have gone at 9 o'clock, and Scroop and Jones followed an hour later. That there were four that morning meant that each was deprived of substantial time to speak, and as a result these executions are noteworthy for subversive public prayer, rather than subversive public speech. The original narrative begins with Scot in prison some days earlier, learning that Harrison has just been condemned; he assures a worried friend, "I am not troubled at that; a fit of an ague would cost a man more, I believe."[146] When it was his turn, he said, "Blessed, O blessed Chains! I would not be without these Chains." He assured his friends that he would continue to "own that Cause which God had often honoured," sanctifying the Regicide as the others had done. He did seek a reprieve, but not to save his life indefinitely; rather, "methinks my Wedding Garment is

---

[145] Ibid, p. 121.
[146] Ibid, p. 129.

not quite ready: a little more time, that I may as a Bride be ready trimmed."[147] He the Court's ministers that he would let them know if he thought of anything worth repenting.[148] He was not troubled that his body would be abused, saying instead that it was appropriate "that the dead Bodies of the Witnesses must be unburied, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." Like others, he praised God for counting him worthy to suffer for "His Cause," quoting Psalm 116:13, "I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord."[149] At the gallows, he quoted Paul, as had Christopher Love a decade earlier: "I stand here a Spectacle to God, to Angels and Men," noting that he hoped to join them soon in heaven. He began to defend his life as a fight to halt "the approaches of Popery," but here the sheriff stopped him from speaking; in a departure from the previous days' patterns, he was limited to prayer, not pontification, which is interesting since Scot had been more republican than theocrat. Scot protested, "Sir, tis hard that an Englishman hath not liberty to speak…it is a very mean and bad cause, that will not bear the words of a dying man."[150] Rather than be silent, however, he used his prayer as an opportunity to defend his politics, noting that God "hath engaged me in a Cause not to be repented of; I say in a Cause not to be repented of"—at which the Sheriff interrupted him again, saying, "Is this your Prayers Mr. Scot?" He prayed on, despite the interruption, that God would "Remember thy Cause in England."[151] Scot's performance is entertaining and upbeat, arguing with the sheriff and praising his "Cause," though he does not explain what it is. W.S., however, would provide a damning explanation.

---

[147] Ibid, pp. 130-31.
[148] Ibid, p. 132.
[149] Ibid, p. 133.
[150] Ibid, p. 135.
[151] Ibid, pp. 138-39.

Scot was infamous for having said that he wanted his involvement in the Regicide inscribed on his grave. Although this point was discussed at length during his trial, the martyrological narrative did not mention it; but the commentaries cited it repeatedly as proof that Scot was wholly unrepentant, despite his cheerfulness at his execution. The writer describes how Scot had been sent to London as a youth "to be brought up in some honest calling, which he was never so honest as to practice," instead partnering with a Bridewell brewer before joining Parliament and sowing the seeds of anti-monarchism.[152] The biography recounts his central role in the King's trial. Finally it describes how he returned to Parliament in 1659, after Monk had reconvened the Rump, and to the horror of all present moved that they reconfirm the legality and necessity of the Regicide. Despite protestations, he proclaimed "that he desired no greater honour then to have it Engraved upon his Tomb-stone, 'Here lies Tho. Scot, one of the Judges of the late King,' to the end the World might take notice of it."[153] Such pride in treason as defined by royalists would have limited Scot's ability to appear as a martyr. Bate notes that at Charing Cross, Scot had a "seeming cheerful gravity" and "obdurately and insensibly ascended the Ladder," saying little publicly. The rhyme mocks him, since though he wanted his tombstone to proclaim his role in the Regicide, his execution and dismemberment ensured that his body would never rest in a grave.[154] In the "observations," W.S. laments that "This man…strives now in the face of the world to leave behind him a good Memory, and by a feigned repentance to gain some Credit in the

---

[152] Ibid, p. 123.
[153] Ibid, p. 127.
[154] Ibid, p. 128.

peoples estimation."[155] Of course any potential martyr seeks to leave a "good memory" behind, but this is more difficult when one "makes that his greatest glory, which time hath punished with a furious revenge."[156] The condemnation is taut, reminding readers that the regicides had inverted good and evil, allying themselves to Satan:

> If final Impenitency be a sign of final Ruine, what shall we think of these who not onely acted what men and Angels condemn, but have given their horrid Treasons the glorious name of Gods own CAUSE, making, if possible, God the Author of Villany: Read then in this man, a desperate Traytor, a known enemy to all goodness, perjured in his first principles: In his life loose, in his prayers blasphemous, and his end miserable.[157]

Even Judas managed to hang himself in grief, W.S. writes; but Scot was hanged without recognizing his sin, making his situation even worse than the most famous betrayer in Christian history. The narrative concludes with a reminder of the theatricality of the day: "here let us leave this infortunate man, and see who next enters to play his part in this fatal story."[158]

That would be Adrian Scroop, who was less famous than the others and received less treatment in all versions of this text. He still presented himself as an unapologetic potential martyr through several memorable incidents, such as when he reassured his weeping child at his condemnation, "Who would be troubled to dye? For can any one have greater honour, than to have his Soul carried up to Heaven upon the wings of the Prayers of so many Saints?"[159] When he was visited in prison by a relative who urged him to repent, he pushed him away, saying, "Avoid Satan," a parallel to Christ's response

---

[155] Ibid, p. 141.
[156] Ibid, p. 142.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Ibid, p. 129, third pagination.

to the Peter when he said that he would not let Jesus suffer.[160] Before going to his execution, he invoked Psalm 26:6, "I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord."[161] In going about the altar of God while processing to the place of execution, Scroop placed himself in the position of a priest offering sacrifice or, alternatively, the sacrifice itself—in either case this is essentially *in persona Christi*. Upon reaching the ladder at Charing Cross, he proclaimed that he bore "no animosity nor Malice against any man" and forgave all who convicted him, an honorable announcement that reminded listeners that he had proudly been "born and bred a Gentleman."[162] The remainder of his speech and prayer was typical, asserting that he was returning to the arms of Christ and reminding witnesses that there was "no reproach or shame to follow the Lord Jesus Christ, to Die in his Cause; for that is it which I judge I am now going to do."[163] Scroop, like his comrades, would be a martyr. The commentary was brief; W.S. noted that it was terrible for a gentleman to fall as far as Scroop had. He admitted that it was touching to see Scroop's children's love for their father and how they were comforted by a friend at the execution, but this was nothing compared to the grief felt when England lost its father the King at Scroop's own behest. At that point, "we the poor Subjects and Children of our Murdered Prince and Father, had no Comforter; nay, if at any time Sighs or Tears broke their Chrystial Prisons, we found rods of Correction, nay

---

[160] Ibid, p. 130. Cf. Matthew 16:23, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men"; also Matthew 4:10, to the Devil himself during the temptation in the desert, "Go thee hence, Satan."

[161] *Compleat Collection*, p. 131. It is interesting that he did not continue with the following verse, "That I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wondrous works"; but it may be assumed that listeners and readers would know this.

[162] Ibid.

[163] Ibid, p. 132.

Rods steeped in Vinegar and Gall to keep us quiet."[164] The regicides had inverted good and evil, making it illegal, in theory, even to comfort those who mourned the King. The description of royalists' sufferings also inverts the martyrological discussions of familial affection. The text concludes by asking whether a traitor could genuinely have such confidence that he responds to the offer of repentance "with a fuge Satan," and argues that it is difficult "to wash ones hands in Innocency when the Devil holds the Basin."[165] Scroop's entire worldview, then, has been so twisted that he is no longer aware of what is good: he blindly embraces evil himself, far more than simply leading others to think that the evil is good. He actually believes in it.

Along with Scroop, the elderly Welshman John Jones was in the second shift of hangings that morning, and he too was brief both at the scene and in the accounts. *The Speeches and Prayers* makes up for this by reproducing a letter, in which Jones reminded the unnamed addressee from prison that none should mourn him "but rather rejoyce that my portion is in heaven, and that my…Removall out of this earthly Tabernacle, is but in order to my Cloathing with immortality."[166] While leaving Newgate, Jones comforted one of Scroop's children, asking why he wept when his father was merely "going to reign with the King of Kings in everlasting Glory," where the child would one day rejoin him.[167] Jones had lamented after the executions of Harrison and Carew that he was not already in heaven to welcome them, but concluded that he would "be content to go after them." On his journey, he observed that the sledge was "like Elijah's Fiery Chariot, only it goes through Fleet street," making him a prophet assumed by God to heaven before the

---

[164] Ibid, p. 134.
[165] Ibid, p. 135; i.e., "Be gone, Satan."
[166] Ibid, p. 140.
[167] Ibid, p. 142.

eyes of his successor Elisha.[168] Jones and Scroop together had "grave and gracefull Countenances," which "caused great Admiration and Compassion in the Spectators."[169] Jones also worried about supporters of the Cause who had fled abroad, since they would be "hunted from place to place, and never be in safety, nor hear the voice of the Turtle."[170] Jones was polite to the sheriff, who thanked him for avoiding "any reviling language, as some others have done before."[171] Despite Jones's confident performance, the account noted how grisly the scene had become, as the executioner, having drawn and quartered three so far that day, "was so drunk with Blood" that he "grew sick at stomack," forcing him to send "his Boy to finish the Tragedy upon Col. Jones."[172] W.S. was kinder to Jones, since he was "seemingly penitent" and acknowledged from the ladder "That it was the Power that made the Law," perhaps a problematic philosophy, but one that allowed him to admit that Charles II "did nothing but what he would have done himself…For the King did but like a loving and dutifull Son to a dear and loving Father."[173] W.S. respected this partial change of heart but still warned readers that even though "his gray Haires pleaded much gravity…Reverence is not due to Traytors; To be zealous in a bad Cause, argues a Conscience fit for Villany."[174] Jones's remarks on *de facto* power failed to acknowledge that Charles I had been King by God's will, not merely by the sword.

---

[168] Ibid, p. 142.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Ibid; the "voice of the Turtle" is a reference to the Authorized Version's rendering of the Song of Songs 2:12, in which the speaker's beloved invites her to awake for spring and witness, among other things, the turtle's voice; modern translations correct this to the more logical "turtledove."
[171] Ibid, p. 146.
[172] Ibid, p. 142.
[173] Ibid, p. 139.
[174] Ibid, p. 146.

The second to die that Wednesday but last to appear in this section of the narrative was Gregory Clement, who received very brief treatment. According to W. S. and Bate, he was an unsavory soul, expelled from the Rump Parliament for "lying with his Maid at Greenwich."[175] He neither spoke nor prayed publicly at the gallows, which the original writer had cited as evidence that "he departed this life in peace," but there was little else to be said; the martyrologist could not invent martyrdom from nothing. On the other hand, *Mercurius Publicus* reported that Clement had confessed to his guilt and proclaimed his punishment just, a point that a martyrologist would have taken care to avoid.[176] W.S. seized this opportunity to argue that Clement had been "struke Mute with the Horrour of his Conscience... I can say but little, where he scarce saith anything himself: onely this, That if Dying for the Good Old Cause, Dipt in the Kings Blood, onely can make a Saint-like Martyrdome, and Martyrdome be the onely way to be saved, I shall never go to Heaven."[177] The propagandist used Clement's silence as evidence of guilt, since he failed to defend his cause, the fundamental qualifier for martyrdom.

The last two regicides were executed on Friday, 19 October at Tyburn, not Charing Cross, and from a cart, not a ladder. This signaled a return to normal after the bloody week had, in theory, put a stop to anti-royalism in the newly restored monarchy. The verbose Daniel Axtel was first, and was also quartered; but the body of the reticent Francis Hacker was given to his family whole, in mercy to his royalist relatives. Because Hacker spoke so little, the accounts combined the two as one narrative; as W.S. put it, Hacker "left the whole business of prayer to be carried on by Col. Axtel, who performed

---

[175] Ibid, p. 147.
[176] *Mercurius Publicus* 42, October 11-18, p. 672.
[177] *A compleat Collection*, p. 148.

it for them both."[178] Axtel spoke at great length, taking every opportunity to portray himself and his companion as the final martyrs for the Good Old Cause. During his imprisonment, Axtel maintained a "cheerful countenance," holding his Bible as he returned from sentencing; he proclaimed, "I shall have the use of this book two dayes more, and then enjoy the fullness of the Gospel to all Eternity."[179] He urged his wife not to cry, asking, "what hurt have they done me, to send me sooner to Heaven? And I bless the Lord I could have freely gone from the Bar to the Gibbet." Similarly, when visitors noted that his cell was uncomfortable, he replied, "What matter is it to have a little dirty way, when we have a fair House to come into?"[180] His death was a comfort, making him eager to go to the gallows and willing to tolerate inconveniences along the way. Several times he spoke of his chains: to his daughter he said that he hoped she had not avoided him for the shame of them, but reminded her that "they that will not bear the Cross, shall not wear the Crown." Similarly, he spoke to a visitor from Ireland and asked him to "tell them (said he, shaking of his Chains rejoycingly) that you saw me in my chains; and I reckon all these links as so many Pearls to Adorn me; and I am sure they are so in Christs account; and tell them, that for that Good Old Cause which we were ingaged in, under the Parliament, I am now going to be their Martyr."[181] Axtel, like most of the others, linked the Cause to Christ, arguing that death for a political enterprise was also death for his faith; but this was particularly evident in his statement that he died for liturgical reforms. When a visitor asked what news he should bring to Gloucestershire, he replied, "Bid them keep close to Christ, and let them not touch with Surplis or Common-prayer-book;

---

[178] Ibid, p. 160.
[179] Ibid, p. 164.
[180] Ibid, p. 163.
[181] Ibid, p. 164.

and bid them (what ever they do) love the image of Christ where-ever they see it, in Presbyterian, Independent, Baptised or other."[182] Axtel's idea of a free church had little room for ceremonialists. Reflecting on the manner of his death, he explained, "they have merely murthered me; and they might as well have done it at the Tower, as have brought me hither to make this bustle"; in the end it will all be futile as "I shall do them more hurt in my death, then I could do in my life."[183] This too is a classic martyr's performance, announcing that one's death gave life to one's cause. The reference to the accoutrements of the Church of England, which he would repeat at Tyburn, is striking, as is the reminder that Christ can be in any denominations but the established church.

Axtel remained cheerful throughout his last days, not merely with his several visitors but also with fellow prisoners. When his companions were led to Charing Cross earlier in the week, he called out to them in encouragement, "The Lord go with you, the Angel of his presence stand by you."[184] When the news came back that they had died "nobly and cheerfully," he asked "how do they stand?" The obvious response was, of course, "upon a ladder"; but he replied, "Blessed be God…it is a Jacobs Ladder." The night before they died, Hacker was despondent; Axtel tried to comfort him, reminding him that "by this time tomorrow we shall be with our Father in Glory…our God is the God of Newgate." When they set out, he proclaimed, "I am now going to my bed of Roses, my last bed."[185] He held up his gloves as he left, saying, "These are my wedding Gloves."[186] Axtel's flamboyant final hours are riddled with statements like this, ascribing

---

[182] Ibid, p. 165.
[183] Ibid.
[184] Ibid..
[185] Ibid, p. 166.
[186] Ibid, p. 167.

meaning to each detail. By comparison, Hacker was quiet, which the writer of the *Speeches and Prayers* was forced to concede; he explained that he "had not the gift of Oratory…yet was very sweetly born up under his suffering" and had been a Presbyterian, having indeed "an interest in Jesus Christ," whatever witnesses might have supposed.[187]

At Tyburn, Axtel continued his showy performance, making much of holding his Bible and announcing that it contained "the very cause for which I have engaged." The sheriff stopped him only when he explained how the Presbyterian ministers, including Christopher Love, had shown him "the justness of the War," leading him to devote his life to Parliament and now to die for that cause.[188] He took comfort in the bright sun and noted, "how much more is the glory of the Son of God, who is the Sun of Righteousness."[189] After Axtel's lengthy speech, Hacker read a short statement, explaining that he had served Parliament in good faith; he asked Axtel to pray on their joint behalf, and the colonel delivered. According to the author, "the Lord helped him with excellent Expressions suitable to both their conditions."[190] He prayed that he would be united with Christ in death, that all present would find conversion to Christ, that the City of London would receive God's mercy as He had promised Abraham for Sodom, and that those in power would govern justly. He prayed for the "chief Magistrate of this Nation," presumably the King, "that he may become a friend unto Christ, and a friend to the people of Christ, and reign in righteousness," rejecting injustice and ruling for God.[191] The prayer may have been sincere, but it fell short of a hearty "God save the King." In an

---

[187] Ibid, pp. 169-70.
[188] Ibid, p. 171.
[189] Ibid, p. 172.
[190] Ibid, p. 175.
[191] Ibid, p. 180.

awkward footnote to the execution, after his and Hacker's heads were covered, the cart seemed to move, prompting him to say "Lord Jesus receive my spirit" with his hands raised; when it then did not move further, he said it again, to no avail. The martyrologist explained that this was because

> there was no man found to put forward the horse to draw away the Cart, until the common Hang-man came down out of the Cart himself to do it; the Carman, as many witnesses affirm, saying, he would loose his Cart and Horse before he would have a hand in hanging such a man; By this means he had opportunity to lift up his hands and utter the like words the third time also.[192]

The anecdote draws sympathy from the reader; if the paid servants of the execution refused to fulfill their duties, then surely this man was a son of God. This would seem to be sufficient to demonstrate Axtel's righteousness, but the writer offers another story: though most in the crowd had "behaved themselves very civilly," two people had called out, "Hang them Rogues, Traytors, Murtherers" when Axtel and Hacker were led onto the cart. A man urged them to keep quiet, "for the Sheriff knoweth what he hath to do," at which they fell silent and listened to Axtel's words. Then, he writes, "those very persons were so affected, that they could not refrain from pouring out many Tears upon the place, and went aside to a place a little more retired to weep; and that man that before desired them to be civil, went after them and beheld them, to his great admiration."[193] The man in question is not identified, but this has the semblance of an eyewitness account, rather like the Gospel of John: the stories were either told to the writer, or he saw them himself. They are absent from the newsbooks. Axtel, in these anecdotes, inspired witnesses, perhaps not to convert to his cause but at the very least to turn from their vengeance and

---

[192] Ibid, p. 182.
[193] Ibid.

ponder his virtue. We have seen similar examples in this study, especially in the aftermath of Christopher Love's execution. In each case, the potential martyr, by behaving bravely and confidently, draws sympathy from his audience, undermining the response intended by the state.

As usual, W. S. and Bate rebutted this interpretation, arguing that Axtel and Hacker had received their just reward. Axtel, a man of a "malicious and covetous spirit," had been a grocer before joining the army and before his rise to prominence among Parliamentarians, finally becoming one of the chief guards and escorts of Charles on the way to the scaffold.[194] He had been proud of his role in the Regicide and "had often confest in Ireland, That he had been the chief Instrument in bringing the King to that Fatal Axe."[195] The biography tells how he had chided Colonel Huncks for refusing to sign the final warrant, calling him "a peevish man" and complaining that "now they were going into a safe Harbour, Col. Huncks should strike Sail before they had cast Anchor."[196] The biography also notes that Axtel had been "a general disowner of Orthodox Ministers, and a great countenancer of Sects and Factions, and a self-conceited Preacher himself," which offers an alternative reading of his confident, scripture-heavy last speech and prayer: though he was deeply religious, he rejected Christianity as understood by the Church. Hacker, meanwhile, who was "of a greater bulk of body then of perfections of mind," had actually led the regiment escorting Charles to the

---

[194] Ibid, p. 153.
[195] Ibid, p. 158.
[196] Ibid, p. 154.

Banqueting House.[197] His defense had been that he was following Cromwell's orders, which he was obliged to heed.

W.S. and Bate also commented on those who had been reprieved, and others "who wander about the world as Vagabonds, like Cain, with the cry of blood at their heels," hoping that they would soon be captured.[198] All of these men "are set up as Lots Wife's Pillar of Salt," warning witnesses not to "imbrew their hands in the sacred blood of his own Anointed," an act almost as bad as "Deicide."[199] The book urges Christians to pray for God's purification, and that He might "keep these Nations from Rebellion and privy Conspiracy, from all false Doctrine and heresie, that no Jesuitical plots from abroad, or Anabaptistical or Schismatical Consultations at home, may be ever to raise sedition in the people, or disturb the peace of the King."[200] This is the purpose of the entire book: to exhort England to follow its restored king and to learn from these executions that the Regicide was a sin for which someone had to be punished—and these ten unrepentant regicides were the best examples. Even if their "speeches and prayers" were forgeries, a possibility that W.S. did not consider, they had been published and required rebuttal. The final pages of that rebuttal reiterate that these men were guilty of murder because they dared "to protect what is a sin to think of" by "guard[ing] those bloody Shambles where Virtue and Majesty stood like Lambs before the Butcher." Through the nation's mourning any future rebellion should be stayed. "See the end of these men," W.S. urges the reader; "their names shall perish, and their memory shall be rooted out: to enjoy the pleasures of the world for a while, & Tyburn at the end, is the

---

[197] Ibid, p. 159.
[198] Ibid, p. 161.
[199] Ibid, p. 162.
[200] Ibid.

Traytors Legacy."[201] He concludes with an anecdote of a man who had "trembled to come before Bradshaw, imagining that sure he must be more than Man that durst sentence his King"—but in reality, the regicides were fragile men who, though it may have taken some time, had finally faced their just punishment. "If such men as these deserve the title of Saints," W.S. wrote, "unless it be in Plutoes Legend, I leave it to more serious judgements."[202] But surely he had provided a judgment for his readers already.

The several versions of the original *Speeches and Prayers*, although condensed here under W.S.'s title, encapsulate the primary contest of the potential martyrdoms of 1660. Edmund Ludlow read the same texts, and his account of the executions was nearly identical to the original copy, including the hagiographical commentary. Most of the ten regicides executed that October presented themselves as martyrs at the scaffold; and while a few were subdued, the combined presentation of *The Several Speeches* encouraged readers to view the men sympathetically. Both the supportive and critical versions treated the men as dying for some common cause, which was the argument created by the court in the first place; yet in reading their individual performances, it becomes clear that, even though most were glad for one another's company, they interpreted that cause differently and characterized it as such through powerful performances at the gallows. W.S.'s commentaries attempted to deconstruct these potential martyrs of the Good Old Cause, but no amount of commentary could remove Harrison's image of bravery and confidence, clutching his breast and proclaiming that Cause to bystanders—not, at least, in 1660.

---

[201] Ibid, p. 183.
[202] Ibid, p. 184.

As noted earlier, however, in 1664 that would change, when Thomas Brewster, Simon Dover, and Nathan Brooks were tried for libel, fined, pilloried, and imprisoned for printing the *Speeches and Prayers*. In the same session, another publisher, John Twyn, was convicted of treason for a different book and subsequently drawn and quartered: dangerous texts were on trial themselves. As the editor of the account of these trials observed, "It was only his Majesties Mercy toward the other three, to call that a Misdemeanour, which the Law calls Treason."[203] Where W.S. had been willing to admit that the published speeches of 1660 were authentic, by 1664 this was insufficient, and they were dismissed as "meer Forgery" by the account's editor.[204] Twyn's treasonable book was tellingly described as "an Arrow drawn out of a Presbyterian Quiver…The very Shaft, that formerly pierced the Late King through the Heart," an interesting commentary on the Presbyterians' rapid fall from fortune after their peak in 1660.[205] The editor commented more generally that "There has not been any One Traytor cut off by the Stroke of Justice, since the Blessed time of His Majesties Restauration, whose Case, and Tryal has not been Surreptitiously Printed, and Published…with most Scandalous

---

[203] *An Exact Narrative of the Trial and Condemnation of John Twyn*, etc, sig. A2. Lord Chief Justice Hyde said the same thing; p. 72. In the trial witnesses testified that they were given the manuscript by Giles Calvert; ibid, p. 37.

[204] Ibid, sig. A3; forgery was not discussed at the trial and could be an attempt by this publisher to insult his rivals.

[205] Ibid, sig. A2v-A3. John Twyn's alleged treason had nothing to do with the speeches of the Regicides but rather for printing a book that endorsed rebellion. His case is still important; Lord Chief Justice Robert Hyde told him that "There's nothing that pretends to Religion that will avow or justifie the killing of Kings, but the Jesuit on the one side, and the Sectary on the other"; ibid, p. 34. Twyn proclaimed in his last speech that he was sick when the manuscript was delivered and handed it to his servant, meaning that it was published without his knowledge of its contents, which he would never have approved; but he needed money for his family and was not in a condition to assess its value. This oversight was fatal mistake. He also refused to receive the Sacrament from the Church of England, noting that he dissented from its liturgy, but otherwise he prayed earnestly for his own salvation. For his speech, see ibid, pp. 74-75. For each of these trials, see also *State Trials* 6.513ff, which mostly reproduces the published account from 1664.

Reflections upon the King, and His Government." This was all a result of "the Insufferable Liberties of the Presse."[206] In the trial, two illustrative passages from the speech and letters of John Cook were presented as evidence that even printing texts that were already "public" could be libelous if their content was objectionable.[207] The forgery allegations, as well as the reasons that they were charged so long after the publication, remain uncertain, though some late discoveries by Roger L'Estrange seem to have been a key instigator. In any case, just four years into the Restoration, it was no longer sufficient to deconstruct the regicides themselves: now their last words, usually a privileged category, had to be suppressed. The Serjeant-at-law John Keeling (or Kelynge) accosted one of the witnesses for "think[ing] it lawful to print what a man sayes when he dies, and to scatter it abroad though never so bad, it's a great offence."[208] By this thinking, even W.S. could have been charged for libel, simply for letting the regicides' speeches stand.

---

[206] Ibid, sig. A3r-v.

[207] Ibid, pp. 41-42; the passages in question appeared in W.S.'s *Compleat Collection* on pp. 55-56.

[208] Ibid, p. 58; Hyde similarly lamented in his closing remarks that "The Press is grown so common, and men take the boldness to Print what ever is brought to them, let it concern whom it will; it is high time Examples be made...He must not say, He knew not what was in it; that is no Answer in Law. I speak this, because I would have men avoid this for time to come, and not think to shelter themselves under such a Pretence." Hyde also explained that the King had charged them with libel, a misdemeanor, rather than with treason because "He desires to Reform, not to Ruine his Subjects"; p. 72.

Chapter 5: “Hang’d in the Strings”: The Regicides in Cheap Print and Satire

This chapter continues the argument begun in chapter 4: the writers of royalist propaganda attempted to homogenize the ten condemned regicides by treating their “Good Old Cause” as reducible to the unthinkable killing of a king. We will continue to assess how martyrs were constructed and deconstructed in 1660 and 1661, but we will use these shorter, cheaper, more generically varied sources, including broadsheet accounts of the executions, songs about the Restoration, and a variety of satires, all of which were more digestible forms of propaganda. Short factual pamphlets supplemented longer accounts like Finch’s trial record and would have more easily—and affordably—given essential details to English readers. Satires also presented royalist arguments as accessible, amusing summaries of the wider martyrological contest. Royalist pamphleteers undercut the men’s performances not by challenging them directly but by attacking their reputations and invoking long-held tropes. Mockery of philanderers and buffoons could be more effective than comments on enormous speeches, especially since they turned attention away from those unavoidably impressive last performances. An important component of this deconstruction was the frequent invocation of royalist martyrs of the previous decade, which essentially placed two martyrologies in contest with one another: satirists mocked regicides in the same pages that they praised royalist heroes, linking their respective deaths and citing punishments in 1660 as justice for executions by the ousted regime years earlier. When possible, we will also consider defenses of the Good Old Cause, especially Hugh Peters’s dying advice to his daughter, which attempted to rehabilitate his reputation and uphold him as a martyr.

Related to this satirical deconstruction, the second part of this chapter will consider a more grisly example of anti-martyrological polemic, demonstrated primarily through symbolic action and then defended with still more accompanying satires. These formed the second propagandistic defense of the Restoration. On 30 January 1661, the twelfth anniversary of the Regicide, the exhumed corpses of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw were delivered to Tyburn for hanging and beheading; their bodies were buried beneath the gallows, and their heads were raised on poles atop Westminster Hall. The actions themselves, especially the disinterring of Cromwell from his tomb in the center of the Henry VII Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey, sent a powerful message that the most important figures of the Interregnum were not to be held in any esteem. The propaganda did not end there, however; defenders of the Crown produced satirical pamphlets mocking the disgraced heroes of the Good Old Cause, including stories of Cromwell's activities in hell, the three men's ghosts meeting at Tyburn, and a copy of their "last speeches," in which they finally confessed their crimes. The literature surrounding this extraordinary episode could be more acerbic than anything directed towards the ten regicides of October 1660, as there were no dying performances to respect. The posthumous executions provided propagandists with a blank sheet that they could fill as they wished.

I

Pamphlets and broadsheets accompanied newspapers, like *Mercurius Publicus* and *Parliamentary Intelligencer*; but aside from brief commentary the newsbook accounts avoided becoming completely polemical. Similarly, Finch's trial account

existed, arguably, for posterity more than polemic, though the trials still had a polemical angle. Pamphlets could be more aggressive in their propaganda, even when they were not satirical. Often they were accompanied by illustrations of either the last speech of Charles I (but not the execution itself, which was never depicted), or the executions of the regicides, or both, contrasting the dignity of the King with the mayhem of his killers. One sheet merely listed the regicides' names, noting their involvement in the "High Court of Injustice" and the King's "martyrdom."[1] The informational broadsheet *A Looking-glass for Traytors* was published in 1660, providing a manageable account of the events for the general reader. It included a wide-angle illustration of the trial of an unnamed regicide in the Justice Hall of the Old Bailey. It mostly provided practical information, like the names of principle figures in the trials, important statements made by the accused and the judges, and dates of their executions. Other than the title of the broadside it was not especially polemical; it condemned the men but did not go out of its way.[2] Similarly, the several editions of *The Great Memorial*, one of which was published in Edinburgh and substituted "Britain" for "England" throughout the text, avoided specific polemic and instead provided the names of the regicides, the text of the King's sentence, and a short account of his execution.[3] By contrast, another pamphlet expanded the basic list to cast Cromwell as the arch-villain, describing each of the other regicides in turn as his

---

[1] *A List of His late Majesties Unjust Judges, and Others*, 1660.
[2] *A Looking-glass for Traytors*, 1660, broadsheet; published by by Thomas Vere and William Gilbertson.
[3] *The Great Memorial: or, A List of the Names of those Pretended Judges who Sate, and Sentenced our late Soveraign King Charles the First*, 1660. There are at least four distinct imprints that vary only in the accompanying illustration; one depicts Charles standing on the scaffold in an identical engraving to that accompanying *The True Characters* (see below), while the others present a portrait of Charles, one with a miniature image of the scaffold behind him. The Edinburgh edition merely has the Scottish royal coat of arms.

henchmen.[4] A third sheet listed all the problems from which England had been freed, in sixty-two rhyming lines following a repeated formula, as in "No more Imprisonments, nor Confinements, / No more Jamaica's, nor Exilements." Many of these referred to unpopular Interregnum policies, like "No more Acts against Christmas Pyes." Others referred to individuals, such as "Tom Scot that Jack in a Box," and "No more Miles Corbet Divil of the Nation, / No more Cooks the Devills by Creation."[5] A fourth satire, similar to this, named sixty-two traitors living and dead, adding humorous epithets for each, such as "John Pontius Pilate Ravilac Belial Bradshaw," "Nimrod Herod Oliver Aceldama Cromwell," "Miles Bulheaded splayfooted circumcis'd Baconfac'd Corbet," and "Henry Burdello Mahomet Martyn," all collected as members of "Lucifer's Lifeguard." The men are each lampooned as some figure from history, highlighting their treachery or their immorality; Cromwell becomes the earthly king who overthrew the heavenly one, and playboy Henry Marten joins a Turkish harem. The list goes far beyond the regicides who were tried in 1660, including people like "Satan Postilion Prideaux accuser general," who had resigned rather than participate in Charles I's trial but nonetheless went on to prosecute other royalists and Christopher Love, and "Edmund Fart by his Fathers Copy Ludlow," the famous exiled Parliamentarian.[6] Short printings like these handily deconstructed potential martyrs for the Good Old Cause.

---

[4] *Oliver Cromwell The Late Great Tirant his Life-Guard: or the Names of those who complied and conspired with him all along in his Horrid Designs to bring this Nation to Universal Ruine and Confusion*, 1660.

[5] *Vox Populi Suprema Rex Carolus, or, The Voice of the People for King Charles*, 1660, single page.

[6] *Lucifer's Life-guard: Containing a Schedule, List, Scrowle or Catalogue, Of the first and following names of the Antichristian, Anabaptistical, Atheistical, Anarchical and Infernal Imps, who have been Actors, Contrivers, Abettors, Murderers and Destroyers, of the best Religion, the best Government, and the best King that ever Great Britain enjoyed*, 1660. The "fart" refers to the "Parliament Fart" of 1607, but the

We will consider satires more closely below, but two serious publications first merit closer attention, a pamphlet and a broadsheet, because of their accompanying illustrations. They share different versions of the same image, one as a crude woodcut and the other as a more detailed engraving—but the scene and composition were the same. The pamphlet lists all the men who were tried in 1660, not just the ten who were executed, as well as Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Ireton, telling the "true characters" of each. It argues that each of these men, even those who died before the Restoration, had received the just punishment of God; it condemns these would-be martyrs, even going so far as to discuss how Robert Lockyer and Miles Sindercombe were punished by the usurping interregnum governments, presumably in retribution for their radicalism. The frontispiece, however, is the most relevant detail for this study. The facing illustration covered an entire page, with two thirds taken up by a straightforward depiction of King Charles I speaking from the scaffold in front of the Banqueting House on 30 January 1649. Versions of this appeared in a variety of literature. Charles appears as a sober, resolute figure, raising his hand over the people almost as if in benediction, with mounted soldiers in the background maintaining order. This is contrasted with the "representation of the execution of the King's Judges" in the bottom third of the page, in which one man hangs from a gibbet and another is quartered. By depicting the punishments of the regicides, it suggests that these executions should be viewed; but it is better to think of Charles I as he lived, a pious, loving, and faithful ruler.[7]

Henry Ludlow responsible was the step-brother of Edmund's father, also named Henry. See *Early Stuart Libels* C, "The Parliament Fart."

