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The principal argument of this thesis is that royalist literary publishing in the civil wars and Interregnum was a more coherent and wider movement than has been recognised. It asserts the importance of print culture to royalists, both as a vehicle for personal responses to political circumstances, and as a means to criticize and undermine the opposition. The thesis uses the publisher Humphrey Moseley as a lens through which to examine the publisher's role in the dissemination of a wide range of royalist texts. It demonstrates that publishers, as well as authors, were driven by their political and ideological opinions.

The thesis begins by establishing that the royalist and Anglican convictions expressed within the texts published by Moseley corresponded with his own. This opening chapter also demonstrates the editorial control that he exerted when publishing a book. Next follow five case studies. In the second chapter I examine writings of Moseley's most prolific author, James Howell. I argue that in response to the censorship act Howell shifted to a more subtle method of polemical writing, most notably when he embedded extracts from his polemical pamphlets in his historical allegory Dodona's Grove which Moseley published in 1650. Chapters Three to Six are genre-based case studies. These chapters analyse the ways that a variety of genres were used by royalists in support of the Stuart cause and the Anglican Church. In the final chapter I set Moseley within the context of royalist publishing more widely. I review the careers of Henry Seile and Richard Royston to demonstrate that Moseley was not the only publisher committed to the royalist cause and that his productions belonged to a broad spectrum of royalist publishing.
Long Abstract

The Publisher Humphrey Moseley and Royalist Literature, 1640-1660

Nicola Whitehead, Jesus College

Thesis submitted for the degree of D.Phil. at the University of Oxford, Michaelmas term 2014.

The principal argument of this thesis is that royalist publishing in the civil wars and Interregnum had a coherence and significance that have not been fully recognised. It asserts the importance of print culture to royalists, not just as a vehicle for personal responses to political circumstances, but as a means to criticize and undermine the opposition. This thesis uses the publisher Humphrey Moseley as a lens through which to examine the publisher's role in the dissemination of a range of royalist texts in an array of genres. It demonstrates that publishers, as well as authors, were driven by their political and ideological opinions. I seek to explore the publishing practices of Moseley to reveal the various ways that royalist literature was used to combat parliamentary rule. I demonstrate that royalist writing was more wide-ranging than has previously been acknowledged. This should prove an important contribution to the history of royalism, and to the history of publishing.

An investigation of Moseley's career underlines the importance of print culture to royalists, and shows that multiple genres were used to combat what royalists saw as a usurping parliamentary government. Through a series of case studies, I argue that books were published in order to undermine and delegitimize parliamentary authority and to defend the Anglican Church. This thesis establishes an overlap between the ephemeral pamphlet and
newsbook culture and the literary texts which I examine that has hitherto not been acknowledged.

The introduction begins by establishing the shortage of studies on the subject of royalist publishing. I discuss the rise of the printed word in the seventeenth century and the publisher's role in producing books. I then outline Moseley's practices and the nature of his royalist publications. Next, I survey the contextual background of publishing. I discuss the constraints placed upon publishers by censorship legislation; and the hardships suffered by royalists who formed the core of the publishers' customer-base. In September 1649 the Commonwealth government's 'Act against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books and Pamphlets' quashed the royalist production of polemical pamphlets and newsbooks. I suggest that although royalists were discouraged from publishing these types of ephemeral material, literary texts remained as a viable medium for making polemical points in a less direct manner.

Chapter one examines the role that Moseley played in a book's construction and publication. An analysis of Moseley's own prefaces and biographical detail is made to confirm his allegiance to the Anglican Church and to the Stuart cause. His writers, commendatory poets and dedicatees were also largely Anglican royalists. It was Moseley who determined, to a large extent, how these men were represented and how their texts were read through the prefatory material. A preface establishes a premise and pre-determines, to some degree, our reading of and response to a book. Moseley's prefaces were extraordinarily copious. I show that his title-pages, frontispieces, and prefaces were used to guide the reader to associate royalism with culture and learning. This chapter shows that Moseley's efforts to cast parliament as ignorant and unscrupulous destroyers of learning, and royalists as the defenders of scholarliness and literature promoted an alignment of high literary culture with royalism in
In the second chapter I discuss the political use of intertextuality by the writer and polemicist James Howell. This chapter shows that until the censorship legislation of September 1649, Howell published royalist pamphlets which repeatedly defended the king's prerogative against the encroachment of parliamentary privilege. I argue that in response to the censorship act, Howell shifted to a more subtle method of polemical writing, most notably when he recycled extracts of his polemical pamphlets in his historical allegory *Dodona's Grove*. This is an important examination of the intertextuality between pamphlets and literary texts which has to date received scant attention.

I then move on to a series of genre based studies in Chapters Three through to Six, beginning with an examination of two of Moseley's most significant publications: his folio edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* (1647), and his octavo edition of William Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragedies and Tragi-Comedies* (1651). The chapter begins with an analysis of the Puritan opposition to the theatre and the way that royalists used this antipathy to make a political point. I demonstrate that Moseley published the Beaumont and Fletcher volume in the folio format to associate the work with William Shakespeare and Ben Jonson's earlier folio editions in order to forge a close identification between literature and the Stuart court. An examination of Moseley's Cartwright volume reveals that this book was published as a condemnation of the parliamentary attempt to bring the University of Oxford, the geographical and emotional heart of the royalist cause, to political obedience. In the extensive prefatory material of these two volumes Moseley gathered together royalists from the court and the university to mark their refusal to accept defeat, and to demonstrate that the Stuarts were the better protectors of literature and learning.
In the fourth chapter I examine English translations of French prose romances. In England, during the 1650s, Moseley was the most prolific publisher of the genre. This chapter begins with an analysis of the history of romance. I show that by the mid-seventeenth century this was a form of writing which had for some time been known to have political import. The Caroline court of the 1630s, through the influence of Henrietta Maria, had adopted romance as a means to bolster the image of Charles I as a beneficent and peaceful patriarch. I suggest that Moseley's motives for publishing this genre were political. I argue that in their subject matter the French prose romances that Moseley published encouraged a nostalgia for monarchical rule by reaffirming the values which Charles and Henrietta Maria had fostered in the 1630s. Finally I suggest that the publication of prose romances with their idealistic visions of monarchy were an antidote both to the hard-headed Hobbesian brand of royalism and to the pragmatic republicanism of the 1650s.

The fifth chapter concerns two books of Psalms published by Moseley: Henry Lawes' Choice Psalmes put into Musick (1648), and Henry King's Psalmes of David (1651 and 1654). In this chapter I set these two books within the historical context of Psalm translation, and a culture of claim and counter-claim of the Psalms which began in the 1630s. I show that differences between the translations of the 1630s reflected the widening social, ecclesiastical, and political divide in English society that led to civil war, with Puritans opting for a plain rendering of the Psalms and Anglicans preferring more elegant translations. During the 1640s the book of Psalms became a combative mode. The publication of a revised book of Psalms was debated in the Westminster Assembly, in both Houses of Parliament and in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Amid these debates, in wartime Oxford, Jeremy Taylor published his Psalter of David (1644) as the 'best weapon' to fight the enemy pressing in. This chapter examines the different ways that the Psalms were used to support the royalist cause. I pay attention to the editing, lexical choices, and layout of the texts to demonstrate
that these books were published by royalists to skew the Psalms towards a reading which was sympathetic to Charles I and the monarchical form of government. I show that when Henry King translated the Psalms, he opted for the plain style in an attempt to cross the ecclesiastical and political divide to reach a wider audience.

The subject of the sixth chapter is continental histories. I examine the political motives behind Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth's translations of Guido Bentivoglio's *Historicall Relations* of 1652 and *Compleat Historie of the Warres of the United Provinces* of 1654. First, a survey of the sub-genre of royalist historical-political writing which took place in the 1640s and 1650s sets Monmouth's translations in context. I then suggest that Monmouth, like other royalist translators of continental histories, used these books to parallel the civil wars in England with wars on the continent to show that the English parliament's claim to have fought against the king in the name of religious freedom and political liberty was hypocritical. That Bentivoglio, writing in the 1630s, looked to England as an example of a state with an enviable monarchy was a useful tool in the royalists' literary armoury. Similarities are then drawn between the arguments which appear in the histories and those which had been used in royalist pamphlet and newsbook culture of the 1640s. This is a further example of a recourse to literary texts for polemical purposes in the 1650s that I have already noted.

In the final chapter I widen the subject of royalist literary publishing by introducing two other loyalist publishers, Richard Royston and Henry Seile, who are rarely discussed. Henry Seile is not even included in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first charts the life and career of Seile. I pay particular attention to the men whose books he published, and to the prefatory material contained within the books to assess how he operated within not simply the book market, but the royalist book market. This
approach is repeated in the second section on Richard Royston. My examination of their lives, careers, and publication lists demonstrates that these two publishers were, like Moseley, driven by political as well as commercial interests. When Moseley is set beside these two royalist publishers it becomes clear that each bookseller had a particular group of writers, and that the clientèle of the three publishers rarely overlapped.

My conclusion stresses the importance of royalist literary publishing in this period and Moseley's place within it. Publishers hold a unique position as mediators between authors and the wider reading public. Moseley's authors were, for the most part, men who circulated in and around the court and Anglican clergy members. I argue that Moseley exerted an editorial control over his books which maximised their royalist bias. For those books which were published posthumously, it was Moseley who determined how his authors were represented, and how their texts were read. He directed his readers to align literary culture with royalism and to make common-sense connections between learnedness, good judgement and legitimacy. Finally, my research shows that booksellers with particular political interests worked together with authors who shared their royalist ideals.
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Introduction

Contexts and Methods

In 1991 Conrad Russell suggested that it was the royalists who were the 'peculiarity we should be attempting to explain' rather than the parliamentarians upon whom the majority of scholarly attention had been lavished.¹ In recent years the study of royalism has benefited from a series of studies which have responded to Russell's point.² Nevertheless, an imbalance remains. Scholarship on royalists still tends to focus on the social and political elite.³ This thesis focuses instead on a businessman: the royalist publisher, Humphrey Moseley, and his publication of royalist literature. Moseley is often referred to as a 'royalist publisher', but

aside from cursory comments his activities as a royalist have received little critical attention.\textsuperscript{4} Equally, royalist publishing has a coherence and significance that have not to date been fully appreciated. Often when discussing royalist literature, historians and literary critics alike focus either on ephemeral newsbooks and pamphlets or on more 'literary' works by canonical royalist poets.\textsuperscript{5} This division has created the impression that the two kinds of writing bore no relation to each other. Foucault said that the 'frontiers of a book are never clear-cut: beyond the title, the first lines and the last full stop, beyond its internal configuration and its autonomous form, it is caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences'.\textsuperscript{6} If this is true today, then it was even more so in the early modern period when literary borrowing, pastiche and even plagiarism were commonplace. Readers, in turn, were not only more accepting of these practices, but alert to the various forms of intertextuality as they appeared in books.\textsuperscript{7} This is a neglected aspect of royalist writing which I seek to uncover.


\textsuperscript{5} The most notable works on royalist literature, for example, Jason McElligott's \textit{Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England} (Woodbridge, 2007), focuses wholly on newsbooks and pamphlets, while James Loxley's \textit{Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword} (Basingstoke, 1997) and Robert Wilcher's \textit{The Writing of Royalism} (Cambridge, 2001) both focus on canonical works of literature. Individual royalist poets have received attention from for example, T. Corns, \textit{Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660} (Oxford, 1997); S. Zwicker, \textit{Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture (1649-1689)}; and R. Anselment, \textit{Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War} (London, 1988). Few writers have paid attention to questions of genre: Annabel Patterson has discussed the royalist adoption of romance and familiar letters, while Dale Randall and Susan Wiseman have investigated the continued use of the dramatic medium by royalist authors in plays pamphlets and dialogues after the closure of the theatres 1642: A. Patterson, \textit{Censorship and Interpretation} (Wisconsin, 1984), pp. 185-90; D.B.J. Randall, \textit{Winter Fruits: English Drama 1642-1660} (Lexington, Kentucky, 1995); S. Wiseman, \textit{Drama and Politics in the English Civil War} (Cambridge, 1998).


\textsuperscript{7} On plagiarism in this period see P. Kewes, ed., \textit{Plagiarism in Early Modern England} (Basingstoke, 2003).
Critical attention to royalist literature has been focused on the 1630s and 1640s rather than the 1650s. This is to some degree because after the censorship legislation of September 1649, royalist pamphlets and newsbooks were quashed. Nevertheless the lack of studies on royalist writing of the Interregnum has created a distorted view of writing in the period which this thesis seeks to rectify. To address this imbalance, and in order to fully understand the scope and character of royalist writing I have chosen to study a particular prominent bookseller whose business flourished in the 1650s. Moseley is the publisher who did most to discover and address a market for the widest range of royalist literature. 'Royalist' is of course a blanket term, which defies tight definition. But it will be used in this thesis to mean someone who supported Charles I in the civil wars and whose primary political aim after the regicide was the return of the Stuart dynasty. This is admittedly a broad definition, but one which excludes, for example, those who wanted to preserve the monarchy – as most parliamentarians did – but who supported the war effort against Charles I; those who opposed the exiled court’s attempts to regain the throne under the republic and protectorate; or the Levellers, whose opinions briefly dovetailed to some degree with those of royalists after the regicide.

The group of publishers and writers who are discussed in this thesis are united by their identification of the cause of the Church with that of the crown. These royalists were committed to episcopacy – albeit in varying degrees – and to the Book of Common Prayer and as such are best described as Anglicans. Using the word 'Anglican' is fraught with difficulties. It is, admittedly, an anachronism: few, if any, would have used it to describe

---

8 Critics who have taken a chronological approach to analyse the development, and varied nature of royalist poetics include James Loxley who has looked to both manuscript and published royalist poetry to examine the interaction between poetry and politics from the 1630s through the civil wars but does not venture into the Interregnum. Robert Wilcher has traced the journeys of individual royalist writers from 1628 to 1660 as they coped with royalist military defeat, the execution of Charles I and the abolition of monarchy, but he devotes just one short chapter to the post-regicide period. See Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry* and Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*.

themselves at the time; and the group which it describes had diverse views. Some were uncompromising supporters of episcopacy and of religious ceremony whom we might call high churchmen, or Laudians. But there were also those who, in common with a number of parliamentarians, would have accepted modifications to Church ceremony and of episcopacy. Despite these variations our authors and publishers were at one in identifying the cause of the Crown with that of the Church of England.

From 1634 to 1661 Moseley published over 300 titles. The size of his business and the number of literary texts that he published during the revolutionary period has led some to describe him as a canon-maker. Yet he and many of the works that he published have received little if any critical attention. Over ninety years ago John Curtis Reed gathered together biographical material of Moseley's life and reprinted the extant documents relating to his book-selling business. Reed's valuable study has never been updated or supplemented and remains the most readily available and frequently consulted and cited source of biographical and bibliographical information on Moseley. However, Reed's study is limited in scope: it contains no analysis of Moseley's prefaces, or of the books that he published, or of his activities as a royalist which would provide us with a clearer picture of the production of royalist literature. This thesis addresses this deficiency.

10 See Appendix A, pp. 223-30.
The words printer, publisher, stationer and bookseller will figure frequently in this thesis. A stationer was a member of the Stationers Company, whether a printer or publisher. A bookseller was primarily engaged in the selling of books, but was also responsible for organizing and financing their production. Booksellers were also called publishers and I use these terms interchangeably. Publishers might also be printers, as was the case with Henry Seile, a royalist printer and publisher who figures in this thesis. It was the job of the printer to supply the type and the press and to produce the physical book. The community of booksellers and printers was a close one and business relationships between individual booksellers and printers often lasted for many years. In the early 1640s Moseley's favoured printer was Thomas Badger, and in the 1650s the majority of his works were printed by Thomas Newcomb or Thomas Wilson, both of whom were beneficiaries in his will.

Scholars have given more attention to the financial imperatives of publishers than to their political or ideological motives. In his *The Book in the Renaissance* Andrew Pettegree, writing of London publishers who were 'in search of profit', poses the rhetorical question 'and what other sort was there?'. Perhaps he was thinking only of the sixteenth century, a period when print and publishing were still in their relative infancy. Even so, this remains the prevailing view. Whilst it is true that we cannot take it for granted that books or pamphlets reflect the politics of their publisher, or seller, we can deduce a publisher's politics when there is a discernible pattern in the books that he published and when this pattern matches the

15 TNA PROB 11/303/623.
personal information that we can glean from their biographical history. This thesis establishes just such a pattern in the books which Moseley, Seile and Royston published.

As the seventeenth century progressed, the prefatory material of books became more creative and ambitiously conceived. Although the reading public was expanding, there were also more writers and more books to choose from. In order to entice readers, publishers made their books distinctive by introducing prefatory material such as dedications, commendatory poems, and visual material which promised a certain uniqueness. Once an author sold their manuscript to a bookseller he or she had no further rights in the text so the prefatory material came largely, although not exclusively, under the control of the publisher. Prefaces were used to attract a certain kind of reader, and to control the way that a reader approached the text. A preface 'is literally, prae-fatum, that which is stated or mentioned before; it establishes a premise'. Prefaces pre-determine, in some measure, our reading of and response to a text, and when a publisher supplements an author's work by inserting prefatory material, he may attempt to influence the way in which that text might be read. It will be shown that Moseley, with his extensive prefatory material, used prefaces to support the notion that literature belonged to royalists and by corollary that parliament sought to destroy it.

It will be seen that Moseley chose to publish books by royalist and Anglican writers whose works harked back to a bygone era. Together with his writers Moseley sought to keep alive the fading traditions and values of the halcyon days of the Stuart past. Themes of friendship and loyalty associated with royalism are littered through Moseley's prefatory material. The scale of his business suggests that his authors, almost without exception, were happy to be

20 A point made by Peter Thomas in his John Berkenhead, pp. 127-34.
presented in this way.\textsuperscript{21} Moseley's relationship with some of his royalist writers was collaborative and lasted for many years. He had no shortage of writers willing to contribute commendatory poems as will be seen. Indeed, Moseley gathered together in his prefatory material a literary community many of whom had previously gathered in person at the court.\textsuperscript{22} Commendatory poems had been a common feature of manuscripts shared by the courtly literary community. When Moseley introduced commendatory poems into his prefatory material, he imbued his books with the same protective and validating force of friends, and the same air of exclusivity as a manuscript.\textsuperscript{23}

Many of the books that Moseley published evoked a wistful longing for the Arcadian days of the 1630s, and a sense of friendship and conviviality. This aura of friendship and conviviality had been central to the poet Ben Jonson and his followers in the 1630s. Writers who belonged to Jonson's circle: Sir William Davenant, Robert Herrick, Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, William Cartwright, Jasper Mayne, William Habingdon, James Howell and Edmund Waller all appear in Moseley's books either as commendatory poets or as authors in their own right. Royalists formed similar coteries from the end of the first civil war to the Restoration. Sometime during 1646 or 1647, between the first and second civil wars, the scholarly poet Thomas Stanley formed one such coterie whose members wore a black ribbon or armband to express their grief at the royalist defeat and sympathy with the king's plight.\textsuperscript{24} This circle included Edward Sherburne, James Shirley, Alexander Brome, Robert Herrick and Richard Lovelace all of whom wrote prefatory poems for books published by Moseley.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{21} One possible exception is John Milton. See below pp. 40-3.
An understanding of the climate within which Moseley conducted his publishing business provides the necessary framework within which he produced and sold his books. The early 1640s witnessed an unprecedented rise in the number of pamphlets and books which was followed by a series of measures to suppress them. Moseley's business was subject to and constrained by censorship legislation that was specifically designed to inhibit printers and publishers from producing and selling royalist propaganda. He catered for readers who were largely – although not exclusively – royalist and who were, at times, exiled from the capital and suffered financial penalties for their allegiance to the king.

That the invention of printing precipitated or at least facilitated social change is beyond dispute.\(^26\) In the seventeenth century, the rise of the public sphere was propelled partly by rising literacy rates and partly by the availability of cheaper print.\(^27\) By the 1640s up to 30% of rural men could sign their names, while 78% of men in London were fully literate.\(^28\) Pamphlets were relatively cheap, generally ranging from one to six pence, although in the civil wars prices were sometimes higher.\(^29\) Cheap print was meant to be 'inclusive' rather than 'exclusive' as Tessa Watt has shown: it was aimed at both a reading and a listening audience and it was increasingly popular across the social spectrum.\(^30\) The flourishing of print reached its apogee in 1641-2. In July 1641, the institutions which had prosecuted breaches of the licensing system, the Star Chamber and High Commission, were abolished, leaving the press

---


\(^{29}\) Watt, *Cheap Print*, p. 3; McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 27.

\(^{30}\) Watt, *Cheap Print*, p. 3.
temporarily without its legal regulation. The media storm which ensued was unprecedented. The numbers of titles printed rose from just over 900 in 1640 to well over 4,000 in 1642.\textsuperscript{31} David Cressy has argued that the growth of uncontrolled printing can be traced back to the first weeks of the Long Parliament, and that from this date there is a direct correlation between political and religious crises and the fluctuations of press output.\textsuperscript{32} That in the year 1641 over 800 out of a total of just over 2,500 publications contained the word 'parliament' in the title suggests that Cressy was at least partly correct.\textsuperscript{33} However, the successive issues of 1641 – the trial of Strafford; the attack on Laud; the fear of Catholic plots; and the hysteria surrounding the Irish rebellion – all contributed to the surge in print. Yet, as far as we know, Moseley eschewed ephemeral texts which responded to these events, and chose instead to publish books even though, as he admitted, 'the slightest pamphlet is nowadays more vendible than the Works of learnedest men'.\textsuperscript{34}

Not only did Moseley choose to publish books rather than the potentially more profitable pamphlets, but he chose to publish royalist works in London, a city largely controlled by a government which was hostile to the king's supporters and to royalist print. Parliament recognised that in the upheavals of the 1640s print had attained a new potency.\textsuperscript{35} Through the 1640s it sought to put legislation into place that would control the press and rein in royalist propaganda.\textsuperscript{36} In 1642 the House of Commons transferred to itself power for the regulation of print that had hitherto been exercised by the Crown. Then, in June 1643, it passed its 'Ordinance for the Regulation of Printing' that required pre-publication censorship.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{31} Figures are taken from the ESTC and include all works published in London in English.
\textsuperscript{33} Figures taken from the ESTC.
\textsuperscript{34} Humphrey Moseley, 'The Stationer to the Reader, in J. Milton, \textit{Poems} (1645), sig. a3.
\textsuperscript{35} S. Achenstein, 'Texts in Conflict', p. 50.
\textsuperscript{36} The royalist newsbook, \textit{Mercurius Aulicus} sold for as much as eighteen pence in London: McElligott, \textit{Royalism, Print and Censorship}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{37} Firth and Rait, i, pp. 184-7.
November 1643 it was ordered that all stationers found printing or selling pamphlets from 'Oxford, or elsewhere' which were 'scandalous to the Parliament or the Proceedings thereof, shall have Their Estates sequestered'. Despite these tough measures, royalist literature was still bought and sold in the capital. Printers and publishers of contentious material simply kept their names from the title-pages and became more elusive. On 30 September 1647 a further ordinance was issued which was aimed at printers and booksellers who were involved in circulating royalist texts, but this act also had little effect. Finally, on 20 September 1649 the new Commonwealth government's 'Act against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books' tightened control on the presses and imposed hefty fines for transgressions. This act succeeded where earlier ones had failed and suppressed 'all but a few of the most determined opponents of the Commonwealth'. From September 1649, 'no hostile criticism was tolerated' and the very few royalist pamphlets which circulated after that date 'were probably in all cases the production of foreign printers'.

The execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649, the climactic event of the 1640s, separated royalists from their sovereign. Legislation quickly followed which was aimed at preventing royalists from proclaiming their allegiance to Charles II. It was made a treasonable offence for any person or persons to 'presume to Proclaim, Declare, Publish, or in any way promote Charls Stuart, Son of said Charls, commonly called the Prince of Wales, or any other person to be King, or chief magistrate of England, or of Ireland'. On 7 February kingship was formally abolished. On 17 March 1649 the people were 'discharged of Allegiance to the late King's issue'; and any attempt to promote 'any one person whatsoever to the Name, Style,

38 CJ, iii, p. 315.
39 The number of royalist books, pamphlets and newsbooks in the Thomason Collection is testament to the continued availability of royalist texts after the legislation of 1643.
40 Firth and Rait, i, pp. 1021-3.
41 Ibid., ii, pp. 245-54; Potter, Secret Rites, p. 4.
42 C.H. Firth, 'Royalists under the Protectorate', The English Historical Review, 52 (1937), p. 646.
43 Ibid., p. 646.
44 Firth and Rait., i, pp. 1263-4.
45 CJ, viii, pp. 16-18.
Dignity, Power, Prerogative, or Authority of King of England and Ireland' was to be 'deemed and adjudged High Treason'.

Royalists were denied participation in English politics by the successive Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes. From 1642 royalist MPs had been disabled from sitting in parliament. Indeed, by 1649 most of the MPs who had been elected in 1640 had left Westminster – by choice or compulsion – leaving behind a 'Rump' parliament. In March 1649 parliament issued its Declaration ... Setling the Present Government In the Way of A Free State which asserted that the proper foundation of government lay in an agreement of the people. The new government was 'intrusted and authorized by the consent of all the People thereof, whose Representatives by election they are'. Although the Rump, which remained in power until 1653, claimed to act as the representative of the people, it had been purged of its royalist and Presbyterian members, and the people neither were nor wanted to be represented by it.

The Rump was forcibly dissolved in April 1653 as was the short-lived Barebone's Parliament in December. The Instrument of Government which followed excluded royalists not only from standing for parliament, but from voting in elections for the next twelve years. The Remonstrance of February 1657 began the reintegration of former royalists. Article 12 allowed royalists to be appointed to offices if restored by act of Parliament and only if they took an oath abjuring Charles Stuart. As a result, royalists began to drift back into positions of authority in the institutions of local government – the committees and commissions of local government.
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46 Firth and Rait, ii, pp. 18-20.
47 D.L. Smith and P. Little, Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 36-39.
48 A Declaration of the parliament of England Expressing the Grounds of their Late Proceedings And of Setling the Present Government In the Way of A Free State (London, 22 March 1648/9), p. 27.
50 Smith and Little, Parliament and Politics, p. 36.
51 Ibid., p. 37.
52 Ibid., p. 37.
peace – which had previously been purged.\textsuperscript{53} However, the Humble Petition and Advice which was ratified on 25 May 1657 retreated from the relative leniency of the Remonstrance, and royalists were once again excluded from any office or public trust.\textsuperscript{54}

After the execution of the king in 1649 the newly formed Commonwealth government was severely threatened by the survival of royalist ambitions which expressed themselves both in conspiracies in England, and in plans for an invasion from Ireland or Scotland. In August 1649 Cromwell was sent to quash a coalition of confederate Irish and royalists which planned to cross the Irish Sea under naval cover provided by Prince Rupert. In June 1650 Charles II arrived in Scotland. Cromwell returned to England and headed north. In September 1650 he led an expedition to Scotland, and defeated the Scots at Dunbar. A year later Charles II invaded England with a Scottish-royalist army which was routed at Worcester. This was the last time a royalist army of any significance fought to restore Charles II to the throne.

An examination of the books that Moseley published reveals the ways that royalists reacted to successive and unwelcome parliamentary and protectoral governments after their military collapse through the medium of print.\textsuperscript{55} For some who continued to plot against the new government writing was a complementary activity. However, the failure of the royalist effort in the first and second civil wars, the execution of the king in 1649, and the military failures at Dunbar in 1650 and Worcester in 1651 taught many royalists that military intervention was futile. For these royalists print remained as a medium through which they could attempt to subvert the political power in force and reaffirm the authority of the Anglican Church without

\textsuperscript{55} On Royalists' antipathy to further military involvement: \textit{CCISP}, ii, p. 73; Firth, 'Royalists under the Protectorate', pp. 645-6; and Underdown, \textit{Royalist Conspiracy}, pp. 16, 225 & 328.
recourse to arms. Providence, rather than warfare, was to be their guide to a restoration of the Stuarts.

Moseley chose to publish books which catered for an alienated market whose participants were repeatedly removed from London. Those who had become strangers to St. Paul's Churchyard relied on friends to send them books. From the outbreak of the civil wars the atmosphere in the capital had been hostile to royalists. Blanket exclusions from London were applied to royalists, often irrespective of whether they had sought an accommodation with the new regime by compounding for their estates. Between 1648 and 1651 acts and ordinances were passed on four occasions to remove them from London. Under the terms of the February 1650 banishment delinquents were to leave London and confine themselves within five miles of their dwellings. All those who failed to remove themselves were to be apprehended and imprisoned. Although this act was designed to remain in force for one year, it was continued to November of the following year.

Some royalists suffered real hardship during the 1650s because of the financial burdens imposed on them by the revolutionary regimes. Many of the 780 who lost their lands in the three acts of sale in 1651-2 went to considerable expense trying to recover them piecemeal over the next few years. In this context it seems unlikely that Moseley's motive for publishing royalist works was solely financial. Often published in folio these books were
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56 Letter from Brian Duppa to Sir Justinian Isham, 10 January 1660, in G. Isham, ed., The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650-1660 (Northampton, 1951), p. 175.
57 Little scholarly attention has been paid to 'internal' exile from London: P. Major, 'Twixt Hope and Fear': John Berkenhead, Henry Lawes, and Banishment from London during the English Revolution, Review of English Studies, 59 (2008), pp. 270-80.
58 Ibid., ii, p. 349.
59 Ibbid., p. 349.
60 Major, 'Twixt Hope and Fear', p. 272.
expensive to produce and many of his customers, because of their royalism, suffered financial hardship and periods of exile from the capital, which was the location of his shop.\textsuperscript{63} The normal print-run for a book in the mid-seventeenth century was 800 copies in the folio format, and 1,500 to 2,000 copies per impression for cheaper formats.\textsuperscript{64} Publishing in these numbers at a time when royalists suffered financial constraints meant that Moseley took a considerable financial risk unless he knew that he had a solid royalist market willing to spend money on the right kind of book. Moseley claimed that he tailored his books to suit his customers' financial constraints. When he published William Cartwright's \textit{Comedies Tragi-Comedies With other Poems} of 1651 in octavo, he said that he had done so to suit the reader's pocket because at that time the 'most ingenious' had the 'least money'.\textsuperscript{65} I am not suggesting that Moseley published books at a loss, only that if profit were his only concern royalist literary works may not have been a wise choice. There are no records which would enable us to assess the profitability of his business, but he left no debts when he died in 1661.

Having outlined the contexts in which the works were produced and consumed, it remains to explain the content and structure of the thesis itself. I take a selection of Moseley's writers to examine the various ways that literary texts were used by royalists. This thesis locates these texts within the contexts of their publication, the writers' own biographical background and literary corpus, and within the context of royalist writing in general. The historical circumstances within which texts were intended to interact during the civil wars and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
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Interregnum were, in some cases, quite different to the date of original composition and I investigate the implications of Moseley's transplantation of these books out of their original contexts.

The thesis begins with an examination of Moseley's career and the editorial control that he exerted over the books that he published. One of the key sources for this study is the catalogue of Moseley's publications which appears in Donald Wing's *Short Title Catalogue*. This catalogue allows us to see the scope of Moseley's canon. An assessment of his list of publications together with his prefatory material reveals that Moseley played an active part in gathering manuscripts, dedications and commendatory poems from royalists for publication. Next follow five text-based studies each written in a different genre. The order in which these chapters are presented is to some extent arbitrary. Each of them explores the ways that particular genres were used by royalists. It is only when we set these books beside each other that we are able to establish the comprehensive nature of the use of literature for what is, in effect, the purposes of propaganda. Among this seemingly disparate collection of books there is a kernel of royalist opinion which demonstrates the existence of a holistic royalist world in republican England.

In the second chapter I assess the work of Moseley's most prolific author, James Howell, who wrote in an array of genres. Howell was a notorious royalist polemicist in the 1640s. In 1650 he embedded sentences, paragraphs and complete pages from his political pamphlets of the 1640s in a literary work, the second part of his historical allegory *Dendrologia: Dodona's Grove*. Howell's absorption of extracts from his popular pamphlets into a literary text is an important example of the intersection of two kinds of writing which are often assumed to be separate activities.
Chapters three and four focus on two genres which were used almost exclusively by royalists: drama and romance. The third chapter focuses on Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* (1647), and William Cartwright's *Comedies Tragi-Comedies With other Poems* (1651). Against the backdrop of Puritan antipathy to the theatre, Moseley published these posthumous collections to encourage a close identification between literature and the Stuart court. In the fourth chapter I examine Moseley's involvement in the publication of translations of French romances in the 1650s. This chapter places romance in its historical context to reveal why the genre was popular with royalists in Interregnum.

In the fifth chapter I turn to two books of Psalms, the first by the composer Henry Lawes and the second by the Anglican bishop Henry King. These two books were designed to inculcate or strengthen nostalgia for Stuart rule and a vision of a monarchy that was divinely appointed. The sixth chapter examines Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth's translations of Guido Bentivoglio's *Della guerra di Fiandra* (1632-39) and *Relazioni in tempo dele sue nunziature* (1629). An analysis of the circumstances of these translations suggests that these books were published in order to expose the hypocrisy of parliament's confrontations with Charles I in the 1640s. These books implicitly point to a parallel between the specious motives for rebellion which began in the Low Countries in the 1560s and parliament's motives in the English Civil Wars in the 1640s.

In the final chapter, I take a step back in order to set Moseley's activities as a royalist into the wider context of royalist publishing. I have chosen Richard Royston and Henry Seile from a list of royalist publishers which includes: John Williams, Richard Marriott, Richard Lowndes, Timothy Garthwaite, Nathaniel Brook; and the printer-publishers, William Dugard
and Ruth Raworth. It is often difficult to trace how heavily these men were involved in supporting the king because they hid their activities from the authorities. Jason McElligott has provided a useful outline of the royalist activities of Royston, Lowndes, Williams, and Marriott in his *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, where Henry Seile also receives a mention. Little more is known of Marriott or Williams, but for Royston and Seile more evidence exists which needs to be addressed. McElligott admits that he makes no attempt to link particular authors with particular booksellers which for these two publishers in particular is a crucial aspect of their business. It is for this reason that I have chosen these two publishers. This chapter, then, forms a contextual background for publishing which reveals signs that the royalist book trade in London was more coherent and less disparate than has previously been assumed.

This thesis challenges the assumption that publishers were driven only by economic motives. The wide ranging use of literature over various genres, each of which arouses certain expectations in the reader, can only indicate a concerted effort to undermine the successive parliamentary and protectorate governments. The books that were published by Moseley which form the core of this thesis reveal the way that royalist literature tried to influence the course of history during this period of rebellion and rupture. This investigation of Moseley's publishing business reveals a very successful attempt to align literary culture with Stuart culture. There was a determined effort to inculcate in the minds of the reading public the conviction that monarchy was the defender of tradition while the successive republican and protectorate governments sought to destroy it.

---

Chapter One

Humphrey Moseley: Royalist Publisher at the Prince's Arms

Although Humphrey Moseley is often referred to as a royalist publisher, his activities as a royalist have received little critical attention.¹ This chapter examines these activities. We shall see a pattern of royalism and Anglicanism in his publications. Many of the writers whose works Moseley published were royalists who were associated with the court; and the theological works that he published were almost exclusively written by Anglicans, many of whom had been ejected from their livings by parliament. But it is not merely in his choice of texts that his royalist preferences are revealed. The dedicatees and the poets whose commendatory verses he included ahead of the main text of his books were almost without exception royalists. He actively promoted royalism in his books. An examination of the prefatory material of the volumes he published shows that he was a skilled manipulator of this textual space for political purposes. It will be seen that his title-pages, frontispieces, and prefaces were intended to guide the reader to associate royalism with literary culture, learnedness, and the established Anglican Church.

Moseley was born in London in early 1603.² He began his career as a stationer on 29 March 1619 when, at the age of sixteen, he was apprenticed to the London bookseller Matthew

---


Lownes. After receiving the freedom of the Company of Stationers on 7 May 1627, he entered into partnership with the London bookseller Nicholas Fussell who traded at the sign of the Ball in St. Paul's Churchyard. Together they mainly published theological texts for the next ten years. Moseley was admitted to the livery of the Stationers' Company on 28 October 1633. The first book he produced as an independent publisher – as distinct from merely in a partnership – was James Hayward's translation of Giovanni Francesco Biondi's romance Donzella Desterrada: Or, The Banish'd Virgin which appeared in 1635. This choice foreshadows the character of much of his later royalist publishing. It was around this time that Moseley dissolved his partnership with Fussell, and in 1638 he moved to the shop where he remained throughout the civil wars, Commonwealth and Protectorate called the Prince's Arms – an appropriate name in view of his political sympathies – in St. Paul's Churchyard.

Moseley's Anglicanism

We can deduce Moseley's Anglicanism from his attendance at an Anglican Church and from his own words. It is evident from the baptism and burial records of the Moseley family that they continued to attend services held at St. Gregory's by St. Paul's after 1643. St Gregory's

---

3 The best source of information concerning Moseley's biographical and bibliographical detail to date is J.C. Reed, 'Humphrey Moseley, Publisher', *Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers*, 2 (1927-30), pp. 57-142 which includes a list of works published by Moseley and copies of the prefaces and dedicatory epistles contained in these volumes.


5 *TRCS*, iii, p. 686. Fussell petitioned Charles II at the Restoration for a continuation of the reversion of the office of Common Crier of the Court of King's Bench granted him by Charles I to whom he presented a copy at Oxford of his translation of the Pious and Learned Annotations of Diodati, and was said to have been looked upon as a malignant and deprived of all public employment. See CSPD, 1660, p. 367; G. Diodati, *Pious and Learned Annotations upon the Holy Bible* (London, 1648). Moseley was also involved in the publication of this book: two copies, one held in the Worcester Cathedral Library and one in St Paul's Cathedral Library carry the imprint 'second edition by M. Flesher for N. Fussell to be sold by H. Moseley'. See Wing, i. p. 754, ref. D1506A. Fussell and Moseley must have remained on friendly terms as Moseley left his old partner 20 shillings in his will: TNA, PROB 11/303/623.


7 Ibid., iv, p. 324.


9 Parish records of St. Gregory's by Paul's, Liber B: 16 February 1640, fol. 16; 28 July 1646, fol. 23; 15 December 1647, fol. 107; 22 May 1648, fol. 109; 23 October 1653, fol. 113.
was one of only a handful of churches in London that continued to hold Anglican services after the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer in 1643.\textsuperscript{10} Prayer book services in St. Gregory's were 'kept up surreptitiously or by the connivance of the authorities', although the diarist John Evelyn, who attended services at St Gregory's while in London, noted in his diary that a service was broken up by soldiers in 1658.\textsuperscript{11}

The men who were most strenuous in raising troops for parliament in 1642 were those obsessed with a fear of popery and the need for a more godly reformation.\textsuperscript{12} The government of the Church by bishops and the system of ecclesiastical courts that had emerged as part of the Elizabethan settlement had not provided the detailed surveillance of spiritual and moral life which was so prized by the Churches of Geneva and Scotland.\textsuperscript{13} During the 1630s Archbishop William Laud, with the support of Charles I, had pursued a systematic reorientation of national worship from sermons to sacraments and prayer. The ritualistic excesses practised by some bishops troubled religious conservatives as well as radicals.\textsuperscript{14} Many wanted to see a Church structure with patterns of worship and discipline that had a clear scriptural basis. The reaction against Laudianism – as for shorthand we can call it – provoked demands for the abolition of episcopacy and of the Book of Common Prayer. In the months which immediately followed the convening of the Long Parliament in November 1640 petitions for root-and-branch reform poured in from London and the counties.\textsuperscript{15} The debates on Church government which followed in the Commons in the spring and summer of 1641 witnessed a gradual polarization of members so that by the time of the first recess an

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{14} A. Fletcher, \textit{The Outbreak of the English Civil War} (London, 1985), p. 288.
\end{flushleft}
Anglican party had formed. This party defended the Church against petitions which sought to be rid of Laudian clergy and of 'a Church order that was so easily subverted by them'.

It was amidst this religious polarization that Moseley published books which he intended to be 'serviceable to the Church'. This can be seen most clearly when Moseley published books after an author's death. In these cases Moseley was free to exercise control over how the books, and indeed their authors, were presented to their readers. Whilst some of the divines whose work Moseley published were not Laudian, he could nevertheless use them to counter the criticisms that were being levelled at the Laudian Church: that its bishops were corrupt, that it was insufficiently guided by scripture, and that it relied too heavily on ceremony at the expense of preaching. For example, in 1640 he published a posthumous collection of the sermons of the bishop Arthur Lake, a 'moderate Calvinist' who had died in 1626. Moseley published this book to defend the role of bishops in the English Church. To counter the claims of both sectaries and Presbyterians that the Anglican Church hierarchy had no historical or biblical basis, divines and propagandists such as Henry Hammond and Henry Ferne argued that bishops had an uninterrupted succession that could be traced back to the apostles. Moseley used his preface to Lake's Ten Sermons to make the same claim. Bishops, said Moseley, were 'sacred Magistrates of the Church', and were 'derived most undoubtedly from Christ and his Apostles'. He expressed his hope that through Lake's example, however disaffected some were to episcopal hierarchy, the Church would 'continue still to flourish

18 H. Moseley, 'A Short Preface of the Publisher to the Reader', in A. Lake, Ten Sermons upon Severall Occasions (1640), sig. A3'.
19 K. Fincham, 'Lake, Arthur (bap. 1567, d. 1626)', ODNB.
21 Moseley, 'A Short Preface of the Publisher to the Reader', in A. Lake, Ten Sermons upon Severall Occasions (1640), sig. A3'.
under a happie and gracious supply of many Religious and able Bishops like to this Author’. He went on to express his own admiration for the 'venerable hierarchie' of bishops and lamented the 'Maladie of this present age', and the 'distemper and malignity against those sacred Magistrates of the Church'.

It is likely that in 1647 Moseley published the *Private Devotions* of Lancelot Andrewes – who had also died in 1626 – in response to the abolition of episcopacy on 9 October 1646. Andrewes had exercised a profound influence on Laud, whose enforcement of Church reform had proved so unpopular through the 1630s. Laud was not only influenced by Andrewes, but had overseen and manipulated the printing and publication of the divine's works in the 1630s to lend textural authority to his vision of the Church. Moseley's edition of the *Private Devotions* was published in the same vein. On the title-page and frontispiece he used the rhetorical device of tripling to hammer home Andrewes' episcopal position. He referred to him as 'The Universall Bishop', 'Late Bishop of Winchester' and 'Quondam episcopi wintonienses'. In the frontispiece portrait Andrewes holds and points to a book with his finger inside as though marking a page. In his preface, Moseley described Andrewes as one of the 'true oracles' of the Church, who was well known for his 'pietie and learning'. He possessed a prophetic voice that was guided by the book rather than by 'inspiration'. The sectarian claim to divine 'inspiration' was derided by Anglicans and royalists. Moseley griped
at the current fad for 'ex-tempore' prayers that were popular among religious sects.

Challenging the claim that set forms of worship lacked biblical precedent, he wrote that it was against this 'wild fancy' that he was publishing Andrewes' 'set formes' of prayer which had biblical origins: they were 'for the most part selected out of holy Scripture'.

Most of the theological works in Moseley's list of publications were written by Anglicans. There are, admittedly, a few exceptions: in 1655 he published a funeral sermon, *The Saints Expectation and Reward*, and in 1659 *Two Assizes Sermons* by Michael Thomas, rector of Stockton in Shropshire; and between 1658 and January 1660 Moseley published works by the 'moderate' Puritan Isaac Allen and the Presbyterian John Arrowsmith. Although these texts cannot be considered royalist or Anglican, they do not oppose the Stuarts or the Anglican Church. Thomas's funeral sermon of 1655 speaks of 'these sad times' when 'the best men have the most heavy afflictions laid upon them' and probably had some appeal to royalists. Allen was noted for his moderation and political neutrality during the civil wars, and in his *Excommunicatio excommunicata* he speaks out against the over-zealousness of the Presbyterian Manchester classis and its hostility towards episcopacy. Arrowsmith, like many Presbyterians, was a reluctant subscriber to the engagement. Moseley's willingness to publish his *Theanthropos* in January 1660 – a time when cooperation between royalists and their former opponents was viewed by most royalists as the best means to facilitate the
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30 Ibid., sig. A4r. Moseley also published Andrewes' *A Manual of Directions for the Sick With Many Sweet Meditations and Devotions of the R. Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes, late Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1648) with a second edition in 1655; and *Apospasmatia sacra, or, A Collection of Posthumous and Orphan Lectures* (London 1657).

31 Wing, iv, pp. 629-31.

32 See Appendix A, pp. 223-30.


35 J. Twigg, 'Arrowsmith, John (1602-1659)', *ODNB*.
restoration of Charles II\textsuperscript{36} – is an indication that Moseley's Anglicanism was of the type that preferred conciliation and compromise to intransigence and division within the Protestant Church.

Almost every divine whose work Moseley published had been ejected from his living and/or suffered sequestration. Perhaps the most notable example is Robert Mossom whose \textit{Sion's Prospect} Moseley published in 1653. In 1642 Mossom had shown no hesitation in following the king to York. Whilst there he translated \textit{Anti-Paraeus, or, A treatise in the defence of the royall right of kings}, and delivered two sermons which were subsequently published by the king's command through the York publisher Stephen Bulkley.\textsuperscript{37} Mossom held fast to the practice and principles of Anglicanism for which he was expelled from his curacy at Teddington, Middlesex, on 25 July 1650.\textsuperscript{38} He then moved to St Peter Paul's Wharf, London, where he continued to use the banned Book of Common Prayer, offering holy communion monthly, 'which brought a great concourse and resort to it'.\textsuperscript{39} Other Anglicans whose titles appear in Moseley's list of publications include: William Gay, who was sequestered in 1647; Edmund Porter, prebendary of Norwich who was sequestered in 1644; Richard Gardiner, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, who was sequestered in 1646; Nicholas Darton, who was ejected from his living in 1647 and was excluded from the pulpit by 1649; Benjamin Hinton, minister of Hendon, who was sequestered in 1643; William Towers who was ejected from his preferments by parliament in 1646; and Thomas Powell who was ejected from his living and


\textsuperscript{37} R. Mossom, \textit{The king on his throne: or A discourse maintaining the dignity of a king, the duty of a subject, and the unlawfulness of rebellion, delivered in two sermons preached by R.M.} (York, 1642). A second edition was published in 1643 which was printed in York but still circulated in London: British Library ref. E.86[24].

\textsuperscript{38} S. Kelsey, 'Mossom, Robert (bap. 1617, d. 1679), \textit{ODNB}; Matthews, \textit{Walker Revised}, p. 54.

shipped himself beyond seas some time in the early 1650s. Before he left England, Powell translated Virgilio Malvezzi's *Stoa Triumphant* which Moseley published in 1651. In his dedicatory epistle Powell reflected bitterly that the translation had been 'the production of some spare time, when I was debarred from better employment, to wit, the exercise of my function and ministry'. The choice of *Stoa Triumphant* was pertinent to Powell's current circumstance: it was 'a Philosophical Lecture of Patience and equanimity, to an exiled friend' which extolled the 'Heroick bravery of the Stoicks'.

The sequestration and ejection of royalists and Anglicans during the 1640s and 1650s resulted in over a decade of financial hardship, whether they remained in England or went into exile. In addition to supporting the Anglican Church in his books, Moseley provided more tangible support to royalists and the Anglican clergy. P.W. Thomas noted that the former editor of the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*, Sir John Berkenhead, worked for Moseley while in financial difficulties. In 1647 Sir Richard Fanshawe was in London 'daily in fears to be imprisoned' as he tried to raise money to return to the Prince of Wales who was by then in France. It was in the same year that his translation of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido* was first published, which suggests that selling manuscripts to publishers was a handy source of income for royalists in financial difficulties. Robert Gentilis, a former fellow of All Souls College, Oxford and, according to Wood, from the late 1630s a 'retainer to the royal court',
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42 Ibid., sig. B.


worked as a translator for Moseley through the 1640s and 1650s. Also from the University of Oxford, Edmund Chilmead, a chaplain of Christ Church who was ejected in 1648 'came to London in great necessity' where, in his dire poverty, he turned to translating and ghost writing. In 1649 Moseley registered Chilmead's translation of Jacques Gaffarel's *Unheard of Curiosities* which he then published in 1650. One of the leading Anglican clerics from Oxford, Robert Sanderson, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity, also published works to ease his state of penury in the 1650s. It seems, then, that Moseley was using his publishing business as a means to provide financial assistance to impoverished royalists and Anglican clergymen.

