

BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Enabling Open Access to Birkbeck's Research Degree output

Elegy and the politics of grief

<https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/50216/>

Version: Full Version

Citation: Bassett, Jane Elizabeth (2022) Elegy and the politics of grief. [Thesis] (Unpublished)

© 2020 The Author(s)

All material available through BIROn is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law.

Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Elegy and the Politics of Grief

Jane Elizabeth Bassett

MPhil

Birkbeck, University of London

Abstract

This thesis asks what it meant to write elegy over the years 1640 to 1670. It explores how writers used and transformed elegy and the different elegiac traditions and conventions they inherited in the context of the deepening political and military crisis in English society and evaluates them in the light of extended critical debate as to how and in what ways elegy changed over this time.

Chapter One argues that the polarisation and bitterness engendered by the Civil War led to many of the conventions of elegy being placed under increasing pressure, but that ultimately elegy's flexibility as a genre sees its survival. The chapter is organised around three key sets of events: 1641 to 1642, as the country moved towards Civil War; 1646 and the death of the Earl of Essex; 1648 and the deaths of Royalist 'martyrs' Lucas and Lisle and of Parliamentarian Thomas Rainsborough,

The second chapter explores Royalist funeral elegy written following the regicide through consideration of two collections, *Vaticinium Votivum*, and *Monumentum Regale*. Both collections are placed in a growing market reflecting the disbelief, rage and grief felt by Royalists and are used in an overtly polemical manner. Eulogy and lament are mixed with vitriolic calls for vengeance, damning the regicides and the parliamentary cause as avatars of anarchy and pushing elegy to its limits.

The final chapter explores the royalist elegies of Royalist Hester Pulter and those of Republican Lucy Hutchinson, mourning her husband, and considers how their writing is shaped by their personal and political isolation and the constraints placed on them as women writers. It shows how they draw on traditions of pastoral and love elegy and meld them with the eulogy and the polemic of funeral elegy in ways that it is argued begin to transform the genre.

Table of Contents

1. Title page
2. Declaration
3. Abstract
4. Note on the Text
5. Introduction
6. Chapter 1: Civil War Elegies
 - Plate 1: Engraving by William Hole of Henry Prince of Wales' effigy
 - Plate 2: Engraving of the effigy of the Earl of Essex, printed on Thomas Philpott's *Englands sorrow for the losse of their late generall*
7. Chapter 2: Post-Regicide Elegies
8. Chapter 3: Women Writing in Defeat: the elegies of Hester Pulter and Lucy Hutchinson
9. Conclusion
10. Appendix 1: Table of Post-Regicide Elegies
11. Bibliography

Note on the Text

Abbreviations: the following have been used

EEBO: Early English Books Online

ESTC: English Short Title Catalogue

ODNB: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

OED: Oxford English Dictionary

Spelling

Where quotation is used from sixteenth and seventeenth century texts, the original spelling has been retained. Letters that are no longer in use have been removed: for example, w has replaced vv.

In the case of names, a standardised version has been used throughout, except when using titles and quoting extracts from original texts. So for example, Thomas Rainsborough is referred to throughout as such. However, original spelling has been retained in quotation: examples include *Colonell Rainsborowes Ghost, col. Rainsborough or Coll. Rainsborrow*.

Use of Upper Case and Lower Case

When quoting from original texts Upper and Lower Case have been retained, as it is unclear when they may or may not have been considered significant by authors or printers.

In the interests of balance both Royalists and Republicans are referred to using the Upper Case.

Punctuation

When quoting from original texts original punctuation have has retained, as it is unclear when it may or may not have been considered significant by authors or printers.

Italics within texts have been removed.

Citation

Books have been referenced alphabetically, according to the MHRA (Modern Humanities Research Association) Guide pp. 80 – 81.

Electronic articles with stable URLs have been referenced by name, author and publication.

This includes articles on JSTOR, Project Muse and others including *ELH (English Literary History)*, *History*, *Études Épistémè*, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, *Journal of British Studies*, *Journal of Military History*, *Literature Compass*, *Notes and Queries*, *Parergon*, *Past and Present*, *Reformation*, *Renaissance Studies*, *Representation*, *Studies in English Literature*, *The American Historical Review*, *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, *The Seventeenth Century* and *The Yearbook of English Studies*

Texts, where not in print, have been taken from EEBO and are referenced using their stable ESTC citation.

Where texts do not have a stable URL, the link used and the date accessed are given. This is the case for references to the ODNB.

Introduction

What did it mean to write elegy over the years 1640 to 1670, and how did this shape elegy as a genre? This thesis explores who was writing elegy and for what purposes throughout this period, in an England shaken by the dramas of the Civil Wars, the regicide and the moves from monarchy to Commonwealth and Protectorate and back. Chapter One first looks at work produced in the run up to the outbreak of war, commemorating Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and Parliamentarian Sir Richard Wiseman, before moving on to consider how writers use the death of Parliamentary leader, the Earl of Essex, to intervene publicly in debate over the conduct and future of the war. Finally, it considers how elegy becomes increasingly bitter and polemical in the febrile atmosphere of late 1648, as writers mourn the deaths of Royalists Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle and Parliamentarian Thomas Rainsborough. Chapter Two explores the violent, highly polemical responses to the shock of the regicide by male writers of elegy, through consideration of two memorial collections, *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*. The final chapter examines the elegies produced by two women, Royalist Hester Pulter, who again mourns royalist ‘martyrs’ including Charles I, and Republican Lucy Hutchinson whose elegies commemorating her husband were written in the aftermath of the Restoration of 1660. It asks how these two women drew on elegiac traditions in ways that differed from their male predecessors, and for what ends they used and changed the genre.

The elegies will be placed in the context of the political and military crises in English society during these years, and the anger and bitterness they generated. Historians have estimated that the Civil War was among the most destructive wars that the British Isles have ever experienced, and the 1640s saw increasing polarisation between Royalists and Parliamentarians as it progressed and both sides hardened their positions.¹ This culminated in

¹ Michael Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire* (London: Penguin, 2009), p. xxii.

the regicide and the shock and sense of disbelief it generated, and continued to generate into the 1660s after the return of the monarchy.² Men and women writers from all sides of the political divides drew on different elegiac traditions and conventions over this period to mourn their dead, and their work will be examined in the context of this history, and through the work of literary historians and critics who have explored the literature of these years, including Nigel Smith, Andrea Brady and David Norbrook. In addition, the writings of critics such as Dennis Kay, G.W Pigman and Peter Sacks on the development of elegy have underlined the flexibility of the genre and its capacity to be used for different purposes.³ Their work will be drawn upon to illuminate the variety of traditions writers of elegy in the mid-seventeenth century could fit for their own purposes. An important consideration will be to evaluate the considerable critical debate as to how and in what ways elegy changed over this time, and the extent to which it survived as a genre under the pressures of social and political change and the different uses made of it by both Royalists and Parliamentarians.

Writers of elegy in the 1640s come from a variety of political and social backgrounds, but there are significant differences between Royalists and Parliamentarians. Dennis Kay, writing on vernacular funeral elegy, convincingly suggests that by the 1640s, following the tradition built up through the memorials to Sir Philip Sidney in 1586 and to Prince Henry, following his unexpected death in 1612, the form ‘had become established almost overnight as a form (or series of forms and strategies) which every educated person would be expected

² Charles Carlton, *Going to the Wars: Experiences of the British Civil Wars 1638 – 1651* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 57.

³ Andrea Brady, *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, 2000); G.W Pigman III, *Grief and the English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Peter M Sacks, *The English Elegy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985); Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994).

at some stage to practise'.⁴ However, this raises, without answering, the question as to whether the writing of elegy in the years after Prince Henry's death is confined to 'educated person(s)' or indeed how he would define 'educated' and how in turn it is linked to social status. Neither does he consider the question of gender, which is explored below. Prince Henry was publicly commemorated by a range of well-known writers, including George Chapman, John Webster, Thomas Heywood and John Donne. In the 1640s Royalists and supporters of Charles I, such as John Cleveland, John Denham and Henry King, who were from well-connected families with close links to the Court and the Church of England, wrote elegy.⁵ Their work circulated in manuscript and was sometimes published, either by design of the writer or by a printer taking the opportunity to capitalise on a market, an issue which is discussed in Chapter Two in connection with the plethora of memorial writing, including elegy, that appeared in the wake of the regicide.

In contrast to the writers of elegy supporting the king, few of those championing Parliament seem to have been well-known, and some perhaps mixed their writing with other occupations. Many are anonymous or are identified by their initials alone, such as those who wrote commemorating Sir Richard Wiseman in 1642 or Thomas Rainsborough in 1648. One exception to this can be found in the elegies published following the unexpected death of the Earl of Essex in September 1646 when, as will be seen, the dominant Presbyterian or 'Peace Party' faction in Parliament ensured its supporters could publish openly. These included Daniel Evance, who had been the Earl's chaplain and who wrote an extended memorial to the Earl of Essex, *Justa Honoraria: or funeral rights*, as well as merchant Josiah Ricraft and ex-

⁴ Kay, p. 203.

⁵ John Cleveland, *The Poems of John Cleveland* ed. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1967); Sir John Denham, *The poetical works of Sir John Denham*, ed. T. H. Banks, 2nd edn (1969); Henry King, *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

soldier William Mercer. In all these cases it appears that such writers were of lower social status than many supporting the royalist cause and were educated to varying degrees.⁶

The question of how women used elegy in this period and how they sought to negotiate its conventions has largely been ignored or downplayed by earlier critics. Kay bypasses the question of gender entirely, when discussing who was writing elegy in the years after the death of Prince Henry. It is of course the case that the subjects of public funeral elegy in the 1640s and their authors, where named, suggest it is an overwhelmingly masculine genre, and it is argued here that this is reflected in the evocation of heroic and militarised tropes by many male writers of elegy. Peter Sacks concedes that ‘longstanding sexual discrimination has impinged on women’s experience of mortal loss’, arguing that mourning in elegy is traditionally undertaken by the male lover. Nonetheless, he suggests that there is ‘substantial overlap in men’s and women’s mourning’, an approach which elides what is specific in the work of women such as Hester Pulter in the 1650s and Lucy Hutchinson in the 1660s, and how their writing may have been both constrained and liberated by the contexts in which they wrote, including the extent to which they lacked access to a public audience.⁷ Their writing, including the elegies which are the focus of this thesis, has since been explored by feminists such as Sarah Ross and Elizabeth Scott-Bauman, whose work is drawn upon here.⁸

Writers of elegy in the mid-seventeenth century inherited a rich, complex set of traditions, many deriving from classical models, that had developed from the late sixteenth century and had established a range of conventions that could be used and re-shaped for different purposes and could draw on a variety of genres as circumstances altered. These

⁶ Daniel Evance, *Iusta honoraria: or, Funeral rites* (London, 1646) ESTC RO201160.

⁷ Sacks, p. 13.

⁸ Sarah Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics in Seventeenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Elizabeth Scott-Bauman, *Forms of Engagement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

traditions were informed both by vernacular funeral elegy that developed following the deaths of Sir Philip Sidney and that of Henry, Prince of Wales, and by the conventions of pastoral and love elegy inspired by the Greek and Roman elegy of Theocritus and Virgil, which Peter Sacks explores in *The English Elegy* and which found expression in the work of Edmund Spenser and, later, in John Milton's 'Lycidas'.

Sacks stresses the importance of lament and the search for consolation and argues that the definition of elegy that came to dominate 'particularly after the sixteenth century, was that of a poem of mortal loss and consolation'. Drawing on Freud's distinction between mourning and melancholia, he points to mourning as 'work' and implies the difficulty of coming to consolation and acceptance.⁹ As Freud puts it, 'when the work of mourning is completed the ego becomes free and uninhibited again'; in contrast, the melancholic is trapped 'clinging to the [love] object'.¹⁰ A key aspect of the pastoral elegiac tradition is one of lament for lost love, and this can be seen in the use of elegy for mourning personal loss, such as Henry King's elegy to his wife, 'An Exequy To his matchlesse never to be forgotten Friend', following her death in 1624. Here, King balances lament and an acceptance of God's will with an acute sense of personal loss: 'thy sett | This eve of blackness did beget, | Who wast my day (though overcast | Before thou hadst thy noon-tide past' (ll. 23-26). Another example is Milton's lament for his friend Edward King in 'Lycidas'.¹¹ Intense, personal grief and mourning for physical and erotic loss are combined with political rage in Lucy Hutchinson's elegies, and the extent to which she attains any degree of acceptance and

⁹ Sacks, p. 3.

¹⁰ Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume XIV, *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement and Other Works* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953 – 1974), pp. 244–245.

¹¹ King, *Poems* pp. 68–72; John Milton, 'Lycidas' in *Complete Shorter Poems* ed. Stella P Revard and Barbara K Lewalski (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2009).

consolation for her husband's death, or remains trapped in melancholy, will be examined in Chapter Three.

Sacks points to the flexibility of elegy as a genre and its use for wider purposes, noting it 'could contain a broad range of topics, including exhortatory martial epigrams, political philosophy, commemorative lines, or amatory complaints'. Indeed, elegy, unlike other contemporary forms such as the sonnet, had no fixed form or length and this is reflected in the variety of texts examined here. Sacks outlines a set of elegiac conventions which provide a useful tool in considering some aspects of elegy. These include what he describes as 'ceremonious self-dramatization' whereby the performance of grief draws attention to the mourner as much as to the mourned. He also identifies the use of repetition, reflecting the mourner's continuing grief, and what he characterises as elegiac cursing and the desire for revenge, as well as the related issue of elegiac questioning of the loved one's death.¹² These conventions are grounded in his use of Freud's work on mourning and melancholia and the latter's insistence on the difficulty of achieving consolation. This, however, leaves open the question as to whether writers use elegy to achieve or even to seek consolation, personal or political. Chapter Three explores the extent to which Pulter and Hutchinson reconcile themselves to what they have lost. In addition, it will be seen that as the Civil Wars progressed, funeral elegies are increasingly concerned with anger, revenge and the dramatisation of shock and disbelief for polemical purposes. This culminates in the articulation of aggressive and vitriolic calls for revenge on the regicides, mixed with laments for the dead king, which are examined in Chapter Two.

Writers in the period of the Civil Wars and Restoration thus had available sets of different but often over-lapping conventions they could draw on and mould to their purposes. The hybrid and potentially contested nature of the elegiac genre and its literary ancestry is

¹² Sacks, pp. 2-3, 18-23.

underlined by Brady, who notes that poems ‘both of lament and love – funeral elegy, and amorous lyrics in imitation of Ovid and Propertius – were called “elegies” in the early modern period’ and that though ‘the two types were distinct in content they did retain some stylistic similarities: both could include self-defence or criticism of contemporaries’.¹³ The flexibility of elegy and its capacity for both mourning and political commentary was embedded in vernacular funeral elegy, whose emergence can be traced back to two key moments: the death of Sir Philip Sidney from gangrene in 1586, following the battle of Zutphen, and that of Henry, Prince of Wales in 1612. Both were followed by the public expression of grief, marked by elaborate funerals and by the extensive publication of memorial writings. Peter Marshall notes that the death of Sidney ‘prompted an outpouring of over 200 poetic elegies from admirers, collected and printed in multiple volumes’.¹⁴ These were followed a quarter of a century later by the more than fifty funeral elegies printed commemorating Prince Henry.¹⁵ In both cases, they illustrate elegy’s capacity to encompass a wide range of issues and give subsequent writers a clear and flexible model for polemical intervention in the politics of the period, and an ability to draw on a mixed set of genres. At the same time, they embed a key set of poetic conventions in elegy, including the extensive expression of lament combined with the use of panegyric and idealisation of the dead men and their elevation as ideal, heroic masculine heroes. In addition, writers draw on the traditional Christian requirement of submission to the will of God, and respect for the injunction not to speak ill of the dead. How writers balance adherence to these conventions

¹³ Brady, *Funerary Elegy* p. 11.

¹⁴ Peter Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 273.

¹⁵ Elizabeth Goldring, “‘So Just a Sorrow so well expressed’: Henry Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration’ in Timothy Wilks ed. *Prince Henry Revived* (London: Southampton University and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007), p. 28.

and how and in what ways they subvert or transform them, through rage, satire or the desire for revenge is explored throughout this thesis.

Idealisation and panegyric are central to the model of elegy that writers in the 1640s inherited. As Lorna Clymer points out, the ‘plentiful funeral verses’ for Sidney and Prince Henry ‘vividly demonstrate how an individual could have been mourned and extolled as exemplary, even emblematic of virtues idealized by a particular era’.¹⁶ Pigman rightly challenges earlier critical traditions that he associates with O.B Hardison who regarded elegy as ‘the poetry of praise, a branch of epideictic rhetoric’ and convincingly argues that the ‘combination of praise, lament and consolation indicates a mixed genre’. Nonetheless he agrees that idealisation of the dead is characteristic of elegy, commenting that what ‘a reader of elegy quickly notices is not merely praise of the deceased, but its exaggeration’.¹⁷ However, he does not consider how overt praise and exaggeration can be used satirically, to mask underlying messages, an issue that will become important when considering elegy in the 1640s. Among the many instances of such exaggerated praise found in the Prince Henry elegies is one example from Webster’s *A monumental column, erected to the liuing memory of the euer-glorious Henry Prince of Wales*. Webster, perhaps recalling the Duchess’ description of herself in *The Duchess of Malfi* (Act 1, Scene 1 ll. 290 – 291), also written in 1612, refers to Henry as ‘a perfect Diamond set in lead’ (A2r) and links the light of the diamond with the light of heaven ‘from which his glories do breake forth’ (A2r), placing the genre firmly within a Christian context. Such idealisation frequently draws on classical images. Webster links Henry with Athene, as a man of both peace and war, who, ‘in his right

¹⁶ Lorna Clymer, ‘The Funeral Elegy in Early Modern Britain: A Brief History’ in *The Oxford Handbook of The Elegy* ed. Karen Weisman (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 177.

¹⁷ O.B Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press: 1962), pp. 114–5; Pigman, pp. 40-41, 45.

hand weild | A caduceus; in the other *Pallas* shield' (A2v) and the frequent use of classical images establishes motifs that recur in elegy and memorial writing from the 1640s to the 1660s.¹⁸

The use of panegyric accompanied by reported public and sometimes privately felt grief does not preclude the use of elegy for polemic or political intervention, and writers in the period 1640 to 1670 draw on this flexibility. Frequent references to tears and lamentation are accompanied by elements of satire and polemic. For example, Chapman's *An epicede or funerall song on the most disastrous death, of the high-borne prince of men, Henry Prince of Wales* laments Henry's death, makes conventional use of the pathetic fallacy and of images of tears and lament to describe the grief of the 'mournfull familie | Muffled in black clouds [who] full of teares are driven | With stormes about the relickes of this Heauen.'(C1r).

However, he then goes on to launch a fierce attack on 'flatterers' who are 'houshold theeues, traitors by law, | that rob kings honors, & their soules-bloud draw; | Diseases, that keep nourishment from their food. (C1v). The use of stock images of lamentation serves to soften the edge of his attack on corruption and to distance it from King James I, who is presented as the victim of such 'houshold theeues'. The King is not directly criticised, and attacks are directed towards those around him, whilst Chapman expresses conventionally loyal sentiments towards the monarchy, thus establishing a delicate and sometimes precarious balance between polemic and conventionalised grief. The incorporation of loyalty to the institution is meshed with the capacity to embed contemporary controversy into elegy, thus marrying praise and lament with political polemic and satire and establishing a pattern that resonates into the 1640s. This is of particular importance for Parliamentary writers of elegy in the early 1640s, who sought to emulate Parliament's stance that the king's advisors, and

¹⁸ John Webster, *A monumental column, erected to the liuing memory of the euer-glorious Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S101831; John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, ed. Brian Gibbons (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 1964, 2014).

not the king himself, were responsible for the ills of the kingdom. However, as political tensions mounted, it is a balance that came under increasing pressure.¹⁹

The elegies to Sidney and Prince Henry illustrate the potential of funeral elegy, linked in both cases with elaborate funeral processions, for religious and political factionalism as well as for the projection of a heroic masculinity of honour and sacrifice. Both men were presented as Protestant heroes in the context of debates over war with Spain, linked to what Jason White defines as ‘militant’ Protestantism.²⁰ Alan Hagar and Kay convincingly demonstrate how mourning for Sidney was used to promote hopes for a combined Protestant military offensive against Spain on the European continent.²¹ The projection of Sidney as a Protestant hero and martyr was echoed in the tributes offered to Prince Henry and Tim Harris describes factional disputes in 1612, which clearly echo those of the 1580s, between ‘the Howard faction, led by the earls of Northampton and of Suffolk, who tended to be against Parliament and in favour of a pacific foreign policy in alliance with Spain’ and ‘those who were in favour of a militant Protestant foreign policy and thus keen for the king to deal with Parliament’ to which Henry was linked.²² The anti-Catholicism found here is briefly reflected in some of the elegies to Strafford, in the light of the outbreak of the Irish rebellion and Strafford’s (wrongly) supposed Catholic sympathies but becomes less apparent after this.²³ However, it will be seen that Royalist elegies throughout the 1640s increasingly affirm

¹⁹ George Chapman, *An epicede or funerall song on the most disastrous death, of the highborne prince of men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S107694.