[7] *The True Characters of the Educations, Inclinations and several Dispositions of all and every one of those Bloody and Barbarous Persons, Who Sate as Judges upon the Life of our late Dread Soveraign King*

The broadsheet, which is otherwise similar in content to *A Looking-glass for Traytors*, adds an account of the Regicide first, commenting, "Thus fell King Charles, and thus fell all Britain with him." It observes that through these events "we plainly may perceive how the Kings of Christendome are daily crucified (as Christ their Lord was) between two Thieves the Jesuits and the Sectaries, who have designed all those Princes to destruction, whom in their own Trayterous and Irreligious Hearts they have condemned for Tyranny." Charles suffered like Christ amidst guiltier parties, the Jesuits and the radical sects. The broadsheet describes in brief but precise detail each of the ten executions, observing the reactions of the crowds. For example, of Harrison it notes that "true Christians did grieve in earnest to see him die so impenitently," a public sorrow not for his death but rather for his obstinacy. It recounts the infamous claim that Harrison had told his wife "that he would come again in three days; but we hear nothing as yet of his Resurrection." Harrison's messianism and potential martyrdom are dismissed as an attempt to comfort his wife. Such mocking criticisms are supported by the illustration, a crude woodcut version of the engraving that had accompanied *The True Characters*. The composition of the scene of Charles's execution is almost identical, with the scaffold, its occupants, the crowd, the mounted soldiers, the Banqueting House, and even Charles's gesture of benediction arranged in the same way. The depiction of the execution of the regicides is, however, more detailed than the engraved version, including a sledge bearing a beheaded corpse, and a tower in the background with heads on pikes. The prisoner on the ladder appears to be speaking, while another's head is upheld and announced by the executioner. While a modern perspective might lead one to conclude

---

Charles I, 1660, frontispiece; the upper portion also appeared in a slightly expanded but otherwise identical version on one of the several editions of the broadsheet *The Great Memorial*.

that the new regime of Charles II was more bloodthirsty than the Commonwealth, it should be remembered that the drawing and quartering of traitors was, if not an everyday affair, at least expected when the cause arose. In these two diptychs, Charles is the revered martyr, while his killers have received their long-deserved punishment. He is portrayed at his best, speaking to the crowd and making himself the "martyr of the people," but without his actual death. The regicides' desecration, on the other hand, should be seen by all. Such illustrations permitted a greater crowd than was present at either scene to "witness" each of these executions as the new regime wished.[8] Nevertheless, this was only the intended reading; an anti-royalist could easily have taken the Regicide scene as sober and rational, while the punishment of the regicides demonstrated the restored regime's bloodlust.

At least as important as these polemical but otherwise straightforward accounts were the great number of satires that appeared, some in song or poetic verse, and others as prose narratives of various figures' ghosts' interactions with one another. These satires undercut the message of the would-be martyrs of the Restoration, turning figures like Hugh Peters, the most popular target, into lampoons, emblems of the disastrous decade from which the Restoration had saved England. They also arose within the context of a heavily satirical moment in English political history, beginning with the literal roasting of rumps to celebrate the King's return.[9] Songs and satires about the regicides circulated with other political tracts and used familiar tropes from the previous two decades; many

---

[8] *A true and perfect Relation of the Grand Traytors Execution, as at severall times they were Drawn, Hang'd and Quartered at Charing-crosse, and at Tiburne*, 1660, broadsheet.

[9] Mark S. R. Jenner, "The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England," *Past and Present* 177 (November 2002), pp. 84-120. The term "rump" was only used generally to refer to the remnant of the Long Parliament beginning in 1659; ibid, p. 89.

were collected in single volumes, but others appeared as broadsheets or pamphlets.[10] Some songs were set to familiar tunes while others may not have been intended to be sung at all.[11] Satires of the Rump Parliament as well as satires of other political details of the Restoration often used inversion, such as both actual and textual examples of "mooning the Rump" to mock it, "presenting it with its 'true' face."[12] In a similar way, satires of the regicides of October 1660 and satires of the posthumous executions of January 1661 described the inversion of these infamous men, placing them where they belonged: not in stately tombs, surrounded by monarchs in Westminster's finest chapel, but rather dismembered and scattered around London on bridges, gates, and Westminster Hall, or else reburied under Tyburn Tree in London's most wretched soil. These often relied on scatological and diabolic references, as well as the preexisting reputations of the men that had been a part of royalist polemic since the 1640s. The contest of martyrdom occurred at all levels; the following analysis will include blackletter ballads, satires, and songs, both printed individually and contained in larger collections.[13] With this

---

[10] Ibid, p. 94; however, collections also advertised themselves as including previously unpublished material, adding to their desirability in the marketplace. See Angela McShane's criticism of Jenner, "Debate: The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England," *Past and Present* 196 (August 2007), pp. 254-55.

[11] McShane, p. 258; she cites, for example, the compiler of *Ratts Rhimed to Death* (1660), who "apologized 'To the Reader' for 'the ill tunes to which they are to be sung, there being none bad enough for them'." Although this could mean that they were merely meant to be read, the apology is itself a sneer at the ousted Rump.

[12] Jenner, p. 99.

[13] McShane finds Jenner's conclusions of the extent to which "common" readers were interested in such scatological literature to be overblown. To some extent, "blackletter" ballads, frequently apolitical and notable as a genre for their traditional typeface and broadsheet format, were meant for a common audience; but the social classifications in McShane's argument are too rigid, as these audiences could not always be broken into discrete groups. Other recent work argues that by 1660 English political culture was produced and consumed at all levels. Jason Peacey argues that during the civil wars, the "avid reading of tracts, pamphlets and newspapers was not merely limited to a metropolitan or gentry elite, but rather transcended social boundaries and geographical obstacles…a broad cross section of the population gained regular and

background in mind, we can consider those satires that involved the regicides and see how they worked to create an "anti-martyrology," arguing that these men were not saints by treating them as objects of ridicule, relegated from their former positions of power to the lowest level of society.

One joyful song, sung to the tune "Come let us Drinke, the time invites," tells of the ten executions in October. The song discusses how the "Traytors" desperately "wanted a Phisitian," since a "grand disease" had consumed them "from the foot unto the head"; but the doctors devised a "purgation" by bleeding Harrison, the "patient," at "the execution Tree." The second part of the song, which is prefaced by an inaccurate woodcut of a man kneeling at the block, describes each of the others in turn. The descriptions are generic and predictable, noting that Carew "in Tyranny did deeply wallow…Which made him on the Gallowes swing," and similar comments on the others. Hacker and Axtel receive the most religious language, as they "receiv'd their absolution" at Tyburn; but there is no apparent reason that they are singled out in this way. The song is essentially a verse form of the narratives that we have considered above, stating the days on which each man died and reminding the reader, or the singer, that they were all justly punished for committing treason "against our King, / that ever blessed Martyr." Now "their quarters on the Gates, / hangeth for a Memorandum: / 'Twixt the heavens and the earth, / Traytors are so little worth, / to dust and smoake wee'l send'm."[14] The song praises Charles as the true martyr while belittling the ten men as traitors, not martyrs,

---

substantial access to both topical information and contemporary debates"; McShane, pp. 255-56, 27, and Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, p. 29.

[14] *A Relation of the ten grand infamous Traytors who for their horrid Murder and detestable Villany against the late Soveraigne Lord King Charles the first, that ever blessed Martyr, were Arragined, Tried, and Executed in the Moneth of October, 1660. Which in perpetuity will be had in remembrance unto the worlds end*, 1660, broadsheet.

despite what they said for themselves. Since they are "patients" in need of a "physitian," the executioner becomes a doctor, curing the disease of treason. References to the physicality of execution and the public displays of the men's heads and quarters at the city gates reinforce that interpretation for those who might not have witnessed the event. Public execution could be praised and remembered in song.

A longer blackletter ballad tells the same story with different imagery and better rhymes. Set to the popular tune "Packington's Pound," which remains current among students of English renaissance music, enabling one to approximate how it might have sounded, it highlights the irony that these judges of the King will soon be judged themselves, again stressing the inversion brought by the Restoration. It emphasizes their role in the High Court of Justice and rejoices that they have been "brought to the bar" themselves.[15] The broadsheet includes several woodcut illustrations, arranged in an erratic assortment. They are difficult to decipher but appear to include a jail, possibly Newgate; the King kneeling in prayer as in *Eikon Basilike*; and the calamitous destruction of an unidentified building. The song explains how none would have expected "in the time of the War" that "The High Court of Justice should come to the Bar," as it seemed then to wield absolute power. Its downfall, decreed by "the High Court of Heaven," shows England's rebels that "nothing is certain, but uncertainty." Eventually those who had rebelled through their "High Court of Hell" would receive their due punishment. The content suggests that this was composed before the trials of the regicides had begun, and indeed before it was certain who would face trial, since some who escaped punishment are discussed and Tyburn, not Charing Cross, is the only named execution site. It praises

---

[15] *The High Court of Justice at Westminster, arraigned at the Bar in the Old Bayley at the Sessions-House*, 1660.

Charles I, "a King / In whom all the graces of Princes did spring," as "A Monarch that meant / All love and content," which proves that his killers' "hearts were more hard than Barbarians." They had inverted Christianity by killing Charles, even if "with a colour of pureness they did it, / And under the Mask of Religion they hid it." They murdered the King by making "a new Law," but it was "a good old Law that shall hang up them." The narrator confronts the regicides: "Your fasting and praying on other mens Lands / Have brought your necks under the hang-mans commands, / The people do moan, / The Gallows doth groan, / Till you have ascended the three legged Throne." This berates them for using their rebellion as an opportunity for exploitation, with the double entendre "fasting and praying" likely meaning "feasting and preying," but reminding readers or singers that these actions had been cloaked in the mantle of Christian virtue. However, this has now placed them under the power of the executioner, who will lead them to their "three legged Throne," a reference to Tyburn Tree.

The song then mocks individual regicides. It lampoons Hugh Peters's reputation as a rake, noting that he now "lies terribly under the lash," being forced to "forsake both the world and the flesh" and leave his mistress, a butcher's wife, behind. When he had "fought against Kings" to gain "Wedding-Rings," he could not have expected "to bee hang'd in the strings." Hewson, who escaped to the continent, is mocked for his background as a cobbler: "the three corner'd shop-stall [Tyburn] hee now must ascend, / Where Dun [the executioner] will prepare him a Coblers-end…And now the blinde Cobler will lose Awl at last." The jokes about Hewson's profession, and the pun on "awl," echo polemics against Hewson the year before, when he had put down a rebellion in the city; Pepys reported that his picture had been symbolically hanged in Cheapside in

January.[16] The song warns Harrison to "take heed lest for such a great slaughter / His soul meet an High Court of justice hereafter," advising him that he should not be so bold as to repeatedly "justify this bloody fact hee hath done." In conclusion, the song laments that the trial was necessary in the first place, for "I griev'd when his Majesty lost his dear breath / More than I shall joy at his Murtherers death." Revenge is insufficient, as the damage was done in 1649; but this song nevertheless guides the reader and the singer to reflect on the calamity of the Regicide and the rebels' just reward on that "three legged throne." The song concludes with a prayer for the King, urging the reader, "Rejoyce and be glad all that innocent are, / For the High Court of Justice is brought to the Bar." Through the restoration of a proper judicial court, the national nightmare can finally end.

Another song, less complex but memorable with its short lines and repeated "fa la la la lero," proclaimed the "downfall of that Phanatick Crew." It includes an illustration of a devil carrying a man and woman to the mouth of a giant beast, probably representing hell itself, at least in the context of this broadsheet; but since this is not depicted in the song's text, the woodcut may, as was common, have been borrowed from another source. The song begins, "Charles the first was a noble King," and wishes that all the rebels may "howl and cry." The "Noble stock" that he left behind, Charles II, will "give a Traytor a handsome knock / For making a King to submit to the block." The song uses well-worn polemical tropes like mocking Cromwell as a brewer's son, Richard Cromwell's

---

[16] *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, vol. 1, p. 28; for more on Hewson's shoemaking, see Neil Durkin, "His Praeludinary Weapons: Mocking Colonel Hewson before and after the Restoration," in Dermot Cavanagh and Tim Kirk, eds., *Subversion and Scurrility: Popular Discourse in Europe from 1500 to the Present* (Aldershot, 2000).

ineptitude as Lord Protector, and Hewson's "Coblers stall."[17] The song rejoices that "we have cleared white-Hall of Lobsters and Geese" and "Turned Rump and Kidnies out of the house," which now will permit England to "make wars with France & peace with Spain" and "get money and trading again." The economic and geopolitical observations here are unique among extant songs about the regicides, which typically focus on domestic affairs and the inversion of Christianity that the Regicide had implied. The following stanza, though, notes that England should "Let no Coblers preach and pray," commenting on the religious upheaval that had come from the destruction of the monarchy and the episcopacy—with common men becoming ministers, the experience of the past decade had left all in disarray. The ballad concludes by listing those who were executed. This broadside argues that with Charles II's return, all has been set mostly right; but the regicides must be destroyed to complete a full restoration.[18]

Poems joined these ballads in presenting a memorable mockery of the condemned regicides, directly casting them as the inversion of all that was good about the "Blessed Martyr Charles the First." *The Tryall of Traytors, or, The Rump in the Pound*, a broadsheet published by John Clowes in 1660, is more woodcut than text, illustrating a number of the King's judges but drawing from a different cast of characters than the ten executed regicides: instead the leaders of the briefly restored Rump Parliament are mocked at the time of their downfall. The extended title praises the memory of the "Blessed Martyr Charles the First," who has finally been avenged. The image, which

---

[17] Mocking Cromwell as the "brewer's son" was a time-honored royalist screed; see Laura Knoppers, "Sing old Noll the Brewer': Royalist Satire and Social Inversion, 1648-64," *Seventeenth Century* 15 (March 2000), pp. 32-52.

[18] *The Traytor's Downfall, or, A brief relation of the downfall of that Phanatick crew who Traiterously Murthered the Late Kings Majesty of blessed Memory. To the Tune of, Fa la la &tc*, 1660.

depicts a group of animals enclosed in the "pound," was actually used in two broadsheets. Each commented on the downfall of the Rump in 1659 and the Restoration in 1660, using the animals to represent different political figures who opposed the King's return. One version, which recounts the attempt of the "animals" to block the Restoration, tells how the "Lyon" had to protect "the harmless Lambkins" from "the Wolf, and all those Rebels who / Did seek to kill them and their Sov'reign too." This lion, presumably Charles I, "without Law, by Will was only try'd, / And (though a Lyon) like a Lamb he dy'd." The other members of this lion's family fled into exile until "that old Dagon's Image down did fall," prompting his subjects to "bring / The Lyon home again to be their King." Charles II, presumably, then returned, restoring the nation and ending "the slaughter, and the Tyrany / Of that curst Council." The rest of the "Dragons cursed crew / For shelter into ev'ry corner flew, / Some got away, some taken were and try'd, / For Treason, and as Traytors, so they dy'd."[19] The poem covers more than the execution of the regicides, but their fate concludes the text, noting that all had been returned to normal through their punishment.

Meanwhile, in *The Tryall of Traytors*, which is likely the first of the two broadsheets because it refers to each component of the woodcut, the animals are captioned with specific names, not merely epithets as in *The Dragons Forces*. Here "Col. Silly Asse" is identified as Lenthall, the Speaker of the restored Rump, "shaking like a Quaker." Of the ten animals, Hugh Peters, Thomas Scot, and John Cook are the only ones who would be executed in 1660; Haselrig died in the Tower in 1661, and others survived as exiles or prisoners. All appear here because of their role in the Rump. The poem

---

[19] *The Dragons Forces totally Routed by the Royal Shepherd, Wherein is laid open, a horrid and bloudy Plot*, 1660.

rejoices that "Times Wheel is turned round! / Subjects are free, whilst Traytors in the Pound / Do ly, for bloody Murder" of their "Martyr'd prince." It recounts how "Haselrig that Fox" was "the Mouth unto that cruel stump, / That ugly, stinking and deformed Rump," but had fortunately been stopped by "noble Monck," who saved England's "Loyal Subjects all." It mocks the other figures, including Hewson, "that blind cobling Bear," and Henry Vane, who might have been a Jesuit, the poem implies, if not "For Conscience sake." In the background, there is another animal behind bars; though *The Dragons Forces* did not explain its presence, here it is identified as Thomas Harrison, who "doth from the grates / Eccho forth a mournful dismal sound / Of grief, for all his brethren in the pound." Also in the background, on the opposite side, is a man—the only human—apparently holding a spyglass, saying, "I stand to spy, your Knavery"; the poem confirms that he is "Jack Spy-knave," who "laughs to see / These Traytors Pounded, and himself so free." Fortunately by corralling these animals, "poor England" has been "freed from future harms," while their coat of arms, small but identifiable as those of the Commonwealth, hang from a gibbet in the foreground, adjacent to a much larger gallows that awaits the animals. It will "fill all poor Exiles hearts with laughter / To think how soon these Rebels will go after."[20] Though not all the "beasts" died that October, the message is clear that as the Rump has been hanged symbolically, so too will its ringleaders. The broadsheet is an early deconstruction of the potential martyrs of the "Good Old Cause."

---

[20] *The Tryall of Traytors, Or, The Rump in the Pound*, etc, 1660. Mark Jenner identifies this animalization of the Rump as minimizing the cannibalistic qualities of roasting and eating rumps; "The Roasting of the Rump," p. 112.

More to the point, an important subgenre from this period dealt with execution generally or the hangman himself, typically engaging him in some dialogue with another figure in commentary on the proceedings. Execution references were peppered throughout restoration literature, such as a poem from 1660, predating the regicides' trials, that warned all who had despoiled the Church of England to flee "Away to Tiburn" and to "away be jogging" since the hangman is coming to set the wheel of Fortune to its 1641 position.[21] The writer notes that poems mocking the King's enemies "smell sweet as any Rope / for English Traytors."[22] Similarly, in a poem published within a collection of Rump literature, the hangman, who repeats "I and my Gallows groan" at the end of each stanza, observes that his "Ropes are turned into Rimes," literally executing people by way of satire.[23] He concludes his song by remembering how "Tyburn was once in mourning clad, / For a great Man"; but now "A full bunch will make you all glad."[24] In another, Tower Hill and Tyburn themselves are engaged in a contest with one another. Tyburn laments to Tower Hill, "And now thou wilt dayly thy belly fulfill / With King-killers bloud whilst I must fast"; since Tyburn "live[s] out of Town so far," it "Must only be fed by Fellony," giving the triple tree a sense of dejection since it could only enjoy common criminals, not traitors against the state.[25] The Tower reassures Tyburn, however, that "There are a sort of Mongrils, which / My Lordly Scaffold will disgrace," such as Hugh Peters, Henry Marten, John Hewson, and Thomas Harrison, whom the Tower urges

---

[21] *The Purchaser's Pound: or, the Return to Lambeth-Fair Of Knaves and Thieves with all the Sacred Ware*, 1660, p. 6.
[22] Ibid, p. 1.
[23] "The Hangman's last Will and Testament, with his Legacy to the Nine Worthies," in *Rump: or, An Exact Collection*, 1662, vol. II, p. 148.
[24] Ibid, p. 151.
[25] "A Quarrel betwixt Tower-hill and Tyburn," ibid, vol. I, pp. 340-41.

Tyburn to take. It would be wrong, the Tower explains, to mix "Martyrs and Murtherers bloud"—Laud, Strafford, and Hewitt had died at the Tower, so Tyburn, with hangman Dun's assistance, should dispatch these others to the Styx. It will be much better that "those that their King did kill / Should hang up in the Kings high-way."[26] Regicide, however, is apparently more than Tyburn can bear:

Then taunting Tyburn, in great scorn,
Did make Tower-hill this rude reply:
So much rank bloud my stomack will turn,
And thou shalt be sick as well as I.

These Traytors made those Martyrs bleed
Upon the Block, that thou dost bear,
And there it is fit they should dye for the deed;
But Tower-hill cryed, they shall not come there.

With that grim Tyburn began to fret,
And Tower-hill did look very grim:
And sure as a Club they both would have met,
But that the City did step between.[27]

In this way, the scene of execution was both grisly and entertaining; but even in satire, the royalist martyrs deserved a special honored place, prompting the Tower to drive the regicides out to Tyburn with the common criminals. As we know, all but two of these men would be executed at Charing Cross, but Tyburn received its due in time.

By sacralizing the materials of execution and upholding Edward Dun, the public executioner of the early 1660s, as a hero, the satires could cast the regicides as villains on a variety of levels, including the personal debt owed to Dun and his profession. As noted above, it was Dun who would "prepare [Hewson] a Coblers-end," ending his life rather

---

[26] Ibid, p. 342.
[27] Ibid, p. 343; with Tyburn in the west and the Tower in the east, the City did indeed "step between."

like assembling a shoe.[28] In 1662, the lately captured regicide Miles Corbet, one of several executed that year, would be described similarly: "Dun was his Doctor, who thought him fit to bind / A Cord about his neck, to keep the wind/ From fuming up his head. But, (O! sad note!) / The Rope begot a squinzy in his throat, / which choakt him up!"[29] As above, the executioner is the doctor, curing the illness of treason through hanging. A Restoration song of praise wished that all "Rebels and Traitors on Tyborn may swing…Esquire Dun take them, / never forsake them / Untill thou make them peep through a string."[30] An account of a plot that was quashed in December 1660 also encouraged readers to "bequeath" the rebels "into the hands of Esquire Dun the Hangman, who can better satisfie them then the ruines of a Kingdom. We have done already with the Traitors of October, now so much of this for the Traitors of December."[31] The pamphlet's concluding rhyme notes, "October is gone, /December is come, /And brought more work for Esquire Dun."[32] In each of these cases, Dun is a symbol of justice and the return to normal; now actual traitors, rather than imagined ones, will be executed, and by the duly appointed executioner of London.

Dun appears as a character in two longer dialogues, once merely as "the hangman" and another time by name. In the first, published before the trials of the regicides and printed for John Andrews, the hangman meets with the Halter-maker, the man who makes the noose, to rejoice that the King's return has brought them steady

---

[28] *The High Court of Justice*, broadsheet.
[29] *The Traytors Perspective-glass. Or, Sundry Examples of Gods just judments executed upon many Eminent Regicides*, 1662, pp. 39-40.
[30] T. J., *A Loyal Subjects Admonition, or, a true Song of Brittains Civil Wars*, 1660, broadsheet.
[31] *Englands Deliverance or, The Great and bloody Plot discovered, Contrived against the Kings Majesty, the Queen, the Duke, and all the Royal Progeny, Parliament, and Kingdom*, 1660, p. 13.
[32] Ibid, p. 15.

employment. Though this scenario might seem to depict a vengeful monarch, in context it mocks the regicides, encouraging readers to enjoy the peace and stability that has brought about their punishment. The halter-maker laments with a pun that "trading hath been slack," but he expects the market to improve. The hangman, too, has been troubled because the former regime "would suffer none for to be hanged but for murther only," significantly limiting his profession.[33] The conversation is comical, rife with puns, giving a lighthearted tone to an otherwise serious subject.[34] They discuss the traitors' dismay that they will "be called to an account after so many years injoyment" of stolen goods and ponder whether they might escape justice even now.[35] The discourse is interrupted by a list of their crimes, focusing on the executions of royalists throughout the 1650s:

Our King we murdered, yet the works not don
For then on Holland, Capel, Hambelton
Our pause we laid, by us was Darbys loss,
As by the Scotch Kirk that Noble Earl Montross,
We Garret kild, & valiant Brown Bushel,
Sir Alexander, Cary, and Vowel,
Aston, Stacy, and Hewet who doth lye
A martyred Saint, and Noble Slingsby.[36]

These saints are again the reason that so many men must now die. The two discuss costs and expect "good trading," for which the halter-maker must take care "to make thy

---

[33] *The Hangmans joy, or the Traytors Sorrow. Being, a very merry Dialogue between the Hang-man, and the Haltermaker*, 1660, p. 4; presumably this refers to the use of beheading in nearly all treason cases.
[34] These include jokes on alcohol, such as the hangman's offer to give the halter-maker a quart of "Canary" in exchange for news, to which he replies, "Dost thou think that I am a Canary-bird, thou fool, they sing in a Cage"; ibid. In another example, the two dispute over costs, and the hangman promises to pay the halter-maker either a half-penny or else "small beer" while he buys himself "strong liquor," reinforcing the perhaps standard assumption that executioners are routinely drunk; ibid, p. 11.
[35] Ibid, p. 5.
[36] Ibid, p. 7.

Halters very strong, and not too long."[37] The overjoyed hangman is "sure that I shall do more work in one month now, then I have done in seven years heretofore, for I am credibly informed, that there are twenty great heavie men to be executed."[38] He calls out, "Run for the Carpenters, come away, build up the Scaffold at the Tower hill, and another in the Palace-yard, let us do to them as they did to us, or it shall hard."[39] This discourse, while comical, upholds the hangman and the halter-maker as men worthy of employment. Their return to a normal workload signifies the restoration. The pamphlet's references to the King and the murders of so many of his supporters demonstrate that the regicides' treason deserved immediate punishment.

This tack continues in another pamphlet, published early in 1661 after the death of Sir Arthur Haselrig in prison; Dun, who is named, laments that he was tricked out of his due payment when Haselrig slipped from the noose. Haselrig banters with Dun, clearly pleased that he has evaded punishment; he laughs that though Dun would have "served me as the Fishermen do Herrings," meaning to "hang them in a string," he was ultimately "more cunning then the rest for I slip my neck out of the coller as the saying is in pudding time."[40] As in the previous dialogue, the hangman mocks Haselrig and the other regicides for enriching themselves during the interregnum; but this time Dun cites this as proof that he is owed a substantial fee for dispatching the men, and Haselrig has denied him of receiving it. Haselrig suggests that Dun merely wished to steal his velvet cloak, but this only reinforces the reader's interpretation of a lucre-hungry traitor. When Haselrig claims that his death from illness has cleared his debts, Dun disputes, "Indeed Sir let me tell you,

---

[37] Ibid, p. 11.
[38] Ibid, p. 13.
[39] Ibid, p. 15.
[40] *The Hang-mans Lamentation For the losse of Sir Arthur Haslerigge, dying in the Tower*, 1661, p. 4.

there were eight hang'd at Charing Cross whether they would or no, and I hope your worship will not refuse it to hinder me of a small fee."[41] They insult one another, and Haselrig is stunned that "Dun would perswade me hanging is the best death."[42] In the end, Dun says that if he had known that he would have "spent a great deal of mony in waiting for this small job of yours," then he would have wished "the Divel had fetch't you seven year sooner."[43] In the end, though Haselrig may have cheated Dun, he has not cheated death; presumably he will receive his eternal punishment soon.

Other pamphlets also dealt with regicides who were spared the October executions, such as Robert Titchborne, John Ireton, and Henry Marten. These pamphlets mocked their inversion from power to prison. If their punishment never came, it was the King's mercy that had saved them, not any validation of their crimes. One pamphlet reported a conversation between the "Two City Jugglers," Titchborne and Ireton, each former Lord Mayors, at some point before the October executions. Titchborne is glad at their reunion in prison, but he fears that they "shall not part, until the gallows part us," for "there will be no Redemption, without a Habeas Corpus, which will convey us to the place of Judgement, and from thence to the place of Execution."[44] Titchborne reminds Ireton that they were "guilty of the undoing of many a family" and "have bin joyfull instruments in taking away of many lives."[45] He fears that the recent "turn will cause us to have a turn, where wee must turn over the Ladder," which would be deserved since he

---

[41] Ibid, p. 9.
[42] Ibid, p. 11.
[43] Ibid, p. 16.
[44] *The two City Iuglers Tichborn, and Ireton: Being a Dialogue: Wherein, Their Rebellions, Treacheries, Treasons, and Cheats, are fully discovered and brought to light*, 1660, pp. 2-3.
[45] Ibid, p. 4.

was "counted a Saint, while in very truth I was a white Divell."[46] Though their conversation is largely devoted to city politics, as befits their office, the men are preoccupied with execution, reinforcing its importance. The pamphlet concludes with a short rhyme: "Three merry boyes, and three merry boyes, / and three merry boyes are wee, / That ever did sing three parts in a string, / under the Tripple Tree."[47] The outcome remains uncertain, of course, and Ireton and Titchborne would ultimately elude execution.

In a similar pamphlet, Titchborne meets Henry Marten, the greatest rake of the rebellion. Marten is troubled by Titchborne's sullen appearance, asking "what makes your Soule thus to Droope" and suggesting that he looks "as dejected as if the Executioner were about to doe his Office." Indeed, Marten says, his friend's face "is as Gashly as our Brethren that are turned Surveyor of the rivers Thames whose Heads are Elevated upon London Bridge," implying that the former Lord Mayor appears dead himself.[48] Titchborne explains that his "chaines of gold," the trappings of office, had been turned into "fetters of iron," and that his "Grapes of Canaan" had soured, a religious image that the amoral Marten finds distasteful.[49] But Titchborne is repentant, warning that "some of our brethren now endure for having a Hand in the Blood of that just man," the King. Marten mocks him for praying and complains that even hearing it "goes against my Nature"; but Titchborne accosts him for this, since "we had all been praying Saints

---

[46] Ibid, pp. 5-7.
[47] Ibid, p. 12.
[48] *The Pretended Saint and the Prophane Libertine. Well met in Prison. Or a Dialogue between Robert Titchburne, and Henry Marten, Chamber-Fellowes in Newgate*, 1661, pp. 3-4.
[49] Ibid, p. 4; "fetters of iron" probably refers to Psalm 149, while the grapes probably refer to Numbers 13, in which Moses' scouts return with grapes as a sign of the Promised Land's fruitfulness.

that Cut off the Kings Head."[50] This draws attention to the sacralization of the Regicide, which Titchborne has now rejected. Marten asks if there are "any hopes of Escaping the Gallowes," and observes that if the people have their way then the standard punishment will be extended to being "buried a Live, Starved to Death," or even flayed, "as Memento of ever-lasting shame, and as a warning piece to succeeding Ages how they meddle with the sacred institution of Kings and Princes." Titchborne presciently replies that the only way for them to survive will be the King's mercy—but he would prefer to die, as perpetual imprisonment would make him "live like Tantalus all my dayes; that is to say onely mockt with pleasure and delight."[51] In the end, these two would long outlive their condemned brethren; but in 1660 and 1661, they were easy objects of derision for Restoration polemicists, inviting mockery as they suffered in prison after a decade enjoying the spoils of war. Their imprisoned suffering, like execution, is as an appropriate ordeal for men who had behaved so badly in life. Satires like these were allied to those about the executed regicides, undercutting any attempt to make these men martyrs and upholding instead the royalist victims of the Interregnum as well as the restored monarchy itself, which is presented as both fear-inspiring and also capable of exceptional mercy.

II

Despite his infamously brief performance at his execution, Hugh Peters appeared far more frequently in printed satires than the rest of the regicides, even though he was not technically a regicide himself since he did not actually sign the death warrant. He also

---

[50] *The Pretended Saint and the Prophane Libertine*, p. 8.
[51] Ibid, pp. 9-10.

appeared often in satirical pamphlets discussing Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw at the time of their exhumation and "execution" in January 1661. For this reason, Peters should be discussed on his own, as the most comprehensive representative of anti-martyrological polemic at the time of the Restoration. Peters had been the voice of the old regime, defending the Regicide with Psalm 149; he was even rumored to have held the axe on 30 January 1649. His brief time on the lam in 1660 generated even more stories, especially since he was captured after hiding in a woman's bed. Through satires, he would become the bridge between the living and the dead, representing his old friend Cromwell, who was already in hell. But he would also defend himself in several pamphlets, including a "fatherly advice" book addressed to his daughter. Through such literature, his potential martyrdom was contested more extensively than one might have expected from his sullen appearance in October 1660.

The first satires came before the Restoration. In 1659, after the collapse of the briefly revived Rump, a pair of related pamphlets appeared, condemning Peters's entire ecclesiastical career for advancing evil rather than good. This tactic foreshadowed the responses to his execution, which was treated as the fulfillment of a lifetime of false ministry. These pamphlets, like other sources, stressed Peters's reputation for fiery preaching that, to the satirists, was devoid of substance, emphasizing entertainment rather than theological discourse. The first, purporting to be Peters's "funeral sermon" on the "perfect Path to Worldly Happiness," consists of an extended discourse on a paraphrased quotation from a popular picaresque Spanish novel, "Let us while we live make use of

our time, for a mans life is ended in a day."[52] The "sermon" expounds upon this theme with mock seriousness, considering how the roguish Peters had worked to achieve temporal, not eternal, happiness by use of nine gifts, including "nonsense," "cozening," and "hypocrisie."[53] The unnamed preacher exhorts all listeners to "make the best use of your time; That is to say, get Mony, get Estates, get Friends at Court, and labour to enjoy the promises; the fat of the land, my beloved, is your fee-simple [i.e., unrestricted inheritance], therefore let not Canaan be taken from you."[54] In this way, "men will respect yee, worship yee, and place yee uppermost at their meetings...The women will feast yee, and cram not only your bellies but your purses…When you come down sweating from your pulpits, they will put yee into warm beds, and rub over your weary limbs with their soft and tender hands."[55] This exhortation draws on Peters's widely-held reputation for rakish behavior, hedonism, and self-enrichment through his position of influence. The way to live, according to "the life and manners of our deceased Brother here before us," is to exploit other Englishmen and live, in general, according to the principles of Machiavelli. In the final comments on Peters's life, the "preacher" reminds the "congregation" that "He was first unwilling to dye, knowing what comforts he left behind him, but seeing there was no remedy, he lean'd his head on the pillow, and

---

[52] *Peters Patern Newly Revived, with Additions; Or, The perfect Path to Worldly Happiness, As it was delivered in a Funeral Sermon preached at the interment of Mr. Hugh Peters lately Deceased*, 1659, p. 3. The quotation is adapted from Mateo Alemán's novel *Guzmán de Alfarache*, Book II, chapter 5, which was translated by James Mabbe decades earlier and republished as recently as 1656. Tthe full verse reads, "Let us dye like dogs, or live like men. For a mans life is ended in a day; but poverty, is a daily death"; *The rogue: or, the life of Guzman de Alfarache the witty Spaniard In two parts,* 1623, p. 228. Also cf. 1 Corinthians 15:32, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die."
[53] *Peters Patern Newly Revised,* p. 6.
[54] Ibid, p. 11.
[55] Ibid, p. 12.

peaceably yielded up the Ghost." The preacher ambiguously notes that "he went to his long home as willingly as a young Bride goeth from her friends into the Country with her new married Spouse."[56] Peters is hesitant to leave the world, for it is unclear where he will end up, having directed his life towards temporal pleasures and not the hereafter. This prepares the reader to think of Peters as the opposite of a martyr, one who had never sacrificed for any greater cause.