**Moseley and the Stuarts**

The religious and political were closely intertwined in this period and Moseley's interlocking Anglicanism and royalism are apparent in his prefatory material. His royalism is manifest in the number of dedications to Charles I and other members of the royal family. The first dedication to Charles I appeared in January 1642 when Moseley published 'The Vote', a poem that the writer James Howell had presented to the king as a New Year's gift. In that month the chain of events which began with Charles's decision to impose a new set of ecclesiastical canons and a new prayer book on the Scots had reached a crisis point. To fund his wars with the Scots Charles had been forced to summon the Short Parliament in April 1640. However, after over a decade without a sitting, parliament was more interested in airing its grievances than attending to the king's needs, and the Short Parliament was aborted. By autumn of the same year the king realised that he would need to act in a more conciliatory manner, and on 3
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48 M. Feingold, 'Chilmead, Edmund (1610-1654)', *ODNB*; *TRCS*, i, p. 329; Wing, ii, p. 116.
November 1640 he summoned what would come to be known as the Long Parliament. In the months that followed Strafford was executed, Archbishop Laud was impeached, and a number of far-reaching reforms were pressed on the king.\footnote{Gardiner, *History of England*, Volume 9, 1639-41 (London, 1884), p. 249; C. Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 182-3.} Ship money and forest fines were declared illegal; the prerogative courts of Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished; the Triennial Act required the crown to call a session of parliament at least once every three years; and the act that is often referred to as the Continuation Act stipulated that parliament could not be dissolved without its own consent.\footnote{Ibid., p. 225; Gardiner, *History of England*, ix, p. 290.}

Yet despite these concessions, many members of the Long Parliament believed that Charles had given his assent to these reforms reluctantly and would therefore ignore their provisions given any opportunity. John Pym, the most forceful member of the House, was fearful that their work would be overturned in an instant by an armed uprising on behalf of the king supported by his Catholic subjects.\footnote{J.H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (3rd edn., Cambridge, 1968), pp. 25-7. John Morrill has modified this view of Pym from chief architect to one of a group, but he too refers to Pym as the most visible and active of the various spokesmen for the several cabals in parliament: J. Morrill, ‘The unweariableness of Mr Pym: influence and eloquence in the Long Parliament’, in S.D. Amussen and M.A Kishlansky, eds., *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 1995), p. 22.} The rebellion in Ireland in late October 1641 heightened these fears. Popular violence in London broke out in London on 26 December, partly in response to rumours that Charles intended to resort to force against parliament.\footnote{Pearl, *London and the Outbreak*, p. 224.} Charles, for his part, resented the conduct of the leaders of the reform party in the House of Commons who, he believed, were motivated by personal envy and malice. It was this view, and the advice of Lord Digby, that led him at the beginning of January 1642 to charge the ringleaders: John Pym, Denzil Holles, John Hampden, William Strode and Sir Arthur Haselrig with high treason.\footnote{Gardener, *History of England*, ix, pp. 129-32.} They were forewarned and the attempt to arrest them only alienated Charles's subjects further. On 10 January 1642, fearing for his safety, the king left...
London.\footnote{Russell, \textit{Fall of the British Monarchies}, p. 457.} It was at this point, when the king's unpopularity in London was perhaps at its highest, that Moseley published Howell's poem. In it Howell expressed a desire to write the king's annals, 'To vindicate the truth of Charles his raigne, / From scribling pamphleteers'.\footnote{J. Howell, \textit{The Vote, or A Poem Royall} (London, 1642), p. 5.} Antony Milton has noted that awkward memories of the Personal Rule meant that in the 1640s the image of Charles I did not figure largely in royalist propaganda.\footnote{A. Milton, 'Veiling the Crown', in J. McElligott and D.L. Smith, eds., \textit{Royalists and Royalism in the Interregnum} (Manchester, 2010), p. 88. See also W.J. Sasche, 'English Pamphlet Support for Charles I, November 1648-January 1649', in W.A. Aiken and B.D. Henning, eds., \textit{Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein} (London, 1960), pp. 149-68.} True enough, in Moseley's books there are fewer dedications to Charles I than in 1648 when there was a change of mood.\footnote{In addition to Howell's \textit{The Vote}, there is his, 'To His Majestie', in idem, \textit{Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ; Familiar Letters Domestick and Forren} (London, 1645). Howell's second collection was dedicated to James, Duke of York, but still sets him in relationship to the king. See J. Howell, 'To His Highness James Duke of York, A Star of the greatest magnitude in the Constellation of Charles-Wayn', in idem, \textit{A New Volume of Letters Partly Philosophical, Politicall, Historicall} (London, 1647).} The king's imprisonment, the alleged plans to disinherit Prince Charles in favour of his brother James, Duke of York, and the second civil war stimulated a flurry of support in royalist pamphlets and in Moseley's publications in 1648.\footnote{Gardiner, \textit{CW}, iv, pp. 100-1.} True enough, in Moseley's books there are fewer dedications to Charles I than in 1648 when there was a change of mood.\footnote{H. Carey, \textit{To The Most Sacred majesty of Charles the first, Monarch of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, &c.}, in V. Malvezzi, \textit{Romulus and Tarquin}, trans. H. Carey (London, 1648); and H. Lawes, 'To His Most Sacred Majestie, Charles, by the Grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.' in \textit{Choice Psalms put into Musick for Three Voices} (London, 1648), sig. A3'. Carey's dedication is discussed below in Chapter Six and Lawes' dedication is discussed in Chapter Five.} Dedications to the king appeared in Henry Carey's translation of Virgilio Malvezzi's \textit{Romulus and Tarquin}; and in the \textit{Choice Psalms} of the court composer Henry Lawes.\footnote{E. Sherburne, 'To His most Sacred Majesty', in \textit{Seneca's Answer to Lucilius His Quære; Why Good Men suffer misfortunes seeing there is a Divine Providence?}, trans. E. Sherburne (London, 1648).} Edward Sherburne's translation of \textit{Seneca's Answer to Lucilius} was not only dedicated to, but was written for Charles I.\footnote{H. de Quehen, 'Sherburne, Sir Edward (bap. 1616, d. 1702)', \textit{ODNB}.} Sherburne had served on the royalist side at the battle of Edgehill of 23 October 1642, and was sent to Oxford as an ordnance officer by the king who awarded him with an MA by special command in December.\footnote{H. de Quehen, 'Sherburne, Sir Edward (bap. 1616, d. 1702)', \textit{ODNB}.} After the fall of Oxford in June 1646, he moved to London to live in chambers in Middle Temple where he became close friends with the poet Thomas...
Stanley. It was around this time that Sherburne translated Seneca's Answer 'for [his] Majesties view', which flattered Charles I with an image of his 'own invincible Patience … in bearing and over-mastering Misfortunes'. He claimed that 'whilst the times are such, that they deny me according to my particular Duty to serve the just Commands of Your Majesties Will' he would show that he continued to have 'a Will to serve' through his writing.

While it is possible that Moseley did not possess a detailed knowledge of the contents of every book that he published, it is inconceivable that he did not oversee the layout and subject-matter of the prefatory material including the dedications. Publishers used introductory content to help guide a buyer to commit to a purchase. Francis Kirkman, a contemporary bookseller turned writer, described the methods of book-selling in a way which indicates that a sound knowledge of the contents of the text was imperative to encourage a sale. He records that

If a customer comes into our shop to buy a book, [the bookseller] hath such ways of preferring and recommending of it, that they seldom go and not buy, for he will open the book, and ... shew them one place or another, out of which he will preach to them, and tell them, that very saying or discourse is worth all the money in the world.

For evidence of Moseley's intervention in the presentation of a text for political purposes we can look to Robert Ashley's translation of Virgilio Malvezzi’s Il Davide Perseguitato which was first published by Thomas Alchorn in 1637. Ashley died in 1641. A few years later, Moseley bought the rights to the book and issued two further editions: one in 1647, during the course of Charles I's imprisonment, and another in 1650 after his execution. These two

---

64 Sherburne, 'To His most Sacred Majesty', in *Seneca's Answer*, sig. A2v.
65 Ibid, pp. 3-4.
67 TRCS, i, p. 275.
editions contained a new frontispiece which, by giving the biblical David the face of Charles I, offered an analogy between the persecutions of David and the English king. Below the frontispiece portrait is one of the most frequently used biblical injunctions used by the king's supporters: from Psalm 105, 'Touch not mine Anointed'.

Dedications to the future Charles II feature strongly in books published by Moseley from 1646 to 1648. Howell dedicated his *Lustra Ludovici, or the Life of the late Victorious King of France, Lewis the XIII* to the young prince. Likening Charles to his royal uncle, he recommended a similar style of kingship: Louis XIII, he said, had come to be 'fear'd as well as belov'd of his subjects, and a mixture of these two passions make an excellent government'. 68 This dedication, dated Midsummer's Day 1646, coincided with the fall of Oxford, the end of the civil war, and the prince's departure to France. 69 In 1648 Moseley published a second edition of Sir Richard Fanshawe's translation of Battista Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*. Fanshawe wrote in his dedication to the prince of his hope that a royal marriage might bring peace to England. The book also contains a collection of poems which support Charles I's policies on some of the most contentious issues from the beginning of the Personal Rule: 'An Ode upon His Majesties Proclamation, Anno 1630, for the Gentry to reside in their severall Countries'; a poem celebrating the building of Charles I's flagship 'The Soveraigne: His Majesties Great Shippe'; and another on the trial of the Earl of Strafford who 'gave his blood to quench a Civill Warre'. 70

---

In 1648 Moseley published John Raymond's *Itinerary Contayning A Voyage Made through Italy*. It includes a dedication to the prince and 'A Letter' dated 11 November 1648 from the author of *Mercurius Aulicus*, John Berkenhead. In this letter Berkenhead laments the state of England and heralds the young Charles as 'the most hopefull Prince in the World'.\(^\text{71}\) In the same year, Moseley published the Anglican divine Richard Drake's translation of Andrewes' *A Manual of Private Devotions and Meditations*. Drake too dedicated his work to the prince. Here he complained bitterly of the recent 'invasion upon God, the King, the Church, and whatsoever is called holy'.\(^\text{72}\) It would be no sin, he wrote, to 'look for the righting and maintenance of them all, from your Princelie Arm, assisted with the power of heaven'.\(^\text{73}\) So:

\begin{quote}
Ride on, Great Prince, upon the Horses of Salvation, and the Lord of Hosts fight your battles, may the sword of the Lord and Prince Charles be mighty in operation, for the redemption of His sacred Majestie, and the Restitution of this Church and Kingdom to Their ancient Libertie and Glory. May honor, Prosperity and Peace so accompany and crown your pious, Christian, and Princelie undertakings, that our eyes may once more see the King upon His Throne, gloriously triumphing in the Affections of His subjects, and happily united in the indissoluble bonds of Love and Loyalty.\(^\text{74}\)
\end{quote}

The most audacious of Moseley's royalist prefaces appears in Edward Wolley's translation of George de Scudery's *Curia Politiæ* of 1654. The execution of Charles I in 1649 had been swiftly followed by acts of parliament that put a stranglehold on royalist propaganda. On the day of the king's execution it became a treasonable offence for anyone to '...presume to Proclaim, Declare, Publish, or any way promote Charls Stuart, Son of said Charls, commonly called the Prince of Wales, or any other person to be King, or chief

\(^{\text{71}}\) J. Berkenhead, 'A Letter from a most ingenious Friend, to whom the Author sent His Mercurio Italico', in J. Raymond, *An Itinerary Contayning A Voyage Made Through Italy in the yeare 1646, and 1647* (London, 1648), n.p.


\(^{\text{73}}\) Ibid. n.p.

\(^{\text{74}}\) Ibid. n.p.
magistrate of England, or of Ireland'. On 17 March 1649 the office of kingship was abolished. The people were 'discharged of Allegiance to the late King's issue' and any attempt to aid, assist, abet, or comfort Charles, eldest son to Charles I, or to promote 'any one person whatsoever to the Name, Style, Dignity, Power, Prerogative, or Authority of King of England and Ireland' would be 'deemed and adjudged High Treason'. On 19 January 1654 a further act reiterated the terms of that of 30 January 1649. Despite these acts some copies of Wolley's translation of *Curia Politiæ* are addressed to 'His Most Excellent Majesty Charles By the Grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith &c' (my italics). In this dedication, Wolley, who served as chaplain to both Charles I and Charles II, explained his intention in translating the book. It was to teach men to learn 'their duties towards their soveraigns' and to guide them 'to loyalty and true Obedience to Gods Anointed' so that Charles might be returned to his 'Illustrious Throne'. A survey of the thirty-six copies of the book that survive in university libraries around the world found four with this dedication. The remainder have in its place a toned-down dedication to 'True Honor and Renown'. The existence of these two dedications suggests that Moseley was tailoring books to suit his buyers' political sympathies. There is a mystery about this book. Almost all of copies that I have found – those with and without the royal dedication – carry a note of authorization by Cromwell's Secretary of State, John Thurloe. Perhaps this was intended to prevent a more inflammatory version of the work from being printed.

75 'An Act prohibiting the proclaiming any person to be King', in Firth and Rait, i, pp. 1263-4.
76 'An Act for the abolishing of the Kingly Office', in ibid., ii, pp. 18-20.
77 'An Ordinance Declaring that the offences herein mentioned, and no other, shall be adjudged High Treason', in ibid., ii, p. 833.
79 E. Wolley, 'His Most Excellent Majesty Charles By the Grace of God, of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith &c' in Scudery, *Curia Politiæ*, sig. A2'-A2'.
80 See Appendix B, p. 231.
81 Thurloe was appointed to assign such persons as he saw fit to print *Curia Politiæ* 'and no persons whatever to presume to print it without his leave'. See CSPD, 1653-1654, p. 297.
Moseley's Dedicatees

While it is difficult to gauge the level of an individual publisher's involvement in determining to whom writers should dedicate their works, Moseley's list of dedicatees is worthy of attention. Although he published in excess of three-hundred titles during the course of his career, the number of dedicatees is small and almost all are notable royalists. Most frequently occurring are the Marquesses of Dorchester and Hertford, and the Earl of Dorset.82 Henry Pierrepont, Earl of Kingston and Viscount Newark, had been one of the king's most reliable supporters in the House of Lords between 1640 and 1642.83 He served on the Privy Council in Oxford, and in the year 1645 was created Marquess of Dorchester. After the fall of Oxford in 1646, Dorchester returned to his estates in Nottinghamshire, and then to London in November 1649.84 In 1652 he married Katherine Stanley, the second daughter of William, Earl of Derby who had been executed in 1651 for fighting alongside Charles II at Worcester. Despite being 'closely watched' because he had rendered himself 'so obnoxious' to parliament by his royalism, he was rumoured to have been part of a plot to assassinate Cromwell.85 When Charles II returned to England at the Restoration in May 1660, Dorchester was among those who travelled to Dover to attend him upon his arrival and was shortly after sworn in to the new Privy Council. Dorset and Hertford were equally loyal to the crown.86 Although both belonged to the 'peace party' which fell out of the king's favour, they remained his loyal followers and in the days before the regicide they 'sent to the Councell of the Army to engage both their persons and estates that the King shall performe whatsoever he yields unto'.87

Along with the Duke of Richmond, and the Earls of Southampton and Lindsey, Hertford

82 See, for example, Howell's dedications to Dorset in his Epistolae Ho-Elianæ (London, 1650); and to Southampton in his A Fourth Volume of Familiar Letters (London, 1655).
86 For an account of Hertford and Dorset's royalism see D.L. Smith, Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649 (Cambridge, 2002).
87 Cited by Smith, Constitutional Royalism, p. 141.
remained with Charles during his trial, and on 8 February these four peers acted as pallbearers at the king's funeral at Windsor.\textsuperscript{88} Moseley published James Howell's elegy on Dorset together with his epithalamium on the marriage of Dorchester to Katherine Stanley.\textsuperscript{89} Whilst Howell mourns the passing of one royalist noble, he celebrates the union of two royalist dynasties which signals the possibility of the birth of another.

In Moseley's books noble dedicatees were celebrated for their scholarliness and for their patronage of the arts as well as for their royalism. Robert Gentilis claimed that his reason for dedicating his translation of Virgilio Malvezzi's \textit{Chief Events of the Monarchie of Spaine in the yeare 1639} (1647) to Dorset was the earl's love of learning, which was evinced by his 'daily favours continually flowing upon scholars'.\textsuperscript{90} Similarly, Robert Mossom dedicated his defence of the Anglican Church, \textit{Sion's Prospect}, to Dorchester because of the marquess's 'patronage'.\textsuperscript{91} Mossom also said that he dedicated the book to Dorchester because of his loyalty to the 'oak and the lawrel', emblems of the king and poetry, and because in the 'general maze of the Churches troubles' the marquess had shown himself to be 'the Clergy's Patron'.\textsuperscript{92} A number of Moseley's dedicatees sheltered members of the Anglican clergy through the troubles. William Towers dedicated his \textit{Atheismus Vapulans} to Lord Francis

\textsuperscript{88} D.L. Smith, 'Seymour, William, first marquess of Hertford and second duke of Somerset (1587-1660)', \textit{ODNB}.

\textsuperscript{89} J. Howell, \textit{Ah Ha; Tumulus, Thalamus: Two Counter-Poems, the First an Elegy on the Edward late Earl of Dorset; the Second, an Epithalamium to the Lord Marquess of Dorchester} (London, 1653), sig. B'.


\textsuperscript{92} Mossom, 'To the Right Honourable Henry, Marquess of Dorchester' in idem, \textit{Sion's Prospect}, sig *2. In May 1641 Dorchester also made two speeches in the House of Lords in which he insisted that the bishops place in the House was sanctioned by custom, antiquity and to serve the needs of the Church which were subsequently printed: H. Pierrrepont, \textit{Two speeches spoken in the house of the Lords, by the Lord Viscount Newarke. The first concerning the right of bishops to sit in Parliament, May 21, 1641. The second about the lawfulness and conveniency of their intermeddling in temporall affaires, May the 24th. following} (1641).
Newport, 'a Mercifull and ever-Friendly Lord, in such a stiff Age'. Newport had been a captain of the horse in the royalist army. Captured near Oswestry in late June 1644 he remained a prisoner until March 1648. After his release, he was an active royalist conspirator, and was arrested as such in June 1655. Towers was Newport's chaplain and addressed his dedicatory epistle, 'From my study (which your Lordship built) in Todington. Nov. 20. 1653'. He compared the present age of 'Thunder and Astonishment' to 'the former Halcion-daies of Peace'. His dedication to Newport summarises his highly political reasons for writing the book. His wished to express his outrage at the contemporary claim that there was no Power in the State, but, Originally in the People (which Opinion, how dangerous and disloyal it is even to Any Authority, in Any State, if the People have but a Will to Disobey, I leave to the Prudent Wisdome of those Several Authorities, to consider) no Power in the Church, even to Ordain Ministers, but Fundamentally in the People (which Opinion, if not how Destructive it is to all true Christianity, yet how Promoting it is, to the Sowing of Tares, in Christ's Field).

Robert Gentilis dedicated his translation of Malvezzi's *Considerations upon the Lives of Alcibiades and Coriolanus* of 1650 to Anne and Arabella, the daughters of the Earl of Strafford, whose 'excellencies', he said, had 'survived' their father's fate and were revived in their brother. Gentilis presented the book as a token of his 'gratful acknowledgement of the manifold obligations wherewith I am everlastingly tied to you'. In a dedication to William, the second Earl of Strafford, Gentilis praised the Wentworth family for giving 'shelter to

---

93 W. Towers, ‘To the Right Honourable, the Lord Newport, Lord of High Ercall, his singular good Lord, the Author dedicates the Book and Himself, and implores his Honourable Protection upon both’, in idem, *Atheismus Vapulans, or, A Treatise against Atheism, Rationally Confuting the Atheists of these Times* (London, 1654), sig. A2v.
96 Ibid., n.p.
97 Ibid., n.p.
Certainly, Sir Richard Fanshawe was sheltered by the family from 1652 to 1653. Fanshawe had been arrested after the Battle of Worcester in September 1651, imprisoned in Whitehall and questioned by the Council of State. Cromwell arranged for his release in November due to his poor health and on bail of £4,000. It was after his release that Fanshawe sheltered at the Wentworths' home at Tankersly in Yorkshire, and it was whilst here that he translated Luis de Camoes *The Lusiad* which Moseley published in 1655.

There is evidence that Moseley may have had some influence over the choice of dedicatees. James Shirley dedicated his *Poems* to Bernard Hyde, a lawyer from Middle Temple, in the hope that he might make himself 'more known' to him. That Moseley left twenty shillings each to Bernard, John and Humphrey Hyde in his will indicates that he might have suggested the dedication. In 1653 Moseley dedicated a translation of Madelaine de Scudery's prose romance *Artamenes, or the Grand Cyrus* to Lady Anne Lucas, wife of Sir John Lucas, a notable royalist whose brother was the martyred Sir Charles Lucas. Moseley's familiarity with his dedicatee indicates – or at least gives the impression – that the two were known to one another. There is one further dedication which exemplifies Moseley's editorial control. In 1652 John Donne's *Essayes* were published through the stationer Richard Marriott with a dedication to the republican Sir Harry Vane. On 7 March 1653 the rights were transferred to Moseley who cancelled the dedication, combined the work with Donne's *Juvenilia*, retitled the volume as *Paradoxes, Problems, Essayes, Characters* and dedicated it instead to the


100 *Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe*, p. 110.


royalist Lord Newport.\textsuperscript{104}

\textbf{Moseley the Royalist Canon Maker}

From 1645 to 1661 literary works formed the core of Moseley's business. The catalogues which appeared in the back of his books from 1650 onwards advertise not only the books to be found in his shop, but himself as a skilled publisher with well-stocked shelves. By 1659 he looked back over his career congratulating himself for having for many years 'annually published the Productions of the best Wits of our own, and Foreign Nations'.\textsuperscript{105} No other publisher could claim a greater number of poets in their catalogue than Moseley who led the way for Henry Herringman, Pepys's favourite bookseller, and even Jacob Tonson, perhaps the most famous literary publisher of the early modern period, to follow.\textsuperscript{106} It has been noted that amid his publishing activities there are signs that Moseley was not simply capitalizing on current literary taste, but was helping to shape it.\textsuperscript{107} From 1645 he published books by famous poets including Edmund Waller, James Shirley, Sir John Suckling, William Davenant, Sir John Denham, John Milton, Richard Crashaw, Abraham Cowley, Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Sir Richard Fanshawe, Henry Vaughan, Thomas Carew and William Cartwright. In addition, Moseley regularly bought up literary works from other publishers so that by the time of the Restoration he owned the copyright to most extant dramatic works.\textsuperscript{108}

In his prefaces Moseley establishes himself as a purveyor of fine literature. He congratulates himself for transferring poetry from the closed manuscript culture, from 'hands amongst

\textsuperscript{104} TRCS, i, p. 412.
\textsuperscript{105} H. Moseley, 'To the Reader', in J. Suckling, The Last Remains of Sir John Suckling. Being a Full Collection of all his Poems and Letters (London, 1659), sig A3'.
\textsuperscript{106} Moseley's left Herringman twenty shillings in his will to purchase a mourning ring: TNA, PROB 11/303/623.
\textsuperscript{108} TRCS, i, pp. 245, 250, 256, 417 & 436-7; and ibid., ii, pp. 168, 195, 206 & 227.
persons of the best quality' to 'the world'. Asserting his faithfulness to an author's original copy he demonstrates his integrity, while at the same time indicating that he has access to sources within royalist coteries. His 1648 edition of Suckling's *Fragmenta Aurea*, for example, was, according to the title-page, 'published by a friend to perpetuate his memory' and was 'printed by his owne Copies'. Presenting himself as a medium for poetic exchange and circulation, he wrote that he would 'doe a service by this publication'. He excused himself for publishing Cowley's *The Mistress* without the author's knowledge or permission on the grounds that the poet would 'gaine reputation' by it and his country would 'receive delight'. Prospero-like Moseley instructs his readers to 'Admire his [Sucking's] wit ... while I withdraw into a shade, and contemplate who must follow'.

The odd men out in Moseley's list of secular writers are John Milton and the political casuist Anthony Ascham. Ascham is now known as a 'non-republican supporter of the Commonwealth' who wrote *A Discourse: Wherein is examined, What is particularly Lawfull during the Confusions and Revolutions of Government* which was published by Moseley in July 1648, and a second edition titled *Of the Confusions and Revolutions of Government* which extended his *A Discourse* by nine new chapters. This extended version was published anonymously in 1649. In 1649 Ascham also wrote his vindication of the Commonwealth government, *The Bounds and Bonds of Publique Obedience*, which was published by the parliamentarian publisher John Wright. The political circumstances into

109 H. Moseley, 'An Advertisement to the Reader', in *Poems &c Written by Mr Ed. Waller of Beckonsfield; lately a Member of the Honourable House of Commons* (London, 1645).
110 The copy for John Denham's *Cooper's Hill*, for example, is from 'his owne papers': 'To the reader' in J. Denham, *Coopers Hill* (London, 1655), sig. A2'; also Suckling's *Remaines* come from a 'faithful Transcript from his own handwriting': Suckling *Last Remains* (London, 1659), sig. a2v.
112 Ibid., sig. A2v.
which these three books were written and published could hardly differ more. John Wallace has indicated the importance of reading Ascham's *Discourse* in the context of its publication date of July 1648, but we should also consider the context within which the text was written and registered. In the first six months of 1648 when Ascham wrote his *Discourse* few, if any, anticipated a settlement that did not include Charles I as monarch. Moseley registered the book on 23 April 1648 – before the outbreak of the second civil war. In his Preface Ascham reveals his distaste for the 'cholericknesse of war' and his intention to 'shew how we may weather out such stormes'. Given this context, Moseley may have become involved in the publication of Ascham's *Discourse* because of its anti-war sentiments. There are two impressions of Ascham's *Discourse* which are identical except that Moseley's appears on the title-page of only one. It is possible that in light of the turn of events, he came to regret or even withdrew his involvement in this publication.

Critics disagree over how strongly or consistently Puritan and radical a figure Milton was before 1640, but it is safe to say that he was not a royalist in 1645. Milton's biographers have for many years asked why he chose that year to publish his first volume of poetry. Thomas Corns has observed that having engaged in extended polemical debates in his tracts on

---


117 A. Ascham, *A Discourse: Wherein is examined, What is particularly lawful during the Confusions and Revolutions of Government. Or How farre a man may lawfully conforme to the Power and Commands of those who with various successes hold kingdomes divided by Civill or Forreigne Warres* (London, 1648), Preface, n.p.

118 Dedications in Moseley's books to members of the royalist 'peace party' such as Dorset, Southampton and Hertford suggest that he preferred negotiation and compromise to further bloodshed. For dedications to members of the peace party see above p. 33 & below p. 72. Marco Barducci has noted that Ascham's *A Discourse* serves 'as a reminder of Ascham's moderation and capacity to appeal to a both a Presbyterian and royalist audience': M. Barducci, *Order and Conflict: Anthony Ascham and English Political Thought, 1648-50* (Manchester, 2015), p. 40, n. 14.

episcopacy, education, censorship, and divorce in the early 1640s, Milton may have published his poems as a means to renew his respectability.\textsuperscript{120} There has also been some debate as to whether the decision to publish was solely Milton's and over who had control over the book's production.\textsuperscript{121} The prevailing opinion is that Milton had the greater say over the material production of his \textit{Poems}.\textsuperscript{122} I suggest, rather, that the two men had an equal say over the prefatory material. As we have already seen, after an author's death a publisher had the freedom to present a book – and its author – as he saw fit. Even if the author were living, like Milton, the absence of copyright laws in this period meant that writers had little control over their work once their manuscript passed out of their hands. However, this does not necessarily mean that a bookseller in possession of a manuscript paid no respect to its author's wishes. It simply means that the framework which guided the publisher was moral and economic rather than legal. If a bookseller offended a writer, or a dead writer's executors, his reputation might suffer and he could as a consequence be denied access to further manuscripts.

The paratextual material that surrounds Milton's \textit{Poems} gives interesting clues about the negotiations which took place between a publisher and an author in possession of a manuscript. Moseley claimed to have been the catalyst in the process of getting Milton's poems into print by soliciting the poet's papers from him.\textsuperscript{123} Whether this is true or not, the prefatory content highlights Moseley's skills in manipulating title-page material when he worked with a writer who did not share his political views. We can see in retrospect that he set Milton's book amongst a gallery of courtly poets, Waller, Suckling and Carew, by using

\textsuperscript{120} A suggestion made by Corns in his 'Milton's Quest for Respectability', \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{122} The exception is Dubranski, in ibid, pp. 85 & 91.
\textsuperscript{123} H. Moseley, 'The Stationer to the Reader', in \textit{Poems of Mr. John Milton, Both English and Latin, Compos'd as several times. Printed by his true Copies. The songs were set in musick by Mr. Henry Lawes Gentleman of the Kings Chappel and one of His Majesties Private Musick} (London, 1645), sig. a4\textsuperscript{r}.
the identical layout for each title-page. Milton may not have known what his publisher's intentions were. When he published Milton's *Poems*, Moseley had only used the same format on the title-page to his edition of Waller's *Poems* (1645). But he would repeat it in his 1646 edition of Suckling's *Fragmenta Aurea*, his 1651 edition of William Cartwright's *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies with other Poems*, and Thomas Carew's *Poems with a Maske* which has the sonorous title page: *Poems. With a Maske, by Thomas Carew Esq; One of the Gent. of the privie-Chamber, and sewer in Ordinary to His late Majesty. The songs were set in Musick by Mr. Henry Lawes Gent: of the Kings Chappell, and one of his late Majesties Private Musick.* Charles I is mentioned twice and, as in Milton's book, Henry Lawes's connection to the king is emphasized. This repeated patterning of the title-pages tilt the volumes towards Moseley's 'distinctly court-oriented readership' and can be viewed as part of a deliberate strategy to associate each text, and its author, with the Caroline court.¹²⁴

Moseley's prefatory encomium to Milton's *Poems* associates the poet's work with his recently published 'choice pceces' of the royalist Waller, whom parliament had banished for his complicity in the conspiracy which took place in the spring of 1643 that came to be known as the 'Waller plot'. Waller's readiness to speak out against parliament had won him a great reputation amongst royalists in 1642. Although this reputation was tarnished when he surrendered the names of his fellow conspirators,¹²⁵ Clarendon still remembered him as 'the boldest champion the Crown had' at that time in the two Houses.¹²⁶ When he published Waller's poems, Moseley arranged the collection so that the poet would be remembered as the 'champion' of the royalist cause that Clarendon later recalled. The poems placed at the beginning of the book are political statements from a royalist perspective. The book opens

with the poem ‘Upon his Majesties Repairing of Pauls’ (1635) which countered the Puritan attacks on Laudian innovation by presenting Charles I as moderate reformer of religion with a 'grand design / To frame no new Church but the old refine'. After this comes ‘To the King on his Navy’ (1636), which celebrates the king's policy of ship-building, a policy that had resulted in the highly unpopular ship-money tax which Waller avoids any mention of.

In his preface to the Poems, Moseley invites us to see Milton as a learned poet, one with a command of several languages and the resources of high culture which, since the days of Baldassare Castiglione's The Book of the Courtier, had been associated with court poets. In the corners of the frontispiece portrait are the Muses of elegy, tragedy, history and divine poetry. These advertise the generic range of the book and by doing so distinguish Milton from Puritan plain-style poets like George Wither. Moseley said that Milton's poems were published not for profit, but for his 'love' for the English language, which had made him 'diligent to collect and set forth such peeces both in Prose and Vers, as may renew the wonted honour and esteem of our English tongue'. The assumption, common in the renaissance, that the arts formed part of a properly constituted state looms large in Moseley's preface. It had been a standard element of the Astraea myth that justice, knowledge and reason returned in the golden age, the age with which James and Charles Stuart identified themselves when they took Augustus, the great patron of literature, as their model. Some years later, in his preface to Henry Vaughan's Olor Iscanus Moseley went as far as to align himself with the

---

127 E. Waller, Poems & c. Written by Mr. Ed. Waller of Beckonsfield, Esquire, lately a Member of the Honourable House of Commons. All the Lyric Poems in this Booke were set by Mr Henry Lawes Gent. of the King's Chappell, and one of His Majesties Private Musick (1645), sig. B2v.
128 Ibid., sig. B1v.
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great roman emperor who had saved Virgil's *Aeneid* from the fire: 'I am not Reader Augustux videx: Here is no Royall Rescue', but the rescue was nevertheless analogous to that of Augustus since Moseley had saved the poems from 'oblivion' when Vaughan had decided to 'fire his own House'.

Milton's *Poems* came with 'the highest Commendations and Applause of the Learnedest Academicks both domestick and forrein' including: Henry Lawes; the ambassador and provost of Eton, Henry Wootton; the Italian poet, Antonio Francini; and the Italian statesman, soldier, author, and literary patron Giovanni Battista Manso. These commendations from learned friends congratulate Milton as a humanist and accomplished scholar. Small wonder that Milton and Moseley were to some degree both satisfied by this image. Milton's respectability was rejuvenated; and Moseley through his frontispiece, title-page and prefatory material shackled the learned poet to the court and the king. It seems, then, that the two men, to some degree, agreed on how Milton was to be represented albeit for conflicting reasons. Milton sought to present himself as a learned poet to transcend the politics and polemic that he had seemingly left behind. Moseley, conversely, bound poetry and politics together by portraying Milton as a scholar and poet whose dedication to literary culture was a product of his royalist associations. It was just this kind of yoking together of art and politics that Milton would rail against just a few years later in his *Eikonoklastes*. Although at the time the *Poems* had served Milton's purpose in renewing his respectability, he perhaps later regretted that he had come to be associated with Moseley's courtly poets and had thereby helped to associate art and learning with royalism. Moseley did not publish any more of Milton's books which indicates that the poet was not entirely happy with the outcome of their dealings.

The Royalist Appropriation of Literature

Derek Hirst has pointed out that the royalist bid to appropriate the English canon, and learning and the arts generally, was more than just an attempt to create a partisan monopoly: it was intended to question the legitimacy of parliamentary rule.\(^{134}\) We can see an attempt to portray parliamentarians as witless Philistines in Moseley's books. For example, the author of the sixth edition of *The Academy of Complements* (1645) added an epistle to the reader in which he lamented that 'in these times Wit is a rare commodity'.\(^{135}\) Elsewhere, in a dedication that is included purely for polemical purposes, John Donne junior complained that since the beginning of the war his study in London had been searched on numerous occasions, and all of his books had been 'sequestred, for the use of the committee'.\(^{136}\) He asked for protection from two monsters: 'Men that cannot write, and Men that cannot reade'.\(^{137}\) In Moseley's own preface to Sir John Suckling's *Fragmenta Aurea* in 1646, he presents the dead poet as a symbol of art and learning. The very title suggests that the collection represents the broken remnants of a golden age. Suckling's name is portrayed as being synonymous with 'Art and Honour' and Moseley deemed that without these attributes no man could be 'qualified a Competent Judge'.\(^{138}\) He leads the reader to see a logical progression from literary culture, to honour, and finally to good judgment, and by implication, he questioned the legitimacy of the current parliamentary government.

One of the key literary forms to be appropriated by royalists was the elegy. After the regicide the elegy became a vehicle for mourning both the loss of the king, and the loss of a royalist

---

135 Anon, 'The Authors Epistle to the new Edition', in *The Academy of Complements Wherein Ladies, Gentlewomen, Schollers, and strangers may accommodate their Courtly practice with gentle Ceremonies, Complementall amorous high expressions and forms of speaking or writing of Letters most in fashion* (London, 1645), n.p.
136 J. Donne, 'To the Right Honourable Phillip Harbert', in J. Donne, *Biathonatos: A Declaration of that Paradox, or Thesis that Self-Homicide is not so Naturally Sin, that it may never by Otherwise* (London, 1648), n.p.
137 Ibid. n.p.
culture. Moseley published three books which contained elegies that mourned royalist friends and their royalist values. In 1650 he published a book of poetry by the royalist poet Robert Heath who had followed Charles I to Oxford in 1642. It is probable that Heath fled abroad, for Moseley published the book 'without his knowledge'. In Heath's elegies men lost in the royalist cause are symbolic of the loss to art, culture and social hierarchy. The subjects of his poems are often poets and musicians cut down by an uncultured parliamentary force. Perhaps alluding to the paean to hierarchy by Shakespeare's Ulysses: 'untune that string, / And hark what discord follows', Heath rails at 'Such untun'd souls, who discord lov'd too well' and by whose 'discords we have lost our harmony'. In an elegy to William Lawes, the younger brother of Henry Lawes, also a royalist, instrumentalist, and composer, Heath puns on the family name, 'But e'r sin' / Our Lawes expir'd, this Common-wealth hath bin / Quite out of tune'. The pun offered an irresistible opportunity to critique the lack of legitimacy of the Commonwealth government which royalists claimed had no respect for art, hierarchy, and law.

As a verse form the elegy offered royalists a suitable vehicle for voicing their losses both personally and politically. In his elegies Heath moved beyond personal grief to political despair. In his 'Upon the death of my dear friend T.S. Esquire, slain at the first fight at Newbery, 1645', he wrote 'Pale ghost! I weep not 'cause thy precious blood / Honour'd when spilt, a cause so just, so good'. His subject 'nobly thus did seek an early grave, / Because he scorn'd to live a subjects slave'.

---

139 These are R. Heath, Clarastella; Together with Poems Occasional, Elegies, Epigrams, Satyrs (London, 1650); Vaughan, Olor Isacanus; and J. Collop, Poesis Rediviva: or Poesie Reviv'd (London, 1655).
141 W. Shakespeare, Troilus and Cressida, ed. D. Bevington (London, 2006), 1.3.107; R. Heath, 'On the Death of that most famous Musician Mr. W. Lawes, slain in this unhappy Civil Warr', and 'On the losse of Mr. N.W. his three fingers cut off at the battel of Edgehil, he being a poet and a Musitian', in idem, Elegies, Clarastella, pp. 3 & 9.
142 R. Heath, 'On the Death of ... Mr. W. Lawes', in ibid., p. 9.
143 R. Heath, 'Upon the death of my dear friend T.S. Esquire, slain at the first fight at Newbery, 1645', in ibid., p. 4.
poets in Henry Vaughan's *Olor Iscanus* is an elegy to Charles I's second daughter, Princess Elizabeth. The young princess was said to have never recovered from the execution of her father, and died in captivity in Carisbrooke Castle in September 1650. She had become a symbol for royalists of parliament's brutal disregard for royal blood. In April 1649 the poet John Quarles dedicated his *Regale lectum miseriae* to her. He praised ‘that patronesse of Vertue … the sorrowfull daughter to our late martyr'd Soveraigne’.\(^{144}\) Vaughan contrasts her fragility with the violence of the opposition. She was 'A flowre of purpose sprung to bow / To headless tempests, and the rage, / of an incensed, Stormie Age'.\(^ {145}\) A more elaborate panegyric to the princess had appeared before her death in Christopher Wase's translation of Sophocles' *Electra*. An anonymous friend of the translator, one H. P., added some verses criticizing what he considered to be her unworthy treatment. All the muses, he said, bow 'Low as their [parliament's] arrogance is bold and high, / Who have enacted, that the Hat and Knee / The Hinge of Honour be forgot to thee'.\(^ {146}\) Wase suggested that the princess was a symbol of the tragedy which he translated in her honour. Plays, he said

> are the Mirrors wherein Mens actions are reflected to their own view. Which perhaps is the true cause, that some, privy to the ugliness of their own guilt, have issued out warrants, for the breaking of all those looking-glasses; lest their deformities recoil, and become an eye-sore to themselves.\(^ {147}\)

The existence of one of Moseley's catalogues at the back of copies of Wase's translation indicates that if he was not involved in the publication of *Electra*, he was selling it.

One of the largest collections of elegies was the *Lachrymae Musarum* which was published

\(^{144}\) J. Quarles, *Regale lectum miseriae* (London, 1649), sig. A2'.
\(^{145}\) H. Vaughan, 'An Epitaph upon the Lady Elizabeth, Second Daughter to his late Majestie', in idem, *Olor Iscanus*, p. 29.
\(^{146}\) H.P., 'To the Most Excellent Princesse the Lady Elizabeth, On my Friends Dedication of *Electra*', in *Electra of Sophocles: Presented to her Highnesse the Lady Elizabeth; With an Epilogue Shewing the Parallell in two Poems, The Return and the Restauration*, trans. C. Wase (The Hague, 1649).
\(^{147}\) C. Wase, 'To the Most High and Most Vertuous Princesse the Lady Elizabeth', in *ibid.*, sig. 2'.
in response to the death of the young royalist Lord Henry Hastings. Richard Brome, the editor, gathered almost every living poet except Milton and George Wither to mourn Hastings, a royalist nobleman, and thereby equated royalism with high culture. James Howell's elegy to the royalist Earl of Dorset, which Moseley published in 1653 and again in 1655, mourns the passing of the earl and through synecdoche the abolition of the House of Lords:

Lords have been long declining (we well know)  
And making their last Testament; but now  
They are defunct, they are extinguish'd all,  
And never like to rise by this Lord's fall:  
A Lords whose Intellectuals alone  
Might make a House of Peers and prop a Throne,  
Had not so dire a Fate hung o'er the Crown,  
That Privilege Prerogative should drown.

Howell's elegy on Dorset is not just a personal elegy, but an elegy for a lost institution. The number of elegies to royalists with their polemic undertones that appear in Moseley's books highlights his involvement in establishing this verse form as a peculiarly royalist one.

In this chapter I have examined the extent to which Moseley manipulated prefatory material for political purposes. He was not a politically neutral publisher concerned merely with his profit margin. Book prices, at this time, were largely determined by the quantity of paper used to produce the work. Since many of Moseley's books were published in folio, or contained many pages, they were more expensive to print than pamphlets and therefore probably more difficult to sell. By his own admission, 'the slightest pamphlet' was 'more

---

150 Howell, Ah, Ha: Tumulus; and his Epistolae Ho-Eliane (1655), book iv, pp. 116-17.
152 F.R. Johnson, 'Notes on English Retail Book-Prices, 1550-1640', The Library, 2 (1650), pp. 84, 89 & 92.
vendible than the Works of learnedest men. Moseley was driven by a combination of his desire for profit and his political and religious concerns. It is evident from his prefaces that he was a traditionalist who supported the monarchy and the Anglican Church. He directed his readership to align literary culture with royalism. His writers, commendatory poets and dedicatees were largely Anglicans and royalist. It was he who determined, to a large extent, how these men were represented and how their texts were read. Moseley was a canon-maker, but more than this he established a canon which consisted of royalist literature that has had far-reaching repercussions. His efforts to cast parliament as ignorant and unscrupulous destroyers of learning, and royalists as the defenders of scholarliness and literature has promoted an alignment of high literary culture with royalism in this period which remains to this day.

153 Humphrey Moseley, 'The Stationer to the Reader', in Milton, Poems, sig. a3'.
Chapter Two

James Howell and the Politics of Intertextuality

James Howell was Humphrey Moseley's most prolific and popular writer. He was also the most blatantly royalist. During the course of his literary career Howell wrote poems, histories, dialogues, allegories, fables, dictionaries, letters, a travel guide and a survey of London. His Victorian editor, Joseph Jacobs, calculated that no work of prose literature other than Bacon's *Essays*, Browne's *Religio Medici*, and Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* showed such continued popularity in the seventeenth century as Howell's four volumes of familiar letters, the *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ*. Although he is most famous for his collections of familiar letters, Howell also wrote political pamphlets in support of Charles I until September 1649, when the new Commonwealth government issued its 'Act against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books and Pamphlets' to combat the royalist press. In the same month Howell published his last royalist pamphlet for five years. In this chapter I argue that not to be defeated by the parliamentary censorship, Howell instead used literary works to continue to support the king. I show that in 1650 he took sentences, paragraphs and complete pages from his political works to continue his support of the king.  


2 The most useful catalogues of Howell's works remains that in Jacobs, 'Introduction', pp. lxxiii-cii; and Wing, ii, pp. 267-9.  

3 Jacobs, 'Introduction' in *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ*, i, p. lxvi. The four titles are: *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ, Familiar Letters Domestic and Forren* (London, 1645); *A new Volume of Letters* (1647); *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ, Familiar Letters Domestic and Forren* (London, 1650); *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ, Familiar Letters Domestic and Forren* (London, 1655). For ease of reference I refer to them all as *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* together with the year of publication and page references.  

4 Firth and Rait, ii, pp. 245-54.
pamphlets of the 1640s and interpolated them into a literary work, his historical allegory

*Dendrologia: Dodona's Grove the Second Part.* The chapter begins with an assessment of

Howell's life and career. I then review his royalist pamphlets and Moseley's involvement in

their publication. Finally, I examine the way in which Howell used his *Dodona's Grove* to

continue to press the case for the Crown.

**Howell's Royalism**

James Howell was born in 1593 in Carmarthenshire. He was educated at Hereford Grammar

School and then in Oxford, at Jesus College. After leaving Jesus College he had a variety of

employments often combining the roles of secretary and tutor to noble families. Five years

touring the Continent between 1617 and 1630 gave Howell the perspective of a 'true

Cosmopolite', and in his writing he often viewed events through a European lens. The

languages that he learned or honed during his travels served him well and enabled him to

secure several missions abroad, some on behalf of the government. At the beginning of 1623,

he undertook a mission to Spain to recover a merchant ship on behalf of the Levant company.

In 1632 he acted as secretary to, and orator for, the Earl of Leicester on an embassy to

Denmark; and in 1633 he carried out a 'flying journey as far as Orleans' at the 'request of Mr.

Secretary Windebank', who was at the time the Secretary of State. In between his missions

abroad Howell acted as secretary to some notable figures. In 1626 he became secretary to

Lord Scrope, the then Lord President of the Council of the North, who was soon to become

---

5 The first and second parts both have the title *Dendrologia Dodona's Grove* (published in 1640, 1644, 1645, 1649 and 1650) I shall refer to the first part (which was published in 1640, 1644, 1645 and 1649) as *Dendrologia* and the second part (which was published in 1650) as *Dodona's Grove* to avoid confusion.


7 Ibid., section vi, p. 90. For accounts of his tours of Europe see Howell, *Epistolæ* (1645), section i, p. 46 and ibid., section ii, p. 15. The works in which events are viewed from a European perspective are his *True Informer* (1643), *Discourse or Parley* (1643), *A Venice Looking Glass* (1649), and *Dodona's Grove* (1650).


9 Howell, ibid., section v, p. 44; and section vi, pp. 2-15; Howell's diary of the embassy can be found in Bodleian MS Rawlinson C, 354, fols. 1–43; and the Earl of Leicester's letters relating to the trip and Howell's part in it are printed in *HMC De L'Isle and Dudley MS, VI 1626-1698*, pp. 18, 20 & 26.

the Earl of Sunderland.\(^{11}\) In 1628 Sunderland 'procured' Howell's election as a Member of Parliament for Richmond in Yorkshire, but the dissolution of parliament on 10 March 1629 and the death of Sunderland in the following year saw the end of Howell's parliamentary career.\(^{12}\) Between 1635 and 1636 he penned letters giving the latest news in London to Thomas Wentworth who was then serving as Lord Deputy in Ireland,\(^{13}\) and a letter dated 15 February 1635 survives which shows that he acted as secretary to Henrietta Maria on at least one occasion.\(^{14}\)

Howell's long-term ambition was to gain a post as clerk in one of the king's councils.\(^{15}\) Over the years he made several contacts within those councils: with Sir Edward Walker, extraordinary clerk of the Council of War for Charles I, and clerk to the Privy Council of Charles II from 1649;\(^{16}\) and Sir Edward Nicholas, clerk to the Privy Council from 1635 to 1641, and from 1641 to 1662 Secretary of State.\(^{17}\) He was friends with Sir Philip Warwick, a secretary to the Lord Treasurer, William Juxon. From 1647 Warwick served Charles I in a secretarial capacity at Hampton Court and Carisbrooke.\(^{18}\) As Paul Seaward has noted, Howell may have also known Edward Hyde, later Earl of Clarendon, from the 1630s through their mutual friends Ben Jonson and Sir Kenelm Digby.\(^{19}\) Howell wrote a letter to Clarendon at the

\(^{11}\) Howell, *Epistolæ* (1645), section iv, p. 35.


\(^{14}\) Ibid., i, p. 515.

\(^{15}\) See for example Howell's letter to Sir Philip Mainwaring in which he wrote of his hope to succeed Sir Edward Nicholas as clerk to the Privy Council when Nicholas became Secretary of State in November 1641: Howell, *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (London, 1645), p. 82. According the antiquary Anthony Wood during the 1630s Howell had 'severall beneficiall employments particularly assisting the clerks of the council'. See A. Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, 4 vols., ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1813-20), iii, p. 744.


\(^{17}\) *Acts of the Privy Council, 1627*, p. 287; *CSPD, 1635*, p. 420; *CSPD, 1641-3*, p. 185; S.A. Baron, 'Nicholas, Sir Edward (1593-1669)', *ODNB*.

\(^{18}\) *CSPD, 1640*, p.45; D.L. Smith 'Warwick, Sir Philip (1609-1683)', *ODNB*.

Restoration in which he claimed that the earl had promised him 'the contribution of [his] favour', which confirms some prior contact between the two.\textsuperscript{20}

Eight days after the Royal Standard was raised at Nottingham on 22 August 1642, Howell's ambitions were finally realised when he was sworn in as an extraordinary clerk of the Council of Charles I.\textsuperscript{21} Two months later, he travelled to London 'upon his Majesties affairs', but was arrested and imprisoned in the Fleet.\textsuperscript{22} Some doubt as to the reason for his arrest remains to this day.\textsuperscript{23} Whilst at the Restoration Howell insisted that he had been arrested for his royalism, the antiquarian Anthony Wood claimed that it was because the writer had run into 'much debt'.\textsuperscript{24} Wood, however, is not always reliable, and may have come to this conclusion simply because the Fleet was well-known as a debtors' prison. However, men were incarcerated there for a variety of offences. During the 1630s, the Presbyterian lawyer William Prynne and the future Leveller leader John Lilburne both spent time in the Fleet on the charge of sedition;\textsuperscript{25} and in the 1640s parliament used the prison for royalists, or delinquents as it termed them.\textsuperscript{26}

Sir John Digby, for example, brother of Sir Kenelm Digby and a notorious royalist, was imprisoned in the Fleet less than two weeks after Howell.\textsuperscript{27} The royalist publisher Richard Royston was an inmate as a result of his publishing activities;\textsuperscript{28} and Marchamont Nedham, author of the parliamentarian newsbook \textit{Mercurius Britannicus}, was committed to the prison for two weeks in 1646 by parliament for labelling Charles I a tyrant.\textsuperscript{29} On balance, it seems

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Undated letter from James Howell to Clarendon, TNA, SP 29/39 f. 132.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Privy Council Register, xii, p. 213.
\item \textsuperscript{22} TNA, SP 29/1 f. 196: letter from James Howell to Charles II dated May 1660.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Jacobs believed that he was arrested for his royalism: Jacobs, 'introduction' in Howell, \textit{Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ}, p. xliii, while Daniel Woolf thinks that he was arrested because of insolvency, see Woolf, 'Conscience, Constancy and Ambition', p. 256.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Wood, \textit{Athenæ}, iii, p. 744.
\item \textsuperscript{26} For example, CSPD, 1641-3, pp. 51, 55 & 506; CJ, ii, pp. 673, 701 & 916; LJ, iv, pp. 221, 559, 570 & 615.
\item \textsuperscript{28} See below Chapter 7, pp. 205.
\item \textsuperscript{29} LJ, iv, p. 861; J. Raymond, 'Nedham, Marchamont (bap. 1620, d.1678)', \textit{ODNB}.
\end{itemize}
most likely that Howell was arrested as a royalist. At the Restoration he said that he was arrested 'under the notion of [being] a dangerous person by the Long Parliament'.

Whilst the *Journal of the House of Commons* states no reason for Howell's imprisonment, Prynne observed that the writer was arrested because he had fallen 'heavily under the displeasure of the highest Court of parliament'. Friends in the Commons had informed him that Howell had 'abilities' and connections with 'malignants' which might lead him to do 'much mischief, and very ill offices against this parliament, if not restrained'. And restrained he was, for Howell remained in the Fleet from November 1642 until some time between the end of 1650 and early 1651.

No official records concerning Howell's release have been traced, but he may have been freed on terms similar to those of the royalists Sir Richard Fanshawe and Abraham Cowley, both of whom were imprisoned and then released on the proviso that they would no longer write texts that were derogatory to the government. Marchamont Nedham had written for parliament until 1647 when he was solicited to write for the king. After the regicide he switched sides again having been persuaded, either by his conscience, or by someone within the government, to write for the Commonwealth. Jason McElligott has suggested that the fledgeling Commonwealth government thought it better to combat the royalist press by persuading those responsible for it to come to terms with the regime rather than to make martyrs of them. It is possible that like Nedham, Howell agreed to use his writing skills for the Commonwealth.

Whatever the terms of his release, it seems that some sort of an accommodation was reached, although there is reason to believe that this was not a happy alliance. In 1651 the Council of

---

30 CSPD, 1660-1661, p. 12.
32 Ibid., p. 2.
33 TNA, SP 29/1 f. 196 letter from James Howell to Charles II dated May 1660.
State employed him to translate an account of the Spanish proceedings in the case of the assassination of Anthony Ascham in Madrid. In the same year he published his *Survay of the Signorie of Venice* which he dedicated to the Rump, and in 1655 he dedicated his *Som Sober Inspections* to Cromwell. After the Restoration, the royalist pamphleteer and licenser of the press Roger L'Estrange quipped that Howell had been 'a perfect Cavalier', 'a perfect republican' and a 'perfect Protectorian'. But reading beyond Howell's dedications, L'Estrange's epithets prove unfounded. Howell's *Som Sober Inspections* is both an attack on parliament and a defence of Charles I; and in 1655 Howell claimed in his *Epistolæ Ho-Elianae* that his *Survay of the Signorie of Venice* contained 'not a syllable therein but what makes for Monarchy'. He argued that in the *Survay* he had written with the 'verity and indifference' required of a historian, and objected to any accusation that he had 'chang'd his principles, and [was] affected to Republiques'. At the Restoration Howell was one of the most assiduous applicants for royal favour. He wrote directly to Charles II in May 1660 to press for the resumption of his post of clerk of the Privy Council. In this letter he claimed that he had remained under bail for seven years following his release from the Fleet, during which time he had been plundered three times to his 'utter undoing'. His pleadings eventually paid off, for sometime during 1661 he was appointed 'historiographer royal', a post which was created for him and for which he received a royal bounty of £100 plus a pension of £200 per year. He spent the remaining five years of his life writing short tracts in support of the new Caroline regime.