²⁰ Jason C White ‘Militant Protestants in the Jacobean Period, 1603 – 1625’, *History* Vol.94 No. 2 (2009) 154–175 (pp. 169, 171).

²¹ Alan Hagar, ‘The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney’s Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader’ *ELH* No.1 Spring 1981 1–16; Kay, p. 66.

²² Tim Harris, *Rebellion: Britain’s First Stuart Kings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp.120, 126–7.

²³ Braddick, *England’s Fury* pp. 168–172; Nicholas Canny, ‘The attempted Anglicisation of Ireland’ in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* ed. by J.F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996), p. 172; Hugh Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland 1633 - 1641: a study in Absolutism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1959, 1989), p. 205.

loyalty to the Church of England, characterising Parliamentarians and especially the regicides as un-Christian, linking them to hell and the anti-Christ.

Religious debate and its place within elegy need to be seen in the context of what Marshall and others have characterised as Protestant memorial culture. This shapes the requirement that funeral elegy maintains the necessity to accept God's will, and this is evident in the elegies to Prince Henry. Christopher Brooke, for example, instructs readers to 'Presume not in thy Thoughts t'expostulate | With God, who holds the lumpe of all thy kind' (C4v).²⁴ Protestant memorial culture was founded on a rejection of purgatory and of the possibility of interceding for the dead or affecting their fate, but Protestants increasingly saw the importance of both commemorating the dead and learning from their lives, implicitly assuming their ultimate salvation. Thus, memorialisation is shaped by the convention that dictated the need not to speak ill of the dead, or to presume to know their fate. Bishop Gervase Babington, for example, in his 1622 list of 'fit and allowable duties' towards the dead, alluded to 'moderate mourning, hope in their resurrection, and faithful performance of their testaments'.²⁵ Marshall cites an entry in Sir John Oglander's commonplace book on the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham which concluded 'he was the greatest subiect that England ever had. Of his contrary virtues I will say nothing: *de mortuis, nil nisi bonum*' (though Oglander did undercut this by adding that 'No man was more adored in life, and few less respected in death').²⁶ This has important implications for elegy and other forms of memorial writing in the 1640s and beyond, particularly when writers reflected on the death of an opponent: examples considered here include parliamentary writing on the Earl of

²⁴ Christopher Brooke, *Two elegies consecrated to the neuer-dying memorie of the most worthily admired; most hartily loued; and generally bewailed prince; Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S166715.

²⁵ Gervase Babington, *The Workes of the Right Reverend Father in God*, ed. Miles Smith (London: 1622) iii 124, cited by Marshall, p. 266.

²⁶ F. Bamford (ed) *A Royalist's Notebook: the commonplace book of Sir John Oglander* (1936), p. 41.

Strafford, or Henry King's elegy to the Earl of Essex. A central question facing writers was to what extent a reluctance to condemn the dead man or to judge God's decisions could be partially submerged by or balanced against criticism of a dead man. One solution to this question would be to draw on other genres such as satire, or on the use of over-exaggerated praise, and this can be seen in King's elegy to Essex. Equally, however, Royalist writers in the late 1640s ignore this convention when elegising Thomas Rainsborough and seek instead to damn him.

There has been extensive critical debate on how and in what ways elegy is put under pressure by the tensions created by war and revolution, and the extent to which it survives or is transformed as a genre, and this will be explored throughout this thesis. Nigel Smith has argued influentially that following the regicide 'the death of the king sucked all elegiac energy into its own subject' and that elegies on Charles 'went beyond all rules of the form and disbelief was a dominant theme'. In addition, he asserts that while royalist elegies 'could not sustain their traditional boundaries', republican elegy was in reality panegyric. He speculates on possible alternative futures for elegy – for example, had the Restoration not happened – but while characterising correctly the sense of disbelief Royalists in particular experienced following the regicide, he has little to say on later elegy, such as that by Lucy Hutchinson.²⁷ Other critics have concurred that elegy, among other genres, experienced a crisis. Covington argues that 'modes of writing such as the chivalric elegy, for example, strained when bodies were dishonourably mangled or, worse, went missing (as with Edmund Verney or Lord Falkland); providence – the framework buttressing so many genres – was fine until defeat was in view'.²⁸ Indeed, the royalist reaction to the execution of Lucas and Lisle demonstrates that while they are treated as chivalric heroes, a greater concern was to

²⁷ Smith, pp. 287-88, 293

²⁸ Sarah Covington, "'Realms so barbarous and cruell': Writing, Violence in Early Modern England and Ireland", *History* July 2014, 487–504 (p. 497).

demonise Thomas Fairfax and others who condemned them. Joad Raymond helpfully argues that ‘the literary culture of the 1640s and 1650s underwent a series of generic transformations’ as ‘the atoms of literary genres were repeatedly fragmented and reassembled in response to traumatic events’, and it will be argued that this approach offers a useful interpretation of how elegy becomes more driven by propaganda throughout the 1640s yet survives in altered form. He does not, however, consider how the work of Pulter and Hutchinson mixes genres in a different way, remaining polemical, while moving away from militaristic tropes and drawing on elements of pastoral and love elegy.²⁹

The wider literary and funerary contexts in which elegy was written are important. In the first place, elegy and other memorial writings need to be placed within a field of memorial rituals. Brady describes elegy as ‘one funeral document among many’, citing ‘sermons, epitaphs, murder pamphlets, guides to and descriptions of good dying, mothers’ legacies, wills, confessions and last testaments’ and notes they are often connected to mnemonic objects’ such as monuments and effigies.³⁰ The explicit modelling of Parliamentarian the Earl of Essex’s effigy on that raised to Prince Henry over thirty years before, and the subsequent beheading of it by Royalists, is discussed in Chapter One and illustrates the importance of such objects and the political uses they could be put to.³¹ Other memorial rituals linked to the elegies include ‘last dying speeches’ such as that made by the Earl of Strafford at his execution. This caused widespread controversy, with the printing of both the speech itself and counter speeches, and its impact on memorial writing will be considered here. It is also noticeable that many elegies and other forms of memorial writing

²⁹ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 214.

³⁰ Brady, *Funerary Elegy* p. 2.

³¹ ODNB Essex < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/7566> > [accessed 30th July 2022].

are published in hybrid formats, being printed in broadsheets, or embedded within other texts, and drawing on a range of genres. This raises questions about how elegies are read when placed alongside other forms, such as prose exposition, news reports or funeral sermons and how these may be used to mask the underlying message or place apparent adherence to elegiac conventions, such as the use of exaggerated praise, in a different light.

The publication of elegy and other memorial writing also accompanied public events such as funerals and processions, which could be utilised for political and factional purposes. Contemporary Thomas Lant noted that at Sidney's funeral, the streets were 'so thronged with people that the mourners scarcely had room to pass', and while critics have debated the political manoeuvrings around Sidney's funeral they clearly show its importance and how it was linked with memorial publications.³² The continuing significance of funerals becomes clear when we consider the funeral of Henry Prince of Wales in 1612, and the conscious imitation of it in the Earl of Essex's funeral, in 1646. Other 'popular' mobilisations which both mourned the dead and made an explicit political intervention included the processions preceding the funerals of Parliamentarians Sir Richard Wiseman in 1642 and Thomas Rainsborough in 1648.

The different ways in which elegy was published or circulated and the pressures writers experienced set the scene in which they appeared. Many elegies were published anonymously over these years; few are recorded in the Stationers' Company books.³³ There was a variety of reasons for this. Anonymity may have allowed writers to feel freer to express their sentiments, and both royalist and parliamentarian writers at different times may have

³² Hagar, p. 53; Kay, pp. 66–8; Thomas Lant, *Sequitur celebritas et pompa funeris* (London, 1588), ESTC S101077, quoted in John Buxton 'The Mourning for Sidney', *Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1989), p. 49. Kay and Hagar agree that it was probably at least in part arranged to distract attention from the execution of Mary Queen of Scots eight days earlier. More convincingly, Buxton argues that given the celebrations the week before of her execution it would not have diverted popular feeling (against Mary) but intensified it.

³³ Stationers' Company, *Registers or Entry Books of Copies 1554-1842*.

felt under political pressure or have been evading censorship or persecution. As David Como points out, ‘students of the Civil War and interregnum have challenged the notion that there was a complete disintegration of censorship during the 1640s and 1650s’.³⁴ Jason Peacey, examining the role of propaganda and the press during the Civil War and Interregnum, has shown that ‘closer examination of the actions and motivations of the reformers in the Long Parliament reveals not opposition to licensing as a means of controlling the press, but rather to the ways it had been used by [Archbishop] Laud’.³⁵ Crown controls over printing were abolished in June 1641; yet Parliament clearly sought to control the proliferation and uses of publications in these years, including elegy and other memorial writing. Joad Raymond cites examples showing that both Commons and Lords ‘on numerous occasions in 1641 and 1642 had expressed concern over the flourishing of scandalous printed books’, and between 1641 and 1643 made attempts to control printing.³⁶ The 1660s and the Restoration saw continued imposition of censorship and the emergence of Roger L’Estrange as royal censor. Writers and printers would have had good reason for caution across this period.³⁷

Elegy also circulated in manuscript and Thomas Cogswell has argued that scholars have over-privileged print culture. He suggests that Parliament had little control over the distribution of manuscript and argues that Charles I was well-served in what he describes as ‘this guerrilla war in manuscript’, citing Royalist poets such as John Denham as being involved.³⁸ In addition, prejudice against print as vulgar remained, especially among

³⁴ David R Como ‘Censorship and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War’, *Journal for British Studies*, Vol 51, No 4 (2012), 820–857 (pp. 822–823).

³⁵ Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda and the Press during the English Civil Wars and the Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004), p. 137.

³⁶ Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641 – 1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1996), p. 28.

³⁷ ODNB, *Roger L’Estrange* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/16514> > [accessed 2nd December 2021].

³⁸ Thomas Cogswell, ‘Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture’, *Huntington Library Quarterly: The Remapping of English Political History, 1500 - 1640* Vol. 60, No. 3 303–326 (1997), pp. 305, 314.

Royalists, who continued to circulate work in manuscript, though Arthur Marotti suggests this prejudice was diminishing and argues that ultimately the printed book ‘became a haven for their work and a sign of political resistance to the authority of those who had defeated the king’s forces’.³⁹ Manuscripts emerged into print in the context of both a relaxation in censorship, as well as a growing market, as the events of the Civil War and the regicide unfolded.

Nonetheless, print was not without its risks. Royalists responding to the regicide, or Republicans facing accusations of treason in the 1660s, would have certainly felt themselves to be in danger if they published openly and may have found manuscript circulation allowed them to express their thoughts. And finally, ‘respectable’ women risked accusations of impropriety if they went into print. Neither Hutchinson nor Pulter published their work, and indeed they could both have been in danger of persecution if they did so. Commenting on personal grief and political loss, Hutchinson’s writing circulated in manuscript, while the audience for Pulter’s work seems to have been confined at most to members of her family. The impact of the semi-porous public-private boundaries on their work, and how these women may have been both constrained and liberated in how and what they wrote, is considered in Chapter Three.

³⁹ Arthur F Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric* (London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 259.

Chapter 1: Memorial writing in the English Civil War

Introduction

This chapter explores how royalist and parliamentary writers use funeral elegy and other memorial writing in the 1640s and for what purposes. It considers texts written in three distinct periods, all of which can be considered moments of crisis in a period of war and revolution. The first section focuses on the early 1640s, as tensions between King and Parliament escalated in the run up to the outbreak of the Civil War in August 1642 and examines elegies commemorating royalist statesman and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and Parliamentarian Sir Richard Wiseman. The second section of the chapter is centred around elegies published in response to the death in September 1646 of the Earl of Essex, Lord-General of the Parliamentary army until 1645. Finally, the chapter examines elegies commemorating figures who were represented as martyrs by Royalists and Parliamentarians respectively: Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, executed at the end of the siege of Colchester in August 1648, and Colonel Thomas Rainsborough, who was assassinated by royalists two months later.

The chapter asks who was writing elegy in this period and explores how both royalist and parliamentary writers drew on earlier elegiac traditions in the context of the polarisation of political positions in the embittered atmosphere of the later 1640s. It asks how and in what ways elegy is changed as a genre, and to what extent its traditional purposes - mourning, lament and consolation – are displaced and its generic boundaries, already flexible and imprecise, are at times permeated by satire and polemic. In addition, the elegies explored here are placed within the context of a wider memorial culture and the chapter explores elegy's links with pamphlets, dramatic dialogues and other publications which mix genre and form, as well as its relationship with memorial rituals, such as 'last dying speeches', funerals and processions. It is also noticeable that many elegies and other forms of memorial writing

are published in hybrid formats, some being printed separately in broadsheets, while others are embedded within other texts and draw on a mixture of genres.

Elegy and memorial writing in the early 1640s

This section explores how writers used elegy in the early 1640s in the context of the increasingly polarised situation that culminated in the formation of royalist and parliamentary parties and the outbreak of war in August 1642. Elegies explored here include those to Royalist Strafford, whose execution in May 1641 was preceded and followed by a proliferation of polemical writing by both Royalists and Parliamentarians.¹ This will be followed by an examination of elegies to the lesser-known Parliamentarian Sir Richard Wiseman, and a royalist lament for the state of the nation, *This Last Ages Looking Glasse: or Englands Sad Elegie*.²

Strafford became a key figure in the growing confrontation between King and Parliament, following the calling of the Long Parliament in November 1640. He was impeached by the House of Commons and finally beheaded in front of a crowd of ten thousand on 12th May 1641. Terence Kilburn and Anthony Milton, following Hugh Kearney, show how the identification of Strafford as the King's evil minister and councillor was found

¹ *A Description of the passage of the late Earle of Strafford over the River Styx with the conference betwixt him Charon and William Noy* (London, 1641) ESTC R9191; *A Short and True Relation of the life and death of Sir Thomas Wentworth* (London, 1641) ESTC 35187; John Denham, 'On the Earl of Strafford's Trial and Death' in ed. T. H. Banks *The poetical works of Sir John Denham*; (New Haven and London: Archon Books, 1969); *Good Admonition Or keep thy head on thy shoulders and I will keep mine* (London, 1642) ESTC R216265; *Great Strafford's Farewell* (London, 1641) ESTC R26761; *The downfall of greatnesse. For the losse of goodnesse* (London, 1641) ESTC R204322; *The Earle of Straffords Ghost* (London, 1644) ESTC R7062; *The Earle of Strafford His Elegiack Poem* (London, 1641) ESTC R41946.

² *London's Teares upon the never too much to be lamented death of our late worthy Member of the House of Commons, Sr Richard Wiseman* (London, 1642) ESTC R210707; S.H., *This last ages looking-glasse: or Englands sad elligie* (York, 1642) ESTC R4702; W.P., *The Apprentices lamentation together, with a dolefull elegie upon the manner of the death of that worthy, and valorous Knight Sr. Richard Wiseman* (London, 1642) ESTC R210701. All henceforth referred to by title and/or author.

in speeches in Parliament from a wide swathe of political opinion, including ‘constitutional royalists’ who subsequently joined the king, such as Edward Hyde, the Earl of Bristol, Lord Digby and Lord Falkland.³ However, civil war was not seen as inevitable, and despite the hostility to Charles I’s personal rule, Parliament repeatedly sought to present the problems facing the nation as residing not in the person of the King, or in the monarchy, but in those surrounding him, including Queen Henrietta Maria, Archbishop Laud and Strafford himself. This stance finds expression in *The Grand Remonstrance* presented from Parliament to Charles in December 1641, which affirmed loyalty to the king and referred to ‘an abounding Malignity, and opposition, in those parties and factions who have been the cause of those evils and do still labour to cast aspersions upon that which hath been done, and to raise many difficulties for the hinderance of that which remains to be done, and to forment Jealousies betwixt King and Parliament’ (A2r).⁴ Indeed, as late as June 1642 the House of Commons expressed its loyalty to the King and condemned a print showing Charles I on foot and bareheaded in front of Sir John Hotham, the Governor of Hull, who is depicted standing above him on the walls of Hull as he refused Charles entry into the city.⁵ This political balancing act and the identification of Strafford in the Bill of Attainder as guilty of attempting ‘to introduce a tyrannical government’ (B1v) shapes elegies memorialising Strafford by pro-parliamentary writers.⁶

³ Terence Kilburn and Anthony Milton, ‘The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford’ in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* ed. by J.F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996), pp. 235–241.

⁴ *A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom* (London: 1641) ESTC R490080.

⁵ Braddick, *God’s Fury* 189 – 90; ‘House of Commons Journal Volume 2: 10 June 1642’, in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 2, 1640-1643* (London, 1802), pp. 617-619. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol2/pp.617-619> [accessed 12th October 2019].

⁶ Oliver St John, *An argument of law concerning the bill of attainder of high-treason of Thomas, Earle of Strafford, at a conference in a committee of both Houses of Parliament by Mr. St. John, His Majesties Solicitor Generall* (London, 1641) ESTC 006110368.

There is much debate as to the extent of the ideological breakdown both between and within what became the Parliamentary and Royalist camps. However, expressions of loyalty notwithstanding, positions were hardening and this is reflected in royalist elegies in particular. Braddick argues that Strafford's trial and execution left a 'legacy of division and bitterness', and historians, including Derek Hirst and Brian Manning, have argued that fear of the 'mob' exacerbated tensions in Parliament and led to the formation of both Royalist and Parliamentary parties.⁷ Such fears of popular unrest can be seen, for example, in the account of his life by puritan and supporter of Parliament, Richard Baxter.⁸ At the same time, P.J. Kenyon and, following him, Kevin Sharpe argue that John Pym's speech impeaching Strafford demonstrates a high degree of agreement between Pym and Strafford. Sharpe does not, however, sufficiently consider the degree to which adherence to expected rhetoric may mask deeper tensions than are expressed. In addition, he does not comment on the possibilities of ruptures not only between King and Parliament, but within the parliamentary side itself. He is nearer the mark when he states that 'ideals are often asserted at the very moments that they are being undermined in practice; that a shared language about how things ought to be may mask damaging political conflicts about how to restore them to perfection'.⁹ Certainly these tensions, as well as the defection of figures such as Hyde to the royalist camp, are among the factors that account for what are the equivocal and at times surprisingly

⁷ Braddick, *God's Fury* p. 139; Brian Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution* (London: Bookmarks, 1991), pp. 49–71; Kilburn and Milton, 'The Public Context' p. 235; Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict: 1603 – 1660* (London: Edward Arnold 1999), pp. 172, 178; ODNB, *Thomas Wentworth* <<https://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/view/10.1093>> [accessed June 10th 2018].

⁸ Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae, or, Mr. Richard Baxters narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times* (London, 1696) ESTC R16109 pp. 19, 24-25.

⁹ P.J. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution 1603 – 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966) pp. 191–192; Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: the culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 116.

sympathetic portrayals of Strafford in some of the elegies and other memorial documents by supporters of Parliament.