A second satire from 1659 is a direct successor to the previous pamphlet and says that it has become all too clear where Peters has been since his apparent "death." This pamphlet tells of Peters's "resurrection" and subsequent conversation with a merchant he chances to meet in a tavern; the merchant is displeased to see Peters, whom he had believed was dead after reading *Peters Patern*, and tells him to "get thee to those of thy Congregation, thy infernal friends." He admits that he recognizes "Hue" Peters, though it is difficult: "Thou hast had many Hues, but this is the worst Hue that ever I saw thee in… I know thou ever had'st a cloven Tongue, hast thou no cloven feet? Ar't a man, flesh, blood, and bone, that we may drink, converse, and be familiar?"[57] He challenges Peters's humanity, suggesting that he is a devil with hooves to match his snakelike forked tongue. When Peters asks for wine, the merchant tells the waiter, "No matter what, so it be the coolest in the Cellar, for this Gentleman came from a hot place lately," which is, of course, hell. The minister interjects that he would prefer sack, which he was known to enjoy; and the merchant agrees that it is best for "one over-heated."[58] The remainder of the conversation consists of Peters's surprise at "Peters Patern," which he initially

---

[56] Ibid, p. 13.
[57] *Peters's Resurrection By way of Dialogue, Between Him and a Merchant: occasioned Upon the Publishing a pretended Sermon at his Funeral, wherein is affirmed those sayings of Machiavel*, 1659, p. 3.
[58] Ibid, p. 4.

disdains since he was not dead but then comes to appreciate, since it accurately describes his life.[59] The merchant, however, is increasingly frustrated; Peters's ramblings do little more than repeat aphorisms, prompting him to conclude that "Thou art made up of nothing, but old sayings like a Botchers breeches of old shreds."[60] He agrees, though, with Peters's admission that some of those nine "gifts," particularly "Lying, Cozening, covetousness, and Hypocrisie," had been indispensable during his life.[61] This pamphlet reaffirms Peters's rakish and self-aggrandizing lifestyle, suggesting that while he may not be dead yet, death would be an appropriate turn in the near future.

By contrast, one 1660 pamphlet, ostensibly written by Peters himself and published around the time of his capture, explained how he had heard "by printed papers" of his reputation among the new regime, and therefore felt he had to "profess that I never had head nor hand in contriving or managing the late Kings death," since he spent 30 January 1649 "sick and sad in my Chamber."[62] He rejected other accusations, claiming that all were false but unsurprising given his fall from fortune: "David knew why Shemei curst him," presumably meaning that God had bidden his enemies to curse him as a reminder, as in 2 Samuel 16:11; one day, when his fortunes reversed, his progeny would avenge the curse, as the dying David commanded Solomon to do in 1 Kings 2:8-9. Peters's acknowledgement that his side has lost implies that it would one day be revived.[63] Finally, he protests that he should not have been exempted from the Act of

---

[59] Ibid, p. 7 and passim.
[60] Ibid, p. 9; a "botcher" was one who repaired clothing with "botches," or patches.
[61] Ibid, p. 14.
[62] *The Case of Mr. Hugh Peters, Impartially Communicated to the View and Censure of the Whole World: Written by his own hand*, 1660, p. 2.
[63] Ibid, p. 5.

Oblivion; but he resolves to pray for his country, as an English gentleman should.[64] Allied to this defense is a sermon from October 1660, which notes that Peters had "dyed," as if of natural causes, without referring to his execution in any way. The sermon is a straightforward discussion of Isaiah 55:1, "every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters." The preface instructs the reader how to interpretet it: "This Sermon is not as a Trumpet sounding Rebellion, but as a School-Master teaching Religion, its call is to believing, not to Rebelling. Pass not your sentence upon it before your reading of it, which were to let your passion give the sentence of condemnation, before your judgment hath sate upon the bench for examination."[65] The sermon is not obviously political and does not refer to Peters's execution, but its publication garners sympathy for him and his cause. If he is merely an honest minister, preaching on God's blessings, then perhaps his death was unjust. Especially since so many of his critics referred to his sermons as jests and mockeries of Christian preaching, these pamphlets should be seen as rebuttals. They prepared the reader to see him as a potential martyr, targeted by the new regime for preaching the true faith.

Such defenses, however, were few. The published reports of Peters's arrest portrayed a man on the run, which proved that he was aware of his guilt and would save his life by whatever means necessary, even those distinctly unbecoming a gentleman. Given Peters's reputation for philandering, sympathetic readers presumably would be willing to accept these tales. The account praises "Divine Providence, which we may truly call wonderful" for overruling "the Counsel of our former Oppressors" and restoring

---

[64] Ibid, pp. 6-7.
[65] *A Sermon by Hugh Peters: Preached Before his Death: As it was taken by a faithful hand*, 1660, preface, p. 2.

the monarchy.[66] Although "their Plots (like Potters Vessels) were broken upon the Wheel," or failed prematurely, the rebels still "resolved to make good their Ground, or expire like Cataline," dying in the midst of rebellion. Fortunately for the "Oppressed City and groaning Countreyes," God ended this.[67] The pamphlet describes how the rebels' "Balaam-like Prophet and Soothsayer High Peters" is now a prisoner, after hiding in the bed of a Southwark woman who had just given birth, preventing the King's honorable men from searching. He was captured soon after in another house, with money sewn into his clothes, calling himself Mr. Thompson.[68] He agreed to leave with the guards, provided that they call him Thompson, not Peters, or "the people in the street will stone me." Peters, aware of his reputation, is described as "St. Hugh, who when our Glorious Sovereign was led to Martyrdom, fell so heavy upon his righteous Soul, blaspheming him upon his then Text (Psalm 149, To bind their Kings in Chains &c) and many other sordid Notions, too wicked and prophane to be here recited."[69] The narrative contrasts Peters's purported role as prophet of the Parliamentarians with his actual salacious reputation, culminating in a woman's bed, a fitting end for one who had profaned his ministry by misinterpreting the psalms to defend the earthly goal of king-killing. The past ten years have been overturned by the grace of God, and some detective work.

A sharply critical pamphlet also referred to Peters's capture, addressing him in an open letter. Warning from the frontispiece that "Justice hath leaden feet, but iron hands," the writer, "T.V.," advises Peters that there is still time "to call on God for mercy, though

---

[66] *The Speech and Confession of Hugh Peters, Close Prisoner in the Tower of London; And His Horrible Expressions and Doctrine when Our Glorious Soveraign was led to Martyrdome*, 1660, p. 1.
[67] Ibid, pp. 2-3; the parenthetical reference is to Psalm 2:8-9, in which God assures the King that he will destroy the heathen "with a rod of iron" and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."
[68] Ibid, p. 4.
[69] Ibid, p. 5.

your Body suffer by the hand of Justice." The writer laments that Peters has "made the Pulpit a Players stage, a Drum of Treason and Rebellion."[70] He implies that Peters had wielded the axe in January 1649, charging that the King's "Head was ship't off by you, and such vizzarded Divels as you are," making him even worse than Guy Fawkes and Cataline. Now he is "like Judas, cursed to posterity."[71] Peters will face his punishment soon, "since divine vengeance suffered not any of the Murtherers of Julius Caesar, who was but an Usurper, to die any other then a violent death."[72] The betrayal of Caesar had long been compared to that of Christ, as in Dante's *Inferno*, among other literature; but killing Charles I was far worse than killing the Roman dictator. The writer contends that Peters was aware of his sins, since when captured in Southwark he had insisted that he "would not be such a Villain as Hugh Peters for a thousand pound."[73] A martyr, in theory, would defend himself, proud of his cause, and not lie in this way. The author describes Peters's impending dishonorable death with relish, because soon his quarters would be "set up for Crowe's-meat on the City Gates, and thy traitorous Head stand Sentinel on London-bridge, for the fouls of the Aire to pick out thy accursed eyes for the murther and treason against our late Lord and Sovereign King, whose wisdom, piety, faith and patience, God hath crowned with a glorious Crown of immortality."[74] In conclusion, T.V. prays that through Peters's example, all traitors' houses would soon be "plucked down and made a Jakes [i.e. a privy], their Memories blotted out…or, if remembred, with perpetual scorn, cursing, and infamy, as being men, whose paths lead to

---

[70] *Hugh Peters's Passing-Bell Rung out in a Letter To Him, from One that hath been an Accurate Observer of Hugh Peters and Oliver Cromwells Bloody Actions*, 1660, p. 3.
[71] Ibid, p. 4.
[72] Ibid, p. 6.
[73] Ibid, p. 5.
[74] Ibid, pp. 5-6.

the chambers of death, and their steps to the pit of hell." Not only their bodies but their possessions and their memories must be disgraced and destroyed. The pamphlet contrasts Peters with the King, reminding readers that "This was Charles the First, the Wise, the Just. This, this was the man; this the Christian King, the Saint, the Martyr, whom thou Iudas (alias Hugh Peters) and thy fellow-Traitors destroyed, and like Cannibals devoured."[75] In this way, the restored monarchy again replaces the ignominy of its destroyers of 1649, reestablishing peace in the nation. The King remains a sacred figure, "wise" and "just," caring for the nation as these men had failed to do in the interim. The letter encourages readers to ponder the inversion of martyr and traitor.

The story of Peters's arrest in Southwark as well as his execution inspired songs mocking his cowardice in his final weeks. One, primarily about his capture, exhorts all "brave Cavaliers" to "tryumph and be jolly," since "the Rump is not forsaken"—Peters's capture will permit him to "preach anew" to his fellow traitors, who have reconvened in prison. The song, with the refrain "hey, ho, Hugh Peters," tells how "In Southwarke side he lodg'd, / some-times in Kentish Town," circumscribing the City itself; but finally he found himself in "Tower Quarters" to his own vexation. This misfortune permitted him to preach to Vane, Scot, Mildmay, and other traitors, who had always "lik'd your Doctrine well, / Which gave them such direction / how they should go to hell." Then he preached from a "Rumping text, / For which he should be Voted / at Tyburn to preach next." Again, as with previous commentaries, Peters's preaching is treasonous and would best be delivered at the gallows. Just as would-be martyrs called their scaffolds "pulpits," here the satirist uses the same image to condemn. The song assures us that Peters "had a hand /

---

[75] Ibid, p. 7; Mark Jenner identifies the accusation of cannibalism as a crucial theme of anti-Rump propaganda, and here it is cast at Peters as well; "Roasting the Rump," p. 111 ff.

in martering of our King," for which he will soon die; but it also encourages Peters to take this opportunity to tell all that he knows of the Regicide. This repeated the rumors that Peters, famously absent on 30 January 1649, had been the executioner:

> These that had on long Vizards
> did on the Scaffold stand
> Like the base presumptuous Wizards,
> plac'd by the Divels hand.
> So expert and so even
> was one 'tis thought 'twas you
> The blow was fatal given
> come Peters tell me true.[76]

The identity of the executioner remained a subject of debate, and Peters was not the most frequently mentioned potential candidate; but his own insistence that he was sick that day fueled the suspicion that indeed he was there, disguised, wielding the axe. In presenting him as guilty and mocking his capture in Southwark, the song is another important part of the deconstruction of the potential martyrdoms of the regicides. The song relies on his likely execution, contrasting it with the death of the King. Another song, set to the tune "The Gelding of the Devil," tells of how Satan had been on the run, rather like Peters himself, until "not knowing where to be / In Hugh Peters he took sanctuarie." Despite this, he was still captured, and "Hugh Peters could not be his Baile," finding them both "condemned to the Gallow Tree." There "the Divel parted with's train / Who a thousand years hence means to see you again."[77] Through the execution of Peters, Satan himself

---

[76] *England's Object: Or, Good and true News to all True-hearted Subjects, for the taking and apprehending of that horrid deluding Sower of Sedition Hugh Peters, by the name of Thomson, in Southwarke, Saturday September the first*, 1660, broadsheet.
[77] *Hugh Peters last Will and Testament: or, The Haltering of the Divell*, 1660, broadsheet.

has been turned out of the nation. Each of these songs anticipates Peters's death and inhibits favorable opinions of him.

In yet another satire, the imprisoned Peters discusses his fate with Henry Marten, another notoriously rakish regicide who would nevertheless survive, imprisoned, until 1680. Like others, the satire includes a series of comments on execution, beginning with Marten's wish that they be hanged together; Peters agrees that "one Gallows might serve us both, but I knew the time once when a whole Kingdome could not" satisfy their greed.[78] Peters notes nostalgically that they had taken their "full swing in Rebellion then," but Marten replies, "Gad I cannot tell for that, but the full swing for Rebellion I am sure we shall take ere long."[79] This "swing" for rebellion, hanging, reminds readers of the executions of the Interregnum. Peters admits to having pressured Cromwell to execute John Hewitt and Peter Vowell, "two Loyall Subjects of the King, and I believe I was bravely commended for it." Marten replies, "Ah, but I am afraid now you'll bravely hang for it."[80] They discuss Cromwell, whom Peters had wished to baptize as a new "Nebuchadnezzar," since he had likely never been baptized in the first place.[81] The text includes a poem, in which Peters recapitulates his confession, adding Sir Henry Slingsby to the list of unjust executions that he had endorsed with an almost touching reflection:

For as he was aged, so he was innocent,
And in our plots he ne'r had finger in't.
But I most impious Vilain did put in,
That he unto the Tower should be brought
And Martyr like, to suffer for his King.

---

[78] *The most vile and lamentable Confession of Hugh Peters of All his Bloody Advices given to the late Oliver Cromwel*, 1660, p. 5.
[79] Ibid, p. 6.
[80] Ibid, p. 9.
[81] Ibid, p. 11.

I always in such horrid Murders sought,
Then like a lamb he bowed down his head,
Which from his body soon was severed.[82]

Slingsby, of course, had been a plotter, but for a good cause, never having a "finger" in those of the rebels. Marten wishes that he "could take a rope and hang my self" for these crimes; but Peters disagrees, reminding him that others will do this for him and "on you Anatomie will make, / That all might say, see whats come on him now, / And when your heart they open do within / They wonder will at such a stony thing."[83] This pamphlet deals less with the King himself, instead linking Peters's impending death (and, optimistically, Marten's) to royalist martyrs who had fought to overthrow the government that Peters had blessed. Peters's treason spanned an entire regime, which he had reinforced from the pulpit as well as privately through consultations with the Lord Protector.

Other accounts of Peters's life and death exploited his reputation for "jests" and immoralities. One related an extended, apocryphal tale of his poisoning the King's deer as a young man, which set him on the path toward his ultimate fate of having his quarters on the city gates and his head on London Bridge, "where wee will leave them to the Readers judgment, whether hee was more honoured in a Tyrants counsel, or on the Gibbet at Charing-crosse."[84] The pamphlet included a poem on the same theme: "The

---

[82] Ibid, p. 13.
[83] Ibid, p. 14. "Anatomie" refers to the dismemberment of traitors after hanging or, possibly, the scientific dissection of the cadavers of condemned criminals.
[84] *The History of the Life and Death of Hugh Peters that Arch-traytor, from his Cradell to the Gallowes. With A Map of his prophane Jests, cruell Actions, and wicked Counsels. Published as a Warning piece to all Traytors*, 1661, p. 11. The story about the King's deer supposedly happened at Brasenose College, Oxford; but he earned his degree at Trinity College, Cambridge, and the narrative is mostly scurrilous polemic.

Earth did scorne his Corpes though in a tombe / Should have a burying place within her wombe: / Hold Muse bee silent, for thou hast done faire / And leave him on the Gates to Fowles of th'ayre."[85] Other texts collected tales of Peters's life, usually focusing on the 1650s. One bore a woodcut of Peters wearing devil's horns, or alternatively any of the men he may have cuckolded during his life.[86] Another more clearly depicted Peters with a devil leaning over his shoulder and whispering in his ear.[87] These pamphlets tended to reproduce the same texts in different arrangements, and many of them dealt with his infamous sermons. In one example, he crouched down in the pulpit and then rose again, saying, "My Beloved, Where think you I have been now? I'le tell you, I have been in Heaven, and there's my Lord Bradshaw; but to say the truth, I did not see Cromwel; the Lord knows whither the Great Wind blew him."[88] In another sermon, after Cromwell's death, he reportedly had proclaimed "That he knew Oliver Cromwel was in Heaven as sure as he could then touch the head of his Pulpit, and reaching up his Hand to have done the same, came short thereof by half a yard."[89] Such stories exploited Peters's reputation as the prophet of the Regicide to suggest that Cromwell must be in hell, as Peters himself would soon be. They also made him look like a buffoon, giving sermons of little substance.

There was one key defense of Peters published in 1660, far more significant than the pamphlets around his arrest, and it merits analysis on its own: his last advice to Elizabeth, his only daughter. The book is styled in the tradition of fatherly advice, similar

---

[85] Ibid, p. 13.
[86] *Hugh Peters Figaries: Or, His merry Tales, and witty Jests, both in City, Town & Countreys. In a pleasant and Historical Discourse*, 1660, frontispiece.
[87] *The Tales and Jests of Mr. Hugh Peters, Collected into one Volume*, 1660, frontispiece.
[88] *Hugh Peters Figaries*, p. 5.
[89] Ibid, p. 7.

to Slingsby's book for his sons; but in practice, it rebuts these various attacks on Peters, treating him as a potential martyr after all. Instead of a madman, a villain, or a pulpit comedian, *A Dying Father's Last Legacy to an Onely Child* presents a sober, prayerful man providing for the spiritual betterment of his beloved daughter, who no doubt would be subject to much misfortune because of her father's fate. However, while Slingsby's subtext reminded his children and other readers to remain faithful to the exiled Crown, Peters's book was more personal and seems to have been cultivated with the stereotypes of the preacher to the Rump in mind. As such, rather like Slingsby's book, it takes the place of the execution speech that he failed to give, presenting his cause in a positive light after his persecution by a hostile state. Most importantly, it retells his biography, inverting the accusations of personal greed by depicting a selfless minister who only sought to lead England back to God.

Peters's book included his portrait, in which he appears with his death date as a respectable preacher, as if he were a hero to be remembered—in other words, a potential martyr. The poem beneath the portrait presents "the Dictates of a Dying man" to the reader, who will sing "like th'expiring Swan" his "Epicaedium," or funeral ode. Perhaps even the worst of men could have a swan song, but the poem praises Peters further. The minister "was a shining Lamp…Extinguisht by a fatall Damp," but his last words, here published, will "perfume the world" like "Incense hurl'd / On sacred Altars" to the point that future generations must "Revere that Torchlight, which this age put out."[90] Furthermore, the preface to the "impartial reader," signed only by "G.F. N.B.," assures all that despite Peters's "unhappy End of a wearisome pilgrimage," he was nevertheless

---

[90] Hugh Peters, *A Dying Fathers Last Legacy to an Onely Child: or, Mr. Hugh Peter's Advice to his Daughter*, 1660, frontispiece.

"very Instrumental in the Church of God" and brought "many Souls to Christ" on both sides of the Atlantic.[91] The editor of this book, printed for the radical Giles Calvert and Thomas Brewster, who had been behind the *Speeches and Prayers*, presents a hagiography of a saintly Peters. He concedes those faults that Peters himself admitted, since "in this Discourse he bewails the vanity of his own Spirit" and "finds himself too busie in *Aliena Republica*"; but the "Children of God" should not be "cast out of the Family for every fault though heinous" lest "we…condemne the Generation of the Iust." Whatever his occasional faults, Peters lived and died well, since even "when he had no hope to save a frail Body, yet he minded his own and others Souls," making himself a "Master Workman in that Mysterie, wherein he had laboured successfully so many years."[92] In his death, a "sad shameface Catastrophy," God had "wiped away all Tears from his Eyes" and made him "perfect by his great Sufferings."[93] This short preface, which Peters presumably did not write, invites the reader to meet a different Hugh Peters from the one usually depicted in the London press: a man who served God's church and led souls to Christ up to his last breath. There is no discussion of the Regicide, and the only reference to the Civil Wars is the observation that he came to England from America when it was embroiled in violence, which here is meant to suggest that he was willing to tolerate danger to proclaim the Word rather than to aggrandize himself, a point that the actual text explains in greater detail. Peters's book, albeit addressed to his daughter, fulfills this partisan interpretation, as its scriptural exegesis and spiritual instruction are

---

[91] Ibid, A2 r-v.
[92] Ibid, A3.
[93] Ibid, A3 v.

meant to rehabilitate his reputation and remind the reader to follow God despite the adversities of the world.

A Dying Fathers Last Legacy still provides a straightforward series of Christian instructions to Elizabeth Peters. Much of the book is pious and not outwardly political, such as the repeated reminders to read the Bible and to study other worthy books; he claims to have even left her a library of his best selections.[94] Elsewhere he provides practical advice on how to pray. These discourses occasionally include implicit references to his own ordeals, such as when he praises pious suffering, reminding Elizabeth that "The Waldenses and Germans had never been so famous for Suffering, had they been unchatechized."[95] This connotes martyrdom: preaching the Truth may lead to worthwhile suffering. Later in the book he prays in verse "that the Saints would learn to suffer, where / Nothing can help, more than a Groan, or Tear," meaning that they must embrace the suffering that comes with following Christ and focus on higher things.[96] Similarly, he writes that the best way to avoid "trifling" in her thoughts will be to "Every Morning [go] down to Golgotha, and from thence go up to Mount Calvary," and thereby focus her life on Christ's sufferings for the sins of humanity.[97] While upholding the study of religion for its own sake, he makes a possible backhanded reference to his own recent experiences: "He that sets up Religion, to get any thing by it more than the glory of God, and the saving his own Soul, will make a bad Bargain of it in the close."[98] For a man who was accused of perverting religion to achieve worldly ends, especially in his use of Psalm

---

[94] Ibid, p. 9.
[95] Ibid, p. 5.
[96] Ibid, p. 121.
[97] Ibid, p. 33.
[98] Ibid, p. 6.

149, this bit of instruction has to have been self-aware, a sly defense of his decisions with a tinge of regret. Later, in a warning that would likely have drawn a royalist's ire for alleged hypocrisy, he reminds Elizabeth to keep a godly wisdom, lest she fall into "vanity" and "foolish jesting," or even begin "to play with the blessed Word of God."[99] Peters's provides an alternative reading to his so-called "witty jests," vindicating his legacy not only for Elizabeth but also for England.

In addition to these instructions and warnings, Peters encourages his daughter through an extended discourse on death and judgment, referring vaguely to his own fate. For example, when he admits that Elizabeth may have certain fears because of the circumstances in which his death will leave her, he reminds her that "the Lord Jesus answers all to his little Flock when he says, *Fear not*; yea, more particularly, *Fear not them that can only kill the body*."[100] His and her souls would outlive any persecution. He also reflects on the Last Judgment. "Life is sweet, and Death terrible," he writes; but it also provides an opportunity for good, since "you may see Him of whom you have heard so much, who hath done and suffered so much for you."[101] Death would be sweetened by "the Death of Christ, who suckt out the poison of it," and therefore she should not fear it.[102] He does not refer to his own fate but merely reminds her that even though she can trust that Christ died for her, she still would be held account at the last judgment and must prepare herself each day. But surely she will be among the righteous: "Your faithfulness to me and your Mother will find acceptance in Heaven."[103] In particular he notes that

---

[99] Ibid, p. 42.
[100] Ibid, p. 61.
[101] Ibid, pp. 87-88.
[102] Ibid, p. 89.
[103] Ibid, p. 117.

before Christ, "Hypocrisie is unmask'd, Truth naked; there your fellow Saints shall sit Judges, though dispised amongst men; there the Son of man shall appear, because despised as the Son of man."[104] After he was judged by his enemies, this is a poignant comment. All of those who had been spurned by their own people are elevated, which is why he calls the last judgment "the Great Day," a cause for rejoicing. Its arrival would mean that Elizabeth—and presumably Peters himself—were in Heaven, where there are "no more fading Riches, dying Friends, changing Honors…no more hearing the chain of the Prisoner, nor anger of the Oppressor."[105] As with other passages in the book, there is a hint that Peters is really discussing his own misfortunes, despised by his people at the end of his life; but anything more explicit than this would be difficult to prove.

Despite these possible allusions to Peters's trial or execution, most of the book is not overtly political. His spiritual instruction, however, builds to a more substantial section of self-reflection, which does become polemical, to a point. He writes that this account of himself will allow her either to "wipe off some Dirt, or be the more content to carry it" in understanding her father's troubles.[106] He describes his youth, his attraction to studying his faith more closely, and his decision to move to New England. By his account, his return to his home country at a time of unrest was an accident; but upon his arrival, he felt called to serve in godly ministry to those who needed it most. He rebuts some of the common criticisms against him by providing an alternate, positive version of his life. He was given an estate by Parliament against his wishes, since he was "as well contented without Land, as with it; never being ambitious to be great or rich since I knew

---

[104] Ibid, p. 91.
[105] Ibid, pp. 92-93.
[106] Ibid, p. 97.

better things."[107] He assures Elizabeth that he never knew any woman other than her mother.[108] He was not involved in the trial of Archbishop Laud, he explains, nor had he sought the King's death, for which he had been "scandalized."[109] This is a stretch given the record of Peters's sermons, but he was reported to have fallen into a deep melancholy at the time of the Regicide, causing his absence, despite claims that this was a cover for his axe-bearing. He regrets leaving his congregation in New England, he writes, calling his departure "a Root-evil" that let him become "Popular, and known better to others than my self."[110] Avoiding particulars, he notes that his involvement with the government was not always for the best, though his intention had always been to advance true religion and provide for the common good.[111]

Despite the frame of fatherly advice, this was not a private letter. Peters's intentions for the text are not always clear, but in the form that we read it, it is a book, like Slingsby's, intended by the publisher to be purchased and read by a wide audience. Therefore it is an indirect martyrological text. Peters presents himself as a prayerful minister, concerned for his family like any good father as his death approaches. These themes are similar to those we have seen with Love, Penruddock, Slingsby, and Cook. The book is interspersed with poems, especially toward the end, briefly and memorably reminding Elizabeth and all his readers where they should direct their souls. Peters's book is something of a final sermon and fills the gap left by his almost nonexistant last speech. In his conclusion he prays that "Prince and Rulers, all that guide, / May be good,

---

[107] Ibid, p. 115.
[108] Ibid, p. 106.
[109] Ibid, p. 103.
[110] Ibid, p. 108.
[111] Ibid, p. 112.

and do good; which is God-like." They must remember that the "End of Rule's from Christian Policy, / To live in Godlinesse, and Honesty." He hopes that "Religion truly pure may grow, / Above Prophanenesse, and Idolatry," and that "this present Government" will "surmount / All went before, and that in Gods Account."[112] This prayer avoids any particular reference to the restored monarchy, but it warns, implicitly, against any drift toward tyranny or otherwise ungodly leadership. The state must serve God and lead the people toward Him. The epilogue is even addressed to "Whosoever would Live long and Blessedly," providing a list of rules, such as "Let thy Thoughts be Divine, Awful, Godly," and "Let thy Apparil be Sober, Neat, Comely." These instructions are not for Elizabeth: they are for all of England. In his last days in Newgate, Peters reminded his countrymen how to live in a godly manner, subtly challenging the restored regime. Although he apologized for his engagement in state affairs, he upheld his religious calling to the end—which, he says, had driven all his political decisions, thereby putting them in the service of God. The book was cautious, but it implied that he was a martyr while questioning the restored regime from the perspective of a dying father to his child.

III

Although achieving a very different end, Peters also served as a bridge between living and dead in the satirical literature of the Restoration. A sub-genre of satires had him voyaging to hell and meeting Cromwell, conversing with his ghost in London, and finally meeting him and the other leaders of the Good Old Cause under Tyburn Tree.

---

[112] Ibid, pp. 120-21.

These satires ignored Peters's view of himself, exploiting instead long-standing royalist polemic to supplement a wider campaign to destroy the late Lord Protector's image, culminating in the posthumous executions of 1661. While Cromwell died in bed and was never upheld as a martyr, his funeral, with admittedly mixed results, had tried to present him as a sanctified, loving ruler. Placing him in hell with his cronies through satire inverted that scenario. Some of these satires were about Cromwell alone, such as a dialogue from early 1660 involving Cerberus, Cromwell, and the King of Sweden, meaning Carl Gustav, who had just died in February; he and Cromwell repeatedly call one another "brother." The two discuss the origins of hell and Satan, prompting Cromwell to launch a rebellion: "I was fortunate on Earth; and may be so here, for I know nothing venture nothing have, Brother, Why may not I get off Belzebubs head as well as the Kings."[113] Cromwell appears as a buffoon, presuming that he can outsmart the Devil and claim hell as his own. In the end, the Devil stops Cromwell's plot and promises the Lord Protector "that he would deal with his associates, as he us'd to deal with his supposed Enemies, that is to say, he would condemn 'um, and punish 'um, without hearing 'um speak for themselves," a reference to Cromwell's former treatment of royalists.[114] Cromwell is prevented from speaking further when one of Satan's subordinates "stopp'd up his mouth with Cow-dung, as Bakers stop their Ovens"; another "Chained him before the General pissing place next the Court Door, with a strict charge, that nobody that made water thereabouts, should pisse any where, but against some part

---

[113] *A Parly Between the Ghosts of the Late Protector, and the King of Sweden, At their Meeting in Hell*, 1660, p. 11.
[114] Ibid, p. 18.

of his body."[115] As we will see, this was possibly the worst treatment that Cromwell received in Restoration satires; in others, he and his comrades were happy in hell, leading him to ask Peters, his preferred messenger, to send those who were still living to him as quickly as possible.

A pamphlet describing "Peters's Dreame" recounts the minister's mythical voyage, like that of Odysseus, Aeneas, or Dante, "through many mazes and winding Meanders…to those infernall regions, whither some of the antient Heroes (more happy then my selfe) have dared to descent, and with prosperous successe returned, if Poets speak truth."[116] Peters comes to "the brink of that Hellish Lake where Charon with his weather-beaten Boat waites," whence he is led through Hades by Leveller John Lilburne, who had been sent by "Pluto" to guide him through the "entrails and bowels of his Kingdome."[117] On his way, he meets several grotesque figures who explain that they were those "who by crying down Religion, and preaching up Faction, made a way for such as you to tread in"; however, after coming to Hell, these damned Roundheads have learned how wrong they were.[118] After this unsettling encounter, Peters enters a room with a long table of famous cruel men, like Cesare Borgia, and finds "old Noll [i.e., Cromwell] sitting cheek by jole with the Devill himselfe, where they were in a grand consultation, what new offices to bestow on those new made and new comme (though long expected) Lords."[119] Cromwell is Satan's partner, assigning jobs for new recruits like Thomas Pride and Henry Vane. The assignments make comical sense, like making

---

[115] Ibid, p. 19.
[116] *Hugh Peters's Dreame*; no date, presumably 1659-60, p. 1.
[117] Ibid, p. 2.
[118] Ibid, pp. 2-3.
[119] Ibid, p. 4.

John Hewson the cobbler to the Devil, or ordering Henry Marten to "supervise the Seraglio," since the Devil knew he was "a sufficient Cunny-catcher."[120] Such bawdy jokes encouraged the reader to think of these men in an ill light: they may appear to be having fun, but they are in hell; soon we learn of the effect that this has had on the dreamer. Peters recognizes "the blacknesse of their perjured soules, more horrid then is to be imagined" after these encounters. He tells Lilburne that "all is not gold that glitters: I see there is more craft in men then honesty," since these men "invent a plot and set their emissaries to entice men to it, and then punish them like a tyrannical Schoolemaster; they make them cry, and then whip them for crying."[121] Lilburne concurs with the deeply affected Peters that these men have valued "the powr of Kings, not the nature of Kings, making Lawes rather to finde faults then prevent them," for which he too has repented, though too late.[122] The dialogue stops as they enter Satan's dining room, where there are "two Presbyters in their cloakes drest like an Hare in her wool, well larded with the fat of a solemne league and covenant, served with joy of a thanks-giving dinner…by an unmannerly Scot." Other dishes were made of "sneaking Anabaptists and creeping Independents, well sowsed in the teares of widowes and Orphans," and included "relishes of the Saints" that made even "the Divells stomack [grow] a little Queasy" until Lilburne offers him a "rich cordiall of dissimulation and hypocrisy."[123] In the Underworld, Peters finds his former comrades, the leaders of the now-ousted regime, feasting on false religion, which they had used for temporal gain. This is not a Dantean hell, as all these figures are free to move about; but the narrative is still framed rather like the *Inferno*.

---

[120] Ibid, pp. 4-5.
[121] Ibid, p. 5.
[122] Ibid, p. 6.
[123] Ibid, p. 7.