37 R. L'Estrange, 'Notes upon Mr. Howell', in idem., *A Modest Plea* (1662), n.p.
40 TNA, SP 29/1 f. 196 letter from James Howell to Charles II dated May 1660. He wrote a second letter to the king in September: TNA, SP 29/17 f.9.
41 *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1660-7*, pp. 363 & 457.
Royalist Pamphleteering

It is difficult to establish with any certainty the nature of the relationship between Moseley and Howell: whether it was equal and collaborative, or whether Howell was Moseley's hack as has been suggested.\(^{43}\) From the beginning of his career until his release from the Fleet, Moseley was the only bookseller whose name appears on Howell's title pages;\(^{44}\) and Howell wrote more books and more commendatory poems than any other writer in Moseley's catalogue.\(^{45}\) These commendatory poems may have been volunteered by the writer, or they may have been commissioned by the bookseller. Moseley was an assiduous collector of prefatory verses for some of his books: Warren Chernaik has pointed out that he seems to have approached every poet who passed through London for commendatory poems for his edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* of 1647.\(^{46}\) From 1650, possibly coinciding with his release from the Fleet, other publishers' names begin to appear on the title-pages of Howell's books.\(^{47}\) Even so, Moseley continued to publish Howell's work and advertised his other books in his own catalogues. That Howell personally sent numerous copies of his works to friends and patrons suggests either that he retained some autonomy or ownership of his texts, or that Moseley paid him with books in addition to or even instead of money which was common practice at the time.\(^{48}\) Whichever explanation is correct, the longevity of their business relationship suggests that it was a happy and collaborative one. In Howell, Moseley found a writer who served the royalist cause, and in Moseley Howell found

---

44 Some pamphlets do not have the name of author, printer, or stationer on the title-page, and some bear the name of a printer only, but no other stationer is named until 1650 when Howell published a French-English Dictionary together with Randle Cotgrave. See *A French-English Dictionary: compil'd by Mr Randle Cotgrave: with another in English and French. Whereunto are newly added the animadversions and supplements, &c. of James Howell Esquire* (1650).
45 For example the two catalogues at the back of Howell's translation of Mazella's *Parthenopoeia, or, The History of the Most Noble and Renowned Kingdom of Naples*, trans. J. Howell (1654), Wing ref. M1542 and *Epistola Ho-Eliana*, Wing ref. H3073.
47 For example, Richard Lowndes, Henry Seile, Henry Herringman, Nathaniel Brook, Cornelius Bee, Samuel Thomson, Thomas Leach, John Streater, Henry Twiford, George Sawbridge, John Place, Abel Roper, and Thomas Dring. None of these published Howell's individual titles with Moseley's regularity. See Wing, ii, pp. 267-9.
a publisher who had a customer base eager to purchase his royalist texts. A quick glance at the number of Howell's works in the Short Title Catalogue shows what a popular writer he must have been.

Howell's earliest works were written to curry favour at court and all were published by Moseley. Howell first ventured into print with his historical allegory Dendrologia which was published in 1640, although it had circulated in manuscript earlier. The book contained, as he told Sir John Coke, 'many things that redound much to the Honour of our King and State'.

It defended Charles I's actions when dealing with the hostile parliaments of the 1620s, and during his attempt to impose religious uniformity on the Scots during the 1630s. On 1 January 1642 Howell presented the king with his printed poem, The Vote, as a new year's gift. This was a verse which, as Kevin Sharpe observes, 'asserted royal authority in every line'. In the same year his Instructions for Forreine Travel was dedicated to Prince Charles.

Whilst in the Fleet, Howell spent much of his time writing. In addition to two collections of his familiar letters and his history of the French king, Louis XIII, Lustra Ludovici (1646), he

48 M. Plant, The English Book Trade: an Economic History of the Making and Sale of Books (3rd edn., London, 1974), pp. 217-18; and H.S. Bennett, English Books and Readers, Volume 3, 1603-1640 (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 229-30. Howell sent copies of his Dodona's Grove to Sir William Mason, Dr. William Harvey, and Montague Bertie, Second Earl of Lindsey, see Howell, Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ (1655), section iv, pp. 60, 90 & 108; to Sir Lewis Dyves he sent his History of Naples (1650) and his Lustra Ludovici (1646), see Howell Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ (1647), p. 97; and ibid., (1655), section iv, p. 108; he sent a French edition of his Dendrologia to Lord Herbert of Cherbury, see Howell, Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ (1645), section vi, p. 67; and various books to John Selden and Bulstrode Whitelocke. In the Selden Collection in the Bodleian Library are five books which contain a handwritten dedication to Selden from Howell dated 3 May 1652, see: Instructions for Foreign travel (1650), shelfmark, 8°H29Art.Seld; The Vision (1650), shelfmark, H49Art.Seld; Dendrologia (1649), shelfmark, 8°H30Art.Seld; Dodona's Grove (1650), shelfmark, 8°H31Art.Seld; and Dendrologie (Paris, 1652 [1648]), shelfmark, 4°H30Art.Seld. For references to books sent to Whitelocke see The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, ed. R. Spalding (Oxford, 1990), pp. 393, 413, 485, 492 & 508.

49 In 1638 he sent what must have been a manuscript copy to Sir John Coke the then Secretary of State. See James Howell to Sir John Coke, 20 Feb 1637/8 in HMC, Cowper II, p. 176.

50 Ibid., p. 176.

51 See Wing ref. H3128A.

penned a series of royalist pamphlets: The True Informer (1643), A Discourse or Parley continued betwixt Patricius and Peregrine (1643), The Pre-Eminence and Pedigree of Parlement (1644 and 1645), England's Teares for the Present Wars (1644, 1645 and a Latin version in 1646), Parables Reflecting on the Times (1644), Mercurius Hibernicus (1644), A Letter to the Earl of Pembroke (1647 and 1648), The Instruments of a King (1648), A Venice Looking-Glass (1649), A Trance; or Newes from Hell (1649), A Winter Dreame (1649), and An Inquisition after Blood (1649). He also later claimed to have written the king's Declaration Touching his Constancy in Religion (1644) which was published in a composite Latin, English and French edition. At the Restoration Howell claimed that many of his pamphlets had been 'strangled in the Presse by the Power which then swayed'. Although he probably said this to enhance his reputation as a royalist propagandist, records show that one, his Discourse or Parley, was referred to the Committee for Examinations. It appears that the censors were successful in suppressing this pamphlet since only one copy remains. There are, by comparison, twenty-six copies of Howell's True Informer registered in library catalogues, which considering the ephemeral nature of the material indicates that this was a very popular pamphlet.

The majority of Howell's polemical pamphlets were printed anonymously and without the name of printer or publisher, and in some cases without even the place of publication which makes it difficult to assess Moseley's involvement. Only two: The Pre-Eminence and Pedigree and England's Teares for the Present Wars – the least overtly royalist of Howell's pamphlets of the 1640s – do have the publisher's name on the title-page, and that publisher is

53 Howell's Epistolæ Ho-Eliane (1645), Lustra Ludovici (1646) and A New Volume of Familiar Letters (1647) were all published by Moseley.
54 Howell included the tract in his Divers Historicall Discourses of the late popular Insurrections in Great Britain and Ireland, Tending all, to the asserting of Truth, in Vindication of their Majesties (London, 1661), pp. 143-65; and Twelve Several Treatises of the Late Revolutions in these Three Kingdomes; Deducing the Causes thereof from Their Originals (London, 1661).
55 Howell, Divers Historickall Discourses, title-page.
Moseley. It was not unusual at this time for a publisher to omit his name from title-pages of contentious works, particularly royalist works that were published between 1642 and 1645. Moseley's name does not appear on the title-page of any books or pamphlets during the years 1643 and 1644 and his activities during these two years remain a mystery. Some of Howell's pamphlets were printed in London and a few were published elsewhere, in Bristol, Oxford, Cambridge and Paris (although it is possible that these were a blind to put off the censors). Moseley's title-pages show that he had connections with printers in the two university towns, so it is possible that he may have been involved in publishing Howell's polemical pamphlets which omitted the publisher's name from the title-page, especially considering their pre-existing relationship.

Whilst it is tempting to try to categorise Howell's brand of royalism, the exercise is difficult for two reasons. Firstly, the old division between between absolutist and moderate or constitutionalist royalists has been contested for some years now. Glenn Burgess, Johann Sommerville, David L. Smith, Jason McElligott and David Scott have all seen this dichotomy
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57 Wing, iv, p. 629. Wing incorrectly assigns Francis Quarles' *Divine Poems* to Moseley in 1643, which according to the title-page was published in 1642. The mistake has arisen because the book was re-issued by Richard Marriot in 1643. Moseley also did not register any works with the Stationers' Company from September 1641 to December 1644. See TRCS, i, pp. 34 & 140.

58 See title pages of *Mercurius Hibernicus* which was published in Bristol, *The True Informer* and the king's *Declaration Touching his Constancy in Religion* were published in Oxford, *Parables Reflecting on the Times* was published in Paris, and the third edition of *Dendrologia* (1644) which had *The Pre-Eminence of Parlement and England's Tears* was published by Moseley in Cambridge.

59 See for example, J. Bird, *Grounds of Grammer* (1641), Wing ref. B2953, which was printed by Leonard Lichfield and published in Oxford; and *Dendrologia*, (1645), Wing ref. H3060, which was published in Cambridge.

as an oversimplification. Burgess has argued that most people who have been categorized as constitutionalists would have agreed that the law was not universal and conceded that in certain situations the king was entitled to act outside of its limits. In other words, the king had both an ordinary legal prerogative which he exercised through the law, but as God's lieutenants on earth, he also had an absolute prerogative, and could act outside the law. Smith, McElligott and Scott have turned their attention to individual opinions over the period of the civil war and Interregnum. They conclude that allegiances were much more fluid and contingent than the categories of absolutist and constitutionalist allows which prevents any convincing division of royalists between the two camps of thought.

There is a second factor which makes Howell's own place in the shifting strata of royalist opinion hard to identify. Howell was not an innovative political thinker. He was a writer and polemicist, and his purpose was to persuade. How, then, can we be sure that his words on the page express his own values and opinions? He may have been Moseley's hack; or he may have been among a number of the king's supporters who, as Sommerville observes, toned down their opinions for popular consumption. However, there are in Howell's works common threads of argument which reveal some crystallized opinion. Throughout the 1640s he wrote solely in support of the king; and many of his texts of the 1640s and 1650s express the opinion that the Long Parliament was to blame for the civil wars because it had acted outside of the law.

---


63 McElligott, and Smith, *Royalists and Royalism*, p. 8; Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics', pp. 36-60, esp. p. 38.

64 Sommerville, 'Absolutism and Royalism', p. 349.
Howell displays an impressive literary virtuosity in his political pamphlets. He wrote in an array of forms: dialogues, parables, letters, dream visions and a lament. He adopted a variety of voices to repeat the same argument: that the Long Parliament was to blame for the civil wars and was a greater threat to the law than the king. He viewed the recent troubles from various perspectives. On the title-page of his *A Venice Looking-Glasse* he used the motto, *Fas est, et ab histe doceri:* it is right to learn, even from an enemy. In addition to his own literary persona, he adopts the voices of Patricius and Peregrine, a native Englishman and a foreigner from the continent; an unnamed Venetian resident in London; Megara, the youngest of the furies; and Mother England, who, in her plea for peace, claims that if the king should be willing to meet parliament half way, then parliament should go 'three parts of the way to prevent him'.

In the printed propaganda of the 1640s both king and parliament claimed to be dedicated to the defence of the English law, and to the rights and privileges of the people and parliament. Both sides used scriptural, legal and political authority to underpin their arguments. In royalist propaganda scriptural injunctions against rebellion featured widely. Howell remarked that 'religion and nature rank treason and rebellion among the foulest sinnes' and he expressed his dismay that the people denied 'passive obedience' and his horror at the thought that the people might 'bind their king in chains'.

---

65 J. Howell, *England's Teares for the Present Wars, which for the nature of the Quarrell, the quality of Strength, the diversity of Battailes, Skirmiges, Encounters, and Sieges ... cannot be parallel'd by any precedent Age* (1644), p. 13. See also 'A letter writ by Sergeant-Major Kirle, to a friend at Windsor’, in *The True Informer*, pp. 37-43. Wing ref. H3121; *A Discourse or Parly, Continued betwixt Patricius and Peregrin (upon their landing in France) touching the causes of the civill wars of England and Ireland* (1643); and *A Trance: Or, Newes from Hell by Mercurius Acheronticus* (1649).


David Jenkins, Henry Ferne and Sir John Spelman, Howell maintained that Charles I was a better defender of the constitution, the law and the liberty of the subject than the Long Parliament.⁶⁸

Howell's pamphlets tended to reiterate or reaffirm the king's own propaganda. He voiced an admiration for the balance of the constitution which mixed the three classical forms of government: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. England had 'an ancient successive Monarchy, govern'd by one supreme undeposable and independent head, … and unto whom a Body Politicke compacted of Prelates, Peers, and all degrees of people is naturally subject'.⁶⁹ He expressed a high regard for the institution of parliament: 'there breathes not a subject under England's crown who hath a higher esteem of it than I'.⁷⁰ Moreover, England's constitution was the perfect mixture of 'monarchy, optimacy and democracy' because of parliament.⁷¹ Howell admired parliament because it guaranteed the liberty of the individual: as a 'free-born subject' it was his 'native inheritance' and 'undoubted right' to claim a 'propriety and portion in the Lawes of the land'.⁷² He had 'an interest' in parliament and in 'the power, privileges and jurisdiction thereof'.⁷³ He felt obliged to remain obedient to whatever was transacted, concluded and constituted by its authority in Church and State.⁷⁴ However,
sovereignty remained 'entire, and untransferrable [sic] in the person of the Prince'.

Howell denied that parliament could arrogate power to itself 'without the King who is the life of the Law'. After the king’s departure from London in 1642 the question arose whether the two Houses could function legally without the king's participation and whether the severely reduced numbers of MPs who remained sitting at Westminster still constituted a true parliament. Howell argued that it could not. It was, he said, 'impossible for them to make a law without the King' as parliament had presumed to do. In January 1642 the Commons, as Hyde put it, executed 'three acts of sovereignty': it besieged the Tower; appointed Sir John Hotham to go to Hull; and ordered the governor of Portsmouth to allow no-one entry except by order of the king and the two Houses. And on 5 March 1642 the House of Lords issued a declaration proclaiming the power of parliament to act for the good of the nation's defence independently of the King and passed the Militia Ordinance. It was these acts, for Howell, which proved that parliament was the greater threat to the law than Charles I.

In each form and in each voice the responsibility for the troubles in England are laid at parliament's door. Howell repeatedly defended the powers and prerogatives of the king against parliamentary encroachment. Like the king, he agreed that parliament was integral to the balance of the state, but there was a crucial distinction to be made between parliament as an institution and the Long Parliament. Corrupted by a 'visible faction', the Long Parliament had overstepped its bounds and had transformed England from a 'monarchy to a democracy,
to a perpetuall kinde of Dictatorship'.

Parliament had overthrown 'not only the prerogative of the crown, but the fundamental privilege of the free-borne subject'; and the king had been forced 'to put himself in Armes for the preservation not only of his own royal rights, but of Magna Carta itself'.

Larding his words with legal terminology, Howell listed the ways that parliament had wielded arbitrary power. It had violated the law with 'causeless imprisonments... unexampled destructive taxes, stopping ordinary processes of law... and a thousand other acts, which neither president, Book, Case, or Statute can warrant'. Howell rightly pointed out that parliament had broken the Petition of Right, the most cherished statement of the rights of the subject of the seventeenth century. Perhaps the most celebrated of the provisions of the Petition of Right was that which related to arbitrary imprisonment. Parliament's recourse to a practice which it had itself condemned in 1628 was naturally made much of in royalist declarations and pamphlets, Howell's included. The king's supporters, he pointed out, had been 'buried alive' in prisons, 'and so forgotten as if there were no such men in the world'. How could this stand with Magna Carta and the Petition of Right which parliament had taken such great pains to vindicate? Howell accused the Long Parliament of being both arbitrary and tyrannical. In his Letter to the Earl of Pembrooke (1647) he reiterated that he was not an enemy of parliaments, but argued that the current parliament was in fact no parliament at all because all the essential parts: 'fairness of elections; freedom of speech, fullness of Members', and 'any head at all' were lacking. Parliament had 'ravished Magna Carta, taken away our birth right and transgressed all the laws of heaven and earth'. It had forced the king to accept the Act of Continuance through which parliament could not be
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80 Howell, True Informer, pp. 18 & 21; the king said that parliament had passed 'beyond' its 'limits' and tended to a 'pure arbitrary power'. His Majesties Answer, p. 8.

81 Howell, A Discourse or Parley, p. 4; His Majesties Answer, p. 1.

82 On the subject of parliamentary tyranny see R. Ashton, 'From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny', in J. Morrill, Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649 (Basingstoke, 1992), p. 303.


85 Ashton, 'From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny', p. 197.


87 Howell, Letter to the Earl of Pembrooke, sig. B2'-B3'.
dissolved without its own consent, and would otherwise have 'dissolved [itself] *ipso facto*'.

The best way to solve the ills of the nation was for Englishmen 'to send for their king to London, where City and Country should petition him to summon a new and free full parliament'.

A new parliament was not summoned. Even though in 1648 members of the Army, Henry Ireton included, and the Levellers argued for its dissolution, and in parliament the largely Presbyterian majority sought a negotiated settlement with Charles which was to be followed by a dissolution, a minority faction wanted to see the king brought to justice. They objected to the idea of dissolution, and suggested that those who voted for continued negotiations with the king should be ejected from the House. Convinced that Charles was a 'man of blood', they demanded his trial and execution. When on 5 December 1648 parliament accepted the concessions made by Charles under the terms of the Newport Treaty a settlement with the king seemed imminent. For those who believed that any settlement with the duplicitous king could only lead to further conflict, the only solution was to purge the House. During the following days the Army staged the coup that is now known as Pride's Purge. On 20 January 1649, Charles I was charged with having attempted to introduce 'an arbitrary and tyrannical government', and on 30 January he was executed.

---

88 Ibid., sig. B3'.
91 Ibid., p. 268.
92 On calls for the king's death to expiate 'blood guilt' see P. Crawford, 'Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood', *Journal of British Studies*, 16 (1977), pp. 41-61.
93 Gardiner, *CW*, p. 270.
The king's execution stimulated a glut of writing in which royalists voiced their outrage and grief. When Moseley published the *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* in 1650, the volume contained a letter in which Howell expressed his shock at the execution of the king. He described it as 'that black Tragedy', which 'fill'd most hearts among us with consternation and horror ... it astonisheth my imagination, and shaketh all the cells of my brain; so that sometimes I struggle with my faith'. In September 1649 Howell published his *Inquisition after Blood* in which he reminded readers of the questionable legality of the regicide. It was a fundamental maxim of law, he said, that 'the King can do no wrong'. It was not possible to try the king legally because he had no peer on earth and it was a 'Fundamental Constitution of the land, that all tryalls must be by Peers'. He asked what 'capacity or power these men had to arraigne the late King' and 'to be in effect his Accusers and Judges'. The king was, he said, sentenced to death 'without conviction or law upon Him'.

Howell's *The Inquisition After Blood*, was the last pamphlet he published for five years. For in the wake of the execution of Charles I in January 1649, and the abolition of the House of Lords on 19 March, the English republic had set about securing itself through the press. It did so in two ways: the active suppression of hostile publications; and the publication of positive propaganda to bolster support for the new regime. To combat the publication of

---
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inflammatory material the government passed its 'Act against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books and Pamphlets' in September 1649. This act was intended to suppress all 'Pamphlets, Papers and Books' produced by 'the Malignant party', both at home and abroad. The newly formed Council of State appointed the Committee for the Suppression of Scandalous Pamphlets to oversee the implementation of the act, and to seek out and destroy the royalist press. This act managed to silence the presses where earlier measures had failed partly because repressive measures were introduced to inhibit printers, and partly because of the assiduousness of the new committee in ensuring that the act was put into effect. Exorbitant fines ensured that few would risk printing contentious material; and printers were ordered to enter a bond of £300 (with two sureties) 'not to print any seditious or unlicensed books, pamphlets, or pictures, nor suffer his presses to be used for any such purpose'. Following the implementation of the act, several royalist publishers and printers were arrested: Thomas Walkley and Henry Seile were arrested for printing pamphlets, and Richard Royston and John Williams for publishing the *Eikon Basilike*. It was not only royalists who suffered. The Presbyterian lawyer and member of the Long Parliament, Clement Walker, was arrested and charged with treason for publishing his *Anarchia Anglicana or the History of Independency* (1649) and the Leveller leader, John Lilburne, together with the printer Thomas Newcomb, was arrested for publishing the *Outcry of the Young Men and Apprentices of London* (1649).

Although neither Lilburne nor Walker were royalists, both criticised the trial and execution of the king: like Howell, Lilburne said that the king had been 'most illegally put to death by a strange, monstrous, illegal, arbitrary court'; and Walker similarly claimed that the
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102 Firth and Rait, ii, pp. 245-54.
104 John Playford, Francis Tyton and Peter Cole were arrested for printing a book entitled *King Charles's Trial* and all books were seized: *CSPD, 1649-1650*, p. 555. Henry Seile was arrested and examined for printing and publishing a 'seditious and treasonable book' entitled *The Royal Charter*: *CSPD, 1649-1650*, p. 454. Royston and his printer John Grismond were also arrested for printing and publishing a scandalous pamphlet: *CSPD, 1649-1650*, p. 362.
'extrajudicall Court' had erected a 'Court Martiall' in order to 'Murder the King' and had usurped to themselves 'more than a Regall, Legall or Parliamentary Authority'.

After these arrests this legislation with its bonds and ruinous fines proved effective. It was so successful, in fact, that by the summer of 1650 the government had finally cut the flow of newsbooks, ballads and pamphlets from the royalist press. Figures in G.K Fortescue's catalogue of the Thomason collection in the British Library reveal that the yearly average of newsbooks and pamphlets published in 1650 to 1651 was only half of the yearly average from 1642 to 1649. Fortescue's figures include all pamphlets and newsbooks regardless of their subject matter or political bias so the effect of the censorship legislation on the royalist press was even greater than these figures suggest. For example, studies of royalist newsbooks have shown that only two titles survived the September act and continued into the following year: Mercurius Pragmaticus and John Crouch's The Man in the Moon, but even these two were terminated in the Spring of 1650.

**Intertextuality in the Interregnum**

Despite the silencing of overt polemic of the type that had been published in pamphlets and newsbooks in the 1640s, royalist writers could still use literary texts to make political comment. As David Norbrook says, with the collapse of censorship in the early 1640s

---


108 These figures are taken from G.K. Fortescue, *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1908), i, p. xxi. I have excluded the figures for 1642 and 1648 which are extraordinarily high as the press responded to the outbreak of the civil war, the imprisonment of the king and the negotiations for settlement.

political debates became more urgent and direct. Here we have the other side of the coin: with the establishment of strict censorship in 1649, royalist writing became necessarily more subtle and indirect. From September 1649 Howell shifted his polemical writing into his literary texts. The most notable example is his historical allegory *Dodona's Grove* which was published by Moseley in 1650. Into this work Howell interpolated extracts from his polemical pamphlets of the 1640s. For the basis of his narrative, he drew on his *True Informer* in which he had detailed the major events from 1637 to the battle of Edgehill in 1642. He embedded his *Parables Reflecting on the Times* in their entirety, and complete pages from his *Pre-Eminence and Pedigree of Parlement* and his *England's Tears*.

When Howell wrote his *Dodona's Grove*, he lifted, shaped and extended his *Parables Reflecting on the Times* (1644), a collection of cleverly made analogies, and embedded them – almost seamlessly – into the work. Each is used to both simplify and emphasize a point that he has made. For example, in *Dodona's Grove* Howell explains that in 1641 Charles I gave way to a series of measures which parliament, in his eyes, had designed to wrest legislative power from the king. Chief among them were the Triennial Bill through which no more than three years could pass without a parliament, and the Act of Continuance – which Howell repeatedly suggested was contrary to law – through which Charles I gave up his prerogative right to terminate the present parliament. From that moment on, parliament could only be dissolved by its own consent, and adjourned only by order of each house. For Howell giving parliament this 'eternall sway' was a monstrous concession that was forced upon the
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king.\footnote{114} It was through this act that the king 'did \textit{uncrown, unscepter, and unsword} himself' and 'turned a Kingdom into a Common-wealth'.\footnote{115} The Earl of Dorset, he said, greeted Charles I the following morning 'by the title of his \textit{fellow subject}'.\footnote{116} Howell reiterated this point by interpolating his parable, the 'Assembly of Architects'. He used a common analogy between restructuring a building and the parliamentary reforms. In his parable, on the advice of the Lord of the Commons, the king summons masons and architects to mend some structural faults in his palace. Contrary to the king's command not to interfere with 'those ancient pieces, whereon the Palace flourish'd so long', the renovators threaten to demolish the very foundations of the building. To tamper with the foundations of government, Howell warned, was dangerous. It damaged the structure of the state and could take years to repair, or might even prove fatal.

When Howell embedded his parables in \textit{Dodona's grove}, he tightened them structurally, and in places made changes to colour the text with an even more royalist hue than the originals. His criticism of the House of Commons in his 'Assembly of Architects' in \textit{Dodona's Grove} is more pointed than in its original pamphlet form. In the earlier pamphlet version, the masons and architects are instructed to reduce the king's building to a 'just proportion' which indicates fairness.\footnote{117} In \textit{Dodona's Grove} they are to advise how to mend 'pretended' structural faults for 'the \textit{better contrivance of the public rooms}, and to reduce the building to an \textit{uniform} and just proportion'.\footnote{118} These changes are subtle, but noteworthy: the 'pretended' faults, 'better contrivance of the public rooms' and the 'uniform', which were not in the pamphlet, make the reasons for reform more specious than the original suggested. When Howell added the 'uniform' he indicated that parliament's intention from the beginning of the troubles had been
a levelling of society which it had now achieved through the regicide, and the abolition of monarchy and the House of Lords.

The publication of *Dodona's Grove* invited a reinterpretation of the events of the previous decade in order to regain sympathy for the king and to secure the nation's commitment to monarchy. Howell looks back no further than the beginning of Charles I's reign for the origins of the civil war.¹¹⁹ For him the Caroline peace was destroyed by a handful of jealous and ambitious men who propelled the country into rebellion against a just and honest king.¹²⁰ Howell claimed that royalists adhered to the king because of 'those solemn and indispensable *Oaths* they had taken' and 'to the *Laws* both ecclesiastic and Civil already in force'.¹²¹ Puritans, or 'petty Novelists who were discontented with the Times', by contrast, adhered to parliament. They drew the lower orders of society 'the shrubs and studdles' after them, especially in London. A Puritan faction became predominant in the House of Commons 'out-wearying, out-acting, and out-watching' the royalists, until 'at last none was permitted to speak there ... unless he went along with the sense of that party'.¹²² It was strange, said Howell, that *Reason* should be so curb'd in a free *Nationall* Assembly, wherein liberty of speech and suffrage was ever held to be the greatest and most essential priviledge'.¹²³ Royalists began to forsake attending 'because they could not speak there in safety, so they betook themselves under the shelter of the *Oke* who was bound to give them *protection*.¹²⁴

Howell focussed on demonstrating that, contrary to parliament's accusations, from as far back as the Grand Remonstrance Charles I had been willing to rule in a parliamentary way.¹²⁵

¹¹⁹ *CHR*, i, p. 3.
¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 4.
¹²¹ Howell, *Dodona's Grove*, p. 103 [incorrectly numbered, should be 203].
¹²² Ibid., p. 204.
¹²³ Howell, *Dodona's Grove*, p. 204.
¹²⁴ Howell, *Dodona's Grove*, pp. 204-5.
¹²⁵ *The Grand Remonstrance, with the Petition Accompanying it*, in Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, p. 204; and for the king's claim to rule in a 'parliamentary way' see 'The King's Answer to the Petition Accompanying the Grand Remonstrance', in ibid., pp. 233-4.
Throughout *Dodona's Grove* he contrasts Charles's respect for the law with parliament's arbitrary behaviour. He pointed out that at the opening of the Long Parliament Charles had said that if any part of his revenue was found to be illegal or heavy to the subject, he would lay it down.\(^{126}\) Echoing the king's declarations of the 1640s he argued that a cabal in parliament had subverted the law in pursuit of its own interests. Parliament, as the king had suggested in his *Answer*, had become corrupted by the cabal who had besotted the people with the idea of a 'new utopia of Religion and Government' in order to take control of the running of the state and 'ingrosse the chiefest offices to themselves'.\(^{127}\) He claimed that the Act of Continuance was not legal. Divers lawyers, he said, 'held that grant to be frustraneous and void in itself, it being a maxim in the *Druinian* law, that the King cannot pass any grant prejudiciall to the Crown and the regall power, as that prov'd to be'.\(^{128}\) Although some had argued that there was little danger, provided that parliament would keep themselves 'within the bounds of their privileges' by acting according to the king's warrant, Howell claimed that 'this grace was turn'd after into wantonness'.\(^{129}\) The question of privilege was to prove crucial, for as Clarendon said, as a result of this act parliament was enabled to label 'any opposing or questioning' of their power 'a breach of their privileges'.\(^{130}\) For royalists like Howell and Clarendon, the Continuation Act gave the Long Parliament unbounded privilege. As in his pamphlets, Howell reiterated his respect for parliament as an institution, but criticised its encroachment on the king's prerogative. He claimed that parliament 'is where the king is'.\(^{131}\) Moreover, according to English law, he said, the king 'is the beginning and the end of the great Senate'.\(^{132}\) By this criterion, if the country had no king, then it necessarily followed that the Rump Parliament which remained after the regicide was no parliament at all.

---

126 Howell, *Dodona's Grove*, p. 66.
127 *Nineteen Propositions Made By Both Houses of Parliament, to the King's Most Excellent Majesties: With His Majesties Answer thereunto. By the King* (Cambridge, 1642), pp. 1-3 & 5. See also *His Majesties Declaration to His Loving Subjects, 12 August 1642* (1642), pp. 29, 35 & 65.
129 Ibid., p. 118.
130 *CHR*, i, p. 356.
132 Ibid., p. 224.
At the end of *Dodona's Grove*, Howell indicated that he would write a third part of his history of the reign of Charles I to continue the story to its natural conclusion:

_Dodona_ next shall trembling tell  
What a sad period _Him_ befell,  
How to mankind's eternall wonder  
His _trunk_ from _top_ was cleft asunder.\(^{133}\)

He did not continue his history of Charles I, but in 1655 he published his *Som Sober Inspections*, a political treatise into which he recycled material from *Dodona's Grove*.\(^{134}\) He also included abbreviated and paraphrased sections of the anonymous royalist treatise *The Freeholders Grand Inquest* of 1648. The authorship of this pamphlet is uncertain.\(^{135}\) Johann Sommerville, in line with the standard view, attributes it to Filmer, though he recognizes that parts of the text were written by another hand. Corinne Comstock Weston, however, believes it to be the work of the lawyer and politician, Sir Robert Holborne.\(^{136}\) Both argue their cases strongly. On balance it seems more likely that it was the work of Filmer. When Howell included the _Freeholders_ in his *Some Sober Inspections* he removed phrases and sentences which were characteristic of Filmer's thought. For example, he omitted the claim in the _Freeholders_ that 'supreame power is alwaies arbitrary; for that is arbitrary which hath no superiour on earth to controll it' no doubt because he was uncomfortable with the term 'arbitrary' and its associations with tyranny.\(^{137}\) Over the previous decade, as we have seen,

---

133 Ibid., p. 287.
134 *Som Sober Inspections* was published by the royalist publisher Henry Seile who is discussed in Chapter 7. J. Howell, *Som Sober Inspections Made into the Cariage and Consults of the Late-Long Parlement* (London, 1655).
137 Anon, _The Freeholders Grand Inquest Touching Our Soveraigne Lord the King and His Parliament* (London, 1647/8), p. 30-1; see also the corresponding passage in *Som Sober Inspections*, p. 38. See also, for example, Howell's own use of the term 'arbitrary' to condemn the trial of Strafford, *Dodona's Grove*, p. 97.
Howell had frequently condemned parliament for wielding arbitrary and tyrannical power. *Dodona's Grove* and *Some Sober Inspections* are Howell's longest and most thorough defences of Charles I, and his most sustained critiques of the Long Parliament for its arbitrariness and tyranny.

Reading beyond Howell's dedication to Cromwell in *Som Sober Inspections*, the true focus of the text is apparent. The recycling of *Dodona's Grove* into *Some Sober Inspections* shifts the focus of the text from Cromwell to Charles I. Of the 184 pages of *Some Sober Inspections*, over 100 are dedicated to Charles I and his dealings with parliament in the years 1637 to 1642. Howell again argued that Charles had not been tyrannical, or even extraordinary in his dealings with parliament. He had been a 'credulous easie' king, but not a tyrannical one. Howell cited Henry VIII and Elizabeth I as rulers who had encroached on the privileges of parliament far more than Charles I had done.\(^\text{138}\) In his dedication to *Some Sober Inspections*, Howell thanked Cromwell for dissolving parliament and thus having 'quell'd a monster with many heads' that was likely to 'gourmandize, and devour the whole Nation'.\(^\text{139}\) This is often used as evidence that he had accepted Cromwell as monarch, L'Estrange certainly thought so.\(^\text{140}\) This is possible, but I suggest that Howell saw a route to the restoration of the Stuarts through the Lord Protector. A year earlier in his *Admonition to the Lord Protector*, he had proposed an agreement whereby after Cromwell's death Charles II would be restored to the throne.\(^\text{141}\) Howell was not alone in suggesting that an agreement might be reached which would ensure the return of the Stuart monarchy. Roger Boyle, later Earl of Orrery, is said by his chaplain and biographer, Thomas Morrice, to have found Charles II favourable to 'a design of making a match between his majesty, and one of Cromwell's daughters' as a means to...

---

\(^\text{138}\) Howell, *Som Sober Inspections*, pp. 33, 52 & 59-60.

\(^\text{139}\) Howell, 'To His Highness, The Lord Protector', in *idem*, *Som Sober Inspections*, sig. A2v.

\(^\text{140}\) The true import of the text was not lost on all readers. Sir William Dugdale certainly approved of it: recommending it to a friend he said that in 'cogging up [the] Protector … for destroying that monster (as he calls it) [he] hath taken the boldness to speak more truth, barefaced, than any man that hath wrote since they sate'. Letter from William Dugdale to John Langley, 9 October 1655, in *HMC Fifth Report*, p. 177.
secure the kingdom and his own future. But Cromwell is alleged to have dismissed the proposition because he felt that the Stuart king would never forgive those who had been involved in his father's execution. This 'design' was recorded long after the fact and should be treated with caution. However, there were also printed propositions for an agreement between Cromwell and the Stuart king. The Welsh prophet Arise Evans voiced his hopes for a 'Union between Him [Charles II] and his Highness the Lord Protector'. Similarly, the Irish prophet Walter Gostelo predicted in his Charles Stuart and Oliver Cromwell United (1655) that Cromwell would be instrumental in the restoration of the king.

There is no suggestion in any of Howell's works that he favoured military intervention to restore either of the Stuart kings to the throne. David Smith has shown that after the regicide, the Duke of Richmond, Marquess of Hertford, and the Earls of Lindsey, Southampton, and Dorset, all of whom, like Howell, shared a similar political outlook, withdrew from military intervention in the belief that eventually monarchy would be restored without recourse to

141 There is some dispute as to the authorship of An Admonition: Jacobs attributes it to Howell, but Wing attributes it to James Heath. Woolf concurs with Wing because, in his opinion, the tract does not resemble any of Howell's later writings in style. However, Howell was a demonstrably versatile writer and the tract does resemble some of Howell's writing in his Epistole; and, as Woolf admits, the tract's message is similar to Howell's later tract, A Brief Admonition of Some of the Inconveniences of all the Three Most Famous Governments Known to the World (1659). Also, Wing's attribution to Heath is faulty: it is based on a notation in the Bodleian copy ref: G.Pamph.1787 (6), but this pencil notation, "? by James Heath", is preceded by a question mark, and is not contemporaneous. The only evidence that Heath published any other work prior to 1661 is Wing's attribution of a book (The Commons War, Wing ref: H1322), which can no longer be traced. The style of Heath's writing does not resemble that in An Admonition. It is, then, more reasonable to attribute the tract to Howell, who was a versatile and well-established writer by 1654, rather than Heath, a historian whose short career as a published writer is likely to have begun in 1661. For Jacobs' attribution to Howell see, Epistole, p. xciii. For Wing's attribution to Heath see Wing, ii, p. 217; and for Woolf see 'Public Duty and Private Conscience', p. 273, n. 90. Similarities in style and tone between Howell's writing and that in An Admonition can be found in his Epistole Ho-Elianæ (1645), pp. 25-7; (1647), pp. 5-6; and (1655), book iv, pp. 75-7.


143 A. Evans, The Euroclydon Winde Commanded to cease: or, A quenching of the Fiery Darts by Scripture-Arguments, Declarations and Visions (1654), title-page.

144 On Evans and Gostelo see B. Woodford, Perceptions of Monarchy without a King: Reactions to Oliver Cromwell's Power (Montréal, Quebec, 2013), pp. 129-30.

145 For the similarities in their political outlook see D. Smith, Constitutional Royalism, pp. 4-5 & 255.
arms. In Howell's *Epistloæ* there are letters to Hertford, Dorset, and Lindsey; and during the 1650s he dedicated works to Hertford, Dorset, and Southampton all of which were published by Moseley. Although it would be a stretch of the imagination to suggest that this indicates some political collusion between these men, the repeated appearance of their names in these texts shows that literature was being used to forge or maintain connections between royalists of a similar political outlook. In his letter to Hertford, Howell recommended that they should 'acquiesce in an humble admiration' of 'providence' because 'all things do co-operate to the best at last'. Whilst parliament's victories had led it to claim providence as its guide, as Kevin Sharpe observed, after Charles II's miraculous escape from Worcester in 1651, royalists re-appropriated the language of providence to contest the republic and to claim that God protected the king. Military victories had generally been interpreted as a sure sign of God's approbation and favour, whilst defeats had been seen as a sign of God's disapproval and punishment. Charles's escape marked the turning point from a period of God's punishment of royalists to the beginning of their deliverance. In his *Epistolæ* Howell advised royalists to remain patient, 'till the great Wheel of Providence' should turn again, for the 'Spokes of the Wheel, which point at all human Actions, return exactly to the same place after such a time of Revolution'. It was 'the all-disposing high Deity of Heaven' that commanded 'the Winds and the Weather', and after a storm he never failed 'to send us a calm, and to recompense ill Times with better'.

147 For correspondence see Howell, *Epistola* (1650), pp. 1-3 & 13-16; *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (1655), book iv, pp. 6-11 & 38-40. Howell's *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (1650), was dedicated to Dorset; *Parthenopoeia* (1654) was dedicated to Hertford; and *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (1655), was dedicated to Southampton. As we have seen, Howell also wrote an elegy on the death of Dorset which Moseley published twice.
Most historians agree that in 1660 the king came to be restored as a result of divisions on the revolutionary side, and not because of the strength of royalist beliefs.\textsuperscript{152} This distinction is too strong. It is clear that in the 1640s James Howell, together with Moseley, published royalist propaganda. In the 1650s the two men were not to be thwarted by parliamentary censorship legislation, for royalist writing reacted by turning to more subtle and indirect methods. Pamphlets and newsbooks were quashed, but literary works still offered a viable means of publishing and promoting royalist views. Howell consistently pressed the case for the restoration of the monarchy with a balance between privilege and prerogative. When he published his \textit{Dodona's Grove the Second Part} in 1650, he introduced the work with an exhortation to royalists to 'pursue the point of their former Discourse'.\textsuperscript{153} And not only is \textit{Dodona's Grove} an exhortation to royalists to continue to write oppositional literature, but Howell and Moseley demonstrated in the face of oppressive censorship how this could be done. Howell repeatedly expressed his confidence in monarchy as the best and only legitimate form of government. Recycling his pamphlets in the form of a historical dialogue was a means to re-ignite the royalist defence of the Stuart monarchy.

\textsuperscript{152} For example, Zagorin, \textit{History of Political Thought}, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{153} Howell, \textit{Dodona's Grove}, proem.
Chapter Three

Dramatic Poetry: Beaumont and Fletcher, and William Cartwright

On 2 September 1642, less than two weeks after Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham, the Long Parliament ordered that stage plays, as 'spectacles of pleasure', should 'cease and be forborn'.¹ Because plays commonly expressed 'lascivious Mirth and Levity' it did not comport with the current public calamity to allow performances to continue. This was intended to be a temporary measure until the 'sad causes and set Times of Humiliation' ceased.² Yet the London theatres were largely silenced for the next eighteen years and in some cases were dismantled or destroyed. In their propaganda, those who sided with the king used the continued hostility of parliament, the republican government and the Protectorate towards the theatre as evidence of their antipathy to learning and culture. From 1646 to 1659 Moseley published works of dramatic poetry which did much to reinforce this view. Arguably his two most politically motivated publications of drama – and certainly his two largest – were Comedies and Tragedies (1647) by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, and Comedies Tragi-Comedies With other Poems (1651) by William Cartwright. When Moseley published his Beaumont and Fletcher volume in folio, he joined the two dramatists with William Shakespeare and Ben Jonson in a way that encouraged a close identification between literature and the Stuart court. Moseley's Cartwright volume, through its introductory material, condemned the parliamentary attempt to bring the University of Oxford, the geographical and emotional heart of the royalist cause, to political obedience. These two volumes strike a note of defiance, and a refusal to accept defeat of the old order: a

¹ Firth and Rait, i, pp. 26-7; CJ, ii, p. 746; CJ, ii, p. 749.
² Firth and Rait, i, p. 27.
monarchical government which protected a rich history of learning and of culture.

Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher: *Comedies and Tragedies* (1647)

Puritan antipathy to the theatre was nothing new in the 1640s. Since the late 1570s they had attacked all manner of games and pastimes, and especially the theatre. They saw it as a danger to public morals both for the subject matter and because they were suspicious of public gatherings for any reason other than worship. There was a tendency to view Puritan attacks on the theatre as a wider attack on literature itself and poets came to its defence. When Stephen Gosson published his attack on stage plays, *The School for Abuse* in 1579, Sir Philip Sidney responded with his audacious *The Defence of Poesy* (c.1580) – a defence not of the theatre, but of poetry.\(^3\) What began as a minor anxiety for Puritans about the theatre in the Elizabethan period grew as the early Stuart period progressed. Their increasing antipathy brought about a backlash on the stage.\(^4\) The Puritan became a handy addition to the playwrights' stock of characters: he was usually a parody of hypocrisy, greed and gullibility.\(^5\) Ben Jonson's *Zeal-of-the-Land Busy* epitomized the public perception of the rabid Puritan who denounced stage-players as 'an abomination'.\(^6\)

The patronage system which thrived in this period meant that the relationship between poetry and the court was to some degree symbiotic, and there developed a public perception that the two were aligned.\(^7\) Criticism of the Stuarts and criticism of drama often went hand-in-hand because the plays and masques of the 1630s were mostly written by courtly gentlemen or

---

5. Ibid., p. 21.
aspiring courtiers. The most notorious criticism of this alignment appeared in 1632 when William Prynne’s *Histriomastix* was published. With its attack on the sinfulness of pastimes including plays and masques, the book, with its emphatic criticism of Henrietta Maria’s participation in such debaucheries, was an implicit attack on the theatre and the theatre-loving court of Charles I. Drama of the 1630s was filled with the conventions and atmosphere of the Stuart court, and often contained outspoken satire of Puritans. This is not to suggest that no dramatists were critical of the crown, or that all Puritans were hostile to the theatre. Recent work has done much to examine the complex nature of the relationship between Puritans and drama, and between drama and the early Stuarts. Yet it remains true that there was – and still is – a perception that during the 1640s and 1650s the theatre was a victim of an ideological division and the popular party was ‘very largely antipathetic to it’. As will become clear, this was a perception that Moseley did much to foster.

The parliamentary ordinance which closed the theatres in 1642 was, while the war continued, generally well observed with only a few violations. After the surrender of Oxford on 26 June 1646, which signalled the end of the war, the theatre companies might have been forgiven for believing that the legislation had lapsed and consequently they were free to resume performances. The Salisbury Court, Cockpit and Fortune theatres staged plays with little or no

---

9 Ibid., p. 74.
concealment and the same was probably true of the Red Bull. However, despite the end of hostilities, after a flurry of performances, parliamentary suppression of the theatre resumed. New ordinances were issued on 16 July 1647, and on 11 February 1648 and the theatres remained officially closed until the Restoration in 1660. Under the February ordinance theatre buildings and audiences also suffered: all theatres and playhouses were ordered to be pulled down and any spectator caught watching a performance was to be fined five shillings. The Globe had been demolished in 1644 to make way for a tenement block; in 1649 the Salisbury Court and the Phoenix theatres were pulled down, the Fortune and the cockpit were dismantled, and in 1655 the Black Fryers was demolished. The destruction of these buildings which had housed such vibrant activity must have remained as a visible reminder to Londoners of the hostile attitude of parliament towards the stage.

The Puritan-led parliament's continued suppression of the theatre allowed the king's adherents to appropriate drama as a peculiarly royalist activity. Parliamentary newsbooks condemned illicit performances while their royalist counterparts condemned the legislation against the theatre. Royalist polemicists encouraged their readers to see parliamentarians as victimisers of culture and of learning, and conversely to see themselves as the defenders of traditional values and ways of life. They capitalized on parliament's antipathy to the theatre by portraying its members as detesters of learning wallowing in ignorance. At the Restoration Sir John Denham reiterated the point, 'They that would have no KING would have no Play / The

---

14 For orders from the Commons to suppress stage plays see CJ, v, p. 246.
15 Firth and Rait, i, pp. 1070-2; on 22 October 1647 stage plays were suppressed in London and players were committed to jail: Firth and Rait, i, p. 1027.
16 Ibid, p. 1071.
18 For example *Perfect Occurences*, 6 October, p. 281; *Mercurius Anti-Pragmaticus*, 28 October 1647, p. 2; *Mercurius Elenticus*, 29 October 1647, p. 1; & 19 January 1648, p. 66.
Laurel and the Crown together went, / Had the same foes, and the same Banishment'.

The idea that the players were on the king's side continued for many years. In 1699 James Wright claimed that at the outbreak of hostilities most of the players 'went into the King's Army, and like good Men and true, Serv'd their Old Master'.

In the media of the time, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher became icons not just of the theatre, but of royalist culture. In the Prologue to The Tragedie of King Charles I, a play which denounced Cromwell and other Puritan leaders for the murder of the king, the speaker complained that the public had been denied the 'learned lines' of Jonson, Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher, by the 'Monsters of the times'. Royalists believed that all that was best in urbane culture was crashing about them. The polite gallantries of the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher came to symbolize courtly life and they enshrined the noblest artistic and political ideals that it had fostered. While royalists claimed the dramatists as their spiritual ancestors, parliamentarians did nothing to undermine their claim. For parliamentarian polemicists play-going was an idolatrous diversion which prevented a better reformation of the Church. This ideological division is never more clear than in the writing of the serial turncoat and newsbook writer Marchamont Nedham. While writing the parliamentarian newsbook Mercurius Britannicus, he ribbed the author of the royalist newsbook Mercurius Aulicus, John Berkenhead, for 'his Grandfather Ben Jonson and his Uncle Shakespeare and his

20 J. Denham, The Prologue To His Majesty At the first PLAY presented at the Cock-pit in WHITEHALL. Being part of that Noble Entertainment which Their Majesties received November. 19 from his Grace the Duke of Albermarle (London, 1660), British Library ref. 669.f.26 [30].
22 For a discussion of Jonson as an important symbol for the passing of better times and monarchy in Robert Herrick's Hesperides see S. Pugh, Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality: Classical Literature and Seventeenth Century Royalism (Farnham, 2010), pp. 74-5.
23 Anon, 'The Prologue to the Gentry' in The Famous Tragedie of King Charles I Basely Butchered by those who are, omne nesas proni patare pudor inanes crudeles, violenti, importunique tyranni mendaces, falsi, perversi, perfidiosi, faedifragi, falsis verbis infunda loquentes (1649).
25 M. Nedham, Mercurius Britannicus, 9 Nov. 1643, p. 89.
Couzen Germains Fletcher and Beaumont. Royalists at court were scorned for their dramatic idolatry:

> I am perswaded in time they will go heere to put downe all preaching and praying, and have some religious Masque or play instead of Morning and Evening Prayer; it has been an old fashion at Court, amongst the Protestants there, to shut up the Sabbath with some wholesome Piece of Ben Johnson or Davenant, a kinde of Comicall Divinity...  

However, when in 1647 Nedham was persuaded to change sides and he began writing for the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, his attitude towards the theatre also changed. He wittily turned parliament's closure of the theatres against them: 'the Houses have new vamped up an old Ordinance for abolishing stage plays; and to prevent acting hereafter, the Boards and Scaffolds in each Playhouse must be pulled down, except it be in their own; because they have not played out all their parts yet'.

Theatres were the place where authority was traditionally contested, and Nedham welcomed the idea that in time to come the stage would be the arena in which parliament's errors would be displayed and punished. He said: 'Though the House hindered the Players this week from playing... at Salisbury Court, yet believe me / He that does live, shall see another Age / Their Follies stript and whipt upon the Stage'. Like Nedham, the author of the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Melancholicus* argued that parliament had closed the theatres because its authority could be challenged there. The stage was a corrective which parliament had suppressed because it would reveal their iniquities. It was in the theatre that the spectator could see 'truth and falsehood in their naked colours'. It was there that players would

---

31 *Mercurius Melancholicus*, 22 January 1648, p. 130.
scourge iniquity until he bleeds again; there you may read the
Parliament in print, there you may see Treason courting Tyranny, and
Faction prostituted to Rebellion there you may see (as in a mirrour) all
State-jugglings ... and underhand dealings portray'd to the life.\(^\text{32}\)

But the live performance of plays was not the only means by which the dramatic spark could
be kept alive: from 1646 printers and booksellers engaged in a lively traffic in play-books and
Moseley was the most prolific publisher of dramatic works of the period. Between 1646 and
1659 he published over fifty works of dramatic poetry in a variety of forms to suit a variety of
pockets. The most lavish and probably most expensive of these was his folio edition
Beaumont and Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* of 1647.