Strafford's memory and the writings it inspired was thus placed at the centre of a propaganda battle, which was heightened by the theatrical nature of events surrounding his trial and execution, and which Kilburn and Milton describe as 'being very consciously played out before a wide and intrigued public audience'.¹⁰ These included his 'last dying speech'. As J.A Sharpe notes, at an execution 'the condemned was expected to make a farewell speech' and to make a 'penitent end'. Strafford instead 'took the opportunity to emphasise his innocence of religious or political heterodoxy', and openly warned of the consequences of his execution, asking 'every man to lay his hand upon his heart, and consider seriously whether the beginning of the happiness of a People should be written in letters of Blood'. Equivocally, he both prayed for peace and but also invoked revenge: 'I desire Almighty God that no one drop of My Blood may rise up in judgement against you (B1r)'.¹¹ In response, as Brady notes, to 'counter his resistance during his trial and on the scaffold, parliamentary propagandists forced Strafford to confess the justice of his sentence in elegies, letters and poems, as well as in multiple narratives of his death'.¹² This can be seen in purportedly confessional elegiac texts such as *Great Strafford's Farewell* and *The Earle of Straffords Ghost*. In addition, the concern of supporters of Parliament over Strafford's final speech was reflected in several counter publications, including, as Braddick notes, the circulation of a purported 'repentant speech he had made before reaching the scaffold' to lords and gentlemen accompanying him.¹³ This was followed by a series of pamphlets and counter

¹⁰ Kilburn and Milton, 'The Public Context' pp. 230–231.

¹¹ J.A Sharpe "'Last Dying Speeches": Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in the Seventeenth Century', in *Past and Present*, No. 107 (1985), pp. 144–167 (pp. 152, 154); Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford *The Last Speeches of Thomas Wentworth* (London, 1641) ESTC R231586.

¹² Brady, *English Funerary Elegy*, p. 107.

¹³ Braddick, *God's Fury* p. 138.

pamphlets both affirming and challenging the authenticity of this fictitious earlier speech.¹⁴

This battle for Strafford's memory and legacy helped shape how writers, both Royalist and Parliamentarian, responded to Strafford's death.

Strafford's references to blood in his 'last dying speech' evoke the febrile atmosphere of the time and begin to establish his status as a martyr sacrificed to those seeking to divide the country. He is unequivocally mourned in an elegy by the royalist poet John Denham, 'On the Earl of Strafford's Trial and Death', which was unpublished but may well have circulated in manuscript. Denham had been a witness for the Defence at Strafford's trial and uses elegiac praise and panegyric to present Strafford as a powerful hero and a statesman, eliding the dissension among Royalists who had bitterly criticised Strafford.¹⁵ He praises 'Great Strafford' for his 'too much merit' (l.4), and evokes his patriotism and 'wisdom such, as once did appear | Three kingdoms' wonder and three kingdoms' fear' (ll. 7–8). On the surface, Denham is drawing on conventional tropes of heroism to mourn Strafford and present him as a patriot. However, the exaggeration is explicitly used by Denham to contrast Strafford with those responsible for his death, counterpoising his nobility to the cowardice and dishonesty of his enemies, and suggesting that his presence lives on:

He's not too guilty, but too wise, to live:
Less seem those facts which treason's nickname bore,
Than such a fear'd ability for more.
They after death their fears of him express,
His innocence and their own guilt confess. (ll. 20-24)

¹⁴ *A Protestation against a foolish, ridiculous and scandalous speech pretended to be spoken by Thomas Wentworth, late Earle of Strafford, to certaine lords before his comming out of the tower* (London, 1641) ESTC R20408; Kilburn and Milton, 'The Public Context' pp. 245–247; Thomas Wentworth Earl of Strafford, *The Earle of Straffords speech on the scaffold before he was beheaded on Tower-hill, the 12 of May, 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R235657; Thomas Wentworth Earl of Strafford (falsely attributed), *The last speech of Thomas Wentworth, late Earle of Strafford to the Lords and gentlemen in the tower, who accompanied him to the place of execution with his last speech on the scaffold, May the 12th 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R184659.

¹⁵ ODNB, *John Denham* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/7481> > [accessed 28th January 2022].

Denham uses the elegy to cast Parliament's actions and, by implication, the issues raised by the Long Parliament as treason. His use of sharp contrasts - 'too guilty... too wise' - underlines the central royalist contention that Strafford was a victim of lesser men. In the process, he consciously asks the reader to recall Strafford's last speech and portrays him as a victim and a martyr, a motif that begins to recur in elegy in these years, culminating in the elegies to Charles I after his execution. Denham uses the flexibility of the elegy to both mourn Strafford and to give voice to royalist anger. Nonetheless, his tone is relatively muted and his focus is on Strafford the individual, rather than on wider political or religious issues. Parliamentarians are attacked by implication rather than through sustained polemic, with abstract references to 'public hate' and 'legislative frenzy'. In this process, the boundaries of elegy are being gently tested and the flexibility of the genre and its openness to satire and polemic is reaffirmed. A similar pattern is found in one of the few openly royalist printed poems, the anonymous *The Earle of Strafford his ellegiack poem*. 'Strafford' portrays himself as the victim, and the elegy becomes a lament reflecting on the fall of great men and on the 'sacrifice' he is making. Again, polemic, though present, is muted and the tone is melancholic rather than enraged, and 'Strafford' shows conventional Christian acceptance of his fate, calling on death to 'come neerer' (A1r). Both texts are used to express anger and ostensible grief but also signpost how elegy will be used in an increasingly partisan way.

Royalist writers had to negotiate their way around popular hostility to Strafford, and perhaps weigh up to what extent they could express open anger and indignation, while drawing on elegiac conventions of praise and acceptance of God's will. However, the task of royalist writers in commemorating Strafford was comparatively straightforward. In contrast, the memorial writings examined here by those sympathetic to Parliament are often more ambiguous and double edged in their treatment of Strafford and draw on a range of genres and approaches. One broadsheet ballad, *Good Admonition*, with its chorus and tune, 'merrily

and cherrily' (A1r), is used to openly celebrate Strafford's death and to link his execution to his supposed support for Catholics. The ballad presents his death as giving hope for a better time: [when England] 'from all Popery | It once might be free' (A1r). The texts which are discussed here are more ambivalent and maintain an uneasy balance between elegiac and religious convention and political comment, reflecting the tensions within Parliament and the unease generated by Strafford's death and his final speech. One such is the dramatic dialogue *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earle of Strafford over the river Styx*. A second is the elegy *The Downfall of Greatnesse*, which is followed by an extended prose commentary.

The dramatic dialogue *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earl of Strafford over the River Styx* shows Strafford arriving in the underworld. The pamphlet incorporates dialogue, elegy and prose commentary, and draws on elements of epic, elegiac mourning and satire. Joad Raymond argues that where 'poetry did intermingle with a news-discourse prior to 1647, the clash of genres was usually deployed to satiric effect'.¹⁶ However, the pamphlet is more ambiguous. The writer takes a clearly pro-parliamentary stance, and his condemnation of Strafford's misdeeds is suggested by the fact that Strafford is greeted by William Noy, Attorney General to Charles I until his death in 1634.¹⁷ Noy was popularly associated with the imposition of the notorious 'ship money', which was declared illegal in the wake of Strafford's execution.¹⁸ Strafford is shown to acknowledge his guilt and that 'this present Parliament hath more eyes than Argus' (A4r). The reference to the unsleeping all-seeing giant and watchman of Greek myth, with his one hundred eyes, suggests the author is concerned to use his reflections on Strafford's death to demonstrate Parliament's

¹⁶ Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the English Newspaper* p. 164.

¹⁷ ODNB, *William Noy* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/20384> > [accessed February 2021].

¹⁸ Kenyon, *Stuart Constitution* p. 89.

watchfulness and care for the nation, as well as its power against transgressors like Strafford.¹⁹

The writer of *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earl of Strafford over the River Styx* presents Strafford's transgressions, but these are placed alongside his depiction in heroic mode, and he is shown as understanding too late, in the manner of a tragic hero, that he showed a lack of honour or care for the nation. As the text mixes genres, moving from dialogue into an elegy, the writer takes on Strafford's voice. Drawing on epic convention, he compares himself, in an extended simile, to a 'desperate merchant' who foolishly sets out to sea:

Too late repenting of his rash advice
Findes himselfe fast lock'd within the armes of death,
So I when honours circled me and peace
Did woo my safety with a curteous smile,
I rather chose to seeke out ways to danger,
T'untye the three Realms, and with a fatall trip
Ungrunde the foote of Justice and the Lawes (A3r)

The reference to the 'three Realms' – England, Scotland and Ireland – is used to stress Strafford's culpability and his lack of care for the three nations, and raises the issues of law, justice and the abuse of power which were at the heart of Parliament's case against the King. It also challenges Denham's royalist assertion of Strafford's patriotism. At the same time, the use of the first person appears confessional and invites the reader's sympathy, and while implicitly judging Strafford it does not appear satiric. The intermingling of genres and the association of the dead man with epic cast Strafford as a heroic figure. This is reinforced by the use of blank verse, rather than the rhyming couplets used in most contemporary elegy, and implies it was the tragic flaw of a great man that led to his downfall, in a clear contrast with the rhetoric used about Strafford in the run up to his trial. In addition, the setting is

¹⁹ Ovid, *Metamorphoses* trans. by Mary M Innes (London: Penguin Books, 1955, 1977), pp. 45–48.

ambiguous, neither heaven nor hell, but the classical underworld, where both Elysium and Tartarus could be found, and Strafford states that all he wants is ‘that which I came for, Rest’ (A4v). Final judgment and the idea of damnation are thus avoided as the writer balances between a sense of literary and religious propriety and his desire to make a clear political point. Kilburn and Milton, echoing Raymond, describe *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earl of Strafford over the River Styx* as a ‘satirical pamphlet’, but its ambiguity suggests we need a more nuanced reading recognising how it echoes the tensions around his trial and execution.²⁰ The writer draws back from speaking ill of the dead man, using praise and epic convention, drawing on elements of both elegy and satire, so as to highlight both Strafford’s talents and his fall.

The ambivalent portrayal of Strafford in *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earl of Strafford over the River Styx*, is echoed in the elegy *The Downfall of Greatness*. Strafford is similarly presented as both hero and villain, a victim of his own tragic flaws, as implied by the very title of the elegy. This is reinforced by the list of his honours, titles and positions and by the sub-title, ‘His History and Tragedy’ over a portrait of Strafford in the guise of a statesman (A1r), whose eminence as well as his fall is stressed:

In this (as in a mirror) you may see
Wentworth, want worth, his life and tragedie,
He was a Peer, once Pillar of this Land
Who a whole Kingdome had at his command (A2r)

The trite rhyming (‘see’/’tragedie’) and the punning on Strafford’s name (‘Wentworth/want worth’) demonstrate the inevitability of Strafford’s fall, and this is reinforced later by the unsophisticated rhyming of ‘This great mans execution was long expected | Did come at last, and quickly was effected’(A2r). The description of his passage from the highest of positions to disgrace and death sends the message that Strafford’s end

²⁰ Milton and Kilburn, p. 242.

was inevitable, and is reminiscent of earlier, medieval conceptions of Fate and the turn of the wheel of Fortune. The writer draws on panegyric, idealising Strafford's attributes, describing him as 'expert and skilful', and as the ideal Renaissance man, 'Souldier and Scholar' (A2r). Elegy is being used to show the rightness of the parliamentary cause, but it also suggests Parliament respects traditional social hierarchies, rather than siding with the dangerous popular agitation that surrounded Strafford's trial and execution. This is reinforced by the conventional religious and consolatory message about the need to accept God's will and the triviality of earthly concerns: 'Honours are bubbles, Phantasmes that delude | Dull soules' (A2v).

The Downfall of Greatness ends with the reflection that 'his whole splendour was we see | A well writ Prologue to his Tragedy' (A3r) and, as in *A Description of the passage of Thomas late Earl of Strafford over the River Styx*, tragic motifs are drawn on. The theatrical metaphor is apposite: political positions were not fixed, and indeed for many on the parliamentary side would never be so, and the principal players could be portrayed as acting out different roles. However, the theatrical metaphor also allows the writer to distance himself from overt criticism of King Charles, while defending Parliament against Strafford. Elegy permeated with tragic motifs is again being used in a delicate balancing act to make a political attack on Charles I's policies, while still apparently expressing loyalty to the monarchy, and the established order. At the same time, the poet makes a populist attack on Strafford's and, by extension, on Charles I's policies in Ireland: 'His rule in Ireland its well known to all | Was potent, tyrannous and tragicall' (A2v).

The poet's circumspect approach is used to partially disguise and wrap a protective cover around the political and religious points addressed. This is further developed in the prose postscript to *The Downfall of Greatness*, which allows the writer to elide the role of King Charles, but also to further attack Strafford for his attempts to 'dissolve parliaments,

and to subvert the rights, liberties and privileges of Parliaments, and the ancient course of Parliamentary proceedings' (A4r). Strafford is repeatedly described in terms that position him in opposition to Charles and his 'horrid offences and nefarious crimes.... indang'rd a general insurrection against Majestie itself' (A4r). The use of prose briefly distances the author from the mourning and lament and allows him to make a more direct attack, which reinforces the idea that Charles, like his father, is ill served by those around him. It is, however, difficult for the reader not to implicate Charles himself in these actions. At the same time, the author is cautious, reflecting the tensions within Parliament and among its supporters. Thus, he calls on the 'headless multitude (or rather the many headed monster, bellua multorum capitum)' not to 'censure and condemne this great man as one utterly lost' (A4v). The reference to the hydra or many-headed monster evokes what Christopher Hill describes as fear of the people who were 'fickle, unstable, incapable of rational thought: the headless multitude, the many-headed monster'.²¹ It is a motif that Royalists use repeatedly, drawing on a range of images rooted in a horror of the 'popular' and of the 'mob', as will be seen in the elegies written in the aftermath of the regicide which are explored in Chapter Two. Here it is used to balance between political criticism and loyalty to the Crown, and to reinforce the fears of popular agitation felt by many in Parliament, including those being pulled towards constitutional royalism. This is emphasised by the adoption of a conventional Christian position, stating on a note of reconciliation that we 'ought to judge charitably of him' and stressing that 'God did open his eyes'(A4v).

A consideration of the memorial writings on Strafford suggests that writers, particularly Parliamentarians, were cautious about how they used elegy and memorial writing in the politically charged atmosphere of the early 1640s. While they push at the conventional

²¹ Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, 1991), p. 181.

boundaries of such writing, a balance is largely maintained between mourning and polemic, in contrast to the hostile and emotive language employed in Parliament and on the streets. The writing is shaped by some of the traditional conventions and uses of elegy, including the use of praise and consolatory sentiments and the use of epic and heroic tropes inviting us to mourn the dead. This is underlined by a memorial culture which stressed the need not to challenge God, and was reluctant to speak ill of the dead, and many of the memorial texts to Strafford seem to adhere at least partially to this convention, his unpopularity and the popular acclaim that greeted his death notwithstanding. Though clearly writing as political opponents of Strafford's, and asserting the justice of his fate, writers of memorial texts back away from condemning the man and indeed are troubled by the consequences of doing so in terms of maintaining social and religious order in the face of the mass agitation around Strafford's trial and execution. This underlying ambivalence suggests that while memorial writing is beginning to come under the competing pressures of increasing political and social tensions, it was still possible in 1641 to shape memorialisation so that it conformed to many of the conventions and assumptions underlying the uses and forms of elegy.

Finally, writers responding to Strafford's fate had good reason to be wary of publishing, and to be cautious in what they said. Many published elegies and other memorial writings are anonymous; few are recorded in the Stationer's Company books.²² The advantages anonymity offered to writers seeking to use elegy and other forms of memorial writing for political comment were clear. For Royalists who went beyond manuscript circulation it offered protection from the popular hatred of Strafford; for Parliamentarians and Royalists alike, it allowed them to evade censorship and possible imprisonment and persecution. In addition, Parliament was increasingly concerned about the free flow of information and about the open polemic displayed in the many elegies and other writings

²² The Stationers' Company *Registers or Entry Books of Copies* 1554-1842.

published in the wake of Strafford's execution. Such concerns were expressed by one parliamentary supporter and writer, J.B. who published a pamphlet, *The Poets Knavery Discovered, in all their lying Pamphlets*, which refers to 'the three hundred lying Pamphlets' printed since Strafford's death, and to 'his pitifull Elegies fathered upon himselfe (A2v).²³ He also expresses satisfaction that Parliament ordered their suppression (A2r). With parliamentary loyalists such as J.B. expressing such sentiments there was further reason for memorial writers to remain cautious in their uses of the genre.

The oblique and ambiguous way in which political conflict is evoked by parliamentarian writers in memorial writing on Strafford can also be seen in the elegies to Parliamentarian Sir Richard Wiseman, who was injured and later died in December 1641 after protests at Westminster where crowds of apprentices and others had gathered, demanding 'No bishops', thus confirming both the King and Parliament's fears of 'the mob'.²⁴ Unlike Strafford, Wiseman was not a well-known national figure. However, he had a history of radicalism and of challenging authority and had been severely punished in 1638 for accusing Lord Keeper Coventry of accepting bribes. He was fined £18,000, deprived of his baronetcy and held in The Fleet by order of the Star Chamber, until he was released from it in January 1641 by order of the House of Lords.²⁵ Wiseman's history and death made him an ideal candidate for a public display of support for Parliament, under the guise of mourning. J.F Merritt suggests he supplied Westminster, where he was resident, with its own 'martyr' and this is reflected in the elegies mourning his death.²⁶

²³ J.B., *The Poets Knavery Discovered, in all their lying Pamphlets* (London, 1642) ESTC R18881.

²⁴ Manning, *The English People* pp. 138–142; John Rees, *The Leveller Revolution* (London and New York: Verso, 2016) pp. 4-6.

²⁵ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 4: 4 January 1641', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 4, 1629-42* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 123-124. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol4/pp123-124> [accessed 26 September 2017].

²⁶ J.F Merritt, *Westminster 1640 – 1660: a royal city in a time of revolution* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2013) pp. 14–15, 22.

The elegies to Wiseman highlight the link between wider funeral rituals and memorial writing.²⁷ Wiseman's hearse was led through London by two hundred apprentices to burial in St Stephens in Coleman Street, already a district associated with the London radicals. The title of *The Apprentices Lamentation Together With a dolefull Elegie upon the manner of the Death of that worthy and valorous Knight Sr. Richard Wiseman* clearly links it to the procession. It was printed by William Larnier, who was later associated with the Levellers, and had already printed early works by radicals John Lilburne and Katherine Chidley.²⁸ However, despite the clear political affiliation of both author and printer, and the violence and instability in the capital, the elegies themselves maintain a certain distance from both the circumstances of Wiseman's life and death and from direct political conflict, and this suggests that the writer approaches his task cautiously and is concerned to adhere to known elegiac conventions.

In both *The Apprentices Lamentation* and *a dolefull Elegie* Wiseman is portrayed as heroic, and his death presented as an act of God or fate that must be accepted. In *a dolefull Elegie* P.W. draws attention to his heroic and noble 'Valour', while casting scorn upon the 'worthlesse man that threw | The fatall stone ... that durst not trie | A combat for the victory' (A1r). *The Apprentices Lamentation* describes him in panegyric terms as 'the mirror of our times', twice cites his 'worth' and describes him repeatedly in explicitly religious terms as of 'blest memory', of 'blessed state' and 'blest to eternity' (A1r). The writer stresses the necessity of obeying God without question:

He died the Mirrour of our times; whose fate
We dare not murmure at, to expostulate,
And reason with the Deity, t'were sinne,

²⁷ Ian Gentles, 'Political Funerals during the English Revolution' in *London and the Civil War* ed. Stephen Porter (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1996) p. 207; Keith Lindley, 'London and Popular Freedom in the 1640s' in G Richardson and GM Ridley, *Freedom and the English Revolution: essays in History and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), p. 121.

²⁸ Rees, *Leveller Revolution* p. 6.

Nor dare we wish the act undone againe (A1r)

The religious allusions hint at martyrdom and link Wiseman to the godly. Later in the poem his ‘obsequies’ are conventionally linked to tears, ‘the floudgates of our eyes’ and it appears elegy is largely used for the conventional purposes of mourning and consolation, and for honouring the dead man, in contrast with the violent disorders that led to Wiseman’s death. However, submerged beneath this rhetoric, both elegies make an oblique call to action, albeit ambiguous and vague. The extensive use of praise implies a great loss and the closing lines of *The Apprentices Lamentation*, while again drawing on images of tears, suggest that Wiseman’s death was not in vain and others could follow his example: ‘Stop our teares current, and forbear to moane, | And turne our grieffe to imitation’ (A1r). Similarly, *a dolefull Elegie* ends with a pun (‘Yet see the *Wiseman* triumphs in his death’) that again implies Wiseman’s death will have unseen consequences.