Lilburne takes the guiding role of Vergil, but here he is clearly not a noble pagan but rather a chief architect of the previous decade's unrest, now recognizing his sin and wishing that he had repented sooner. Peters wakes in his bed; perhaps for him there is still time.

Other pamphlets feature Peters in a key role as intermediary between living and dead, but in these cases Cromwell manages to leave Hell for a time, sparing Peters the journey. There are at least three "reports" of the late Lord Protector meeting with Hugh Peters in London in 1659-60. The first, wherein Cromwell and General Monck hold a "conference," is essentially Peters's report to his late leader of what has transpired since his death, followed by Cromwell's angry exchange with his turncoat general. Cromwell gives "a Sop to Cerberus" before leaving Hell to take a walk in Saint James's Park, where he meets Peters, whom he tells, "It's a great deale cooler here, then where I was just now!"[124] Similar to his appearance in *Hugh Peters's Dreame*, here Cromwell has become Satan's "Substitute and Grand-Vizier," running the infernal government and assigning jobs to his comrades. He spends his time in the esteemed company of the apostate emperor Julian, the prophet Mohammed, Richard III, Ravaillac, and Guy Fawkes.[125] After his excited account of his late activities, Peters tells him that not all is well in London; Cromwell's "son Richard is a simple Foole," and the government has changed multiple times since the Lord Protector's death. Peters leads him to Monck, who reproves Cromwell as "a most miserable Caytiff, reprobate from heaven, and eternal felicity, and

---

[124] *A Conference Held between the Old Lord Protector and the New Lord General, Truly Reported by Hugh Peters*, 1660, p. 1.
[125] Ibid, p. 2.

condemned to the portion of the Devill and his angels in utter destruction."[126] Cromwell defends his newfound office, noting that most of his old friends are now serving with him, such as Thomas Pride, now "head brewer at Acharon"; but they still need a cobbler, so Hewson, he hopes, will join them soon.[127] When Monck accuses him of bloodthirstily killing Henry Slingsby and "the eminent Martyr Dr. Hewet," Cromwell realizes that he has been betrayed and asks why Monck must invoke God, saints, and martyrs, which "brings horror and despaire into my Conscience, and wounds me to the very soule immortally." Cromwell leaves and Monck accosts Peters for forcing him into "such an Hellish Conference."[128] The satire leaves the reader with a clear dichotomy: Monck, the savior of England and the engineer of the Restoration, is appalled by Cromwell's love for power, even after death. The nation will be better off with Monck's settlement.

In a second pamphlet, Cromwell takes a different tone, now asking Peters to convey his gratitude to Monck. The satire depicts the late Lord Protector as happy with his new life. However, he has a problem—he is lonely and misses his comrades, whom he hopes the new regime will send to him. He promises to make Peters "Arch-Bishop of our Infernall Babell" if he sends word to Monck, an arrangement that the minister accepts.[129] The two discuss the activities of the surviving regicides, noting merrily but falsely that "Harry [Marten] is gone to sweat out the Pox at Serranam in the West Indies, as sure as a Club, and has taken a whole Covey of Whores with him, to plant the

---

[126] Ibid, p. 4.
[127] Ibid, p. 5.
[128] Ibid, p. 6.
[129] *O. Cromwells Thankes to the Lord Generall, Faithfully presented by Hugh Peters in another conference*, 1660, p. 3.

country."[130] After the optimistic Cromwell departs, Peters visits Monck and tells him, in verse, that he should dispatch the surviving regicides soon, but not too many at a time lest they upset Charon's boat: "This Order keep, and you will finde, / The rest, that shall be left behind, / You may dispatch with ease, / From Tiburn, or from Tower-hill: / A few Fanaticks sped thus, will / Prevent a worse disease."[131] The execution of the surviving regicides will help to cure the nation of its lingering illness of rebellion.

In the third "conference" of this series, Cromwell is bewildered, and Peters is agitated, even worried. The Lord Protector arranges to meet Peters in Saint James's Park "by a Succubus, one of the infernal Pursuivants," where he asks why their old friends are distraught. He is comfortable enough in hell, he says, and Peters had done no worse than he in life.[132] Peters explains: "Oh, but Sir, you had the luck to die in your bed, and to have a pompous Funeral with all Princelike solemnities (never to be paid for!) Whereas, I am yet alive (tis true) but how long I shall so continue, I am in very great doubt: However the thoughts of my death, do not so much perplex me, as the manner thereof, as tis universally concluded." Cromwell, who had avoided execution, does not understand why the manner of death would matter, so Peters explains that he is "Not to be broyled like a Spitch-cock, as Saint Laurence was, nor to be uncased of my skin, as the Arch-bishop of Spoleto was, but to be tortured and torn in pieces with wild horses, as Ravilliac was."[133] This reinforces the message that the executions were intended to send—he is not to be martyred like famous saints of the past but rather to be duly executed in disgrace as a regicide. Cromwell urges Peters to take "the powder of black Poppey, and other Opiatic

---

[130] Ibid, p. 5.
[131] Ibid, p. 8.
[132] *A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell and Hugh Peters in Saint James's Park*, 1660, p. 1.
[133] Ibid, p. 2.

Powders up into thy Nose, as Miles Sindercombe did to cozen me and the Hang-man," since this would spare him dismemberment by the executioner and send him to Cromwell's side whole; but this reminds Peters that the Leveller assassin Sindercombe's body has been moved to make room for Cromwell's, as Charles II has been proclaimed King; the Lord Protector is to be disinterred.[134] Now Cromwell is upset. Unlike in the other meetings, he seems unaware of the Restoration, or at least of its consequences. Only Peters's invocation of their former pleasant times manages to lead the conversation to a more positive outlook. Nevertheless, Cromwell is worried that Peters may attempt to strike a deal with the Cavaliers to spare himself the torture, as some repentant regicides had done. In keeping with his freewheeling approach toward marriage, Peters considers marrying a royalist's daughter; Cromwell pleads that he not become a turncoat, assuring him that "porter Cerberus e'er nods his three heads at the very mention of thee."[135] This flattery convinces Peters to rejoin Cromwell's side, and they proceed to dance a jig and sing of the joys of hell and the downfall of Richard Cromwell; but when Cromwell departs, Peters hesitates again because of his execution: "If I was sure to be by th' neck suspended, / I would not care how soon I was dispatch'd," he says; but he knows that he "shall be tortur'd worse than on a Rack, / And torn in pieces like Ravilliac."[136] The impending, and deserved, execution of the regicides is the primary cause for Peters's wish to escape, and the primary impediment to his voyage to Hell. These three satires deconstruct Peters, Cromwell, and other potential heroes of the Good Old Cause, leading readers to conclude that their punishment will befit those who had killed their king.

---

[134] Ibid, pp. 4-5.
[135] Ibid, p. 10.
[136] Ibid, p. 13.

In advance of the impending posthumous executions, which would be held on 30 January 1661 to mark the anniversary of the regicide, pamphlets and broadsheets continued to circulate, telling of the hellish hijinks of those who were already dead. One pamphlet details Bradshaw's dispute in hell with Ravaillac over who deserved the title "Lord President of Hell," with Ignatius Loyola arbitrating. Bradshaw crosses the Styx in Charon's boat, but the ferryman laments that "Thy guilt's too heavy, and in vain implores / A Scullers help; your Lordship should have Oars." He has cause for concern, since "Noll lately pass'd; alas, he broke my Boat." When he asks Bradshaw how he died, suggesting that he might have ridden "Post upon the three-leg'd Mare," meaning Tyburn, the old judge responds that a "pillow was my block," implying that even dying in bed his death represented a form of execution. Charon becomes irritated that "such a Rogue should dye, and naturally," and tells him to hurry to Hell and "Read Lectures unto Machiavel"; but in a final insult, Bradshaw refuses to pay, insisting that Charon had a special arrangement with Parliament; at last he begrudgingly offers sixpence.[137] The meat of the poem, however, deals with Bradshaw's claim that his Regicide was worse than Ravaillac's assassination of Henri IV. Ravaillac asserts that his "life was a Religious Cheat," and misleadingly claims to have been a Jesuit; the order had rejected him and Henri IV's assassination was distinctly rogue. Bradshaw retorts that while Ravaillac killed the King of France, the Rump managed to kill the King of France and England at once. Furthermore, he was the ringleader of an entire team that had engineered some of the worst villainies known to history:

My fault exceeds yours, and more weight doth carry

---

[137] *Bradshaw's Ghost; a Poem: or, A Dialogue between John Bradshaw, Ferry-man Charon, Oliver Cromwel, Francis Ravilliack, and Ignatius Loyola*, 1660, p. 1.

Than it, by how much Charles excedeth Harry:
Yours was Lay-murther. Sacriledge mine. You can't
Like me boast: You a King kill'd, I a Saint.
They me ith' Book of Martyrs will Remember,
And as to Faux, give a day in November.
Your Murther was Religious; true, and I
Committed too a Pious Villany.
In Charles I kill'd the Church, that's more than you;
I Sacrific'd the Priest and Temple too:
I made the Cushions Blocks: The Butchers wore
The Sleeves that Canterbury had before.
I Capel slew, if they the Saints did track
I slew, they'd muster up an Almanack:
Their Bloods wou'd add new Rubricks, whilst that they
Blush all the Year into one Holy-day.
Nor sin'd I singly, I made hundreds be
Co-partners with me in that Villany. […]
And does your Dagger think for to out-brave
My Ax? I kill'd, but yet debar'd a Grave:
So that in hindring Charles a Tomb-stone, I
A Monument built to my own Infamy.
I pluck'd his Statue down; what should I have
For my Deserts? I murthered his Grave:
Nor was I this alone content to do,
I made Cloaks Preach him Traytor, Tyrant too: […]
What think you then, that he deserved hath,
That kill'd both the Defender, and the Faith?
Judge all! and if the place you me deny,
Why then you'r worser Devills all than I.[138]

This long passage has been reproduced to demonstrate how Bradshaw draws the distinctions between his crimes as the judge of the King, in a formal courtroom setting, and other famous assassins. He claims that he will be remembered in the "Book of Martyrs," not as a martyr but rather as the creator of one. His treason will be remembered like the Gunpowder Plot. Rather than acting as an independent assassin, killing one man,

---

[138] Ibid, p. 3.

he destroyed an entire system, including the Church, and clothed the leading rebels in the garb of bishops. The men he killed are saints, enough to turn the entire calendar into one extended "holy-day." For all of this, Bradshaw argues, he deserves to be the supreme judge in Hell. Here Ignatius Loyola offers to judge between the two regicides. Predictably, he endorses Bradshaw, since he killed one like God. As for the Rump, the Devil himself is "but Clerk to their Close-stool," meaning that Satan manages their privy. They outrank him in his own realm. Although Bradshaw was spared the ordeal of execution, this satire is an important contributor to the deconstruction of his and Cromwell's memories. Charles I's judge has gained the approval of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the detested Jesuits, making him one of the greatest traitors England has ever known. The poem is humorous, but the political aim is clear; he is guilty of crimes unlike any previously known, killing a king and led by greater evil than even the notorious Ravaillac, whose name was synonymous with regicide. Furthermore, he is guilty of the deaths of other royalist martyrs, too. The deconstruction of these rebels coincides with the praise of dead champions for the Crown.

At this point Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Henry Ireton left Hell, and their graves, to "die" again at Tyburn. This was one of the most unusual and memorable actions taken by the restored monarchy, orchestrated in a manner to maximize visibility, coordinated with the day of fasting in commemoration of Charles I's death, and intended to send a clear signal to any who remained unconvinced by the ten executions of October.[139] Attacking the monarchy merited not merely torture for the living but also exhumation for the dead.

---

[139] Notably, there were also examples of royalist exhumations and appropriately distinguished reburials, such as that of Lucas and Lisle, who were murdered in cold blood (according to royalists) at Colchester in 1648; James Heath, *The Glories and Magnificent Triumphs of the Blessed Restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II*, 1662, pp. 174-82.

The three men were disinterred at Westminster and brought to Tyburn, where they were hanged on 30 January 1661, cut down at sunset, and beheaded.[140] John Evelyn went to church and praised the day, "O the stupendious, & inscrutable Judgements of God." He noted how the "thousands of people" at Tyburn had once "seene them in all their pride & pompous insults," and urged them to "looke back at November 22: 1658, & be astonish'd—And fear God, & honor the King, but meddle not with them who are given to change."[141] Evelyn's pious royalism is well-known, but he made a shrewd observation by referring all to November 1658, when Cromwell was buried: just over two years later, all appeared to have been mended. Pepys, meanwhile, noted that it was the "Fast Day" but said little else, other than that his wife and Lady Batten had been to Tyburne to see for themselves while he went for a walk in Moorfields. He did, however, see the three heads posted at Westminster Hall the following week.[142]

The treatment of Cromwell's corpse has generated some important recent scholarship. For example, Laura Knoppers's *Constructing Cromwell* analyzes several of the texts that will be considered here, discussing how the late Lord Protector's memory was deconstructed and then reassembled as a villain by restoration propagandists. As Knoppers argues, "in attempting to destroy the memory of Cromwell, such acts also did the opposite: displaying, reminding, and remembering in the very process of erasing the

---

[140] *State Trials* 6.1335-37.

[141] *Diary of John Evelyn*, volume III, p. 269. Cromwell's funeral was not short on pomp, but it was also infamously disorganized, with the procession arriving after dark to Westminster Abbey—where no candles could be found. Evelyn observed, "[I]t was the joyfullest funeral that ever I saw, for there was none that Cried, but dogs, which the souldiers hooted away with a barbarous noise; drinking, & taking Tobacco in the streetes as they went"; ibid, p. 224.

[142] *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, volume II, pp. 26-27, 31.

Cromwellian image."[143] The memory of the previous decade continued to haunt all attempts to forget it. The treatment of Cromwell's corpse, however, turned these attempts at forgetting into a farce: "the disinterment of Cromwell was intended as a solemn display of justice and punishment. But, exhumed from the grave, Cromwell was once again up and about in the public sphere. Interpreted and disseminated in printed satire, the ceremony of exhumation lost its solemn juridical import and became part of a blackly comic mode."[144] This is an accurate assessment, and this study draws a similar conclusion; but Knoppers mostly limits her analysis to Cromwell himself. The following analysis will consider these satires in a wider context. Cromwell was not "executed" alone: he shared Tyburn with two comrades. He was the most significant; but taken with Ireton and Bradshaw, and viewed as the final propaganda display of royalist revenge, the treatment of Cromwell's body is an important part of the deconstruction of potential martyrologies for the Good Old Cause. Although he could not be punished with Hugh Peters the previous October, royalist polemicists took it upon themselves to join him with Peters anyway through the macabre desecration of his corpse.

The geography and chronology were important, so it will be useful to summarize some background.[145] Henry Ireton had died in Ireland in 1651; Cromwell had died in September 1658, though his funeral was more than two months later; and John Bradshaw died in October 1659. They should have been joined by Thomas Pride, but his corpse

---

[143] Laura Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 173.
[144] Ibid, p. 182.
[145] For the general account, as well as the fate of Cromwell's head in the centuries that followed, see Jonathan Fitzgibbons, *Cromwell's Head* (Kew, 2008), esp. pp. 27-59. Some curious conspiracy theories circulated in the years that followed, including that it was Charles I's body, not Cromwell's, that was hanged at Tyburn, but there is virtually no evidence that any of these were true, and substantial evidence that they were not; p. 43.

may have been too decrepit to withstand any display, even for a few hours; furthermore, his burial was not at Westminster, so he may have been too much trouble to retrieve.[146] The other three bodies were wretched enough, which was noted by observers. That there were only three made for a balanced display on Tyburn's triangular gallows. The three coffins were taken first from Westminster to the Red Lion Inn in Holborn and then dragged on sledges down the road to Tyburn, following nearly the same route as anyone going from Newgate, and arrived at about nine in the morning. There the bodies were removed and hanged for most of the day, still in their burial cloths; late in the afternoon they were taken down and beheaded, with each head shown to the crowd in the same manner as one freshly executed. Some appendages of the men were taken by witnesses as souvenirs.[147] Their heads were then taken to Westminster and placed on poles high above the southern side of Westminster Hall, where they remained for decades. Other than the several trials of Corbet, Okey, and Vane in 1662, this was the final physical act of discrediting the regicides; but the propaganda campaign was incomplete.

A poem tells of this triumvirate's "journey," explaining how the men found their way to Tyburn for their new adventure. Mercury, the classical guide of the dead to the Underworld and occasionally back to earth, comes bearing a "pick-axe," presumably his famous staff, to wake "Noll from th' violated Arched Cave," noting that it was his "last Treason to usurp the grave" in Henry VII's chapel at Westminster Abbey. This sacrilege must be repaired: Cromwell will follow him to his "tripple Altar, / Where my grim Priest attends thee with a Halter." The "triple altar" is Tyburn, and the hangman has become Mercury's priest. Cromwell awakes in frustration, lamenting that his eardrum "beats still

---

[146] Ibid, p. 38.
[147] Ibid, p. 31.

with jealousies and fears" that have kept him from any restful sleep since his death. Mercury then visits Ireton, calling him a "subtile Engine" who, "Though long interr'd, is free from Natures rust," referring to what must have been an especially grisly exhumation of a man who died a decade before. He commands Ireton's "treacherous reliques" to rise, follow him, and join Cromwell at "the Triple-tree." Ireton asks in vain if his "long possession settled in my urn" might spare him the trip and laments that he must be "First earth'd, then hang'd, and so expos'd to shame." Finally Mercury comes to Judge Bradshaw, telling him that his "Grove and Walk's in the triang'ler posts," where he must "murmur sentences, be the disgrace, / And the ingenius of that Justice-place." Bradshaw tries to overrule this sentence, by which "The Courts adjourn'd to Tybuurn," insisting that only he can make such a call; but when he sees the "sledge and straw" to soak up the blood of the condemned he realizes that he has no choice. Mercury's last task is to wake Thomas Pride, the "ponderous lump, / Mishapen Parent of a monstrous Rump," but he realizes that he will need additional help taking the body. Pride responds, knowing that he will escape the posthumous execution, "'tis double costs, and double wo, / To pay the Surgeon and the Hangman too, / I had no Cear-cloth, so I'll keep my urn, / I see sometimes stinking will serve the turn." Mercury leaves the putrid Pride where he finds him. Finally Squire Dun, the executioner, appears, announcing that he is ready: "Oh Agitators, if now there be any / Have need of the Squire of the rope or his Zany [i.e., his assistant], / Though quarters and heads are on several poles, / The Head-Quarters are at Tyburn Holes."[148] This grisly joke observes that, while the regicides of October have been placed on display, the most important deceased leaders of the former regime are

---

[148] *Justa sive Inferiae Regicidarum: or, Tyburns Revels, Presented before Protector Cromwel, Lord President Bradshaw, Lord Deputy Ireton*, 1661, broadsheet.

now on their way to their new "head-quarters," a double pun on their military careers and the dismemberment of their comrades. Again, the methods and scenes of execution are the way to undercut any attempt at seeing these men well. In their presentation, they are objects of mockery to reinforce the intended message of the physical act of posthumous execution, which inverts their former lofty status. The pamphlets support the material propaganda, allowing the message to be sent to a wider audience than simply those who visited Tyburn on 30 January 1661.

Notably, in these pamphlets Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw each have a voice, even though they are dead—they say what the propagandists want them to say, but they are presented as if they are offering their opinions on the events. In the most profound example, their last speeches, which were "for weightie reasons omitted" at the gallows, were "recorded," and published by the "Pamphleteers to his Infernal Highnesse"—the printers of Satan or, alternatively, Cromwell's old propagandists.[149] This imagined version of their last speeches demonstrates the importance of that genre in the construction or deconstruction of martyrological causes as well as the blank pages that would accompany a speechless execution. Since the "last speech" was a familiar genre for readers and observers of executions, and since the activities of the ghosts of Cromwell and Bradshaw had already appeared in the press, these false speeches were both a humorous and a sensible means to attack them. As W.S. had observed, for a royalist it would be wrong not to speak ill of the condemned regicides of October 1660; now the three posthumously condemned regicides of January would undergo a similar ordeal. Cromwell begins with a telling truth: "It being a thing commonly expected at this place to

---

[149] *The Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw, Intended to Have been spoken at their Execution at Tyburne*, 1661, frontispiece.

speak something; I shall not break that good old custome, (although I must needs confesse, I have broken all else that lay in my power).”[150] This is an important point: condemned men—even traitors—had a right to speak, and an execution without words must have seemed incomplete to witnesses, even if there were “weighty reasons” to omit them, like being dead already. The words put into Cromwell’s mouth by supporters of the Crown portray him as cunning but corrupt. He admits his guilt, as a good prisoner should, but he does not apologize for his treason. Rather, he is proud, on the whole, noting that he “followed all waies Gentlemens exercises; Swearing, Whoreing, Drinking, and other the like commendable qualities, whilst I was a young man; When I grew more in years, I grew more cunning, and having play’d the Fools part before, I playd the Knaves now.”[151] He was sorry to see Monck turn to the other side, he says, since the “Caveleerish spirits” will “hinder that good work of Reformation we intend”; but he admits that it was “not the first time the devil was cheated by a Monk.”[152] Finally, he thanks the printers who had served the Protectorate; he will again “undertake to send them work, and for an earnest I desire they may print this speech.”[153] Cromwell, or at least this version of him, is well aware of the importance of publishing an execution speech, just as readers and publishers would have been in 1661. Finally he is pushed off the ladder and buried under the gallows. The lampoon “speech” ensures that witnesses will not sympathize with him, and it fills the gap left by an otherwise muted execution. If Cromwell were to die again, he had to speak again, one last time.

---

[150] Ibid, p. 3.
[151] Ibid, p. 4. Evidently none of these are considered especially significant, since later he notes that bigamy was “a venial sin I think”; ibid, p. 6.
[152] Ibid, p. 5.
[153] Ibid, p. 6.

Ireton follows him to the scaffold. He proclaims that, although he is not a gentleman, he has purchased "a very fair Coat of Arms." He apologizes for having been absent for so long, since he had died a decade earlier, but assures his audience that he had sent "the King into a better world, though I thought other," making his saint-creating regicide a disguised and surprising blessing. He explains that he had gone because "I thought I might meet many of the Cavaliers there, and be a continual plague to them, by the Interest I had in the black Prince," who had shown him "a great respect at my first arrival."[154] He reminds his listeners that there is still a "remnant…of those Agitating spirits that were in my dayes, that will stand close by the Good Old Cause, though they are sure to meet with Hell and Damnation in the end."[155] In case this would seem to uphold the "Cause" for the pamphlet's readers, he explains that he had never followed either religion or the law. Finally he tells the crowd, "I hope I have satisfied you all, yet no more then you knew before"—that is, everything he has said of himself is common knowledge—which makes them "all fools to stand so long in the cold for nothing." He dies after one final comment, noting that his brother, the former Lord Mayor, had "no more wit then his Horse."[156] Ireton's speech mostly deals with his relationship with his father-in-law and his military background; having died so long before, he was a distant memory for witnesses, but he is presented as eagerly voyaging to hell shortly after the Regicide, as if to continue his warring against the Royalists there—making him an enemy of the Crown in life and death.

---

[154] *The Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw*, p. 7
[155] Ibid, p. 8.
[156] Ibid, p. 9.

Finally it is Bradshaw's turn; the judge, having died in 1659, is the freshest corpse among the three. He is also the saddest; he laments, "my Country hath disowned me," though he also vows to try to advance his cause "in the other World." He is sorry, he explains, that he and Cromwell had drifted apart, but "he had a King in his Belly, and I had a Common-wealth in mine," a significant comment on the diversity within the Good Old Cause.[157] He admits that he had never been a religious man and was not sure how religion would even fit into a commonwealth; perhaps, he says, Judaism could have worked, "because they Crucify'd their King."[158] He then warns his listeners that, though they may have thought him "an able Lawyer," he was in fact ignorant of the law, which would explain his "continual practice against either Law or Reason." He comforts his audience by assuring them that there is no such thing as "conscience," for if there were, at some point he would have found it. In conclusion he bids them keep warm, as he is feeling the cold, "being but thin clad, on purpose for my journey, being to go into a very hot Country." In a final joke, the pamphleteer has Bradshaw promise to stop speaking, since he has already "spoken more then you expected I should."[159] These three "speeches" are presented in the same format as any other from this period. As in the W.S. versions of the October executions, each speech concludes with a rhyming epitaph, mocking the speaker. The texts are ludicrous, and no reader would have been expected to believe them; the point is that these men were quite dead, and here they are being desecrated as an essential part of the Restoration's necessary inversions of the recent past. Posthumous execution was rare, so in a sense these "speeches" filled a vacuum left by the

---

[157] Ibid, p. 10.
[158] Ibid, p. 11.
[159] Ibid, p. 12.

hangings of 30 January 1661; but their fundamental exceptionalism made them significant, turning the pamphlet into a companion piece to the theater of execution, giving a humorous script to an unsettling day.

We should consider one more pamphlet, wherein we learn what several of these figures "did" after their executions, thereby completing their deconstruction as would-be martyrs for the Good Old Cause. *A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn* portrays the three exhumed traitors as perplexed by the interruption to their comfortable life beyond the Styx. It also includes Harrison and Peters, executed three months earlier, and Thomas Pride, who apparently has come after all. Each man gives a short address, followed by a brief epitaph restating his role in the Regicide; there is little dialogue. Cromwell begins with a speech that describes the situation for the reader:

> Why how now my Mirmidons, what's the reason we cannot lye quiet in our Graves? [I] Thought it had been punishment enough for me to have been fetcht away in a Whirlewind; that almost shook the whole Universe; and like to have sunk Charon, and overturned his Boat, when he Ferried me over the River Stix. Did we ever think to be call'd to so strict an Account for our murdering of so good a King, and so many of his Honest Subjects; but now alas, we find the dire effects of our blood and Villany, crying out loud for Justice against us at a High Court of Justice indeed, where I and all of the late murderers of the pretended Court of Justice that murthered their King, must all answer for their horrid murders and treasons which they committed while they were upon the earth.[160]

Cromwell laments that he has been captured in death and now forced to pay for his crimes at an authoritative court. He accosts Bradshaw for sentencing "thy Martyr'd

---

[160] *A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn being a Discourse of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride, Thomas Scot, Secretary to the Rump, Major Gen. Harrison & Hugh Peters the Divell's CHAPLAIN*, 1661, p. 3. The Myrmidons were Achilles's men in Homer's *Iliad*, which could imply, given the other classical references, that Cromwell is the epic hero, cut down unfairly after slaying his great enemy in battle. Alternatively, in the seventeenth century the word meant "follower"; in either case, Cromwell is a leader addressing his men.

King," making him worse than "Pilate, which sentenced our Saviour; for he would have seemingly wash'd his hands of the guilt of it, if he could: But thou like an impudent and bloody Villain did not only give sentence against thy King, but gloried in it." Even so, Cromwell admits that he had been the necessary mover for the Regicide, for which he is "in perpetuall torment."[161] Bradshaw blames Cromwell for giving him the idea, but he too admits that once he began, he "resolv'd to prove an absolute Villain…and make the World believe that what I did was according to Law." He laments "the unheard of torments that I endure," and his epitaph is merely "I burn in Hell."[162] Ireton asks the obvious question: "what is the news of breaking open the Caves of the earth, and fetching out our dead bodies; is not our plagues here already enough, but that we must again be taken out of our graves, and made a Spectacle to the World, by being hang'd and buried under the Gallows, a just reward for such blood suckers as we were [?]"[163] No longer are they enjoying hell. They are distinctly unhappy, and posthumous execution is but an added insult. He wails, "Oh Father Cromwell it is not above 3 or 4 years since our Words and Swords was Laws, and that we were King-killers, and hang'd and banish'd every one that did but speak against us, or our Tyrannical doings." This is cause for grief, as they had once been powerful; but their "words and swords" were law, not Law itself. After some reflection, he admits that their "rotten carcasses" had been "the cause of hanging and murdering so many innocent persons, whose blood we now find, to our sorrow, crying so loud against us for vengeance." This is an important observation: not only had they killed the King, they had killed many of his supporters, all honest Englishmen, both

---

[161] Ibid, pp. 3-4.
[162] Ibid, p. 4.
[163] Ibid, p. 5.

on the battlefield as well as at the scaffold. Furthermore, their shared admission of guilt for killing the innocent is an important observation for the reader; it reinforces the reasons for which the men were disinterred and hanged. Ireton's rhyme proclaims that he is now "got into th' pot / With my Sire Cromwel too too hot."[164] He, like the rest, will now go, or perhaps return, to Hell.

The three posthumously executed men now stand aside to make room for newcomers. Thomas Pride cries that he is "scorch to pieces." He is served by a "Satanical Attendance," even receiving payment from the Devil himself; but he bemoans his decision to pursue evil instead of brewing beer, at which he curses the three men as he leaves them, "your plagues attend you."[165] Thomas Scot arrives, and Ireton tells the others how he had wished his tombstone to record his role in the Regicide, noting the irony that now "he hath neither Grave nor Epitaph" since his quarters are posted on the city gates.[166] Scot's speech is brief, but he admits that his punishment was the "just reward for all bloody Traytors," several of whom, he adds, will follow shortly: "for as we took pleasure in blood and cruelty together, so let us be tormented together, it is pity we should be parted."[167] Harrison muses that this meeting must be the explanation of his promise that he would return after several days; he laments that he did not repent his sins at the gallows and urges "all you of my phanatick crew, who are yet alive, to leave off your Rebellions and Treasons, and make Religion no longer a Cloak for your wicked and bloody designs." Instead, the Fifth Monarchist says, they should "truly honour King Jesus, and obey his Vice-regent, King Charles the 2d…then may you scape that shameful

---

[164] Ibid.
[165] Ibid, pp. 5-6.
[166] Ibid, p. 6.
[167] Ibid, p. 7.

death, which I too lately suffered and justly brought upon myself."[168] Finally, late to the party, Peters arrives, asking, "So so, a brave Convention, what all you met together and not call me to your meeting?" Cromwell is happy to see him, saying, "Oh, my beloved Chaplain, art thou come, I have mist thee long, wert thou hang'd too, or didst thou hang thy self?" Peters laments that "the Kings blood…and other innocent persons that we have caus'd to be murdered, it is that cries so loud against us." He explains to Cromwell that he was hanged at Charing Cross so that he could see where they had killed the King, thereby sending his ghost "to keep company with you in this place of darknesse and desolation."[169] With that, the ghosts depart for their new home.

This is all great fun, but the point is that these late narratives were explicitly linked to public execution, removing even dead men from their former positions of power. This satirical and polemical work was necessary because there remained a genuine threat to the restored monarchy from radical sectarians and republicans. In some ways this is standard propaganda, a political authority seeking to reinforce itself through the demonization and exclusion of the Other. But in another way it demonstrates how purported martyrs and their opponents gripped the attention of political observers in the English Revolution. Charismatic martyrs for the Good Old Cause still had significant power. Defenders of the restored monarchy employed all the propaganda tools available to destroy that potentiality.

Although the long-term propaganda war of the Restoration was still in its early stages, with several rebellions, executions of later-captured regicides, and calamities like the Plague and the London Fire yet to come, these early displays of royal authority were

---

[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid, p. 8.

important components of the deconstruction of some martyrs and resurrection of others. It is important that not everyone who expected to be or who could have been executed was. As we have seen through these satires, as well as in the trials of the twenty-nine men who appeared at the Old Bailey, the starting list was longer than ten. Charles II knew the power of martyrdom and did not wish to have it used against him. The message of these trials, executions, and satires was that the true martyrs were Charles I and his devoted followers; but most men could be forgiven.

Even so, the condemned regicides of October knew that they had to cast their deaths in deeply spiritual terms, arguing that the Regicide had been God's will. It is unclear how many witnesses were convinced by such claims. To reinforce the Crown's intended interpretation of the executions, commentators and satires explained how whatever they might have said, these men had fought and died for earthly ends, foolishly going to Hell as befits a lost sinner. They had couched their atheistic actions in religious language, critics wrote, so as to more easily bamboozle a religious nation. Now the restored monarchy and the Church could put England on the right path again. In other words, the best way to argue that they were not martyrs was to demonstrate that their aims were secular: a "real" martyr still had to die for Christ. In this way, the contest of martyrdom of 1660-61 was over the causes for which these men died. If the cause was one of politics and power, then they were fundamentally traitors, not martyrs, like the Jesuits of old. The potential martyrs, however, despite hidden fractures within the Good Old Cause, argued that they were indeed suffering for their religious beliefs about the common good of England. Brave performances still carried weight. But royalist propagandists had one more option to undermine the potential martyrs of the Restoration:

they could exhume their own men, or at least their memories, to construct a triumphant royalist martyrology, a lineup of genuine heroes whose virtue would overshadow the misguided bravery of the regicides. This revival of the 1650s will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: "The Spiced Ashes of a Martyr's Name": Royalists Resurrected

At the same time that the restored monarchy was hanging and exhuming unrepentant regicides, a parallel and closely related propaganda campaign was underway to revive the royalist martyrs of the Interregnum. We have already analyzed the extensive efforts to portray these men as martyrs for both the Crown and true Christianity at the time of their deaths, but in the wake of the Restoration that campaign resumed with new fervor. Now writers could assemble catalogues of "the" royalist martyrology, united in victory and presented as an esteemed collection of noble and loyal men who had given everything for the cause of restoring the monarchy. This campaign of state-endorsed, if not always state-sponsored, propaganda began in 1660, producing media ranging from short pamphlets and lists of names to extended, detailed compendia of the glorious dead. The books and pamphlets that this loose campaign produced served as a positive counter-martyrology to the defenses of the regicides considered in chapter 4, rather than the negative attacks that we addressed in chapter 5. This chapter will assess the most important royalist martyrologies from 1660 to 1665, taking note of how different approaches reveal disagreements or tensions among royalists about the best ways to memorialize or, alternatively, forget the traumas of the previous two decades. There was a pressing need for a collection of martyrs and heroes to counter the "rebels" who were "no saints." These men, whose memories until 1660 had lived as an assemblage of yellowing pamphlets, were effectively "canonized," collected as a seemingly official group that supported an official cause.