Moseley's volume of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher was produced, as P.W. Thomas has
observed, as a 'propagandist reassertion of the Stuart ethic at a crucial moment in the fortunes
of the Court'.\(^\text{33}\) The book was published in February 1647, a tense time for royalists and
parliamentarians alike.\(^\text{34}\) On 3 February Charles I had set out from Newcastle under the
guardianship of commissioners of the English parliament.\(^\text{35}\) Hopes were high that steps would
be taken to consolidate a peace that would see the king take his place at the head of a new
order. As Charles's fortunes hung in the balance, texts which pricked nostalgia for a lost
Stuart culture were not published unthinkingly. Moseley's Beaumont and Fletcher folio was a
timely reminder of the glories of the pre-war Caroline court. It was 'A 'Balme unto the
wounded Age' and its intention was to inculcate the view, as the poet James Shirley said in his
prefatory poem, that 'nothing now is wanting but the King'.\(^\text{36}\)

\(^{32}\) Ibid, p. 130.
\(^{34}\) Moseley dated his epistle to the reader 14 February 1646 [i.e. 1647]. See Moseley, 'The Stationer to the
Reader', in F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John
Fletcher, Gentlemen* (London, 1647), n.p.
\(^{35}\) Gardiner, *CW*, iii, p. 212.
\(^{36}\) J. Shirley, 'Upon the Printing of Mr. John Fletchers workes', in Beaumont and Fletcher, *Comedies and
Tragedies*, n.p.
No publisher had previously taken it upon himself to publish a first folio edition of a dramatist's work.\footnote{37} In 1616 Ben Jonson oversaw the publication of his plays in folio. It was an act of bibliographical and literary miscegenation: the folio format had previously been reserved for works of permanence and dignity such as the Bible, history books, and works of heraldry. These were religious books or works of reference – serious works – not plays.\footnote{38} The year 1616 was also the year of Shakespeare's death. Jonson's folio probably stimulated Shakespeare's fellow actors, John Heminge and Henry Condell, to prepare a similar volume, the now famous Shakespeare \textit{First Folio}, as a tribute to their deceased colleague. Their intention was, according to their preface, 'to keep the memory of so worthy a friend and fellow alive'.\footnote{39} Heminge and Condell dedicated the Shakespeare folio to the great patron of literature William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, and his younger brother Philip, then Earl of Montgomery. In 1647 Moseley linked his Beaumont and Fletcher volume with the Shakespeare \textit{First Folio}. It was, he said, 'directed by the example' of the Shakespeare volume. Like Heminge and Condell, Moseley dedicated his book to the Earl of Pembroke. However, William Herbert had died in 1630; Moseley's book was dedicated to Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke, a notable yet wavering parliamentarian. Was this dedication designed to tug on the errant earl's sense of loyalty and heritage during a tense time of political negotiation? Effusive in its praise of the Herberts, the dedication dwells on the family's famous attachment to poets and literary pursuits.\footnote{40} It reminds Pembroke of the titles he received from the Crown and the positions he held within the king's household.\footnote{41} In the same year James Howell published his \textit{Letter to the Earl of Pembrooke} in which he too reminded

\footnote{37} Although Humphrey Robinson is credited as joint publisher on the title page, Moseley claimed in his epistle to the reader that the 'care and Pains' in producing the book had been 'wholly' his. See H. Moseley, 'The Stationer to the Reader' in ibid., n.p.


\footnote{39} \textit{Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories &Tragedies.Published according to the True Original Copies} (London, 1623).

\footnote{40} On the Pembroke family's literary patronage see M.G. Brennan, \textit{ Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family} (London, 1988); and on Philip, the fourth Earl of Pembroke in particular see D.S. Lawless, 'Massinger and His Patrons', in idem, \textit{Philip Massinger and His Associates} (Muncie, Indiana, 1967), pp. 41-67.
the earl of his heritage, and of the oaths that he had sworn to defend 'the Honor, and Quarrels, the Rights and Lordship' of his sovereign.  

Moseley's Beaumont and Fletcher folio was prefaced with thirty-four commendatory poems, more than had ever appeared in a work of literature before. The commendatory poems are strategically placed, as Paulina Kewes has noted, to foreground the gap between the plays and their publication contexts. This gap served explicitly political ends by contrasting the flourishing theatrical life and patronage of the pre-civil war era with its current demise. This is nowhere more evident than in the dedication to Pembroke: it is addressed to a patron who was no longer giving patronage to the stage, and was written by players who were no longer playing. The commendatory poems serve a second purpose. In addition to acting as a physical reminder of the distance between what had been and what was, they represent a textual space in which embittered royalists could gather together and voice their views. The commendatory poets were largely drawn from the royalist literati and were 'disposed to see Beaumont and Fletcher from a partisan point of view'. These were men who forged a link between poetry and the court of Charles I in wartime Oxford. The opening prefatory poem was penned by John Villiers, Lord Grandison, a general in the king's army; and Berkenhead penned the Latin encomium beneath Fletcher on the frontispiece. Sir George Lisle, who was to be executed by Fairfax after the siege of Colchester in 1648, stated in his commendatory poem that John Fletcher – his 'kinsman' – would have 'been o' th Better Side', that is, of course, the royalists' side. Several of the commendatory poets had been or were to be arrested and imprisoned for

41 The dedication reads, 'To the Right Honourable Philip Earle of Pembroke and Mountgomery: Baron Herbert of Cardiffe and Sherland, Lord Parr and Ross of Kendall; Lord Fitz Hugh, Marmyon, and Saint Quintin; Knight of the most noble order of the Garter; and one of His Majesties most Honourable Privie Councell: And our Singular Good Lord'.
supporting Charles I including Richard Lovelace, James Howell, John Pettus, Roger L'Estrange, and Sir Thomas Peyton who suffered a series of imprisonments which extended intermittently for a period of eight years for his royalist plotting.\textsuperscript{46}

Many of the commendatory poems are straightforward panegyrics of the two dramatists whose work expressed the social and literary ideals of the royalist court. Richard Lovelace observed that readers could 'rejoice and glory' in the book 'and feast each other with remembering' the past resplendence of the stage.\textsuperscript{47} Others carried out the practical business of denigrating parliament's antipathy to poetry and ignorance. Peyton sniped at parliament's unwanted interference in the laws of the land and of poetry:

\begin{quote}
...whether to commend thy Worke, will stand,  
Both with the Lawes of Verse and of the Land,  
to put doubts might raise a discontent  
Between the Muses and the \underline{———}
\end{quote}

Despite the blank, the omitted word is obviously 'parliament'. Peter Thomas has eloquently described the communal character of satire in contemporary royalist newsbooks which jeered at rebel dullness, or ignorance.\textsuperscript{49} This kind of satire was echoed in the commendatory poems of the Beaumont and Fletcher volume. Henry Mody praised the 'vast summes of wit' that Fletcher left to a world of 'mad zeale and ignorance'.\textsuperscript{50} John Pettus said that in this volume the reader could expect to find 'The Intellectual Language' which was 'admir'd in better times' but


\textsuperscript{48} T. Peyton, 'On Mr. Fletchers Workes, never before published', in Beaumont and Fletcher, Comedies and Tragedies, n.p.

\textsuperscript{49} Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, pp. 120 & 159.

\textsuperscript{50} H. Mody, 'On Mr. John Fletcher, and his Workes', in Beaumont and Fletcher, Comedies and Tragedies, n.p.
'dares the Test / Of Ours'. The courtier, poet and translator Sir Robert Stapylton aligned poetry with monarchy, whilst at the same time he too set royalist poetry against the parliamentarians' lack of integrity and literary merit.

… A Poets name
(Late growne as odious to our Moderne states
As that of Kings to Rome) he vindicates
From black aspertions, cast upon't by those
Which only are only inspr'd to lye in prose.

There is a recognition that the closure of the theatres had an unintended positive side. The silencing of the stage and its transfer from an oral to a paper form of communication gave people 'the liberty to dwell and converse in … immortal groves'. According to the title-page, the plays were 'Never printed before'. What could previously only be glimpsed at on the stage as in a 'conjuring glasse, as suddenly removed as represented' could now be lingered over at leisure. Thomas Stanley shrewdly pointed out that in seeking to quash the theatre, parliament had unwittingly ensured its survival and longevity.

… They that silenc'd Wit
Are now the Authors to Eternize it;
Thus Poets are in spight of fate reviv'd,
And Playes by Intermission longer lived.

The Beaumont and Fletcher folio stood as a monument to a Stuart monarchy which had celebrated drama and literature. When Moseley published this book, it represented a purposeful attempt to celebrate England's cultural heritage in order to discredit the ignorance and intolerance of parliament. Moseley's Cartwright volume has much in common with his Beaumont and Fletcher folio. A commendatory poem by William Cartwright appears in the Beaumont and Fletcher volume. Nine commendatory poets wrote verses for both books. Of those nine, five were members of the University of Oxford and two – John Berkenhead and
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52 R. Stapylton, 'On the Works of the most excellent Dramatick Poet, Mr. John Fletcher, never before printed', in ibid., n.p.
53 Ibid., title-page.
54 Shirley, 'To the Reader', in ibid., n.p.
Jasper Mayne – were among the most feisty defenders of the king's cause. Almost all of the poets who wrote commendatory poems for the Cartwright volume had studied at Oxford during their youth and half were members before the parliamentary Visitation. Indeed, Moseley's Cartwright edition was 'ushered... into the world', as Anthony Wood put it, by verses that were mostly written by Oxford men. It is to the Cartwright edition that I turn to next.

**William Cartwright: Comedies Tragi-Comedies With other Poems (1651)**

By the seventeenth century the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were the principal training ground of the nation's nobles, clergy and lawyers. The state had long relied on the clergy for promulgating its opinions in England's churches, and since the Reformation the Crown had monitored the conformity of the two universities to the religion of the state. At the outbreak of the war in 1642, it was in each party's interests to gain influence over the two universities. Cambridge was swiftly captured by parliament at the beginning of the civil war and in the purge that followed over two hundred fellows and students were ejected. Among this number were the poets Abraham Cowley, Richard Crashaw and John Cleveland who all moved to Oxford. From the beginning of hostilities, Oxford rallied to the king. University men mustered at Christ Church where they were quickly joined by forces under Sir John Byron and together they set about fortifying the town.

---


period of repression under parliamentary forces in Oxford saw the arrest of William
Cartwright, among others, for 'utteringe' words against parliament and for 'trayninge at the
Universities musters'. But this period was brief and once freed from the parliamentary
occupation Oxford remained loyal to the Crown. Charles I made Oxford his wartime capital
and from late 1642 until the end of the war the city was crowded with royalist soldiers,
courtiers and noblemen living cheek-by-jowl. From 1643 to 1645 the university was the
'fountainhead' of royalist propaganda and political thought which flowed from the presses of
the Oxford printers Leonard Lichfield and Henry Hall. The main royalist newsbook,
Mercurius Aulicus, was written there by the Anglican divine Peter Heylyn and then John
Berkenhead. Parliament faced a more determined resistance in Oxford, perhaps, than
anywhere else in England. According to Edward Hyde, it was 'the only city of England that he
[Charles I] could say was entirely at his devotion'.

The fall of Oxford in June 1646 signalled the collapse of the royalist effort and victory for
parliament. Although the city surrendered, the royalist spirit which had predominated
remained strong. Parliament's efforts to bring the university to political and theological
obedience were strongly resisted. Almost a year after the surrender of Oxford, on 1 May 1647,
an ordinance was passed for the 'Visitation and Reformation of the University of Oxford'.
The Visitors were appointed to 'enquire of, and hear and determine all and every crimes,
offences, abuses, disorders, and all other matters whatsoever'. All those who had 'taken up,
or been in Arms against the Parliament, or against any of the Forces raised by Authority

60 Ibid., ii, p. 451.
royalist literature from Oxford see Thomas, Berkenhead, pp. 52-5.
63 CHR, vi, p. 99.
64 On the Puritan Visitation of the University of Oxford see M. Burrows, The Register of the Visitors of the
University of Oxford from AD 1647 to AD 1648 (London, 1881); I. Roy and D. Reinhart, 'The Civil Wars',
in Tyacke, History of the University, pp. 723-31; B. Worden, God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the
65 CSPD, 1645-47, p. 551.
thereof, or that have been active in in assisting or encouraging the Forces raised against Parliament' were ordered to be rooted out and ejected.\textsuperscript{66} At the university, the Visitors met with opposition from the Convocation whose members included Samuel Fell, the Dean of Christ Church and chief dignitary of the university, Gilbert Sheldon, Warden of All Souls College and future Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Hammond, a Canon of Christ Church, and Robert Sanderson another Canon of Christ Church and Regis Professor of Divinity. Clarendon, some years later, wrote that this 'Convocation' against the Visitation 'must remain to the world's end as a monument of the learning, courage, and loyalty of that excellent place to eternity, against the highest malice and tyranny that was ever exercised in and over any nation'.\textsuperscript{67} Parliament reacted with a further ordinance dated 26 August 1647 under the terms of which all those who did not submit to parliament could be committed to prison, as were Sheldon, Fell and Hammond.\textsuperscript{68} In January 1651, the university elected Oliver Cromwell as its Chancellor, a position which had traditionally been filled by a churchman, statesman, or nobleman of influence.\textsuperscript{69} Published in the same year, Moseley dedicated his Cartwright volume, 'To the most renowned and happy mother of all learning and ingenuity, the (late most flourishing) University of Oxford'. It was a timely reminder of her royalist past: Moseley harked back to the time before the civil wars, to a time when 'Oxford was a University'.\textsuperscript{70}

Any doubt that Moseley had Oxford's royalist past in mind evaporates when we encounter compliments to three Oxford men in his prefatory epistle: Thomas Barlow, Brian Duppa and Dudley Digges. For Moseley, these three gentlemen of 'piety and learning' represented Oxford at its best, and all were committed royalists and polemicists. During the 1630s, Digges had contributed loyal poems to collections published by the university including \textit{Musarum}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66} Ibid., p. 551.
\item \textsuperscript{67} \textit{CHR}, iv, pp. 282-3.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Firth and Rait, i, pp. 925-6 & 1001; Burrows, p. lxvii.
\item \textsuperscript{69} B. Worden, \textit{God's Instruments}, p. 91.
\item \textsuperscript{70} H. Moseley, 'To the Reader', in W. Cartwright, \textit{Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With other Poems by William Cartwright} (1651).\
\end{itemize}
Oxoniensium and Solis Britannici perigaeum coronæ Carolinæ in 1633, and Flos Britannicis versis novissimi filiola Carola et Mariae in 1637. However, his most substantial work and his most notable contribution to contemporary royalist political thought was his The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking up Armes against their Soveraigne, which was published posthumously in 1643 and had 'great vogue among Royalists'. Thomas Barlow had written a biting satire on the Oxford Visitation some years earlier in which he described the Visitors as 'men who are to make Lawes for others, and not to bee ruled by any themselves'. Duppa was a key figure in Oxford under whose guidance and personal patronage fellows and students upheld the royalism that he exemplified in his own works. As editor of the volume of poetry eulogising Ben Jonson, Jonsonus Virbius, Duppa brought together a group of poets and scholars who shared his dual support of art and the establishment. Cartwright was one among his contributors. Also attributed to Duppa is A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings used in His Majesties Chappell and in His Armyes (1643) which, according to its title-page, was published by the king's command and was to be duly 'read within all his Churches and Chappels in this His Kingdome'. Contained in the same pamphlet is 'A Prayer to be said during these times of troubles' in which Duppa prayed for 'salvation to Our King', and his delivery 'from the perill of the sword'.

Like Duppa, Digges and Barlow many of the poets who penned prefatory verses to the Cartwright volume had previously contributed to the wealth of royalist polemic and political thought. The most noteworthy among these, perhaps, were Martin Lluellyn, Henry Vaughan, Robert Waring, John Berkenhead and James Howell. Martin Lluellyn, one time tutor to

71 D. Stoker, 'Digges, Dudley (1613-1643)', ODNB.
73 T. Barlow, Pegasus: Or the Flying Horse from Oxford Bringing the Proceedings of the Visitours and other Bedlamites there, by the Command of the Earle of Montgomery (Oxford, c. 1648). Although the pamphlet itself is not dated, Thomason dated his copy 29 April 1648 British Library ref. E.437 [28].
75 B. Duppa, A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings used in His Majesties Chappell and in His Armyes (n.d.), p. 7.
James, Duke of York, produced a rare elegy on Laud which was published shortly after the Archbishop's death.\(^{76}\) This was followed by a verse riposte to the embarrassing appearance of Charles I's letters in *The King's Cabinet Opened* which was published later that year.\(^{77}\) Lluellyn's volume of poems, *Men-Miracles with Other Political Poems* (1646), contained these and other loyal poems and was dedicated to his ex-pupil the Duke of York.\(^{78}\) Henry Vaughan's gathering of poems from his student days and later from his retirement is less overtly partisan in content. However, his royalism is clear in the mode of his introductory address, 'To all Ingenious Lovers of Poesie', the 'more refined spirits' who can 'out-wing these dull times', soar above 'the drudgerie of durty Intelligence' and revel in the 'Dregs of an Age'.\(^{79}\)

Like Thomas Barlow, Robert Waring was involved in the propaganda against the Visitation: in 1648 he wrote *An account of Mr. Pryn's refutation of the University of Oxfords plea sent to a friend in a second letter from Oxford* which signalled his involvement in John Fell's defence of the university: *The privileges of the University of Oxford in point of visitation cleerly evidenced by letter to an honourable personage: together with the university's answer to the summons of the visitors of 1647*. In addition to writing and editing the royalist newsbook, *Mercurius Aulicus*, Berkenhead was a notorious polemicist for the king.\(^{80}\) In another of his newsbooks, *Mercurius Bellicus*, he described the Visitation as 'a furious rape' committed by a 'savage monster' the like of which 'was never known in any age'.\(^{81}\)

As we have seen, the 'Act Against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books' of September 1649 prevented royalists from printing propaganda in pamphlets and newsbooks. However,

\(^{77}\) M. Lluellyn, *A Satyr, occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled The King's Cabinet Opened* (Oxford, 1645).
\(^{79}\) H. Vaughan, 'To All Ingenious Lovers of Poesie', in *Poems with the tenth Satyr of Juvenal Englished by Henry Vaughan* (London, 1646), n.p.
\(^{80}\) For the only and best account of Berkenhead's career as a polemicist see Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*.
criticisms of the Visitation could still be made in royalist literary works. In his prefatory poem to the Cartwright volume, Berkenhead continued to describe the destruction of Oxford:

As the great World built in a Week, shall lye
Flat at one blow (for Death and Time shall dye:)
So Oxford, twice-six Ages upward grown,
Sunk all at once, and fell from Best to None. 82

As in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, the parliamentary attack on learning and literary culture is condemned. Ralph Bathurst claimed that: 'They who (worse than ten Inquisitions) do / Forbid not only Books, but Learning too.' 83 In his commendatory poem Robert Waring railed at the unqualified 'Town-wit' that had been sent to judge the university and its scholars:

And now, yee Town-Wits, who are still so fierce
To vote and drink against all scholars verse,
Telling us 'Tis ill writ,
'Tis Learning and not Wit,
It tasts of Oxford---oh
That your verse would do so!
Leave, leave, for now Old Oxford's fled, the New
Is fitted for such knowing souls as You. 84

Berkenhead in particular equated parliamentary rule with political, religious and cultural destruction. The Commonwealth government, he said, looked on poetry 'as on some fatall thing, / As if it were some good Bishop or great King ...'. 85

Many of the commendatory poets had been directly affected by the Visitation. Significantly every Oxford man whose commendatory poem was published by Moseley had, in the first instance, refused to submit to the Visitors. Of the commendatory poets, Ralph Bathurst was the only Oxford man who submitted to the authority of parliament, the others, who were largely drawn from Christ Church, the prime royalist foothold within the university, had all been ejected. In his commendatory poem, Sir Edward Dering the younger lamented the

---
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ejection of Oxford scholars:

For where hereafter shall the Muses tread
Their even Measures? They alas are fled
From their old Seats their frightened heads to hide
By Helicon's now long neglected side:
There were such times, Great Oxford was the Stage
Both of a Golden and an Iron Age:86

Dering's 'even Measures' is evocative of Caroline harmony which was a common trope in royalist poetry as we have seen.87 He viewed wartime Oxford as both a 'Golden and an Iron Age'. John Fell looked back to the mid-1640s with similar sentiment in his The Life of that Reverend Divine Dr. Thomas Fuller (1661). He recalled a distinguished gathering of talent owing to the peculiar circumstances of war: ‘Oxford was then the common refuge and shelter of such persecuted persons, so that it never was nor is like to become a more Learned University,… nor did ever Letters and Arms so well consist together, it being an accomplisht Academy of Both’.88 Dering's poem may have been influenced by Sir John Denham's Cooper's Hill which celebrated the harmonious relationship between the muses and monarchy in similar terms. Denham wrote:

Sure there are Poets which did never dream
Upon Parnassus, nor did tast the stream
Of Helicon, we therefore may suppose
Those made not Poets, but the Poets those.
And as Courts make not Kings, but Kings the Court
So where the Muses and their train resort,
Parnassus stands: if I can be to thee
A Poet, thou Parnassus are to me.89

The repeated chiasmus in 'Those made not Poets, but the Poets those. / And as Courts make not Kings, but Kings the Court' has a hypnotic effect which merges 'Kings', 'Courts' and

87 See above, p. 45.
88 J. Fell, The Life of that Reverend Divine Dr. Thomas Fuller (1662), p. 22.
'Poets' in the imagination and encourages the reader to see them as interdependent. For Dering the muses were the Oxford scholars who had 'fled' or been ejected from their seats by the parliamentary Visitors. It is worth noting that James Howell also associated the Muses with the University of Oxford as did Hyde who said Charles I had been received by the university 'with that joy and acclamation as Apollo should be by the Muses'.

The university was, as the Earl of Monmouth suggests, inextricably linked with the Court and poetry:

...Cartwright was he
Who when the Court and University
Did with most lustre flourish, took all Eyes,
Wrote wit for Youth, and Learning for the Wise.

Like the prefatory poems in the Beaumont and Fletcher volume, those in the Cartwright edition invoke the glory of English culture under the Stuarts. When Moseley gathered together his commendatory poets in print, he recreated the sort of literary community that had previously gathered in person in the court and at Oxford.

George Hill, the scholar poet, in his commendatory poem suggested that there was an impulse to survive the persecution of the Visitors:

Let times ne'r so bad, that none can thrive,
When most men break, Poets we see can live;
And their unbridled Muse securely run
Undaunted through the rage of Tax or Gun:
Thus midd'st the wither'd Trees 'tis always seen
In Winter-time the Laurell holds up green.

This was a call to throw off despair no matter how 'bad' the times, and to run 'unbridled' and 'undaunted' through financial crippling or warfare. In the bleakness of the royalists' metaphorical winter, the laurel – an ancient symbol for poets – possessed the power to hold up
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'green'. Several of the commendatory poems strike a similar tone of defiance. William Towers described Cartwright and his poetry as having the power to resurrect: 'thus re-born', 'Prometheus-like we steal from Heav'n our Light'. Towers uses the myth of Antaeus, a classical symbol of the unconquerable:

Thus when they thought Antaeus most cast down, 
he seem'd to kiss the earth, but graspt the Crown, 
They who wrote tumult, and not Elegy, 
Did thy quick strain into a Fame defie; 
Great King of Poets! Who didst most of all 
Rise King when throngs of small wits sought thy Fall.  

Richard Iles also claimed that a redemption and resurrection could be gained through poetry:

...Cartwright has redeem'd; whose Book thus writ, 
Declares the Resurrection of Wit. 
And as Seth's Pillars in the Deluge stood 
Which told there was a world before the Flood.

Moseley's Cartwright volume, like his Beaumont and Fletcher folio, was intended to memorialize the past. Both were also published to condemn the derogation of literature and learning whilst at the same time they attempted to fortify royalist resolve. That Moseley chose to publish the works of the celebrated dramatists Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher is not surprising: every student of literature today is at least familiar with the names Beaumont and Fletcher. But why did he choose to publish the works of William Cartwright, who was relatively unknown in his own time outside of Oxford? It is to explain why Moseley chose this poet for his next big venture that I now turn.

**William Cartwright**

William Cartwright was not a professional playwright: he was an ecclesiastic and academic with a penchant for writing lyric and dramatic poetry. He has not, and did not at the time have,
the stature of Beaumont and Fletcher. When Moseley searched for a successor to his Beaumont and Fletcher folio, there were far more worthy candidates: George Chapman, Philip Massinger, Thomas Dekker or the prodigious Thomas Middleton, for example.

Cartwright's plays are not original and although drama was not judged on originality in the seventeenth century as we tend to judge it today, he lacked the ability of Shakespeare or Jonson to treat a well-known story with any originality. His characters tend to say too much and do too little so that his plays lack dramatic tension and denouement. His canon is small and performances of his plays were largely confined to Oxford. One of the few plays staged in London was Cartwright's *The Siege*, but it was not well-received. Josias Howe, in his commendatory poem, indicated that its London performance 'crackt the Rooms', and made the audience 'groan' until 'th'Siedge did end'. There is no evidence that Cartwright's popularity extended beyond Oxford and the court. As we have seen, Moseley boasted of the number of commendatory poets that had flocked to praise Cartwright, yet the sheer number of eulogies prefacing the work has an air of protesting too much. Despite the protestations of Cartwright's skill and popularity it seems likely that his reputation in the later seventeenth-century rests largely on Moseley's 1651 volume. Aubrey pondered what a 'Pitty 'tis so famous a bard should lye without an inscription'. The lack of inscription on Cartwright's grave indicates that the scholar and poet was perhaps not so highly esteemed when he died in 1643 as he was after Moseley published his works. Biographical information about William Cartwright is today drawn largely from David Lloyd, a fervent royalist and biographer whose *Memoires* (1668) included ‘the life and martyrdom of King Charles I’. However, Lloyd's observations on Cartwright's reputation are drawn almost entirely from the commendatory poems in Moseley's
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1651 volume. Lloyd quoted at length from the poems of Monmouth, Bathurst, Fell, Severne, Towers, Dering, Lluellyn and Pettus.\textsuperscript{99} It appears, therefore, that Moseley rescued Cartwright from oblivion. With this in mind it is reasonable to conclude that the stationer's impetus for publishing a writer whose reputation he himself built must lie rather in his political motives than his profit margin.

Cartwright appealed to Moseley as a type, a type which in the flux of seventeenth-century thought and event represented all the old virtues as he understood them to be: loyalty to the king and to the established Church.\textsuperscript{100} Although Cartwright was relatively unknown on the London stage, he was known to royalists as a Caroline panegyrist and propagandist. His devotion to Charles and Henrietta Maria is an outstanding feature of his poetry. Between the end of the 1629 Parliament and the Short Parliament of 1640 the university publications devoted to the monarchy surpassed the number issued in the previous four decades.\textsuperscript{101}

Frequent contributors to poems celebrating the royal family in the 1630s aside from Cartwright include Jasper Mayne, Martin Lluellyn and Josias Howe, all of whom wrote commendatory poems for the Cartwright edition. There are, in all, eleven English poems by Cartwright addressed to various members of the royal family and many references to them in other poems. He chronicled each of the royal births and created a mode of praise for the

\textsuperscript{99} D. Lloyd, \textit{Memoires of the lives, actions, sufferings & deaths of those noble, reverend and excellent personages that suffered by death, sequestration, decimation, or otherwise, for the Protestant Religion and the great principle thereof, Allegiance to their Soveraigne, in our late intestine wars, from the year 1637 to the year 1660, and from thence continued to 1666 with the Life and Martyrdom of King Charles I} (London, 1668), pp. 422-5. Compare to Monmouth, 'Upon Mr. Cartwright's Excellent Poems Now collected and published'; Bathurst, 'On the Death of Mr. William Cartwright, and the now publishing of his Poems'; Fell, 'On Mr William Cartwright's excellent Poems, collected and published since his Death'; Severne, 'On Mr Cartwright's Poems Now collected and Published'; Towers, 'On Mr William Cartwright's surviving Poems'; Dering, 'On the Incomparable Poems of Mr William Cartwright, late Student of Christ Church in Oxford'; Lluellyn, 'To the rich memory of my honoured Friend the Learned Author'; and Pettus, 'On Mr Cartwright's excellent Poems, now Collected and published', in Cartwright, \textit{Comedies, Tragi-Comedies}, n.p.
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Caroline Stuarts that used the traditions of university poetry to support the monarchy. In October 1642, according to John Aubrey, Cartwright 'writt … the sermon that by the King's command he preached at his returne from Edge-hill fight'. In his commendatory poem Henry Vaughan remembered Cartwright as an accomplished and effective mouthpiece for the king:

Thou art the man, whom Great CHARLES so exprest!
Then let the Crowd refraine their needless humme,
When Thunder speaks, then squibs and winds are dumb.

Moseley, it seems, resurrected Cartwright not because of his skill in writing dramatic poetry, but because in the past he had been a prolific spokesman for the king.

The degree of intertextuality between the Cartwright volume and two pieces of his royalist propaganda from July 1643 is notable. Two of the poems that Moseley included in his volume of Cartwright's works had appeared in royalist pamphlets in 1643. In July 1643 Cartwright contributed poems to the collection of elegies titled *Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sir Bevil Grenvill, Knight* and a volume of poems which celebrated Henrietta Maria's return from the Low Countries: *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibathpia Serenissimae Reginarum Mariae Ex Batavia Feliciter Reduci*. That a number of his commendatory poets had also contributed verses to these two pamphlets cannot be a coincidence.

When Henrietta Maria returned to England from the Low Countries in July 1643 with military supplies, the prospects for a royalist success were high. A series of victories culminating in the annihilation of Sir William Waller's force at Roundway Down had taken place in the very week that the queen entered Oxford. To celebrate the safe return of the queen a volume of poems was published. No fewer than fourteen of the poets who contributed to this volume
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also wrote commendatory poems for the Cartwright edition. In the same month, the death of
the royalist hero Sir Bevil Grenville at the battle of Lansdown on 5 July prompted a volume
of commemorative verse that celebrated his courage and sacrifice. Grenville had led his
Cornish pikemen against four cavalry charges before dying a hero to the royalist cause.
Although the contributors to this volume are identified solely by their initials rather than by
name, it is likely that they were the same men who participated in similar royalist polemic:
Digges, Mayne, Berkenhead, Cartwright and Lluellyn, for example, are easily identified.\textsuperscript{105}
Again, all of these appear in the Cartwright volume. When Moseley chose to feature poems
written by these men, he associated the Cartwright volume with the broader polemical
strategies of royalism which had emanated from Oxford during the war.

When Cartwright's poem on Henrietta Maria's return from the Low Countries and his eulogy
of Sir Bevil Grenville were reprinted in Moseley's 1651 edition of Cartwright's works, they
were heavily censored with blanked out sections. The first censored poem, with two fully
blanked stanzas, is Cartwright's panegyric on Henrietta Maria, 'On the Queens Return from
the Low Countries'. Henrietta Maria had shown bravery and determination when she
undertook the task of negotiating with foreign governments and arms dealers. She had ferried
her purchases personally through stormy seas and a naval blockade, and had even come under
fire of parliamentary ships which bombarded the harbour at Bridlington soon after she had
disembarked on 23 February 1643.\textsuperscript{106} In his poem Cartwright gave a hyperbolic account of the
queen's actions to show that she was a genuine asset to the king's cause despite her recent
impeachment for treason by parliament.\textsuperscript{107}

Courage was cast about Her like a Dresse

\textsuperscript{105} Verses on the Death of the Right Valiant Sir Bevil Grenvill, Knight Who was slaine by the Rebels, on
Landsdown hill neare Bath July 5 1643 (1644), pp. 2-5, 5-8, 9-11, 11-12 & 17.
\textsuperscript{106} Gardiner, CW, i, p. 94; Henrietta Maria described the bombardment in a letter to Charles I. See M.A.E.
Green, Letters of Henrietta Maria: including her private correspondence with Charles the First, collected
\textsuperscript{107} CJ, iii, pp. 100, 124, 126 & 130.
Of solemn Comelinesse;
A gather'd mind, and an untroubled Face
Did give Her dangers grace.\textsuperscript{108}

In the censored verses Cartwright shifts from praising the queen to excoriating her enemies.

The two stanzas which are blanked out from most of the 1651 editions warrant quoting in full:

\begin{quote}
When greater Tempests, then on Sea before,
Receav'd Her on the shore,
When she was shot at, \textit{for the King's own good},
By villaines hir'd to Blood;
How bravely did Shee doe, how bravely Beare,
And shew'd, though they durst rage, she durst not feare. (stanza 2)

Look on her enemies, on their Godly lyes,
Their Holy Perjuries,
Their Curs'd encrease of much ill gotten Wealth,
By Rapine or by stealth.
Their crafty Friendships knit by equall guilt,
And the Crown-Martyrs blood so lately spilt. (stanza 5).\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

Cartwright lauded the queen's triumph and scorned the rebel forces with venom. The 'shot at, \textit{for the king's own good}' is a sidelong taunt at the claim which was made in official statements that parliament fought to rescue the king from evil counsellors who had led him into war.\textsuperscript{110}

Howell had also observed the irony that parliamentarians had 'visibly' attempted 'to assaile and destroy' the king's person, whilst claiming to fight 'not \textit{against} him, but for him'.\textsuperscript{111}

Cartwright used parison, a favourite device of early modern rhetoricians, to pile accusations against the parliamentarians: 'Their Godly lies', 'Their Holy Perjuries' and 'Their crafty Friendships'.

Shifted from its original context of 1643, the poem gained new meaning in 1651. The 'Crown-Martyrs blood' in the original was a reference to Strafford who had been executed on 12 May
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1641. In 1651 readers could easily have made the erroneous assumption that the poem referred to Charles I: Cartwright's twentieth century editor Gwynne Evans made this mistake.\footnote{See G.B. Evans, \textit{Plays and Poems}, p. 759.} The 'Curs'd encrease of much ill gotten Wealth, / By Rapine or by stealth' was an effective piece of propaganda. In his sonnet, 'On the Lord General Fairfax at the Siege of Colchester' which was written in 1648, Milton warned Fairfax of 'the shameful brand / Of public fraud. In vain doth valour bleed / While avarice, and rapine share the land' which parliamentarians were susceptible to.\footnote{J. Milton, \textit{The Shorter Poems}, ed. John Carey (2nd edn., Harlow, 2007), pp. 323-4, ll. 10-14.} When Moseley published the Cartwright volume in 1651, the Commonwealth government had laid itself open to claims of avarice and self-interest. In April 1650 it sold off the lands of the late king and royal family, of the bishops, and of those they termed 'delinquents' which aroused accusations of corruption and greed.\footnote{CJ, vi, p. 393; J. Howell, \textit{Epistole Ho-Elianæ} (1655), pp. 76-7; Underdown, \textit{Royalist Conspiracy}, pp. 57-8.} If this was an effective piece of propaganda in 1643, it was even more so in 1651.

The deleted lines from Cartwright's eulogy to Sir Bevil Grenville were similarly offensive to the new Commonwealth government. The twelve lines blanked from most copies of the 1651 edition read as follows:

\begin{quote}
You now that boast the Spirit and its sway,  
Shew Us his Second, and we'll give the Day.  
We know your politique Axiom – Lurk, or Fly.  
Ye cannot conquer, Cause ye dare not Dye.  
And though you thanke God, that you lost none there,  
Because Thwere such, who Liv'd not when they were;  
Yet your great Generall (who doth Rise and Fall.  
As his successes doe; whom you dare call,  
As fame unto you doth Reports dispense,  
Either a Traitor, or His Excellence)  
How e'r he reignes now by unheard of Lawes,  
Could wish His Fate together with His Cause.\footnote{W. Cartwright, 'Upon the death of the Right Valiant Sir Bevil Grenvill, Knight', in idem, \textit{Comedies, Tragi-Comedies}, p. 304.} (lines 81-92).
\end{quote}

Cartwright turned Grenville's death into conquest through paradox: the 'dead conquered while...
the living slew' is just the kind of refusal to accept defeat that Moseley's commendatory poets expressed. Contempt for the rebels who tried to destroy the royalist spirit pulses through the verse. It is clear why these lines were offensive to the newly established Commonwealth. Written in 1643, the 'Traitor' General had referred to the Earl of Essex, but in the new context of 1651, it might well be taken to mean Cromwell who had replaced Fairfax as Lord General in 1650. Under the Treason act of 14 May 1649 any person who published or printed any text that proclaimed the government to be 'Tyrannical, Usurped or Unlawful' (my italics) would be adjudged of high treason. With this in mind it is not surprising that Cartwright's line 'How e'r he reignes now by unheard of Lawes' was ordered to be removed before it reached the press.

Although these two poems were supposed to be censored, they were not blanked in all of the copies that Moseley sold. The book was printed in variant states. The editor of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, Philip Bliss, was the first to notice that although Moseley stated in his postscript that he had not provided an index, two copies held in the Bodleian Library – one with a full index and another with fragments of it – show that one was actually printed, but was subsequently removed. This rare index sheds some light on the way that Moseley published his Cartwright volume: the two censored poems were not included in the index and did not appear in these copies. Moseley's postscript gives an indication of the reason for their omission. There are two versions of the postscript. The first, which is very rare, reads:

This *Impression* hath stood at the *Printers* Threshold ready to come forth; but staid for three sheets of our *Author's Manuscript* (remaining in the hands of an *Honourable Person*) which till last week we could not recover; and we would not publish a lame *Edition*. We shall not trouble you with an *Index*, for already the Book is bigger than we

---

116 For example, p. 96 above where Towers discussed Antaeus who gained power from defeat.
117 Firth and Rait, ii, pp. 120-1.
119 Only two editions have been found which contain this postscript. See Evans, *Plays and Poems*, p. 68, n. 4. I have found no additional copies with this postscript.
meant it, although we chose this Volume and Character purposely to bring down it's [sic] bulk. The Printer's faults (such as they are) must lye at his own door; for the written Copy was very exact. But (to save you that labour) the next Page tells you his ERRATA.

The second form of the postscript is the same except that the first sentence is omitted. The first version throws some light on the problem of the disappearing index and the censored poems. Although Moseley denied that an index existed, the two copies in the Bodleian show that an index was set up and some copies printed. Moseley appears to have withdrawn the index when the two poems which had been held up – presumably by the censors – were made available.

There are two distinct states of the two poems in circulation: the first (very rare) uncensored version; and a second censored version in which the two poems that troubled the censors contain blanks in place of the offending lines. Why did Moseley publish two versions of these poems? In usual circumstances blanks in books were caused by the use of paste-slips which were used in instances where errors were spotted by the corrector once the printing process was under way. This was commonly because of some error in the distribution of type.\textsuperscript{120} The result looks rather unsightly and would have been distasteful to Moseley who was demonstrably proud of his works: his errata lists always put the blame for errors firmly in the hands of his printers. More often than not, errors could be corrected simply by stopping the press and making a 'stop press' correction. In this instance the defective sheets already printed could be discarded so there would be no need for the unsightly blanks.\textsuperscript{121} In all the copies I have seen the pages in question are numbered 301-306 duplicating numbers in the original indexed copies, so the two poems could have been removed without disturbing the page-number sequence. This prompts us to conclude that the poems were blanked because they

\textsuperscript{120} R.B. McKerrow, \textit{An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students} (Oxford, 1994), pp. 222-4.
were censored. In one rare copy held in the British Library pages 301-306 are duplicated twice, one with the censored versions of the poems and one with the full uncensored version.\textsuperscript{122} The most likely explanation is that Moseley chose to publish the book in various forms to suit his customers. He included the poems with blanks to emphasize that they had been censored. This might have piqued the reader's curiosity enough to make them seek out the missing lines elsewhere.\textsuperscript{123} It was also an act of protest against the crude effects of the heavy handed censorship of the commonwealth regime.

The twin pillars of Moseley's literary publishing career are his folio edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's \textit{Comedies and Tragedies} (1647), and his octavo edition of William Cartwright's \textit{Comedies, Tragedies and Tragi-Comedies} (1651). When publishing these two volumes he sought to create a literary tradition and to shape a cultural and historical representation to suit his own purposes. These two volumes, with their extensive prefatory material, represent a unique textual space in which royalist soldiers, poets, and academics came together to express their literary and political ideals. These books were used to discredit parliament and the Commonwealth government by highlighting their belligerence and Philistinism. In his preface to the edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, Moseley portrayed himself as the saviour of scattered dramatic texts which had escaped 'these Publick Troubles, free and unmangled' meaning the disruption of the civil war. In his 1651 preface to his edition of William Cartwright he yearned for 'those days [when] Oxford was a University' or those days when Oxford University was free from the unwanted interference of parliament and the republican regime's representatives. The Cartwright edition was Oxford's revenge on those who had ejected so many of its fellows and scholars since the Visitation began in 1647.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{122} British Library shelf mark: G.18609.
\textsuperscript{123} Christopher Hill has also suggested that suppressed books enjoyed enhanced sales. See C. Hill, 'Censorship and English Literature', in \textit{The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill}, Volume One: \textit{Writing and Revolution in 17th Century England} (Brighton, 1985), p. 49.
against the expulsion of its members, and harked back to the haleyon days of an Oxford under Caroline protection and to the old order in general. Moreover, these efforts of propagandists and literary publishers in the civil wars and Interregnum to foster an identification of the Puritan-led parliament and republican government with hostility to the theatre and literary culture remains with us today.\(^\text{125}\)

\(^{125}\) Only recently has this view been challenged by Susan Wiseman in her *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1998).
Chapter Four

French Prose Romance in Interregnum England

During the civil wars there were some forms of literature that both sides tried to appropriate. Ballads were used by royalists and parliamentarians alike because of their associations with popular sentiment which both sides claimed to represent;¹ and Psalms, as will be seen in Chapter Five, were translated by both sides in order to influence opinion. But there were some literary genres which seemed to belong particularly to the royalists. This is true of elegy and drama as has been seen in Chapters One and Three. The genre of romance is another.² From 1652 to 1661 Moseley was the most prolific publisher of translations of French prose romances. Just a few months before he died in 1661, Moseley published a full five-part translation of Gaultier de la Calprenède's prose romance Cassandra which announced on its title-page its royalist pedigree. The French work was 'Elegantly rendered into ENGLISH' by 'Sir Charles Cotterell Master of the Ceremonies to His late Majesty of Blessed Memory, and to our present SOVERAIGN CHARLES II. KING'.³ In the closing pages of the volume is an advertisement under a monarchical head-ornament which lists the numerous French prose romances that the buyer could find in Moseley's shop.⁴ In this chapter I trace the evolution of romance to examine why it had such appeal to royalists during the Interregnum. It will

---

³ G. de la Calprenède, Cassandra the Fam'd Romance the Whole Work: In five Parts; Written Originally in FRENCH AND Now Elegantly Rendred into ENGLISH. By Sir Charles Cotterell, Master of the Ceremonies to His late Majesty of Blessed Memory, and to our present SOVERAIGN CHARLES II. KING of Great Britain, France and Ireland &c (London, 1661), title-page
⁴ H. Moseley, 'Other Excellent Romances Printed for Humphrey Mosley at the Princes Arms in St. Pauls Church-Yard', in ibid., part Ult. p. 80.
become apparent that this was a genre that appealed to royalists because of its history of political engagement, and because of its association with the English court of the 1630s.

**The Evolution of Romance as a Royalist Genre**

Romance as a genre descended from sources as diverse as Homer's *Odyssey*, the Greek prose fiction of Heliodorus, and the chivalric *romans* of medieval Europe. From its Greek heritage through the medieval chivalric romance into the early modern period, the genre developed as one of its foundational narratives the recuperation of lost royal heirs and the rationalization of hereditary monarchy. In the Renaissance it was usually concerned with characters who lived in a courtly world, and often involved an episode of pastoral escape. Romances offered a means through which cultural values and ideals were recorded, maintained and promulgated. They were widely regarded as educational: to subjects they offered models of loyalty and faithfulness; and to princes they offered advice and ethical guidance on the behaviour required for society and the body politic to function at its best. Tudor England expected romance to test values, but ultimately to reaffirm them.

Romance was the chosen vehicle for Sir Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and John Barclay to write about Elizabethan and Jacobean government. Written around 1580, Sidney's *Old Arcadia* was conceived at a critical moment in English history. The *Arcadia* is set in an ancient and mythical land, but it is also a commentary on contemporary Elizabethan politics. At the time Elizabeth I was contemplating marriage to the heir to the French throne, the

---

9 Ibid., p. 6.
Catholic Duke of Anjou. This was a match that Sidney believed would produce 'a sea-change in English and European politics': it threatened the return of Catholicism to England and the establishment of an absolute monarchy on the French model. Sidney's pastoral romance warns against the perils of absolute monarchy and political inaction, but also reaffirms the superiority of a monarchy which governs by the law and which values good counsel. In his Faerie Queene, Spenser celebrated, memorialized and critiqued Elizabethan rule, most notably in his thinly veiled assessments of her policy towards Ireland and the trial of Mary Queen of Scots in Book V.

Barclay was born and educated in France and from 1605 spent roughly ten years at the court of James I in England. His father, a Scottish jurist, had a close association with James, whom he helped to assert the idea of absolute monarchy in opposition to Papal incursions. Barclay continued his father's work by writing a series of works which flattered or appealed to James I. Later, while living in Rome, he began what would become his greatest work, the posthumously published romance Argenis (1621). Argenis discussed the uses and abuses of power and was popular with James I because of its support for absolute monarchy and the ignoring of parliaments.

There was a good deal of cross-pollination of romance in the 1620s between England and France. Although Spenser's Faerie Queene was virtually unheard of in France, Barclay's Argenis was an international sensation. It was first published in Latin in Paris in 1621 and achieved immediate success throughout Europe. In England, James commanded that the poet

11 Worden, Sound of Virtue, p. 89.
15 See J. Barclay, Regi Jacobo Primo, carmen gratulatorium (1603); Series patefacti nuper parricidii: in ter maximum Regem regnumque Britanniae cogitati & instructi (1605); and Sylvae (1605).
16 Smith, Literature and Revolution, p. 235.
17 Salzman, Literature and Politics, p. 106.
and playwright Ben Jonson translate the work into English. Jonson's translation was duly registered with the Stationers' Company, but the manuscript was lost in the poet's infamous fire before it was printed. Although Jonson did not attempt to re-write his translation, perhaps because his patron died, other English versions, by Kingsmill Long and Robert Le Grys, were published in 1625 and 1628 respectively. Argenis was also translated into French (1622), Spanish (1626), German (1626), Italian (1634), and Dutch (1643). In France the most influential writer of prose romance in the early seventeenth century was Honoré d'Urfé whose most famous work, L'Astrée, was first translated into English in 1620. Like Sidney, d'Urfé set political comment within a chivalric and pastoral framework. L'Astrée combined stories of shepherds with veiled accounts of the adventures of Henry IV. L'Astrée was an immensely popular romance divided into five volumes which ran to over five-thousand pages. The first three volumes were published respectively in 1607, 1610, and 1619. The fourth was published in 1627 two years after the author's death and the fifth volume was written and published by d'Urfé's secretary Balthazar Baro. L'Astrée's popularity had much to do with the success of Sidney's Arcadia in France. Sidney's twice penned Arcadia had 'crept' over in the early years of the seventeenth century in the vernacular and was translated into French in 1624 and 1625 allegedly at the request of Henrietta Maria's mother, Marie de Medici.

---

18 The letter writer John Chamberlain noted that James had requested that Jonson translate Argenis and that the translation was registered in the Stationers' register. See N.E. McClure, ed., The Letters of John Chamberlain, 2 vols. (Philadelphia 1939), ii, pp. 435-6; and Jonson's Execration Upon Vulcan. Kingsmill Long published and English translation in 1625, and Robert Le Grys was commissioned to translate the book in 1628. The title-page announces that it was published 'upon his Majesty's Command'.

19 J. Barclay, Barclay his Argenis: or, The loves of Poliarchus and Argenis: faithfully translated out of Latine into English, by Kingesmill Long, Gent (1625); and idem, John Barclay his Argenis, translated out of Latine into English: the prose upon his Majesties command: by Sir Robert Le Grys, Knight: ... and published by his Majesties command (1628).


23 Ibid., p. 281. The two translations are L'Arcadie de la Comtesse de Pembrok, composee par Messire Philipp Sidney, Chevalier Anglois et mis en nostr langue, par J. Baudoin (Paris, 1624); and L'Arcadie de la Comtesse de Pembrok: Composee par Messire Phillipe Sidney Chevalier Anglois. Traduite en nostre langue par un gentil-homme françois (Paris, 1625). The gentleman in question was actually a woman, Genevieve Chappelain. Baudoin's translation is dedicated to 'la Reine Mere du Roy'.

---
sixteenth century courtiers like Sidney and Essex had dressed in costumes and made speeches in which the deeds they had performed in the queen's service were cast in the imagery of romance.\textsuperscript{24} In the seventeenth century the French nobility dressed as d'Urfé's characters from \textit{L'Astrée}.\textsuperscript{25}

These romances were highly influential in setting the fashions in the \textit{salons} of France from the 1620s and in the English court of the 1630s.\textsuperscript{26} In the early seventeenth century French society, largely through the influence of Marie de Medici, adopted the institution of the \textit{salon} which had flourished in the Italian city-states. Influenced by Castiglione's \textit{The Book of the Courtier}, rulers established \textit{salons} to further art, culture, and civility in their states to give the aristocracy goals other than internecine rivalry and warfare.\textsuperscript{27} Upon her marriage to Henry IV, Marie de Medici, who was born in Florence, transplanted these ideals into France where she became a great patron of the arts.\textsuperscript{28} The \textit{salons} brought together men and women who had a common interest in social diversion and rational discussion. The most well-known of the \textit{salons} was that led by Catherine de Vivonne at the Hôtel de Rambouillet which flourished from the early 1620s to the 1640s.\textsuperscript{29} The circle that gathered at the Rambouillet sought to base their lives and behaviour on the stories they read in romances and d'Urfé's \textit{L'Astrée} in particular.

One of the most important and influential features of \textit{L'Astrée} was the doctrine of Neoplatonic love, the concept that society could be bettered through virtue and chastity.\textsuperscript{30} Plato's ideas had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Norbrook, \textit{Poetry and Politics}, p. 198.
\item \textsuperscript{25} R. Picard, \textit{Les salons littéraires et la société française, 1610-1789} (New York, 1943), chapter 5.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Veevers, \textit{Images of Love}, pp. 16-18 & 44-5.
\item \textsuperscript{27} J. Donawerth and J. Strongson, eds., \textit{Selected Letters, Orations and Rhetorical Dialogues of Madeleine de Scudéry} (Chicago, 2004), p. 14.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Veevers, \textit{Images of Love}, p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{30} E. Veevers, \textit{Images of Love and Entertainment: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainment} (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 14-21.
\end{itemize}
gone through many transformations in the Renaissance. In the fifteenth century they gathered a Christian significance in the Florentine Academy primarily by Marsilio Ficino who translated all of Plato's extant works into Latin. Ficino's revival and Christianization of Plato's philosophy introduced the idealization of love as the route to a union with the divine.\textsuperscript{31} Through Ficino's influence Platonic love became a dominant theme of French literature and d'Urfé's \textit{L'Astrée} was no exception.\textsuperscript{32} That Henrietta Maria fostered the French fashion for Neoplatonic romance at the English court, and hastened the adoption of its ideas by court poets was established by J.B. Fletcher over a hundred years ago.\textsuperscript{33} Fletcher traced the origins of Henrietta's Maria's fashions to the Hôtel de Rambouillet and to the influence of d'Urfé's \textit{L'Astrée}.

In England, interest in French romance grew roughly in proportion to Henrietta Maria's increasing influence at court. In 1629 French players, including women, appeared upon the English stage at court for the first time, and by 1632 these court productions had become common.\textsuperscript{34} The fashion for romance imported by Henrietta Maria influenced court life and culture throughout Charles' reign and beyond to the Restoration.\textsuperscript{35} The extension of the concept of love beyond the personal to a principle of universal peace made a useful political statement for Charles I in the 1630s as he shied away from joining his Protestant counterparts who were engaged in the Thirty Years War on the Continent. In masques at court and in poetry the royal couple were displayed under various mythological and pastoral disguises enacting the union of heroic virtue and divine beauty or love which was the product of their marriage.\textsuperscript{36}

This idealization of married love counteracted the value of action in arms and warfare with a

\begin{footnotes}
\item[32] Ibid., p. 232.
\item[33] J.B. Fletcher, 'Précieuses at the Court of King Charles I', \textit{Journal of Comparative Literature}, 1 (1903), pp. 120-53; and Veevers, \textit{Images of Love}, pp. 1-24.
\item[35] Fletcher, 'Précieuses at the Court', pp. 120-53.
\end{footnotes}
universal peace and harmony. Charles cast himself as the patriarchal protector of his people, whose wisdom would defeat malignant spirits, and who would lead his country to an unrivalled peace and contentment. Moreover, the marriage contract with its claims of love and affection was used as an analogy for the obligations and obedience subjects owed to the Crown.