The ambiguity in the elegies to Wiseman, which both praise and mourn him while also making oblique political comment, can be related to the political balancing act taken by Parliamentarians who sought to both oppose Charles’ policies and to proclaim their loyalty to him, even as tensions rose with the king’s attempt to arrest five members of the House of Commons for treason, and his subsequent departure from London on 10th January 1642.²⁹ This can be seen in a broadsheet publication commemorating Wiseman where a short acrostic elegy (oddly, referring to the death of Sir William Wiseman), *London’s Teares upon the never too much to be lamented death of our late worthy Member of the House of Commons, Sr Richard Wiseman* follows a prose preamble.³⁰ This mourns Wiseman, calling upon readers

²⁹ Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 178-179.

³⁰ The reference to Sir William Wiseman at the top of the acrostic elegy seems to be a printer’s error. The title and headings above the preamble to *London’s Teares* refer to Sir Richard Wiseman. The acrostic elegy itself refers very specifically, with its references to ‘sordid and bloody treachery’, to the events in Westminster that led to Wiseman’s death. ODNB, *Wiseman* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/29792> > [accessed February 14th, 2021].

to ‘weepe over him, whom with all your teares you cannot recover again’, and describes the procession conducting Wiseman’s hearse, again linking the publication to wider memorial acts. However, while asserting Wiseman’s heroism, the writer also stresses his essential patriotism, describing him as ‘animated with the true love of his King, Religion and Country’. The split between king and Parliament is ascribed to these ‘matchlesse Matchiavels of our age, these perfect enemies of our Kingdome’ (A1r), a description alluding to Strafford and others such as Archbishop Laud. As in the postscript to *The Downfall of Greatnesse*, the writer’s use of prose seems to allow for more direct political comment, though respecting the political balancing act Parliament was attempting. He appears less constrained by the boundaries, however imprecise, of elegy, though there is still the need to confirm to religious orthodoxy. Despite the obliquity and mildness of the elegies to Wiseman they can be seen to be doing political work, even as they emulate the traditions inherited from earlier in the century. They also suggest that these elegies and other memorial writings are used, as Lorna Clymer puts it, as a warning ‘about impending risks or effects of loss caused by an irreplaceable, exemplary person’s death’, thus asserting the writer’s patriotism.³¹

The use of elegy to make ostensible appeals to the unity and health of the nation, while also promoting a partisan political agenda, can be found on both sides of the conflict, including the openly royalist elegy, *This Last Ages Looking Glasse: or Englands Sad Elegie*. It was printed in York, where the King was temporarily based, after the increasingly sharp political conflict between King and Parliament had led to Charles I raising the Royal Standard in Nottingham on 22nd August 1642. The printer, Stephen Bulkley, was centrally involved in printing proclamations and broadsides for the royalist cause and Thomason

³¹ Lorna Clymer, ‘The Funeral Elegy in Early Modern Britain: A Brief History’ in *The Oxford Handbook of The Elegy* ed. Karen Weisman (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 171.

records that it was re-printed in London on 22nd October 1642.³² The first major battle of the Civil War, the battle of Edgehill, took place on 23rd October 1642 and ended in military stalemate.³³

Rather than commemorating or mourning an individual, *This Last Ages Looking Glasse* is a sustained and melancholy lament for the state of England, and a cry of rage against the rebels. S.H. appeals to nostalgic and traditional notions of an idyllic land and expresses his fears for its death, evoking the king, the church and the natural order as he seeks to explain what has gone wrong, in the hope of appeasing God and rallying the King's followers. Written in rhyming couplets, the first part of *This Last Ages Looking Glasse* is structured into five shorter sections, each headed by one of the five senses, which seem to be intended to both humanise and universalise a sense of grief and bewilderment. These are followed by a final section *Common Sences* (B1v to B6r), which can be read as a reflection upon the state of the nation. The rhetorical question at the start of each section, 'What Age is this?' and the evocation at the end of each section of a prayer or refrain invoking his 'God and King' reinforce the writer's sense of shock and incomprehension, as S.H. uses the elegy to express his anger and to attribute the calamity that the outbreak of Civil War represents to the country's and Parliament's sins against God.

In *Seeing* (A3r), the first section of *This Last Ages Looking Glasse*, S.H. suggests the state of the 'Age' is due to a collective national failure to see or acknowledge their own sins, and he uses frequent references to vision, or the lack of it, to mourn his England. They are 'as blind beetles' who 'cannot see | Our own sad woefull miserie', and who 'see all things but what we should'. Ironically, the references to blindness may recall the 'Blind mouthes' (l.

³² <<http://bulkleyblog.blogspot.co.uk/2011/11/stephen-bulkley-senior-and-senior-and.html>> [accessed 12th January 2021].

³³ Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 243–247.

119) in Parliamentarian John Milton's attack on corrupt churchmen in *Lycidas*.³⁴ The lack of specificity in the pronoun ('they') and the reference to beetles – lowly insects that can be trampled underfoot – distances the writer from those whose treason and disloyalty may have led to the state of England and contrasts them to a collective 'we'. This use of elegy to elaborate on the sins of the nation recalls the use of similar motifs in the Prince Henry elegies. For example, Josuah Sylvester, who had received a pension of £20 a year from Henry as a court poet, listed those who by their sins caused God to take Henry away, culminating in the conclusion that 'All, All are guiltie, in a high Degree, | Of This High Treason and Conspiracie (B1r).³⁵ Here, it allows S.H. to establish his moral and religious credentials before moving onto more overtly political comment and criticism.

In the third section, *Hearing*, the elegy becomes more explicitly political and propagandist. Parliament's supporters are portrayed as men of violence and anarchy whose 'sole delight is onely bloud', and S.H. expounds the royalist commitment to the King's position as above the law and Parliament, and as head of the established church:

What blasphemies do some relate?
Against Our God, Our King, and State;
Some cry out of Church Government,
Some to ruine the Temple are bent,
And some cannot endure to heare
The sound o th'Organ in their Ear (A3v)

The tone has shifted from one of loss and mourning to an outraged rant. The rhetorical question and the denial of the truths of the established church, as symbolised by the 'Organ', give the poem an edge that pushes the elegy towards satire, as S.H. deplores the attacks on the established church. These included the Bishops Exclusion Bill, which had

³⁴ John Milton, 'Lycidas' in *Complete Shorter Poems* ed. Stella P Revard and Barbara K Lewalski (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2009), pp. 74-80.

³⁵ Josuah Sylvester, *Lachrimae lachrimarum. or The distillation of teares shede for the vntymely death of the incomparable prince Panaretus* (London, 1612) ESTC S118066; ODNB, *Sylvester* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/26873> > [accessed February 2021].

removed Bishops from the House of Lords in February 1642, and iconoclasm that ‘moved beyond anti-Laudian gestures’ into activities such as tearing down altar rails, and attacks on the liturgy and on the use of clerical vestments.³⁶ For this royalist poet the social breakdown Denham had feared eighteen months earlier has come about. The polemical tone is maintained later in the poem, as S.H. again attacks Parliamentarians, puritans and others who threatened the church and the established order:

With Strange Sects we are divided;
Decent order is neglected,
Church government neglected
All ceremonies now must downe
They with garlands their actions crowne. (B5r)

The tone, while ranting, is one of desperation as he expresses the hope that God will cleanse the land and let those who ‘love the Olive branch of peace flourish’ (B6r), rather than making a resolute call to arms. However, his portrayal of Parliamentarians and of those attacking the established Church is impersonal; there is no reference to any identifiable individual. The elegy is moralising in tone, and there is no sense that this conflict could move beyond the fact of rebellion and disobedience to the wider political and religious conflict that developed during the decade of Civil War. Instead, it seems that for S.H., as for Hamlet, ‘time is out of joint’ and that his task in the elegy is to bring the nation back to its senses.³⁷ He uses the final section as a call to revert to ‘Common Sence’, which he conflates with the re-establishment of the political and religious status quo. This culminates in a rallying call as elegiac mourning for the nation gives way to what is almost a prayer: ‘Let Charles glorie through England ring, | Let subjects say, God Save the King’ (B6r).

S.H. uses elegy to express his feeling of despair that each day brings ‘brings forth more cruell things’ (B1v). The extended final section of the poem repeats and enlarges upon

³⁶ Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 144, 186.

³⁷ *Hamlet* Act 1 Scene 5, l. 188.

his distress and confusion, but also struggles to understand the causes of this disaster, which, like those mourning Prince Henry, he sees as God's punishment, with allusions to biblical plagues: 'Yea further Gods most heavie hand, | With pestilence hath plagued this land' (B2v). As the political consensus fractures, S.H. clings on to the certainties of the ideology that underpinned it, drawing on conceptions of the 'commonweal' anchored in a nostalgic and idealised understanding of political balance with the king at its centre. As Sharpe puts it, 'as God authored and maintained the harmony of the world, so it was the role of the king to sustain the harmony of the commonwealth', which S.H. portrays as being disrupted by violent and religious sectaries.³⁸ The outbreak of Civil War threatened and ultimately shattered this vision, leaving loyalists like S.H. bewildered. At the same time, however, *This Last Ages Looking Glasse* represents a move towards more overtly bitter and partisan writing, even as this is partly cloaked by lament and mourning for the country.

In virtually all the elegies and other memorial writings examined here from the early 1640s, the writers make explicit references to patriotism and to the parlous state of the nation, and this is often linked to the suggestion that the country is being punished by God for its sins. In this process, they draw on conventional praise and panegyric of the deceased, as well as religious teachings concerning respect for the dead and the need to draw consolation from mourning. This does not preclude the use of memorial writing for explicitly advancing a political and religious agenda, and exaggerated praise for an individual implicitly leads the reader to condemn his enemies and imply that the writer's side alone, whether Royalist or Parliamentarian, is committed to securing the safety of the nation.

There is some difference in the extent to which Royalist and Parliamentarian writers draw on and subvert elegiac convention, however. When Denham writes in memory of Strafford, his use of praise and his elevation of Strafford as a martyr conform to elegiac

³⁸ Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England* p. 52.

convention, but there is also underlying anger and a sense of outrage as Denham attacks those who called for Strafford's death. In *This Last Ages Looking Glasse: or Englands sad elegie* a sense of anger and of confusion is overt in S.H.'s mourning for the nation, and elegy is used to make a clear-cut and polemical attack on Parliament and on the enemies of the King and the established church.

For writers taking a pro-parliamentary position, the use of memorial writing is more complex, as they negotiate Parliament's formal political position. The elegies to Wiseman make very conventional use of praise to mourn him, drawing on traditional images such as those of tears, and portraying him as both hero and martyr. The calls to action are however muted, and there is little attempt to attack Royalists beyond vague references, which can be linked to Parliament's unwillingness to attack the King himself and its desire to present him as being betrayed by false advisors. This is reinforced when parliamentarian writing on Strafford is considered. It does not lack political commentary and justification of Strafford's execution, but Strafford is treated with a degree of respect not accorded by Royalists to their opponents. Writers draw on epic and tragedy to portray him as a great man fallen and largely respect religious injunctions not to speak ill of the dead, and to leave their fate to God, rather than presuming to know His judgement. As a result, the sense of bitterness or anger is strangely muted, and even an enemy such as Strafford can be honoured, to an extent, though at the same time writers begin to test the boundaries of elegy and memorial writing, drawing on satirical and polemical elements more overtly.

The next section in this chapter moves on to consider what happens to elegy and memorial writing, and how writers use it as the war becomes more bitter, and division mounts both between and within the different factions in the Civil War. It will focus on the elegies and other writings published in the wake of the death in September 1646 of the Earl of Essex.

The Essex Elegies

The unexpected death in September 1646 of Robert Devereux, 3rd Earl of Essex and Lord-General of the parliamentary forces until his resignation in April 1645, following the introduction of the Self-Denying Ordinance and the formation of the New Model Army, was followed by an elaborate state funeral and the writing and publication of an extensive memorial literature.³⁹ The rituals surrounding Essex's death were seized upon by politicians and writers to intervene in the increasingly bitter debates that had opened in Parliament over what kind of religious and political settlement it sought for the country, following its victory over the king. The elegies explored here illustrate how writers' use of the genre became more polemical as political attitudes hardened and polarised, and elegy was explicitly used to intervene in factional battles in Parliament between what had become known as the 'peace party' and the 'war party'. In addition, an unpublished work by Royalist Henry King is also considered, and the extent to which the conventions of elegy are under pressure is explored.⁴⁰

³⁹ *A briefe and compendious narrative of the renowned Robert, Earle of Essex, his pedigree, and his valiant acts, performed when he was generall of the Parliaments army.* (London, 1646) ESTC R201158; *A funerall elegie upon the deplorable and much lamented death of the Right Honourable Robert Deveruex [sic] late Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210638; J. B., *A mournful elegie, in pious memory of the most honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex and Ewe* ESTC R232169; Daniel Evance, *Justa honoraria: Funeral rites in honor to the great memorial of my deceased master, the Right Honorable, Robert Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R201160; William Mercer, *An elegie vpon the death of the right honorable, most noble, worthily-renowned, and truly valiant lord, Robert, Earle of Essex & Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210635; Henry Mill, *A funerall elegy upon the most honored upon Earth, and now glorious in Heaven, His Excellency Robert Devereux Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210641; Thomas Philipot, *An elegie offer'd up to the memory of His Excellencie Robert Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R40096; Josiah Ricraft, *A funeral elegy upon the most honored upon Earth, and now glorious in Heaven His Excellency Robert Devereux Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210596; William Rowland, *An elegie upon the death of the right Honourable & most renowned, Robert Devereux Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210643; Thomas Twiss, *An elegy vpon the unhappy losse of the noble Earle of Essex* (London, 1646) ESTC R201159. All henceforth referred to by name and/or author.

⁴⁰ Henry King, 'On the Earl of Essex' in *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p.99.

Essex had extensive military experience on the continent, fighting with Palatinate forces in the Thirty Years War, and Parliament had appointed him as Lord-General of the Parliamentary forces in July 1642 ‘for the just and necessary defence of the protestant religion, of your majesty’s person, crown, and dignity, of the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and the privileges of parliament’.⁴¹ The wording, like that in the Grand Remonstrance six months earlier, conformed to a rhetoric of balance and harmony. Essex’s appointment underlines the limited remit of parliamentary war aims in 1642, and their commitment to maintaining proper social hierarchies.⁴² His military achievements were arguably limited. John Morrill states that ‘he did not win a single battle outright, but he did not lose a pitched battle outright either’.⁴³ Vernon Snow is more positive, arguing that ‘Essex’s relief of Gloucester marked the turning point in the Civil War’. He also notes, as does Adamson, that Essex was granted triumphal entry into London on more than one occasion, and that after his death and funeral large numbers came to see his funeral effigy in Westminster Abbey, suggesting continuing public respect.⁴⁴ That his effigy was subsequently vandalised by ‘embittered cavalier John White’ reinforces, in contrast, royalist perceptions of Essex. Nonetheless, Essex’s quarrels with other commanders such as Waller and his defeat at Lostwithiel in Cornwall in September 1644 left him exposed, and Snow convincingly argues that when he returned to London his reputation had been diminished, and this left him open to criticism.⁴⁵

⁴¹ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 5: 12 July 1642', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 5, 1642-1643* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 204-208. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol5/pp204-208> [accessed 13th January 2019]; Vernon Snow, *The Life of Robert Devereux, the third Earl of Essex 1591 – 1646* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970) pp. 94, 113.

⁴² Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 210.

⁴³ John Morrill in ODNB, Earl of Essex < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/7566> > [accessed February 2018].

⁴⁴ J.S.A Adamson, ‘The Baronial Context of the English Civil War’ in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol 40 (1990) pp. 93–120 (107); Snow, *The Life* pp. 493-494.

⁴⁵ Snow, *The Life* pp. 450, 462–463,

The attacks on Essex's military reputation fed into a larger debate over the conduct of the war and its ultimate aims. These concerns shaped the elegies and other writings that followed his death, as well as the organisation of his funeral. Historians have described an increasingly tense battle in Parliament over the conduct of the war and what kind of settlement it sought with the King. As David Underdown has noted, it is simplistic to think of the Presbyterians or 'peace party' and the Independents or 'war party', and while these labels will be used here for convenience, this warning must be borne in mind. Divisions in Parliament were less clear cut and cannot be seen simply in terms of rigidly organised groupings. MPs manoeuvred and judged issues on their merits and on local and personal interests.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, Essex was clearly linked with leading Presbyterians from the 'peace party', such as Denzil Holles and Sir Philip Stapleton. Braddick, Gentles and Snow point to opponents of Cromwell being invited to Essex's house in December 1645, to discuss how to impeach Cromwell. The latter called, in the Committee of the Army, for the war to be 'more vigorously prosecuted' and the Independents found common ground with the sectaries and separatists in seeking this, along with a greater liberty of conscience in religious affairs.⁴⁷

Essex's unexpected death in September 1646 turned him from a fading political and military hero into the epitome of chivalry and statesmanship. The elaborate public and official mourning ceremonies, including a state funeral, highlight the symbolic importance the Presbyterians attributed to Essex, which is reflected in the elegies mourning him. Morrill notes that 'more than 3000 people were marshalled by the officers of the College of Arms for a funeral based on that of Henry, Prince of Wales'.⁴⁸ Publicly, the political classes in both

⁴⁶ David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (London: George Allen and Unwin 1971, 1985), p. 45.

⁴⁷ Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 350–351; Gentles, *The New Model Army* p. 5; ODNB, *Essex*; Snow *The Life*, pp. 466–469; Underdown, *Pride's Purge* p. 66.

⁴⁸ ODNB, *Essex*.



Plate 1 Engraving by William Hole of Henry Prince of Wales' effigy, which was printed (A3V), together with the title *The Herse, and Representation of our late Highe and Mighty Henry Prince of Wales, & etc*, with George Chapman's elegy *An epicede or funerall song on the most disastrous death, of the high-borne prince of men, Henry Prince of Wales 1613.*



Plate 2 Thomas Philpott's *Englands sorrow for the losse of their late generall or an epitaph upon his Excellencie Robert Earle of Essex, &c. Who died September 15. 1646. with a perfect memoriall of the particular services and battels that he himself was engaged in person* (London: 1646).

Houses of Parliament sought to honour Essex, and to present him as a hero. The House of Commons resolved to ‘accompany’ his body to his funeral and to contribute ‘Four thousand Five hundred Pounds’ to its costs, while the House of Lords ordered that all lords meet to go to the funeral.⁴⁹ Such apparent unanimity reflects on the surface a desire to emphasise the unity and patriotism of Parliament and the nation, as exemplified by Essex. This is reinforced by the explicit references to Prince Henry’s obsequies, in which ‘almost all the details of the composition of the cortege seem to have been copied copiously from accounts of Henry’s funeral’ including the hearse and effigy, which were recorded by engraver William Hole (Fig. 1). The Presbyterians/ ‘peace party’ clearly sought to elevate Essex to the status of hero, and Goldring convincingly argues that the images of Essex’s effigy ‘self-consciously invite comparison with Henry’s – down to and including the design of his hearse’ and were part of a conscious effort to recall a more settled and consensual past.⁵⁰ Imitations of Hole’s engraving can be found reproduced on at least three memorial writings published in honour of Essex, emphasising the link between elegy and wider memorial ritual. These include Thomas Philipot’s epitaph *Englands sorrow for the losse of their late generall* (Fig. 2), which forms part of a one-page broadsheet. Adamson argues that the staging of Essex’s funeral in imitation of Prince Henry’s can be read as a conscious decision to use his obsequies to evoke an imagined past and that such ‘archaic chivalric ritual was also an appeal to the imagination: to order and rationalize the traumatic and dislocated politics of 1646 by an act of relocation in

⁴⁹ Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 396, 400; Hirst, *Authority and Conflict* p.266; House of Commons Journal Volume 4: 15 September 1646’, in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 4, 1644-1646* (London, 1802), pp. 668-670. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol4/pp.668-670> [accessed 25 August 2017]. ‘House of Commons Journal Volume 4: 1 October 1646’, pp. 679-680 [accessed 25 August 2017]; ‘House of Lords Journal Volume 8: 20 October 1646, pp. 531-540 [accessed 25 August 2017].