Most texts on royalist martyrs were published within weeks of their deaths and then dropped out of the print record for the remainder of the Interregnum; later sales were

possible but also difficult to quantify. Execution speeches do not appear to have been reprinted often, probably out of a combination of decreased demand and Protectorate censorship. The catalogues that came out of the royalist martyrological revival borrowed from such preexisting texts while grouping them as theoretically equal representatives of a united cause. This did not begin in 1660, of course; commemorations of the "Three Renowned Worthies" of 1649 had treated them as a triumvirate of noble martyrs, even if they tended to praise Capel the most. And after 1660, certain figures still attracted more attention. A key result of making a canonical martyrology, however, was to minimize the differences within the group, transforming them into supporters of the 1660 restoration rather than fighters for the cause as understood in, say, 1651. Even so, some writers cast a wide net, uncovering lesser cases that had not been discussed before. William Winstanley's 1665 *Loyall Martyrologie* presents more than thirty men in chronological order, sandwiching King Charles I between the relatively unknown Colonel Poyer and the more famous Duke of Hamilton, minimizing any variance in their ideologies and avoiding the temptation to rank them. Christopher Love also appears as a loyal friend of the Crown despite his Presbyterianism. The framework of a "Royal Martyrology" eliminated grey areas and permitted propagandists to present the group as a coherent unit, a loyal column that could be employed *en masse* against the regicides. Most importantly for this study, this had the effect of minimizing the martyrs' own religious language: they appeared as supporters of political restoration, which was accurate; but even though their speeches were usually reproduced in full, commentators had little to say about the religious imagery that they had used. God may have showered blessings on England in 1660; but while these men had often proclaimed themselves to be martyrs for Christ first,

martyrologists tended to emphasize Crown first and Christ second. Just as royalist writers homogenized the regicides in October 1660, so too were the royalists now understood solely in their roles as martyrs for the cause. The label fit many of them easily; but some, like Christopher Love, were problematic.

The key tension in this renewed martyrological project was between those who could be upheld unambiguously as royalist martyr-heroes and those whose cases were more complicated, especially in light of post-Restoration religio-political debates. As we have seen in previous chapters, some potential royalist martyrs did not fit the mold, like the Duke of Hamilton, a pseudo-Presbyterian Scot; the Earl of Holland, an occasional Parliamentarian; and most dramatically, Christopher Love, a Presbyterian and formerly committed opponent of the Crown. Some royalist martyrologies produced after 1660 grappled with these complicating factors, but in most cases the preferred tactic was to accept these men as martyrs in spite of themselves. From a literary standpoint, the structure of a collected martyrology required a different narrative from an account of one man's case, as it presumed from the outset that they were representatives of a shared cause reaching from Strafford to Hewitt. Precedents for this include earlier martyrological literature, like Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and even texts from late antiquity. In some instances, of course, the potential martyrs had presented their own cases this way, as we have seen in earlier chapters; but when a subsequent author compiled them, that author took control over the preexisting narratives, choosing to eliminate or augment certain details.

This chapter will attempt two things. First we will consider the scope of martyrological literature, much of which was produced on a far more expansive scale

than anything we have seen previously for royalists (the regicides' *Speeches and Prayers* notwithstanding). While these presented a canonical martyrology, each was a distinct text, and none had official approval.[1] In the second part, we will turn to the difficulties posed by the memorializing of Christopher Love, whose Presbyterianism and history of anti-royalism in the 1640s still presented stumbling blocks for those who wished to provide a collection of pure royalist saints. Attempts to treat him as a traditional royalist martyr embody the tensions among supporters of the Restoration in the months and years after the initial settlement. A moderate and inclusive Church of England, as envisioned by Charles II in the Declaration of Breda and the Worcester House Declaration, was rapidly giving way to the aggressive uniformity mandated by the Cavalier Parliament; but signs in 1659 and 1660 had suggested that Anglican Royalism might not have been so authoritarian in its implementation. Policies like the so-called Clarendon Code attempted to eliminate dissent within the Church, and a Presbyterian like Christopher Love likely would have been driven out in 1662, just as he had been in the early 1640s. More radical sectarians continued to pose legitimate threats to stability through occasional rebellions, feeding fears that any form of dissent threatened the unity of the kingdom. Therefore a consistent royalist martyrology was needed to support both the restored regime as well as the policies that had been forced upon it. Memories of the previous decade were accordingly updated for the political needs of the present.

---

[1] The "approved" royalist martyr was, of course, Charles I, and he was observed every 30 January in the Church of England; see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, and "The Office for King Charles the Martyr in the Book of Common Prayer, 1662-1685," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53:3 (July 2002), pp. 510-526.

I

The most obvious contributions to the construction of this Restoration Royalist martyrology were the wide-ranging books of "Royal Martyrs," most of which bore some variation on that title. These collections were very long, were fairly expensive, and often recycled the same information. Some of these books were not technically martyrologies at all but rather histories of the Civil Wars or the Protectorate that reinforced a royalist perspective on recent history. The third part of Presbyterian Clement Walker's *History of Independency*, for example, first published in 1651 as *The High court of Justice, or Cromwell's New Slaughter-house in England*, was reprinted in 1660 with almost no change from the first edition, other than a new frontispiece that erroneously proclaimed 1660 to be "the second Year of the States Liberty, and the Peoples Slavery," a comment that had appeared in the 1651 edition and was not updated by restoration editors. A fourth part was published late in 1660 by "T.M.," extending Walker's narrative from his death in 1651 through the trials of the regicides, with short accounts of their executions concluding the volume.[2] These were broad histories, however, not martyrologies. John Gauden's *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house*, likely written earlier but also published in 1660, similarly praised the King and placed his execution in the context of a long period of tyranny. The text condemns Cromwell and his ilk, lamenting that "beyond all Papall and Mahumetane Tyranny you usurp over our Souls, no lesse than our bodies; and seek (now) by slavish fears, and sinfull agreements to make us all as much the Children of the

---

[2] Clement Walker, *The High Court of Justice, or Cromwel's New Slaughter-House in England*, 1660; T. M., *The History of Independency. The Fourth and last Part*, 1660.

Devill as your selves." But Gauden does not address other cases.[3] Texts like this referred to the victims of Cromwell's "slaughterhouse" with martyrological language, but the intent was to condemn the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes; they were not martyrologies in their own right, and if they used the term "martyr," they usually applied it to the King alone. They joined other histories of the recent past that were flooding the market in 1660, obviously from a royalist ideological stance but without the same call to reverence that a self-described martyrology might make.

Other publications, while not explicitly martyrologies, were more systematic in linking the previous two decades of tyranny to the martyrdom of the King. The most important, *England's Black Tribunall*, was primarily an account of the trial of Charles I, consisting of preexisting texts; but it included the last speeches of some co-martyrs of the King as an appendix, ranging from Strafford to Hewitt but excluding Love. The speeches were identical to other versions in circulation. This went through several editions. The title was also applied to a related text decades later, including a collection of poems, illustrated with portraits, about several of the most important of the King's fellow martyrs.[4] The contents do not require additional analysis, as there was little, if any, commentary; the speeches were presumed to speak for themselves. But the intent of the compilers was clear: Charles was unjustly killed by that "black tribunal," and other men had suffered for the same cause.

---

[3] John Gauden, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house; Or, His Damnable Designes laid and practiced by him and his Negro's, in Contriving the Murther of his Sacred Majesty King Charles I Discovered*, 1660, p. 2.

[4] *England's Black Tribunal, Set Forth in the Trial of K. Charles, I*, 1660; compare to *England's Black Tribunal; Being the Characters of King Charles the First, and the Nobility that Suffer'd for him*, 1680, which consisted of poems rather than speeches but was obviously indebted to its titular predecessor.

Royalist martyrs were a cause for both celebration and mourning, of course. One poem praised the Restoration while lamenting the loss of Charles I and his best lieutenants. John Crouch, who penned a variety of elegies during the 1660s and 70s, treated the Restoration as a glorious victory after a period of tyranny and treachery against honest men.[5] Unlike more generic accounts of the King or his trial, Crouch's poem specifically invokes royalist martyrs; it is, in effect, a short version of longer works that would appear between 1660 and 1665. The fifteen page poem begins by welcoming Charles II as "Our Blest Phoenix" who "came/ From the spic'd Ashes of a Martyrs name" to "revive the Dead" and warm the land at the rising of a "Brittish sun," perhaps a nod to the often ignored Scotland.[6] But while much of the "mixt poem" is indeed "panegyrical," the "historical" sections rebuke the ousted Protectorate. Crouch contrasts the rebirth of the Stuart crown with the fittingly grisly treatment of Cromwell, "once so gay and brave, / Thief of three Kingdomes, now not worth a Grave." Crouch prays that, since Bradshaw had placed "Three Kingdomes' Head upon the Block" to dye his judicial robes red, the late judge's "name and memory" should "rot."[7] Crouch weighs this against the heroism of Charles I and II and their supporters who died for the royal cause, naming in rhyme all the royalist martyrs of the previous decade. Unlike the long martyrologies that began with Strafford, this poem begins with Hamilton, Holland, and Capel, who "make one Breakfast for this Caniball." The meal gains some religious significance when

---

[5] Crouch elegized the burned City of London in 1666. Around the Restoration, he wrote a poem of thanksgiving for Henrietta Maria's recovery from an illness, praising her as a "living Martyr"; *The Muses Joy for the recovery of that Weeping Vine Henretta-Maria, The most Illustrious Queen-Mother, and Her Royall Branches*, 1660.

[6] John Crouch, *A Mixt Poem, Partly Historicall, partly Panegyricall, upon the Happy Return of His Sacred Majesty Charls the Second, and his Illustrious Brothers, the Dukes of York and Glocester*, 1660, pp. 1-2.

[7] Ibid, pp. 4-5.

Christopher Love and John Hewitt, identified in the margin as the "two Priests" mentioned, shed their "sacred blood" on the "Fiends Altar"; interestingly, this homogenizes the men, even though they viewed their "priesthood" quite differently. They are followed by John Penruddock and Henry Slingsby, as "many more must go / To enlarge the book of Martyr's Folio." A few, he notes, were spared, since "some / Heaven rates above a Civil Martyrdome."[8] The elegiac quality of the poem is noteworthy, since it praises each of these men as heroes for a common cause; but this linking of "civil martyrdom" to a Foxeian Protestant martyrdom is intriguing, if unexplained. The royal cause had religious components, but besides the reference to Foxe, Crouch's descriptions are secular. Crouch condemns sectarianism and praises Monck. The poem is not strictly a martyrology, but it invokes the men who died for the King as participants in a collective action worthy of praise and inclusion in the "Martyr's Folio." Had these men not given their lives for the King's return, tyranny could have continued to reign.

Another pamphlet, authored by a "W.P.," discusses the deaths of Charles and his co-martyrs more exclusively. The poem is nuanced in its praise of Charles I, however, beginning by conceding that in 1639, the people of England had prayed, "Lord, send a Parliament, to make us joyfull."[9] This strategy worked for a time, the author argues, and genuine hardships like the Ship Money were alleviated; but soon the country fell into

---

[8] Ibid, p. 6. We will reassess this in the section on Love, below. "Civil Martyrdom" is an unusual phrase that does not appear in other martyrologies; it was used, however, by Walter Charleton, who explained in his 1663 history of Stonehenge that Geoffrey of Monmouth dubiously claimed it was a monument for those Britons who had "suffered a Civil Martyrdom" at the hands of the Saxons; *Chorea gigantum, or, The most famous antiquity of Great-Britan, vulgarly called Stone-Heng*, 1663, p. 15. Although that story is not relevant here, it is interesting that Charleton describes them as "sacrificed in honour of their Country," since they could not be martyrs for their pagan faith.

[9] W. P., *England Still Freshly Lamenting The losse of Her King, With several of Her Dearest Children; Which have been beheaded, hanged, and shot, by O. Cromwel, and the Long-Parliament*, 1660, p. 1.

war. Parliament overstepped its bounds and turned on its King and, as a result, the people it was to represent: "Then after this they laid on us great Taxes, / To hew us down as if it were with Axes," ultimately imprisoning those who could not meet Parliaments constantly increasing demands.[10] Once Parliament began the "toleration of such things that's evil," it was inevitable that they would turn to "that accursed act of killing Kings" and "Drink deep the dregs of the infernal things." The author lists all who died for the King's name, including Capel and his companions, Andrewes, Hide (erroneously described as dying at Tower Hill), and Love. The sectarian mutineer Robert Lockyer is even mentioned as evidence that Parliament's tyranny knew few bounds.[11] The author notes an important distinction at 1653, when culpability shifted from Parliament to Cromwell himself, who after some initial improvement would still opt for "heading, hanging like a beast." John Gerard, then, "did feel the smart / Of his keen Axe, which went unto the heart." Other well-known royalists followed, as well as many more scattered throughout the country for whom the author "can't make any true relation."[12] This poem does not make many gestures toward the Restoration itself, but rather focuses on the killings of these men who fought for the King as proof that the Commonwealth and Protectorate were oppressive regimes, far worse than what England had suffered in the late 1630s. As a result, it would be wise to remain faithful to the restored regime. The men are not called "martyrs," but the poem shares the hallmarks of more overtly martyrological literature.

---

[10] Ibid, p. 3.
[11] Ibid, pp. 4-5.
[12] Ibid, p. 6.

Several broadsheets and short pamphlets discussed royalist martyrs, some of which were little more than a list of names; but notably they extended the honor to wider groups than the famous executions of the 1650s. For example, one broadsheet lists those who died in battle, grouping all of them under the heading of "The Royal Marytrs." The list is prefaced by Proverbs 10:7, "The Memory of the Just is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot." Foreshadowing the wide net of "martyrs and confessors" that William Winstanley would cast in 1665, here all the "Lords, Knights, Commanders, and Gentlemen that were slain in the late Wars" merited the crown of martyrdom, with those who were executed forming a category of their own at the end. Those who died in battle were more numerous and grouped by rank. The list concludes with an advertisement to readers that any names omitted may be given to the printer for subsequent editions. There is no further commentary provided, and the names are meant to speak for themselves.[13] A separate pamphlet from 1662—the year of the Act of Uniformity—hardly mentioned violent deaths but rather presented the names and sufferings of all the Anglican clergy who had lost their positions or property as a result of the "Grand Persecution by the Presbyterians" during the "late Rebellion." According to the pamphleteer, these men deserved to be considered martyrs, even those who were still living. They were categorized by London parish, with a few mentioned from elsewhere. John Hewitt was inexplicably absent.[14] While its commentary was limited, the implicit criticism of the

---

[13] *The Royal Martyrs: Or, A LIST of the Lords, Knights, Commanders, and Gentlemen, that were slain in the late Wars, in defence of their KING and Country. As also of those Executed by High Courts of Justice or Law-Martial*, 1660.

[14] *A Generall Bill of the Mortality of the Clergy of London; or, a Brief Martyrology and Catalogue of the Learned, Grave, Religious, and Painfull Ministers of the City of London*, 1662. This is a possible example of exaggerating one's suffering retrospectively; regarding commemorations of the Regicide, Andrew Lacey writes, "It is difficult to assess the extent to which Royalists were obliged to hide their grief over Charles's

Presbyterians during the previous two decades is a marked shift from the Anglican-Presbyterian alliance of 1659-60; now it was the formerly expelled Anglican clergy who were martyrs, not the currently expelled Presbyterians.

Another broadsheet, published at about the time of Charles II's return to England, presented "The State Martyrologie" as exclusively those who had been executed for Royalism, making a more concise list and allowing room for portraits of the restored king and some of his most famous martyrs as well as a summary of the political history of the previous decade. The phrase "state martyrology" is significant: this broadsheet is almost entirely secular. The text recounts Cromwell's tyranny, his son's downfall, and the recent restoration. The portrait of Charles II, freshly crowned and wearing royal robes, is flanked by "undaunted" Montrose and "renowned" Capel on the left, and "valiant" Derby and "truly pious" Hewitt on the right. These men and the rest who are listed are praised for having "Suffered Violent Deaths for their Loyalty to his Sacred Majesty King Charles the Second."[15] This broadsheet is grounded in the political moment of May 1660, a cause for rejoicing, and probably explains why the martyrs are depicted alongside Charles II, not Charles I. Short publications like these permitted versions of the royalist martyrology to reach a wide audience, reminding those who may have forgotten that Charles I was not the only victim of Parliament's and Cromwell's tyrannies. Those published at the time of the Restoration served to inculcate joy in readers that England was again free; those later

---

death during the Republic and observe their mourning rituals in secret…[I]t may be that Royalists after the Restoration tended to exaggerate the dangers and disabilities they faced"; Lacey, "The Office for King Charles the Martyr," p. 514.

[15] *The State Martyrologie, or, Innocent Blood Speaking its Mournfull Tragedy, in the History of the late Anarchy since 1648 to this present Time*, 1660, broadsheet.

in the 1660s could be additional reminders or, alternatively, warnings of new problems posed by the persistence of sectarianism.

Discussions of Charles I as a martyr were generally more widespread than discussions of other royalists because of his status and the preexisting martyrology produced by the early publications of *Eikon Basilike*. Besides the broadsheets covering this subject, Charles I appeared in other literature, such as a new edition of John Reynolds's sensationalist collection of murder stories, first published in the 1620s but reprinted often throughout the seventeenth century. The 1661 edition announced that five new stories, "the sad Product of our own Times," were added to the usual "Murthers Revenged" of Reynold's book, the foremost of which was "Charles the Martyr," whose name was emblazoned on the frontispiece, capitalizing on the Restoration to sell new copies. The account of the Regicide was essentially the same as others published since 1649; but appearing alongside stories of murder and revenge from Italy and France, Charles's death becomes a matter of personal honor with divine retribution. The editor of this new edition describes how famous men like Thomas Rainsborough, Henry Ireton, and Isaac Dorislaus all died within a year or two of the Regicide, clearly the result of "the only hand of God, and not of man," as judged from "the examplarinesse of their punishment." The others, either on the run or else "found guilty of that execrable murther, and executed to the joy of all good subjects," were proof of further "divine vengeance" since the monarchy had been restored. In the end, "the pit they digged for others they are fallen into themselves, and their mischievous device is fallen on their own pate."[16] Even though the appendix reminded readers that "the depth of their villainy and

---

[16] John Reynolds, expanded by T.M., *Blood for Blood: or Murthers Revenged*, 1661, p. 321.

the unheard of actings" of Charles's killers set them apart as a final warning against murder, there was some risk that placing Charles within this sensational book would have appeared crass.[17] Indeed, the editor of another book accused the publishers of belittling the gravity of the Regicide. Such tales were not "consonant and agreeable to the same Subject," prompting him to place the King's execution instead alongside his fellow royalist martyrs, not vengeful Italian murderers, by which the sad tale risked being "Romanced or stuft."[18]

As opposed to the shorter lists of names, most self-described martyrologies were much more extensive and, therefore, expensive. Penned by authors with reputations for supporting the royalist cause, including several notable early historians of the Civil Wars, these larger works presented a more complete account of the sufferings caused by the tyranny of Parliament and Cromwell. Those published before the trials in the autumn of 1660 called for swift retribution towards those guilty of murdering men loyal to the King. Clement Walker's aforementioned *High Court of Justice* was republished in 1660 and extended by a different author. These partisan histories anticipated works like George Starkey's lengthy 1660 pamphlet *Royal and other Innocent Bloud*, framed as a letter to the restored House of Lords but structured as a narrative of the many injustices acted by the governments of the Interregnum. The letter is undersigned by Starkey and dated 18 June, placing this some months before the regicides' trials.[19] Describing himself as "A true honourer and faithfull friend of his Country" in the frontispiece, Starkey upholds the memories of the victims of the previous regime and demands that the perpetrators,

---

[17] Ibid, p. 362.
[18] *Royall and Loyall Blood Shed by Cromwel and his Party, &c*., 1662, preface, B4-v.
[19] George Starkey, *Royal and other Innocent Bloud Crying Aloud to Heaven for due vengeance*, 1660, p. 43.

described as "Ringleaders…great Midianitish oppressors, insulting Moabites, Philistine Lords," be "stript of all succor" and brought "to the scourge of justice."[20] However, in his pamphlet there is no central list qualifying or quantifying the royalist martyrology. Rather, Starkey constructs an extended biblical narrative of "innocent blood crying aloud" to encourage the new government to punish the malefactors properly. God has removed obstacles by restoring both King and Parliament, which will permit these "worthy Patriots" to "become our Zorobabels to redeem and restore our captivity, to repair our breaches, to settle again upon its true and antient Basis, these three great, howsoever sadly broken Kingdomes."[21] With this structure, he tells of the Regicide and other royalist martyrs who, though not individually as important as Charles I, formed a powerful group in their own right. The "private, but as cruell" murders of familiar figures like Capel, Bushell, Penruddock, and Slingsby, each of which "defiles a land," now demand "legall reckoning" and "their bloud who shed it." Indeed, this blood would be on the hands of the entire nation if it were not adequately punished now; otherwise, "God himself shall come to take satisfaction," and Starkey "tremble[d] to think…what our lot may be."[22] Those responsible, like Arthur Haselrig and Henry Vane, had to be brought to account, since they "had as deep hand in that Crimson fact, as any who were present at sentence."[23] Despite this call, Starkey even doubts whether earthly punishment would be sufficient—though it was, presumably, worth the effort at mending the breaches opened by Parliament's tyranny. For example, he asks:

---

[20] Ibid, p. 2.
[21] Zerubbabel, who led the Jews back from the Babylonian Captivity; ibid, p. 4.
[22] Ibid, p. 10.
[23] Ibid, p. 15.

> Shall Henry Martin, that infamous Lecher, who having among Strumpets consumed his Patrimony, hath long lain in Gaole, to the defrauding his Creditors, be accounted (when he is taken,) a competent Sacrifice in lieu of his Sacred Majesty, Lord Capel, Hamilton, and Holland? So Cornelius Holland, the Linke-boy, who hath nothing of Estate, but what is the price of bloud, and reward of his villanies, be given up to Justice (when he is catcht also) in revenge of Hewits, Slingsby's, Yeomans, and Butchers bloud? Thomas Scot, that Saint, (who besides his other villanies, most ungraciously, paid his wife Grace in the same coin, which he in exchange of greater pieces, received from his girls at a vaulting School, but peppered her so the wrong way, that she stank the sooner, and lies buried in Westminster) be made exemplary, (when he likewise comes to hand) in lieu of Mr. Love, Gibbons, Bushel, Col. Gerard, and Vowel, and so the rest? Or must all these be made the price of Royal bloud only?[24]

The King was not the only one whose death had to be avenged, and perhaps there was not enough rebel blood amongst those still living to make proper amends, since men of such little value were all that could be offered in exchange. We have considered such anti-regicide polemic in the previous two chapters, but Starkey serves as a useful reminder that the need to punish the regicides was directly linked to the honor and sanctity of the men killed for the King's cause during the Interregnum. As Starkey's title makes clear, this "royal and innocent blood" demanded vengeance. The pamphlet represents what might be called the "payback" wing of the restored royalists, those who believed that the Crown was too merciful.

While Starkey, writing some months before the October 1660 executions, paired the royalist martyrs with their killers to emphasize the need for revenge, authors later in the 1660s focused on the virtues of the King and his loyal lieutenants. The enormous *Royall and Loyall Blood* compiles trial and execution narratives that had been published in the 1650s. The anonymous editor promises that the stories are "faithfully and diligently

---

[24] Ibid, p. 22.

Collected out of the best observations, not Romanced or stuft" as in *Blood for Blood*, which we have addressed above.[25] In this case, the King will only be accompanied by those who died worthily for his cause. Charles I is described as "a Prince who lived innocently, Ruled justly, and dyed Holily."[26] His execution speech, identical to other published copies, appears with a portrait of Charles that had been printed elsewhere. The remainder of the book provides other speeches, arranged in a hierarchy rather than chronological order. Laud, for example, is first, followed by Strafford. Despite the editor's claim that errors from other editions have been corrected, the structure of the book is erratic, with an account of Eusebius Andrewes's case appearing separately from his speech, as well as unrelated and disconnected passages, such as an account of the death of Thomas Overbury. The book is even more erratically paginated than most in this period. The accounts of these men's executions are followed by a short account of the wars and a summary of the executions of the regicides. Little of the material is original, but there is a notable omission: Christopher Love. For a book that placed Laud first and described Hewitt as dying for his "resolute defence of the Protestant Religion, which he manifested in his sermons at Saint Gregories by St. Pauls," the exclusion of Love was surely intentional.[27]

The most important other examples of royalist martyrologies were James Heath's 1663 *New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors* and William Winstanley's 1665 *Loyall Martyrology*, each by significant authors of the Restoration who wrote other

---

[25] *Royall and Loyall Blood*, preface, B4-v.
[26] Ibid, second preface, A-r.
[27] With rare exception, the speeches printed here appear to have been taken directly from sources such as *The Severall Speeches* (1649) of Hamilton, Holland, and Capel; *An Exact Relation…of John Morris* (1649); and other accounts that we have addressed in previous chapters.

histories and biographies of notable figures before and after these two. By then the primary revenge against the regicides had been achieved, and the martyrs could be discussed on their own merits with less need to establish the importance of remaining loyal to the King; but the 1660 executions remained appealing stories, and Winstanley included them as an appendix. Even so, by the mid-1660s the Restoration appeared secure; the Fifth Monarchist threat had subsided, several escaped regicides had been hunted to their deaths, dissent had been pushed out of the Church (in theory), and Charles II was still mostly popular. In some ways this was the high point of the Restoration, the last phase of Charles II's honeymoon before the disasters of plague, fire, and the Raid on the Medway. But between 1662 and 1665, England could at least pretend to revel in its restoration. As a result, these great martyrologies represent the coalescing of the royalist narrative and the elimination of dissent. They present a unified group of martyrs to inspire a unified nation. Each of these books spans hundreds of pages and draws on the same basic material, with Heath's longer volume providing more details; but Winstanley's account uses a broader definition of "martyr" to include battlefield deaths and even the city of Worcester. Each book begins with Strafford, not Charles, as the protomartyr for the royal cause, and each includes some obscure figures who were not addressed extensively in print in the 1640s and 50s. They also include Christopher Love, but with some apology.

The first of these, penned by the prolific Restoration historian James Heath, was less inclusive than Winstanley's, even if it went into greater detail in individual cases.

Published in 1663, a year before Heath's death, it rode the tide of victory.[28] Heath focused on those who were executed, not battlefield deaths; but he did include a section of "confessors," meaning those who had exemplified the royalist cause through their steadfast loyalty. Unlike Winstanley, he reprinted most of the previously published execution speeches in full, forming a tome of more than four hundred pages but also limiting the book's originality. To provide some broad context, Heath called the recent onslaught a revival of the Marian persecutions, albeit with a new face. He presented recent history as a series of religious wars, "a strange and a new kind of Fire, like a subterraneous Conflagration, as indiscernably, as irresistibly smothered and kindled in the minds of some Factions Persons, pretending to a more holy and severer Discipline of Life."[29] The origins of this conflagration lay in the rise of Puritanism in the Elizabethan church, he argues, and culminated in the rejection of Kingship when Parliament took advantage of the "Lenity and good Nature" of "Charles the Martyr."[30] Because Charles I had been attacked as a religious figure, those who died for each king "may deservedly be canonized for Martyrs, for Confessing and Maintaining to their death, so precious and so commanded a Duty of Loyal Obedience."[31] Heath equated loyalty to the Crown with faithfulness to Christianity, inviting these men to be "canonized for Martyrs" because they reminded witnesses of obedience to the King. The speeches of Strafford, Laud, and the rest had been printed many times by 1663; but Heath's goal was comprehension

---

[28] James Heath's partisan histories included *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine War*, 1663, which at some 900 pages was hardly brief; and the "scurrilous, mendacious, malicious" biography *Flagellum, or, The Life and Death, Bith and Burial of Oliver Cromwel*, 1663; John Morrill, "Rewriting Cromwell: A Case of Deafening Silences," *Canadian Journal of History* 38 (December 2003), p. 564.
[29] James Heath, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors*, 1663, p. 2.
[30] Ibid, p. 4.
[31] Ibid, p. 10.

within clearly defined parameters, making his book appealing to buyers as a handy reference and chronicle of those who died publicly for the royal cause. Nevertheless, he rearranged minor details to fit his goals, placing Capel before Holland and omitting Hamilton altogether—these were, after all, "English Martyrs." Heath also tended to privilege fame. For example, the text erroneously identifies Henry Hide as the brother of the Earl of Clarendon, who was significantly more famous in the early 1660s than he had been in 1651, which would explain the lack of familial explanations in contemporary accounts. (Hide was actually Clarendon's cousin; Winstanley would make the same mistake two years later.) Heath advises the reader that it would "detract from this Marytrs merit" to "involve it in his Brothers, whose capacious influence upon the Councels and affairs of this Nation, hath rescued all honest and loyal men from the brinks of misery and ruin ten thousand times worse than Death."[32] This attempt to divert attention actually attracts more, suggesting that Heath sought the patronage of men in power. Furthermore, the book concludes with a separate section, almost a new book, dedicated to "the most Illustrious Triumvirate," by which he means the heirs of Derby, Strafford, and Capel, whom he considers the pinnacle of loyalty. Such additions make Heath's long and expensive book remarkably elite in its scope and intentions.

William Winstanley's shorter but still extensive "Loyall Martyrology" is more inclusive, complicating old presumptions about royalism and social class. The martyrology is also more explicitly linked to an inversionary counter-martyrology, with his heroes' narratives supplemented by accounts of the regicides' deaths and the "Dregs

---

[32] Ibid, pp. 294-99. As in 1651, Henry's name was usually spelled "Hide" despite the more common spelling of "Hyde" for the Earl of Clarendon. Heath was mistaken, as Henry Hide was a cousin of Edward, not a brother.

of Treachery." This appended section, the frontispiece informs the reader, is provided "For encouragement to Virtue, and determent from Vice." Winstanley reminds his readers on the frontispiece that "Rebellion is as the Sin of Witch-craft," an oft-quoted verse.[33] Rebellion, he explained, had made "all things…topsie turvy," causing such reversals of order as "Religion subverted by Rebellion" and "the Gown giving place to the Corslet."[34] The book is accompanied by a collection of portrait miniatures of all the royal blood martyrs as Winstanley defined them, which are identified by number with a brief epitaph for each. Charles, "Like Phoebus glistering in the Morning tide," presides over Strafford and Laud in a central column, and is flanked by thirty-five others, his "Brave Hero's on each side." Even though the book's focus is the extended series of narratives, this preamble provides a simple, memorable catalogue. Strafford, Derby, and Capel are the most important, grouped as "Stars of the first Magnitude." Morris is "undaunted," while "stout" Andrewes "deserv'd all People's love."[35] These snippets were simple, but they made their point—and while the poem and the portraits were arranged in a partial hierarchy, Winstanley paid at least as much attention to the best ways to group them in rhyme.

---

[33] In the full verse, Samuel tells Saul that he has lost God's favor by disobeying Him: "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king"; 1 Samuel 15:23. The verse had gained its own currency in England independent of this context, however, and appeared in a variety of collected sermons throughout the early modern period.

[34] William Winstanley, *The Loyall Martyrology, or, Brief Catalogues and Characters of the most Eminent Persons who Suffered for their Conscience*, 1665, "Preface to the Reader." Winstanley's works included a biographical collection of great men, and even great villains, across time, entitled *England's Worthies: Select lives of the most eminent persons from Constantine the Great, to the death of Oliver Cromwel late Protector*, 1660.

[35] Ibid, frontispiece.

More important, however, is Winstanley's decision to include a far wider group of people as royalist martyrs than just those who died for the cause. He establishes this in the dedication to Sir John Robinson, Lieutenant of the Tower, whom he describes as follows:

> [O]ne of those Loyal Confessors, that by your Sufferings have indeared your Memory to all Posterity; so no doubt, had not that Gangreen of Rebellion been the sooner cut off, your Eminent Parts would by those bloody Regicides, who were Enemies to Worth and Loyalty, have brought you into the Number of These Royal Martyrs who laid down their Lives in Defence of Gods Laws, and his Annointed's Cause, of both which you were so Gallant an Assertor.[36]

The potential for becoming a martyr, then, was sufficient to merit the title, even though political circumstances had spared their lives. This dedicatory preface indicates the wide scope that Winstanley takes, including both famous battle deaths as well as "Loyal Confessors," men who served the King by example in life and would have died for him if required. This structure draws on the categories of the early and medieval church, where non-martyred saints, like King Edward, earn the title "Confessor." Heath had included "confessors" too, but his section on them is quite short, perhaps because there were no speeches, and lacks any preamble.

Winstanley's individual narratives are shorter than Heath's, briefly retelling the stories of Strafford, "the Pro-to-Martyr of the Late Times," Laud, and Charles with less famous figures interspersed.[37] These minor cases, however, are crucial to Winstanley's argument that the "loyal martyrology" transcends social rank, including men like Robert Yeomans and George Bowcher, "Able, Pious, Loyal Gentleman" of Bristol who were killed in 1643 after attempting to help Prince Rupert in his unsuccessful efforts to retake

---

[36] Ibid, dedicatory preface, A4 r-v.
[37] Ibid, p. 5.

the city for the Crown.[38] Even more humbly, he tells of a Mr. Chaloner, a Cornhill linen draper who had plotted to sabotage army installations around London to facilitate a Royalist reconquest, and Daniel Kniveton, a Fleet Street haberdasher who had become a messenger for the Crown; they were each hanged in 1643 by Parliament.[39] Little had been written about these men during the previous two decades. To be fair, Heath had included them, but his methodology was more elitist. Winstanley, who dedicated his book to the Lieutenant of the Tower rather than to Capel's heirs, uses these men to construct a socially diverse royalist martyrology that any Englishman might have joined. While more significant figures still occupy more space, this organization subordinates the individuals, making them part of a monumental unit, more powerful together than on their own.