Martin Butler has shown that the political functions of the literary culture that Henrietta Maria imported from France provided a focus for opposition to policies of Charles I. His passivity was compared unfavourably with the Protestant hero, Sweden's King Gustavus Adolphus. John Milton attempted to refute the crown's appropriation of literary culture when he was commissioned to produce a masque in honour of the Earl of Bridgewater. The result, his masque *Comus*, radically challenged the 'cultural politics of the court genre'. The bestial character Comus was created to exemplify and critique Cavalier licentiousness, Laudian ritual, the depravities of Caroline masques and holiday festivities and past-times such as maypoles, morris dances and whitsun ales. In this way the court was depicted not as the locus of virtue that the Caroline masques suggested, but rather as the residence of Comus. Ann Baynes Coiro has shown that in the 1640s most parliamentarians rejected the idea that the royal marriage was the embodiment of right order and harmony in the kingdom.

---


38 Ibid., p. 200.

39 B. Shapiro, *Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558-1688* (Stanford, California, 2012), p. 149. See for example Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha* although this was not published until 1680.


effects of romance and its ideals on the nobility. Courtiers, he said, had been turned into 'slaves', the 'king's mere creations'; a sad decline from the 'bold barons' who had defended the liberties that they had seen enshrined in Magna Carta. Wither's focus of attack was the way in which the English court had mimicked its French neighbour's fashions and addiction to romance. He accused courtiers of being 'Apes unto the French' who 'followed most of their fashions', their 'hair powdered with dust' and their faces 'dewed' with 'Gesmin butter'.

With its criticism of absolutism and political inaction *Arcadia* might also have been thought all too apposite to the policies of the early Stuarts and Charles I in particular during the years of the Personal Rule. However, it was claimed for, although not monopolized by, 'the tradition and decorum of Cavalier culture'. Published three times in the 1590s, and still read and republished in James I's reign, Sidney's *Arcadia* continued to grow in popularity under Charles I. It was republished in 1628, 1629, 1633, and 1638. Although publication then ceased until 1655, in 1629 John Quarles published his verse-romance *Argalus and Parthenia*, the names being those of the prime exemplars of Platonic love taken from from Sidney's *Arcadia*. Quarles was no Sidney, but the book must have sold well regardless of its lack of literary merit as it was republished in 1630, 1632, 1635, 1647, 1654, 1656 and 1659. Also, in 1640 James Shirley published his dramatization of *Arcadia* which he claimed had been 'Acted by Her Majesties Servants at the Phoenix in Drury Lane'. As Annabel Patterson points out, *Arcadia* was popular with Charles I because he used it to identify himself with chivalric romance in the St. George legend, and Henrietta Maria with pastoral romance.

---

46 J. Shirley, *A Pastorall called the Arcadia Acted by Her Majesties Servants at the Phoenix in Drury Lane* (London, 1640).
47 Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, pp. 25-6.
Barclay's *Argenis* also remained popular. It was republished in 1625, 1628, 1629, 1634 and 1636. According to its title-page, the 1628 translation by Robert le Grys was published 'by his Majesties Command'. As Lois Potter and Blair Worden have pointed out, that Barclay and Sidney's romances feature weak kings and stress the political importance of a strong monarchy does not mean that the two writers intended to subvert the monarchies under which they lived and served. On the contrary, Barclay never suggests that the prince's power should be limited, and the consequences of such limitation are shown to be disastrous. Sidney may demonstrate the weaknesses of monarchy, but he also makes clear the weaknesses of aristocracy and democracy; and despite his aversion to absolutism, it is only when he discusses monarchy that he also shows the strengths.

During the civil wars and Interregnum royalists found in Sidney's *Arcadia* a key to class solidarity and a language in which to express and assess their own recent history. Nigel Smith has argued that although Sidney's *Arcadia* was a chief influence on romance up to the 1640s, it failed to sufficiently explain the situation royalists found themselves in after the civil wars and was abandoned, an argument which he says is supported by its publishing history. However, as Potter has indicated, two continuations of Sidney's *Arcadia* which were written soon after the regicide suggest otherwise. The first, which circulated in manuscript, was probably written in 1649 by a member of the Digby family. The Digby manuscript ends with the execution of the king and a condemnation of the rebels who sought 'nought, but blood'.

---

48 Barclay, John Barclay his Argenis, translated out of Latine into English: the prose upon his Majesties command: by Sir Robert Le Grys, Knight: ... and published by his Majesties command (1628).
50 Ibid., p. 76.
52 Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 25.
53 Potter, *Secret Rites*, pp. 93-4. The manuscript is entitled The History of Arcadia, or an Addition to and a Continuance of Sir Phillip Sidney's ARCADIA: Usually Styled The Countesse of Pembroke's ARCADIA', Yale University, Beinecke Library, Osborn MS b.107,62. According to the provenance notes the book was given by one of the 'Lord Digby's family' to Sir Charles Holt. A copy of the full text from the Osborn MS has recently been published: M. Mitchell and A. Lange, eds., *Continuations of Sidney's Arcadia 1607-1867*, 4 vols. (London, 2014), i, pp. 277-461.
The grandees set aside the rightful heir and 'charged all men, upon paine of death, not to propose Elpistos or any man else king of Arcadia; where they turned the fabricke of Monarchiale [sic] government, into a confused chaos of Democracy'. A second continuation, written by Anna Weamys, was published in 1651. This continuation has also been shown to reflect its writer's royalist political affinities. Quarles' *Argalus and Parthenia* was republished in 1647, 1654, 1656 and 1659 – the three final editions of which were published by Moseley. And in 1655 a composite edition of Sidney's *Arcadia* was published in folio. Within the volume is an extract from the politically conservative Peter Heylyn's *Cosmographie* which recommends Sidney's book because it offers 'notable rules for demeanour, both private and publicke'. If royalists abandoned romance, as Smith suggests, because it failed to 'explain the situation' that they found themselves in, then no-one told Charles I. In his *Eikon Basilike* the king took Pamela's prayer from *Arcadia* and used her words as if they were his own. John Milton was outraged. In his cutting riposte to *Eikon Basilike, Eikonoklastes*, he accused Charles I of plagiarizing Sidney's work and thereby polluting what was ostensibly a work of devotion with the 'orts and refuse of Arcadias and Romances, without being able to discern the affront rather then the worship of such an ethnic Prayer'.

With the outbreak of the civil war and the dispersal of the English court the publication of romances declined in England during the 1640s. In France, by contrast, the genre continued to thrive. The two most popular French authors of the genre were Madeleine de Scudéry and

---

54 Ibid., p. 461.
57 See 'Prayers used by His majesty in the time of His sufferings', in the edition of *Eikon Basilike* published by William Dugard in March 1649 and all subsequent editions.
58 Milton, *CPW*, iii, pp. 362-5. Annabel Patterson has observed that whilst Milton commended *Arcadia* for its 'worth and witt', he revealed his distaste for the genre when he qualified his compliment by setting it within the damning generic classification 'in that kind': Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 178-9.
Gautier de la Calprenède. In the political crises of France of the 1640s and 1650s known as the Frondes, Scudéry and de la Calprenède followed the Duc de Condé who sided with the king in the first Fronde and with the aristocracy in the second Fronde, although there is evidence that de Scudéry's support swung back to the king during 1652. Gautier de la Calprenède was born near Cahors around 1610. After studying at Toulouse, he joined the French army and fought in the German campaign. In 1632 he moved to Paris and by 1650 had gained the position of gentleman-in-ordinary in the king's chamber. His ten-volume Cassandre, which was divided into five parts, was published between 1642 and 1645 and the first volume of his twelve-part Cléopâtre was published in 1647. He began his final novel Faramond in 1658, but the first two volumes were not published in Paris until 1663. In 1637 de Scudéry was introduced by her playwright brother Georges to the literary salons of Paris. She quickly became a frequent guest at the Hôtel de Rambouillet. During the Rambouillet years, she launched her own literary career. Under the name of her brother Georges, she published an historical novel, Ibrahim or the Ilustrious Basa, in 1641; and Artamène or the Great Cyrus, a novel printed in ten volumes from 1648 to 1653. Although Artamène is set in ancient Assyria, it was clearly a roman-à-clef which depicted various members of Rambouillet's literary circle through pseudonyms. From 1653 Madeleine and Georges Scudéry established a new salon: the samedis, where a large literary circle assembled.

Scudéry continued to work as a prolific author and published her ten-volume Clélie or a Roman History from 1654 to 1661. Moseley published all of de Scudéry and de la Calprenède's works that were printed in France in his lifetime. In addition he published Bishop Camus' Elise in 1655; d'Urfé's L'Astrée in 1657; and Pierre d'Ortigue de Vaumorière's
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62 The best summary of Madeleine de Scudéry's life and works can be found in Donawerth and Strongson, Madeleine de Scudéry: Selected Letters, pp. 3-7.
The Grand Scipio in 1660. He also bought the rights to Gomberville's Polexandre in 1653 and advertised the book in his catalogues. From 1652 until 1661, when Moseley died, French prose romance translation maintained a popularity in England that it would never again achieve.

The Politics of Prose Romance in Interregnum England

By 1652 romance was, virtually without exception, a royalist genre. Romance translators were on the whole either royalists or associated with royalists. This was partly because 'only after periods of (enforced) inactivity were gentlemen and aristocrats able to produce such long works'. Translators by this time also had a fresh impulse drawn from immediate contact with the 'heroic' literature of France. Sir Charles Cotterell and George Digby both translated de la Calprenède's Cassandra while in exile and both translations were published by Moseley. Cotterell was a courtier who had served in the royalist army. He collaborated with William Aylesbury to translate, at the king's request, Davila's Storia delle guerre civile which was published in 1647 by Moseley's colleague, the printer and publisher Ruth Raworth. In March 1649, following the king's execution, Cotterell accompanied Aylesbury and the duke of Buckingham into exile, where he offered hospitality to royalist fugitives, and took service
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63 TRCS, i, p. 417. For a catalogue see Moseley, 'Other Excellent Romances', in Calprenède, Cassandra, part Ult. p. 80.
64 P. Salzman, 'Royalist epic and romance', in Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution (Cambridge, 2006), p. 216; Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation, p. 188.
65 Ibid., p. 234.
66 Upham, French Influence, p. 387.
67 A possible candidate for the authorship of the continuation of Sidney's Arcadia manuscript.
68 According to the Stationers' Register Cassandra was first translated by George Digby, although his name is not included on the title-page. Moseley published Digby's translation first since he registered his translation on 28 October 1651 and Cotterell's on 7 January 1652. Digby translated only the first three books of the first part, which Moseley published in octavo; and Cotterell translated all five parts which Moseley published in folio, probably because this was a complete translation which warranted publishing in the more expensive format: TRCS, i, pp. 382 & 388.
69 Ruth Raworth printed Milton's Poems (1645), James Shirley's Poems (1646), and John Suckling's Fragmenta Aurea (1646) for Moseley and sold him the rights to Fanshawe's translation of Guarini's Il Pastor Fido in 1648.
successively with two members of the royal family before returning at the Restoration.\textsuperscript{70} Digby had also joined the king at Oxford at the beginning of the civil war and after the royalist surrender went to France with other English exiles. It is not known how Moseley came into possession of Digby's or Cotterell's manuscripts, but James Howell, according to his \textit{Epistolae}, corresponded with Digby; and Ruth Raworth, as we have seen, had dealings with both Cotterell and Moseley.\textsuperscript{71} The same printer's device appears on the title-pages of Davila's \textit{Storia delle guerre civile} and Cotterell's translation of \textit{Cassandra} which indicates that it was Raworth who introduced Moseley to Cotterell's manuscript.\textsuperscript{72} Most of Moseley's translators are less illustrious than Digby or Cotterell, but most have royalist connections. For example, Henry Cogan translated Scudéry's \textit{Ibrahim}. Although little is known of Cogan, he was assessed by the Committee for the Advance of Money, which had been appointed on 26 November 1642 to gather loans for public service in support of parliament, at £80 in 1643.\textsuperscript{73} On 29 April 1644 he was ordered to be brought into custody for failure to pay, which suggests that he was not a willing supporter of parliament.\textsuperscript{74} He was a friend of the royalist Sir Justinian Isham who stayed at his house in Charing Cross on occasion during the years 1649 to 1653.\textsuperscript{75} Cogan was an assiduous translator who on two occasions dedicated a book to a friend or patron. On both occasions the recipient was a royalist: he dedicated his \textit{Court of Rome} (1654) to Isham; and \textit{The Voyages and Adventures of


\textsuperscript{71} See James Howell, \textit{Epistolae Ho-Elianae} (1645), pp. 72-3.

\textsuperscript{72} The same device, two hands activating pumps with the motto \textit{Dum Premor Attollor}, appears on the title pages of two other royalist works that were printed by Thomas Newcomb, Raworth's second husband who took over her business after her death in 1653: see J.P. Camus \textit{Elise or Innocencie Guilty: A New Romance Translated into English by John Jennings, Gent} (1655) which was published by Moseley and Sir William Davenant's \textit{Gondibert} (1651) which was published by John Holden.


\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., i, p. 220.

\textsuperscript{75} There is a draft of a letter from Isham to Cogan in which the writer expresses his wish that he was 'taking a turne with you in the Park where I had the happiness of your conversation': G. Isham, \textit{The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650-1660} (Northamptonshire Record Society, 1951), p. 71. n.2. Re Isham lodging with Cogan at Charing Cross see ibid., pp. 29, 61 & n.1, 70-1 & n.2.
Fernand Mendez Pinto to William Earl of Strafford, the son of the royalist martyr Sir Thomas Wentworth. According to a letter of intelligence in 1655, Strafford was 'deeply involved' in royalist plotting.\textsuperscript{76} Given these acquaintances and his unwillingness to fund parliament's efforts during the civil wars, we may conclude that Cogan's sympathies probably lay with the Stuarts. John Jennings is another of Moseley's translators about whom little is known. But by his own account he had recently 'lived in France'; and he referred to the Interregnum as a 'lamentable age' that was filled with 'much malignity' which suggests that he too was a royalist.\textsuperscript{77}

Part of the reason for the popularity of French romance translations in the 1650s was that the genre 'gestured towards a remembrance' of the exiled royalist community: it served as a 'political sign of solidarity via genre'.\textsuperscript{78} The surge in translation of French romances coincided almost exactly with a flowering of politically motivated English prose romance. Roger and Robert Boyle and Sir Percy Herbert all wrote English prose romances while in exile in Paris.\textsuperscript{79} Herbert's \textit{Cloria and Narcissus, A Delightful New Romance, Imbellished with divers Politicall Notions} (first published in 1653 and 1654) was republished in 1661 with a new title which indicated its royalist bias: \textit{The Princess Cloria or, The Royal Romance}.\textsuperscript{80} Herbert's address 'To the Reader' makes clear his intention to align the book with the royalist cause. This 'whole work' had been printed 'formerly in the worst of times; that is to say, under the Tyrranical Government of Cromwell; when but to name or mention any of the Kings concernments, was held the greatest crime, almost could be committed against that Usurpation'.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{76} T. Birch, ed., \textit{A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe} (1742), iii, p. 749, letter of intelligence from Mr. Manning, 8 July 1655.
\textsuperscript{77} Jennings, 'To the Reader', in Camus, \textit{Elise}, n.p.
\textsuperscript{78} A. Zurcher, 'Political Ideologies', p. 554.
\textsuperscript{79} P. Herbert, \textit{Princess Cloria} (published in parts beginning 1653), Robert Boyle, \textit{The Martyrdom of Theodora and Didymus} (published in 1687 but circulated in manuscript in the late 1640s and early 1650s); Roger Boyle, \textit{Parthenissa} published in parts beginning 1651). Other English prose romances written in the Interregnum include Richard Braithwaite's \textit{Panthalia} which was published in 1659; and Sir William Sales Theophania which was written in 1645, but was not published until 1655.
\textsuperscript{81} P. Herbert, 'To the Reader', in \textit{The Princess Cloria or, The Royal Romance} (London, 1661), sig. A'.
The dedications to Moseley's French prose romance translations form links between royalist coterie circles and perhaps even intellectual academies which were similar to the French salons. George Havers, for example, dedicated his translation of Pierre Dortigue de Vaumorière's *The Grand Scipio* to Martha Carey, wife of Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth. It is likely that the family were patrons of literature: Robert Boyle expressed his joy that a manuscript of his received approbation from Martha, for 'Paper cannot have either a higher Applause or nobler End then the being Lik'd and Practis'd at Moore-parke'. It is possible that this manuscript was his prose romance, *The Martyrdom of Theodora and Didymus*, which was in circulation in the late 1640s and early 1650s. The translator John Davies dedicated his version of the ninth and tenth parts of de la Calprenède's *Cléopâtre* to the royalist poet Katherine Philips. Philips was instrumental in the formation of coterie circles with royalist sympathies during the Interregnum. There was, it is true, no Hôtel de Rambouillet in England, but there were the houses of Katherine Philips at Cardigan, and Martha Carey at Moore Park. Philips did much to acclimatize to England the literary fashions of her French neighbours. With the help of friends she translated some of the plays of Corneille; and the society which gathered around her took the feigned names bestowed upon the habitués of the French Hôtel. Susan Wiseman has observed that such usage of shared vocabularies encouraged a discourse of friendship which circulated in print and manuscript in the 1650s establishing 'a semi-private counter-culture that opposed the Commonwealth and Protectorate'. The Philips circle may also be connected with the royalist Thomas Stanley's
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82 Monmouth's royalism and his use of literature in support of monarchy is discussed in chapter 6.
circle through Davies. Davies dedicated his translation of the third volume of *Clelia* in 1658 to Lady Constance Enyon, daughter of Sir James Enyon a royalist soldier, and sister-in-law to Stanley. Davies was keen to point out her connections. He signals his debt to her 'noble relations, and particularly those at Cumberlow' singling out Thomas Stanley, the author of 'the History of Philosophy', for special praise. Davies may have been an intermediary between the poetic circles of Cardiganshire and Hertfordshire bringing them, with their similar interests in continental literature, together. These two circles, then, formed part of a royalist society united by political and cultural ties.

It has been observed that romance was a genre with encrypted meanings to be determined only by those familiar in reading its codes. The setting of stories in other times and locations was a device through which writers could encode political commentary and criticism. Truth, they claimed, was too dangerous to print openly: 'Lord what times are these, when harmlesse Truth is dasht out of Countenance, that she dare not appeare but when she comes in disguize!' In the Interregnum the censors clamped down on royalist propaganda, but the strategy of oblique communication continued as it had done before the breakdown of censorship which followed the abolition of Star Chamber and the High Commission in July 1641. The 'relevance' of reading events in contemporary England was asserted even in translations which removed the text from the political and geographical circumstances within which they had been originally written. Moseley indicated that romances were a suitable medium for discussing contemporary politics. French romances, he said, had the ability 'to touch on affaires of our times'. Moreover, designs of 'War and Peace' were 'better hinted and

---

89 P. Salzman, 'Royalist epic and romance', p. 216; Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 188.
90 Anon, 'To The Reader', in *The Shepherd's Oracle Delivered in an Eglogue* (Oxford, 1644), sig. A1'.
91 Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 188.
cut open by a Romance, than by down-right Histories; which being bar-fac'd' were forced to be 'too modest and sparing'.

Yet neither can the strange success of the Graecian Conqueror, the fatal destruction of the Persian Monarchy, the deplorable end of unfortunate Darius, the afflicted estate of his Royal Family in exile and Captivity, the easie compliance of his subjects with the prevailing Party, nor any other passage in it seem improbable to us, whose eyes have in this short space, been witnesses of such Revolutions, as hardly any Romance, but sure no History can parallel.

The original text, which was published in 1642-45, was probably innocent of any allusions to events in England, but the English translator's intention is explicit. The function of the 1652 Cassandra was to consolidate sympathy for the English 'Royal Family in Exile', and to reproach those who had taken the Engagement for their 'easie compliance...with the prevailing Party'. This sentiment of 'easie compliance' was similarly expressed in the pages of Madeleine de Scudéry's Clelia. Her imaginative interpretation of the well known story of Cloelia from Livy's history of ancient Rome is, in her own words, about how Rome came to be freed from the usurpation Tarquin, and the capture and release of the Roman princess Clelia. De Scudéry concluded an account of Tarquin's usurpation of Rome in Clelia with the words, 'it must be said to the shame of all Romans, that they all did sit still, with their hands in their Pockets, and all submitted themselves'. Given that Moseley had suggested that in romances readers should find in the protagonists 'every man and no man' royalists could easily imagine
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93 Ibid., sig. a4'.
94 Ibid., sig. a4'.
95 Noted by Patterson, Censorship and Interpretation, p. 189.
that in de Scudéry's *Clelia* the dictator figure Tarquinius Superbus represented Cromwell.¹⁰⁰ In *Clelia*, a virtuous Roman prince, Herminius, recalls 'how Tarquin came to usurp the Supreme power'.¹⁰¹ He draws a distinction between 'the vertue of the late lawful King' and 'the tyrant [who] caus'd [him] to be massacred'.¹⁰² Writing after the execution of Charles I, de Scudéry may have had England's regicide in mind when she wrote the work. In France the Frondeurs sympathised with the English royal family. They believed that the Parlement of Paris differed greatly to the English Parliament.¹⁰³ De Scudéry's antipathy to Cromwell and the rebellion in England is clear in her correspondence. Like many Frondeurs who condemned the execution of Charles I as a 'massacre inflicted by a barbarous people',¹⁰⁴ de Scudéry expressed her hope that God would ensure 'that those who plan to make of France what Cromwell and Fairfax have made of England may never be given credence'.¹⁰⁵ Whether de Scudéry was in contact with royalist exiles is not known for certain. However, from 1637 to 1647 she frequented the salon at the Hôtel Rambouillet with Henrietta-Maria's niece, the Duchess of Montpensier, and the duchess was in regular contact with royalist exiles including Charles II from 1646 so it likely that she was.¹⁰⁶

French romances were popular with royalists in England in the 1650s because they were reminiscent of a lost court culture: they reaffirmed the cult of Platonic love which Henrietta Maria had promoted in England in the 1630s. C.V. Wedgwood and Kevin Sharpe have accused the Caroline court of the 1630s of excluding the world outside and communicating

---

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 24.
¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 90 & n. 27.
only with itself, yet there is evidence that the court's fashion for romance was highly influential.\textsuperscript{107} It is true that the audiences who watched court masques were drawn from the social elite. But this elite consisted of officials and magistrates who sat in parliament and then channelled authority to the realm at large.\textsuperscript{108} Martin Butler has shown that despite this seemingly closed community, there was an attempt in the 1630s to publicize court festivities beyond Whitehall's immediate territory. This was achieved through the publication of printed texts, manuscript copies which circulated from hand to hand, and letters sent to the country by a network of correspondents, a process which became 'markedly systematic under Charles I'.\textsuperscript{109} The influence of court culture can be measured in the curricula of girls' boarding schools from the 1630s. It became increasingly common from this time for girls from the 'middle and gentry classes' to be sent away to boarding school.\textsuperscript{110} It has been shown that their curricula were influenced by the 'fashions at court'.\textsuperscript{111} During the 1630s 'dancing and masquing' as well as 'religion, morals, the making of riddles, the reading of French romances, French conversation and needlework' were fashionable.\textsuperscript{112} The republican Lucy Hutchinson complained about the pernicious influence of the Caroline court culture. Looking back to this period from the 1660s she wrote:

The gentry of the land soone learnt the Court fashion, and every greate house in the country became a sty of uncleannesse' To keepe people in their deplorable security till vengeance overtooke them, they were entertain'd with masks, stage plays, and various sorts of ruder sports. Then began Murther, incest, Adultery, Drunkenesse, swearing, fornication and all sorts of ribaldry to be no conceal'd but countenanced vices, favoured wherever they were practised because they held such conformity with the Court example.\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[108] Butler, \textit{Stuart Court Masque}, p. 2.
\item[109] Ibid., p. 3.
\item[111] Ibid., p. 186.
\item[112] Ibid., pp. 186-7.
\end{footnotes}
That Hutchinson complained that when the gentry returned from London they mimicked the court's 'masks' and 'stage plays' suggests that court fashions spread far beyond the walls of Whitehall.

While Hutchinson complained of the poor example set by the gentry, royalists such as the seventeenth-century letter writer Dorothy Osborne believed that the court had provided examples worthy of emulation. She rued the folly which she believed the younger generation in the 1650s had fallen into for want of the role-models that the royal court had offered. She felt that the lack of 'a Court to govern themselv's by' was the greater cause of their ruin.\footnote{K. Parker, ed., \textit{Dorothy Osborne: Letters to Sir William Temple} (London, 1987), Letter 59, p. 179.}

Though she accepted that the court was no 'perfect scoole of Vertue' she felt that 'Vice there wore her maske, and apeard soe unlike herself that she gave no Scandall'.\footnote{Ibid., Letter 59, p. 179.} Members of the court, she said, 'gave good Example, and the Eminence of theire condition made others strive to imitate them'.\footnote{Ibid., Letter 59, p. 17.} To Osborne the characters in romance novels offered, in the absence of the members of the court, alternative images of virtue to be emulated.\footnote{Osborne suggests them as a replacement of 'better company'. See ibid., Letter 9, p. 57.} French romances were designed to encourage such emulation. They presented images of courtly figures whose manners and eloquence readers were explicitly encouraged to employ. In de Scudéry's \textit{Ibrahim} the picture of a leisureed class 'moving in surroundings of great opulence' was held out to 'tempt the dreams of Parisian aristocratic and bourgeois society'.\footnote{Bannister, \textit{Privileged Mortals}, p. 131.} And in de La Calprenède's \textit{Cassandre} the values on which the French \textit{noblesse d' épée} based their class-myth are applauded and held up for universal admiration as the only true aspiration for men with noble ideals.\footnote{Ibid., p. 152.}

The romances that had been imported and translated from the \textit{précieuse} culture of
seventeenth century Paris offered royalists an escape to an elegiac golden world far from the disappointments of their own history. Romance is often marked by a persistent nostalgia for some other golden time or place. They invite the reader to look back with nostalgia and by implication to make judgements about and feel discontent for the present. This nostalgia in romance undermined the republican ideals of the 1650s, so much so that simply to write in this form 'was to make a statement about one's relation to the party in power'. Royalists clung to a past with which the new Commonwealth had broken. The republican government had no roots in the English past, and in a society that was rooted in custom and tradition, royalists had a history which the republicans had no stake in. David Underdown notes that during the Interregnum 'laments for the disappearance of old habits and good fellowship were widespread'. In the late 1640s there was a tendency in royalist literature to look back to the 1630s as a time of peace and plenty. Richard Fanshawe had praised Charles as the 'author of peace' and 'Halcyon dayes' in his 'An Ode Upon Occasion of His Majesties Proclamation in the Yeare 1630' which was published by Moseley in 1648 as we have seen. Also published in 1648 was Robert Herrick's Hesperides which lamented the passing of traditional social activities and values in a way that implicitly encouraged action to preserve them. Romances similarly harked back to a golden age and reminded readers of the halcyon days of the 1630s when pastoral and romance had been central to the Caroline myth.

122 Potter, Secret Rites, p. 74.
In royalist political thought no new claims were made in the 1640s, but the king's legal position in England was simply reaffirmed. In the 1650s despite the changed political landscape, with the exception of Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651), no new political theory was put forward by royalists. Rather than searching for some new means to re-establish monarchy their works tended to look back with nostalgia to the old order. French prose romances offered the same reaffirmation of a royalist value system. Their shared heritage with the literature of 1630s England made them a suitable vehicle for maintaining the values of honour, duty and obedience. The unitive and Platonic version of virtue which relies on the bonds of marriage and patriarchy that romance promoted was central to the political and moral-philosophical debates which took place during the revolutionary period. Were communities held together by mutual interests or by affective ties of love and loyalty? Could both types of community be referred to as a 'commonwealth', or was the second better described as a 'family'? It was characteristic in the early modern period to think about politics through the analogy between the household and the kingdom, fatherly and kingly power, and between marriage and consensual political subordination. William Davenant described political subordination in terms of marriage in the preface to his heroic romance *Gondibert*: 'Obedience', he said, 'like the Marriage yoke, is a restraint more needful and advantagious then liberty.' Robert Filmer, in his *Patriarcha* famously asserted the divine right of kings. He argued from biblical precedent that patriarchal authority is the true model of all government, and that each family and state naturally owes obedience to its father or prince.

Prose romances uphold the theory of patriarchal rule expounded by Filmer. In 1655 Moseley published John Jenning's English translation of Jean-Pierre Camus' *Elise* which promotes

obedience to paternal authority. Camus cautioned against rebellion which he believed was driven by self-interest. The book explains the 'extreme difference' between 'virtuous affection just and holy, and a brutish passion unlawful and dishonest'.

In this romance, the eponymous Elise, daughter of Sophia, or wisdom, helps the character Philippin to master the desire to disobey his father's commands:

but when the law of sense rebels against that of thy understanding, sowing revolts, seditions and contradictions in the city of thy exterior, tis then … thou returnest into thy first frenzies: yet fight thyself, and thou mayest become a reasonable vanquisher, vanquish thy passion.

The words 'first frenzies' is reminiscent of the brutish state of nature which Hobbes describes in his *Leviathan*. For royalists this kind of liberty was licence, an immoderate and unbridled passion which ultimately would lead to chaos. In *Elise* the consequences of disobedience are exemplified in the character Philippin. When he disobeys his father, he 'appears free, and yet is more a slave then when he was under the jurisdiction of his father; A horse broke loose without either bit or bridle, a ship without a stern'. Unusually for a prose romance, *Elise* has a tragic ending. The anti-hero, Philippin fails to observe his father's commands and the results are shown to be catastrophic.

The royalist Thomas Hobbes and James Harrington, a member of the ancient gentry, both turned away from the theories of the divine right of kings and patriarchal authority after the regicide. They opted to come to terms with the new power in force. Their ideas were, in varying degrees, Machiavellian rather than Platonic in that their concern was with the *de facto*. They accepted that all forms of government were self-interested. In his philosophical,
but bleak interpretation of human history, *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes depicts the natural condition – the state of nature – in which mankind lives in continual fear of violence and death. Human beings seek peace, not out of any inherent sociability but out of self-interest. In this case, the best way to bind society in order to achieve peace is to construct a social contract. Hobbes's commonwealth is ruled by a sovereign power responsible for protecting the security of the individual. Should that sovereign power fail to offer protection then the individual is free to make a new contract with the new power in force. Harrington's strictly anti-monarchical solution was practical rather than philosophical. There is, admittedly, a curious generic oscillation in Harrington's *Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656) between romance narration and political and economic treatise, but Harrington denied that his book should be read as a romance. In his *Oceana*, Harrington provided a blueprint for a society which was based on the premise that successful political power follows economic power and interested citizenship. Harrington's theory of an equitable society is captured succinctly in his metaphor of two girls and an undivided cake, “‘Divide’ says one unto the other, ‘and I will choose; or let me divide, and you shall choose’”. Harrington accepted that man was inherently self-interested, but thought that society could be better governed by enforced equilibrium.

As Helmut Koenigsberger has said, what constitutes republican virtue is clearly distinguished from that which constitutes the kind of virtues which made one a good subject of a prince or an accomplished courtier in a monarchical society. Loyalty was to the republic – or the state –


and not to the person of the prince. Because Harrington accepted that men were governed by self-interest, rather than linking virtue to the individual he linked virtue to an abstraction: the 'law'. 136 Although republican virtue was hailed by its supporters because it was better placed to put the public good before private interest, this difference in the object of loyalty placed republics at a disadvantage, for people usually find it easier to be loyal to a person than abstractions such as an institution or the law. 137 Romance has been described as 'politically naïve and sentimental' in contrast to 'hard-headed Hobbesian royalism' or the 'pragmatic republicanism' of the 1650s. 138 But romances which rely on a heroic prince and the quest for personal glory and magnificence had a vital dynamic force which was denied to the citizens of a republic or to Hobbes' contractual society. In its place in a republic stood soberness and frugality, or in Hobbes' world, shallow self-interest. 139 Prose romances offered an antidote to the bleakness of Hobbes' self-interested society and to the sober frugality of republican rule.

Debates which take place in the pages of de Scudéry's French romance Clelia pose questions about how to react to a usurping power, but neither the transfer of allegiance nor rebellion are offered as a suitable solution. Instead they offered an alternative way of responding to a usurping power, one which appealed to English royalists who believed that military intervention was futile. In Clelia Herminius considers the pros and cons of a proposed rebellion against the usurper, Tarquin, 'I believe we ought to reverence the Gods in the persons of those who have legall power, and should undergo their violent domination, with the same patience as we endure Earthquakes and Deluges'. 140 Rebellion brings with it the possibility that 'instead of being the Deliverers of our Country, we shall be the Destroyers of it'. Herminius suggests that there is a danger that those who propose to foment an uprising might

136 Harrington, Oceana, p. 19.
137 Ibid., p. 49.
138 Zurcher, 'Political Ideologies', p. 554.
be accused of preferring private revenge to public peace. When Brutus leads the rebellion against Tarquin, he finds that he is incapable of controlling the unleashed passions of the crowd, and has to acquiesce in the execution of his own sons. In general the work questions the politics of power and ambition and proposes that a better course of action is not to rebel, or to transfer allegiance, but to retreat into a realm of sociable and tender friendship. De Scudéry's French retreat has its English equivalent in the royalist Izaak Walton's literary retreat to the countryside in *The Compleat Angler* which was published in 1653 and 1655 and was subtitled 'the contemplative man's recreation'. Hobbes' *Leviathan* justified submitting to parliamentary government to satisfy the individual's self-interest. One of the central concerns of prose romances was to expose and rebuke the pursuit of self-interest. Romance writers required their readers to imitate rather those virtuous men and women who preferred friendship to 'interest and commodity'; they should adopt an 'attitude of Christian Stoicism in the face of adversity' rather than surrendering to the demands of self-interest and to wait for providence to resolve their difficulties.

In his preface to d'Urfé's *Astrea*, the translator John Davies claimed that romances represented 'Academies' for the well-rounded individual. They were 'Schools of War for the Souldier, and Cabinets for the Statesman' and furthermore they were 'the correctives of passion'. In French romances vices of ingratitude, disobedience and inconstancy driven by passion or self-interest are set against counterexamples of virtuous heroes and heroines who demonstrate unwavering constancy, obedience and gratitude. When he chose to publish the many prose
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141 Ibid., p. 27.
142 A point made by Jacqueline Broad and Karen Green, *A History of Women's Political Thought in Europe 1400-1700* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 188.
144 Self-interest had been the subject of political debate from the outbreak of the civil wars as J.A.W. Gunn has shown in his *Politics and the Public Interest in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1969).
romances that appear in his catalogues during the 1650s, Moseley opted for a literary vogue which was known to be politically engaged. In the 1650s romances appealed to royalists because they reminded them of the period of the Personal Rule. They were a vehicle for upholding notions of royalism by reminding people of what they 'ought to do'.\textsuperscript{147} Romances abound with images or 'patterns' of virtue which deny Hobbes' view of a human nature driven by self-interest that allowed the transfer of allegiance to a conquering force. For royalists, romance had consolatory, even polemical power because its stories generally offered an assurance of a cyclical time-frame where after a period of retreat and withdrawal all wrongs are eventually put right. Dale Randall has argued that one reason for the popularity of tragicomedy – which is a 'dramatic manifestation of romance' – in England in the 1650s was its fundamental relevance to the situation that royalists found themselves in.\textsuperscript{148} Tragicomedies and romance, 'implicitly and continuously insinuate that, whatever threats or losses come our way, a happy ending is possible.\textsuperscript{149} French romances offered royalists a way of comprehending, and analysing their dilemmas of the 1650s, even if that meant accepting providence as the solution to their difficulties and waiting for time to come full circle.

\textsuperscript{147} Herbert, 'To the Reader', (1661) sig. A'.
Chapter Five

The Politics of Psalm Translation

It is well known that biblical texts were a staple of political argument used by royalists and parliamentarians alike during the civil wars.\(^1\) Little attention, however, has been paid to polemical interpretations within translations of books of the Bible itself. In this chapter I examine the political uses of the Book of Psalms. In 1550 Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins introduced the first full translation of the Psalms into England.\(^2\) Hundreds of editions of this collection were published as Protestants speedily accepted this form of worship. Like the Book of Common Prayer, the Psalter provided some common culture across social, political and gender divisions.\(^3\) In the sixteenth century poets such as Thomas Wyatt and Philip Sidney translated selected Psalms, and during the seventeenth century they attracted a diversity of translators including Francis Bacon, George Wither, George Herbert, George Sandys, Francis Rous, William Barton, Jeremy Taylor, Henry Lawes, John Milton, Henry Vaughan and Henry King. The Book of Psalms had long provided a word for all seasons and was a treasure store of comfort and enlightenment. Sir Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon asked

---


'what is there that may not be learned out of the Psalms?'\textsuperscript{4} But from the turn of the seventeenth century there was also an impetus for translating the Psalms that was as much political as theological.\textsuperscript{5} In this chapter I examine two books of Psalms and Moseley's political motives in publishing them. The first, Henry Lawes' \textit{Choice Psalms} of 1648, was written for an elite audience, and was published to both celebrate and memorialize a royalist aesthetic that was necessarily abandoned because of the rebellion and civil war. The second, Henry King's \textit{Psalmes of David} of 1651 and 1654, was written in a plain style to appeal to ordinary people, and, through lexical and syntactical manipulations, was geared towards a positive reading of monarchy.

\textbf{The Context of Psalm Translation}

The standard metrical version of the Psalms published since the Reformation was that of Sternhold and Hopkins. Sternhold and Hopkins' Psalms were available in small, cheap octavos and duodecimos affordable for the poorer folk, as well as in elaborately printed quartos and folios for the wealthy.\textsuperscript{6} Versions were printed both on their own and in complete editions of the Old Testament; they were included in both the Bishops' Bible and the English text of the Geneva Bible – which was favoured amongst Puritans – and were often bound together with editions of the Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{7} When James I acceded to the throne he hoped to produce a new version of the Bible and Psalter which would bring the English and Scottish Protestants into a unified British Church. James' motives were political as well as religious: he wanted a Bible to replace the Geneva Bible which ran contrary to his concept of divinely appointed monarchy.\textsuperscript{8} His hopes were to some extent satisfied in 1611 when the \textit{King

\textsuperscript{4} E. Hyde, \textit{A Compleat Collection of Tracts} (London, 1747), pp. 381-2.
\textsuperscript{6} Hamlin, \textit{Psalm Culture}, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., p. 33.
James, or Authorized Version of the Bible (hereafter AV), was published. Yet, although the
translation of the Psalms within the AV has been shown to parallel the Hebrew more closely
than the Geneva Bible,9 the Geneva Bible remained popular with Puritans, and there is
evidence, according to Kenneth Fincham, that people took annotations from the Geneva Bible
and added them to their copies of the AV.10 After the publication of the AV, James made public
his intention to produce a new Psalter and until at least 1620 he made it clear that its
composition was 'his prerogative'.11 Although not finished in his lifetime, this Psalter was
completed by William Alexander, Lord Sterling, and was published in 1631. When Charles I
attempted to introduce it into Scotland along with the Book of Common Prayer, rather than
unifying the two Churches as James had intended, it catalysed a split within the Church of
England.12

During the 1620s and 1630s the political and religious leanings of Psalm translators began to
emerge more clearly in the lexical and syntactical choices they made when rendering the book
into English, and in the metres that their words were set to.13 These leanings reflected the
deepening divisions in the Protestant Church. Some desired a greater reformation to cleanse
the Church of any hints of popish practice. These wanted simple church buildings without the
distractions of idolatrous ornamentation such as elaborate vestments, stained glass and
decorative carvings.14 Others believed that the reformers of the Edwardian era had swept away
too much in their zeal for purity. They wished to restore practices which they believed were

9  Ibid., p. 148.
10  K. Fincham, 'The King, the Bishops, the Parishes and the King James Bible', at the seminar series Religion
    in the British Isles 1400-1700, held at Jesus College, Oxford, 7 June 2012.
11  J. Doelman, 'The Songs of David: King James and the Psalter', in idem King James I and the Religious
    Culture of England (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 139. In 1603 the Stationers' Company paid for a royal patent
    which gave it exclusive rights to any versification of the Psalms: J. Doelman, 'George Wither, the Stationers
12  Doelman, King James, pp. 135-57.
13  Three critics to have focused on the polemical potential of Psalms translation are: H. Hamlin, 'Psalm 137:
    singing the Lord's song in a strange land', in idem, Psalm Culture, pp. 218-52; Nelson, 'Historical
    Consciousness', pp. 501-25; and P. Loscocco, 'Royalist Reclamation of Psalmic Song in 1650s England',
    Renaissance Quarterly, 64 (2011), pp. 500-44.
14  G. Parry, Glory, Laud and Honour: the Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation (Woodbridge, 2008),
    chapter 3.
sanctioned by antiquity, for where such sanction existed any kinship to Roman ceremony was seen as an irrelevance. Those who desired church buildings stripped of ornament also wanted a clean and simple rendering of the Psalms, while those who preferred ceremony and ornament believed that the book, like the church, should reflect the glory of God. Their complaint against simple renderings was articulated by John Donne:

I must not rejoice as I would do
When I behold that these Psalms are become
So well attyr'd abroad, so ill at home,
So well in Chambers, in thy Church so ill,
As I can scarce call that reformed until
This be reformed …
And shall our Church, unto our Spouse and King
More hoarse, more harsh than any other, sing.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1632 the poet George Wither published his \textit{Psalms of David Translated into Lyric-Verse} which emphasized its plainness, and in 1636 another poet George Sandys published his \textit{Paraphrase on the Psalms of David} which was celebrated for its lustrous language.\textsuperscript{16} The differences between the translations of Wither and Sandys have been said to reflect 'the widening social, ecclesiastical, and political divide in English society that was soon to lead to the Civil War'.\textsuperscript{17} In his \textit{Psalms of David} Wither said that he had 'laboured to deliver the meaning of the Originall Text, as powerfully, as plainly and as briefly' as he could to suit 'the Capacitie of the Vulgar'. He avoided 'rhetoricall illustrations' and did not tie himself to the Hebrew when he could find 'expressions' that were more 'agreeable with our English Dialect'.\textsuperscript{18} He opted for brevity and simplicity so that his Psalms could be more easily memorized and used by the general public.\textsuperscript{19} Sandys' \textit{Paraphrase} was intentionally more aesthetic and elegant. His book was intended for the more refined liturgical taste which was to

\textsuperscript{15} J. Donne, 'Upon the translation of the Psalms by Sir Philip Sydney, and the Countesse of Pembroke his Sister', in \textit{Poems by J.D. with Elegies on the Author's Death} (London, 1635), p. 367.
\textsuperscript{16} A second edition was issued in 1638.
\textsuperscript{17} See Hamlin, \textit{Psalm Culture}, pp. 52-66 & 72.
\textsuperscript{18} G. Wither, 'A Preface to the Reader', in idem, \textit{The Psalms of David Translated into Lyric-Verse, according to the scope of the Original. And Illustrated with a short Argument, and a breife Prayer, or Meditation; before and after every Psalme} (Netherlands, 1632), n.p.
be found at court, or in the private chapels of the aristocracy, or even in Cathedrals.\textsuperscript{20} The volume was dedicated to Charles I and Henrietta Maria, and Sandys advertised that the accompanying tunes were composed by 'Henry Lawes of the Chapel Royal' – probably to add prestige to his volume. In the commendatory poems to Sandys' \textit{Paraphrase} attempts such as Wither's to simplify the Psalms were criticised because they blunted the meaning and arbitrarily separated religion from art.\textsuperscript{21} Henry King stated that the Psalms, like every other cultural manifestation, were devoid of beauty and significance when plainness was too zealously pursued.\textsuperscript{22} He praised the accuracy and refinement of Sandys' translation and highlighted the harmonious relation between the poet's paraphrases with their variety of metres and the glorification of God:\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{quote}
Your Muse rekindled hath the Prophets Fire,  
And Tuned the Strings of his neglected Lyre;  
...  
I must confess, I have long wished to see  
The Psalms reduced to this Conformity.  
Grieving the Songs of Sion should be sung  
In Phrase not differing from a Barbarous Tongue.  
As if by Custom warranted, we may  
Sing that to God, we would be loth to Say.  
...  
The Language, like the Church, hath won,  
More lustre since the Reformation;  
None can condemn the Wish, or Labour spent  
Good matter in Good words to represent.  
...  
Men who a Rustick Plainness so affect,  
They thinke God served best by their neglect.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

King associated the Puritan 'Rustic Plainness' that Wither had used with a tendency towards a zealotry that distracted from the true service of God.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} Gillingham, \textit{Psalms Through the Centuries}, p. 152.  
\textsuperscript{21} Berman, \textit{Henry King}, p. 81.  
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 81.  
\textsuperscript{23} There was a lively and ongoing debate on the propriety and scriptural basis of Psalm singing in Church worship which began in the sixteenth century and intensified during the 1640s and 1650s: H. Hamlin, \textit{Psalms Culture}, p. 32-3 and n. 51; and P. King 'The Reasons for the Abolition of the Book of Common Prayer in 1645', \textit{Journal of Ecclesiastical History}, 21 (1970), pp. 330-1.  
\textsuperscript{24} H. King, 'To my Much Honoured Friend, Mr George Sandys,' in Sandys, \textit{A Paraphrase upon the Psalms of David and upon the Hymnes dispersed throughout the Old and New Testaments} (1636), n.p.
\end{flushright}
The civil war of the 1640s was largely fought over divergent visions of the future of the national Church. This decade witnessed the most complete and drastic revolution which the Church of England has ever undergone.\(^{25}\) A parliamentary ordinance of 12 June 1643 declared that

'\textit{the present Church-Government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and other Ecclesiastical Officers depending upon the Hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burthensome to the Kingdome, a great impediment to Reformation and growth of Religion, and very prejudicial to the State and Government of this Kingdome}'.\(^{26}\)

The entire structure of the English Church was demolished and on the clean-swept ground an entirely new Church system was erected.\(^{27}\) In 1643 the group of divines brought together by parliament as the Westminster Assembly gathered to debate reform of the English Church including its staple liturgical text: the Book of Common Prayer.\(^{28}\) To some more precise Protestants, the very idea of a set form of liturgy was unacceptable and so on 4 January 1645 the Commons issued its 'Ordinance for taking away the Book of Common Prayer'.\(^{29}\) The old prayer book was replaced by the \textit{Directory for the Public Worship} at least in theory, if not in practice for attachment to the Book of Common Prayer was strong in England and its widespread use continued.\(^{30}\) The \textit{Directory} did not lay down any set forms for worship, but offered instead a guide for services.\(^{31}\) One of the objectives of the Westminster Assembly was to produce a new Psalter. Psalters were very popular with the people, but the Assembly was


\(^{26}\) 'An Ordinance for the calling of an Assembly of Learned and godly Divines, to be consulted with by the Parliament, for the setting of the Government of the Church', in Firth and Rait, i, pp. 180-4.


\(^{29}\) 'An Ordinance for taking away the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and putting in execution the Directory for the public worship of God', in Firth and Rait, i, pp. 582-607.


troubled by the notion that the Psalms were also a 'set' form of prayer. For some members of the Assembly, to prescribe a set book of Psalms would amount to a visible compromise of their principled rejection of scriptural formality. On the other hand, it was argued that if people were allowed to choose whichever version of the Psalms they liked, several translations might come to be used by members of a single congregation and the ensuing cacophony would be a 'great Distraction and Hinderance to Edification'. As a result of this deadlock, the Westminster Assembly remained content with perusing, revising and sanctioning existing versions of the Psalms.

Between 1645 and 1654 the Westminster Assembly, the House of Lords, the House of Commons, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland debated the vices and virtues of different versions of the Psalms and the ideal form that a properly revised edition might take, but struggled to come to an agreement. Books of Psalms by the Member of Parliament Francis Rous, and the clergyman William Barton were alternately accepted by one body and rejected by another. Rous, who had already published books of Psalms in 1638 and 1641, published a third volume in 1643 which, according to its title-page, was published by the authority of the 'Committee of the House of Commons in Parliament for Printing', but this edition was rejected by the Westminster Assembly. In November 1645 a revised edition of Rous' Psalms complete with alterations which had been suggested by the Westminster Assembly was authorized by the House of Commons and his book was published in 1646 with the recommendation that it be 'publicly sung in churches'. Even so, although Rous' version was now acceptable to the Westminster Assembly, the Scottish Church, and the

---

33 LJ, viii, p. 284.
Commons, it was never accepted by the House of Lords. In the meantime Barton had composed and published editions of the Psalms in 1644 and 1645 which were favoured by the House of Lords, but not the Commons.\textsuperscript{37} Eventually, in 1654 Barton's version received the imprimatur of the Protector and his Council and his third book of Psalms was published by authority that year. In his \emph{A History of the English Church}, W.A. Shaw put the delay in concurrence, at least in part, down to the opposition of the Independents, who disliked the injunction of any uniformity in Church practice.\textsuperscript{38}

Rous and Barton understood that to satisfy the demands of the Westminster Assembly, and the Lords and Commons they needed to present a suitably plain and accurate version of the Psalms. Barton's title-pages and prefaces foreground both the authority of the Westminster Assembly and his deployment of plainness of style. His 1644 edition was simply titled \textit{The Book of Psalms in Metre}. In the following year, this edition was retitled to advertise its plainness and faithfulness to the Hebrew original more clearly: \textit{The Book of Psalms in Metre Close and Proper to the Hebrew, smooth and pleasant for the Metre, Plain and easie for the Tunes}. In addition to this plainness and authority the work had been overseen by 'more than forty eminent Divines of the City and most of them of the Assembly'. This was a text which spoke to a godly readership and one which saw the 'Divines of the City' as leading the way in true godly worship. Rous, in his 1643 translation of the Psalms, also emphasized the fidelity of his translation to the original, except where 'cadence or currence, or some old and abolished words' demanded change.\textsuperscript{39} These ideals were maintained and further clarified in his 1646 edition. In his preface Rous explained that he had avoided 'poeticall painting' which would cast 'lightness upon the divine gravity of these Spirituall Songs'.\textsuperscript{40} Although more elegant and refined words had been 'at hand', he had omitted these to render the work

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{37} LJ, vii, p. 705.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Shaw, \textit{A History of the English Church}, i, pp. 382-3.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Rous, 'A Preface' in \textit{The Psalmes of David} (1643), n.p.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Rous, 'A Preface' in \textit{The Psalms of David} (1646), sig. A3v.
\end{itemize}
favourable to 'the common capacities … it being a duty of more mercy and charity to profit
many, then to please a few'.\textsuperscript{41}

In the royalist camp, the divine Jeremy Taylor pointed to the problem that the Psalms
represented for the parliamentarians because of their rejection of set forms of prayer. He
cleverly showed that having embraced the Psalter Puritans had unwittingly embraced
liturgical principles that they claimed to oppose: 'I see that all sorts of people sing or say
Davids Psalms, and by that use, if they understand the consequences of their own Religion,
accept set forms of prayer for their Liturgy'.\textsuperscript{42} If their impulse was to use the Psalms
prescriptively, he contended, then there was little difference between a Puritan Psalm and any
Anglican prayer. Taylor indicated that replacing an existing liturgy with a standardized Psalter
was nonsensical. Moreover, such hair-splitting and hypocrisy had caused the war: 'they that
have commenced this war against the King and Church, first fell out with our Liturgy, and
refused to join with us in our prayers'.\textsuperscript{43} This led him to conclude that re-unification in the
Church could help the return to peace: 'I have therefore a strong persuasion that if we were
joined in our prayers we should quickly be united in affections'.\textsuperscript{44} In 1644 he produced a
royalist book of Psalms in the plain style in the hope that it would help to heal the rift.