⁵⁰ Elizabeth Goldring, “‘So Just a Sorrow so well expressed’: Henry Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration’ in Timothy Wilks *Prince Henry Revived* (London: Southampton University and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007), pp. 281, 286, 292.

the past: in the romanticized and heroic age of Prince Henry'.⁵¹ However, as Braddick points out, the arrangements for the funeral were consciously being used to cast the Independents and the Army as the obstacles in the way of a peaceful outcome to the war, and while Essex's funeral 'attempted a moment of public unity celebrating a hero of the parliamentary cause, identifying it with a Presbyterian church settlement', it was in fact 'a more ambiguous affair than [this] ritual suggested ... and almost all the chief mourners were prominent Presbyterians: Fairfax, Cromwell and Ireton were all absent'.⁵² It is in the context of this increasingly fractured political landscape that these partisan elegies to Essex need to be read.

Several of the elegists and others memorialising Essex had personal and political connections with him. It seems clear that they were writing with the approval and encouragement of leading Presbyterians in Parliament and were not hindered by a fear of censorship or official disapproval, and at least two of the elegies to Essex appear in the Stationers Company Register. Daniel Evance was Essex's Servant-Chaplain (A1r), as he states on the frontpiece to *Justa honoraria*, an extended piece using a mix of elegy and other forms to lament Essex. It was printed for Edward Husband, Printer to the Honourable House of Commons. Of other elegists, William Mercer had served as captain under Essex, while Thomas Philipot had previously written in praise of Essex.⁵³ From the start, the lamentation and expressions of praise in Evance's *Justa honoraria* are undercut by satirical and overtly political undertones. The frontispiece (A1r) pointedly refers to 'all them that are real mourners at his funeral', and one section extends a superficially 'humble invitation of His Excellency Sir Tho: Fairfax to my Lords funeral' and to be 'The Mourner-General at his Obsequie' (C4v). As noted above, Fairfax did not attend.

⁵¹ Adamson, 'Baronial Context' pp. 191-193.

⁵² Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 478-80.

⁵³ Thomas Philipot, *A Congratulatory Elegie offered to the Earl of Essex* (London, 1641) ESTC R10826; The Stationers Company Register records the elegies of Thomas Philipot and Robert Rowland, for example.

Both Evance and Philipot draw extensively on the exaggerated praise typical of elegy and memorial writing. Evance celebrates Essex as a warrior and an epic hero, and an extended series of metaphors compares him to a tree ‘well spread and mounted high’ which might ‘three Kingdoms well have sheltered’, and which, after the ‘tempest’ is over ‘unshaken stood | Like some great Oak within a ruin’d wood’ (B2r&v). The reference to the oak tree evokes Essex’s strength but, as a quintessentially English tree, also his patriotism. This is reinforced by the reference to the three kingdoms – a contested image used by both Royalists such as Denham and by Parliamentarians in the elegies to Strafford, to emphasise their care for responsible government. Philipot uses the same simile of an oak tree being battered in a storm in *An elegie offer’d up to the memory of His Excellencie Robert Earle of Essex and Ewe* to stress Essex’s heroism and fortitude. His description of Essex ‘As some tall Oake ‘gainst whom the envious Wind | Oft in impetuous Hurricans combin’d | Does stand unmov’d, although assailed by all | The angry Gales’ (A1r) extends a semi-mythical status to him, while the references to hurricanes imply that the war can be compared to disturbances in nature and the natural order.

The conventionally exaggerated praise of the dead man by both Philipot and Evance is used to criticise his opponents. Philipot mourns Essex’s death, but also suggests that those who stood against him were ‘envious’ and impetuous’, while Evance’s reference to the ‘ruin’d wood’ also implies that the country is now ‘ruin’d’ and that only someone of Essex’s stature could save it. Underlying this is the clear implication that the course of Cromwell and his allies will be disastrous for the country, which Essex and his allies are seeking to unify. The apparent conservatism and outward conformity to elegiac convention allows both writers to cloak factional attack in panegyric. In a similar manner, praise of Essex’s military feats becomes double edged and extends to a political attack on both Cromwell and the New Model Army. Evance evokes Essex’s military triumphs to attack Cromwell as ‘envious’, and

to downplay the latter's key role in the parliamentary victory at the battle of Naseby in 1645, declaring 'Keynton is as fresh as Nazeby-field, | And Newbery and Gloster will not yield | Their names to envious Oblivion' (B3v).

Epic and heroic descriptions of Essex are used to remind readers of his loyalty to both king and country, and of the sacrifice he made when appointed as Lord-General. Evance alludes to the raising of flags that signalled the start of war and to Charles's branding of Essex as a traitor: he 'own'd the Standard for the State | When Princes frown'd him to a Trayter's Fate' and sacrificed himself 'for King and Country's good' (B3v). As in the elegies to Strafford and Wiseman, Evance uses elegy both to justify rebellion, and also to distance that rebellion from the king himself. The stress that Evance places here on Essex as a man of principle committed to the Parliamentary cause also allows him to allude to him as a martyr, and to use the elegy to launch an attack laced with polemic and satire on their religious and political enemies, reflecting that had Essex survived, the three kingdoms would not be at political and religious odds:

Then Heresie would be whipt and stript; and they
Who mutiny by Schism, would not be
Without their Recompense; and Blasphemies
Would have their Revenge from lesser Deities,
Then England's Peace might spin, Scotland return,
And Ireland not to her last cyndars burn (B4r)

The tone of this writing is embittered and has less to do with remembering and honouring Essex than with a sustained rant against his opponents, the Independents and sectaries, that is reminiscent of the S.H.'s *Englands sad ellegie*. There is no reference to their ostensible enemies, the Royalists. The stress in these lines is on religious and political division, with the references to 'Heresie' and 'Schism' and with the use of violent and, in the case of the allusion to Ireland burning, almost apocalyptic images that link religious separatism to anarchy. His stance is far less unifying than the official obsequies suggested and imply that the unity presented by Parliament and by the funeral is illusory. If elegy is

being used to create a portrait of Essex as a semi-mythical, heroic figure, it also being used in a far less elevated manner to openly promote the cause of a Presbyterian settlement, the disbandment of the New Model Army and a settlement with Charles. In the process, while the outward forms of elegy and memorial writing are partially respected, the spiritual and religious sentiments they purportedly embody are undermined.

Elegies by Josiah Ricraft and J.B. also suggest that the Presbyterians were working systematically to use Essex's funeral and the memorial writing associated with it. Ricraft, author of *A funeral elegy upon the most honored upon Earth, and now glorious in Heaven His Excellency Robert Devereux Earl of Essex and Ewe* and a London merchant, was an enthusiastic supporter of Thomas Edwards, author of *Gangraena*, who Ann Hughes describes as his 'fellow polemicist and Presbyterian activist' and who had a history of attacking Independent churches.⁵⁴ Ricraft himself had published a pamphlet attacking independent Minister John Godwin, *A Nosegay of rank Smelling Flowers*.⁵⁵ Like Evance, Ricraft uses praise to launch more direct attacks on their enemies. He starts *A funeral elegy* conventionally, referring to the consolation of Essex's gain of 'eternal glory' in heaven (A1r) and uses images of illumination, comparing Essex to a 'star' made to 'give these Isles more light' (A1r). However, he quickly moves into a direct attack on Essex's political and religious opponents, referring to 'each idle Sect, | Which troubles both Religion and the State (A1r). The stress, as with Evance, is on the anarchy that derives from abandoning the natural religious and political order. Such direct attack embedded in elegiac form can be found in J.B.'s *A mournful elegie, in pious memory of the most honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex and Ewe*. It seems reasonable to identify J.B. with the J.B. who had published *The Poets*

⁵⁴ Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena: or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time* (London, 1646) ESTC R9639; Ann Hughes, *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 143, 153.

⁵⁵ Josiah Ricraft, *A Nosegay of rank Smelling Flowers* (London, 1646) ESTC R200808.

Knavery Discovered, in all their lying pamphlets. There he had attacked the many elegists and other writers commemorating Strafford, especially those purporting to represent Strafford's voice, and had expressed his satisfaction that Parliament was seeking to control such publications. Ironically, he shows little hesitation in *A mournful elegie* in using elegy for equally polemical purposes. It is used to launch an explicit attack on the Independents and Sectaries, and to blame them for the state of the nation, targeting them as 'Schismatiques, Tub-Preachers, Anabaptists, Heretiques, / The Independents, Antinomians, Papists, / The Brownists, and (which is worst of all) the Atheists' (A3v). J.B.'s indignant list of sectaries, satirising the Independents and their allies, stresses his sense of anger and frustration and he also draws on an impending sense of catastrophe. He despairs for the state of the kingdom, using images of storms that 'have produced shipwracks' that seem a realisation of the fears expressed by S.H. in *This Last Ages Looking Glasse*. His apocalyptic fears that the now obsolete 'axill-tree of the world should crack' (A3r) suggests the kingdom itself in danger of collapsing into chaos, implicitly counterposing Essex's masculine virtue and heroism to the anarchy threatened by the Independents, and by outbreaks of riots throughout the country.⁵⁶ Rather than offering the consolation that might be expected in memorial writing J.B. implies that with the loss of Essex comes the loss of God's guiding hand. Instead, he offers an image of catastrophe.

The elegies of Essex by his supporters, while adhering to expectations of funeral elegy in their expressions of grief and lament and their use of panegyric and idealisation, have moved away in tone and sentiment from the earlier elegies to Strafford or Wiseman, and there is less a search for consolation than a conscious and rage-driven intervention into the fraught political debate within Parliament. A sense of rage combined with an outward show

⁵⁶ Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 482-485; OED: axill-tree refers to the pole of heaven, which was believed to support the world.

of adherence to the conventions of memorial writing can also be found in the elegy by Royalist Henry King, 'On the Earl of Essex'. King's elegy was unpublished at the time of Essex's death but Harold Love suggests that it is likely it circulated in manuscript, like many of his other poems, prior to their publication in 1657.⁵⁷

Nigel Smith describes 'On the Earl of Essex' as satire.⁵⁸ King certainly uses spiteful and satirical reference to Essex's unhappy marriages, and the humiliations they brought to him, to present him as misled, and to undermine the image of masculine virtue Presbyterians sought to foster.⁵⁹ By his actions Essex has betrayed not only his wives but his King and class, breaking the bonds 'of Wedlock, and of Loyalty' (l.4). However, the satirical element is balanced by King's suggestion that there was also something heroic about Essex and, as some of the writers on Strafford had done five years earlier, King draws on elements of tragedy to imply a fatal flaw in Essex that led to his downfall:

Yet had some glimm'ring Sparks of Virtue lent
To see (though late) his Errour and Repent:
Essex lies here, like an inverted Flame
Hid in the Ruins of his House and Name (ll. 7 – 10)

The invocation of Essex's 'House and Name' allows King to present Essex's fall as the tragic fall of a great man realising his errors too late, and there is a tone of sadness and regret in his ambiguous lament for the man himself, and perhaps some reluctance to speak ill of the dead. As Margaret Crum puts it, 'King's rather majestic statement of the royalist view seems to show an undercurrent of respect' for Essex.⁶⁰ At the same time, however, King also evokes the memory of Essex's father, the second Earl of Essex, who had been executed for treason in 1601, and this allows him to intervene polemically, suggesting Parliament by its

⁵⁷ Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in seventeenth century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993), pp. 50, 52.

⁵⁸ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 287.

⁵⁹ ODNB, *Essex*; Snow, *The Life* pp. 40–45.

⁶⁰ Margaret Crum, in *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* p. 209.

actions has set a national catastrophe in motion.⁶¹ His purpose, however, if the poem circulated in manuscript to Royalists, seems to be both to vent his rage and to provide comfort in a time of defeat and reassurance as to the ultimate defeat of Parliament who with ‘their Dead General ere long they must | Contracted be into a span of Dust’ (ll. 38–39). The underlying anger and bitter criticisms of Parliament, and of Essex, are partly veiled by the mixing of genres, though elegiac conventions are strained to their limits.

By 1646 there was anger and bitterness on both sides, as well as intense debate as to the future political settlement, and this feeds into how elegy and memorial writing are used, and how they are permeated by polemic and by competing genres, whether satire, tragedy or epic. There is ritualistic recourse to praise and to the need for consolation from Presbyterian writers, but also factional political attack under the guise of an appeal to national unity. The Royalist King barely conceals bitter satire and rage, as he seeks to affirm royalist feelings of despair and outrage but is also impelled to show some respect for the dead, lamenting Essex as a great one fallen. These elegies have become more polemical and less focused on the memory of the dead man, both drawing on elegiac form, and questioning it. The next section of this chapter considers elegy and other memorial texts written at the end of the Second Civil War, and how they are used to commemorate ‘martyrs’ such as the Parliamentarian Thomas Rainsborough, and Royalists Lucas and Lisle.

Political Martyrdom: Lucas and Lisle and Thomas Rainsborough

This section explores how writers used elegy in the tense and increasingly bitter atmosphere that followed the end of the Second Civil War, which had broken out in 1648, following protracted and ultimately fruitless negotiations between the king and Parliament, that ended with Charles’ escape from Hampton Court in November 1647. The surrender of

⁶¹ ODNB *Second Earl of Essex*, <https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-7565?rskey=RBUqxq&result=2> [accessed September 2022].

Colchester on 27th August 1648, to Lord General Sir Thomas Fairfax, after a siege lasting eleven weeks, signalled the effective end of the War and was followed by the execution of royalist leaders Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle.⁶² Two months later, in what was widely perceived as an act of revenge, parliamentary leader and radical Colonel Thomas Rainsborough was assassinated in Doncaster by Royalists.⁶³ These deaths generated intense controversy and anger among Royalists and Parliamentarians respectively, and Brady argues persuasively that both sides, as well as the New Model Army, used these contested deaths in an extended propaganda war in which they sought to intervene in the fraught political debate around the fate of Charles I. In this process, elegy and its conventions were put under increasing pressure, as the elegies explored here demonstrate.⁶⁴

The elegies to Lucas and Lisle and to Rainsborough need to be placed within the context of increased bitterness and political polarisation. Underdown argues that petitions in April 1648 from areas such as Essex show ‘the extent of alienation’ of the moderate ‘political nation’ from the Army in the spring of 1648, and Hirst describes the Second Civil War as a ‘revolt of the provinces against the hated centre’.⁶⁵ Manning and Rees, in contrast, detail agitation and petitions influenced by Leveller propaganda coming from sections of the army and from civilians, calling for the trial of the king, from mid 1648 onwards.⁶⁶ Within the Army itself there was increasing pressure to put the king on trial, and the atmosphere was febrile: an Army prayer meeting at Windsor in April 1648 had agreed ‘to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for that blood he had shed, and mischief he had done to his

⁶² Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 545-548.

⁶³ Rees, *Leveller Revolution* pp. 261-65; Adrian Tinniswood, *The Rainborowes: Pirates, Puritans and a Family’s quest for the Promised Land* (London: Vintage 2014), pp. 277– 80, 285–287.

⁶⁴ Andrea Brady, ‘Dying With Honour: Literary Propaganda and the Second English Civil War’, *The Journal of Military History*, Volume 70, Number 1 pp. 9–30 (2006), pp. 9–10.

⁶⁵ Hirst, *England in Conflict* p. 283; Underdown, *Pride’s Purge* pp. 94, 182-184.

⁶⁶ Brian Manning, *1649: The Crisis of the English revolution* (London: Bookmarks 1992), pp. 24–29; Rees, *Leveller Revolution* pp. 231–232.

utmost against the lord's cause and people in these poor nations'.⁶⁷ Braddick notes that while this did not reflect a 'settled desire to kill the King', it did 'reflect ... a strong resentment at the profligacy with which royalists were willing to spend human lives'.⁶⁸ In addition, as Barbara Donegan argues persuasively, there was 'a change between the first and second civil wars' that 'marked a decline from the mutually observed professional codes that moderated relations between enemies before 1648'.⁶⁹ Braddick endorses this, commenting that the 'horrors inflicted on Colchester were within the laws of war, but only just' and notes that 'both sides accused the other of a lack of decency'.⁷⁰ The siege of Colchester was characterised by much suffering on the part of its inhabitants: rations were cut and protests erupted, led by starving women. Women and children were sent out of the town; however, the besiegers would not let them pass and they returned.⁷¹ Lucas and Lisle were executed the day after the siege ended: Fairfax put much stress on the legality of his decision to execute them and stated they were shot 'for some satisfaction to Military Justice, and in part of avenge for the innocent blood they have caused to be spilt' (A2r). Other accounts also commented on Lucas' involvement in earlier atrocities in Froome, and on both men's betrayal of their honour, and of commitments not to bear arms again.⁷²

Royalists seized on the propaganda opportunity the execution of the two men offered. Their response to Lucas and Lisle's execution was uncompromising, and writers of elegy took full advantage of it to attack their opponents and to elevate the two men to the status of

⁶⁷ Allen, William *A faithful Memorial of that Remarkable Meeting of many Officers of the Army* (1659) ESTC R9713.

⁶⁸ Braddick, *God's Fury* p. 549.

⁶⁹ Barbara Donegan, 'Atrocity, War Crime and Treason in the English Civil War', *The American Historical Review*, Volume 99 1137–1166 (1994), pp. 1138–1139.

⁷⁰ Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 545–547.

⁷¹ Brady 'Dying with Honour', pp. 13–14.

⁷² Brady, 'Dying with Honour' pp. 18–21, 23; Gentles, *New Model Army* pp. 256–257; Sir Thomas Fairfax, *A Letter Concerning the surrender of Colchester: the Grounds and Reasons of putting to death Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle* (London, 1648) ESTC R202094.

martyrs for King and country. In this process, they pushed the boundaries of elegy as a genre to their limits, drawing extensively on satire and polemic. Aware of growing pressure to put the king on trial, they may have felt they had little to lose in attacking Parliament by portraying the deaths of the two men as unjustified murder, though many of them were cautious enough to publish anonymously. None of the elegies considered in this chapter gives – or seeks to give – insight into the individual character of the men mourned. In fact, even fellow Royalists found Lucas and Lisle less than exemplary. Edward Hyde, writing many years later, observed of Lucas that he was brave but ‘of a nature not to be lived with, an ill understanding, a rough and proud nature, which made him during the time of their being in Colchester more intolerable than the siege, or any fortune that yet threatened them’.

Nonetheless, Hyde unequivocally states they were ‘murdered’, and this is echoed in the titles of many of the elegies.⁷³ Of three anonymous elegies published in the wake of the executions, one is entitled *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparallel’d Unsoldierly Murder Committed at Colchester, upon the persons of the two most incomparable Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle*. Another, *An Elegie on the Death of that most Noble and Heroick Knight, Sir Charles Lucas*, is subtitled with the comment ‘Murthered by the Excellent Rebell Fairfax’. A compilation by Philanactos, *Two Epitaphs*, refers to the two men as being ‘basely assassinated at Colchester’, while Henry King’s ‘An Elegy on Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle’ follows the title with the brief comment ‘Murdered August 28: 1648’.⁷⁴

⁷³ Edward Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars*, ed. by W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), Vol. 4 pp. 388-389.

⁷⁴ *An Elegie on the Death of that most Noble and Heroic Knight, Sir Charles Lucas* (London, 1648) ESTC R210902; *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparallel’d Unsoldierly Murder Committed at Colchester, upon the persons of the two most incomparable Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle* (London, 1648) ESTC R205178; *An Elegie on the most incomparable Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle* (London, 1648) ESTC R210944; Henry King, *The Poems* pp. 101-110; Demophilus Philanactos, *Two Epitaphs occasioned by the Death of Sr Charles Lucas and Sr George Lisle basely assassinated at Colchester* (London, 1648) ESTC R203844; Philocrates, *The loyall sacrifice presented in the lives and deaths of those two eminent-heroick patternes, for valour, discipline, and fidelity; the generally beloved and*

Royalists use panegyric in the elegies to portray Lucas and Lisle in exaggeratedly militaristic terms, highlighting their male prowess and honour, and drawing on familiar motifs portraying them as classical epic heroes, including linking them to Troy, another fallen city. This is a motif also found in other royalist writings such as Abraham Cowley's *The Civil War* with its evocation of loss and defeat, alluding to Virgil's *Aeneid*.⁷⁵ The writer of *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparalleled Unsoldierly Murder* describes the inhabitants of Troy heroically resisting the siege, until hunger forces them to surrender. In addition, he uses images of light and of fire, describing the victims' ascent to heaven. Both men are of a 'matchlesse yet a different heat' (A4r) and Lucas is said to have 'possess'd a stout Majestick fire' (A4v). The writer compares Colchester to the Ark, the biblical allusion linking the royalist stand there to the survival of the humanity in the face of catastrophe:

Like the Creations shelter (once) the Arke
 When the exhausted town defended hears,
 'Bove the distresse of Troy, though not the years:
 At last they doe subscribe, but leave this Fame,
 They knew no Conqueror, till Hunger came (A2v)

The reference to Troy is a motif that recurs in other elegies. Henry King refers to the Greeks triumphing over the body of '(till then) victorious Hector' (l.44) but further twists the knife, noting that Achilles, enraged by the death of Patroclus may have some excuse, unlike those who killed Lucas and Lisle. He further portrays Lucas and Lisle as embodying the pattern of heroism and compares them to the mythic heroes and brothers of Helen of Troy, the 'Brother-Starres | Castor and Pollux' (ll. 272–278), in ironic contrast to their failure to adhere to their commitments not to bear arms again.

bemoaned, Sir Charles Lucas, and Sir George Lisle, knights (London, 1648) ESTC R202768. All henceforth referred to by title and/or author.