Winstanley's differences should not be exaggerated, however. His stories of martyrs after the Regicide were consistent with those contemporary publications that did exist and surely drew on them for factual material. Unlike Heath or the compiler of *Royall and Loyall Blood*, Winstanley does not reproduce those texts; but there is little difference in substance. He summarizes information that was already known. Hamilton appears with the author's apology, noting that while "of another Nation" he was still "a Peer of this" and a victim of the same court that condemned his king. Capel still follows as the best of the three lords, earning gushing praise as "a most Noble, Heroick, Gallant Peer, Eminently Famous for his Charity…whose Noble Virtues fill the Trumpet of Fame to all Posterity," and even as a "True Christian Hero."[40] The other individuals appear in

---

[38] Ibid, p. 6.
[39] Ibid, pp. 8-9.
[40] Ibid, pp. 24-27.

turn, with the text noting several of the rarely-mentioned men who were executed for joining Penruddock's revolt; but overall the accounts are brief. Winstanley stresses the humble origins of many of the men and appeals to his readers to inform him of any who may have been omitted through his ignorance, so that they could be included in subsequent editions.[41] Finally he praises all these men with a poem, arguing that despite their cruel treatment, meant to destroy their spirits, they were instead "raised far more high" and crossed "by the Rebells bloody hand / Through the Red Sea, unto the promist Land," where they joined all the saints "amongst that happy Quire" that sings to God eternally.[42]

Other martyrologies would have stopped here, but Winstanley adds those who died in Scotland and a long section about the more notable men who had died in battle, starting with the Bishops' Wars. Then he turns to those who suffered materially but were not forced to die for the cause, conceding that it would be impossible to include everyone because if "those gallant Confessors" were counted completely, "it would make a Volume as big as Foxes Martyrologie, and tyre the brain of the most sedulous Reader."[43] He traces the stories chronologically, he says, so that he would not be accused of ranking anyone.[44] In his conclusion, he reiterates that his work would be "infinite" if he were to "enumerate all those Persons that suffered by Sequestrations, Plunderings, and Rapines." Instead, he "refer[s] every particular of those sufferers to that great and general day of Account, when their Enemies shall receive the reward of their Fraud and Violence, and

---

[41] Ibid, p. 41.
[42] Ibid, p. 56.
[43] Ibid, p. 75.
[44] He writes, "And that no Occasion may be taken at this Catalogue for matter of Precedency, as nominating the most Eminent Sufferers in the first place, we will (as near as we can) observe the order of time"; ibid, p. 76.

Themselves a just recompence for all their Sufferings."[45] His most interesting inclusion in this section, however, and possibly the most interesting point in the entire book, is not even a person. At its appropriate place in the equalizing timeline, he hails "the Martyred City of Worcester," a "scene of ruined Loyalty," of which "each Citizen…might be transcribed into this Register, as being all sufferers for the Royal Cause" since they refused to surrender without a direct order from the King. In their "Fatal Defeat," they "suffered deeply with him," earning them a collective mention in this martyrology.[46] While all of England had been described as collectively suffering in various texts, Winstanley's discussion of Worcester is the only instance of so collective a "martyr" in royalist literature. Winstanley cast a wide net, but his interpretation, as he saw it from 1665, was necessarily comprehensive. The kingdom had been reconstituted, and the enemies of the state, whom he discusses in the final and longest section of the book, had been punished appropriately. All living Englishmen could rejoice in the sacrifices taken by their fathers and brothers not many years earlier. Lest anyone presume that England was entirely secure, however, he concludes with a verse from the Book of Ecclesiastes: ""Curse not the King, no not in thy thought, for a bird in the Air shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter."[47]

This was the state of the royalist martyrology after the Restoration: a catalogue of heroes not unlike the Communion of Saints, to which they were often compared, who served both religious and political ends. As far as contested martyrdom was concerned, the contest was won by the royalists; there was a canon of martyrs, followed by a canon

---

[45] Ibid, p. 99.
[46] Ibid, p. 91.
[47] Ibid, p. 173; Ecclesiastes 10:20.

of traitors. Lurking in the margins, however, was the question of how to include those who did not so neatly fit the mold, especially those who died for the Crown only after fighting against it not long before.

II

An anomaly: the still-contested case of Christopher Love

The sources that we have considered thus far homogenized the royalist martyrology ideologically even while stressing its undeniable social diversity. In some cases, the martyrs' own words supported such a homogenization; while they differed subtly in their motives and beliefs, these men presented themselves as fighting and dying for a common cause. However, there remains the notable anomaly of Christopher Love, who remained controversial after 1660, just as he had been in 1651. His case was too significant to ignore, so he was mentioned often; but some royalist writers remembered him unfavorably, believing that he was partly responsible for the Regicide. The famous Presbyterian's representation in Restoration martyrologies either elided his complications or else briefly apologized for them, attempting to force him into the broad category of "royalist martyr." Winstanley and Heath were apologetic, including him in spite of his Presbyterianism. Others either ignored Love's dubious past or used it as proof that in returning to the monarch one could still attain both political and Christian salvation. To do this, apologists tended to downplay his Presbyterianism, even though, as we have seen in chapter 2, his faith was always his stated motivation. His support for restoration in 1651 had been a tool to advance Presbyterianism and the Solemn League and Covenant according to his own vision.

The changing interpretations of Love must be viewed in light of the rapidly changing religio-political contexts of the early Restoration. As noted in chapter 4, there had been some cooperation among Presbyterians and more traditional Anglicans between Cromwell's death and the Restoration, driven in part by their joint fear of both republicanism and sectarianism, which threatened to tear London apart. Presbyterians in particular "were the constitutional heirs of the parliamentary agenda of the 1640s," which of course had at one time opposed monarchy; but "[i]n an unrepresentative regime installed by the army, London Presbyterians found a contradiction to their ideal even more blatant than that posed by Charles I."[48] Sentiments like this contributed to the short-lived Presbyterian-royalist alliance, which in turn was reinforced by Charles II's efforts at constructing a broad church settlement, such as through the Declaration of Breda's appeal to Presbyterian concerns regarding both the Church of England and Parliament.[49] However, Charles II's vision was not fulfilled. The Cavalier Parliament's several acts of the 1660s regarding the Church, known collectively as the Clarendon Code, would work to eliminate dissent in the Church of England, despite the King's own preferences for indulgence. One of Parliament's first actions in 1661 was to condemn the Solemn League and Covenant. Presbyterian ministers, who had thought that they would have a place in the Church, found themselves amongst the more radical Quakers and Congregationalists who were forced out of ministry by 1662. But the more Presbyterians protested, the more Anglicans rejected them as just another form of fanatical sectarianism.[50] This political

---

[48] De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, p. 25.
[49] Ibid, p. 62.
[50] Ibid, pp. 71-72; also Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration*, p. 168.

context influenced royalist martyrologists' treatment of Christopher Love as well as Presbyterian support for royalism after the Regicide.

Some Presbyterian texts did circulate early on, such as John Vicars's posthumously published catalogue of woes that had befallen those who took the Engagement, which we have already considered in chapter 4 for its emphasis on providential retribution; but its publication in 1660 also reflects Presbyterian concerns in light of the Restoration. For example, *Dagon Demolished* and the related *Winding-Sheet for Traytors* each invoke one Mr. Shereman, who owned a silk shop in Paternoster Row. The pamphlets describe how Shereman had previously belonged to Love's congregation but then took the Engagement, turning on his pastor. That he soon after "sunk down…stark dead" in his shop as his wife stood nearby was proof of God's judgment upon those who rejected Presbyterian ministers. It is not stated whether Shereman's death came before or after Love's own.[51] Another, Colonel John Venn, died in his sleep the night of 7 July 1650—a year before Love's execution—purportedly for having rejected Love personally and allying himself with the Rump. Love had previously been the chaplain of Venn's regiment. Though Venn's death was less dramatic than Shereman's, the writer treats it as equally important, as God had "banished him first out of the Land of the Living."[52] The account provided in these two pamphlets presumes that breaking with Love resulted in the same end as betraying or conspiring against the King. *Dagon Demolished* was written by a Presbyterian, but its belated publication and reproduction in *Winding-Sheet* suggests that in 1660 Love was deemed worthy of remembrance for his loyalty. These were not even men who testified or judged against him in 1651. Shereman

---

[51] John Vicars, *Dagon Demolished*, 1660, p. 11; and *A Winding-Sheet for Traytors*, 1660, p. 8.
[52] Vicars, *Dagon Demolished*, pp. 11-12.

and Venn merely left his congregation. These details demonstrate how early in the Restoration, Presbyterians believed they would have a key role in the Church of England.

During the trial of Thomas Harrison in 1660, Love's execution was even mentioned as one of his key crimes, even though Harrison protested that he was in Scotland for the duration of Love's trial. Harrison probably approved of Love's death, but he was hardly directly complicit in it, at least not in the way that he had been in the Regicide. Nevertheless, Love's death was the second fault raised by the ministers who visited Harrison in Newgate. The others were guilt in the King's death, "breaking the Old Parliament," and a general disregard for family duties and Sunday observances. It is notable that Love was mentioned so specifically, while others who died in this period were ignored. Love's death, then, loomed large among the various crimes of the regicides.[53] By contrast, Francis Hacker invoked Love in his last speech as one of several Presbyterian ministers who had been instrumental in showing him the "justness of the War."[54] Love continued to be a controversial figure, serving multiple sides depending on interpretation. This is probably why some of the most notable Restoration royalist martyrologies failed to include him, such as when *England's Black Tribunal* skipped from Sir Henry Hide to the Earl of Derby.[55] As a Presbyterian, Love's allegiances could swing in various directions.

More typical royalist media several years later would include Love as a key martyr while apologizing for his Presbyterianism. Winstanley includes Love in the

---

[53] W. S., *A Compleat Collection*, pp. 8-9.
[54] Ibid, p. 171.
[55] *England's black Tribunall, Set forth in the Triall of K. Charles I*, 1660, p. 147; this reprinted every other royalist martyr's speech, even those of Hamilton and Holland, as well as of less famous figures Chaloner, the Cornhill linen draper.

illustrated frontispiece but only in passing; he is inexplicably joined to Peter Vowel, who is simply described as "religious," and therefore "with Love for Loyalty their Lives forgo."[56] In this wording, Love almost becomes a pun to praise Vowel, but he is identified by number as one of the portraits associated with this line. When he appears in the actual text with his companion John Gibbons, their treatment is brief and apologetic. Winstanley writes that "though they dyed upon the Presbyterian Account, which abated much the lustre of their Sufferings, yet dying in opposition to Tyranny, and upon the Account of his Majesties Restauration, deserve to be had in perpetual remembrance."[57] Dying for the right side was sufficient to count as a martyr, but the companions do not receive quite the same praise that Winstanley showers upon other famous royalists and the city of Worcester. For comparison's sake, his account of Love's martyrdom is about as long as that of Brown Bushel, each consuming half a page. Given the enormous amount of commentary received by Love in 1651, much of it favorable, this brevity is noteworthy. Heath's martyrology takes a similar approach. He acknowledges that "some scruple" could be made against Love and Gibbons, since the Presbyterians had their own cause "interwoven" with that of the King. Their complex motivation "abates something of the lustre, though not the worth of this Crown," since their immediate goal was still restoration.[58] Amongst the ministers who were engaged in the Love plot, Heath writes, "Love appeared to be most active and stirring"; but "whether out of Conscience of some unwarrantable, undutiful demeanour towards the King during the War, I take not upon

---

[56] Winstanley, *The Loyall Martyrology*, frontispiece.
[57] Ibid, p. 32.
[58] Heath, *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs*, p. 327.

me to determine."[59] This cautious suggestion that Love may have supported the Crown in 1651 out of suppressed guilt for opposing it in 1645 is the extent of Heath's commentary on Love, almost as if he were grasping for some explanation for Love's willingness to die in 1651. He does not provide Love's speech, a telling omission by Heath, who usually provided multiple original documents. Love's Presbyterianism was unavoidable, but it remained a sore point for royalists. It would almost have been easier, for consistency's sake, if Love had not supported the Crown; he did not fit into a tidy royalist narrative.

Other literature ignored Love's Presbyterianism entirely. Crouch's "Mixt Poem," which describes the Royalist martyrs of the Interregnum, alludes to Love and Hewitt as "two Priests" whose "sacred blood besprinkle[s]" the "Fiends Altar."[60] It is striking to see these two conveniently paired simply because they were clergy, especially with such a potentially sacramental image, which the avowedly anti-Laudian Love could not have appreciated. They each may have died consciously as martyrs, and they each may have conspired to restore the monarchy; but 1651 was not 1658, and a Presbyterian was not a ceremonialist Anglican. By presenting a consistent royalist narrative, Crouch overlooks differences among martyrs, making Love a son of the Church, as if he were Hewitt's companion. This uses his name while ignoring every detail of his ministry, exploiting him as an opportunity to attack the lately deposed tyrants.

On the other hand, a short book published in 1662 attacks Love's Presbyterianism directly, treating him as one of those who were punished for betraying the King. This hints at the purge of dissenting clergy from the Church of England, ongoing by 1662. Whereas in Vicars's *Dagon Demolished* the loss of Love's friendship had brought ruin

---

[59] Ibid, p. 328.
[60] Crouch, *A mixt poem*, p. 6; their names were printed in the margin.

upon Shereman and Venn, the author of *The Traytors Perspective-glass* lists Love alongside the likes of Isaac Dorislaus, stabbed by royalist agents, and John Milton, stricken with blindness. Love had been cited in opposition to men like this in other pamphlets, but here he is an example of divine retribution. His death for the King in 1651 only meant that he did not have to be reviled quite as much. The writer condemns him as a "firebrand of Rebellion" and a fomenter of war with Scotland, a questionable allegation in light of his career, and in fact the very accusation cast upon him by the Commonwealth.[61] Love sought an alliance with Scottish Presbyterians to support the Covenant, which is why he came to support Charles II by 1651. Furthermore, this ignores Charles's own efforts to work with the Presbyterians in 1651 as well as 1660, a point that angrier royalists may have wished to forget. Since the Love affair made royalism's history appear inconsistent, it was better not to include him as a martyr. But this pamphlet is a minority. It was more common simply to ignore his Presbyterianism and uphold him as a generically virtuous hero.

The most substantial Restoration discussion of Love, however, came in a deeply martyrological poem by the Presbyterian-royalist Robert Wild, published in several editions in 1660; Wild himself would lose his clerical appointment in 1662. Based on its content, it is likely that Wild's poem, like Vicars's *Dagon Demolished*, was penned closer to 1651 and only printed later; it does not refer to the Restoration and gives the impression that the narrator has witnessed Love's death recently. The poem, not quite an elegy in its structure but elegiac in its tone and content, casts Love's death as a "Tragedy" and mimics the structure of a play, with short "acts" and a prologue and epilogue. The

---

[61] J.T., *The Traytors Perspective-glass*, 1662, p. 22.

narrator is the only voice, and he identifies himself as one who has recently left "a slaughtred Monarchs Herse" and come "to a Murther'd Prophet's Tombe."[62] He regrets that he must turn from Charles to Love, but "the tenth Tear…is his Fee," perhaps a tithe for the Church. According to the "argument," Love has died because "cruell Cromwell," a "raging Dog," had burned Scotland, implying that the Scots and the English were better suited as Protestant allies, not enemies. Love was forced to sacrifice himself as "a Divine to bleed his welcome home / For He [Cromwell], and Herod, think no dish so good, / As a John Baptists Head serv'd up in blood."[63] Once again, as we saw repeatedly in chapter 2, Love is both prophet and martyr. Wild compares him to John the Baptist, implying that, even though Love died before Charles, he also prefigures him for the observer, pointing the way to the true leader. Cromwell, on the other hand, becomes King Herod, beheading the prophet he had once admired to preserve his own reputation. In these introductory lines, which do not refer to Presbyterianism, Love is more closely allied with Charles than he might have admitted. He begins as a true prophet of the royal cause, though ambiguities will appear shortly.

The remainder of the poem is divided into five "Acts," which roughly follow Love's trial, sentence, extended imprisonment, execution, and posthumous divine judgment. First, the High Court of Justice was composed of "Philistines," and "Love, like Sampson, fetch'd to make them sport," meaning that he was brought to entertain the public. He was not really "Try'd, but baited," and then was forced to fight "with Beasts, like Paul at Ephesus." Yet despite his exploitation, he remained "Stout, like a Lyon" in

---

[62] Robert Wild, *The Tragedy of Christopher Love at Tower Hill August 22 1651*, 1660; some editions appear in pamphlet form, divided into several pages, but one appears as a single page. This will cite by "act" for this reason. The text is identical in each edition.
[63] Ibid, "Argument."

discrediting his accusers and proving his own innocence.[64] This series of comparisons is similar to Mary Love's characterization of her husband in her biography, explaining how Christopher Love is the modern embodiment of biblical virtue. They are platitudes, praising him while ignoring the specifics of his motivating philosophy. The next act, however, notes that some "sectary longed" to "try how Presbyterian Blood did tast." Love's virtues had failed to produce any "softnesse in their Rocky hearts," so rather than betray his own beliefs he bowed his head, prepared to give his blood, which would be "drink Divine" for his persecutors.[65] Although "our Martyr longs to be in Heaven, and Heaven to have him there," Love's execution was delayed for more than a month. The narrator uses this to compare Love to Christ: "And that he may tread in his Saviours wayes, / He shall be tempted too, his forty dayes," with offerings of safety if he would simply worship Satan—that is, the illicit government. The poem characterizes the petitions as written by Love under duress from his enemies, who wished to make it appear that Love was willing to recant in exchange for his life. They urged him to "pity your wife, / And the Babe in her," in a malicious ruse to make him betray his convictions. Despite these challenges, Love finally "snaps a sunder, Sampson-like these bands," refusing to capitulate and bravely facing death.[66] The poem then moves to the execution itself. The narrator recalls, "Me thinks I heard beheaded Saints above / Call to each other, Sirs, make room for Love." Similarly, the sun, by "blushing," indicated that "it was loath to see a Martyr die." Prepared to join his fellow saints and martyrs, then, as he poured out his blood, it was replaced by the blood of Christ, so that "his own was all to spare."

---

[64] Ibid, Act I.
[65] Ibid, Act II.
[66] Ibid, Act III.

Recalling some of the accounts of his execution, the poem notes that the spectators "appear'd more like to die than he," as he was brave and energetic while they were somber. His speech was so powerful that its "keener words did their sharp Axe exceed, / That made his head, but he their hearts to bleed." In other words, Love achieved more by his scaffold performance than his persecutors ever could. He showed onlookers the path to Christ.[67] Finally, Wild turns to the alleged supernatural reactions to Love's death, describing in detail the storm that arose the night afterwards. This demonstrated God's displeasure at the destruction of so faithful a man, but it was also but a foretaste of the "far greater Thunder-claps" that would soon befall the consciences of Love's persecutors.[68]

The only clear indication besides its vivid imagery that the poem was actually penned closer to 1651 than to 1660 is Wild's expression of fear in the epilogue that prevents him from sharing the poem publicly. Instead he asks Love himself to "Shelter…this Verse within thy shroud, / For none but Heaven dares takes thy part aloud." Otherwise he might face a similar punishment to Love's own. Whenever the words were composed, however, this poem must be interpreted, at least in part, in light of its publication date. Not only was there no longer any danger in publishing about royalist martyrs or praising Charles I in 1660; Presbyterians seemed poised to have a role within the Church. Wild's poem makes a case for Love to be enshrined as part of a broad royalist martyrology to mirror a broad church. Nevertheless, the finer details of Love's preaching were omitted;here he appears as a devoted royalist, even a generic brave man, imitating Christ, Samson, John the Baptist, and Paul at any given moment but not for any

---

[67] Ibid, Act IV.
[68] Ibid, Act V.

specific reason. Viewed from 1660, the poem is a call for unity at a time of triumph, putting differences aside as Presbyterians joined Anglicans in rebuilding the kingdom.

In addition to its role in the changing fortunes of the Presbyterians, Christopher Love's evolving memory in 1660 demonstrates how the royalist martyrology was focused on the essence of the Cause, simplified if not quite reinvented in light of the Restoration. By 1660, there was a consistent canon of royalist martyrs. Some authors may have arranged them differently, or included non-fatal cases of suffering; but the point was that all of these men had undergone some trial for the King's restoration, and therefore had contributed in some way to the stunning victory of 1660. They were presented as the complete opposite of the regicides, who had been physically and ideologically dismembered. There was little room for variety of thought, only for differences in social status. Each case was interpreted by the martyrologists as an example of a man worthy of emulation, demonstrating for all the subjects of the restored Charles II how best to serve their King. They were still upheld as brave men, but in a way they were dehumanized by this process. Martyrologists like Heath and Winstanley manipulated this range of heroes to make new arguments. Unlike at the moments of their deaths, when they called on witnesses to take up arms against tyrannical regimes, by the 1660s royalist martyrs represented the Restoration, a cause that, in its full realization, they could not possibly have known. They still met readers' expectations of a martyr, but their martyrologists had transformed them into something new, fighting for new causes in an ever-changing political landscape.

Chapter 7: An Imprisoned Pilgrimage: Living Martyrdom in the English Revolution

This concluding chapter addresses martyrdom from a markedly different perspective from the public constructions of martyrdom that have occupied most of this dissertation. Sir John Gibson was a self-proclaimed royalist martyr who nevertheless was not charged with treason and did not die in a spectacular execution or on the battlefield. Rather, he was imprisoned from 1653 to 1661 for what he considered politically-induced debt and ultimately died in his bed. Gibson was hardly the first to apply the term "martyr" to a living sufferer. Some contemporary sources, like Winstanley's martyrology of 1665, argued that any suffering for a cause could earn the martyr's crown. Augustine also wrote that the cause, not the suffering, made the martyr.[1] The key qualifier was that one provide some form of witness, which could begin in life; as we have seen in Christopher Love and John Penruddock's correspondence with their wives, and in the "father's legacies" of Henry Slingsby and Hugh Peters, imprisonment was an opportunity for reflection and self-improvement in preparation for death.[2] However, these examples of prison writing still engaged with the public and challenged the state's characterizations

---

[1] Janes and Houen discuss the importance of the martyr's witness even in other faiths: "As with Christian conceptions of martyrdom, Islamic notions link shahadat (martyrdom) to 'bearing witness' to faith and God. In early Christianity, martyrdom was not necessarily limited to those who were persecuted to the point of death; a martyr could be one who led a good, charitable life. Martyrdom in Islamic thinking was similarly a complex phenomenon." *Martyrdom and Terrorism*, "Introduction," p. 2.

[2] Although he considers other prisoners of the English Revolution, including James Hind (see chapter 3), Jerome de Groot has written the most recently on royalist prison writing; "Prison Writing, Writing Prison during the 1640s and 16502," *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 72:2 (2009), pp. 193-215. De Groot argues that "all writing from prison is conceived within a framework of legality, insofar as the status of the prisoner is legally inflected and defined (whether the prisoner accepts the legitimacy of the law or not)," p. 211. Gibson's example certainly does not put this conclusion in doubt, but his interests, as we will see, have much more to do with the Bible than with English law.

of their deaths. Gibson, meanwhile, composed a private work, despite some references to possible future readers. His book was a personal reflection on suffering, not a public proclamation of an official cause. Even so, he believed that he had given witness for his deep faith and his vehement royalism as much as any man at the block. Gibson's reflections serve as a fitting conclusion to this project because they reveal how one man had internalized the public, printed representations of Charles I, thus demonstrating that reading about martyrdom could have immense power over the construction of individual selfhood and the expression of religious and political identity and belief. Gibson's writings provide us with an eclectic but powerful perspective on martyrdom in the English Revolution.

Late in his imprisonment, at about the time of the Restoration, Sir John Gibson wrote in his commonplace book this proclamation: "I am a true Protestant of the Church of England. This Faith have I lived in. This Faith I doe live in. This Faith I will dye in. John Gibson. *In infaelicitate faelix*."[3] Buried in the middle of his bewildering manuscript of nearly three hundred folios, this affirmation of belief and allegiance is how Gibson wished to be remembered, particularly in light of the Latin phrase, his family motto: he would achieve eternal happiness through his temporal unhappiness. By 1660 he had sustained his earthly misfortune of imprisonment for debt for seven years, an indirect result of his life's central disaster, the execution of King Charles I. Though the earlier passages in his book indicate that his faith—Christian and royalist—was wearied if not quite in doubt, by the end he knew that after years of suffering he would see a King on the throne again and, perhaps, a world outside of prison. Over the course of his book,

---

[3] *Commonplace-Book of Sir John Gibson*, British Library, Additional MSS 37719, f. 159 v; hereafter cited as "Gibson."

composed in pieces between 1653 and 1661 in Durham Castle, Gibson would come to know himself and his place in the world through meditations on scripture, oblique poems, and transcriptions of texts that he found useful. Through the text Gibson reinvents himself not as a lonely debtor but as a bloodless martyr, a faithful loyalist with a greater legacy, in sheer volume, than any left by the more famous royalist martyrs of the Interregnum. This concluding chapter will explore how he fashioned his memory, his cause, and most importantly, his faith, primarily for himself but also as an example to any who might read his book. Though he presented it as a gift to his son, by extension it serves as an instruction manual for fellow royalists and all Christians suffering persecution. In this sense it shares much with the prison writings of Slingsby and Peters, addressed to progeny while commenting on broader concerns, even though it is considerably less organized. Gibson was not guilty of crimes worthy of execution, and as such he never gained a notable platform. His marginal position and long confinement, however, made his private martyrdom even more heartfelt.

Gibson has attracted occasional attention from literary scholars because of the complex manner in which his book was composed, and this prior work is useful for interpreting it. The manuscript is a remarkable artifact for book historians, an excellent example of the ways that early modern individuals read and consumed documents, altering and reassembling them in new ways peculiar to each reader. A number of studies have analyzed similar texts, and Gibson's apparent habits support their wider conclusions.[4] Gibson combined his original writings, excerpts from other books,

---

[4] For example, Gibson's methods of composition resemble those cited by Ann Blair; "Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550-1700," *The Journal of the History of Ideas* 64:1 (2003), pp. 11-28.

drawings, and even cut-and-paste illustrations, thereby creating a new text out of preexisting ones. His borrowed passages range from brief quotations to the translated sermons of St. John Chrysostom, which encompass nearly two thirds of the bound manuscript and indicate that Gibson's central concern is the fate of his and others' souls. His personal compositions range from brief ditties, such as anagrams of his name and short Latin rhymes, to a verse autobiography and copies of letters written to those outside. The longest original work, "Amara Dulcis," is a treatise on biblical suffering with parallels to his own travails and to those of Charles I. At several points he includes drawings, such as some imagined coats of arms, and a sketch of Durham Castle, which he calls the "House of my Pilgrimage," transforming his sedentary confinement into a spiritual voyage.

The most substantial study of Gibson is Kathleen Erin Patrick's 1994 dissertation, an annotated edition of the full text. Although Patrick does not address Gibson's self-proclaimed martyrdom, her research provides background on Gibson's own life as well as an indispensable literary breakdown of Gibson's sources, identifying the volumes he apparently had at his disposal, the chronology of his imprisonment, and even the types of paper that he used. Most helpfully she has estimated dates of composition for many of the entries based on context.[5] The book was bound after 1662 and was not assembled in chronological order, making it a challenging manuscript to work with. Patrick argues that it is neither a diary nor a commonplace book because prison writing is a distinct category in which "all the entries move toward a common end: freedom, in all senses."[6] This

---

[5] Kathleen Erin Patrick, "An Edition of the Commonplace-Book of Sir John Gibson, 1653-1660," PhD dissertation, University of Delaware, 1994; her extensive list of dates by folio can be found on pp. 30-31.
[6] Ibid, p. 114.

provides a coherent central theme to what may appear at first glance to be a random collection of documents. More than "prison writing," however, Gibson's book becomes "martyrological writing" because it combines personal reflections on the hope for freedom with his persistent focus on teaching Christianity by his witness. He treated his sufferings as intrinsically Christian.[7]

An article by Adam Smyth builds on Patrick's findings to analyze the physical construction of the book. Smyth discusses how Gibson's practice of cutting sections out of other books and pasting them into his own is a distinctive form of marginalia, creating a new text out of old ones. Gibson, like other early modern readers, glossed the texts from which he borrowed, providing insight to the serious activity that reading entailed. He also created new images. At one point he glued a printed medal from one engraving onto a separate engraving of Charles II, a clever move that linked two ideas into a seamless succession.[8] To the extent that this is royalist literature, Smyth suggests, following Lois Potter, that such reworking of texts was a fundamentally royalist exercise, recreating stability out of destruction.[9] The collage creates a striking three-dimensional appearance; it is meant to fold slightly away from the page, as if it were an actual medal hanging from the neck of the King. This tangibility may have been a source of comfort for Gibson, removed as he was from the company of fellow royalists; but such interpretations remain conjecture. In any event, Gibson's habits of appropriation and

---

[7] Patrick as well as Adam Smyth refer to the text as a "miscellany." More recently Kate Narveson has used Gibson's manuscript as a sustained, if idiosyncratic, meditation on Scripture; *Bible Readers and Lay Writers in Early Modern England: Gender and Self-Definition in an Emergent Writing Culture* (Ashgate, 2012).

[8] Adam Smyth, "'Rend and teare in peeces': Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England," *Seventeenth Century* 19 (2004), p. 47.

[9] Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-60* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 50-1.

recomposition reveal a deeply engaged reader who, in turn, became a writer as well. While the book's arrangement was "breathless, chaotic, fragmented," as Smyth puts it, there was a consistency of thought and philosophy beneath the erratic presentation.[10] Smyth's article is an excellent study as far as it goes; but as Smyth admits, it does not exhaust Gibson's potential for studies of royalism, imprisonment, or martyrdom. Gibson rewrote history as it should be, but he was also rewriting it as it actually was in his mind—a steady progression to salvation, a fall followed by an ascent, and an escape from his house of bondage through religious pilgrimage.

Gibson was a leading member of the North Yorkshire gentry and was proud of his service as a captain of horse of the North Riding at the time of the Siege of York: "A Captaine once I was of Horse / Under Kinge Charles the Martyr, / The honor is of much more force / Then Lords of the new Charter."[11] His service, which ended by 1645, was relatively minor; but it was worth more to him and to England than anything that the Commonwealth or Protectorate might do. His father had previously established an alum-mining monopoly in the area with the support of the Earl of Strafford, whom Gibson considered his patron.[12] Gibson was well-connected in Yorkshire during the 1640s but was unwilling to realign himself with the new establishment, which set him on a path to material ruin. First the mine was closed in about 1650, and Gibson lost a significant source of income. Then Parliament sought repayment for bonds, dating to 1642, which had been meant to pay the King's military expenses but were by then claimed by the Commonwealth. By late in 1652 it became clear that Gibson could not afford to pay his

---

[10] Smyth, p. 38.
[11] Gibson, f. 167.
[12] Patrick, p. 106. Gibson composed an acrostic of the name "Thomas Wentworth," briefly describing his patron's downfall; f. 208.

remaining debt of about £600 without selling off his estate and disinheriting his descendants, so he was imprisoned in Durham Castle indefinitely.[13] He was not destitute in prison, however, since the debt had to be paid in a lump sum; Gibson lived off some of his remaining assets, renting a decent cell and buying plenty of paper while giving up his freedom in exchange for his heirs' security. In a way this was a form of self-imposed martyrdom, sacrificing himself for others; but as an economic decision, its ideological significance is uncertain, and there is a lingering question about whether Gibson was essentially in a predicament of his own making.[14] Over the course of his confinement, however, he developed a detailed interpretation of these sufferings, linking them to his royalism and his faith.

Gibson would be an unexceptional imprisoned debtor were it not for his exceptional manuscript. In the text he refers to his imprisonment variously as a living martyrdom, a pilgrimage, and a personal odyssey, all instigated by his loyalty to the King. Before his son or any other reader, the book was primarily meant for Gibson himself, helping him to cope with his imprisonment and myriad other personal tragedies, including the death of his appropriately-named wife Penelope about a year before his arrest. The book also addresses a broader audience, directly through copies of letters to those on the outside and its dedication to his son, and implicitly through scattered references to imagined future readers, such as his apology for a bad poem: "Pardon my fancie! have my verse excus'd, / That Shepherd poorely pipes! whose Reed is bruis'd."[15] Portions of the book could serve as an instruction manual for how to be both a royalist

---

[13] Patrick offers an excellent analysis of the legal turns that ruined Gibson; pp. 64-65.
[14] Ibid, p. 75.
[15] Gibson, f. 169 v.

and a Christian in times of trouble. The longest composition, "Amara Dulcis," was styled like a printed text and had the finished tone of a published treatise, quite different from his shorter observations and passing comments. Gibson claimed that, despite the mundane reasons for which he was imprisoned, his suffering made him a religious martyr. Since his financial struggle resulted from the illegal rule of Parliament, it qualified as a religious and political persecution. This led him to the remarkable conclusion that "a prisoner and a martyr are the same thing."[16]

Nevertheless, debtors' prison makes Gibson a royalist martyrological outlier, raising the question of whether his living martyrdom was for something other than his devoted loyalty to the Cross and the Crown. Gibson's suffering could have merely annexed religious language to provide it with greater significance. His decision to preserve his property for his heirs, rather than sell land to settle the debt, indicates two possible attitudes. He might have refused to pay because he believed that Parliament's decision to close and confiscate the family's mines was simply the tyranny of an illegitimate government continuing its assault against English liberty. Alternatively, he might have wanted to preserve his estate for his descendants after some earlier missteps transferred part of the family property into the hands of a local Parliamentarian.[17] These questions force us to consider whether Gibson's suffering was primarily a political, or even secular, form of suffering, or whether it was as religious as he maintained. I argue that it was both, and that religion and politics were inseparable in his mind. In reading Gibson's text, his faith is the overwhelmingly dominant theme, providing meaning to

---

[16] Ibid, f. 160.
[17] Patrick, pp. 64-67.

each entry. There is no evidence of cynicism on his part. He may have resented Cromwell, but even that resentment was tempered by his focus on his eternal salvation.