\textbf{The Politics of Psalm Translation in the Civil Wars: Henry Lawes Choice Psalmes (1648)}

Jeremy Taylor was the first writer to publish a book of the Psalms with an overtly political
purpose. From wartime Oxford, Taylor translated his \textit{Psalter of David} which was first
published in 1644. If supply can be taken as a reasonable reflection of demand, then this must
have been an exceptionally popular book since further editions followed in 1646, 1647, 1650,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{41} Ibid., sig. A3'.
  \item \textsuperscript{42} J. Taylor, 'The Preface', \textit{The Psalter of David with Titles and Collects according to the matter of each
Psalme} (1644), n.p. The page numbering in this edition is sporadic and is included where they exist.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., n.p.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., n.p.
\end{itemize}
1655 and 1658. Taylor's preface announced his intention to do 'good service' to the king by his translation. At the beginning of the troubles, he said, he had 'hastened to His Majesty'. Taylor described the war as 'unnatural' because the 'king and the Laws, who by God and Man respectively are appointed the Protectors of Innocence and Truth, had themselves the greatest need of a Protector'. What was to be found in the Psalms were 'very many Prayers against the enemies of the King and Church, and the miseries of war' and the reassurance that God would 'defend his Church and his Anointed'.

It has been observed that John Milton may also have had political objectives in mind when he translated Psalms 80-88 in 1648 and 1-8 in 1653. When he translated Psalms 80-88 in 1648 his political views were crystallizing. Radical ideas which during the 1630s had not yet been 'fully articulated', but were 'implicit in his major works', were coming into sharper focus. In the early 1640s he penned a series of anti-prelatical tracts; he took the Covenant, spoke of his fidelity to the Long Parliament and in 1648 sided publicly with the army and the Rump. Milton was probably stimulated to write the Psalms by the events of the early months of 1648. At this time opinion in the City seemed to favour the restoration of Charles I's powers, while disagreements between the conservative Presbyterians and the Independents about how to
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46 Ibid., sig. A2'.
47 Ibid., A2'.
48 Ibid., A3' & A4'.
51 See J. Milton, Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, Against Smectymnuus (London, 1641); Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and Whether it may be deduc'd from the Apostical times by vertue of these Testimonies which are alleg'd to that purpose in some late Treatises (London, 1641); Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England: and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it. Two Books. Written to a Friend (London, 1641); The Reason of Church-Government Urg'd against Prelaty (London, 1641).
deal with the captive king caused a rift in parliament. At the same time, quarrels among the army generals and the rank and file nearly split the army, and the Scots – parliament's former brethren – realigned with Charles I.\(^53\) Psalm 88, as the critic Margaret Boddy has pointed out, stresses the treachery of friends, which has led her to connect Milton's choice with this particular crisis of 1648.\(^54\) It is also possible that Milton wrote his Psalms in response to debates then taking place in parliament concerning religious reform. For a religious radical such as Milton, the outlook was gloomy in 1648. On 2 May parliament put through its inquisitorial 'Ordinance for the Punishing of Blasphemies and Heresies' which introduced the death penalty for atheism, anti-Trinitarianism, for promoting Arminianism and Anabaptism, denouncing the Presbyterian Church and denying the necessity of observing the Sabbath.\(^55\) At this time Milton was either on the way to, or already did hold many of these views.\(^56\) Carolyn Colette has suggested that Milton's Psalms may have been written in the latter part of 1648 and that his lexical manipulations of Psalm 82 alluded to Charles's misuse of royal power.\(^57\) In September, the duplicitous Charles I began negotiating the Treaty of Newport with parliament, while at the same time he used delaying tactics to play one faction off against another.\(^58\)

It is also possible that, as Margaret Boddy has suggested, Milton translated Psalms 80-88 in response to Henry Lawes' royalist *Choice Psalms* which was published in 1648.\(^59\) Henry Lawes had close connections with the court. He became a member of the Chapel Royal in 1626 and was appointed to the king's musick in 1631. Through the 1630s he composed and took part in masques at court, and later in the decade he wrote songs for plays put on at

\(^53\) Hill, *The English Bible*, p. 381.
\(^54\) Boddy, 'Milton's Translation of Psalms 80-88', p. 3.
\(^55\) *LJ*, x, p. 240-1. Firth and Rait, i, pp. 1133-6.
\(^57\) A point made made Colette, 'Milton's Psalm Translations', p. 248.
Oxford to entertain Charles and Henrietta Maria. Milton was probably disappointed to have seen his sonnet to Lawes, 'To Mr H. Lawes, on his Airs', included in the *Choice Psalmes* and retitled 'To my friend Mr Henry Lawes'. Lawes' *Choice Psalmes* was designed to celebrate and memorialize Caroline rule. In his prefatory material the composer proclaimed his loyalty to the Crown in no uncertain terms. The book was both an offering to the persecuted Charles I and a monument to his brother, William Lawes, who had died in 1645 at the siege of Chester. It was dedicated 'To His Most Sacred Majestie, Charles, by the Grace of God, King of great Brittaine, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c'. Lawes refers to himself as 'Regiae Majestatis a sacra musica', musician to the king's sacred majesty, and his 'most humble, and most loyally devoted subject and servant'. The text was, he said, 'nourish'd' in the service of Charles I. It was from the king's 'Royal Bounty' that he and his brother had 'receiv'd all we injoyed'. To dedicate the work to another would have made him 'taste of these ungratefull dayes', which he would 'most abhorre'. His reference to ingratitude chimes with contemporary royalist pamphlets which reminded the people of the 'bonds of gratitude' between a prince and his subjects. Lawes' *Choice Psalmes* contains thirty musical settings from Sandys 1636 *Paraphrases*, which, as we have seen, was originally intended to be sung in private chapels or cathedrals. As Graham Parry has observed, the suitability of Lawes' *Choice Psalmes* for private use and the date of their publication show their 'continuing appeal to those who maintained the old manner of worship in their homes in the years when formal

---

62 H. Lawes, *Choice Psalms put into Musick, For Three Voices* (London, 1648), sig. A3'.
63 Ibid., sig. A3'.
64 Ibid., sig. A3'.
65 See for example, Anon, *To the Kings most Excellent Maiesty The humble gratulation; and petition of the trained bands, and freeholders, and others the gentry and communality of the county palatine of Chester, whose names and vnder-written. Delivered upon Hoole-Heath, by the trayned bands, a coppie of the same being hung upon the top of every colours; subscribed by the severall companies, and so presented to the King* (1642), Thomason Collection ref: 245:669.f.6[83]; Anon, *The Humble petition and representation of the gentry, ministers, and others of the counties of Cumberland and Westmerland, to His Sacred Maiestie* (1642).
66 See above p. 138.
Anglican services had been suspended.\textsuperscript{67}

It is possible that Moseley published Lawes's \textit{Psalmes} to coincide with the anniversary of Charles' accession to the throne which was celebrated with bonfires across London on 27 March 1648.\textsuperscript{68} Inside the book is a copper-plate portrait of Charles I in lace collar and armour which suggests that the king's military career is not over. However, given the mournful tone of the Psalms selected for the volume and the number of elegies to Lawes' brother William it is more likely that it was published later in the year. The second civil war was over by the end of August. Cromwell had won a stunning victory at Preston over the Scottish and English armies from 17-19 August 1648, and on 28 August Fairfax accepted the famine-induced surrender of the royalist forces at Colchester and executed Sir George Lisle and Sir Charles Lucas much to the horror of the king's supporters.\textsuperscript{69} In his epistle 'To The Reader' Lawes said that he had initially been reluctant to publish his Psalms, but had been persuaded to do so in order to honour the memory of his brother who had been a 'willing sacrifice' to the 'Service and Defence of the King his Master'.\textsuperscript{70} It has been noted that in the desperate circumstances of the second civil war and its aftermath polemical statements were even more insistently made through the 'commemoration of the dead'.\textsuperscript{71} The number of elegies to William that are contained within the volume suggests that this work was intended to memorialize William, and to coincide with the outpouring grief in pamphlet form for the king's more recent martyrs, Lucas and Lisle as part of a wider polemical commemoration of royalists.\textsuperscript{72}

Lawes' \textit{Choice Psalmes} forms part of a wider collection of literature which aligned Charles I
with the Biblical David. He presented the book to Charles I both because of the king's 'known particular affection to David's Psalms', and because the king's condition in prison in Carisbrooke Castle was aptly 'described by King David's pen'. In 1644 Jeremy Taylor claimed that he had chosen to translate the Psalms because 'amongst all the great examples of trouble and confidence', he 'reckoned King David one of the … greatest'. For 'considering that he was a King, vexed with a Civil War his case had so much of ours in it'. In 1647 Moseley also contributed to the identification of Charles I and David when he republished Robert Ashley's translation of Virgilio Malvezzi's Il Davide Perseguitato. Although the work had previously been published in 1637, Moseley commissioned a new frontispiece in which he gave David the face of Charles I. It took no leap of the imagination for readers to draw the analogy between the biblical king and their own defeated and imprisoned monarch. Charles I was also keen to inculcate the vision of himself as another David. In 1643 a newsbook appeared which – according to the title-page – was published by the king's command: Mercurius Davidicus, Or A Patterne of Loyall Devotion. Wherein King David sends his Pietie to King Charles. Its anonymous author ransacked the Psalms for pertinent phrases and threaded them together to form what is, in effect, a prayer for the king's military success. In 1649 the Eikon Basilike, also known as the 'King's Book', was presented to the

72 For example, S. Sheppard, The Famous Tragedie of King Charles I. Basely Butchered (1649), H. King, 'An Elegy on Sir Charls Lucas, And Sir George Lisle, Murdered August 28, 1648, in J. Hannah, ed., The Poems and Psalms of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester (Oxford, 1843), pp. 82-95; Philocrates, The Loyall Sacrifice: presented in the lives and deaths of those two eminent-heroick patterns, for valour, discipline, and fidelity: the generally beloved and bemoaned, Sir Charls Lucas, and Sir George Lisle, knights. Being both shot to death at Colchester, five hours after the surrender (1648); Anon, Two epitaphs, occasioned by the death of Sr Charles Lucas, and Sr George Lisle, basely assassinated at Colchester (1648); Anon, An elegie, on the most barbarous, vnparallel'd, vnsoildiery, murder, committed at Colchester, upon the persons of the two most incomparable, Sir Charles Lucas, and Sir George Lisle (1648); Anon, The cruel tragedy or inhumane butchery, of Hamor and Shechem, with other their adherents: Acted by Simeon and Levi, in Shechem, a city in Succoth a county or Lordship in Canaan. Lately revived and reacted here in England, by Fairfax and Ireton, upon the persons of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, in Colchester, the 28. Aug. 1648 (1648).


74 H. Lawes, 'To His Most Sacred Majestie, Charles by the Grace of God', in idem, Choice Psalms, sig A3'.
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77 This was first noticed by Lois Potter in her Secret Rites, p. 161.
public as the work of Charles I. As David Loewenstein has noted, *Eikon Basilike* alluded extensively to the penitential Psalms in its section entitled 'Penitential Meditations', and in doing so it reinforced the link between Charles and the biblical line of kingship represented by David and Christ.\(^\text{78}\) Additionally, each chapter ends with a prayer from the Psalms in which Charles drew comparisons between his own actions and those of David to defend his political position. Charles I said 'since I may equal David's afflictions, give me also the comforts and sure mercies of David'.\(^\text{79}\) Reflecting on the story of David, Charles saw analogies with his own situation. He hoped that he, like David, would be restored, 'O Lord, canst thou turn the hearts of those parties in both nations, as thou didst the men of Judah and Israel to restore David with as much loyal zeal as they did with inconstancy and eagerness pursue him'.\(^\text{80}\)

Royalists believed that when Charles I identified himself with the biblical David he was merely using the Psalms as a 'store-house' of writings by a king whose troubles mirrored his own.\(^\text{81}\) Milton, however, was outraged that Charles had used the words and protestations of the biblical king 'without the spirit and conscience of David'.\(^\text{82}\) The king had ripped words from the Bible to prove his righteousness when he should more fittingly have shown true 'Christian diligence and judgement' through 'the pledge and ernest of suitable deeds'.\(^\text{83}\) Moreover, he had used the words of David for political effect in order to 'catch the People'.\(^\text{84}\) Milton accused Charles I of attempting to 'bring about that interest by faire and plausible words, which the


\(^{80}\) Ibid., p. 75. For further references by Charles I to David in the *Eikon Basilike* see ibid., pp. 45, 93-4, 100, 144 & 159.


\(^{84}\) Milton, *CPW*, iii, pp. 422 & 601.
force of Armes had deny'd him'.\textsuperscript{85} There was also a worrying possibility that royalists would continue the polemical project despite the death of Charles I. Milton accused the writers of the *Eikon Basilike* of using what was ostensibly a defence of the king to further their own cause.

It was

manifestly the cunning drift of a factious and defeated Party, [whose goal is] to make the same advantage of his Book, which they did before of his Regal Name and Authority, and intend it not so much the defence of his former actions, as the promoting of their own future designs … to corrupt and disorder the mindes of weaker men, by new suggestions and narrations.\textsuperscript{86}

Milton's fears were well-founded, for in 1651 Henry King produced his *Psalms of David* which was designed to show that monarchy was divinely appointed. It is to this book that I now turn.

The Politics of Psalm Translation in the Interregnum: Henry King's *Psalms of David* (1651 and 1654)

In 1651 and 1654 Moseley published Henry King's *Psalms of David*. King, a poet and clergyman was Canon of Christ Church, a royal chaplain, Dean of Rochester from 1639, and a keen supporter of Charles I.\textsuperscript{87} On 27 March 1640 he preached a significant Accession Day sermon at Paul's Cross which advocated obedience to Charles I's sacred authority. He prayed that the Scots who rose up against the king would be 'covered with Shame and ruine'.\textsuperscript{88} King was appointed bishop of Chichester on 12 October 1641 and was consecrated on 6 February 1642, the day after parliament passed its bill excluding bishops from the House of Lords.\textsuperscript{89} He was harshly sequestered in 1643, but managed to transfer his house in St. Paul's Churchyard.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., iii, p. 343.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., iii, p. 338.
\textsuperscript{87} M. Hobbs, 'King, Henry (1592-1669)', *ODNB*. King wrote two elegies on the death of Charles I: 'A Deep Groane, fetch'd at the Funerall of that incomparable and Glorious Monarch, Charles the First, King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland &c', and 'An Elegy upon the most Incomparable King Charls the First'. These are printed in M. Crum, ed., *The Poems of Henry King* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 110-32.
\textsuperscript{88} H. King, *A Sermon Preached at St. Pauls March 27 1640 Being the Anniversary of His Majesties Happy Inauguration to His Crowne* (1640), pp. 3 & 58.
to his son Henry. He stayed in this house until 1645 and it may have been during this time that he became acquainted with Moseley, whose shop was also in St Paul's Churchyard. By 1647 King was staying at Richings, near Slough, at the home of Lady Salter, sister to his close friend Brian Duppa. King and his associates 'constituted a kind of little College there, in which the Ritual of the Church continued to be used, till even that was no longer possible'. From 1653 King was engaged with Duppa in travelling the country ordaining men according to the rites of the forbidden Book of Common Prayer.

While King and his fellow Anglicans survived in 'dens and caves' as Duppa put it, the themes of a large number of the Psalms – God's displeasure with his chosen people, and pleas for divine assistance for a people racked with conspiracies and surrounded by enemies – mirrored the situation that royalists found themselves in. Some provided solace for royalists in troubled times such as Psalm 46 from King's Psalms of 1651:

\[
\text{God is our refuge; our defence} \\
\text{Rests wholly on His Providence:} \\
\text{Which still affords a present aid,} \\
\text{When greatest troubles us invade.}
\]

Others speak of exile as in Psalm 120, particularly the lines, 'Wo unto me constrain'd to dwell / So far from Israel'. The emphasis on mourning, captivity, memory and revenge in Psalm 137, another Psalm of exile, spoke to royalists who felt alienated and oppressed in their

---
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Henry Hammond's rendering of Psalm 137 lamented royalists' exile not simply from London, or Oxford, but spiritually: 'How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?'. Edmund Waller drew on Psalm 137 and its theme of exile in his commendatory poem to William Davenant's *Gondibert* which was penned by the poet while in exile in Paris: 'The drooping Hebrews banish'd harps unstrung / At Babylon, upon the willows hung'. And in 1655 Henry Lawes opened his pamphlet, *Select Psalms*, with Psalm 137. The *Select Psalms* was a politically charged text which included a brief, but pointed extract from Psalm 111:

Lord aloft thy triumphs raise,  
While we sing thy Power and Praise:  
My Soul, The honour of the King,  
Shall in the great Assembly sing;  
His Praise, while men have Memory  
And power of speech, shall never dye.

Psalms such as this sound an affirmative theme which perhaps cheered royalists and offered them assurance that deliverance would come.

When Henry King began his translation, probably in late 1650 or early 1651, he had come to realise that not only could royalists draw solace from the Psalms, but that Psalmody was a useful tool in the war of ideologies. It would be a signal victory of the orthodox Anglican party to recapture sympathy for the Stuart monarchy through this biblical medium. King explained his reasons for publishing his translation of the Psalms in a letter to James
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100 H. Lawes, *Select Psalms of a New Translation To be sung in Verse and Chorus of five Parts, with Symphonies of Violins, Organ, and other Instruments, Novemb. 22. 1655 Composed by Henry Lawes, Servant to His late Majesty* (1655), p. 2.
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Ussher:

I was (I confess) discouraged, knowing that Mr George Sandys, and lately one of our pretended reformers [Barton or Rous] had failed in Two different Extreams; the first too elegant for the vulgar use...the other as flat and poor, as lamely worded and unhandsomely rhimed as the Old ... My Lord, I now come forth, and Adventurer in a Middle-way, whose aim was, without affection of Words, to leave them not disfigured in the sense'.

King returned to the problem that Jeremy Taylor had identified in 1644: that in order to reach ordinary people royalists would have to communicate with them in their own language. As King said, the 'Two different Extreams' of plain and aesthetically pleasing Psalm translation 'had failed'. Rather than unifying the people, these different approaches to biblical exegesis had contributed to the widening social, ecclesiastical, and political divide in English society. When King published his volume in 1651, rather than mimicking the plain style of Barton and Rous which he abhorred, he attempted to find a middle ground between their plain style and the poetic elegance of Sandys' version which he admired. He determined to rein in his artistic impulse in order to produce a simpler book of Psalms that would have wide appeal. In his preface King expressed his desire to render the Psalms 'with perspicuity and plainnesse for the vulgar use', and his book was published in duodecimo, a relatively affordable format. Like Taylor, King aimed to provide a translation that would appeal to ordinary people. For royalist literary culture the efforts of Taylor and King represent a determined attempt at communication with the ordinary man which has, in the past, been denied by critics, with the exception of Jason Peacey who has given a cogent account of royalists' new found willingness to exploit print as a medium to discredit parliament.

102 Henry King to James Ussher, reprinted in Hannah, Poems and Psalms, p. 139.
104 On the royalist attempt to reclaim the Psalms from parliament see Loscocco, 'Royalist Reclamation', pp. 500-44.
have a polemical import is clear in King's letter to archbishop James Ussher: 'Thus while your Grace, and other Champions of the Church, (the Chariots and Horsemen of Israel,) engage against the Publicke Adversaries of Truth, I come behind with the Carriages'.\(^{106}\) There is also a hint, in King's preface to his *Psalmes*, that this was a rhetorical piece. Whoever was able to read his Psalms, he said, would perceive the 'Reason' of the text. King's choice of vocabulary is interesting: the noun 'reason' often featured in contemporary religious and political discussion. It was a lack of 'Reason' that at the Restoration was held to have caused the bloodshed of the 1640s. In his *Eikon Basilike* Charles I had repeatedly contrasted 'reason' with the tumultuous behaviour of the rabble in London.\(^{107}\) King's attempt to bring 'Reason' to the multitude, therefore, can be read as an attempt to bring the people to political obedience.

Although King produced a plainer book of Psalms that was to some degree akin to those of Rous and Barton, his translation shifted the meaning of the Psalms to support a royalist reading. While Rous and Barton were clearly influenced by their desire to provide a book of Psalms that was acceptable to parliament, King was influenced by his allegiance to Charles I. Through lexical and syntactical modulations he presented monarchy in a more favourable light than Rous, Barton, or indeed Milton had done. We can see the difference between royalist and parliamentarian approaches by looking at contrasting treatments of the opening of Psalm 2, which in the *AV* reads:

```
Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vaine thinge
The Kings of the earth let themselves, and the rulers take counsell
  together, against the Lord and against his anointed, saying,
  Let us breake their bandes asunder and cast away their cords from us
he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in
derision. (My italics)\(^{108}\)
```

The 'imagine' is an abstract verb. Rous retained it in his 1643 *Psalmes*, while in 1644 Barton...
opted for a more conscious 'think'. By 1646, perhaps in response to interference by the House of Commons and the Westminster Assembly, Rous had changed his 'imagine' to 'surmise', and by 1654 Barton had changed his 'think' to the more active, malevolent and topical verb 'plot'. In the same version Barton also expanded the fourth verse to include the words 'conspiracie' and 'attempts':

But lo; the Lord that dwells on high,
and doth in heaven abide,
Shall laugh at this conspiracie,
and their attempts deride.

That Parliamentarians saw their victories as evidence of God's providential hand is well-known; to portray royalists who sought to overturn their successes as plotters against the favour which God had imparted was an obvious polemical tactic. Milton and Barton both manipulated the Psalms to present kings as rebels against a government which God had sanctioned, and to foster fears of further royalist insurrections. In August 1653 Milton, who was by then working for the Commonwealth government, also used the word 'plots', in his version of the second Psalm:

Why do the Gentiles tumult, and the nations
Muse a vain thing, the kings of the earth upstand
With power, and the princes in their congregations
Lay deep their plots together through each land...

When Milton wrote his Psalms in 1653, and when Barton published his 1654 version, royalist plots posed an ongoing threat to the fragile stability of the Commonwealth government. On 29 March 1652 John Thurloe became Secretary of State, and in July 1653 he took over from

110 W. Barton, The Book of Psalms in Metre Close and Proper To the Hebrew: Smooth and Pleasant for the Metre: to be sung in the Usual and known Tunes (London, 1654), Psalm 2.4, sig. B'-B'.
111 Milton translated Psalms 1-8 in 1653 and dated all but the first August: Milton, Complete Shorter Poems, pp. 333-40.
112 Ibid., p. 334-5, Psalm 2.1-4.
113 The best account of royalist plotting from the regicide on remains David Underdown's Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660 (Hamden, Conn., 1971), pp. 18-41.
Thomas Scott as head of the intelligence network. He quickly developed a network of spies in England and the continent to seek out royalist plotters and conspirators. In July 1653 the first sittings of the Nominated Assembly, or Barebones Parliament were marked by a resurgence of royalist feeling; and the prospect of a restoration was discussed publicly in the capital. In the second week of August, the month in which Milton wrote his Psalms, Colonel Robert Phelips and Major Fry were arrested for their involvement in plots for surprise attacks on Portsmouth and Poole. In Scotland a royalist movement under the Earl of Glencairn was spreading from the Highlands and was threatening to become a national movement against the presence of the English conquerors. Meanwhile, Charles II was busy pressing his fellow Protestant princes for support and the newly-dubbed Earl of Rochester was gaining considerable sympathy at Ratisbon for the Stuart cause. When Milton set his 'plots' in the wider geographical context of 'each land' he may have had these events in mind.

Henry King performed an equally topical, but royalist rendering of the second Psalm. His translation begins with a double rhetorical question: 'Why do the furious heathen rage? / Vaine people why engage?'. This was probably an allusion to the 'Engagement' controversy which continued at the time King performed his translation and when Moseley published it. In October 1649 the regicide government required that the Engagement should be sworn by virtually every literate member of society, and in January 1650 it was extended to the entire
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male population. When King's volume was first published the Engagement continued to cause controversy. Although George Thomason dated his copy of King's *Psalmes of David* August 1651, inside the book the imprimatur of John Downname is dated 7 January 1650 (meaning 1651). On 27 November 1650 a sweeping order to remove all ministers who had refused to subscribe to the Engagement from their livings was imposed. At the University of Oxford fellows continued to be ejected for refusing to take the Engagement; and at the University of Cambridge William Sancroft was ejected in November 1651 for refusing to take the Engagement. The Engagement controversy had caused much soul searching for royalists. Thomas Washbourne wrote to Robert Sanderson in January 1650 seeking guidance as to whether the 'Engagement' required any more than 'passive obedience to the present power', a power that Washbourne felt he could not resist and had little choice but to 'submit' to. When King shifted the syntax in the Psalm to position the adjectival 'Vaine' at the beginning of the line, he suggested that subscribing to an Engagement, which for royalists was unlawful, was senseless or futile.

In the next lines of the second Psalm Barton and Rous avoided using the word 'anointed' which appears in the *AV*, and which to seventeenth-century minds signified divinely appointed

---
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kingship. King's version reads:

Kings of the earth a party make,
And Rulers counsell take.
Who 'gainst the Lord and Earth doth sway,
And his Annointed, say,
Break we the Bonds they on us lay,
And Cast Their Cords away.\textsuperscript{129}

The polemical charge of the word 'Annointed' had been heightened by the regicide. In its
\textit{Declaration...Setling the Present Government In the Way of A Free State} of March 1649 the Council of State had denied the special significance of Charles's anointment, through which he was believed to have divine sanction to rule.\textsuperscript{130} According to the \textit{Declaration}, 'no learned Divine' would affirm it [anointment] to be applicable to the \textit{Kings of England}, or that 'the words \textit{touch not mine anoynted}, were spoken of kings'.\textsuperscript{131} Royalists emphasized Charles' anointment in order to align their persecuted king with Christ to maximize the polemical potential of his martyrdom. In a sermon at the exiled royalist court in The Hague, the regicides were accused of having murdered 'a glorious Lord though not Christ the Lord, yet the Lord's Christ, God's anointed'.\textsuperscript{132} The chiasmus causes an intentional slippage between the earthly and heavenly Lord. There is also an emphasis on the kinship between earthly and heavenly hierarchy in King's Psalm 2, which is not paralleled in the other translations:

\begin{quote}
Yet have I set my \textit{King} on high,
Adorn'd with \textit{Majesty}:
Upon Mount Sion rais'd the \textit{throne}
Of my \textit{Annointed} one. [My italics]\textsuperscript{133}
\end{quote}

The words which signify the trappings of kingship such as 'Throne' and 'majesty' which were used by King were omitted by the parliamentary translators Milton, Rous and Barton.

Majesty, from the fourteenth century, had been identified with the greatness and glory of God,
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but had also, from the days of Chaucer, come to mean the greatness and dignity of sovereign power and the person of the monarch.\footnote{Richard Rex has shown that Henry VIII introduced the term 'majesty' into statutes and proclamations from 1534 as part of the 'cult of monarchy which accompanied the extension of royal power under the early Tudors'. R. Rex, \textit{Henry VIII and the English Reformation} (Basingstoke, 1993), p. 28.} For royalists the king's anointment was a sign of God's favour. King refers to the 'Annointed one', an individual, whereas in John Milton's interpretation of Psalm 105 God forbade kings from touching his own anointed which Milton interpreted as 'his own people'.\footnote{Milton, \textit{CPW}, iv, p. 403.} King translated these same lines from Psalm 105 ambiguously:

\begin{verbatim}
To whom he said (by his command
That none should them withstand)
'Gainst mine anointed lift no arme,
Nor do my prophets harm.\footnote{King, \textit{Psalmes of David}, Psalm 105.14-15.}
\end{verbatim}

Similarly in King's version of Psalm 18, there is only one anointed: 'He great deliverance doth bring, / In love to His anointed King'.\footnote{Ibid., Psalm 18.49.}

In his translation of Psalm 120 King's version lends an acutely personal voice to David whose words might have come from the mouth of Charles I:

\begin{verbatim}
Lord save me from their cruel lies,
Who would my life surprise.
Make not my soul their envies bait,
To perish by deceit.
...
To quench wars flame, and lessen strife,
I laboured all my life:
But They when Treaties were my care,
For lasting war prepare.\footnote{Ibid., Psalm 120.2 & 7.}
\end{verbatim}

The final couplet is a highly political statement which implies that while Charles I had tried to negotiate a peace, parliament had wanted only war. Rous and Barton do not use the word
'Treaties' in their translations. Rous rendered the phrase as 'but when I speak' and Barton as 'but when I spoke'. The history of Charles I hovers behind King's translation. Royalist propaganda through the civil wars claimed that Charles had 'laboured' 'quench wars flame' and that he had been forced into a defensive war. Yet the case against the king was based on the accusation that he had waged war against his people. This was an accusation that King had already contested in his poem 'A Deepe Groane fetch'd at the Funerall of that incomparable and Glorious Monarch, Charles the First', where he described the regicide as a 'prodigious Murther, by a traiterous Crew'.

The historical circumstances in which each version of the Psalms was written is reflected in the interpretation of individual Psalms. In his translation of Psalm 72 in 1643, for example, Rous rendered the opening lines as:

Then shall he govern uprightly,  
and give thy people right;  
Then shall he judge with equity  
thy poor that have no might.

In 1643 this could quite fittingly be read as a request for an equitable government designed for the ears of Charles I. The Psalmist appeals to God to give the king good counsel so that he may govern with 'justice' and 'equity'. In 1651, King, by contrast, translated these lines as:

The mountains then shall bring forth peace  
The hills by righteousness increase.  
He shall the poor and needy save,  
But break oppressors in the grave.

---
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King interpreted these lines as a call for vengeance rather than equity. The 'poor' in Rous' version 'have no might'. They rely on the equitable rule of the king, whereas in the post-regicide version there is a promise of a future return to 'peace' and an overthrow of 'oppressors'. Equally, in 1654 Barton translated lines from Psalm 144 quite differently to King. Lines which King translated as, 'My rock, my shield, and helper true, / My people to subdue', were rendered by Barton as:

My goodness and my fort likewise,
my shield of saving power,
My saviour from mine enemies,
and my exalted tower.

King's rendering is more forceful than Barton's. Barton's is a fanciful celebration of God's favour. King's version, by contrast, with its 'hands to fight' and 'rock', is gritty and vengeful. Barton's stanza ends in an exalted tower; King's in the promise of a subjugation of his enemies.

Comparing the translations of these Biblical scholars is revealing. The Psalms are flexible: they can be adapted to reflect current events, and they were extremely popular across the social and political spectrum. Publishing books of Psalms was, for royalists, a means to recover and circulate at least a portion of their proscribed prayer book in a way that enabled them to reach out to the people. Jeremy Taylor and Henry King realised that in order to speak to the people, they would need to speak in a language that they understood. Henry Lawes' *Choice Psalms* was published with the expressed intention of aligning Charles I with David. Milton was deeply concerned that through writing, and particularly writing which had a theological basis, the king might 'perswade men that the Parlement and their cause [was]
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pursued with Divine vengeance' and that Charles would then have 'attained his end'. That in 1660 Ralph Josselin saw in Charles II's return to England the nation running to the king 'as Israel to bring back David'; and on 28 June 1660 Gilbert Sheldon delivered a sermon of thanksgiving for the restoration of Charles II at Whitehall which took as its theme, 'Davids Deliverance and Thanksgiving' proves that Milton's fears were well-founded. Henry Lawes and Henry King published the Psalms in different ways, but both used them for polemical purposes. When we seek to explain how England in 1660 came to welcome the restoration of Charles II, we should consider that royalist books of Psalms contributed by reaffirming a vision of monarchy that was divinely appointed.
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Chapter Six

Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth and the Translation of Guido Bentivoglio's *Historicall Relations* and *Compleat Historie of the Warres of the United Provinces*

In England in the sixteenth century historians saw their primary function as educative. Histories taught God's presence in time, and they taught men how to behave. Cicero, the main classical influence for discussions of the purposes of reading history, had called it the witness of the past and the light of truth because from history one learned by example what philosophers taught only through precept. A new genre of historical writing as political advice, which originated in Italy in the writings of Machiavelli and Guicciardini in the early sixteenth century, reached England in the last quarter of the century. Under this influence English historians began to rifle the past not just for instructions on moral behaviour, but to find explanations for contemporary crises. In the seventeenth century, historians turned to the recent past for explanations. During the civil wars and Interregnum, recent European histories offered a means not only to examine the causes of the troubles, but to root out who was to blame.

Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth was one of the most prolific published translators of the Puritan Revolution. In this chapter I demonstrate that Monmouth's translations of Guido Bentivoglio's *Della guerra di Fiandra* (1632-39) and *Relazioni in tempo dele sue nunziature* (1629) were made for political purposes. Bentivoglio was born in Ferrara in 1579, and studied
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civil and canon law at the universities of Ferrara and Padua. In 1587 he was made cameriere segreto to Pope Clement VIII. Under Clement's successor, Pope Paul V, Bentivoglio served as nuncio in Flanders from 1607 to 1615 and in France from 1616 to 1621 where he helped settle the differences between the Catholics and Huguenots. He was created cardinal in 1621, and died in 1644. He left two historical works which deal chiefly with the civil strife in Flanders and France. Monmouth's aim in translating Bentivoglio's works was to demonstrate parallels between the civil wars in England and the Dutch revolt in the late sixteenth century. His translations highlighted, through analogy, that the rebellion in England had been fought hypocritically in the name of religion and political liberty. I place these translations in the contexts of Monmouth's political and literary career, and royalist historical-political writing of the 1640s and 1650s. Similarities are then drawn between the arguments in Bentivoglio's histories and those made in other royalist publications of the 1640s and 1650s to show that Monmouth's translations form part of a particular strand of royalist oppositional literature.

**Monmouth's Royalism**

Henry Carey, second Earl of Monmouth, was the eldest son of Sir Robert Carey, first Earl of Monmouth, a grandson of Mary Boleyn. Owing to their kinship with Elizabeth I, the Carey family prospered in the late sixteenth century. Robert rose rapidly at court and served Elizabeth well, taking up diplomatic missions to the Netherlands, and to the court of James VI in Scotland. He saw active service in one of the naval squadrons against the Armada, and fought alongside Robert Devereux, the second Earl of Essex in support of Henry IV of France. When Elizabeth died, Robert rode non-stop from Richmond Place to Holyrood to be

---
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the first to give James I and VI the news.\textsuperscript{6} When Charles I travelled to England to join his parents in July 1604, it was Robert who escorted the cavalcade to court.\textsuperscript{7} From 1605 Henry Carey's life became intertwined with that of Prince Charles when his mother, a lady-in-waiting to Anne of Denmark, was chosen to take care of him.\textsuperscript{8} Elizabeth Carey is said to have paid exemplary attention to Charles for the seven years that he was in her care.\textsuperscript{9} In 1611 the two boys were parted when Henry matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford. Following his graduation in 1614 he returned to court to attend the prince before leaving to travel abroad from 1614 to 1616.\textsuperscript{10} During his travels around the continent he became proficient in both French and Italian, a skill that served him well when he later turned to translating. On his return from his travels, in 1616, Henry was dubbed a Knight of the Bath in celebration of Charles being created Prince of Wales. His father was created Baron Carey of Leppington in 1622, and Earl of Monmouth in 1625, a new title granted in celebration of Charles's coronation. As we can see, Henry Carey's life was tied to that of Charles I from an early age and, as John Morrill has argued, it was this kind of personal loyalty to the king that drove many to take his side in the civil wars.\textsuperscript{11}

Upon his father's death in April 1639, Henry Carey inherited his title and became eligible to take a seat in the House of Lords as the Earl of Monmouth.\textsuperscript{12} From then until the end of 1641

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
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\bibitem{9} HMC, \textit{Downshire IV}, p. 410.
\bibitem{12} For ease of reference, I shall from here on refer to Henry Carey as Monmouth.
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the new Earl of Monmouth is noted rather for his absences than his attendances in the Upper House. However, from December 1641, a period of public side-taking in which the allegiance of individual lords became ever more apparent, Monmouth emerged as one of the king's most reliable supporters. This may have been the result of Charles's decision to drive a wedge between the Lords and Commons by appealing to well-affected lords for support. Under the advice of Edward Nicholas, Charles and Henrietta Maria requested their attendance at parliament to help tip the balance of votes in the king's favour. Monmouth's increased attendance from this time suggests that he was among those whom the royal couple counted as sympathetic to their cause.

London at this time had become a dangerous city. Divisions in both Houses of Parliament had become the common gossip of the capital. A massive demonstration at Westminster on 29 and 30 November had proclaimed the citizens' alliance with the parliamentary leadership; and in the Common Council elections of 21 December, the old leadership had been displaced by men with parliamentary sympathies. Throughout December 1641 London apprentices gathered at Westminster to demand the removal of the bishops and the exclusion of Catholics from parliament. In January there was a movement against the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and church services were disrupted. The bishops were made scapegoats for all the ills of the commonwealth. Their carriages were searched on entering and leaving New Palace Yard, and some arriving by boat were prevented from landing. On 28 December only two
bishops took the risk of attending the Lords, and on 30 December there were no bishops present in the morning session.\textsuperscript{23} The secular peers were also targeted for defending the bishops.\textsuperscript{24} Violent clashes at Whitehall between disgruntled royalist officers and citizens were a feature of the post-Christmas demonstrations.\textsuperscript{25} Fear and distrust pervaded London politics.\textsuperscript{26} Charles's ill-advised and badly timed attempt to arrest the Five Members on 4 January 1642 was a severe blow to his political credit, and lost him much support.\textsuperscript{27} On 10 January 1642, Charles left Whitehall for Hampton Court, but by 13 January, feeling no longer safe there, withdrew further to Windsor.

Monmouth's political intervention began with a speech in the House of Lords on 13 January 1642, 'Upon the occasion of the present distractions, and of his Majesties removal from Whitehall'.\textsuperscript{28} He lamented the 'sad condition wee are now in'.\textsuperscript{29} London, he remarked, was 'full of jealousies and apprehensions'.\textsuperscript{30} Members of the Lords were not 'free from feares' and the king had withdrawn from his capital believing 'that his Majesties Person was not safe'.\textsuperscript{31} The word 'feares' runs through his speech. Monmouth highlighted the sense of danger which he felt the king, bishops and nobles were in. In reality members of the House of Commons also had genuine fears. Consequently when Monmouth singled out the king and members of the Lords as being in danger there is by implication a suggestion that he believed that the Commons bore some responsibility for the civil 'distractions' which blighted the capital.

Amidst the divisions in the two Houses, he had voiced an opinion which made his allegiance

\textsuperscript{23} Russell, \textit{Fall of the British Monarchies}, pp. 442-3.
\textsuperscript{24} Fletcher, \textit{Outbreak of the English Civil War}, p. 175.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 172.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 176.
\textsuperscript{27} Russell, \textit{Fall of the British Monarchies}, p. 457.
\textsuperscript{28} H. Carey, \textit{A Speech Made in the House of Peers by the Right Honourable the Earl of Monmouth on Thursday the 13 January, 1641} [i.e. 1642]. \textit{Upon the Occasion of the present distractions, and of his Majesties removall from White-hall} (London, 1642).
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., sig. A2'.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., sig. A2'.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., sig. A2'.
clear. That his speech was subsequently printed by John Benson, his favoured printer and publisher at the time, indicates that he arranged for its publication himself. Monmouth, it seems, intended to present the Lords in a favourable light to the general public who at this time were demonstrating an unprecedented thirst for news of the events passing in parliament. Indeed, Richard Cust sees the publication of this speech as an attempt to position the loyalist members of the Lords as 'the main proponents of unity and accommodation'.

Although Monmouth's exact views are difficult to pinpoint from the sources available to us, there is sufficient evidence to show that he stood firm on the subject of the king's prerogative. In the increasingly partisan environment of 1642, he belonged to a group of loyal lords who defended the king and his exclusive rights. Monmouth had his dissent entered in the Lords' Journal against several key votes which encroached on the king's powers. On 14 February, he entered bail for the king's attorney general, Sir Edward Herbert, who, under the instruction of the king, had exhibited the articles against the Five Members. Herbert had charged them with traitorously conspiring to subvert the fundamental laws and of high treason. Affronted by his actions, the Commons began impeachment proceedings against him.

---

32 Monmouth's career as a published author had only recently begun, but Benson was his only publisher at this time. See: V. Malvezzi, Romulus and Tarquin, trans. H. Carey (London, 1637); V. Malvezzi, Romulus and Tarquin, trans. Henry Carey (2nd edn., London, 1638); and G.F. Biondi, History of the Civil Warres of England between the Two Houses of Lancaster and York, trans. H. Carey (London, 1641), all of which were published by Benson.


34 Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, pp. 269.

35 Monmouth was by no means a conspicuous member of the Lords. There is no mention of him in Adamson's The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I (London, 2007); and only one in a long list in a footnote in Russell's Fall of the British Monarchies, p. 479, n. 117. Only Richard Cust has mentioned Monmouth's speech in the Lords. He also singled Monmouth out as 'one of the most dependable of the king's allies' in 1642: Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, p. 269.

on 14 February. The Earl of Bristol had also become a target of the Commons since 1625 when he was alleged to have tried to persuade the king to turn papist. Cromwell resurrected the accusation against the earl during the course of the First Army Plot in the spring of 1641. On 28 March, Monmouth was one of eight lords to protest at the request for the Earl of Bristol to be committed to the Tower on the tenuous charge of concealing the Kentish Petition. Monmouth's antipathy to the Commons is shown by his readiness to post bail for Herbert, and by his protest against Bristol's impeachment.

Throughout March and April Monmouth continued to register his opposition to parliament by entering a series of formal protestations against majority decisions. On 2 March, the Lords voted along with the Commons for putting the kingdom into a posture of defence. Although the Upper House was divided over whether to support the Commons' resolution, the motion was eventually carried and the Lords agreed to enact parliamentary control of the militia by ordinance. When the Militia Ordinance was finally passed on 5 March Monmouth was one of the sixteen Lords who entered their protest. A month later on 4 April, Monmouth entered his dissent against the vote for the Earl of Warwick to take charge of the fleet. Charles had attempted to put Sir John Penington in charge, but parliament had outmanoeuvred him by installing the Earl of Warwick in his place much to the king's dismay. On the next day, 5 April, Monmouth entered his dissent against the request for certain officers of state and privy councillors to be displaced and for parliament to recommend their replacements. These three
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38 Fletcher, Outbreak of the English Civil War, p. 168.
39 Ibid., p. 168.
40 LJ, iv, p. 678.
41 LJ, iv, p. 622.
42 Russell, Fall of the British Monarchies, p. 479; Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, p. 275.
43 LJ, iv, pp. 622 & 627. The sixteen Lords who protest against the final passage of the ordinance were Lindsey, Bath, Southampton, Devon, Cleveland, Monmouth, Portland, Mowbray, Willoughby of Eresby, De Grey, Rich, Howard of Charleston, Dunsmore, Savill, Seymour, and Capel.
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proposals represented a serious encroachment upon the king's prerogative, and each time Monmouth took the king's side.

As the country gravitated towards civil war and divisions deepened, Monmouth continued to take the king's side. In April 1642 Charles attempted to seize his magazine from Hull, but was barred entry to the city by Sir John Hotham who took his instruction from parliament. This, for Charles, represented proof that war was being levied against him.\(^47\) In the House of Lords Monmouth entered his protest against a proposal for Sir John Hotham and his son to receive assistance from the House of Commons for inconveniences they had incurred while undertaking the charge and command of Hull against the king.\(^48\) On 14 May, he protested against a bill to restrain new peers from sitting in the House of Lords. This bill was clearly designed to ensure that Charles could not influence votes by creating new and sympathetic peers.\(^49\) Monmouth protested again on 19 May against the request from the Commons to expedite a declaration for putting into execution the Ordinance for the Militia.\(^50\) And finally on 23 May he protested against the declaration for the Lord Keeper Edward Littleton to be taken into custody with the Great Seal.\(^51\) From 20 May Charles I started to send batches of letters to individual peers commanding them, according to their 'allegiance', to follow him to York.\(^52\) Monmouth was among the first group of peers to abandon sittings to join the king as requested.\(^53\) On 11 June, he, together with Northampton, Devon, Dover, Rich, Coventry, Capel, Howard and Grey of Ruthin was accused in the Commons of promoting civil war, and on 16 June they were impeached.\(^54\)

---
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53 *CSPV*, 1642-3, p. 113, Giovanni Giustiniani to the Doge and Senate, 1 Aug 1642.
Monmouth is believed to have followed the king to Oxford, but there is no record of him taking any active part in the wars. In 1645 the Committee for the Advance of Money, which had been appointed on 26 November 1642 to gather loans for public service in support of parliament, assessed Monmouth for £1,500. Perhaps seeing the writing on the wall, in January 1646 Monmouth negotiated a settlement with the Committee for a reduced sum of £400. He consequently avoided sequestration, but had to acquiesce in the seizure of some of his property: in 1650 parliament ordered Kenilworth Castle to be made untenable. In 1651 its estates were assigned to certain of Cromwell's officers and troops by way of satisfaction for good service and arrears of pay. The park was destroyed, the lake drained and the land divided among them. At the Restoration Charles II renewed Monmouth's lease. Although Monmouth appears to have withdrawn from the conflict he may have been involved in royalist intrigues. In March 1659 a letter from Charles II addressed to Monmouth's daughter Elizabeth at his house in Lincoln's Inn Fields was intercepted. The letter was addressed to a 'Mr. Goston' – no doubt a cypher – in a cover to Elizabeth. It was not unusual for royalists to address letters to female members of a family to avoid attracting the attention of Thurloe's men, so Monmouth may have been communicating with Charles II as 'Mr. Goston'.
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61 Justinian Isham, for example, addressed letters to Brian Duppa's wife to avoid attracting unwanted attention from the authorities. See G. Isham, ed., The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650-1660 (Northampton, 1951), p. 94.
Monmouth appears to have been an Anglican. In a dedicatory epistle to William Cartwright, he praised the Anglican scholar and poet for 'his clever Wit' which, he said, had made amends 'For all the Schismes that other Cartwright' – that is the Puritan Thomas Cartwright – 'writ'.

Monmouth died in 1661 and was buried according to the terms of his will, which was made on the 21 July 1659, by 'some orthodoxicall minister of the Church of England and according to the booke of Common Prayer'. We can, therefore, safely assume from his actions and his words that like Moseley, Monmouth was not only a royalist but an Anglican royalist.

The Context of Royalist Historical and Political Writing

Translating recent histories of Europe was popular among royalists such as Monmouth in the 1640s and 1650s. They found in them parallels with, and explanations for, their own current situation. As Paul Seaward has argued, the Italian historian Arrigo Caterino Davila's *Historia delle Guerre Civili di Francia* (1630) attracted some attention amongst royalists in the 1640s because compelling similarities could be drawn between the origins and events of the French civil wars and the English civil war.

According to its publisher Henry Herringman, the translation had been 'continued and Finished' by the king's command 'at Oxford'. Charles I was said to have read it with such eagerness that 'no Diligence could Write it out faire, so fast as he daily called for it'. He wished that he had read it 'some years sooner', believing that 'being forewarned thereby, he might have prevented many of those Mischiefs we then groaned under'. There is good reason to believe that Charles did indeed approve of and even

66 Ibid., sig. A2.
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encourage the translation. The two translators, Sir Charles Cotterell and William Aylesbury,
 donated a copy of the work to All Souls College, Oxford because, they said, the work was begun and finished there. Under the auspices of its Warden and later Archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert Sheldon, All Souls was a firmly royalist college. Some copies of the 1647 edition contain a dedication to Charles I written by Aylesbury and Cotterell which states that having seen the history in manuscript the king had added ‘a favourable enquiry after the rest’. Continental histories were popular with Charles's supporters too. Sir Edward Hyde said that his favourite modern historians were Davila, Strada, and Bentivoglio. Moseley published translations of Strada's and Bentivoglio's histories in the early 1650s, while Davila's was published by Ruth Raworth, a printer and publisher who worked with Moseley on several royalist publications, including Sir John Suckling's Fragmenta Aurea (1646) and Sir Richard Fanshawe's 1647 translation of Guarini's Il Pastor Fido.

Monmouth had a long career in translating Italian and French works into English. The texts that he chose to translate are largely concerned with war and civil strife and as such were

---
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highly relevant to contemporary England. Through analogy these histories could lead people
to analyse current events in England in a particular way and to view monarchical government
and Charles I in a favourable light. Monmouth's first translation to be published was Virgilio
Malvezzi's *Romulus and Tarquin* which was registered by John Benson on 20 February
1637. It was popular enough to warrant a second edition which was published just a year
later. Moseley bought the rights to this book from Benson in June 1646, and published a third
edition in 1648. All three editions contain a dedication to Charles I which may have been
intended in the 'mirror for princes' tradition. The function of mirrors for princes is not
panegyric but counsel, and any unsparing criticism of the misuse of power in these texts is
compatible with an unwavering affirmation of the sacred and irresistible character of the
king. In this case it was designed to both flatter and advise the king by comparing him with
the two eponymous disreputable Roman emperors. The preface flatters Charles by
highlighting his qualities, whilst the stories of Romulus and Tarquin inside may have been
chosen because they could show the king how not to behave. It was not unusual for analogies
to be drawn between the Stuart monarchs and Roman emperors. James I encouraged
iconography which showed him reviving imperial Rome, and he had wanted to be seen as an
English Augustus. Charles appeared in masques of the 1630s under different guises, but
always as an imperial ruler from an idealized Romano-British past. In 1632 Peter Heylyn
published his *Augustus, or An Essay on those Meanes and Counsels, whereby the
Commonwealth of Rome was altered, and reduced unto a Monarchy*. Heylyn's book was
poised between praise for the wisdom of some Augustan policies and criticism of others.
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78 Ibid., p. 215.
Monmouth may have aimed at a similar balance.\textsuperscript{79}

It is more likely, however, that Monmouth's \textit{Romulus and Tarquin} was intended to garner support for the king. According to his preface, the translation was intended to act as an extended antithesis through which Charles I was contrasted favourably with disreputable opposites. This was possibly a means to combat criticisms which were then being levelled at the king. James Howell later wrote that Charles, at this time, had been criticised for allowing himself to be deified in God's house.\textsuperscript{80} Monmouth said that his aim was to make Charles's qualities more discernible in that ‘\textit{contraria juxta se posita, doe magis elucescere}’: contraries when juxtaposed are illuminated all the more.\textsuperscript{81} How better, he asked, could 'Charles the Gratious' be drawn, than by contrast with 'Tarquin the Proud'?\textsuperscript{82} How better to appreciate the 'blessed Government' that England enjoyed, than by contrasting it with the 'slavery the \textit{Romans} endured under the rule of Tarquin the \textit{Tyrant}'\textsuperscript{83} Charles's piety would be illuminated, he said, by contrasting his godliness with the idolatrous 'self-deification' of Romulus.\textsuperscript{84}

Publishing this book in 1637 with its praise for Charles's piety and graciousness may have also served a political purpose. Discontent in Scotland was brewing even before the violent reactions to Charles's attempt to impose a new prayer book in 1637. Some problems had been inherited from James I: the hatred of the Five Articles of Perth, for example. There were also grumblings at high taxation, and nobles complained that they were sidelined, but most of the discontent in Scotland centred on Charles' religious policies.\textsuperscript{85} The Scots felt that the new
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liturgy smacked of popery and revealed Charles's favour for the Catholic Church, or at least a lack of piety. When Monmouth's second edition of *Romulus and Tarquin* was published in 1638, the troubles in Scotland had deepened. The Scots revived and reworded the National Covenant of 1581, abolished the Scottish episcopacy and established Presbyterianism in its place, moves which Charles interpreted as a direct challenge to his royal authority.\(^{86}\) Although we cannot know whether this was in Monmouth's mind when he performed the translation, the political milieu into which the book was published is noteworthy. When Moseley published the third edition in 1648 it was an equally timely defence of Charles I as England descended into a second civil war.