⁷⁵ Abraham Cowley, *Collected Works of Abraham Cowley, Volume 1* ed. Thomas Calhoun, Laurence Hyworth and Allan Pritchard (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989); Henry Power, 'Teares break off my verse: the Virgilian incompleteness of Abraham Cowley's *The Civil War*' in *Translation and Literature* Vol. 16 No. 2 141–159 (2007), pp. 141–143.

The idealised and exaggerated description and praise used by King and the author of *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparalleled Unsoldierly Murder* are, however, comparatively rare, as the writers seek to use the elegy in a more polemical manner, and the use of panegyric serves, as in the memorials to Essex, to highlight the sins of their enemies. In the two hundred lines or so of *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparalleled Unsoldierly Murder*, no more than thirty are used to praise the dead men. The bulk of the elegy is used to denounce Fairfax and the parliamentary forces and to express from the opening lines a sense of outrage and injustice:

Though all the Trophies Rebels can bring in,
Are but successful guilt and prosperous sin:
And each defeat their savage heat can buy,
But outrage be, and highway victory (A2r)

The evocation of violence and anger suggested by the references to ‘sin’ and to ‘savage heat’ recurs throughout the elegy. The supporters of Parliament are not merely rebels: they ‘are sunken and falne, have stain’d their Name, | Things beneath Rebels, balefull Annals shame’ (A2v). There is repeated, vituperative use of insults and terms of abuse, as well as a refusal to see Parliamentarians as people (they are ‘things’). Fairfax is portrayed as a ‘Traytour’ (A2v), and a ‘deliberate Cannibal’ (A3r) and the poet addresses him directly, accusing him of ‘tyranny’ which ‘alone belongs to you | To slaughter Men and expectations too’ (A3v).

The move away from panegyric to open and vitriolic attack makes *An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparalleled Unsoldierly Murder Committed at Colchester* overtly propagandistic in its call for revenge and ‘justice’, though it also retains some of the features of elegy. The survival of elegy as a genre is, however, put under immense strain in King’s ‘An Elegy on Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle’, which was not written in the immediate aftermath of the events in Colchester, as can be seen in the explicit reference to the death of Thomas Rainsborough two months later. It was not published but it is likely that

it circulated privately among largely sympathetic readers: Royalists and those of mainly higher social status.⁷⁶ It moves rapidly to sustained political attack in which the royalist case against Parliament and the army is rehearsed. King states Lucas and Lisle were ‘murther’d in cold blood’ (l. 42), and revisits the argument over the terms of surrender, which would have been familiar to his audience: ‘For by a Treaty they entangled are, | And Rendring up to Mercy is the Snare’. He refers to Parliament, the Army and Fairfax as religious hypocrites, describing them as ‘their Saintships’ (ll. 59–62), prefiguring an extended attack on them, which is sustained throughout the rest of the poem. This supports Crum’s argument that ‘satire usurps the greatest part’ of the poem. It attacks the hypocrisy of those who claim to fight for freedom and true religion, whilst unleashing mayhem and anarchy. They are the ‘wretched Agents for a Kingdoms fall; | Who yet yourselves the Modell Army call’ (ll. 75–76) and are responsible for all the ills of the kingdom and the war: ‘Murthers and Rapes, threats of Disease and Dearth, / From You as [from] the proper Spring take birth’ (ll. 141–143). Like the author of *Englands Sad Elegie* six years earlier, he links the breakdown of law and order described in these lines to those denying King Charles’s right to rule. His tone, however, is accusatory, and far removed from the sense of despair and bewilderment expressed by S.H. As Crum comments, ‘King found it possible to believe almost anything discreditable to the other side’.⁷⁷

King is making a direct appeal to a Royalist audience by class, linking Parliament and the Army to growing social disorder, and the breakdown of proper hierarchy. They are associated with lower class revolt and described as ‘Levellers’ (l. 168) who take their inspiration from the leaders of the peasants’ revolt, Wat Tyler and Jack Straw ‘whose principle was murther’ (ll. 163–165), motifs he was to further develop in his post-regicide

⁷⁶ ODNB, *King* <<https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/15564>> [accessed 5th March 2022].

⁷⁷ Crum, in Henry King, *The Poems* p. 208.

elegies. Fairfax is presented as betraying his own and King's class, as King claims that 'had that Sense of Honour still Surviv'd | Which Fairfax from his Ancestors deriv'd' (ll.120-121) he would not have acted as he did. King is reflecting Royalists' feelings of despair, betrayal and rage back to them and affirming them as legitimate, using his verse to shore up his own side, and to give them comfort and moral and political affirmation in the face of defeat. He is also using what is ostensibly elegy to offer some hope of vengeance. Having acknowledged Parliament's victory, which has made them 'Masters of the ill You meant' (l. 154), he finishes the poem with an invocation to the ruin of Colchester, which will act as 'The Monuments of their base Cruelty' (l. 316). King invokes memory to assert the need for revenge. However, his call for vengeance is ineffectual, dwelling more on the cruelties of the past than future possibilities, and a sense of despair and loss also haunts the work. While Smith's description of it as 'an unusual, rasping war poem' has much resonance, it doesn't entirely encompass the desperation it conveys.⁷⁸

The desire for revenge by both Parliamentarians and Royalists is reflected in the contested memorialisation of Thomas Rainsborough, and much royalist propaganda began to identify Rainsborough as the author of Lucas and Lisle's deaths, as they elevated the two men to the status of martyrs. Fairfax had enjoyed solid support from Parliament, and he stressed he acted on the advice of a 'Counsell of Warre of the chief Officers both of the Country Forces and the Army' (A2r), which included both Henry Ireton and Rainsborough. Indeed, Hyde, writing many years later, blamed Ireton for the deaths, commenting that he 'swayed the general, and was on all occasions of an unmerciful and bloody nature'.⁷⁹ There were, however, considerable advantages to blaming Rainsborough for the deaths of Lucas and Lisle. There was controversy over the circumstances of his death, with Royalists

⁷⁸ Smith, *Literature and Revolution* p. 287.

⁷⁹ Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 548–550. Hyde, *The History* Vol. 4 p. 389.

claiming they merely intended to kidnap him, and Parliament that it was underhand and that such dishonourable behaviour could be expected of the Royalists. Adrian Tinniswood concludes, on the basis of accounts by both Royalist Lieutenant Paulden and the Parliamentarian author of the anonymous ‘Letter from Doncaster’, that it was ‘more of a cock up than a planned assassination’.⁸⁰ However, Rainsborough’s connections with the Levellers and the more radical elements in the army and his intervention in the debates at Putney were well known and detested by Royalists.⁸¹ Linking him to the deaths of Lucas and Lisle was an effective way of deflecting the dispute over his death.⁸²

King explicitly connects the events at Colchester with Lucas’s aristocratic refusal to treat with Rainsborough at Berkeley Castle in 1645, suggesting that this slight provoked Rainsborough to revenge: ‘Lucas elder cause of quarrel Knew | From whence his Critical Misfortune grew’ (ll. 237–239). Characteristically for King’s presentation of rebels, Rainsborough is identified as one of the lower classes with ‘Rogues and Rebels’ with whom Lucas ‘disdain’d to Treat’ (l. 242); he was in fact part of an extended, prosperous family of merchants, traders and naval men that in previous years had served the monarchy.⁸³ As the pressure mounted for a trial of Charles I, King is clearly attempting to reinforce royalist defence of the monarchy and the established order, even as they faced defeat. From here, it is a simple step to move away from elegiac sentiment and to justify Rainsborough’s death in polemical terms, presenting him as a rebel and his death as justice served:

Nor could he an impending Judgement shun,
Who did to this with so much fervor run,

⁸⁰ A letter from Doncaster’, *Packets of Letters from Scotland and the North Parts of England*, no. 34 (7th November 1648) ESTC P1054; Thomas Paulden, *Pontefract Castle. An Account of how it was taken: And how General Rainsborough was surprised in his Quarters at Doncaster, Anno 1648* (1702) ESTC T160621; Tinniswood, *The Rainborowes* pp. 280, 283–284.

⁸¹ Geoffrey Robertson, *The Levellers: The Putney Debates* (London and New York: Verso, 2007), pp. 61–104.

⁸² ‘Brady, ‘Dying With Honour’ p. 23.

⁸³ Tinniswood, *The Rainborowes* Chapters 3, 12.

When late himself, to quit that bloody stain,
Was, midst his Armed Guards, from Pomfret slain. (ll. 247–50)

King ignores the elegiac convention of appropriate respect for the dead here, and ‘Judgement’ implies that not only earthly but also divine justice led to Rainsborough’s death, a key strand in royalist propaganda that reinforced the presentation of Lucas and Lisle as martyrs. The play *The Famous Tragedie of Charles I*, published after the king’s death, builds on this, portraying Rainsborough, like Macbeth confronting the ghost of Banquo (*Macbeth*, Act III, Scene 4), as eternally damned and haunted by his guilt as he ‘beheld the Ghosts of *Lucas* and of *Lisle*, all full of wounds staring just now upon me, there, there, dost thou see nothing?’ (F3r).⁸⁴

The recurrent portrayals of Rainsborough in hell by Royalists suggests how far writers had moved away from a sense of respect for the dead as they bent elegy to their uses. The pamphlet *An Ironicall Expostulation* illustrates the mix of genres memorialists drew on. It contains a mocking celebration of the death, in October 1648, of Richard Warner, Mayor of London, two epitaphs and ‘A Dialogicall brief Discourse between Rainsborough and Charon’. The dialogue is unequivocal in its condemnation of Rainsborough: he is in hell, and Charon tells him even the Devil ‘abjures all you that Levell’ (A4r), again casting him as a rebel and social inferior.⁸⁵ The ballad *Colonell Rainborowes Ghost* also draws on images of judgement and guilt. Rainsborough, speaking from beyond the grave, admits his ghost is ‘troubled’ (A1r) and that he was responsible for the deaths of Lucas and Lisle and he ‘would not give the Generall [ie Fairfax] rest | till he their deaths had seal’d’ (A1r). This leads to an acknowledgement that his death was just, as he asks for forgiveness: ‘Sweet Iesus Christ forgive my s [...] | For by my meanes those worthies fell’ (A1r). His abjection here reinforces royalist convictions that their cause was God’s cause, and that the guilty would pay for their

⁸⁴ *The Famous Tragedie of Charles I* (1649) ESTC R3816.

⁸⁵ *An Ironicall Expostulation* (London, 1648) ESTC R205800.

sins.⁸⁶

The use of elegy by Royalists for polemic is fuelled by despair, rage and the prospect of final defeat and this adds to the intensity of their calls for revenge, and their elevation of martyrs such as Lucas and Lisle – calls which reach their heights following the regicide in January 1649. These moves were partly mirrored by supporters of Rainsborough in their memorial writings, including *An Elegie upon The Death of that Renowned Heroe Coll. Rainsborrow* by Thomas Alleyn; the anonymous *A Newe Elegie*; T.J.'s *An Elegie*; *In Memoriam Thomae Rainsborough*, which is prefaced by the epitaph on his tomb; and a prose account of his death, *A full and exact relation of the horrid murder committed upon the body of col. Rainsborough*.⁸⁷ Panegyric and idealisation are extensively drawn on in many of these writings on Rainsborough, as writers use them to contest royalist representations of the Colonel. Thomas Alleyn's *An Elegie* is perhaps the most conventional of the elegies and is largely devoted to praising Rainsborough and lamenting his loss. There is extensive use of panegyric in *A New Elegie*, drawing on images of light, with its opening lines 'See thou that starre, which newly has its station | In bright Coronae's heavenly Constellation' (A1r), as well as more direct reference to his role as a soldier and patriot in the Civil War: 'Brave Rainsborough great in Warres Command' (A1r). *In Memoriam* uses more directly partisan praise of Rainsborough, and the elegy itself is preceded by an epitaph:

He that made Kings, Lords, Commons, Judges shake
Cites and Committees quake
He that fought nought but His dear Countries good,
And seald their right with His last blood;

⁸⁶ *Colonell Rainsborowes Ghost Or A true relation of the manner of his Death, who was murdered in his bedchamber at Doncaster* (London, 1648) ESTC R211071.

⁸⁷ Thomas Alleyn, *An Elegie upon the Death of that Renowned Heroe Coll. Rainsborrow* (London, 1648) ESTC R211070; *A full and exact relation of the horrid murder committed upon the body of col. Rainsborough* (1648) ESTC R205507; *A New Elegie In Memory of the Right Valiant, and most Renowned Souldier, Col Rainsborough, late Admirall of the narrow Seas* (London, 1648) ESTC R211069; *In memoriam* (London, 1648) ESTC R211066; T.J., *An Elegie Upon the Honourable Colonel Thomas Rainsbrough, butchered at Doncaster* (London, 1648) ESTC R211064.

Rainsborough, The Just, The Valiant, and True
Here bids the Noble Levellers adieu. (A1r)

The reference to the 'Noble Levellers' and the listing of 'Kings, Lords, Commons, Judges' clearly signals Rainsborough's radicalism and his refusal to be intimidated by traditional hierarchies. Both *A New Elegie* and *In Memoriam* use such praise to present him as the archetypal man of honour, and a hero who sacrificed himself in his country's cause. References to sacrifice, to wounds and to blood clearly cast Rainsborough as a martyr and a Christ like figure, a motif central to elegies mourning Charles I after the regicide. The writer of *In Memoriam* is explicit: 'Nor would He yield, till in the street he dyes | With twice ten wounds, the Armies Sacrifice' (A1r). As in the elegies to Lucas and Lisle, elegy is used for lament, drawing on praise and the respect due to the dead. It also serves the purpose of allowing writers to use exaggeration and the sense of loss to move to attack their opponents and to vow revenge, mirroring the accusations of murder made by Royalists. Thus, Alleyn states Rainsborough was 'most Traiterously Murthered'(A1r). He attributes his death to 'those bloody Caines' (A1r), as does the writer of *A New Elegie*, who also compares Rainsborough's death to Abel's at the hands of Cain (A1r), the archetypal fratricide. Explicit biblical reference such as that used by Alleyn and others clearly underlines the desire of supporters of Parliament to use elegy and memorial writing to parade their religious commitments, and to counter accusations of religious hypocrisy, such as King's scornful 'their Saintships' (l. 61). In addition, such counter accusation is used to suggest that damnation is the fate of those who murdered Rainsborough, and Brady is right to comment that 'Parliamentarian writers maintained the propaganda value of Rainsborough's death' and insisted on his sacrificial status: 'Like Lucas and Lisle, he would be even more effective as an example of his enemies' treachery than he was as a soldier'.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ Brady, 'Dying with Honour' p. 26.

However, polemical attacks on Royalists and calls for revenge are not the only use Rainsborough's defenders have for elegy. *In Memoriam* clearly seeks to mobilise the memory of Rainsborough to intervene in the increasingly impassioned clashes within Parliament and the Army on the future of the king and the post-war settlement. There has been much discussion over the final debates and decisions that led to Pride's Purge and the arrest and exclusion of members of Parliament and, subsequently, to the trial and execution of Charles I, with historians disagreeing as to whether Charles' death was the inevitable conclusion.⁸⁹ Gentles argues that the 'political legacy of Colchester was a deepened conviction on the part of most of the higher officers who had attended the siege that the king, as the ultimate author of the suffering and bloodshed that they and their comrades had undergone, must be brought to account for their crimes'.⁹⁰ In October 1648 Henry Ireton drafted what became *The Remonstrance of his Excellency Thomas Fairfax, Lord General of the Parliaments Forces and of the General Council of Offices of November 1648*, which called for the King to be put on trial, and for some form of 'exemplary justice... in capital punishment upon the principal author and some prime instruments in our late wars'.⁹¹ Rainsborough's death hardened the mood further. Following it, the short-lived newsbook *Mercurius Militaris or The Armies Schout* 4 called for 'the head of Tyrants' and a letter to Parliament from soldiers, *A full and exact relation of the horrid murder committed upon the body of col. Rainsborough*, calls for Parliament to 'bring those to condign punishment which do justly deserve it.' (A3v).⁹²

⁸⁹ Hirst, *Authority and Conflict* pp. 284-285, 286-287; Manning, *The Crisis*, p. 23; Rees, *Leveller Revolution* pp. 262 – 263; Underdown, *Pride's Purge* pp. 97, 100-101, 108, 208.

⁹⁰ Gentles, *New Model Army*, p 257.

⁹¹ *The Remonstrance of his Excellency Thomas Fairfax, Lord General of the Parliaments Forces and of the General Council of Offices of November 1648* (London, 1648) p.64.

⁹² *A full and exact relation of the horrid murder committed upon the body of col. Rainsborough* (1648) ESTC R205507; Braddick, *God's Fury* pp. 560-561; *Mercurius Militaris or The Armies Schout* 4 (London, 1648) ESTC P1193; *An Anatomy of a radical English Newspaper: The Moderate* ed. by Laurent Currelly (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017).

The anger Rainsborough's death aroused found expression in the numbers of elegies published in his memory as well as in his funeral procession, which moved from Tottenham High Cross to Wapping where he was buried and consisted of 'fifty or sixty coaches of women, and men on horseback, numbering around 3000'.⁹³ It was widely reported both by the radical press, including the Leveller newspaper *The Moderate*, and by hostile accounts in the Royalist papers. Gentles describes it as an 'unofficial revolutionary pageant' like that of Leveller Private Robert Lockyer, who was executed six months later following his part in the Bishopsgate Mutiny. He further argues that as such the funeral is 'a gesture of defiance against the established powers. It proclaims that even though a valued warrior has been struck down, his comrades are not demoralised by his loss. On the contrary, they take inspiration from his martyrdom'.⁹⁴ Such an interpretation is borne out by the adoption of Rainsborough's sea-green regimental colours by the Leveller movement. Royalists in contrast wrote satirically of the 'Sea-green order' (A1r).⁹⁵ It is also reflected in many of the elegies and other memorial writings to Rainsborough, and the way they draw on his death to pursue a radical agenda that goes beyond that of the 'grandees'.

Elegists to Rainsborough call for action in a clear rebuke to the Army Grandees and to Parliament. They did so in the context of calls for justice from regiments, such as that from army headquarters at St. Albans.⁹⁶ The author of *A Newe Elegie* makes a direct appeal to the 'worthies, high grave Senators of State' a few weeks before Pride's Purge:

⁹³ Braddick, p. 549; Rees, *Leveller Revolution* pp. 265 – 270; ODNB, *Thomas Rainsborowe* < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/23020> [accessed 3rd February 2021]; Tinniswood, *The Rainsborowes* pp. 285–289.

⁹⁴ Gentles, 'Political Funerals during the English Revolution' in *London and the Civil War* ed. Stephen Porter (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1996) pp. 207, 217.

⁹⁵ *The gallant Rights, Privileges, Solemn Institutions of the Sea-Green Order* (1646) ESTC R211075; Lindsey German and John Rees, *A People's History of London* (London and New York: Verso, 2012), p. 60.

⁹⁶ *A Remonstrance of his excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax Lord Generall of the Parliaments Forces and of the generall councill of officers held at St Albans the 16 of November* (1648) ESTC R200486; Rees, *Leveller Revolution*, pp. 276-277.

Yet stand upright, let not be said for shame,
That now you have lost a member, 'yare groan lame.
Beware the foxes who have hurt you more
Than Lyons, Tygers, or the Bear, or Bore (A1r)

While addressing the 'senators' respectfully, the tone is challenging and mistrustful.