It is difficult to call anything in Gibson's book the "first page" because passages later in the text were written earlier than those placed before. Folio 4, however, is the closest the text comes to an inscription or dedication and seems to have been bound near the beginning for this reason. The actual date is unclear. It is the most condensed expression of the text's purpose and underlying themes, set in Gibson's typical mode of brief original statements, anagrams, Latin phrases, and biblical verses. Gibson sets the theme with a pair of maxims: *Virtus post funera vivit*, meaning "Virtue outlives death," and *In infaelicitate faelix*, his family motto, meaning "Happiness in unhappiness" or "Fortune in misfortune."[18] These two phrases, implying that spiritual victory rises through hardship and aims toward eternal life, characterize the entire text; Gibson wrote *in infaelicitate faelix* on many occasions. He adds, *Suprema hora, Prima quies. A te, ad te*, meaning "At the last hour is the first calm; From you, to you," a fundamental statement about the significance of his own life within Christian history. In birth one enters the world, and in death one leaves it, but not for nothing. Instead he will rest when he reaches this *prima quies* and, in the peace of Christ, return to the Creator.

He follows these Latin verses with anagrams of his and his wife's names: Joannes Gibson becomes "O! In no sign, Base"; and Penelope Gibson forms both "In Gospel be

---

[18] Gibson, f. 4. When these words were carved over the doorway of the Gibson home, Welburn Hall, in 1611, none could have guessed the new significance that they would take forty years later. Gibson wrote occasionally of his Welburn as one of the few earthly locations he wished to see again before his death; one of his many couplets, for example, reads, "Welburne. Lord bringe me Home in safety; that this Earth / May bury me, w[hi]ch fed me from my Birth"; f. 169 v. Gibson, as well as George Frank, who noted its ruinous state in the 1880s, would surely be pleased to know that Welburn was preserved and as of 2015 is a school, which seems a fitting use considering the breadth of Gibson's reading. George Frank, *Ryedale and North Yorkshire Antiquities*, London, 1888, p. 149.

open" and "Longe be Pen pious." Anagramming was a common cultural practice in this period intended to uncover hidden meanings. Smyth argues that in these clunky statements Gibson is reassembling his difficult reality into a more palatable one; but when viewed in the broader context of this rambling religious document, Gibson is resting in the hope of eternal salvation, both for himself and for his wife, who predeceased him not long before his imprisonment began.[19] He then adds a prayer for mercy in his trials: "O Lord, to whome thou hast given but little, doe not require much," an inversion of Luke 12:48, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." This is followed by verses from Ecclesiastes, Job, and the Psalms, a pattern that continues throughout the text.[20] Finally he concludes the dedicatory page with what all this signifies: "Hope to the End, and thou shalt receive the end of thy hope, a crowne of glory." The crown, of course, is not of this world.

One worldly crown does concern Gibson—that of the King. Amidst several verses about being made whole through suffering and finding hope in affliction, he includes this passage: "And when thy little misfortune troubles thee, remember that thou hast knowne the best of Kings and the best of men put to death publicklye by his owne subjects." This could be interpreted in a variety of ways. Perhaps it means that Gibson's plight is less severe. Perhaps it is a general comment on the calamity of the time. But in the broader

---

[19] Gibson, f. 4; Smyth, p. 47.

[20] The three verses are as follows: "My sonne, be admonished: of makinge many books there is noe end, and much study is a wearinesse of the flesh," Ecclesiastes 12:12; "that wch I see not teach thou mee: If I have done iniquitye, I will doe noe more," Job 34:32; and "O Lord prosper thou the work of my hand upon mee; O prosper thou my handy worke," Psalm 90:17. Together these reflect on the penance of his imprisonment and the desire that the work he accomplishes through that penance might be fruitful, however tiring it may be. It will be impossible to reproduce all of Gibson's scriptural references, but these are important as part of his dedication, especially the first—his work, the making of this book, seemed to be endless because it would continue as long as he remained in prison.

context of royalist writings, it invokes Charles I as one with whom to have "compassion," in the literal sense of the word, "to suffer with." As we have seen above, royalists joined Charles's passion to Christ's passion, and an individual suffering for the sake of both Christ and Charles could become a fellow martyr for Truth. Gibson argues the same thing. On the next page, he adds the slogan "Royall and Loyall" before quoting, again, from Job: "Behold my witnesse is in heaven, and my record is on high." Then he quotes Ecclesiastes, the same verse that Winstanley would use in his martyrology: "Curse not the Kinge, noe not in thy thought; for that which hath wings shall tell the matter." And finally he copies a verse from Samuel: "Who can stretch forth his hand against the Lords anointed, and be guiltlesse?"[21] The entry concludes, "Vive Le Roy." While these first bound pages of the book, which were not the first composed, appear erratic in their arrangement, they establish a theme for the full text. Gibson's suffering would be a living martyrdom in the same tradition as the martyrdom of King Charles. Each of them hoped for salvation despite earthly trials. Gibson drew on the themes of *Eikon Basilike*, even copying the King's prayer elsewhere, to uphold his traditional understanding of divine right monarchy. He thereby became a companion of Charles in suffering just as he had been, by allegiance, in battle.

Gibson was a devout member of the established Church of England and rejected the more radical strains of Protestantism that had taken hold of the Commonwealth. His religious identity was inseparable from his royalism, and references to it pervade the book, although it was peculiarly broad. He writes that a "compleate Christian" must have

---

[21] Ecclesiastes 10:20; 1 Samuel 26:9-11; Gibson, f. 5.

the "works of a Papist," "wordes of a Puritan," and "Faith of a Protestant."[22] He sees this as the orthodox path, and he laments in a letter that now "everye man preaches his owne fancie, and starts new opinions, the old Orthodox way beinge left, and our Saviours comand of preachinge repentance and remission of sinns, quite laide aside."[23] The Church of England had offered martyrs of its own for this orthodox vision, and Gibson found them as inspiring as the King. At one point he copies the execution speech of Archbishop Laud; at another, in classic royalist fashion, he writes, "Laud and Blest Charles, in whom were hewed down, / In Laud the Miter, in blest Charles the Crown." The following page goes further, commenting, "King and Priest. Twins of Oyle, Twins of Destiny," a reference to the oil of anointing.[24] Other clergy are important too, as is evident from an epitaph on Maurice Corney, "an Orthodox Minister late departed out of this world into a better." Gibson describes the cleric as having "slipt out to view / Martyr'd King Charles, and all the heroicke crew / Of headlesse Royalists." This was a great honor, and he wishes that Maurice would "call me with Thee to…The new Jerusalem that's plac'd above…Where Royalists must ever sitt and sing…praises to their Lord and King."[25] The most interesting thing here is that Corney, who seems to have died of natural causes, immediately joins the "headless royalists." Church and state are closely tied making Laud and Charles the "twins of destiny." However, Gibson is not always so

---

[22] Ibid, f. 112.
[23] Ibid, f. 191; in the conclusion to this letter, Gibson provides the following litany of unorthodoxy: "I have like wise seene dreadfull Comets, and prodigious Meteors; all kind of Sects. Anabaptists, Brownests, Presbeterians, Independants, Familists, Adamites, Quakars, Antinomians, Socinians, Antitrinitarians, or new Arrians, Millinaries, Hetheringtonians, Anti-Sabbatarians, Traskites, Jesuites, Pelagians, Soule-sleepers, Antiscriptarians, Seekers, Divorcers, Raunters, Manichees, Swinckfeldians, Heakers, Notionists, Freewillers, *cum multis aliis*. Lord open our eyes, that wee may see the Truth"; f. 192 v.
[24] Ibid, ff. 204 v-205.
[25] Ibid, f. 209.

joyful. He often compares himself to Job, and indeed the Corney epitaph shares a page with a poem about the Old Testament's most famous sufferer. Gibson writes that he is "left alone / By my familiars, by my friends unknowne," and begs these "hard-hearted friends" to "take some remorse / Of him, whom God hath made a Livinge Corse." Forgotten by those on the outside, he prays that "I in my owne nest, shall dye in peace."[26] Elsewhere, he writes, "Like an old Alminacke quite out of date I am forgot! such is my ridged Fate."[27] These remarks clearly came at a low point for Gibson, and his sentiments toward his imprisonment alternated between depression and hope, in this case within a single sheet of paper.

Relatively early in his confinement, Gibson wrote what may be the most stunning statement of the entire text, one that echoed the above reference to being a "living corse": "A Prisoner and a Martyr are the same thing, save, that the one is buried before his death, and the other after: where the debt of death, which we owe for sinne to nature, shall be raised, as a gift of faith and patience offered to God."[28] This is Gibson's fundamental claim about the meaning of his suffering. If he is a martyr, then he must suffer for some cause besides refusing to pay Parliament. Blood martyr and prisoner each die a sort of death by being placed into the hands of a persecutor, "buried" and forgotten; but each form of suffering is a path towards eternal life with Christ by purging one's sin. This brief theology of martyrdom does not presume that one is saved by works, but it does join suffering to salvation. Gibson constructs this argument throughout the book by linking his sufferings to those of previous martyrs and, by extension, to those of Christ. In his

---

[26] Ibid, f. 209.
[27] Ibid, f. 190 v.
[28] Ibid, f. 160.

lifetime, he explains, "I have seene the heads of Kinge, Duke, Earle, Lord, Bishope, and Knight taken off for the defense of the Protestant religion." He takes comfort in their martyrdoms, though, since "Sanguis Marterum est semen ecclesia," a Tertullian reference that he makes on several occasions. He then prays, "Lord grant that by a lively faith wee may lay hold of our Saviours sufferings, and then wee shall be more able to goe thorowe all these troubles."[29] Suffering is a sure way to grow closer to Christ, as he writes in a Latin phrase attributed to Luther, "Qui non est Crucianus, non est Christianus"—he who does not bear the cross is not a Christian.[30] Elsewhere he puts it yet another way: "He that would die holily and happily, must in this world love teares, humility, solitude, and repentance."[31] But this is not a passive humility, either, as he adds this poem on the next page: "When I was younge in wars I shed my blood, / Both for my King, and for my Countries good: / In elder yeares, my care was chief to be / Souldier to him that shed his blood for mee."[32] This links the Cross to the Crown as explicitly as *Eikon Basilike* had done, also breaking his life into two related periods. Gibson would still be active in solitude, both through his writing as well as through his prayer and his constant defense of true Christianity; but his cause now is his own soul, which his imprisonment would help him to save. An excellent example of this mission is his sketch of a coat arms bearing two legs, with the motto, "Soe run that you may obtaine"—even in confinement, one must remain busily productive.[33] Gibson's fight did not end at York in 1645 or

---

[29] Ibid, f. 193.
[30] Ibid, f. 220.
[31] Ibid, f. 267.
[32] Ibid, f. 268.
[33] Ibid, f. 165.

Westminster in 1649 because he still sought greater glory for the earthly and heavenly kingdoms. This spiritual victory through apparent defeat is central to martyrdom.

At several points Gibson includes copies of letters, addressed to those on the outside, explaining how he has remained actively devoted to his cause. In one letter, he summarizes salvation history, explaining that he does so "to shew you that I had rather spend my confined dayes, in the way of truth, then in vanities."[34] More importantly, in the letter to his son, dated 1656, he bestows the yet-unfinished book on him "as the trophie of my sufferings, which I have obtained by my own phansie and my penn," to "shew you, that my afflictions were not quite lost unto me, but did worke some good effect."[35] By calling the book "the trophie of my sufferings," Gibson turns his passion into both victory and legacy. But the full text of the letter is particularly revealing. It is prefaced by a prayer that his son would be blessed with "externall, internall and eternall happinesse," a gloss on his own temporal sorrow despite his hope for eternal joy. He then compares the bequest of the book to the portion of land given to Joseph by his father Jacob out of the hands of the Amorites in the Book of Genesis. This gift presumes a prior victory over a foe. Gibson would triumph over his temporal, living form of death, and the fruits of his victory could be passed to his son and heirs. Whether this referred indirectly to the property he had refused to sell is unclear. In any case, the "trophie" could outlive him. He urges his son "to preserve it" not for Gibson's own glory "but for the good things contained in it." Its contents, he hopes, will "be your companie some times to looke upon, in this vale of teares," just as the production of it has been a "recreation…to passe away my melancholy houres." Despite life's drudgery, he hopes that it will help his son to

---

[34] Ibid, f. 191.
[35] Ibid, f. 5v.

"ascend the hill of joye."[36] This parallels Gibson's own company of fellow martyrs, inviting John Esq. to join the van.

On this point, an important trope of martyrological language is the invocation of preceding martyrs; and Charles I, Strafford, and Laud were not the only figures Gibson found inspiring. One of the most important models in the book is "Mr Mole of Yorke," a tutor who was imprisoned for thirty years by the Roman Inquisition for speaking against Catholicism and who subsequently became a Yorkshire hero. The example of Mole permits Gibson to compare the Protectorate to the Inquisition. In his short treatise on Mole, entitled "Patience in Sufferinge," Gibson writes that "he must be more than a man, whom paine and death cannot remove from his holy resolutions." Yet even as his own suffering was not permitted to go too far, he looks to Mole as an inspiration, since he was "thirty years immured" and now "in heaven…dost live, free from suspition, Maugre Rome's cruel bloodye Inquisition."[37] Dating to about 1655, this is one of the earliest entries in the book. It is understandable that Gibson would have looked for inspiration to one who suffered so long, especially one with a notable Yorkshire connection. Importantly, salvific suffering was central to his thoughts from the start.

Later, in a letter dated 1656, Gibson described the various sufferings of Old Testament prophets, kings, and other figures, asserting that "A Godly man is a suffering man: this all divine stories doe make good."[38] He continues the tradition in his own way, even asking to be allowed to participate in this divine drama: "I must not looke to be exempted from that portion of sorrowe which God gave to Noah and Adam…I pray God

---

[36] Genesis 48:22; Gibson, f. 5 v.
[37] Ibid, f. 15 r-v.
[38] Ibid, f. 191.

send me into the lot of Abraham." In a characteristic bit of whimsy, he suggests that he bears a difficult name, citing several Johns, including the King of England, who had led difficult lives. "And I poore John, beinge but Charolophylos, a friend to a King, am unfortunate"; but he would nevertheless follow the lead of his fellow prisoner, St Paul.[39] And while Ruth was not a martyr, Gibson invokes her memory as well: "If we intend to be the servants of God… we must forsake our countrie, and our father's house; we must leave all our dearest, and nearest relations…for whither thou goest, I will go; and where you lodgest, I will lodge."[40] Ruth's example of leaving her people to join the nation of God helps Gibson to accept his prison, where at least he shares an experience with Christ and Charles. Finally Gibson turns to the late king with his favorite wordplay, the anagram. He transforms *Carolus Rex* into *Cras ero lux*: "Tomorrow I will be light."[41] He pastes the royal seal and a portrait of Charles I nearby. Gibson believed that he was in good company as he awaited this heavenly light with hope.

There are extended passages in the text in which Gibson seemed to despair, or at least hold greater resentment toward his situation. Sometimes his sentiments are ambiguous, as when he writes, "Twix't Hope and dispaire, I now lead a life; / My time is full of cares, though voide of strife; / Perpetuall sadnesse is my daylye cheare, / Till Death doe seaze upon mee, in the reare."[42] In his verse autobiography, "Crake it had my infancy," he worries about the future, especially in light of the recent past:

The Decimation of my 'state,
Tis' not worth valuation,
I feare t'will prove a comon fate,

---

[39] Ibid, f. 207 v.
[40] Ibid, f. 228.
[41] Ibid, f. 197 v.
[42] Ibid, f. 174.

To all of this same Nation.
Can I expect freedome to have,
My master for to see,
When hee is banisht like a slave
Into a farr Countrie.

Charles II's continuing exile means that men like Gibson will likely remain imprisoned indefinitely. Gibson links these political frustrations to his familial woes in the verse autobiography, observing that he has been "banish[ed] from the Churche, / And my owne Ithica." He becomes a new Odysseus, seeking to return to his wife, whose name was indeed Penelope. Referring to her death, he laments that he will "never see her more, / For shee is dead, w[hi]ch gave me life. / When my Pen did live, and drew her sweete breath, / Shee was soe faire, she was the fairest on the earth."[43] Her loss is understandably one of the most important examples for him of the personal troubles he must endure, even though Penelope had died before his imprisonment, along with many of their children: "Death tooke awaye my children deare, / And at the last my Joye, / And left me full of care and feare, / My only hopes a Boye." The boy is presumably his remaining son, John.

Penelope's death was especially important for him as a reminder of his own mortality. He knew that he could only be reunited with his loved ones through his own death. One of the more poignant moments in the text is an epitaph, written as if for a shared tombstone:

Sr John Gibson knight,
The Ladye Penelope Gibson.

Two hearts so ioyned, that whatsoever came,
Joy, Paine, or Griefe, the other had the same.

---

[43] Ibid; a line separates "Crake it had my infancy" from the verses on Penelope, suggesting that they may not have been composed at the same time.

Their love so firme, that nothing could it change,
Not death, nor tirrour, though some think it strange.
They being two, in all things became one,
And lyes interred, under this same stone.[44]

Seeming to wish for death, he writes in his autobiography, "My glasse is run, my time is spent," despite it being just 1655: death would be a relief.[45] This sentiment appears repeatedly, as in his couplet "On an Infant that dyed": "The reeling World turn'd Poet, made a play, / I came to see 't, dislik'd it, went a way."[46] Even so, he warns himself that he must press on: "Then learne fond man, now to repent; / Since t'will noe better be."[47] Hard times were there to stay, and he could not make his own way out of life. Gibson had to wait another decade to be reunited with Penelope, at which point he had been a free man for three years. His book included several short poems based on the Song of Songs, but whether these were meant to recall her is unclear.[48] In any case, the death of Penelope troubled him greatly, and it was when he recalled friends and family that he became most melancholy.

Gibson reached a particularly low point around 1657-58, when he wrote several dismayed letters to unnamed individuals, as well as other notes, clustered together in the bound manuscript. A clue lies in one of his rhymes: "Five yeares imprisonment! A broken arme; / Against all sufferings, will make a charme." A serious injury in prison must have been a depressing insult, but he did not give up altogether. In one letter, he writes, "I am not yet in despaire" of a chance for freedom, for God has saved him from

---

[44] Ibid, f. 270.
[45] Ibid, f. 167 v.
[46] Ibid, f. 173 v.
[47] Ibid, f. 167 v.
[48] Ibid, ff. 7-8.

other troubles in the past. He merely wishes "that I may dye in mine owne citie, and be buried by the grave of my father, and of my mother," a reference to the aged Barzillai in 2 Samuel 19, whom he invokes several times.[49] In another letter, he writes, "I may compare my solitarye Cell, to a lodge in a garden of Cucumbers," or else a house filled with bats and owls, two references to Isaiah.[50] In this letter he takes an especially dark tone, indicating that he is already living in a cemetery of sorts, learning "dayly of the death of my friends" and fearing that he "must dye in prison."[51] But he retains his hope in salvation, writing in the next letter that even if he is not graced with "a good Angel to comfort me in this my distresse," he will nevertheless "at the last inherit that heavenly Canaan."[52] And in still another he writes, "I am here but as a stranger travillinge to his Countrie, where the glories of a Kingdome are prepared for me; it were therefore high follie to be much afflicted, because I have a lesse convenient Inne to lodge in by the way."[53] When he begins to despair, he returns to his faith in Christ. Invoking his Old Testament heroes, he writes, "If I cannot have the buryall of old Jacob, with my fathers: yet I hope that I shall obtaine the interment of thy servant Moses, in some place but where, noe man knows: nor doe I care where, so I may dye thy servant."[54] Gibson vows to accept anonymity and isolation from his family as long as he will be cared for by God. By trusting that God will guide him through his desert into Canaan, Gibson joins the ranks of bloodless martyrs, broadly understood.

---

[49] Ibid, f. 205 v-206.
[50] Isaiah writes that "the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a besieged city"; 1:8. Isaiah also refers to owls occupying the abandoned houses of Israel in 13:21, 34:13, and 43:20.
[51] Gibson, f. 206 v.
[52] Ibid, f. 207.
[53] Ibid, f. 207 v.
[54] Ibid, f. 269.

The comparison to Moses's burial on the edge of Sinai leads us to Gibson's profound characterization of his imprisonment as a pilgrimage. The word ordinarily implies a journey, making Gibson a pilgrim-in-place. This is similar to the journey of the martyr, who travels to the theatre of execution before making a final performance, growing closer to God through his travails. Through his book, Gibson makes such a spiritual journey, bearing witness with each step. Gibson does not always take such comfort in this solitude, as in his verse autobiography he laments that "The fatall griefe falne in my lurtch…Is to be banist from the Churche."[55] Elsewhere, however, he transcribes a passage from the Church of Ireland bishop Jeremy Taylor's *The Great Exemplar*, focusing on John the Baptist's and Christ's retreats into the wilderness to be alone with God. The passage was prefaced in the original text and by Gibson with the phrase, "*In solitudine aer purior, caelum apertius, familiarior Deus*": in solitude, the air is purer, the heavens more open, and God more familiar.[56] Near his dedication, he quotes Taylor again, referring to the power of solitude for prayer: "It is a Persecution when we are forced from publick worshippings; [but] no Man can hinder our private addresse to God, every Man can build a Chappel in his brest; and him selfe be the Priest, and his heart the Sacrifice, and every foot of glebe he treads on be the Alter, and this no Tyrant can prevent."[57] It is wrong to inhibit public worship, but Gibson can maintain his own private chapel, of sorts, within his cell. He makes his stationary pilgrimage especially vivid by drawing a picture of Durham Castle with the titles "My Place of Pilgrimage" and "My House of Bondage," joining these concepts as an intentional contradiction.

---

[55] Ibid, f. 167.
[56] Ibid, f. 113.
[57] Ibid, f. 4-v; the "glebe" was the land from which a priest derived his sustenance.

Imprisonment is an opportunity for introspection, allowing him to find God as a pilgrim would. He inscribes two verses under the drawing: Proverbs 18:10, "The name of the Lord is a stronge Tower," and Lamentations 3:9, "He hath enclosed my wayes with hewen stones."[58] These verses, like "pilgrimage" and "bondage," are in conflict. In the first, which would have explained if he had continued it that "the righteous runneth into [the tower] and is safe," Durham Castle becomes a form of protection. In the second, however, Jeremiah laments that God has blocked his paths, since in the surrounding verses God "shutteth out my prayer" and "made my paths crooked." Gibson is grateful for the opportunity to pray, but he remains bewildered by his sufferings. Beneath these verses he adds a letter addressed to "Madame Freedome," whose "long wisht for embraces" he almost thought he had felt, for reasons unexplained. However, "for Juno I embraced a cloud," and his "restlesse wheele of hope" continues to turn, leading him to conclude that "there is nothinge constant in this world, but the constant order of Change and vicissitude." Even so, he amends the letter, "Hope to the End, and thou shalt receive the End of thy Hope."[59]

While prison was a cause of sorrow, Gibson's pilgrimage was possible because of the inability of earthly bonds to contain his soul. He prays, "O Lord (though I am a Prisoner) grant Mee the freedome of thy grace…that upon the barke of my true repentance I may swim to Thee, the haven of my hope."[60] In time he recognizes that he has already been freed through Christ: "Immured though I am, my soule is free, / As is the Lark's, that early praiseth thee, / Soring aloft, with unconfined wings, / Alleluias,

---

[58] Ibid, f. 161.
[59] Ibid, ff. 161 r-v.
[60] Ibid, f. 229.

unto her Maker sings."[61] In other words, while his body is shackled, his soul remains free to praise God. He cannot be silenced by mere confinement. This is a poem of hope, not despair. After copying some helpful verses from Scripture—for example, "We must through much tribulation enter into the Kingdome of God," from the Acts of the Apostles—he adds his own commentary. His sentence is not really a punishment, for "A Prison is but a retirement and opportunity of serious thoughts to a person, whose spirit is confined, and apt to sit still, and desires no enlargement beyond the cancels of the body, till the state of separation calls it forth into a fair liberty."[62] Had he not approached prison in this way, we might not have his book as an object of study. A condition that few could consider good he used as an opportunity for spiritual growth and prayer. In this way it seems that no man could fully appreciate Christianity until he had undergone such a trial.

Where Gibson's personal martyrdom became linked more directly to royalist language, his intentions could appear blurred. For example, he writes, "Touch me not Traytor! for I have a Sting, / For all but such as love and serve the King…I serve no Mortall, but the Cavalier," granting his temporal allegiance to Royalism and assuring his enemies that he will fight back.[63] The choice of "cavalier" instead of "the King" connotes the stereotype of the chivalric, masculine, even bombastic officer. However, Gibson links his royalism to scripture. Amidst some reflections on the death of Cromwell, he writes that Abraham, Moses, and Job were all kings in their own right, thereby making

---

[61] Ibid, f. 160; though written on the same page as the "Prisoner and a Martyr" passage, these are distinct texts.
[62] Ibid, f. 160 v.
[63] Ibid, f. 187 v.

monarchy a divinely instituted form of government.[64] Gibson refuses to capitulate to those who claimed that Charles I was an opponent of liberty. In two parallel descriptions of Charles I and Charles II, very likely penned in 1660, he notes that the martyred king had Magna Carta on his shield, while his son had "Amnestior."[65] These are marks of both English liberty and Christian charity, compounded by Charles's mercy toward his enemies at the Restoration. When he learns of the Restoration, Gibson writes a short prayer, asking that God give Charles II "the valour of Joshua, the heart of David, and the wisedome of Solomon," especially since he had for so long endured "the afflictions of Joseph, with a Job-like patience."[66] The King's sufferings parallel Gibson's own. Understandably, Job is one of his most frequent sources, and Joseph has elsewhere been compared to Gibson's son. This arrangement presents a distinctly personal, even familial, relationship between subject and king, charting Charles II's rise from son of a martyr to loyal servant of Christ and His earthly kingdom.

Late in the manuscript, by both binding and chronology, Gibson drafted his most substantial composition, arranged with the layout of a printed page, complete with a title page containing several relevant scriptural passages. The tidy appearance of this section is strikingly different from the erratic composition of most of the book. This particular text was dated February 1661, after the Restoration and very late in Gibson's imprisonment. "Amara dulcis," as he entitled the treatise, meaning "bittersweet," is an extended discourse on Exodus 12:8, in which God instructs the Israelites to eat the

---

[64] Ibid, f. 159. At Cromwell's death, Gibson penned a series of comparisons between the Lord Protector and Thomas Cromwell, who was Chancellor under Henry VIII; among the points is that "Cromwell the 1st lost his head. Cromwell the 2nd deserv'd it."
[65] Ibid, f. 158 v.
[66] Ibid, f. 159 v.

Passover lamb with bitter herbs. Subtitled "The bitter-sweete sufferings of the Saints and servants of God in all ages of the World," the treatise catalogues and analyzes Gibson's predecessors in suffering for the Faith. Mixing and repeating metaphors in his customary manner, he inscribes the treatise, "Written by an old Barzillai banished from his own Ithica" and signs it "Carolophylos."[67] Here he refers to himself variously as the Gileadite who, because of his old age, asked leave of King David so he could be buried near his family; the husband of Penelope, wandering through his own Odyssey; and the "friend of Charles," a professed royalist. This is the summation of Gibson's entire book. The tract could be analyzed more exhaustively, but here it will suffice to note that it includes, in greater detail and more coherence, much of what precedes it in the manuscript. It may be impossible to recreate Gibson's method for writing the treatise but it seems that, late in his imprisonment and when perhaps he saw a glimmer of freedom with the restoration of the King, he chose to condense his thoughts and musings from the previous seven years into one substantial text. It recounts various Old Testament figures and their journeys from glory to sorrow, in which they were forced "to eat lamb with bitter herbs"; but like the Hebrews, God would lead them out of bondage. Much of the treatise is predictable, but it was obviously meaningful for Gibson. He concludes the section on biblical kings forced to eat bitter herbs by adding, of course, King Charles I. He writes, "Though I doe not range him in the front of these King-like saints; yet let him bring up the reare, for he marked bravely off…and came the nearest to our Saviour in suffering."[68] That model of the Christ-like suffering king consoled Gibson for eight years.

---

[67] Ibid, f. 273.
[68] Ibid, f. 277 v.

By invoking Barzillai, a figure from an obscure passage in 2 Samuel, Gibson also leaves the reader with a poignant image of an old man handing on his legacy—the book—to his son and to the world. In 2 Samuel 19:32-41, Barzillai asks that he may return to die in his city and be buried with his family. He further asks that King David bring his servant Chimham in his stead, and urges David to do with Chimham what he will. David accedes to his request but alters it generously, offering to do for Chimham whatever Barzillai would wish, as well as anything else Barzillai might ask of him. Barzillai returns home to die, but he has also left one in his place to serve the king. And indeed so had Gibson, whose prayer was granted. He was released by 1662 and lived three more years a free man.

Gibson did not, therefore, suffer for the entirety of his life, nor did he die for his cause as so many of his contemporaries did. No writings from Gibson exist apart from the commonplace book; and while a few pages may have been added after he was released, the vast majority of it was penned in prison. It is difficult to say what his attitudes were afterward, but it seems unlikely that he would have faltered in his loyalty to the new regime after such an ordeal. Although at times he seemed to doubt his own salvation, by the time of "Amara Dulcis" he had taken solace in such passages as the third chapter of the book of Wisdom, on the souls of the righteous: "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die…but they are in peace. For though they be punished in the sight of men: yet is their hope full of imortalitye."[69] It would be wrong to presume that he enjoyed Durham Castle, but in a way he was grateful for it, as any professed Christian martyr is grateful for the opportunity to give witness to his faith. Gibson's cause did not require his

---

[69] Ibid.

death, but he still gave his life to it, first in the active service of Charles I and second to the defense of his memory; but in all this his primary service was to God. There is ultimately no clear evidence that he viewed his martyrdom as merely a tool to preserve his family's property. To the contrary, it seems that he had no faith that it would be restored, leaving him with his book of "immured phansyes." With these his son would be well-armed to join those "soldiers [who] bring up the reare, with our garments rolled in bloud," when "Christ our Captaine leadeth the vann," and "we his servants must follow his steps…in suffering."[70]

Ironically at the end of such a long manuscript, he concluded the "Amara Dulcis" with the concession that he was "confined to a sheet of paper," but explained further that no amount of paper could contain all the names of those who had suffered for Christ. Therefore, he exhorted the reader, "let us follow the blessed steps of their holy lives and deaths, that we may alsoe shew forth the light of a good example" and, in so doing, find salvation and eternal life with Christ. Gibson's martyrdom, like that of his compatriots, was a didactic witness, a means of instruction not only for how to die but more importantly for how to live. He believed that he had followed this example and encouraged his readers to do the same. This was crucial for, he warned, time may be running out: "If St Johns age was the last hour, then our times sure are the last minute.[71]

Sir John Gibson's unusual commonplace book was unified by the theme of personal, bloodless martyrdom for the combined causes of Christianity as practiced in the Laudian Church of England and the Royalist political cause. This was sustained by his hope in two forms of resurrection: first, a religious resurrection linked to that of Christ;

---

[70] Ibid, f. 280.
[71] Ibid, f. 282.

and second, a political one of the Kingdom of England. Royalism persisted not only in exile but also in prison cells during the Interregnum, bloodied and humbled but very much alive. Gibson's sufferings add another layer to the interpretations of the various martyrs discussed in the earlier chapters of this dissertation. More importantly for the purposes of this concluding chapter, however, Gibson's commonplace book serves as a unique lens through which to view the sufferings of those who were imprisoned for various causes in early modern England. The rhetoric of martyrdom transcended death, unifying a martyr like Charles to the living, just as the blood of Christ was taken to unify the Church to Christ's immortal body. While this may move from the physical into the metaphysical, Gibson and his fellow martyrs, as he saw them, linked the two as one understanding of their place in the universe. That understanding, however, was also influenced by the immediate politics of the day, and Gibson referred to the dramatic changes brought by the Restoration with joy; but after his eight confined years, even though they had begun with so mundane a crime as debt, he had come to see those temporal changes as minor when compared to the power and hope of the eternal. His bitter herbs would be followed by a much sweeter feast, just as the Kingdom found its jubilant restoration in Charles II's return. On the day of the Restoration, 29 May 1660, Gibson copied two verses. First, he quoted Psalm 126: "When the Lord turned againe the captivitie of Sion: then were we like to them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter: and our tonge with joy." England's Restoration was a release from captivity, just as God had done for His people throughout history. He then added from Hosea, "But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God, and

will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battell, by horses, nor by horsemen."[72] This was a time of mercy, especially because God had saved England without more war. Gibson saw this as a restoration not merely of the Crown and the Church but also of peace.

As a conclusion to this study of martyrdom, Gibson is appropriate, even though he is atypical. As much as Charles I, Christopher Love, or Thomas Harrison, he hoped that the example of his life and his sufferings would show his witnesses, both in person and by word, how to serve God. Each of these men could claim like Charles I to be a martyr of the people: none died solely for themselves—or solely for Christ. Their spiritual struggles were intended to benefit others. Each of them saw themselves as members of a beleaguered church, even if their definitions of that church differed. And each of them found themselves in prison, living martyrs preparing for their burial and, they hoped, the resurrection of the body and the Cause. Gibson's personal devotion should not be assumed to be representative of all royalist responses, and those in positions of influence after 1660 jockeyed the restored monarchy in various directions; but he embodies the personal piety that could be associated with England's trials during the civil wars. Martyrdom may be a blessing, but a time that demands the blood of martyrs is not: like civil war in itself, such unrest demonstrated to England that not all was well with its spirits. Viewed through a martyrological lens, the Restoration was a time of hope for peace.