Soon after Monmouth published his translation of Malvezzi's *Romulus and Tarquin*, he turned his attention to histories which were closer to home, both temporally and geographically. In 1641 his translation of Giovanni Biondi's *History of the Civill Warres of England* was published in folio; and a second part followed in 1646. In 1648 he published his translation of Galliazzo Gualdo Priorato's *A History of the Late Warres and Other State Affairs*.\(^{87}\) Monmouth wrote a dedicatory epistle for this book in which he expressed his loyalty to Charles I. He was, he said, 'debarr'd the attendance upon his Majestie (a happinesse which from his infancy and mine, till of late yeares, I have enjoy'd)'.\(^{88}\) He also voiced his outrage at his own continued exclusion from the House of Lords: he was, he said,

\[
\text{inhibited to sit and vote in the house of Peeres, (the next best of Companyes) for having obey'd his Majesties command, upon no lesse penalty then the forfeiture of my allegiance; and for not having obey'd the Summons of the House of Lords, when I was not in a condition or capacity of doing so, (A fault which mee thinkes, and I wish I could perswade others to thinke so too, Five yeares deprivation of birth-right might be able to expiate).}^{89}\]

\(^{86}\) Ibid., pp. 56-87.
\(^{87}\) Moseley bought the rights to this in 1658, but died before it could be republished. See TRCS, ii, p. 195.
\(^{89}\) Ibid., sig. A3'.
This epistle is dated 5 July 1647,\(^{90}\) and it seems likely that he dated it for a reason. This was a tense time. On 2 June, the army had seized Charles from Holmby House in Northamptonshire and had taken him to Newmarket.\(^{91}\) The abduction of the king was carried out in answer to the Presbyterian attempt to overpower the army with the aid of the Scots.\(^{92}\) From Newmarket the army set off in a slow advance towards London. According to two London newsbooks, after leaving Hatfield for Windsor, the king dined at Monmouth's country estate, Moore Park, on 1 July. This being the case, when Monmouth penned his preface he may well have been privy to the king's thoughts.\(^{93}\) Monmouth's epistle warned that current tensions would lead to further 'discord', 'murder' and 'civil war'.\(^{94}\) Since 'all parties' had acknowledged civil war to be unnatural, he said he was writing to persuade them to put an end to the strife by 'putting their helping hand to an happy accommodation'.\(^{95}\) His allegiance to Charles I was, nevertheless, unwavering. In his prefatory poem to his translation of J.F. Senault's *The Use of the Passions* which was published by Moseley in 1649, he claimed that the book, which did much to support the idea that perverted religious passion was responsible for sin and rebellion, showed that in time 'Rebels unto Loyalty are brought / And Traytors true Allegiance are taught'.\(^{96}\)

**Continental Histories of the 1650s**

The early 1650s saw three translations of histories of the rebellion of Protestants in the Low Countries against the Spanish Catholic monarchy. The writers of these histories drew conclusions that chimed with English royalist propaganda of the period. Like Davila, they traced the roots of rebellion to religious over-zealousness manipulated by political scheming.

Self-interested factions had used Calvinist resistance theory to propel the people into rebellion

---

against legitimate monarchs hypocritically in the name of religion and political liberty.\textsuperscript{97} Two of these histories were translated by Monmouth, and the third was translated by Sir Robert Stapleton, a royalist of Catholic extraction who supported the king at Oxford, and was by the early 1650s living in retirement. All three were published by Moseley. Stapleton's translation of Famiano Strada's history of the Dutch revolt, \textit{De Bello Belgico} was published in 1650. Monmouth's translation of Bentivoglio's \textit{Historicall Relations of the United Provinces} was published in 1652 and \textit{The History of the Warres of Flanders} followed in 1654. Later that year he published a second edition of \textit{The History} under the revised title \textit{The Compleat History of the Warres of Flanders} (hereafter \textit{Compleat History}).\textsuperscript{98} The \textit{Historicall Relations} was registered with the Stationers' Company in April 1652, but the two 1654 translations were not registered.\textsuperscript{99} Moseley may have thought that he could pass the two 1654 editions off as an extension of \textit{The Historicall Relations} – he certainly would not have wanted his prefatory material to the \textit{Compleat History} with its royalist bias to be examined by the censors.

Although the \textit{Historicall Relations} had been published without any prefatory material, the \textit{The History of the Warres of Flanders} and \textit{Compleat History} contain an identical preface by Monmouth which guided the reader to draw comparisons between the Dutch and English rebellions. He lamented the current state of England and expressed his desire to see the country returned to 'her former beauty', or times of 'Peace', which in England no doubt meant the bygone days of Stuart rule.\textsuperscript{100} His belief that parliament had fomented the rebellion is explicit. War had bred:

\begin{quote}
Irreverence towards God, Disobedience of Magistrates, Corruption of
\end{quote}
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\textsuperscript{98} The text of the \textit{History of the Warrs of Flanders} and the \textit{Compleat History of the Warrs of Flanders} are identical. There are some changes to the prefatory material which are largely innocuous, other than the inclusion of the preface by Monmouth which only appears in the \textit{Compleat History}. To avoid confusion all references pertaining to the 1654 editions will be drawn from the \textit{Compleat History}.  
\textsuperscript{99} TRCS, i, p. 394.  
\textsuperscript{100} H. Carey, 'The Translators Epistle', in Bentivoglio, \textit{Compleat History}, sig. A2'-A2".
Manners, Alteration of Laws, Contempt of Justice, Neglect of Learning, no Respect of Consanguinity, Forgetfulness of Friendship, Change of Civil Government, and all the Mischiefs that can be done by Fire or Sword: Many of which, we in the Dominions of England, Scotland, and Ireland Have of Late too Sadly experienced.\textsuperscript{101}

When this preface was published Cromwell had indeed subdued England, and Ireland, and had driven Scottish forces out of England by 'fire' and 'sword'. Monmouth's catalogue of the consequences of war echoes criticisms that royalists had levelled at parliamentarians during the civil wars: disobedience, corruption, neglect of learning, alteration of laws and contempt of justice were common complaints as we have seen.\textsuperscript{102} When he termed the 'Change of Civil Government' a mischief that had been 'of Late too Sadly experienced' he revealed his distaste for the new regime. But here he stopped, not wishing to launch further out into 'so Dangerous and so High-going a Sea', for his criticism of the government had led him into treacherous waters.\textsuperscript{103}

Translator and stationer alike published Bentivoglio's works because the criticisms of rebellion and support for monarchical rule resonated with royalists. As Nigel Smith has pointed out, Moseley's preface implies a parallel between Bentivoglio's contempt for the Dutch Protestants and the attitude the loyal English reader should take with the Puritans.\textsuperscript{104} Moseley stated that the translation of the \textit{Compleat History} was intended as 'a matter of humane instruction'.\textsuperscript{105} Bentivoglio argued that the motives for the Dutch rebellion against the Spanish monarchy were specious. His book taught the necessity of obedience to a monarch; it taught that those who offered the promise of political 'liberty' actually sought only to serve their own interests; and that extreme Protestantism was both schismatic and destructive to the
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Church. Publishing these books both at the beginning of, and in the wake of, the Anglo-Dutch wars of 1652-4 provided an opportunity to highlight the hypocrisy of parliament's professed defence of Protestantism as its justification for resisting the authority of Charles I. From 1641 to 1649 Parliament's claim that it defended the true reformed religion was echoed time and time again in its 'vindications and polemic' against the king.¹⁰⁶ Had parliament not condemned Archbishop Laud for traitorously endeavouring 'to cause division and discord betwixt the Church of England and other Reformed Churches',¹⁰⁷ for suppressing and abrogating the privileges and immunities that had been 'granted to the Dutch and French Churches in this Kingdome'; and for expressing his 'malice' and disaffection towards them?¹⁰⁸ Did article seventeen of the Nineteen Propositions not require Charles I to 'enter into a more strict alliance with the states of the United Provinces, and other neighbouring princes of the Protestant religion'?¹⁰⁹ Since the days of Elizabeth I, the United Provinces had appeared to Protestants in England as their natural ally. Why then had parliament not entered into a Protestant alliance with the United Provinces?

Bentivoglio argued that rebellion in the United Provinces had been encouraged by the French Calvinists or Huguenots. Although Calvin himself did not play a major role in the development of Calvinist resistance theory, as Quentin Skinner has pointed out, there is no doubt that most of the leading protagonists of political resistance in the latter half of the sixteenth century in Europe were Calvinists, or at least took the trouble to present themselves as defenders of Calvinism.¹¹⁰ It was the French Huguenots who, in response to the St. Bartholomew's Day massacres in 1572, introduced the new political theory that we now term

¹⁰⁷ A Relation of the Troubles of the three forraign Churches in Kent Caused by the Injunctions of William Laud (London, 1645), sig. A3'.
¹⁰⁸ Ibid., sig. A3'.
Calvinist resistance theory. A number of Calvinist writers published a series of influential books which claimed that although there was a general obligation to obey rulers, active resistance was justified against kings who ruled tyrannically, especially in cases where they hindered the progress of the true religion. The leading theorists in France were Theodore Beza, François Hotman, Philippe du Plessis Mornay and the anonymous author of the *Vindiciæ, Contra Tyrannos* of 1579. Outside of France writers supporting resistance include Philip Marnix and Jacob van Wesembeke in Netherlands, and George Buchanan and John Knox in Scotland all of whom justified rebellion against tyrannical rule.

Conrad Russell has noted that in the run up to and during the civil wars, parliamentarian polemicists in England had been unwilling to invoke Calvinist resistance theory to support rebellion – although he acknowledged that there are hints of resistance theory buried within certain tracts. For example, in 1643 the Presbyterian lawyer, William Prynne translated extracts of the *Vindiciæ* and included them verbatim in his appendix to *The Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdoms*. Prynne said that the Huguenots were an example of legitimate resistance in the interests of 'conscience and necessity' when they rebelled against the French House of Guise. As Russell observed, Prynne's case should not be taken as representative of the parliamentary position since the majority of its propaganda at this time sustained a 'fiction that no resistance was taking place' and that they were acting purely in self-defence against a king who required protection from himself and his evil counsellors.

---

112 See for example, *Vindiciæ, Contra Tyrannos: or concerning the legitimate power of a prince over the people, and of the people over the prince*, ed. and trans. G. Garnett (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 63-6.
However, as Martin Dzelzainis has recently shown, after the regicide parliamentarians overcame their earlier reluctance to invoke resistance theory; Milton and Goodwin are two examples of polemicists who repeatedly cited its classical texts.\textsuperscript{118} In his defence of the regicide, \textit{Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio} which was published in February 1651, Milton cited Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and Paraeus on the power of the community to overthrow a king.\textsuperscript{119} Thus at the very time that republican writers turned to resistance theory to defend the execution of a lawful monarch, Monmouth turned to translating Bentivoglio's histories which implicitly condemned justification for rebellion on the grounds of religion.

According to Bentivoglio, rebellion which began in France spread to the Netherlands. He claimed that disobedience had been 'openly fomented from without by the Hugonots of France'.\textsuperscript{120} This struck a chord with English royalists who from the beginning of the troubles had accused parliamentarians of possessing an excessive religious zeal which drove them to attack the English Church and king, or alternatively of hypocrisy in using religious justification to disguise their ambition and self-interest. James Howell, for example, claimed that religion was a 'meere vaile to cover their hypocrisie'.\textsuperscript{121} Royalists also claimed that Charles I had been punished for attempting to aid the Huguenot rebels in La Rochelle. Peter Heylyn, the well-known royalist propagandist and polemicist, said that Charles had 'trained up his own subjects in the School of Rebellion', and taught them to 'confederate themselves with the Scots and Dutch, to seize upon his Forts and Castles, invade the Patrimony of the Church, and to make use of his revenue against himself'.\textsuperscript{122} Howell wrote that Calvin's doctrine had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} J. Milton, ‘A Defence of the People of England’ in M. Dzelzainis, ed., \textit{John Milton: Political Writings} (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 76, 125 & 177. It should be noted that although Milton drew on these examples his argument was secular rather than religious. For him Charles I had failed to preserve his covenant with the people which was expressed in his Coronation Oath.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Bentivoglio, \textit{Compleat History}, p. 36.
\item \textsuperscript{121} J. Howell, \textit{A Trance: Or, Newses from Hell} (London, 1649), p. 18; and \textit{Dodona's Grove} (1650), p. 273.
\item \textsuperscript{122} P. Heylyn, \textit{Aërius Redivius} (London, 1670), p. 423; Milton, \textit{Laudian and Royalist Polemic}, p. 212.
\end{itemize}
flown 'to France and hatched the Huguenots', from there 'it took wing to Bohemia and Germany and the Confederate Provinces of the States of Holland, whence it took flight to Scotland and England'. This sect, he said, was the 'Source of the civil Distractions that now afflict this poor Island'.\(^{123}\) In 1639, according to the Venetian ambassador, Charles I felt that the rebellion in Scotland was being 'deliberately fomented' by the Dutch.\(^{124}\)

Calvinism, it was claimed, was fundamentally anti-monarchical. Bentivoglio condemned it as 'the worst of all sects' because 'above all others' it 'makes subjects revolt against their Princes'.\(^{125}\) Strada similarly told his readers that 'nothing is so pernicious to Monarchy' as Calvinism, which taught the people 'to contest with their Prince, and to dissent from him, not only with impurity, but with advantage'.\(^{126}\) Huguenot resistance theory, moreover, had widened the scope for justified rebellion to include instances where malevolent advisers had usurped royal authority, or where a king had overstepped the limitations defined by law.\(^{127}\) Davila accused the Huguenots of covering their self-interest under the 'vail of Religion'.\(^{128}\) Bentivoglio went further and accused them of using their religion to facilitate a change in political government:

> As for the ... point of separation of Government in things which respect the state; 'tis seen clearly that the Hugonots conspire to make a popular Common-wealth Government, which may be directly opposite to Monarchy ... their first palliated pretences of liberty of conscience, is now seen to be by them turned into designs of absolute liberty of Government; and all matters of Religion, into apparent practices of Faction.\(^{129}\)

He also claimed that the Huguenot faction aspired 'directly to the Government of a

\(^{123}\) J. Howell, *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (1650), p. 5; and *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ* (1655), p. 34. This was a point that Howell made repeatedly: see also his *A Venice Looking-Glasse* (London, 1648), p. 4, and *Dodona's Grove* (1650), p. 36.


\(^{125}\) Bentivoglio, *Historicall Relations*, p. 40.

\(^{126}\) Strada, *De Bello Belgico*, book 2, p. 32.

\(^{127}\) Kingdom, 'Calvinism and Resistance Theory', p. 219.


\(^{129}\) Bentivoglio, *Historicall Relations*, p. 91.
Commonwealth, and designed to compass it by the ruine of the Church and Monarchy'.\textsuperscript{130} In La Rochelle, he said, they plotted 'a thousand mischiefs' against the king and Church without acknowledging 'Regall authority'.\textsuperscript{131}

For the continental historians Bentivoglio, Strada, and Davila the taking up of arms for religion and political liberty was engineered by disaffected nobles. The people were gulled into supporting a rebellion which, in truth, was designed to serve the self-interests of a minority who desired a change in civil government.\textsuperscript{132} According to these historians it was ambitious and disgruntled statesmen who were to blame for perverting the people and inciting them to rebel against their legitimate rulers. They fostered rebellions speciously in the name of religion and political liberty in order to challenge monarchical rule. In the \textit{Compleat History}, Bentivoglio blamed the nobility for their ambition which led them to seek out 'pretences' for rebellion.\textsuperscript{133} They drove 'the vulgar people to madness by the poison of false opinions', and propelled them by degrees from liberty to licenciousness; from licenciousness to tumults; and from tumults to Rebellion'.\textsuperscript{134} Of all their pretensions, he claims, 'that of conscience is the most specious; and they who plot most against the common good, seem by this way to be most zealous in procuring it'.\textsuperscript{135} English royalists in the 1640s had argued in strikingly similar terms that the English people had been cozened into rebellion. Marchamont Nedham's royalist newsbook \textit{Mercurius Pragmaticus} declared that 'a few conscionable Lords, Commons, and Priests' had 'lay'd their Heads together … under a pretence of loyaltie, Libertie, and Reformation'.\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Mercurius Poeticus} also rued that 'the people' had been 'swaid

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130} Ibid., pp. 93-4.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Ibid., p. 93.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Ibid., p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Bentivoglio, \textit{Compleat History}, pp. 9-10; and \textit{Historicall Relations}, p.28.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Ibid., p. 9; see also Strada, \textit{De Bello Belgico}, p. 116.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Bentivoglio, \textit{Compleat History}, p. 10; see also Strada \textit{De Bello Belgico}, p. 99 where he claims that young noblemen often spoke of foreign religions and liberty of conscience.
\item \textsuperscript{136} \textit{Mercurius Pragmaticus}, 28 Sep 1647, p. 18.
\end{itemize}
by those dam'd villaines' that 'did beguile'.  

137 John Berkenhead identified Lord Saye and Sele and his Providence Island merchant confederates as those responsible for fomenting discontent.  

138 The rebellion, he said, was 'shaped' in 'Grays-Inne-Lane, where the undertakers for the Isle of Providence did meet and plot it'.  

139 Berkenhead accused them of inventing conspiracies against 'the life of the Lord Say, and some of the chief Members of both Houses' to frighten the people into rebellion.  

140 Bentivoglio accused the nobility of driving religion into fanaticism which led to the destruction of church property.  

141 Bentivoglio was horrified that war had been waged 'so wickedly against the sacred images and altars; and at the sacrilegious destruction in the Churches in Antwerp' where the people had been driven to 'violate Churches, beat down Altars' and 'break Images'.  

142 Strada, in characteristically colourful language, writes of the rebels being 'vomited from hell'.  

143 At St. Omer they overturned altars, defaced monuments and broke to pieces sacred images, 'Whatsoever they saw dedicated to God … they pulled it down and trod it under their feet to dirt, whilst their ringleaders clapt them on the backs, and encouraged them with all their force to destroy the idols'.  

144 Davila too accused the Huguenots of ‘destroying the Churches … and filling all places with rapine and Bloud’.  

145 In January 1641 the English Commons had determined to begin a programme of iconoclasm which would 'deface, demolish, or get rid of all images, altars, crucifixes, superstitious pictures, ornaments and relics of idolatry' from all churches.  

146 The abhorrence for the destruction of
church property voiced in the continental histories chimed with royalist literature of the 1640s in England which was saturated with examples of such behaviour. John Berkenhead, having taken over from Heylyn as editor of *Mercurius Aulicus*, condemned the pulling down of crosses at Abingdon and Cheapside. He accused Cromwell personally of sacking both Peterborough and Lincoln Cathedrals. The pages of his newsbook were littered with examples of churches being defaced or destroyed, pictures demolished, and glass windows smashed, ‘nothing was left’, he said, which was ‘rich or glorious’. Parliament's forces had ripped down organs, broken statues and defaced monuments in churches and cathedrals as sanctioned by parliamentary authority.

As we have seen in earlier chapters, although royalists newsbooks and pamphlets were quashed by the parliamentary legislation of 1649, there were other vehicles available for royalists to publish their oppositional views. Anthony Milton has shown that in the 1650s Peter Heylyn, one of Charles I's chief propagandists in Oxford, continued to attack the 'zealous madnesse' with which the Huguenots had defaced and ruined churches by writing histories. Heylyn derided the Huguenots as 'worse than heathenish', and drew a direct parallel with the English Puritan attacks on the cross. In his *A Survey of the Estate of France* published in 1656, Heylyn argued that in their struggles with the French crown, the Huguenots had been perverse and stubborn and 'deserved affliction for their disobedience'.

Bentivoglio similarly condemned the people for openly denying obedience to their prince and
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147 *Mercurius Aulicus*, 30 April 1643, p. 228, 26 May 1644, p. 1003.
148 *Mercurius Aulicus*, 17 April 1643, p. 218, 15 Sep 1644, p. 1168.
149 See, for example, *Mercurius Aulicus*, 26 Feb 1643, p. 116; 12 March 1643, p. 130; 2 April, p. 172; 21 Apr 1644, p. 952; 12 May 1644, p. 980; 21 September 1644, p. 1168; 26 October 1644, p. 1219; see also *Mercurius Rusticus*, 26 February 1644, p. 161; 16 March 1644, p. 169; and *Britanicus Vapulans*, 4 November 1643, p. 2.
150 *Mercurius Aulicus*, 16 Jun 1644, p. 1040.
152 Firth and Rait, i, pp. 1263-4; ii, pp. 18-20; ii, pp. 245-54.
154 Ibid., p. 18.
declaring themselves 'to be free, absolute, and soveraign'. When Monmouth chose to translate Bentivoglio's works, he opted for a writer whose opinions many royalists shared.

Translating Bentivoglio's histories offered Monmouth a means to appeal to English nationalism by showing the English people that in the eyes of Europe its monarchy had been greatly admired. Bentivoglio conceded that there was nothing more natural to mankind than the love of liberty, and that of all the nations of the world 'the Northern people of Europe have always seem'd most desirous thereof'. However, England's form of monarchy was held up as exemplary: it was a 'freer' government where the people were – or had been – obedient to a monarch whose power was limited: the 'King of England', he said, could not do many things 'without his Parliament'. He described the special relationship between the English monarch and parliament in terms of kinship and matrimony through the voice of Elizabeth I: by the Authority of the Parliament was I brought to the succession of the Crown which I wear. The Religion which I follow is embraced by the Parliament. I have acknowledged the Parliament to be my father: and as I may say, have taken the Parliament for my Husband.

He admired England's government as a unique partnership, in which the monarch was guided by his or her parliament. It had a balanced constitution, which had proved so successful that every prince in Europe had wished to be its ally. Readers were encouraged to feel the pangs of nostalgia for England's old monarchy, and to ask questions about the past and present forms of government. Had the English monarchy been absolute? Was parliament any less prone to tyranny? And at a time when the new Commonwealth in England was struggling to gain recognition across Europe, readers were surely encouraged to reflect on its past enviable

156 Bentivoglio, Compleat History, p. 3.
157 Bentivoglio, Historicall Relations, p. 45.
158 Ibid., p. 47.
reputation on the international stage.\textsuperscript{160}

Amongst the condemnation of rebellion and nostalgia for the past, Bentivoglio's \textit{Historicall Relations} offered a glimmer of hope for the future to English royalists. Revolutions of government, he suggested, were only temporary, and a reversion to monarchical rule was inevitable. He considered that the new Commonwealth of the United Provinces would not last. Although he admitted that the republican government there was likely to 'grow more solid and better established' so that in time it might, like the Swiss government, become 'not only durable, but even formidable', yet there was still an attachment to the old order which could not be erased.\textsuperscript{161} He believed that any country which had a long history of monarchical rule would eventually revert to that form of government because it was ingrained in the national psyche. He concluded that the people's obedience to their prince was so ancient that eventually they would 'endure no other government [than] that of one alone'.\textsuperscript{162}

It is always difficult to evaluate how influential a work of literature was in its own time. However, there is contemporary evidence that these continental histories were not only read and translated, but they affected their readers. As we have already seen, royalists at Oxford were influenced by reading Davila. Charles I is alleged to have said that if he had read his \textit{The History of the Civil Wars of France} sooner, the turmoil of the 1640s might have been averted, and Edward Hyde, although admittedly not an unbiased observer, said that he was certain that parliamentarians had read and 'learnt much of their play' from reading Davila.\textsuperscript{163}

Parliament, it seems, was not insensitive to the effects of reading contemporary histories

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{160} See \textit{CSYP}, 1647-1652, p. 224, 2 May 1651, letter from Michael Morosini, Venetian ambassador in France, to Doge and Senate where he commented on the embarrassing position of England while the republic was not thoroughly established or generally recognized.
\item \textsuperscript{161} Bentivoglio, \textit{Historicall Relations}, pp. 46-7.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Ibid., p. 47.
\end{itemize}
where analogies could be drawn. Howell claimed that some passages of the royalist Major John Wright's translation of Prudencio de Sandoval's *Civil Wars of Spain* first published in 1652 were 'commanded to be omitted because they had too near an analogy with our times'.

To measure the influence of these texts, or to trace the development of royalist thought alongside them, we can also look to the contemporary works of Heylyn. Anthony Milton's analysis of the development of Heylyn's thoughts and attitudes from the 1640s to 1650s has shown that the 'prompt' for his rethinking of the Dutch War was reading Stapylton's translation of Strada's *De Bello Belgico*.

History can provide precedents and explanations for contemporary situations. Strada argued that Tacitus had long ago shown that the principles of rebellion and the shaking of obedience were brought about by 'courting the people with the hope of liberty'. Whilst one must always be cautious in arguing that a translator necessarily agreed with the conclusions drawn in his translations, Monmouth's prefaces demonstrate that he saw his works as a means to analyse and intervene in contemporary events in England. Parliament, in announcing the abolition of monarchy, called it a conversion to a 'Free State'. It looked to the encouraging example of 'Our neighbors in the United-Provinces', and Monmouth took up the analogy. When Moseley and Monmouth published these translations they knew that parallels would be drawn between continental Protestantism and English Puritanism. The *Historicall Relations* and the *Compleat History* demonstrated that disgruntled factions used Calvinist resistance theory to drive extreme Protestants to rebel against their lawful king. The two books abound with images of over-zealous Protestantism which was anti-monarchical, rebellious, and
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166 Strada, *De Bello Belgico*, Book 1, p. 2. For evidence that Heylyn had read Strada's *De Bello Belgico* see P. Heylyn, ed., 'The Collectors Preface', *Bibliotheca Regia, or The Royal Library* (London, 1659), n.p.
167 *A Declaration of the parliament of England Expressing the Grounds of their Late Proceedings And of Setting the Present Government In the Way of A Free State* (London, 22 March 1648/9), p. 16.
destructive to the Church and State. There are striking similarities between the claims made in continental histories and contemporary royalist propaganda, and we must conclude that Monmouth's translations formed part of the royalists' literary armoury.
Chapter 7

Royalist Publishers: Richard Royston and Henry Seile

I have argued in this thesis that Humphrey Moseley's publishing business was at least in part driven by his political and religious convictions. He was not the only publisher committed to royalism. In this chapter I examine the activities of two of his fellow-publishers, Henry Seile, and Richard Royston for two reasons. Firstly, analysing the careers of these two booksellers enables us to assess the scale and extent of royalist literature; and secondly, it places Moseley within the wider movement of royalist publishing. Few attempts have been made in the past to associate authors with a particular bookseller.\(^1\) This chapter shows that this was a common practice not just for Moseley, but several royalist publishers. The list of royalist printers and publishers is long, but Richard Royston and Henry Seile stand out because, like Moseley, they took risks to promote the causes of monarchy and the Anglican Church which for these men were so closely intertwined. Royston and Seile were among those who published the so-called 'king's book', the *Eikon Basilike*;\(^2\) and both signalled their support for the Anglican Church during the 1640s and 1650s by publishing works by eminent and often unpopular stalwart Anglicans. From the very beginning of the 1640, whilst at the height of their unpopularity, Anglicans feature strongly in Seile's catalogue. But from 1642, when he was arrested and briefly imprisoned, Seile's publishing in the king's cause became covert. Royston, by contrast, despite suffering several arrests, fines, and imprisonments published more openly on behalf of the king and Church from 1642 through to the Restoration. I suggest that Royston's

---

1 Only one article has made such a connection: J. Bevan, 'Isaak Walton and His Publisher', *The Library*, 32 (1977), pp. 344-59.

publications form part of a programme that was orchestrated by Gilbert Sheldon, the future Archbishop of Canterbury, and put into practice by the royalist divines Henry Hammond and Jeremy Taylor, both chaplains to Charles I, whose works formed the core of Royston's publishing practice from 1645 to the Restoration.³

**Henry Seile, Printer and Bookseller at the Tiger's Head, Fleet Street.**

Henry Seile was born in 1594, the son of a surgeon from Olaston in Derbyshire.⁴ His publishing career began when he was apprenticed to Matthew Cooke in April 1607.⁵ After serving ten years as an apprentice, he was freed and set up his first shop, the Tiger's Head, in St. Paul's Churchyard where he traded from 1617 to 1637. When this shop was pulled down as part of Archbishop Laud's renovations of St. Paul's, Seile moved to new premises of the same name in Fleet Street, opposite St Dunstan's Church, from where he traded until his death in December 1660.⁶

During the 1620s and 1630s Seile was the publisher of choice to a group of authors who were connected through the courtier Sir Kenelm Digby, or the Anglican divine Brian Duppa, who were themselves connected through the poet Ben Jonson. In 1633 Seile published a posthumous edition of *Certaine learned and elegant vworke of the Right Honorable Fulke Lord Brooke* which contains the bulk of Fulke Greville's works.⁷ The *Certaine learned and

---


elegant workes was edited by Digby. Notably absent from this edition were Greville's Treatise of Monarchy where kingship is portrayed as a product of human fallibility; and his Treatise of Religion which contained some criticism of the established Church. Between 1623 and 1636 Seile published six editions of Resolves, Divine, Morall, Political which was written by Owen Feltham, another friend of Digby. In 1638 Seile published Abraham Cowley's Loves Riddle, which was dedicated to Digby who, according to John Aubrey, acted with great generosity towards the young poet. Like Digby, Cowley is now counted among the network of friends, associates, and literary apprentices of Ben Jonson that is known as the 'Sons of Ben'.

After Jonson's death in 1637, Seile published the memorial volume, Jonsonus Virbius (1638), which was edited by Duppa. And it was through Duppa that Seile provided books, paper and wax for the two young princes, Charles and James in the late 1630s. Feltham, Digby, and Duppa were all fiercely loyal to Charles I and all were followers of Laud in the 1630s.

From 1631 to 1641 and from 1652 to 1659 Seile was publisher of choice for the Anglican divine Peter Heylyn. Heylyn's writings of the 1630s were, on the whole, written in support of the Laudian Church and Stuart rule, and were in several cases directly commissioned by the

---


king and were published “by authority”\textsuperscript{13}. He dedicated his \textit{The Historie of ... St. George} of 1631 and his \textit{History of the Sabbath} of 1636 to Charles I both of which were published by Seile.\textsuperscript{14} Seile also published Sir Robert Le Grys' translation of Barclays' \textit{Argenis} which was dedicated to Charles I. As we have seen this book supported absolute monarchical power and the disregard of parliament.\textsuperscript{15} Le Grys' translation was performed and 'published by His Majesties Command'.\textsuperscript{16} Seile also put his own name to a dedication to the young heir-apparent, Prince Charles, in Heylyn's \textit{Eroologia Anglorum, Or An help to English History} of 1641.\textsuperscript{17} This book was explicitly written to defend monarchical and episcopal authority: Heylyn explained that it was intended to 'satisfie the mindes of those ... that either are enemies of Regall or Episcopall power'.\textsuperscript{18} It is evident, he said, 'that in this country there was never any other government then that of Kings', and that the episcopal succession was 'as long-standing as the Church itself'.\textsuperscript{19} As an apologist for Laud and Laudianism during the 1630s, Heylyn became a highly unpopular figure.\textsuperscript{20} After the outbreak of hostilities in 1642, he made his way to Oxford where he spent much of his time writing propaganda for the king, and contact with his London publisher was temporarily broken.

Seile's publishing output is small compared to that of Moseley or Royston and patterns are more difficult to discern. On occasion Seile did print speeches that had been given in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Interestingly Harvard University Library has a copy of Heylyn's \textit{The History of the Sabbath} which contains a handwritten dedication from Heylyn to Thomas Wentworth, then Lord Deputy of Ireland and friend of Laud.
\item \textsuperscript{15} See above, p. 109.
\item \textsuperscript{16} \textit{John Barclay his Argenis, translated out of Latine into English: the prose vpon his Maiesties command: by Sir Robert Le Grys, Knight: and the verses by Thomas May, Esquire} (1628 and 1629).
\item \textsuperscript{17} H. Seile, 'To the Most Excellent Prince Charles, Prince of Wales, Heire-Apparent to the Monarchy of Great Britain', in P. Heylyn, \textit{Eroologia Anglorum. Or, An help to English history Containing a succession of all the kings of England, and the English-Saxons, the kings and princes of Wales, the kings and lords of Man, and the Isle of Wight. As also of all the arch-bishops, bishops, dukes, marquesses, and earles, within the said dominions.} (London, 1641), sig. A2'-A3'.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Heylyn, \textit{Eroologia Anglorum}, p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Milton, \textit{Laudian and Royalist}, pp. 1-2.
\end{itemize}
parliament. But this should not surprise us, the authorities in London were hostile towards royalists and Anglicans and it was not the place to advertise one's loyalty by turning away business on the grounds of politics. What is significant about Seile's publishing business is his tendency to continue to publish Laudian Anglicans like Heylyn after 1640 despite their unpopularity. In addition to the works of Heylyn, Seile published tracts by two other Laudian divines who had caused offence to Puritans: Dr. William Piers (sometimes Pierce), Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Dr. William Haywood (sometimes Heywood) a royal chaplain. By 1640 Piers was perhaps as hated as Laud for his uncompromising and abrasive push for conformity during the 1630s. Together with Matthew Wren, he had been the most ruthless of the bishops supporting Caroline and Laudian Church policies: when the Book of Sports was reissued in 1633, Piers had given it his wholehearted support by excommunicating or suspending those clergy who refused to read it on Sunday mornings; and he had been the first bishop in the Canterbury province to enforce the ruling that the altar be placed against the eastern wall or window and be railed in. On 24 December 1640, soon after the Long Parliament had assembled, articles of accusation were presented against him, and on the same day bail was set at ten thousand pounds. A year later he was one of the thirteen bishops imprisoned for petitioning the king against legislation being passed in their enforced absence. On 20 February 1641, while in the Tower, Piers preached a sermon which was subsequently published by Seile. In this sermon the bishop defiantly accepted his imprisonment not as just punishment, but as a test of his Anglican faith.

Dr. William Haywood was another acolyte of Laud whose unpopularity was at its peak when

21 For example, B. Rudyerd, *Five Speeches in the High and Honourable Court of Parliament* (1641); and O. St. John, *The speech or declaration of Mr. St-John, now His Majesties Solicitor Generall: Delivered at a conference of both Houses of Parliament, held 16 Caroli, 1640. Concerning ship-money* (1640).
23 *CJ*, ii, p. 58; *LJ*, iv, p. 117; *LJ*, iv, p. 119. On 30 December the recognizance was paid in full by the bishops of Rochester, Gloucester, and Oxford: *LJ*, iv, p. 119.
Seile published his tracts. In 1631 he had been appointed as one of Laud's household chaplains, and one of his duties in this position was to license books. Licensers provoked the hostility of the Puritans by censoring their books while failing to censor popish books. A complaint was made against Haywood for licensing *An Introduction to a Devout Life* because it contained 'Popish Doctrines'. In 1637 Haywood left Laud's service to become a royal chaplain. He must have remained close to Laud for in 1645 he was one of three clergymen chosen by the archbishop to attend him on the scaffold, but parliament refused the request. In 1641 some of Haywood's parishioners presented a petition to parliament, the details of which were subsequently printed. The petition claimed that his sermons contained 'grosse Popish tenets', and that his method of administering the communion upheld and advanced the 'Popish Religion' with its 'strange antic gestures of cringing and bowing'. Seile published *An Answer to a Lawless Pamphlet*, an anonymous tract which gave a point-by-point refutation of the accusations made against Haywood. The tract dismissed the petition as a smear that had been 'set on foot by two or three illiterate tradesmen' who had not even done the Anglican divine the courtesy of discussing their concerns with him before putting them into print. Parliament also came under fire for its willingness to allow a divine to be slandered without evidence: 'their justice', it said, was 'prejudiced' by scattering such libels, and 'exposing men to obloquy before they have been proved guilty'.
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26 Seile may have met Haywood when he took Heylyn's *Augustus* to be licensed for it was Haywood who gave the imprimitur on 5 November 1631. P. Heylyn, *Augustus. Or, An essay of those Meaneas and Counsels, whereby the Commonwealth of Rome was altered, and reduced unto a Monarchy* (1632), n.p.
27 Anon., 'To the Honourable, the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the Commons House in Parliament, the humble Petition of divers of the Parishioners, of the Parish of Saint Gyles in the fields, in the County of Middlesex', in Anon., *An Introduction to a Devout Life in The Petition and Articles Exhibited in Parliament against Dr. Heywood late Chaplen to the Bishop of Canterburie, by the Parishioners of St. Giles in the Field* (London, 1641), sig. A2r.
28 A. Hunt, 'Haywood, William, (1599/1600-1663)', *ODNB*.
30 Ibid., sig. A2r.
32 Ibid., p. 20.
It was not just his religious practices that made Haywood unpopular with parliament. Following the king's declaration of 27 May 1642 which forbade compliance with the Militia Ordinance, parliament moved to address the threat that the king's propaganda posed. On 5 July it issued a declaration which forbade the publication or public reading of any such 'Proclamations, Declarations, or Papers' that were contrary to any 'Order, Ordinance or Declaration' of parliament. Parliament's declaration was subsequently printed on 6 July. Just over a week later, on 14 July, Haywood was arrested for disregarding the order and allowing his curate to read the king's declarations in church, and he was committed to the Fleet. On 23 March of the following year Haywood was sequestrated from the parsonage of St. Giles for allowing another of the king's declarations to be read in church. In October 1642, Seile disregarded parliament's order against publishing and reading the king's declarations when he published the king's speech from Michaelmas Eve at Shrewsbury. This speech must have been particularly irksome because it condemned those who supported parliament while encouraging support for the king. The king called on the gentry to take a stand against those 'ill men' who sacrificed their 'Money, Plate, and ... industry' to parliament in order 'to destroy the Common-wealth', and asked that they be 'no less liberal in helping to preserve it'. Two months later Seile was arrested and held in custody.

It is likely that Seile, cowed by his arrest, avoided parliament's attention from this time by

---

34 *CJ*, ii, p. 652; *LJ*, v, p. 182. A useful discussion of the king's proclamations and his use of the Church to garner support in 1639-40 and 1642 is L. Bowen's, 'Proclamations, Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639-1640 and 1642', *The Historical Journal*, 56 (2103), pp. 297-319.
35 *A Declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, Concerning the publishing of divers Proclamations, and Papers, in forms of Proclamation in His Majesties Name* (London, 6 July 1642), British Library, Thomason ref. 669.f.5(54).
36 *CJ*, ii, p. 673.
37 *LJ*, v, p. 665. For a discussion on the king's proclamations and his use of the Church to garner support in 1639-40 and 1642 see Bowen, 'Proclamations, Royalism, Print, and the Clergy', *Passim*.
38 *His Majesties Speech At Shrewsbury, on Michaelmas Eve last, to the Gentry and Commons of the County of Salop, there Assembled* (London, 1642).
publishing texts without entering his name on the title-pages. On 14 June 1643 parliament
issued its 'Ordinance for the Regulation of Printing' which demanded that the names of author
and printer be shown on the title-pages of works, but the publisher's name was not required.40
Seile appears to have published nothing in the years 1643-1644, but it seems unlikely that he
abandoned his livelihood.41 It is difficult to assess how heavily Seile was involved in royalist
clandestine publishing activity, which by its very nature leaves few, if any, footprints. But one
major contribution of Seile's is his involvement, along with Royston, in the publication of the
Eikon Basilike. Although there remains some uncertainty as to how the book came into being,
the scholarly consensus is that it was assembled for publication by the Anglican divine, John
Gauden, who drew together and edited the papers drafted by the king between 1643 and
1647.42 Perhaps in anticipation of his death, the king is said to have been involved in ensuring
that the book was in print by the end of January. Royston allegedly told Sir William Dugdale
that some time around the beginning of October 1648, he was asked by the king to prepare all
things for printing some papers, which would shortly be conveyed to him.43 On 23 December
the Eikon Basilike was brought to him by the ejected Anglican clergyman Edward Symmons
and he set to work using a series of printers to ensure that the book was quickly in print.44 Two
thousand copies of the book were printed on a press that had been moved to a secret location
outside of the city expressly for that purpose.45 The book was an immediate success and the
Council of State soon sought to suppress it. On 16 March the sergeant-at-arms was ordered to
'seize at the Press, all those Books now printing or printed under the Name of the Book of the
late King'.46 Seile evaded the attention of the authorities, but Royston was summoned to
appear before the President of the Council of State, John Bradshaw, and was pressed to deny

40 Firth and Rait, i, pp. 184-6.
41 Wing, iv, p. 802.
42 R. Wilcher, Writing of Royalism 1628-1660 (Cambridge, 2001), p. 277-86. Royston was already by this
time Gauden's publisher of choice.
43 Madan, New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike, pp. 163-5.
44 R. Hollingworth, Dr. Hollingworth's defence of King Charles the First's holy and divine book, called Eikon
45 Madan, New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike, p. 164.
46 CJ, vi, pp. 166, 175, 183, 199 & 201.
that Charles I had written the book. He refused and spent fifteen days in custody for his troubles. 47

In December 1649 Seile was questioned in connection with printing and publishing Dr. Thomas Bayly's *The Royal Charter Granted unto Kings, by God Himself*. 48 Bayly graduated as Doctor of Divinity in 1644, and became an officer in the royalist army under the Catholic Earl of Worcester. His *Royal Charter*, a spirited defence of the Stuart monarchy, was written some time in June or early July 1649. 49 On the title-page, two biblical quotes demonstrate his desire for the return of the Stuart monarchy: from Matthew 22:21, 'Da Cæsari quæ sunt Cæsaris', and from Job 14.7, 'There are hopes of a Tree, if it be cut down that it will sprout again'. Bayly introduced the work with a quote from Virgil's fourth eclogue, 'Chara dei soboles magnum incrementum', which heralds the birth of a boy as the greatest hope for the future of the nation. 50 Virgil's fourth eclogue was often seen as a prophecy of the coming of Christ, but Bayly clearly had the coming of Charles II in mind. Addressing Charles II directly, he referred to the regicide as the king's 'martyrdom' and to Charles II as England's 'Anchor of Hope'. Urging the young king to take his rightful place he wrote, 'May the Sighs of Your People fill Your Sails with such a prosperous Gale, as may land You safely upon English Ground, and seat You in Your Father's Throne'. 51 The book was a direct refutation of the Council of State's *Declaration ... Setling the Present Government In the Way of A Free State*. In this tract the new Commonwealth government had made two claims to justify the regicide. Firstly, it asserted that Charles had forfeited his right to rule because of his tyrannical behaviour; and secondly, in order to deny any divine quality in the monarch, it argued that the

50 Ibid., sig. A2.
51 Ibid., sig. A2.
king's anointment at his coronation had no special significance. Bayly countered these claims. He reiterated the divine significance of the anointment and argued that it was not lawful for any reason to touch the Lord's anointed – even when a king fails to perform the duties that he swore to in his coronation oath. Finally, in a bold defiance of the republican government, he argued that monarchy was the most necessary and excellent form of government, and declared that there was 'no such thing as a Free-State'. In December 1649 Bayly was imprisoned in Newgate for writing this 'seditious and treasonable' book that Seile was accused of publishing.

Through the years of the Commonwealth and Protectorate Seile committed his name to works that on the surface seemed to be, but were not, innocent of political bias. From 1652 he resumed publishing books by Peter Heylyn. Anthony Milton has argued that while Heylyn's books of 1652 and 1654 appear to be non-controversial, they are in fact 'closely informed by recent events, and are far from being ideologically neutral'. In 1652 Seile published Heylyn's *Cosmographie*. As Milton points out, although Heylyn and Seile presented *Cosmographie* as a retreat from religious writing, it is, in fact, even more hostile, Laudian, and conservative than Heylyn's earlier writings. His discussion of episcopacy in *Cosmographie* was transparently intended as a commentary on recent events in England. In 1657 Seile published Heylyn's *Ecclesia Vindicata* into which the divine had gathered a series of his past works, most of which had been written during the 1640s. These were works, as the title suggests, which defended the Anglican Church and its set forms of liturgy. In February 1658 Seile published Heylyn's argument against the overthrow of the monarchy and established Church, his

52 *A Declaration of the parliament of England Expressing the Grounds of their Late Proceedings And of Setting the Present Government In the Way of A Free State* (London, 22 March 1648/9), p. 27.
54 Ibid, p. 80.
55 CSPD, 1649, p. 454.
57 Ibid., p. 152.
Stumbling Block of Disobedience and Rebellion which was probably written in the early 1640s.⁵⁸ Finally in May 1659 he published the Bibliotheca Regia: or The Royal Library, a collection of the papers of Charles I that were edited by Heylyn.⁵⁹ Seile's paratextual material presents the former king as 'Acting powerfully in all mens sight' until 'from the helm remov'd by envious fate, / The Tempest sinks the Church, the winds subvert the State'.⁶⁰

During the Interregnum, like some of his royalist contemporaries, Seile published works which are marked by an interest in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Amongst his titles are a metrical paraphrase of James I's Basilikon Doron (1651) and William Sanderson's vindication of James I, Aulicus coquinariae: or A vindication in answer to a pamphlet, entitled The Court and Character of King James (1650) which responded to and refuted on a point-by-point basis a libellous memoir, The Court and Character of King James, by Anthony Weldon, a disaffected former Jacobean courtier. Seile and other royalist publishers catered for, or stimulated, a demand for books about, or written by, courtiers of the same bygone era. Seile published Greville's The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney in November 1651. Moseley published Raleigh's Judicious and Select Essayes and Observations in 1650 and together with Richard Tomlins and George Sawbridge A Compleat History of the Lives and Reigns of Mary Queen of Scotland ... and James the Sixth in 1656.⁶¹ George Latham published Francis Bacon's The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth and her Times in October 1651; and Richard Marriot, Gabriel Beadle or Bedell, and Timothy Garthwaite, published the Reliquiae Wottonianae which includes a panegyric of Charles I.⁶²

---

⁵⁹ Thomason dated his copy May 1659. See P. Heylyn, Bibliotheca Regia: or the Royal Library (London, 1659), British Library ref. E.1718[1].
⁶⁰ 'The Explication of the First Figure', in Ibid., n.p.
The number of works published that were sympathetic to Charles I, at times to the point of hagiography, also suggests a deliberate campaign amongst royalists to rehabilitate the king's image. Royston, Seile and Moseley were the key publishers of biographical accounts of the reign of Charles I which appeared during the 1650s. As we have already seen, Moseley published Howell's *Dodona's Grove* which vindicated Charles by placing the blame for the civil war squarely on the shoulders of the Long Parliament; and Royston and Seile both published editions of the king's own version of events in the *Eikon Basilike*. After the book was banned, Royston continued to publish the work within the *Reliquiae Sacrae Carolinae* together with copies of the king's letters and speeches. He published this book clandestinely in 1650, 1651, 1657 and 1658 under the imprint of Samuel Browne in the Hague – a useful blind to put off the censors. From 1658 this work also contained Heylyn's *Short view of the Life and Reign of King Charles* another work which portrayed the late king as 'a Martyr' who had exchanged his 'painfull Crown of Thorns, which they [the Houses of Parliament] first plaited for him, to a Crown of Glory'. In 1655 Seile, together with the bookseller, Edward Dod, published Harmon L'Estrange's *The Reign of Charles I*; and in 1658, Moseley published William Sanderson's *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from His Cradle to his Grave*. A commendatory letter from Howell inside sums up the purpose of Sanderson's history: it gave their 'Royal Master ... a Burial, a Monument, and a Resurrection'.

---

62 On Marriot's royalism see J. Bevan, 'Izaak Walton and his Publisher', *The Library*, 32 (1977), p. 344. Timothy Garthwaite is also notable for the number of texts by Anglican divines that he published. For example: J. Cosin, *A Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture; or the Certain and indubiate books thereof as they are received in the Church of England* (London, 1657); A. Sparrow, *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1657); G. Sheldon, *David's Deliverance and Thanksgiving: A Sermon Preached before the King at Whitehall upon June 28, 1660 being the day of solemn thanksgiving for the happy return of His Majesty* (London, 1660).


64 P. Heylyn, *A Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles* (London, 1658), p. 150 & 152.
By 1660, Seile's title-pages were able to proclaim him 'stationer to the king's most Excellent Majesty'. But like many of his royalist contemporaries who had for so long awaited the restoration of the Stuart monarchy and the Anglican Church, Moseley included, Seile did not enjoy it for long for he died in December 1660. Seile is perhaps representative of the majority of royalist publishers who in the early days of the war were willing to make their views apparent in their work, but under pressure from the prevailing party hid their involvement. The books that he published reveal a bookseller who found a way to support the Anglican Church and Stuart monarchy more subtly. Clearly an early supporter of Anglicanism, Seile trod carefully after 1642 and the full extent of his activities as a publisher is necessarily hidden. For a publisher who shows remarkable tenacity despite his arrests, fines and imprisonments, we must look to Richard Royston whose royalism was always open.

Richard Royston, Bookseller at the Angel in Ivy Lane.

Richard Royston was born in 1601 in the parish of St. Peter in the East, Oxford, the eldest son of a prosperous tailor and important civic figure. He left Oxford for London in February 1617 to take up an apprenticeship with the stationer Josias Harrison and then John Grismond. This John Grismond was the father of a second John Grismond who was to become Royston's favoured printer, perhaps because he shared the publisher's loyalty to the king and established Church. In August 1627 Royston was sworn in and admitted as a freeman of the Stationers' Company. Some time during the next year he opened his shop in Ivy Lane at the sign of the Angel from where he continued to trade until the Great Fire of 1666 destroyed the premises.

---

65 For example Wing ref. B3329 & B3330, T. Blount, *Boscobel; or, the history of His Sacred majesties most miraculous preservation after the Battle of Worcester, 3 Sept. 1651* (London, 1660).
67 On Grismond's royalism see Bevan, *Izaak Walton and His Publisher*, p. 350.
By 1640 Royston was an established bookseller with a small, but varied, list of publications. His royalist partisanship was first made apparent when in September 1642, a matter of weeks after the king raised his standard at Nottingham, he published *Pro-quiritatio Parainetike, or, A Petition to the People*. In this tract parliament was urged to trust the king and to punish those who had driven him out of the city.\(^6^8\) George Thomason noted on the front of his copy that the pamphlet had been 'scattered up and down London on 13 and 14 September' and was 'suppressed by an order 16 September'.\(^6^9\) It is likely that from around this time Royston had some official status as the king's representative in London.\(^7^0\) On 22 February 1686 James II granted him the rights to publish a special edition of the *Reliquiæ Sacrae Carolinæ* because 'in the rebellion of 1641 at great expense and with imminent danger of his life and fortune' Royston did 'print and publish many messages and papers of our Royal Father of blessed memory'.\(^7^1\) In June 1643 the Commons ordered his arrest for printing *His Majesty's Declaration to all his loving subjects; in Answer to a Declaration of the Lords and Commons, upon the late Proceedings of the late Treaty for Peace*.\(^7^2\) Undeterred he continued to arrange the printing and circulation of royalist propaganda. According to the Anglican divine and royalist spy, John Barwick, Royston 'did great Service to his King and Country, by printing and dispersing in the most difficult Times, Books written in defence of the Royal Cause'.\(^7^3\)

\(^6^8\) Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 9.