The writer doubts their leaders' capacity and desire to withstand the wiles of the cunning royalist 'foxes' or of their opponents, the Presbyterians, perhaps echoing Aesop's Fables in his use of 'foxes' to express his concerns. The message is even clearer in F.T.'s *An Elegie*:

What if Heaven purpos'd Rainsboroughs fall to be
A prop for Englands dying Liberties
And did in Love thus suffer one to fall
That Charles by treaty might not ruine all.
For who'l expect that Treaty should doe good
Whose longer date commenc't in Rainsbroughs blood.
See noble Fairfax and bold Cromwel see
What honours are prepared for thee and thee.
Conclude a peace with Charles; thus you shall ride
Triumphant, with your robes of Scarlet dide
In your own dearest blood (A1r)

Rainsborough is explicitly presented as a martyr, his death and the sacrifice of his blood ordained by God to save the radical cause, which is threatened by the prospect of coming to a deal with Charles I. F.T. could not be blunter in his use of the elegy, defining any compromise or deal with the King as the act of traitors who will drown in the blood of those they betray. Only a few weeks later, on 6th December 1648, Colonel Pride purged the Commons, and the scene was set for Charles' trial and execution. Lament and praise for Rainsborough finds consolation not in tears and a quietist acceptance of God's will, but in the continuation of a political argument.

Conclusion

Writers in the 1640s inherited a tradition of public elegy and memorial writing that was never simply about mourning or lamenting the dead. They could draw on well-established conventions of idealisation and panegyric, as well as on traditional Christian and Protestant messages concerning the transience of earthly life, the injunction not to speak ill of

the dead and the need to accept God's will. They also inherited a genre whose flexibility made it open to other genres. However, this balance between the performance of grief and more polemical uses of memorial writing could potentially be uneasy, as Brady rightly suggests, arguing that the 'combinations of praise and criticism, conformity and distinction are just two of the many contradictions which can wrench elegies out of their generic shape. Elegies are at once idealistic representations which seek to immortalise their subjects, and critical responses to the decadence of the age'.⁹⁷ As the 1640s progress this balance becomes ever more uneasy.

In the early 1640s, as Civil War and the fracturing of the nation that it led to grew closer, elegies largely retain their 'generic shape', while drawing on other genres such as those of epic and tragedy. The writings by Parliamentarians memorialising Strafford and Wiseman praise the dead, evoking classical and heroic images. Even as they contest Strafford's political stance, embedding their critique within their writing, they avoid outright condemnation of the man. Royalist Denham is freer in his use of the genre, condemning those responsible for Strafford's death more overtly, but his tone remains muted.

Several factors underlie writers' general acceptance of generic boundaries. One of these may have been fear of censorship or punishment. However more importantly, few, if any, of the writers would have anticipated the course of the war and the fatal shock it dealt to notions of the Commonweal, however fiercely divided they were in their political sympathies. Royalists might deplore rebellion and the attacks on the established church, and express their outrage, as did S.H. in *Englands Sad Elegie*, but in the early 1640s they did not anticipate the regicide and the establishment of the Commonwealth as a possible outcome. Parliament proclaimed its enemy to be not the king but his advisers, and for many this remained their guiding principle. The subsequent splits in Parliament in 1645 and 1646

⁹⁷ Brady, *English Funerary Elegy* p. 2.

revolved around the conduct of the war and what kind of eventual settlement could be reached with the monarchy, with few arguing for a more radical outcome.

Nonetheless, increasing political polarisation was leading to a more overtly propagandistic use of elegy and memorial writing, as the elegies to Essex by parliamentary sympathisers and the elaborate funeral arrangements in whose context they were written and published demonstrate. Mixed with conventional panegyric on Essex's stature as soldier and statesman are sharp attacks on the Independents, which at times move beyond the bounds of elegy and memorial writing to outright polemic and the satirising of religious dissent. Praise is still extensively used but becomes more double-edged as writers use it explicitly to draw out a contrast between the dead man and his enemies. From the royalist side, King's elegy to Essex, while outwardly conforming to elegiac convention, has an underlying sense of rage to it, and draws on elements of satire even as it suggests Essex's status as flawed tragic hero. The balance Brady identifies in elegy is under some pressure, though ultimately writers demonstrate its flexibility and resilience in continuing to hold disparate elements together.

As we move into 1648 and the aftermath of the Second Civil War, the uses of polemic, satire and diatribe are such that elegy as it was conventionally understood can be seen in some instances to be approaching breaking point. As both royalist and parliamentary writers seize overtly upon the deaths of the Lucas and Lisle and Rainsborough as tools in a propaganda war, the outburst of memorial writings points to a potential breakdown in literary and elegiac convention. Writers on both sides sought to paint their enemies in the darkest possible colours, and to create a sense of martyrdom and sacrifice around their fallen heroes in ways that would unify their supporters. While drawing in varying degrees on idealising and panegyric motifs, these writings are highly polemical, with satirical and verbally violent attacks on their opponents and the perceived perpetrators of the men's deaths. Praise is present, but is often cursory, and is primarily used to move into

polemic. There is scant regard for the religious injunction not to speak ill of the dead, and much of the writing is devoted to calls for revenge.

Nonetheless, elegy and memorial writing survive, albeit at times in a distorted form. If the death of supposedly exemplary men creates martyrs who are both celebrated and mourned, it also gives readers hope their sacrifice is not in vain. For some that hope is in a new society; for others it is the hope that revenge will come. If there is rage and despair, there is also grief and lament for a lost world and lost ideals: as Sharpe argues ‘the war, especially when it proved to be more than a temporary outburst of passion, shattered the ideas of wholeness and harmony. The commonweal as one community was no more’.⁹⁸ The resilience of elegy is also found in its embrace of its contradictions, and its ability to draw on and absorb a range of genres. The next chapter will consider two collections of elegies and other memorial writings published in the wake of the execution of Charles I and will discuss the extent to which even as flexible a genre as elegy survives the shock of the regicide.

⁹⁸ Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England* p. 118.

Chapter 2

Post-regicide elegy: blood, martyrdom and revenge

This afternoon, instead of dreaming of Deepden, I was wondering how a man who wished to do right could act so unjustly and unwisely as Charles the First sometimes did; and I thought what a pity it was that, with his integrity and conscientiousness, he could see no further than the prerogatives of the crown. If he had but been able to look to a distance and see how what they called the spirit of the age was tending! Still I like Charles – I respect him – I pity him, poor murdered king! Yes, his enemies were the worst: they shed blood they had not right to shed. How dared they kill him! (Helen Burns in Charlotte Bronte: *Jane Eyre*)¹

Introduction

The dramatic execution of King Charles I on 30th January 1649 generated an extensive and complex memorial literature by Royalists in the months following the regicide. This included many elegies mourning Charles, some in the form of single broadsheets, others in collections, mixed at times with prose and elegies to other royalist ‘martyrs’ such as Arthur Lord Capel.² This chapter asks how writers in two collections, the anonymous *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*, which has been attributed to Royalist poet John Cleveland, use elegy and how they draw on the elegiac traditions that had developed over the

¹ Charlotte Bronte, *Jane Eyre* ed. Stevie Davies (London: Penguin Books, 2006), p. 89

² *A coffin for King Charles a crowne for Cromwell: a pit for the people* (London, 1649) ESTC R211109; *A flattering elegie upon the death of King Charles the cleane contrary way: with a parallel something significant* ([London?], 1649) ESTC R15469; *An Elegie on the meekest of men, the most glorious of princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles I* (London, 1649) ESTC R15458; *An elegy, sacred to the memory of our most gracious sovereign Lord King Charles who was most barbarously murdered by the sectaries of the army* (1649) ESTC R211198; *An Elegy upon the death of King Charles* (London, 1649) ESTC R38485; *An Elegie upon the Death of Our Dread Sovereign Lord King Charls the Martyr* (London, 1649) ESTC R211177; *Royall meditations for Easter. Or Enthuziasmes on the death and passion of our late Lord and sovraine King Charles the First, of sacred memory* ([n.p.], 1650) ESTC R182934; Henry King, ‘A Deepe Groane, fetch’d at the Funerall of that incomparable and Glorious Monarch. Charles the First, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland &c. pp. 110–117 and ‘An Elegy Upon The Most Incomparable K. Charles the First’, pp. 117–132 in *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

Civil War period.³ The chapter considers the extent to which both collections were shaped in the context of what printers and writers found to be a growing and diverse market that had developed in the wake of the regicide. At the centre of this market was *Eikon Basilike*, the portrait – or myth – of Charles the martyr, which the king created in his ostensibly personal account of his life and kingship and whose frontispiece depicts him ‘in his solitude and sufferings’. *Eikon Basilike* and its pervasive influence on the elegies to the king is examined below.⁴

The elegies examined here are shaped by the sense of shock and disbelief engendered by the regicide, a shock which went beyond avowed Royalists. There has been extended debate among historians around the intentions of those mounting the trial, and what outcome they sought, but there was certainly huge unease and few judges and peers had agreed to serve on the court that tried the King.⁵ Reactions to his death were mixed: one witness quoted by Royalist John Gauden, the probable co-author of *Eikon Basilike*, stated that Charles’s death was followed by a groan, ‘so grievous and doleful a cry as I never heard before’ (B4v).⁶ Michael Braddick notes the uneasy reactions of Ralph Josselin, an Essex Puritan and supporter of Parliament who had opposed an ‘easy settlement’ with the King, though he also

³ John Cleveland, *Monumentum Regale: or a tombe, erected for that incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the First King of Great Britane, France and* (London, s.n.1649) ESTC R208853; *Vaticinium Votivum or, Palæmon's prophetick prayer* [1649. London, s.n.] ESTC R204106.

⁴ Charles I/John Gauden, *Eikon Basilike The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty In His Solitudes and Sufferings* ed. by Philip Knachel (London and New York: Cornell University Press: 1949 and 1966). Subsequent references to the text will be to this edition.

⁵ John Adamson, ‘The Frightened Junto’ *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 36–70; David R Como, *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 6; Clive Holmes, *Why was Charles I Executed?* (London and New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2006); Clive Holmes, ‘The Trial and Execution of Charles I’ in *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 2 June 2010, 289–316; Sean Kelsey, ‘A Riposte to Clive Holmes: The Trial and Execution of Charles I’ in *History*, August 2018, 525–544 [accessed 20th June 2020]; Sean Kelsey, ‘The Trial of Charles I’ in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 118, No. 477 583–616 (2003).

⁶ John Gauden, *The Bloody Court or Fatal Tribunal* ([London?], 1660) ESTC R225669.

points to those who strongly supported the regicide and argues that opinion was mixed.⁷

Derek Hirst in contrast, cites Colonel Harrison, who greeted the 30th January as ‘the day, God’s own day, wherein he is coming forth in glory in the world’.⁸ As the epigraph to this chapter suggests, the debate and the passions aroused by Charles’s trial and execution were still alive two centuries later. For Royalists in 1649 his death generated despair and rage, and this shapes the elegies to the king, notwithstanding significance political and tactical differences between strands of royalism, both during the Civil Wars and in the period of the regicide and its aftermath.

This chapter considers how elegists and other writers reflected the rage and despair Royalists experienced in the wake of the regicide. It also explores the extent to which they could or would reflect feuds and shifts in royalist thinking. Groupings or factions around the king have been customarily labelled in terms of sharp opposites such as the ‘war party’ or the ‘peace party’, and historians have referred to Royalists as being either ‘absolutist’ or ‘constitutional’. Cust, following David Scott, suggests that such a degree of consistency does not accord with either individual responses or patterns of behaviour and that ‘leading courtiers and counsellors were constantly shifting in their alliances and reformulating their advice’.⁹ Jason McElligott and David Smith rightly warn that it is important to ‘move beyond prescriptive definitions of royalism – what people must have thought or believed to qualify for membership of the Royalist party – in favour of a descriptive definition which considers what actual Royalists thought, believed or argued’.¹⁰ The extent to which these disagreements

⁷ Michael Braddick, *God’s Fury, England’s Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Penguin Books, 2009; first published Allen Lane: 2008), pp. 578–80.

⁸ Derek Hirst *Authority and Conflict: England 1603 – 1658* (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1986), pp. 254-255.

⁹ Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2005), pp. 361–2.

¹⁰ Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) pp. 1-12; David Scott, ‘Rethinking Royalist Politics’, *The English Civil War* ed. John Adamson (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2008).

and debates among Royalists and their divided attitudes to the king himself and to his actions at different points in the war are elided or faintly reflected in royalist writing following the regicide, as they drew together in bleak solidarity, is discussed here.

There had been tensions among Royalists in the months leading up to the king's execution, reflecting unease over Charles's actions. Sean Kelsey has traced the disquiet of Royalists, including loyalists such as Edward Hyde, over negotiations in Newport in the autumn of 1648 and the concessions made, however insincerely, by the king.¹¹ In addition, their unease arguably extended, albeit cautiously and by implication, to a consideration of the advantages of Charles's potential martyrdom and the subsequent accession to the throne of the Prince of Wales. The future Archbishop of Canterbury William Sancroft wrote to his father that 'there is [now] nothing left for the king and his party in the world but the glory of suffering well, and in a good cause', while journalist Marchamont Needham in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* stated the choice as between 'No-King, or a New'.¹² Lois Potter argues that Royalists were ambivalent, suggesting that while they 'knew exactly what they wanted: Charles I, and, after his death, Charles II' it also 'sometimes seems as if his own party was unconsciously willing the king to die'. Royalists inevitably closed ranks following the regicide, and while they may have experienced what Potter describes as (unacknowledged) tensions, pulled between the shock and despair drawn on by elegists and a harder headed view of political realities, these divisions were publicly submerged in the wake of the king's execution.¹³ For Royalists, Charles's path to martyrdom created a wide scope not only for mourning the king but for pursuing their enemies. Nonetheless, these tensions are echoed in

¹¹ Sean Kelsey, 'Royalists and the succession, 1648 – 1649' in *Royalists and Royalism* eds. McElligott and Smith, pp. 193, 200 – 206, 211.

¹² Marchamont Needham, *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 26 December 1648 – 9th January 1649 ESTC P1293; William Sancroft in H. Carey (ed.) *Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646 – 1652*, Vol 11, p. 103.

¹³ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature 1641 – 1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. xiii, 175.

the elegies examined here, not least in the calls on Charles II to claim his throne and avenge his martyred father.

The impact of the regicide on elegy has been at the centre of critical discussion and the collections of elegies explored here will be evaluated in this light. Nigel Smith's argument that the elegies on Charles 'went beyond all rules of the form and disbelief was a dominant theme' is central to this debate. Disbelief and grief are central to the post-regicide elegies; so, however, are rage, hatred for the regicides and desire for revenge, as well as more traditional elements of elegy such as eulogy and lament, with the elevation of Charles as a Christ-like martyr. Consideration therefore needs to be given to whether post-regicide elegies are so overlaid with rage and hatred for the regicides that they 'could not sustain their traditional generic boundaries'.¹⁴ The boundaries of elegy, notwithstanding its flexibility as a genre, were already under pressure, as analysis of those commemorating Lucas and Lisle and Rainsborough examined in the previous chapter demonstrated, with writers increasingly drawing on elements of polemic and satire accompanied by hyper-masculine threats of revenge. As royalist elegists faced the trauma of regicide, the question of whether and how they could maintain any balance between political partisanship and grief is central.

Joad Raymond's argument that 'the atoms of literary genres were repeatedly fragmented and reassembled in response to traumatic events' is a useful corrective to Smith's view that the boundaries of the genre are overwhelmed in the wake of the regicide.¹⁵ It points to the complex ways Royalists sought to use elegy for a variety of purposes, but also the sense of disorientation they experienced as they sought to process their collective sense of disbelief, and the trauma they experienced in the face of the regicide and the apparent total

¹⁴ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 287-88, 293.

¹⁵ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* (Cambridge University Press, 2003) p. 214.

defeat of the royalist cause. At the same time, political calculations were at play: there was a need to offer solidarity and perhaps comfort to Royalists who, whatever political and tactical tensions had existed between them during the wars, shared this sense of shock. In addition, longer term considerations involved thoughts of both divine and earthly vengeance, and the possible hope represented by the new king in exile, Charles II. This complex mix undoubtedly created tensions for writers, as Andrew Lacey comments:

Yet how many must have been aware of the tensions evident in their work? How to describe the indescribable, think the unthinkable? How to craft language into an acceptable memorial, and how to be simultaneously prostrate with grief, ravished by the contemplation of Charles' heavenly virtues, and full of hatred for his enemies and ready for vengeance in the cause of Charles II?¹⁶

The numbers of elegies produced following the regicide reflect these tensions and uneasily meld political calculation with expressions of grief and outrage. Some were published as single broadsheets; others in collections such as the ones explored in this chapter, mixed at times with prose and elegies to other royalist 'martyrs'. Many, if not most, are anonymous, but in some cases the author may be identified, albeit tentatively. Some only existed in manuscript: as Smith observes 'many [royalist] elegies were not published for obvious reasons of discretion, and many never found their way into print'.¹⁷ However, their proliferation in print form also suggests that printers and writers were aware of a large and diversifying market for memorabilia, evident in the numerous editions of *Eikon Basilike*, and of the need to appeal to different audiences in terms of both price and differences in tone and content, though, as discussed below, it is unclear how much control may have been asserted by writers themselves in this process.

¹⁶ Andrew Lacey, 'Elegies and Commemorative Verse in Honour of Charles the Martyr, 1649 – 1660' in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* ed. Jason Peacey (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 229.

¹⁷ Smith, *Literature and Revolution* p. 290.

The regicide and *Eikon Basilike*: history, myth and propaganda

The influence of *Eikon Basilike* on post-regicide memorial writing is pervasive, and this section considers the factors that allowed Royalists to draw on it so successfully in their elegies and helped them to largely elide differences and tensions within the royalist camp. Nancy Klein Maguire argues that the regicide offered ‘unique polemical opportunities’ which ‘allowed both Royalists and Parliamentarians to turn a political event into an emotional and theatrical occasion’, and writers on all sides of the political divides produced a variety of printed material including pamphlets and sermons, as well as elegies and other memorial writing.¹⁸ *Eikon Basilike* was at the centre of the intense propaganda war Royalists waged against the new regime, a war that began before Charles’ death and continued not only in the immediate wake of the execution but into the Interregnum and Restoration periods.

The power of *Eikon Basilike* as a weapon of propaganda is underlined by the attacks made on it by Parliamentarians as a forgery, and there has been much subsequent debate about its authorship, but most critics agree it was essentially a collaboration. Robert Wilcher notes that from as early as December 1642 Charles had already started writing parts of what became *Eikon Basilike* and had begun to consider his future. Writing to his cousin, the Marquis of Hamilton, he reflected on the possibilities that he might be ‘a Glorious King, or a Patient Martyr’.¹⁹ It seems the King was echoing in irony a letter of May 1641, apparently from Parliament, promising to make Charles ‘as great, as glorious and as potent a prince as any of his ancestors ever were’: as Potter observes, ‘few parliamentary statements were

¹⁸ Nancy Klein Maguire, ‘The Theatrical Mask/Masque of Politics: The Case of Charles I’ in *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 28, No.1 1–22 (1989), p. 16.

¹⁹ Robert Wilcher, ‘What Was the King's Book for? - The Evolution of 'Eikon Basilike', *The Yearbook of English Studies: Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658* 218–228 (1991), pp. 218–219.

repeated more frequently, and more bitterly, than this one'.²⁰ Some of Charles's writings were lost when his papers were captured at the battle of Naseby, as recounted by John Ashburnham, one of the king's attendants and courtiers and the probable author of *The Princely Pellican*, but they were returned to him sometime in the second half of 1647.²¹ Cust suggests it was in the autumn of 1648, during the negotiations at Newport, that Charles 'began a concerted effort to fashion an image of himself for posterity' and that he revised and corrected the manuscript of *Eikon Basilike* that Dr John Gauden had created.²² Philip Knachel, having reviewed the competing accounts of authorship concurs, concluding that it 'was based on a core of material which the King himself composed – and Gauden's manuscript was read and corrected by the King before going to press'.²³ Charles's influence cannot be doubted, and the image of the 'Martyr of the People', as he styled himself in *Eikon Basilike* and in the pre-execution speech attributed to him, gave elegists and other writers a potent myth to draw on.²⁴

Whatever the truth about its authorship, historians generally agree that *Eikon Basilike* was hugely successful in its portrayal of Charles as martyr. Nothing published by defenders of the regicide, including two tracts by John Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and *Eikonoklastes*, matched its influence.²⁵ Advance copies were available on the morning of the execution and thirty-five editions were published in 1649 alone. Knachel notes that by 4th February 1649 the first edition of 2000 copies had sold out for 'the outrageous sum of 15s' –

²⁰ Charles I quoted in Gilbert Burnet, *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald* (London, 1677), p. 203; Potter, *Secret Rites* p.173.