For a few years, peace reigned; but the longer history of English martyrdom had not ended by 1665. Oliver Plunkett, the Irish Catholic Archbishop of Armagh who was

---

[72] Ibid, f. 204.

executed in 1681, serves as a fitting end to this study, inviting us to look both backward and forward. He and most of the other Catholics who were killed for their involvement in the fictitious "Popish Plot" between 1678 and 1681 were targeted for their Catholicism, but for international political reasons. Their accusers, meanwhile, recast the "Good Old Cause" for the heightened anti-popery of the late Restoration; they, like the regicides in 1660, claimed to represent true Protestantism. That cause would bring figures like Stephen College, Lord Russell, Algernon Sidney, and the Duke of Monmouth to the scaffold between 1681 and 1685, when they and other alleged plotters and rebels would proclaim their faith while dying for ostensibly political treasons. On the spectrum of religio-political martyrdom, many of them would continue to invoke their Protestantism as their primary motivation; but their Whig cause's emphasis on secular politics would also continue to increase. For his part, Plunkett, who had represented to these very men the international threat of Catholicism, believed that dying for Christ remained a worthwhile ordeal, just as it had since the earliest years of Christianity. The condemned archbishop wrote to his fellow prisoner James Corker, a Benedictine priest, in Newgate several days before his own execution, rejoicing that "England from St Albans day to these times was glorious for martirs."[73] So it had been, and so it would continue to be, at least for a few more years.

---

[73] *The Letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett*, ed. John Hanly (Dublin, 1979), p.578.

Bibliography

Archival manuscripts

British Library

Additional MSS 37719, *Commonplace-Book of Sir John Gibson*
Sloane MSS 18
Sloane MSS 972
Sloane MSS 3945
Harleian MSS 2043

The National Archives, Kew

ASSI 45
State Papers

Doctor Williams Library

12.50.4 (21), Mary Love, *Life of Christopher Love*

Printed primary sources

Newsbooks

Mercurius Elencticus
Mercurius Politicus
Mercurius Pragmaticus
Perfect Account of the Daily Intelligence from the Armies
Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings
Perfect Passages of Every Daies Intelligence
Several Proceedings in Parliament
Several Proceedings of State Affaires

Books, pamphlets, and broadsheets

A Brief relation of the proceedings of the High Court of Justice, against Sir Henry Slingsby And Doctor John Hewet, 1658.
A Conference Held between the Old Lord Protector and the New Lord General, Truly Reported by Hugh Peters, 1660.

A Gagg to Love's Advocate, Or, An Assertion of the Justice of the Parlament in the Execution of Mr. Love, 1649.

A Generall Bill of the Mortality of the Clergy of London; or, a Brief Martyrology and Catalogue of the Learned, Grave, Religious, and Painfull Ministers of the City of London, 1662.

A Great Victory by the Blessing of God, obtained by the Parliaments Forces, against the Scots forces Commanded by the Earl of Derby on the 25 of August 1651 near Wigon in Lancashire, 1651.

A Just Balance: Or, Some Considerable Queries about Mr. Love's Case, Tryal, & Sentence, 1651.

A List of His late Majesties Unjust Judges, and Others, 1660.

A Looking-glass for Traytors, 1660, broadsheet.

A Looking-Glasse for Malignants: or, Gods hand against God-haters, 1643.

A Mournfull Elegy upon the three Renowned Worthies, single page, 1649

A New Meeting of Ghosts at Tyburn being a Discourse of Oliver Cromwell, John Bradshaw, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride, Thomas Scot, Secretary to the Rump, Major Gen. Harrison & Hugh Peters the Divell's CHAPLAIN, 1661.

A Parly Between the Ghosts of the Late Protector, and the King of Sweden, At their Meeting in Hell, 1660.

A Relation of the ten grand infamous Traytors who for their horrid Murder and detestable Villany against the late Soveraigne Lord King Charles the first, that ever blessed Martyr, were Arragined, Tried, and Executed in the Moneth of October, 1660. Which in perpetuity will be had in remembrance unto the worlds end, 1660, broadsheet.

A Sermon by Hugh Peters: Preached Before his Death: As it was taken by a faithful hand, 1660.

A strange and wonderful Relation Of the Miraculous Judgements of God…the next day after Mr. Love and Mr. Gibbons were beheaded, 1651.

A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell and Hugh Peters in Saint James's Park, 1660.

A True and exact Copie of Mr Love's Speech and Prayer, 1651.

A True and exact Copie of Mr Love's Speech and Prayer, immediately before his Death, 1651.

A True and Impartial Relation of the Death of M. John Gerhard who was beheaded on Tower-hill, 1654.

A true and perfect Relation of the Grand Traytors Execution, as at severall times they were Drawn, Hang'd and Quartered at Charing-crosse, and at Tiburne. Together with their severall Speeches and Confessions which every one of them made at the time of their Execution, 1660, broadsheet.

A True Christian Subject Under an Heathen Prince: or Tertullians Plea for Allegeance, 1642.

A true Copie of a Paper delivered by the Duke of Hamilton to some of his Servantes, at St James that morning before he suffred, in the presence of Doctor Sibbald, The Hague, 1649

A vindication of the ministers of the Gospel in, and about London, from the unjust aspersions cast upon their former actings for the Parliament, as if they had promoted the bringing of the King to capitall punishment, 1649.

A Winding-Sheet for Traytors, 1660.
A Winding-Sheet for Traytors, 1660.
Alemán, Mateo, tr. James Mabbe. *The rogue: or, the life of Guzman de Alfarache the witty Spaniard In two parts*, 1623.
An Account of the taking John Penruddock, Esq, Mr. Hugh Grove, and others, at Southmolton in the County of Devon, 1655.
An Elegie on the Earl of Essex: Who Cut his own Throat in the Tower, 1683
An Elegie upon The most Pious and Eminent, Doctor John Hewitt, 1658.
An Elegy upon that Renowned Hero and Cavalier, the Lord Capel, 1683.
An Elogie, and Epitaph, Consecrated to the ever Saccred Memory of that most Illustrious, and Incomparable Monarch…with an Elogy and Epitaph upon…Arthur Lord Capell, 1649,
An Elogie, and Epitaph, Consecrated to the ever Sacred Memory of that most Illustrious, and Incomparable Monarch, Charles […] Together with an Elogy and Epitaph upon the truely lamented death of that Excellent patterne of perfect Magnanimity, Virtue, Valour, and Loyalty, Arthur Lord Capell, 1649.
An Exact Narrative of the Tryal and Condemnation of John Twyn…with the Tryals of Thomas Brewster, Bookseller, Simon Dover, Printer, Nathan Brooks, Bookbinder, 1664.
An Exact Relation of the Tryall & Examination of John Morris, 1649.
An Exact Relation of the Tryall & Examination of John Morris, Governour of Pontefract-Castle, 1649
Bate, George. *The Lives, Actions and Execution of The prime Actors, and principall Contrivers of that horrid Murder of our late pious and Sacred Soveraigne King Charles the first, of ever blessed memory*, 1661.
Beheaded Dr. John Hewytts Ghost Pleading, yea crying for Exemplarie Justice, against The Arbitrarie, Un-exampled Injustice of his late Judges and Executioners in the New High-Commission, or Court of Justice, sitting in Westminster Hall, 1659.
Bradshaw's Ghost being a dialogue between the said ghost, and an apparition of the late King Charles, 1659.
Bradshaw's Ghost; a Poem: or, A Dialogue between John Bradshaw, Ferry-man Charon, Oliver Cromwel, Francis Ravilliack, and Ignatius Loyola, 1660.
Bradshaw's Ghost; a Poem: or, A Dialogue between John Bradshaw, Ferry-man Charon, Oliver Cromwel, Francis Ravilliack, and Ignatius Loyola, 1660.
Burt, Nathaniel. *An Individual Letter to every man that calls himselfe a Minister of Jesus Christ*, 1651.
Calamy, Edmund. *The Saints Rest: or Their happy sleep in death*, 1651.
Certain Considerations Against the Vanities of this World, and the Terrors of Death, 1658.
Charleton, Walter. *Chorea gigantum, or, The most famous antiquity of Great-Britan, vulgarly called Stone-Heng*, 1663.
Coleman, Samuel. *The Presbyterian's Remonstrance and Declaration to the People of this Nation*, 1651.
Cromwell's Conspiracy. A Tragy-Comedy, Relating to our latter Times, 1660.

Crouch, John. *A Mixt Poem, Partly Historicall, partly Panegyricall, upon the Happy Return of His Sacred Majesty Charls the Second, and his Illustrious Brothers, the Dukes of York and Glocester*, 1660.

Crouch, John. *The Muses Joy for the recovery of that Weeping Vine Henretta-Maria, The most Illustrious Queen-Mother, and Her Royall Branches*, 1660.

Delaune, Henry. *Patrokon Doron, or, A Legacy to his Sons*, 1657.

England's Black Tribunal, 1660.

England's Black Tribunal, Set Forth in the Trial of K. Charles, I, 1660.

England's Black Tribunal; Being the Characters of King Charles the First, and the Nobility that Suffer'd for him, 1680.

England's Object: Or, Good and true News to all True-hearted Subjects, for the taking and apprehending of that horrid deluding Sower of Sedition Hugh Peters, by the name of Thomson, in Southwarke, Saturday September the first: With his Examination and Entertainment by the rest of the Rebellious crew now in the Tower of London, 1660, broadsheet.

Englands Deliverance or, The Great and bloody Plot discovered, Contrived against the Kings Majesty, the Queen, the Duke, and all the Royal Progeny, Parliament, and Kingdom, 1660.

Finch, Heneage. *An Exact and Most Impartial Accompt of the Indictment, Arraignment, Trial, and Judgment (according to Law) of Twenty nine Regicides*, 1661.

G. L., *Love's Advocate, or Certain Arguments tendred to the serious Consideration of all that truly fear God*, 1651.

Gauden, John. *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house; Or, His Damnable Designes laid and practiced by him and his Negro's, in Contriving the Murther of his Sacred Majesty King Charles I Discovered*, 1660.

Gell, John. *The true Case of the state of Sir John Gell, Prisoner in the Tower*, 1650.

Heath, James. *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine War*, 1663.

Heath, James. *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors*, 1663.

Heath, James. *A New Book of Loyal English Martyrs and Confessors*, 1663.

Heath, James. *Flagellum, or, The Life and Death, Bith and Burial of Oliver Cromwel*, 1663.

Heath, James. *The Glories and Magnificent Triumphs of the Blessed Restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II*, 1662.

Hewitt, John .*Repentance and Conversion, the Fabrick of Salvation: or, The Saints joy in Heaven, for the Sinners sorrow on Earth*, 1658.

Hewitt, John. *Prayers of Intercession for their Use who Mourn in Secret, for the Publick Calamaties of this Nation*, 1659.

Hind's Ramble, or, The Description of his manner and course of life, 1651.

Hinde, John. *A true copy of Sir Henry Hide's Speech on the Scaffold*, 1651.

His Majesties speech on the scaffold at White-Hall on Tuesday last, 1649.

Hugh Peters Figaries: Or, His merry Tales, and witty Jests, both in City, Town & Countreys. In a pleasant and Historical Discourse, 1660.

Hugh Peters last Will and Testament: or, The Haltering of the Divell. To the tune of, the guelding of the Divel, 1660, broadsheet.

Hugh Peters's Dreame, n.d., presumably 1660-61.

Hugh Peters's Passing-Bell Rung out in a Letter To Him, from One that hath been an Accurate Observer of Hugh Peters and Oliver Cromwells Bloody Actions, 1660.

In Commemoration of Mr. Christopher Love, who was beheaded on Tower-hill, 1651[?].

J. T., *The Traytors Perspective-glass*, 1662

Justa sive Inferiae Regicidarum: or, Tyburns Revels, Presented before Protector Cromwel, Lord President Bradshaw, Lord Deputy Ireton, 1661.

King Charls his Case: or, an Appeal to all Rational Men, Concerning His Tryal at the High Court of Iustice, 1649.

King Charls his trial at the High Court of Justice … Together with the Several Speeches of Duke Hamilton, the Earl of Holland, and the Lord Capel, London, 1649.

Love, Christopher and Mary. *Love's Letters, His and Hers, to each other, a little before his death*, 1651.

Love, Christopher. *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of Me Christopher Love, since my Tryall before, and Condemnation by, the High Court of Justice*, 1651.

Love, Christopher. *A Modest and Clear Vindication of the Serious Representation, and late Vindication of the Ministers of London, from the Scandalous Aspersions of John Price*, 1649.

Love, Christopher. *A Vindication of Mr. Christopher Love, from Divers scandalous reproaches cast upon him by the Malignant party*, 1651.

Love, Christopher. *England's Distemper*, 1645.

Love's Name Lives: or, A Publication of diverse Petitions [etc], 1651.

Lucifer's Life-guard: Containing a Schedule, List, Scrowle or Catalogue, Of the first and following names of the Antichristian, Anabaptistical, Atheistical, Anarchical and Infernal Imps, who have been Actors, Contrivers, Abettors, Murderers and Destroyers, of the best Religion, the best Government, and the best King that ever Great Britain enjoyed, 1660.

Mr. Love His Funeral Sermon, preached By himself on the Scaffold on Tower Hill, in the hearing of many thousand people, on Friday the two and twentieth day of this instant August, 1651.

Murther Revealed: Or, A Voyce from the Grave Faithfully Relating the Deplorable Death of Dr. John Hewit, Late of St. Gregories, London; with severall Queries propounded to the Consciences of his Bloody Tryers, 1659.

Nine Select Sermons Preached upon special occasions in the Parish Church of St. Gregories by St. Pauls, 1658.

O. Cromwells Thankes to the Lord Generall, Faithfully presented by Hugh Peters in another conference, 1660.

Obsequies on That Unexemplar Champion of Chivalrie and perfect Patern of true Prowesse, Arthur, Lord Capell, 1649, single sheet.

Oliver Cromwell The Late Great Tirant his Life-Guard: or the Names of those who complied and conspired with him all along in his Horrid Designs to bring this Nation to Universal Ruine and Confusion, 1660.

Osborne, Francis. *Advice to a son; or, Directions for your better conduct*, 1655.

Peters Patern Newly Revived, with Additions; Or, The perfect Path to Worldly Happiness, As it was delivered in a Funeral Sermon preached at the interment of Mr. Hugh Peters lately Deceased, 1659.

Peters, Hugh. *A Dying Fathers Last Legacy to an Onely Child: or, Mr. Hugh Peter's Advice to his Daughter*, 1660.

Peters's Resurrection By way of Dialogue, Between Him and a Merchant: occasioned Upon the Publishing a pretended Sermon at his Funeral, wherein is affirmed those sayings of Machiavel, 1659.

Price, John. *Clerico-classicum, or, The clergi-allarum to a third war*, 1649.

Price, John. *The Wounds of a Friend; or, A Letter, Mentioned by Mr. Love upon the Scaffold*, 1651.

Prophecies of the Reverend Christopher Love: and his last words on the scaffold: who was beheaded at Tower-Hill, London, Boston, 1793.

Pulpit Sparks or Choice Forms of Prayers, By Several Reverend and Godly Divines Used by them, both before and after Sermon, 1659.

Quarles, John. *Regale Lectum Miseriae: or, A Kingly Bed of Miserie*, 1649.

Raleigh, Walter. *Maxims of State*, 1656.

Ratts Rhimed to Death, 1660.

Reynolds, John, expanded by T.M. *Blood for Blood: or Murthers Revenged*, 1661.

Royall and Loyall Blood Shed by Cromwel and his Party, &c., 1662.

Royall and Loyall Blood, 1662.

Rump: or, An Exact Collection, 1662, two volumes.

Slingsby, Henry. *A Father's Legacy. Sir Henry Slingsbey's Instructions to his Sonnes, Written a little before his Death*, 1658.

Starkey, George. *Royal and other Innocent Bloud Crying Aloud to Heaven for due vengeance*, 1660.

Steele, William. *Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridge his Case, Spoken to, and argued on the behalf of the Commonwealth, Before the High Court of Justice*, London, 1649.

T. J. *A Loyal Subjects Admonition, or, a true Song of Brittains Civil Wars*, 1660, broadsheet.

T. M. *The History of Independency. The Fourth and last Part*, 1660.

Tertullians Apology, or Defence of the Christians, against the Accusations of the Gentiles, tr. H.B., 1655.

The Army's Martyr, 1649.

The Case of Mr. Hugh Peters, Impartially Communicated to the View and Censure of the Whole World: Written by his own hand, 1660.

The Charge and Articles of High-Treason exhibited against the Earl of Derby, 1651.

The Declaration of Captain James Hind (close Prisoner in New-gate), 1651.

The Declaration of Duke Hamilton concerning His Engagement against England, and his coming in with the King of Scots, 1651.

The Dragons Forces totally Routed by the Royal Shepherd, Wherein is laid open, a horrid and bloudy Plot, 1660.

The Earle of Darby's Speech on the Scaffold, Immediately before his Execution at Bolton in Lancashire, 1651.

The Grand Tryal in Westminster-Hall Of The Lord Ambassadors Brother from the King of Portugal, 1654.

The Great Memorial: or, A List of the Names of those Pretended Judges who Sate, and Sentenced our late Soveraign King Charles the First, 1660.

The Hangmans joy, or the Traytors Sorrow. Being, a very merry Dialogue between the Hang-man, and the Haltermaker, 1660.
The Hang-mans Lamentation For the losse of Sir Arthur Haslerigge, dying in the Tower, 1661.
The High Court of Justice at Westminster, arraigned at the Bar in the Old Bayley at the Sessions-House, 1660.
The High Court of Justice, broadsheet.
The History of the Life and Death of Hugh Peters that Arch-traytor, from his Cradell to the Gallowes. With A Map of his prophane Jests, cruell Actions, and wicked Counsels. Published as a Warning piece to all Traytors, 1661.
The Horrible and Bloody Conspiracy Undertaken by many Desperate Persons, 1658.
The Humble Petition of Many Cordial Friends…in behalf of Mr. Christopher Love, 11 July 1651.
The Last Speech of Col. Eusebius Andrews, sometimes a Lawyer of Lincolns-Inne, at the time of his Execution [etc], 1650.
The Last Speech of M. Peter Vowell, Which he intended to have delivered (had he been permitted), 1654.
The Last Will and Testament of James Hynd, High-Way Lawyer, 1651.
The manner of the Beheading of Duke Hambleton, the Earle of Holland, and the Lord Capell, 1649.
The Martyr of the People or The Murder'd King, 1649.
The most vile and lamentable Confession of Hugh Peters of All his Bloody Advices given to the late Oliver Cromwel, 1660.
The Perfect Speech of Mr. John Gibbons, as it was Delivered by Himself on the Scaffold at Tower-Hill, 1651.
The Perfect Tryal and Confession of the Earl of Derby, at a Court-Marshall holden at Chester, 1651.
The Pretended Saint and the Prophane Libertine. Well met in Prison. Or a Dialogue between Robert Titchburne, and Henry Marten, Chamber-Fellowes in Newgate, 1661.
The Purchaser's Pound: or, the Return to Lambeth-Fair Of Knaves and Thieves with all the Sacred Ware, 1660.
The Royal Martyrs: Or, A LIST of the Lords, Knights, Commanders, and Gentlemen, that were slain in the late Wars, in defence of their KING and Country. As also of those Executed by High Courts of Justice or Law-Martial, 1660.
The several Speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridg, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, Upon the Scaffold Immediately before their Execution, 1649.
The several Speeches of Duke Hamilton Earl of Cambridg, Henry Earl of Holland, and Arthur Lord Capel, Upon the Scaffold Immediately before their Execution, on Friday the 9. of March, London, 1649.
The Severall Tryals of Sir Henry Slingsby Kt. John Hewit D.D. and John Mordant Esq; for High Treason in Westminster-Hall, 1658.
The Speech and Confession of Capt. Brown-Bushel, at the place of Execution on Saturday, under the Scaffold on Tower-Hill, 1651.
The Speech and Confession of Capt. Brown-Bushel, at the place of Execution on Saturday, under the Scaffold on Tower-Hill, 1651.

The Speech and Confession of Hugh Peters, Close Prisoner in the Tower of London; And His Horrible Expressions and Doctrine when Our Glorious Soveraign was led to Martyrdome, 1660.
The Speech and Confession of Sir Henry Hide, 1651.
The Speech and Deportment of John Hewit D.D., 1658.
The Speeches and Prayers of Some of the late King's Judges, 1660.
The Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw, Intended to Have been spoken at their Execution at Tyburne, 1661.
The State Martyrologie, or, Innocent Blood Speaking its Mournfull Tragedy, in the History of the late Anarchy since 1648 to this present Time, 1660, broadsheet.
The Strange and Wonderful Predictions of Mr. Christopher Love, 1760.
The Tales and Jests of Mr. Hugh Peters, Collected into one Volume, 1660.
The Traytor's Downfall, or, A brief relation of the downfall of that Phanatick crew who Traiterously Murthered the Late Kings Majesty of blessed Memory. To the Tune of, Fa la la &tc, 1660.
The Traytors Perspective-glass. Or, Sundry Examples of Gods just judments executed upon many Eminent Regicides, 1662.
The Trial of Captain James Hind on Friday Last before the Honourable Court at the Sessions in the Old-Bayley, 1651.
The Trial of the honourable Colonel John Penruddock of Compton in Wiltshire, and his Speech, 1655.
The Triall of Mr. John Gerhard, Mr. Peter Vowell, and Sommerset Fox, by the High Court of Justice sitting in Westminster Hall, 1654.
The Triall of Mr. John Gibbons, In Westminster-Hall, before the High-Court of Justice, 1652.
The true and exact Speech and Prayer of Doctor John Hewyit upon the Scaffold on Tower-hill, 1658.
The true and perfect Relation of the taking of Captain James Hind, 1651.
The true and perfect Speeches of Colonel John Gerhard upon The Scaffold at Tower-hill, on Munday last, and Mr. Peter Vowel at Charing-Cross, on Munday last, 1654.
The True Characters of the Educations, Inclinations and several Dispositions of all and every one of those Bloody and Barbarous Persons, Who Sate as Judges upon the Life of our late Dread Soveraign King Charles I, 1660.
The True Speech Delivered on the Scaffold by James Earl of Derby, 1651.
The True Speeches of Collonel John Penruddock and Hugh Grove, 1655.
The Tryal of Col. Ashburnham, (Prisoner in the Tower of London) Before His Highness the Lord Protectors Council at White-Hall," 1654.
The Tryall of Traytors, Or, The Rump in the Pound, Wherein is presented the Lively Shapes, and Bloody Actings of the Chief of those Grand Traytors, etc, 1660.
The Tryals of Sir Henry Slingsby Kt. And John Hewet D.D. for High Treason in Westminster-Hall, 1658.
The two City Iuglers Tichborn, and Ireton: Being a Dialogue: Wherein, Their Rebellions, Treacheries, Treasons, and Cheats, are fully discovered and brought to light, 1660.
The Whole Triall of Mr. Love, before the High Court of Justice in Westminster Hall, 1652.

To the Right Honourable, the Commons of England Assembled in Parliament: The humble Petition of divers well-affected people [etc], 1650.
Two Elegeis [sic]. *The One on His late Majestie. The Other on Arthur Lord Capel*, 1649.
Vicars, John. *A Brief Review of the most material Parliamentary Proceedings of this Present Parliament, and their Armies, in their Civil and Martial Affairs*, 1653.
Vicars, John. *Dagon Demolished*, 1660.
Vox Populi Suprema Rex Carolus, or, The Voice of the People for King Charles, 1660.
W. P., *England Still Freshly Lamenting The losse of Her King, With several of Her Dearest Children; Which have been beheaded, hanged, and shot, by O. Cromwel, and the Long-Parliament*, 1660.
W. S., *A compleat Collection of the Lives, Speeches, Private Passages, Letters and Prayers of Those Persons lately Executed*, 1661.
W. S., *Rebels no Saints: Or, a Collection of the Speeches, Private Passages, Letters, and Prayers of those Persons lately Executed*, 1661.
Walker, Clement. *The High Court of Justice, or Cromwell's New Slaughter-House in England*, 1651.
Waller, Edmund. *Upon the late storme, and of the death of His Highnesse ensuing the same*, 1658.
Wild, Robert. *The Tragedy of Christopher Love at Tower Hill August 22 1651*, 1660.
Winstanley, Gerrard. *The Breaking of the Day of God*, 1649.
Winstanley, William. *England's Worthies: Select lives of the most eminent persons from Constantine the Great, to the death of Oliver Cromwel late Protector*, 1660.
Winstanley, William. *The Loyall Martyrology, or, Brief Catalogues and Characters of the most Eminent Persons who Suffered for their Conscience*, 1665.
Wither, George. *Vaticinium Votivum: or, Palaemon's Prophetick Prayer…with several Elegies*, 1649.

Modern editions

A Journal of the Siege of Lathom House in Lancashire. London. 1823.
Early Stuart Libels: an edition of poetry from manuscript sources. Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, eds. Early Modern Literary Studies Text Series I. 2005. <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels/>
Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*. London. 1888. Six volumes.
Evelyn, John.*The Diary of John Evelyn*. Ed. E. S. de Beer. Oxford. 1955. Six volumes.
Gerard, John. *The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest*. Philip Caraman, tr. New York. 1952; repr. 2012.
Howell, William, ed. *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials*. Vols. 4-5. 1809-1811.
Ludlow, Edmund. *A Voyce from the Watch Tower*. A. B. Worden, ed. London. 1978.
Pepys, Samuel. *Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Robert Latham and William Matthews, eds. Berkeley. 1970. Eleven volumes.
Plunkett, Oliver. *The Letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett*. John Hanly, ed. Dublin, 1979.

Rugg, Thomas. *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg 1659-1661*. William L. Sachse, ed. London. 1961.

Tertullian. *Apology*. T. R. Glover, tr. In *Tertullian & Minucius Felix.* T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse, eds. London. 1931.

Secondary sources

Bell, Maureen. "Elizabeth Calvert and the 'Confederates'." *Publishing History* 32 (1992): 5-49.

Binns, Jack. "Captain Browne Bushell: North Sea adventurer and pirate." *Northern History* 27 (1991): 90-105.

Blair, Ann. "Reading Strategies for Coping with Information Overload ca. 1550-1700." *The Journal of the History of Ideas* 64:1 (2003): 11-28.

Brady, Andrea. *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century.* New York. 2006.

Button, Andrea. "Penruddock's Rising." *Southern History* 19 (1997):99-111.

Capp, B. S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism*. Totowa, NJ. 1972.

Coffey, John. Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England 1558-1689. Harlow, UK. 2000.

Dailey, Alice. *The English Martyr from Reformation to Revolution.* Notre Dame. 2012.

de Groot, Jerome. "Prison Writing, Writing Prison during the 1640s and 1650s." *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 72:2 (2009): 193-215.

de Groot, Jerome. *Royalist Identities*. London. 2004.

De Krey, Gary S. *London and the Restoration, 1659-1683*. Cambridge. 2005.

Donagan, Barbara. "Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason in the English Civil War." *American Historical Review* 99:4 (1994): 1158-59.

Durkin, Neil. "His Praeludinary Weapons: Mocking Colonel Hewson before and after the Restoration." In Dermot Cavanagh and Tim Kirk, eds., *Subversion and Scurrility: Popular Discourse in Europe from 1500 to the Present.* Aldershot. 2000.

Evenden, Elizabeth, and Thomas S. Freeman. *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'.* Cambridge. 2011.

Fitzgibbons, Jonathan. *Cromwell's Head.* Kew. 2008.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Alan Sheridan, tr. New York. 1977.

Frank, George. *Ryedale and North Yorkshire Antiquities.* London. 1888.

Freeman, Thomas S., and Thomas F. Mayer. *Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, c. 1400-1700*. Woodbridge. 2007.

Gatrell, V. A. C. *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People 1770-1868*. Oxford. 1994.

Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663.* Oxford. 1986.

Gregory, Brad S. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, Mass. 1999.

Gregory, Brad S. *The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society*. Cambridge, Mass. 2012.

Harris, James. *Copies of the Epitaphs in Salisbury Cathedral, Cloisters, and Cemetery*. London. 1825.

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685*. London. 2005.

Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the ancient world and the folly of the message of the cross*. John Bowden, tr. Philadelphia. 1977.

Höpfl, Harro. *Jesuit Political Thought*. Cambridge. 2004.

Hopper, Andrew. *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution.* Manchester. 2007.

Hopper, Andrew. "The Farnley Wood Plot and the Memory of the Civil Wars in Yorkshire." *The Historical Journal* 45:2 (2002): 281-303.

Hughes, Ann. *Gender in the English Revolution*. New York. 2012.

Hughes, Ann. "Gender and politics in Leveller literature." In *Political culture and cultural politics in early modern England*. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky, eds. Manchester. 1995. Pp. 162-188.

Janes, Dominic, and Alex Houen, eds. *Martyrdom and Terrorism: Pre-Modern to Contemporary Perspectives*. Oxford. 2014.

Jenner, Mark S. R. "The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England." *Past and Present* 177 (2002): 84-120.

Johnstone, Nathan. *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge. 2006.

Kelsey, Sean. *Inventing Republic: The political culture of the English Commonwealth 1649-1653*. Stanford. 1997.

Kistler, Don. *A Spectacle Unto God: The Life and Death of Christopher Love.* Morgan, PA. 1994.

Knoppers, Laura. "Sing old Noll the Brewer': Royalist Satire and Social Inversion, 1648-64." *Seventeenth Century* 15 (2000): 32-52.

Knoppers, Laura. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661*. Cambridge. 2000.

Lacey, Andrew. "The Office for King Charles the Martyr in the Book of Common Prayer, 1662-1685." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53:3 (July 2002): 510-526.

Lacey, Andrew. *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*. Woodbridge. 2003.

Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier. *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven. 2002.

Lake, Peter, and Michael Questier. "Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England." *Past and Present* 153 (Nov. 1996): 64-107.

Lake, Peter, and Steve Pincus. "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 45:2 (April 2006): 270-292.

Lake, Peter. A*nglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English conformist thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London. 1988.

Lamont, William. *Marginal Prynne*. London. 1963.

Laqueur, Thomas W. "Crowds, carnival and the state in English executions, 1604-1868," in *The First Modern Society,* 305-55. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim, eds. Cambridge. 1989.

Marshall, Alan. “To Make a Martyr: The Popish Plot and Protestant Propaganda.” *History Today* (March 1997): 39-45.

McElligott, Jason, and David L. Smith, eds. *Royalists and royalism during the Interregnum*. Manchester. 2010.

McElligott, Jason, and David L. Smith, eds. *Royalists and royalism during the English Civil Wars*. Cambridge. 2007.

McKenzie, Andrea. “Martyrs in Low Life? Dying ‘Game’ in Augustan England.” *Journal of British Studies* 42:2 (April 2003): 167-205.

McShane, Angela. “Debate: The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England.” *Past and Present* 196 (August 2007):254-55.

Monta, Susannah Brietz. *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England*. Cambridge. 2005.

Morrill, John. “Rewriting Cromwell: A Case of Deafening Silences.” *Canadian Journal of History* 38:3 (2003): 553-578.

Narveson, Kate. *Bible Readers and Lay Writers in Early Modern England: Gender and Self-Definition in an Emergent Writing Culture*. Ashgate. 2012.

Newman, P. R. *Royalist officers in England and Wales, 1642-1660: a biographical dictionary*. New York. 1981.

Patrick, Kathleen Erin. “An Edition of the Commonplace-Book of Sir John Gibson, 1653-1660.” PhD dissertation. University of Delaware. 1994.

Peacey, Jason, ed. *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*. London. 2001.

Peacey, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*. Aldershot. 2004.

Peacey, Jason. *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*. Cambridge. 2013.

Pincus, Steve. “Neither Machiavellian Moment nor Possessive Individualism: Commercial Society and the Defenders of the English Commonwealth.” *The American Historical Review* 103:3 (June 1998): pp. 705-736.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-60*. Cambridge. 1989.

Raymond, Joad. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649*. Oxford. 1996.

Robertson, Geoffrey. *The Tyrannicide Brief: The Story of the Man Who Sent Charles I to the Scafffold*. New York. 2005.

Rubinstein, Hilary L. *Captain Luckless*. Totowa, NJ. 1976.

Sharpe, J. A. “‘Last Dying Speeches’: Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England.” *Past and Present* 107 (May 1985): pp. 144-167.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660*. New Haven. 2010.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*. New Haven. 2013.

Shilston, Timothy G. “Thomas Venner: Fifth Monarchist or maverick?” *Social History* 37:1 (2012): 55-64.

Smith, Geoffrey. *Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies*. Burlington. 2011.

Smith, Geoffrey. *The Cavaliers in Exile*. New York. 2004.

Smyth, Adam. “‘Rend and teare in peeces’: Textual Fragmentation in Seventeenth-Century England.” *Seventeenth Century* 19 (2004): 36-52.

Stoyle, Mark. "'Memories of the Maimed': The Testimony of Charles I's Former Soldiers, 1660-1730." *History* 88 (April 2003): 204-226.

Stoyle, Mark. *The Black Legend of Prince Rupert' Dog: Witchcraft and Propaganda during the English Civil War*. Exeter. 2011.

Toynbee, Margaret. "The Andrew Family of Daventry II." *Northamptonshire Past and Present* 3:4 (1963): 151-62.

Underdown, David. Revel, *Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660*. Oxford. 1985.

Underdown, David. *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660*. New Haven. 1960.

Vernon, Elliot. "The Quarrel of the Covenant: the London Presbyterians and the Regicide." In *The regicides and the execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey, 202-224.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford. 1999.

Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*. Lexington, KY. 1996.

Woolrych, Austin. *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660*. Oxford. 2002.

Worden, Blair, *The Rump Parliament.* Cambridge. 1974.