\(^6^9\) Title-page of *Pro-quiritation Parainetike, or, A Petition to the People, For a Christian and unbloudy Decision of Cases of Conscience, in the point of Obedience unto the Deputed of the Lord; as disturb the Peace, and threaten the Ruine of this Church and State* (1642), British Library, Thomason ref. E.240[1].

\(^7^0\) Among the declarations that Royston put his name to in the early years of the Civil War are *The Late Letters From both Houses of Parliament Concerning their Purpose of delivery of a Petition to His Majesty: His Majesties Answer thereunto etc.* (London, 1642), which was, according to the title-page, published 'by His Majesties Command' at Oxford and then re-printed in London for Royston: BL copy ref: E1624. Thomason dated the pamphlet 15 November 1642. See also *Articles of Cessation* 22 March 1643, British Library, Thomason ref. E1232.

\(^7^1\) CSPD, 1686, p. 46. Declarations printed by Royston include: *His Majesties Most Gracious Message, May the 12th from Holdenby...* (London 1647); *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration Left by Him on His Table, at Hampton Court, II November 1647* (London, 1647); *A True Relation of His Majesties private departure from Hampton-Court, the eleventh of November, betweene foure and five of the Clock in the After-noone* (1647); *His Majesties Most Gracious Answer to the Bills and Propositions presented to Him at Carisbrook Castle in the Isle of Wight, Decemb. 24. 1647* (London, 1648), which was dated by Thomason 8 January 1647 i.e. 1648.

\(^7^2\) CJ, iii, p. 131.

\(^7^3\) G.F. Barwick, ed., *The Life of Dr. John Barwick, Dean of St. Paul's* (1724), p. 33.
Between 1643 and 1645 Royston regularly smuggled books from the royalist headquarters in Oxford to London using a network of women who picked up the books that he 'had conveyed by stealth among other merchandise into the western barges on the Thames' to 'sell them to retailers well known to them'.

This network was also used for communicating information out of London to the king in Oxford. Peter Thomas was no doubt correct when he pegged Royston as the man who arranged the printing and circulation of the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* in London. In August 1645 Royston was arrested for publishing the *Souldiers Catechisme Composed for the King's Armie* which was written by the royalist and Anglican divine, Thomas Swadlin. The *Souldiers Catechisme* charged the Houses of Parliament with rebellion and treason and urged soldiers to show obedience to the king.

Royston was accused in the House of Lords of seeking to employ men to 'carry Aulicus into Westminster Hall', and of being a 'constant factor for all other scandalous books and papers against the proceedings of Parliament'. His house and shop were searched for scandalous books and papers, and he was committed to the Fleet. Two weeks later he petitioned for his release and was freed upon giving good security, and on the proviso that he did not sell any books that came from Oxford, 'nor keep any correspondency' from there.

Royston immediately set aside his promise not to sell any books that came from Oxford. From 1645 he published an increasing number of books written by Anglican divines who were

---

74 Ibid., p. 62.
76 Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 50.
78 *LJ*, vii, p. 521.
80 *LJ*, vii, p. 520.
81 *LJ*, vii, p. 538.
resident at the university, most notably Henry Hammond and Jeremy Taylor. These two, as William Proctor Williams has noted, 'had much to recommend themselves to Royston, to the circle of royalist stationers to which he belonged, and presumably to his customers'.

Both Taylor and Hammond were chaplains and trusted advisers to Charles I, and both were prolific writers. Taylor had been a chaplain to Laud and then Chaplain in Ordinary to Charles I. At the beginning of the troubles, in his own words, he 'hastened to His Majesty'. By November 1642 he was in Oxford receiving his DD from the university by royal mandate. As we have seen, while at Oxford he translated the Psalms to do 'good service' to the king. He accompanied the royalist army as its chaplain and was taken prisoner in early 1645 near Cardigan in Wales. Soon after he became chaplain to Richard Vaughan the second Earl of Carbery – a former general in the royalist army – at his home in Carmarthenshire, Golden Grove.

Taylor took his lead from Hammond, who, together with Gilbert Sheldon, was the recognized leader of the Anglican party. For Hammond, the key to promoting the royalist and Anglican cause was through the medium of print. He pressed Sheldon to follow suit, but Sheldon lacked confidence in his writing and failed to put his work into print until the Restoration. From 1642 to 1645 Hammond had been in Oxford publishing royalist propaganda to set those right who had been 'perverted by popular error'. His polemical texts were published anonymously, but Royston is the most likely candidate. As we have seen, he was heavily

82 'Richard Royston' DLB 170, p. 221.
85 See above, p. 143.
87 Sheldon did write in defence of episcopacy with the intention of publication between 1650 and 1652, but was put off by Robert Sanderson's critical comments. Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon*, p.46. Sheldon's first venture into print was his attack on Milton's republican *Readie and Easie Way: G.S., The Dignity of Kingship Asserted in Answer to Mr. Milton's Ready and Easie Way to establish a Free Common-Wealth* (London, 1660), which was published through Henry Selle.
88 J. Fell, *The Life of the Most Learned, Reverend and Pious Dr. Henry Hammond*, p. 35.
involved in getting texts from Oxford into circulation, and from 1645 to 1660 Royston published the majority of Taylor's works and was Hammond's sole publisher. From 1645 Hammond and Taylor wrote volumes of sermons; manuals for prayer; apologies for the Church and for episcopacy; and numerous controversial writings against both Puritans and Papists. The shelves in Royston's shop must have been teeming with their books: Hammond alone published in excess of thirty titles between 1645 and 1660, and most ran to multiple editions.

From 1645 to 1660 Hammond and Sheldon gathered a close-knit group of like-minded theologians and royalists to write, teach and preach in support of the Anglican Church and Stuart monarchs. This group includes such notable figures as Brian Duppa, Henry Ferne and Thomas Pierce, all of whom used Royston to publish their works. The group's policy, according to the historian Robert Bosher, was the 'complete identification of the Anglican and royalist causes'. Taylor articulated the connection in his The Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacie (1647) in which he argued that in the cause of episcopacy 'Religion, and His Majesty the King, and the Church are interested parties of mutuall concernment'. Moreover the 'interest of the Bishops', he said, was 'conjunct with the prosperity of the King'. That the book was published 'by His Majesties command' suggests that Charles I supported their policy – at least publicly. Privately Charles I agonised over what concessions he could make over the Anglican Church in order to regain his political authority. Anthony Milton has argued

---

89 Royston published a letter that he received from Hammond in which the divine referred to himself as 'Your Friend, H.H.': H. Hammond, 'To The Stationer' in idem, A Continuation of the Defence of Hugo Grotius, in an Answer to The Review of his Annotations (London, 1657), sig. A2r.
90 Wing, iv, pp. 195-8.
91 After the fall of Oxford, Duppa, Ferne and Pierce used only Royston to publish their works.
92 Ibid., p. 30.
94 Ibid., title-page.
perceptively that despite the advice of Anglican divines that Charles I should not allow the dismantling of the episcopal Church in 1648 he was willing to do so. With Sheldon and Hammond in prison in Oxford, Duppa, Ferne and Sanderson were the main ecclesiastical advisors to Charles I during the negotiations conducted on the Isle of Wight in late 1648. Contrary to their advice Charles was willing to accept the Presbyterian system for three years, and it was only the purge of parliament and subsequent regicide that ensured that episcopacy was not in effect abolished with 'effective royal approval'. However, no matter what turn the king's mind took behind closed doors, Anglican divines published sermons that continued to identify the king as a stalwart defender of the Anglican Church who was prepared to accept martyrdom in its cause. From September 1648 to the end of January 1649, Royston published sermons by Duppa and Ferne which had been preached before the king during the last months of his imprisonment. These sermons showed the divines advising Charles I to 'accept suffering as the price of a clear conscience and unspotted soul', in other words, that he should prepare himself for martyrdom.

In the week before the High Court of Justice assembled in the Painted Chamber to try the king, Royston published Hammond's Letter to Fairfax. This 'letter' was pure polemic: it argued that there was no scriptural basis for the notion that supreme power lay in the

---

96 Milton, 'Sacrilege and Compromise', p. 151. Duppa wrote privately of his disappointment that the king had accepted the establishment of the Presbyterian system for three years as part of the Newport Treaty, and because of his failure to persuade him otherwise, asked that he would be judged charitably: Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon*, p. 21.

97 B. Duppa, *The Soules Soliloquie: And a Conference with Conscience. As it was Delivered in a Sermon before the King at Newport in the Isle of Wight, on the 25 October, being the monthly Fast during the late Treaty* (London, 1648), dated by George Thomason 14 November 1648. For evidence that Duppa's sermons were perceived in London as preparing the king for martyrdom see *Moderate Intelligencer*, 23 November 1648, p. 23. Ferne's sermon was published after the regicide: H. Ferne, *A Sermon Preached Before His Majesty At Newport in the Isle of Wight, November the 29 1648* (London, 1649). See also H. Hammond, *The Christians Obligations* (London, 1649), which has a similar content and contains a dedication to Charles I dated 16 September 1648.

community of the people. Hammond warned that it was *impolitick* to try the king 'in an arbitrary way' that was 'contrary to the Lawes established'. Parliament's 'designe of altering those lawes, and introducing others more suitable to [its] inclinations' was exemplified in this action. Royston published a second, very similar address to Fairfax written by Gauden, *The Religious and Loyal Protestation of John Gauden ... About the trying and destroying of our Sovereign Lord the King*. The original was allegedly sent to Fairfax on 5 January 1649. Like Hammond, Gauden highlighted the hypocrisy of parliament which had claimed in the civil wars to have fought for the king's honour and safety only to now seek to destroy him. The king's trial was a subversion of 'the fundamentall constitutions of Parliament, Lawes and Liberties'. Building on Duppa's preparation of the king for martyrdom, Hammond and Gauden's pamphlets established Charles I as a Christ-like martyr. Should God 'permit you to go on undisturbed to the shedding of more blood', as the 'Jews' had done in 'crucifying their king', then this would be 'the forerunner of all the calamities that can befall a people'.

After the regicide, Hammond and his Anglican controversialists had to respond to the challenges of a Church that was under pressure not only from Presbyterianism, but also from the Church of Rome. Even though the Presbyterians had been outmanoeuvred by the Independents at the end of the 1640s, their barrage of anti-episcopal polemic continued through the 1650s. Meanwhile, Roman Catholic apologists argued that divine providence had exposed the Protestant Reformation as a schism and that the Church of England was no true Church. Some Anglican divines who went into exile were persuaded by this argument and converted to Catholicism. In England awkward memories of Charles I's alleged
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99 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
100 Ibid., pp. 18-19.
101 J. Gauden, *The Religious and Loyal Protestation, of John Gauden Dr. In Divinity; Against the present Declared Purposes and Proceedings of the Army and others; About the trying and destroying our Sovereign Lord the King* (1649), British Library Thomason ref. E.538[11].
103 Spurr, *The Restoration Church*, p. 11.
104 Richard Crashaw is one such example.
tendency towards popery lingered, and Charles II's temporary desertion to Scottish
Presbyterianism in 1650-1 left English Anglican polemicists with much work to do to sustain,
or re-shape even, the image of the two kings as defenders of their Anglican faith.\textsuperscript{105} As part of
the rehabilitation of Charles I, three retrospective accounts of failed attempts to convert
Charles I were published.\textsuperscript{106} In 1649 Royston issued an account of the debates held between
Charles I and the eminent Scots Divine, Alexander Henderson, which had taken place while
the king was held by the Scots at Newcastle between May 1646 and February 1647. The
argument had been conducted in writing over a period of seven weeks from May 1646.\textsuperscript{107}
Henderson had tried in vain to convince the king that episcopacy was not part of God's plan,
and, according to this account, contrary to the accusations of popishness levelled at him
during the civil wars, the king had proved himself to be a good member of the Church of
England.\textsuperscript{108} In May 1649 Royston was called before the Council of State for his part in the
publication of this tract. In the same year appeared Thomas Bayly's \textit{Certamen Religiosum}
(1649), which was published by the royalist bookseller John Williams. This book described a
conference between Charles I and the Catholic Earl of Worcester purportedly held at Raglan
Castle in 1646.\textsuperscript{109} Bayly claimed that the earl had made strenuous efforts to convert the king to
Roman Catholicism, but Charles had remained constant to the Anglican Church. In his preface
Bayly said that he had published the work to disprove accusations that the Charles I was not
committed to Protestantism. The king, he insisted, had 'showed himself, not only \textit{Able},
\textit{constant}, and \textit{resolute} in his Religion' but had resisted every temptation to convert even when
he was \textit{low}; and wanted help: \textit{poor}; and wanted money', and few men were more keen, or

\textsuperscript{106} Since the event that these texts describe occurred in 1646 and 1647 I can think of no other purpose in
publishing them at this time.
\textsuperscript{107} Gardiner, \textit{CW}; iii, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{108} Anon., \textit{Papers which passed at Newcastle between His sacred Majestie and Alex Henderson Concerning
the Change of Church-Government} (London, 1649). Thomason's copy is dated 29 May 1649, see British
Library, Thomason ref. E.1243[3]. According to Peter Heylyn, the king's disputes with Henderson were
\textsuperscript{109} Thomason's copy is dated 31 September 1649, British Library, Thomason ref. E.1355[1].
more financially able to help than the wealthy Earl of Worcester. In 1652 Royston published a second version of the Certamen Religiosum which defended and supplemented Bayly's earlier edition.

In addition to these retrospective defences of Charles I, royalists set about rebuilding the Anglican Church and the Stuart monarchy under Charles II. Sir Robert Shirley, a close friend of Hammond, saw the possibilities of using the nation-wide organization of the Anglican clergy to serve the young king's interests. Shirley suggested to Hammond the promotion of 'a right understanding among the King's friends ... by settling the Church', for 'whoso ... in these times of persecution professes himself a son of the Church will also by the same principles be a loyal subject'. He proposed that the bishops should lead a reorganized royalist party, while the lower clergy as its agents were to sustain morale, encourage obedience, transmit intelligence and raise funds. It is difficult to prove how much of Shirley's plan was put into effect, but Shirley himself provided an annuity of £100 for the writing of 'such things as might be most advantageous for the present state of the Church of England'. In the correspondence between Hammond and Sheldon for the years 1649 to 1654 there is evidence of an outline, as the historian Victor Sutch has observed, of a determined effort to co-ordinate the clergy and English royalists to write and raise funds in support of the Anglican royalist cause. And in the archives of Jesus College, Oxford, there are letters which show that funds were collected for Anglican ministers and channelled through the London

110 T. Bayly, 'Epistle to the Reader', in, Certamen Religiosum, or a conference between the late King of England, and the late Lo; Marquesse of Worcester, concerning religion (London, 1649), sig. A4'. The work is dated 31 September by George Thomason.
112 Bosher, Making of the Restoration Settlement, p. 36.
114 CClSP, iii, p. 47-9.
115 Ibid., iii, p. 385.
bookseller Andrew Crooke who collaborated with Royston and Moseley over the posthumous publication of Lancelot Andrewes' *Apospasmatia sacra* in 1657.\(^{117}\)

Another part of Hammond's programme was to introduce 'orthodox' divines into the homes of the nobility and gentry as tutors and chaplains. This led to a kind of alliance between the Anglican clergy and the country squires who would be essential to the restoration of the Anglican Church in 1661.\(^{118}\) In England, royalist landowners who had compounded for their estates and hated the new order sympathised with the ejected Anglican clergy and offered them shelter. In their country houses the proscribed services of the Church were performed with renewed devotion. Up and down the country Anglican divines read the Book of Common Prayer privately in the houses of members of the gentry either as chaplains, tutors, or even as esteemed guests. Thomas Morton, for example, lived at Exeter House with the Earl and Countess of Rutland. Peter Gunning, the leading Anglican divine in London, also stayed at Exeter House as tutor to Lady Hatton's son.\(^{119}\) Hammond, following his expulsion from Oxford, was for a while in retirement at the home of Sir Philip Warwick in Bedfordshire.\(^{120}\) He also spent some time at Westwood, the home of Sir John Packington in Worcestershire, where he remained until his death in 1660.\(^{121}\) Thomas Pierce tutored the young son of the Countess of Sunderland.\(^{122}\) In 1656 the countess presented Pierce to the rectory of Brington in Northamptonshire.\(^{123}\) Sir Robert Bindloss, a staunch Anglican, appointed Richard Sherlock as his chaplain.\(^{124}\) Evidence of these alliances can be traced in the prefaces of Royston's books. Members of the gentry were thanked for their support in dedications which appear in the

---

\(^{117}\) Jesus college MS PR Mansell/B ff. 9-11.
\(^{120}\) Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon*, p. 33.
\(^{121}\) Packington was fined for his delinquency and for plotting the assassination of Cromwell: *CSPD, 1649-1660*, pp. 207 & 312.
\(^{122}\) J. Parkin, 'Pierce, Thomas (1621/2-1691)', *ODNB*.
\(^{123}\) Ibid.
\(^{124}\) *CSPD, 1640-1*, p. 93; Matthews, *Walker Revised*, p. 31.
books that Royston published: Sherlock included dedications to members of the Bindloss family; Pierce dedicated books to his patroness, the Countess of Sunderland; and Taylor dedicated multiple works to the Earl of Carbery.\textsuperscript{125}

The authorities were not insensitive to the influence that royalists and Anglicans could have over young and impressionable ears while they acted as tutors and chaplains. The London printer William Dugard was fined, had his presses confiscated, and was discharged and removed from his office as school master of the well-known Merchant Taylors' school for printing the French scholar Claude de Saumaise's denunciation of the regicide, \textit{Defensio Regia}, in January 1650. It was considered 'not safe' that a man of Dugard's royalist opinions 'should be entrusted with the education of so much youth ... who may have very ill principles instilled in them by him in their youth, that may mislead them afterward in their own prejudice of the Commonwealth'.\textsuperscript{126} During the 1640s Dugard had printed and published royalist books including the \textit{Eikon Basilike}. However, following his release from Newgate in 1650 he was persuaded to print and publish on behalf of the Commonwealth government, including Milton's \textit{Pro populo Anglicano defensio}, the official reply to Saumaise's \textit{Defensio Regio}. In return for his services he was permitted to resume his position as school master and had his presses returned.\textsuperscript{127}

Cromwell was aware of the danger that Anglican divines posed in the households of the gentry. Until 1655 he had been willing to turn a blind eye, but in the aftermath of

\textsuperscript{125} See J. Taylor, \textit{A Funeral Sermon for Frances, Countess of Carbery} (London, 1650); \textit{Rules and Exercises of Holy Living} (London, 1650); \textit{Twenty-Eight Sermons preached at Golden Grove} (London, 1651). Taylor also used Carbery's home as the title for his book of instruction on how to live according to the Anglican faith: \textit{The Golden Grove, or, A Manuall of Daily Prayers and Letanies Fitted to the daies of the Week} (London, 1655).

\textsuperscript{126} Cited by L. Rostenburg, 'William Dugard, Pedagogue and Printer to the Commonwealth', \textit{Bibliographical Society of America, Papers}, 52 (1958), pp. 190-1.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p. 192.
Penruddock's uprising he issued an order which forbade royalists employing Anglican ministers 'for the education of their children'.

He complained bitterly that royalists who used Anglican ministers to educate their children 'meant to entail their quarrel and prevent the means to reconcile posterity'. How right he was. From November 1655, ejected and sequestered clergy were no longer permitted to preach either in public or private to any persons other than their own families. However, they found they could still put their words into print. Brian Duppa wrote to Anthony Farindon, 'there was never more need of the press, than when the pulpits ... are shut up ... Let all good sons of the Church go on in their duty, and when they can no longer preach to the ears of men, let them preach to their eyes'.

Publishing, as has been shown, served a dual function: it could influence readers to support the Anglican Church and king; and it could provide extra money, sometimes desperately needed, for writers. Royston published works by Anthony Farindon who had provided Anglican services at St Mary Magdalen, Milk Street until he was ejected in 1655. Once barred from the pulpit Farindon, according to Brian Duppa, was 'fain to betake himself to the press' that he might 'get bread for himself and his children'. Indeed, the list of clergy members who had books and sermons published by Royston after their ejection is worthy of attention. Royston published tracts and books by: Thomas Pierce, Lawrence Womock, Thomas Bayly, Jasper Mayne, Clement Barksdale, Robert Sherlock, William Langley, Edward Boughen, Bernard Nicholas, Richard Gardiner, Matthew Griffith, Henry Jones, John White, Edward Bagshaw, John Duncon, Theophilus Wodenote, Richard Gove, Anthony Sadler, John Sherman, William Creed, Obadiah Walker, John Pearson, John Price and John Sudbury all of

---

128 By the Protector: A Declaration of his Highnes with the Advice of the Council, in order to the Securing the Peace of this Commonwealth (24 November 1655). British Library, Thomason ref. 669.f.20[20]; CSPD, 1655, pp. 224-5; Bodleian, Tanner MS 52, f. 105v.
129 Cited by Bosher, Making of the Restoration, p. 40.
130 By the Protector: A Declaration of his Highnes, n.p.
131 Undated letter from Brian Duppa to Anthony Farindon, Bodleian Tanner MS 52, f. 207.
132 See above pp. 24-6.
whom were ejected from their livings.\textsuperscript{135} The theological output by Anglicans during the Interregnum bears impressive witness to a sustained onslaught on the reading public. Indeed, Bosher has described the Interregnum as 'a golden age of High Anglican theology and apologetic'.\textsuperscript{136} Some Anglicans also made use of the pulpit as a public platform for theological debate and public entertainment. Most notably, in September 1652 Jasper Mayne debated publicly with the Baptist John Pendarves at Watlington in Oxfordshire, and in November 1653, Clement Barksdale defended episcopacy against the Fifth Monarchy preacher Camshaw Helme at Winchcombe Church in Gloucestershire.\textsuperscript{137} Barksdale and Mayne both wrote accounts of their respective debates and sent them to Royston who duly published them.\textsuperscript{138}

There is evidence that Royston was able to disseminate Anglican literature through booksellers outside of London. A survey of the catalogue of the books, tracts and sermons that he published shows that he collaborated with booksellers from around the country including: John Long in Dorchester, Richard Davis and Thomas Robinson in Oxford, Edward Martin in Norwich, Richard Ireland and William Morden in Cambridge, Samuel Woomock in Bury St. Edmunds, John Courteney in Salisbury, and Thomas Miller in Sherborne, Dorset.\textsuperscript{139} He also supplied large quantities of books to the bookseller Alice Curteyne in Oxford.\textsuperscript{140} Transporting letters in the bindings of books was an additional aspect of the booksellers' involvement in


\textsuperscript{136} Bosher, \textit{Making of the Restoration Settlement}, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{137} C. Barksdale, \textit{Disputation at Winchcombe} (London, 1653).

\textsuperscript{138} J. Mayne, \textit{A Sermon against Schisme: The Seperations of these Times/ Preacht in the Church of Wattrlington in Oxford-shire ; with some Interruption September 11. 1652. At a publick dispute held there, Between Jasper Mayne,D.D. And one –} (London, 1653).

\textsuperscript{139} A letter from Samuel Hartlib to Richard Royston dated 7 September 1653, with a receipt for 14 shillings from Royston for books, suggests that Thomas Robinson acted as an intermediary between Royston and Hartlib: Sheffield University Library, Hartlib Papers 41/1/50a-b.

\textsuperscript{140} The fragment of a letter from Alice Curteyne to Royston has been found in the binding of a copy of Peter Heylyn's \textit{Theologica Veteram} of 1654. The letter is an order for 82 copies of 17 editions. All but one of the editions are marked off, presumably meaning they were supplied by Royston: University of Illinois, shelfmark: MS Q. 658.80907 C94.
royalist intrigue.¹⁴¹ John Barwick commented on how easy it was to 'sew Letters privately within the cover of a Book, and then give the Book a secret mark, to notify the Insertion of such Letters therein'.¹⁴²

Royalists who visited Royston at the Angel in Ivy Lane, or Moseley at the Prince's Arms, or Henry Seile at the Tiger's Head knew that they could find a stock of books of a particular sort, and with whose views they were sure to sympathise. All three lived to see Charles II proclaimed king in London on 26 May 1660, but only Royston lived to see his efforts rewarded. From 1660 the crown patronized and protected Royston for his service over the past twenty years. On 29 November 1660 Charles II granted him the monopoly for printing the works of Charles I.¹⁴³ In 1663 a letter from Charles II forced the Stationers' Company to accept Royston as an assistant.¹⁴⁴ And on 29 September 1666 Charles II ordered that he be paid £300 in compensation for his losses in the Great Fire and 'in compassion to' his circumstances.¹⁴⁵ Whether Moseley, had he lived, would have been similarly rewarded we shall never know.

My examination of the careers and publication lists of Royston and Seile demonstrates that they were, like Moseley, driven by political as well as commercial interests. In the turbulent world of the 1640s royalist publishers coped with the upheavals of the civil wars and Interregnum in various ways. There were those like Seile who resorted to underground royalist activity after his arrest in 1642, but continued to publish for royalists.¹⁴⁶ There were some who capitulated following a term of imprisonment such as William Dugard, who, from

¹⁴¹ A suggestion made by David Underdown in his Royalist Conspiracy, p. 201.
¹⁴³ E. Almack, A Bibliography of the King's Book or Eikon Basilike (London, 1896), p. 137.
¹⁴⁵ CSPD, 1666-7, p. 167.
¹⁴⁶ CJ, ii, p. 909.
1650, printed and published tracts for the new regime – although it is possible that this was
an outward conversion driven by financial necessity and that privately his allegiance remained
with the king. Moseley and Royston were a rare breed of booksellers who openly published
royalist texts copiously and continuously from 1645 to 1660. As we have seen, these two
publishers had strong connections with writers who had gathered around the king at Oxford
during the civil wars. Both published books by the Anglican clergy, and appear to have used
their business to support ejected members. But they each had their niche markets. By
comparing Moseley to his contemporaries we can see that he was unique in his speciality for
royalist poets and dramatists. We can also see that the relationship between royalist authors
and their publishers was closer and more collaborative than has previously been
acknowledged. Royston published on behalf of Henry Hammond, Jeremy Taylor and their
cohorts; and Henry Seile was Peter Heylyn's publisher of choice. Moseley was the key
publisher for James Howell, for Henry Carey, the Earl of Monmouth, and for the translators of
French prose romance. For English readers in need of royalist nourishment, these booksellers
provided a literary banquet.
Conclusion

The purpose of my research has been to analyse royalist literary publishing in the civil wars and Interregnum. This has involved a cross-disciplinary inquiry into the rhetorical strategies of royalist literature. It asserts the importance of print culture to royalists both as a vehicle for personal response to political events, and as a means to criticize and undermine the opposition. In this thesis I have used the publisher Humphrey Moseley as a lens through which to examine the publisher's role in the dissemination of a wide range of royalist texts. It demonstrates that publishers, as well as authors, were driven by their political and ideological opinions.

Although Moseley is the most notable publisher of royalist literary works, until now there has been no single work dedicated to his activities as a royalist publisher. This thesis reveals the extent of Moseley's involvement in the publication of royalist literary works. His list of publications is dominated by royalist writers who supported the Stuart kings and the Anglican Church, and he did much to emphasize these connections. The degree of editorial control that Moseley exerted is evident in the prefatory material which surrounds the books that he published. Moseley held a unique position as mediator between his authors – largely men who circulated in and around the court – and the wider reading public, and the study of his publications contributes to our understanding of the relationship between these royalist writers and the wider population.

There has also been a lack of scholarship on the subject of partisan booksellers, and on the role that they played in publishing royalist literature. My review of the careers of Henry Seile and Richard Royston confirms that Moseley, far from being an anomaly, was one of a number
of publishers who were driven by political as well as financial concerns in this period. A publisher whose sole motive was profit would surely have been tempted to change sides publicly around 1650 for the sake of his business even if his private convictions remained of a royalist hue. I have also shown that the relationship between publishers and writers with shared political allegiances was a collaborative and sometimes exclusive one.

John Morrill has noted that as historical documents, literary texts are a source for understanding the 'anxieties, aspirations and self-delusions of an epoch'. Historians have agreed that the developments in form and content of fictional writing are part of the 'warp and woof' of our subject and our understanding of that age. While royalist writing has benefited in recent years from a surge in interest in literary works, studies have tended to focus on the 1630s and 1640s rather than the Interregnum. Jason McElligott, for example, in his Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England has focused on the pamphlet and newsbook culture of the 1640s; Robert Wilcher in his The Writing of Royalism 1628-1660 commits one small chapter to the decade of kingless rule; and Lois Potter in her Secret Rites and Secret Writing pays little attention to post-regicide writing when, in light of censorship legislation, the types of coded writing she describes were most needed. I address this imbalance in scholarly attention by largely focusing on literature of the 1650s. This thesis shows that far from being cowed by the censorship legislation of 1649 which was designed to suppress royalist propaganda, royalist writing of the 1650s was as rich, varied and polemical as that of the 1640s.

Scholarly writing on royalist literature has tended to focus either on individual texts – the Eikon Basilike is the prime example – or on canonical writers. Robert Wilcher, for example, has been criticized for the disproportionate attention he pays to Henry Vaughan in his The

---

If we are to gain a full understanding of the 'anxieties, aspirations and self-delusions' of the royalists we need to look more widely at royalist writing. The range of texts from the 1650s which have received scholarly attention to date is too narrow. Rather than burrowing down into a single text or the works of an individual author, I have examined a selection of books from Moseley's publication list which exemplify how particular genres were used by royalists. My approach reveals a movement of royalist writing which was more wide-ranging than has previously been acknowledged.

In this thesis I have paid close attention to the breadth of genres used by royalist writers. I have shown that drama was used to encourage a close identification between literature and the Stuart court, and to criticize the Puritan antipathy to the arts and to learning. Translations of Psalms were used to memorialize Stuart court culture of the 1630s, and in a more combative way to promote kingship as the divinely sanctioned form of government. The genres of prose romance and history had long been used to make political comment. When Moseley began publishing French prose romances in the 1650s, he opted for a genre which was a well-known vehicle for the reaffirmation of the values of monarchical rule. Histories were often studied to find explanations to contemporary crises. In the 1650s the continental histories which Moseley published offered analogies between the causes of the civil wars on the continent and those in England. These books imply that the pattern of rebellion against legitimate monarchs which had blighted the European continent in the sixteenth century and earlier seventeenth century were repeated in the upheavals caused by hypocritical appeals to political and religious liberty in England.

The study of royalist print-culture has tended to focus on either ephemeral newsbooks and pamphlets or more 'literary' works by canonical royalist poets. This division has created the

---

2 McElligott, *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, p.11, n.9.
impression that the two kinds of writing bore no relation to each other. My research shows that there was a great deal of intertextuality between ephemeral texts of the 1640s and literary works of the 1650s. Royalist polemicists wrote commendatory poems for collections of drama and poetry, which is, in itself, a signal of allegiance. Extracts from royalist polemical pamphlets were included in royalist literary works; and arguments from these pamphlets were echoed in books. This relationship between texts suggests that there was a more co-ordinated effort to promote the royalist cause in literary works than has yet been appreciated.

No single study can fill all the gaps in our knowledge of the publication of royalist literature. My analysis of works published by Moseley is by no means exhaustive. My research has, however, provided an evaluation of the role of the publisher in the production of royalist literature. If booksellers mediated between writers who often belonged to the political elite, and readers who belonged to a wider social strata, the next logical next step would be to analyse the way that these books were received by readers by seeking out books with marginal annotations, or contemporary letters and diary entries which refer to them.  

This study reveals the comprehensive nature of royalist writing, the role of the publisher in that activity, and the extent of the intertextuality between the ephemeral pamphlet and newsbook culture and the more high-brow literary texts. This should prove valuable to scholars whose interest is either in the history of publishing, or in literature, or in royalism in the early modern period. Literary texts are an essential source which provide us with an understanding of the opinions, hopes and self-delusions of an era. My research helps us to

---

3 For example, there is an annotated copy of James Howell's *Dodona's Grove* in Jesus College, Oxford's library in a seventeenth-century hand which decodes the allegorical names; the National Trust has a copy of Howell's translation of Mazzella's *Parthenopoeia* which has underlining throughout and some MS notes referring to pages in the text; and Henry Cogan's translation of de Scudéry's *Ibrahim* and Henry Carey's translations in general are criticized by Dorothy Osborne in one of her letters. See J. Howell, *Dendrologia: Dodona's Grove, or, The Vocall Forest: Second Part* (1650), Jesus College, Oxford, library ref. 1.Arch.1.S5; S. Mazzella, *Parthenopoeia*, trans J. Howell (1654), The National Trust, Belton House copy, no ref.; and K. Parker, ed., *Dorothy Osborne: Letters to Sir William Temple* (London, 1987), Letter 41, pp. 131-2.
understand the breadth of royalist writing in the 1640s and in particular the 1650s. It shows that booksellers with particular political interests drew in – albeit not exclusively – both authors and customers who shared their particular ideals. Moreover, literary texts offer a means of gauging public perceptions, for if no-one agreed with the sentiments expressed in books, then they would not have sold – and the number of copies of Moseley's books scattered around the globe suggest that his books sold well.
Appendices
## Appendix A

### Moseley's Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>IN THIS THESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Dendrologia</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Bird, J.</td>
<td>Grounds of Grammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Darton, N.</td>
<td>The True and Absolute Bishop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Hexham, H.</td>
<td>Three Parts of the Principles of the Art Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Lake, A.</td>
<td>Ten Sermons</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Maddison, R.</td>
<td>England's Looking in and out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Wake, I.</td>
<td>Divine Meditations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Dawson, J.</td>
<td>XVIII Choice Sermons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Gage, T.</td>
<td>The Tyranny of Satan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Instructions for Foreign Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>The Vote, or a Poeme Royall</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Divine Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Dendrologia: Dodona's Grove</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>The Preminence and Pedigree of Parlement</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Two Discourses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Milton, J.</td>
<td>Joannis Miltoni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Milton, J.</td>
<td>Poems of Mr. John Milton</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Philip IV, King of Spain</td>
<td>Royall and Gracious Priviledges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Waller, E.</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Sarbiewski M. / trans. G. Hills</td>
<td>The Odes of Casimir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Crashaw, R.</td>
<td>Steps to the Temple</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Estienne, H. / trans. T. Blount</td>
<td>The Art of Making Devises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Gregory, E.</td>
<td>Historical Anatomy of Christian Melancholy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Angliæ Suspiria</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Lustra Ludovici</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Juvenal / trans. R. Stapylton</td>
<td>The Satyrs of Juvenal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>Narcissus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Triumph of Beauty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Aglaura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Brennoralt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Fragmenta Aurea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>The Goblins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Andrewes, L.</td>
<td>The Private Devotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Beaumont, F., &amp; J. Fletcher</td>
<td>Comedies and Tragi-comedies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Cowley, A.</td>
<td>The Mistresse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>A New Volume of Letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Juvenal / trans. R. Stapylton</td>
<td>Juvenal's 16 Satyrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Malvezzi, V. / trans. R. Gentilis</td>
<td>The Chiefe Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Malvezzi, V. / trans. R. Ashley</td>
<td>Il Davide perseguitato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Musæus / trans. R. Stapylton</td>
<td>On the Loves of Hero and Leander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Montalván, J.P., / trans. T. Stanley</td>
<td>Aurora and the Prince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Reeve, T.</td>
<td>Lazarus, His Rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Andrewes, L. / trans. R. Drake</td>
<td>The Manual Directions for the Sick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Ascham, A.</td>
<td>A Discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Beaumont, F.</td>
<td>The Woman Hater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Bulwer, J.</td>
<td>Philocophus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Crashaw, R.</td>
<td>The Delights of the Muses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Crashaw, R.</td>
<td>Steps to the Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Davenant, W.</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Diodate, G.</td>
<td>Pious and Learned Annotations on the Holy Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Donne, J.</td>
<td>Biathanatos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td>Tragedy of Thierry King of France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Guarini, G.B. / trans. R. Fanshawe</td>
<td>Il Pastor Fido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Lawes, H.</td>
<td>Choice Psalms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Malvezzi, V. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>Romulus and Tarquin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Raymond, J.</td>
<td>An Itinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Seneca / trans. E. Sherbourne</td>
<td>Seneca's Answer to Lucilius his Quære</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Seneca / trans. E. Sherbourne</td>
<td>Medea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Fragmenta Aurea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Beaumont, F., &amp; J. Fletcher</td>
<td>The Woman Hater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Bulwer, J.</td>
<td>Pathomyotomia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Davenant, W.</td>
<td>Love &amp; Honour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Davenant, W.</td>
<td>The Unfortunate Lovers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td>The Tragedy of Thierry King of France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Hall, J.</td>
<td>Resolutions and Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Dendrologia: Dodona's Grove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>The Pre-eminence and Pedigree of Parlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Cavendish, W., Earl of Newcastle</td>
<td>The Country Captaine, and the Varietie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Senault, J.F. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>The Use of the Passions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Shute, J.</td>
<td>Sarah and Hagar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Theocritus / trans. T. Stanley</td>
<td>Europa, Cupid Crucified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Beaumont, F.</td>
<td>The Elder Brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Corneille, P. / trans. J. Rutter</td>
<td>The Cid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Denham, J.</td>
<td>Coopers Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Gaffarel, J. / trans. E. Chilmead</td>
<td>Unheard of Curiosities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>The Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Heath, R.</td>
<td>Clarastella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Hinton, B.</td>
<td>Eighteen Choice Sermons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Dodona's Grove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Epistolae Ho-Elianæ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Instructions and Directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Santa Maria, J. / trans. E. Blount</td>
<td>Policy Unveiled or Maxims of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Malvezzi, V. / trans. R. Gentilis</td>
<td>Considerations upon the lives of Alcibiades and Coriolanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Malvezzi, V. / trans. R. Ashley</td>
<td>Il Davide Perseguittato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Murford, N.</td>
<td>Fragmenta Poetica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Montalván, J.P. / trans. T. Stanley</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Raleigh, W.</td>
<td>His Apologie for His Voyage to Guiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Raleigh, W.</td>
<td>Excellent Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Raleigh, W.</td>
<td>Judicious and Select Essayes and Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Strada, F. / trans. R. Stapylton</td>
<td>De Bello Belgico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Assarino, L. / trans. J. Burbury</td>
<td>La Stratonica or the Unfortunate Queen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Beaumont, F.</td>
<td>The Elder Brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Beaumont, F.</td>
<td>The Scornful Lady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>King, H.</td>
<td>Psalms of David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Digby, G.</td>
<td>Letters between George &amp; Kenelm Digby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Burroughs, J.</td>
<td>The Soveraignty of the British Seas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Carew, T.</td>
<td>Poems with a Maske</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Cartwright, W.</td>
<td>Comedies, tragi-comedies with Other Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Cartwright, W.</td>
<td>The Ordinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Jager, R.</td>
<td>Artificial Arithmetick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Micanzio, F.</td>
<td>The Life of the … Father Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Quarles, J.</td>
<td>Gods Love and Mans Unworthiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Quintana, F.</td>
<td>The History of Don Fenise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Thorius, R. / trans. P. Hausted</td>
<td>Hymnus Tabaci: A Poem in Honour of Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Vaughan, H.</td>
<td>Olor Iscanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Choice Novels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Beaumont, F.</td>
<td>The Wild-Goose Chase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Benlowes, E.</td>
<td>Theophila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Bentivoglio, G. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>Historical Relations of the United Provinces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Burles, E.</td>
<td>Grammatica Burlesa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>A Divine Psalm or Song</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Donne, J.</td>
<td>Paradoxes, Problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Herodian / trans. C.B. Stapylton</td>
<td>Tales of Twenty Caesars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Jonson, B.</td>
<td>The Widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Josippon / trans. J. Howell</td>
<td>The Wonderful … History of the … Jews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Calprenède, G.C. / trans. G. Digby</td>
<td>Cassandra, Princess of Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Calprenède, G.C. / trans. C. Cotterell</td>
<td>Cassandra, Princess of Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Calprenède, G.C. / trans. unknown</td>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / trans. unknown</td>
<td>The History of Philoxypes and Polycrite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / trans. H. Cogan</td>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Brothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Cardinal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Doubtful Heir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Imposture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Sisters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Stanley, T.</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>The Card of Courtship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Bacon, F.</td>
<td>Natural and Experimental History of Winds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>Academie of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Brome, R.</td>
<td>Five New Playes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Carmeni, F. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>Nissena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Denham, J.</td>
<td>Cooper's Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Descartes, R.</td>
<td>Renatus Descartes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Fettiplace, T.</td>
<td>The Sinner's Tears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Filmer, R.</td>
<td>Quæstio Quodlibetica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Gardiner, R.</td>
<td>Richardi Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Ah Ha Tumulus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>A German Diet or, the Ballance of Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Middleton, T.</td>
<td>The Changeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Mosley, N.</td>
<td>Psuchosophia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Mossom, R.</td>
<td>Sion's Prospect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>N.N. / trans. H. Cogan</td>
<td>The Scarlet Gown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Platten, G.</td>
<td>A Discovery of Subterraneall Treasure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Procopius / trans. H. Holcroft</td>
<td>History of the Warres of Emperour Justinian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Scudery, M. / trans. F.G.</td>
<td>Artamenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Court Secret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>Six New Playes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Anon. / trans. R. Gentilis</td>
<td>Le Chemin Abregé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Bentivoglio, G. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>Compleat History of the Warres of Flanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Bentivoglio, Guido / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>History of the Warres of Flanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>King, H.</td>
<td>Psalms of David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>The Academie of Eloquence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Chapman, G.</td>
<td>Tragedy of Alphonsus Emperour of Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Grotius, H.</td>
<td>Politick Maxims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Hall, J.</td>
<td>Resolutions and Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>La Serre / trans. J. Massinger</td>
<td>The Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Lipsius, J. / trans. Gentilis?</td>
<td>A Discourse of Constancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Loredano, G.F. / trans. A. Cockaine</td>
<td>Dianea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Maierus, M. / trans. J. Hall</td>
<td>Lusus Serius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>May, T.</td>
<td>Two Tragedies: Cleopatra / Agrippina.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Mazzella, S. / trans. S. Lennard &amp; J. Howell</td>
<td>Parthenopoeia, or the History of the ... Kingdom of Naples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Argalus and Parthenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Enchyridion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Robinson, H. / trans. N. Robinson</td>
<td>Scholae Wintoniensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Scudery, G. / trans. E. Wolley</td>
<td>Curia Politiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Scudery, M. / trans. F.G.</td>
<td>Artamenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Towers, W.</td>
<td>Atheismus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Valentine, H.</td>
<td>Private Devotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Vaughan, H.</td>
<td>Flores Solitudinis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Washbourne, T.</td>
<td>Divine Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Whitlock, R.</td>
<td>Zoötoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Andrewes, L. / R. Drake</td>
<td>The Manual of Directions for the Sick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Baron, R.</td>
<td>Mirza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Biondi, G. / R. Gentilis</td>
<td>Coralbo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Camoes / R. Fanshawe</td>
<td>The Lusiad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Camus, J.P. / J. Jennings</td>
<td>Elise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Carrell, L.</td>
<td>The Passionate Lovers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Cotgrave, J.</td>
<td>The English Treasury of Wit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Denham, J.</td>
<td>Coopers Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Gay, W.</td>
<td>XI Choice Sermons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Grotius, H.</td>
<td>Politick Maxims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Hippocrates / H. Vaughan</td>
<td>The Aphorisms of Hippocrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Howell, J.</td>
<td>Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Maddison, R.</td>
<td>Great Britain's Remembrancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Manzini, G.B.</td>
<td>His Exquisite Academicall Discourses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Markham, G.</td>
<td>The Perfect Horseman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Philomusus</td>
<td>The Marrow of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Massinger, P.</td>
<td>Three New Playes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Nollius, H. / H. Vaughan</td>
<td>Hermetical Physick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Boyle, R., Earl of Orrery</td>
<td>Parthenissa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Porter, E.</td>
<td>Greek 'God Incarnate'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Sanderson, R.</td>
<td>De Juramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Sarpi, P. / R. Gentilis</td>
<td>The History of the Inquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / J. Davies</td>
<td>Clelia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Gentleman of Venice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Shirley, J.</td>
<td>The Politician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Stanley, T.</td>
<td>The History of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Thomas, M.</td>
<td>The Saints Expectation and Reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Towers, W.</td>
<td>A Sermon Against Murder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Vaughan, T.</td>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>The Academie of Eloquence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>Glossographia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Boccalini / H. Carey</td>
<td>I Raggualgi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Buxtorfius / J. Davis</td>
<td>A Short Introduction to the Hebrew Tongue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Collop, J.</td>
<td>Medici Catholicon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Collop, J.</td>
<td>Poesis Rediviva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Cowley, A.</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>De Grey, T.</td>
<td>The Compleat Horseman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Herbert, E., Baron Herbert of Cherbury</td>
<td>Expeditio in Ream Insulam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Markham, G.</td>
<td>The Perfect Horseman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Argalus and Parthenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Rawlins, R.</td>
<td>Practical Arithmetick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Sanderson, W.</td>
<td>A Compleat History of the Lives ... of Mary Queen of Scotland ... and James the Sixth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / trans. J. Davies</td>
<td>Clelia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Spagnuoli / trans. T. Harvey</td>
<td>Bucolicks of Baptist Mantuan in Ten Eclogues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Stanley, T.</td>
<td>The History of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Strada, F. / trans. T. Lancaster</td>
<td>The Siege of Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Virgil / trans. J. Denham</td>
<td>The Destruction of Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Andrewes, L.</td>
<td>Αποσπασματια sacra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Benlowes, E.</td>
<td>A Glance at the Glories of Sacred Friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Benlowes, E.</td>
<td>The Summary of Wisdome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Boccalini / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>I Ragguagli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Carlell, L.</td>
<td>Famous Tragedy of Osmond the Great Turk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Carlell, L.</td>
<td>The Fool Would be a Favourite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Carlell, L.</td>
<td>Two New Playes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Du Moulin, P.</td>
<td>Of Peace and Contentment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Du Moulin, P.</td>
<td>A Week of Soliloquies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Gamble, J.</td>
<td>Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Gassendi, P. / trans. W. Rand</td>
<td>The Mirrour of True Nobility and Gentility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>La Chambre, M.C.</td>
<td>A Discourse of the Knowledge of Beasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Ligon, R.</td>
<td>True &amp; Exact History of ... Barbados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>M., T.</td>
<td>Life of a Satyrical Puppy Called Nim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Middleton, T.</td>
<td>No Wit, Help Like a Womans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Middleton, T.</td>
<td>Two New Playes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Paruta, P. / trans. H. Carey</td>
<td>Politick Discourses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Porter, E.</td>
<td>Tri-Unus-Deus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Reeve, E.</td>
<td>An Introduction into the Greek Tongue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Reeve, E.</td>
<td>The Rules of Latine Grammar Construed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Stanley, T.</td>
<td>Poems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Urfe, H. / trans. J. Davies</td>
<td>Astrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Wotton, H.</td>
<td>The State of Christendom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Allen, I.</td>
<td>Excommunicatio excommunicata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Gough, J.</td>
<td>Academy of Complements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>La Calprenède, G.C. / trans. J. Coles</td>
<td>Hymen's Præludia: or, Cleopatra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>La Calprenède, G.C. / trans. J. Webb</td>
<td><em>Hymen's Præludia: or, Cleopatra</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>La Serre, J.P.</td>
<td>The Secretary in Fashion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Lemnius, L.</td>
<td>The Secret Miracles of Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Enchyridion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Robinson, H.</td>
<td>Scholæ Wintoniensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Sanderson, W.</td>
<td>A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / trans. J. Davies</td>
<td><em>Celia</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Fragmenta Aurea</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Urfé, H. / trans. J. Davies</td>
<td><em>Astrea</em></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Virgil / trans. E. Waller &amp; S. Godolphin</td>
<td><em>The Passion of Dido for Æneas</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>António, Prior of Crato</td>
<td>Royall psalmes, or, Soliloques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Barker, T.</td>
<td>Barker's delight: or, The Art of Angling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>Glossographia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Carlell, L.</td>
<td>The Deserving Favorite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Chapman, G.</td>
<td>Revenge for Honour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Fludd, R.</td>
<td>Mosaical Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Gassendius, P.</td>
<td>Vanity of Judiciary Astrology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Heylyn, P.</td>
<td>The Parable of the Tares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Calprenède, G.C. / trans. J. Webb</td>
<td><em>Hymen's Præludia: or, Cleopatra</em></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Lee, S.</td>
<td>Orbis Miraculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Lloyd, D.</td>
<td>The Legend of Captain Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Loredano, G.F.</td>
<td>The Life of Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Parry, B.</td>
<td>Chymia Coelestis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Petau, D.</td>
<td>The History of the World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Quarles, F.</td>
<td>Argalus and Parthenia</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Last Remians of Sir John Suckling</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Suckling, J.</td>
<td>Fragmenta Aurea</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Thomas, M.</td>
<td>Two Assize Sermons</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Thor, G.</td>
<td>Cheiragogia Heliana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Webster, J.</td>
<td>Appius and Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Moseley, H.</td>
<td>New Additions to the Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Andilly, A.</td>
<td>The Manner of Odering Fruit-Trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Arrowsmith, J.</td>
<td>Theanthropos</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Markham, G.</td>
<td>The Perfect Horseman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>N., N.</td>
<td>The Scarlet Gown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Philipot, J.</td>
<td>A Perfect Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Scudéry, M. / trans. G. Havers</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Stanley, T.</td>
<td>The History of Philosophy</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Vaumoriere / trans. G. Havers</td>
<td>The Grand Scipio</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Blount, T.</td>
<td>Glossographia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Calprenède, G.C. . trans. C. Cotterell</td>
<td>Hymen's Præludia: or, Loves Master-Piece</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Curia Politiae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Shelf Ref</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. John's College, Cambridge</td>
<td>Dd.3.27</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College, Cambridge</td>
<td>S.16:17</td>
<td>To His Most Excellent Majesty Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge UL</td>
<td>SSS.28.3</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>*fl.95 SCU</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Parish Library</td>
<td>G.2.8</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire Archives</td>
<td>Ref:7305</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Cathedral Library</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Cathedral Library</td>
<td>H/Y-7-28</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Marsh's Library</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>133.e.4</td>
<td>To His Most Excellent Majesty Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>G.915(1)</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Plume's Library</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Cathedral Library</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Trust</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton University Library</td>
<td>JC155.S4</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Cathedral</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto Library</td>
<td>E-10 00925</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Andrews Clark Memorial Library</td>
<td>*fjc155.S43</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry E Huntington Library</td>
<td>Ref:142448</td>
<td>To His Most Excellent Majesty Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University, Beinecke Rare</td>
<td>Ocg45 Se25</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Library</td>
<td>+648g</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folger Shakespeare Library</td>
<td>S2140</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Library</td>
<td>Case J22.802</td>
<td>To His Most Excellent Majesty Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>JC155.S4D61</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Q.320 SCU2C</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>D3429</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>1654.2 De Scudery</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>D231.W93</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Public Library</td>
<td>*KC+1654</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Society Library</td>
<td>Win227</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Company of Philadelphia</td>
<td>*Wing S2140</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1743F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Company of Philadelphia</td>
<td>*Wing S2140</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log.805.F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>JC155.S34</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>No Ref Listed</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitotsubashi University Library</td>
<td>Franklin:2397</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128017852Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Otago Library</td>
<td>Ec1654S</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetham's Library</td>
<td>Y.5.60</td>
<td>To True Honor and Renown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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