²¹ John Ashburnham [?], *The Princely Pellican* (London, 1649) ESTC R203211 pp 21–22.

²² Cust, *Charles I* p. 446.

²³ Knachel, in 'Introduction' to *Eikon Basilike* pp. xxxii.

²⁴ *King Charles his speech made upon the scaffold at Whitehall Gate, immediately before his execution, on Tuesday the 30. of Jan. 1648* (London, 1649) p. 6 ESTC R508023.

²⁵ John Milton, *Prose Works* Volume 3 (Menston England: Scholar Press, 1967), pp. 1–230.

a sum well beyond many.²⁶ Maguire notes that the ‘very wide price range – 2s 3d to 15s’ and that the numbers sold indicate ‘considerable exposure at least, and even the illiterate masses may have seen the frontispiece’.²⁷ Francis Madan’s survey of the publication history shows how the text was expanded with different editions.²⁸ David Harper notes ‘each edition varies from the others, as the work became less authorial and more a public re-imagining of the king as martyr’, though he challenges Elizabeth Skerpan Wheeler’s view that from ‘the start, the image was democratized’ and argues that specific additions, such as a poem by Royalist Francis Gregory, were consciously added in response to challenges to the authenticity of the text.²⁹ However, central to *Eikon Basilike* is an image of Charles based on his desire to present an idealised portrait of himself, justifying his actions during the Civil War and presenting ‘royalism’ as a single, unified endeavour in the face of a Parliament – or factions within it – that was bent from the start on destroying society. As Braddick argues, it ‘was by far the greatest propaganda success following the regicide’ and it is this image of Charles the martyr king and of Parliament as the bringer of social destruction, as popularised by *Eikon Basilike*, that is consistently evoked by elegists writing in the wake of the regicide.³⁰

The impact of *Eikon Basilike* was undoubtedly aided by the king’s performance at his trial and execution, with both him and his opponents conscious of the unprecedented nature of the roles they were enacting. Maguire has argued that the trial itself was set up as a ‘theatrical extravaganza’, in ‘an attempt, perhaps, to use theatrical ritual to legitimise the new

²⁶ Knachel, ‘Introduction’ xxxii.

²⁷ Maguire, ‘Theatrical Mask’ p. 22.

²⁸ Francis Madan, *A New Bibliography of The Eikon Basilike of Charles I* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1950) p. 116.

²⁹ David Harper, ‘Francis Gregory and the Defense of the King’s Book’ in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 106, No. 1 37–61 (2012), p.39; Elizabeth Skerpan Wheeler ‘Eikon Basilike and the rhetoric of self-representation’ in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* ed. by Thomas Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 122–124.

³⁰ Braddick, *God’s Fury* p. 580.

regime and to abolish the mystique of kingship’, and that the king responded by ‘quite consciously playing the role of the tragic hero during his trial and at the execution’.³¹ Historians have largely acknowledged Charles’s bravery and how well he played his part. Derek Hirst argues that the king’s demeanour at the trial and execution meant he ‘did far more for the cause of kingship than he had ever achieved during his life’. Richard Cust, in his measured account of Charles’s life, describes his ‘inspiring display of bravery and defiance’, while Blair Worden similarly suggests that in ‘his demeanour at the trial Charles achieved a kind of greatness’.³² Henry Ireton had argued in the Remonstrance of November 1648 that ‘the Person of the King may and shall be proceeded against in a way of justice for the blood spilt’.³³ Unsurprisingly, it is Charles’s blood-martyrdom and bravery that are reflected in the elegies discussed here, which, like *Eikon Basilike*, cast the parliamentary cause as a whole as illegitimate from its inception. This is reflected throughout the collections *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* and indeed in the mass of royalist elegies produced in 1649 and after.

A complex of publications

Vaticinium Votivum and *Monumentum Regale* are characterised by an ideological coherence which they share with other post-regicide elegies, and which draw on a shared set of motifs and themes. Both collections need to be considered in the context of networks connecting royalist writers and printers, which probably date back to collaboration during the early years of the Civil War, and which survived into the period of the regicide. Certainly, the collections explored here share some material with each other, as well as including items

³¹ Maguire, ‘Theatrical Mask’ p. 17.

³² Cust, *Charles I* p. 465; Derek Hirst, *England in Conflict: 1603 – 1660* (London: Edward Arnold 1999) pp. 245, 254-5; Blair Worden, *The English Civil Wars: 1640 – 1660* (London: Phoenix, 1988), p. 101.

³³ *A Remonstrance of his excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax Lord Generall of the Parliaments Forces and of the generall councill of officers* ESTC R200486 p. 61.

which were also published separately, as the table in Appendix 1 tracing these relationships shows. Many elegies are anonymous, but some writers can be identified, at least tentatively. As discussed above, the popularity of *Eikon Basilike* points to the existence of an expanding and diverse market for royalist elegies and other post-regicide memorabilia, which encouraged printers to publish both single broadsheets and collections. This leaves open the question as to how this sense of a growing and diverse audience may have shaped these collections.

A further issue to be considered is the extent to which printers collaborated with writers or with each other, and how this shapes volumes such as *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*. The overlaps between collections suggests informal networks may have been in operation and texts may have circulated in manuscript. In addition, printers may also have responded to the demand for memorial material and put together collections on their own initiative and for their own profit, though it will be argued that *Vaticinium Votivum* shows greater evidence of conscious internal organisation than *Monumentum Regale*, perhaps reflecting greater author/compiler involvement. Finally, the collections need to be considered in the light of a complex and well-established tradition that went back to the compilation of memorial writing into volumes, such as those dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney and Prince Henry, which Royalists drew on throughout the 1640s and 50s and beyond.

Arthur Marotti argues that for Royalists, the printed book ultimately ‘became a haven for their work and a sign of political resistance to the authority of those who had defeated the king’s forces’, despite some continuing prejudice in favour of limited, manuscript circulation. He further argues that ‘posthumous poetry, like funeral elegies, offered the opportunity to reinforce the political partisanship of poets, publishers and readers’ and that ‘from the mid 1640s through the 1650s collected editions of poets’ works as well as poetry anthologies

were largely a manifestation of Royalism'.³⁴ Evidence of the popularity of such collections among Royalists can be seen in the publication of the first edition of John Quarles' extended memorial volume, *Regale Lectum Miseriae Or A Kingly Bed of Misery*, in 1649 and of *The Princely Pellican*.³⁵ The latter mainly consists of a prose defence of the authenticity of *Eikon Basilike*, but includes elegies to Charles and to Arthur, Lord Capel, one of the three Royalist 'martyrs' executed in March 1649 along with the Earl of Holland and the Duke of Hamilton. Indeed, the narrative created by Royalists around the regicide survived and was used during the Protectorate in the 1650s and in the Restoration period, with the reprinting of volumes such as *Regale Lectum Miseriae* in both 1658/1659 and 1679, and the publication in 1660 of *Virtus Rediviva Or a Panegyrick on the Late King Charls the I* by Thomas Forde.³⁶

The wider importance of collections of memorial literature to royalist memorial culture is also underlined by Susan Clarke who has explored *Lachrymae Musarum*, an extended collection of elegies published following the death in June 1649 of Lord Hastings, the nineteen-year-old son of the Earl and Countess of Huntingdon. The collection includes elegies by known Royalists such as Mildmay Fane, John Denham and Alexander Brome, as well as one by Andrew Marvell (whose elegy appears only in a postscript in the first edition). Clarke argues that 'the grief-stricken response of a group of mid-seventeenth-century versifiers to the death of a young man whose short life reflected promise rather than achievement can best be understood in the context of the propaganda skirmish played out through the funerary verse and satirical responses'. She puts the collection in the context of

³⁴ Arthur F Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric* (London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 258-259.

³⁵ John Quarles, *Regale Lectum Miseriae Or A Kingly Bed of Misery* (London, 1649, 1658/9, 1679) ESTC R230768.

³⁶ Thomas Forde, *Virtus Rediviva Or a Panegyrick on the Late King Charls the I* (London, 1660) ESTC R200917.

the elegies to Charles published during 1649.³⁷ James Loxley agrees, placing the volume in the context of family and royalist networks and arguing that ‘the whole volume’s insistence on the significance of Hastings’ royal blood should be read as a rather public act of defiance’.³⁸ It also reinforces how such collections could draw on links, whether personal or literary, between writers who shared similar views.

There is extensive evidence of royalist writers collaborating during the early years of the Civil War, and these networks appear to have revived in some form in the period after the regicide. Writers had gathered at Oxford where the king’s court had been established in 1642, and from where the royalist newsbooks *Mercurius Aulicus* and *The Oxford Diurnall* were published. John Taylor, the Water Poet, settled there in early 1643 and both Abraham Cowley and John Cleveland arrived in March 1643 from Cambridge. Henry King spent the war moving between friends and relatives, but, as his elegy on Essex demonstrates, was clearly continuing to comment on events. Alexander Brome remained in London, producing satire, while working as a lawyer throughout the 1640s and 50s.³⁹ After the end of the first Civil War in 1646 the royalist community at Oxford dispersed. In some cases, it is unclear where writers went: Wilcher notes that Cleveland, for example, ‘drops out of sight’ and there is little detail on the poet after this date. However, it seems that links between writers sprang into life again following the regicide, and it is clear there was cross-fertilisation of works within a royalist milieu, as well as shared political and ideological positions.

³⁷ *Lachrymae Musarum* (London, 1649) ESTC R2243; Susan A Clarke, ‘Royalists write the death of Lord Hastings: Post-Regicide Funerary Propaganda’ in *Parergon*, Volume 22, Number 2, July 2005, 113–130 (April 2020) p. 114.

³⁸ James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars* (London and New York: Macmillan Press 1997), pp. 196, 199.

³⁹ Crum ed., *Poems Henry King* p. 99; ODNB *King*, < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/15564> > [accessed online October 2020]; Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* pp. 150–152, 154, 182.

This cross-fertilisation can be traced in *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*. *Monumentum Regale* is attributed to John Cleveland, though it was printed with no author named and there is debate as to his authorship. It contains at least three elegies which are subsequently found in his *Poems by John Cleaveland*: ‘Chronistichon’, ‘An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs’ and ‘An Elegie Upon King Charles the First, Murthered publickly by His Subjects’. Cleveland’s authorship of ‘Chronistichon’ and ‘An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs’ has been questioned by Brian Morris and Eleanor Worthington, who attribute ‘Chronistichon’ to Payne Fisher and note that ‘An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs’ is ‘only ascribed to him in three untrustworthy manuscripts’ and argue the style is unlike that of Cleveland. Lacey also suggests the attribution is false.⁴⁰ However, other critics, including Bianca Calabresi, have continued to cite Cleveland in connection with these poems, and this will be the practice here. Certainly, Cleveland did publish another work post-regicide, a prose defence of the divine right of kings, *Majestas Intemerata Or the immortality of the king*.⁴¹ *Monumentum Regale* includes ‘A Deep Groan’ by Henry King, which was also published in separate broadsheet form, as was ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men, The most glorious of Princes, The most Constant of Martyrs, Charles I’. The final epitaph is signed A.B, which could indicate Alexander Brome, though as Marotti, following Hyder Rollins, notes, A.B was frequently

⁴⁰ John Cleveland, *Poems by John Cleaveland* (London: 1665); Lacey, ‘Elegies’ p. 226; Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington in *The Poems of John Cleveland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1967), p. xxvxxxviii; ODNB *Cleveland*, <<https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/5635>> [accessed 8th September 2021]; Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* p. 248.

⁴¹ Bianca Calabresi, ‘“His Idoliz’d Book”: Milton, Blood and Rubrication’ in *The Book in History, The Book as History: New Intersections of the Material Text* ed. by Heidi Brayman and others (New Haven and London: Yale University Press: 2016), pp. 219–221; John Cleveland, *Majestas Intemerata. Or the immortality of the king* (London, 1649) ESTC R209208.

used in early modern publications as a placeholder.⁴² The other two poems and the opening epitaph are anonymous. As the table in the appendix shows, the anonymous *Vaticinium Votivum Or Palaemon's Prophetick Prayer* contains texts in English, French and Latin, a letter to Charles II and a prophecy. It also includes 'Chronostichon' and 'On the Martyrdom Of His Late Majestie' which has been identified as being by royalist schoolmaster Francis Gregory, as well as elegies to Arthur, Lord Capel, who is the subject of several other, single broadsheet publications. The latter include one by Thomas Philipot, who had earlier mourned the Earl of Essex, in a sign of the unease the regicide had created among supporters of Parliament and the subsequent widening of the market and range of readers for memorabilia.⁴³

The publication in 1649 of elegies to Lord Capel and others, alongside those to the king, reinforces the idea that writers saw a need to maintain the sense of a coalition, bringing together despairing Royalists seeking hope and comfort, as well as reaching out to potential allies. One way of doing this was to create a pantheon of martyrs reaching back to Strafford and to Lucas and Lisle. Whatever the links, formal and informal, between printers and writers, there is commonality of themes and ideological coherence in the elegies to Charles

⁴² Arthur F Marotti, 'Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658' in Special Number *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 21 1-26 (1991), p.10.

⁴³ *A mournfull elegy upon the three renowned worthies Duke Hamilton, the Earle of Holland, and the ever to be honoured Lord Capel* (London, 1649) ESTC R211063; *An elegy upon that renowned hero and cavalier, the Lord Capel* (London, 1649) ESTC R36259; *Obsequies on that unexemplar champion of chivalrie and perfect pattern of true prowess, Arthur, Lord Capell* (London, 1649) ESTC R211056; *Two elegies, The one on His late Majestie. The other on Arthur Lord Capel* (London, 1649) ESTC R205639; Thomas Philipot, *An elegie offer'd up to the memory of His Excellencie Robert Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R40096; Thomas Philipot, *Capellus virbius, sive redivivus: or, A monument erected in severall elegies to the memory of the right honourable and noble Arthur Lord Capell, Baron of Hadham* (London, 1662) ESTC R230086; F.H Philomusus, *An elogie, and epitaph, consecrated to the ever sacred memory of that most illustrious, and incomparable monarch, Charles. Together with an elogy and epitaph upon the truely lamented death of that excellent patterne of perfect magnanimity, virtue, valour, and loyalty, Arthur Lord Capell* (London, 1649) ESTC R2265.

and others, whether in collections such as *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* or in single broadsheets, though they may well have been published with different audiences in mind, an issue which will be considered below. Indeed, the titles of the elegies alone clearly establish both the tone and overarching themes of this writing, and their close relationship with each other and with *Eikon Basilike*. The depiction of Charles as the martyr king links his death with that of Christ, which, as Maguire argues, emphasised the enormity of the regicides' infraction of the laws governing the royalist universe.⁴⁴ Thus, *Vaticinium Votivum* repeatedly refers in titles in both English and Latin to Charles's 'sacred' memory (D2v; D6v) and to his 'martyrdom' (C8r; D2v; D5r; F2v). *Monumentum Regale* includes an anonymous elegy whose title refers to 'the most constant of martyrs' (A3v) and Cleveland's own elegy references the 'meekest of martyrs' (C7r). *The Princely pellican* includes the elegy (also published separately) 'A crowne, a Crime, the Monarch martyr' (F3v); and *Royall meditations for Easter* (A1r) alludes to the crucifixion itself with its reference to Easter – a theme which is developed in several of the works considered here.

The chapter now moves on to explore how the depiction of Charles the martyr is used across the collections *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* not simply or even mainly to honour and memorialise Charles, but to give voice to a range of messages that look back over the whole of the Civil War period. In this process, writers seek to glorify the royalist project in the name of religion and social hierarchy, to vilify the regicides and to condemn the parliamentary cause as both illegitimate and murderous from its inception. This chapter will consider how elegists both respect and subvert expectations of elegy and draw on the motifs and images from much previous royalist verse in order to bring these concerns to the reader.

⁴⁴ Maguire, 'Theatrical Mask' p. 14.

Collections of royalist laments: *Vaticinium Votivum*

It is a significant irony attached to royalist publishing throughout the Civil War period that Royalists both denied the legitimacy of ‘popular’ political debate and the participation of the ‘people’ in politics and simultaneously felt increasingly compelled to intervene in such polemics. As Potter states, ‘royalists had no enthusiasm for freedom of the press except where they believed the established authority was an unsanctioned one’.⁴⁵ This was never more apparent than after the regicide, as can be seen in the extensive corpus of printed elegies and other works mourning the king. *Vaticinium Votivum* was one of the earlier publications – Lacey and Potter note it was recorded by Thomason in March 1649 – and reflects the paradox over publication facing Royalists in the period after the regicide.⁴⁶ Consideration of *Vaticinium Votivum* suggests it was aimed at a more educated audience than street ballads such as *A coffin for King Charles a crowne for Cromwell: a pit for the people* and semi-scatological texts such as *A Flattering Elegie*, though there is also much overlap in themes and in the likely purposes of the writers.⁴⁷ It would certainly cost more than such cheaper, single broadsheets, though there is no price on it. It includes texts by a variety of writers and is written in an eclectic mixture of Latin, French and English. Joad Raymond comments that ‘complex classical references, Latin quotations, and the assumption of detailed legal or historical knowledge suggests strict limits on possible audiences’ for some texts. However, he also cautions that ‘populist and widely read texts, nonetheless might contain dense levels of allusion: though the ability of readers to decode these doubtless varied’.⁴⁸ Certainly King’s ‘A Deep Groan’, published both in *Monumentum Regale* and in single broadsheet, is both

⁴⁵ Potter, *Secret Rites* pp. 36, 184.

⁴⁶ Lacey, ‘Elegies’, p. 225.

⁴⁷ *A Flattering Elegie* is discussed by Emily King, *Civil Vengeance: Literature, Culture and Early Modern Revenge* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2019) pp. 128–129 and Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* pp. 297–298.

⁴⁸ Joad Raymond, ‘Popular representations of Charles I’ in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* ed. Thomas Corns p. 48.

erudite and highly allusive but also full of violent populist invective against the regicides. It is impossible to know how many people read it, and in what ways. Nonetheless, it seems clear *Vaticinium Votivum* is aimed at a limited and perhaps coterie audience, and that, as seen below, the compiler had – or claimed he had - direct contact with the Royalists in exile. Indeed, the stress he places on these links asserts the collection’s authenticity and emphasises his loyalty.

Like some early, duodecimo editions of *Eikon Basilike*, *Vaticinium Votivum*, a small volume, could be hidden in the pocket of a clandestine Royalist, or be held ready to hand over to a sympathiser.⁴⁹ It was traditionally and almost certainly erroneously attributed to the poet George Wither, appearing as such in a Spencer Society edition of *Vaticinium Votivum* in 1885. Lyall Kendall points out that the dedication to Charles II by the author/compiler of the collection refers to the latter’s attendance on Charles during his sojourn in Jersey in the second half of 1649, while Wither is recorded as being in London at this time. In addition, this appears to refer to a later edition, given that Thomason received his copy in March 1649. David Norbrook links the title poem to the failure of the royal fleet during the Second Civil War, and to Prince Charles’s subsequent return to Holland and both he and Kendall agree that Wither is a very unlikely candidate for authorship. As Norbrook points out, Wither had ‘accepted Charles’s execution as a divine punishment against the pride of kings; he certainly had no desire for his son to conquer the republic’, whereas the tone of *Vaticinium Votivum* is ‘militantly royalist’.⁵⁰ David Harper, following Francis Madan, notes it was printed in

⁴⁹ Sharon Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 134.

⁵⁰ Lyall H Kendall, ‘Notes on Some Works Attributed to George Wither’, *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 20 390 - 394 (Oct. 1954), pp. 392-393; David Norbrook ‘Some Notes on the Canon of George Wither’, *Notes and Queries*, Volume 43, Issue 3 276-281 (September 1996), p. 279.

London, and its ornaments identify it as having been printed by William Dugard, who was also the printer of the second, expanded edition of *Eikon Basilike*.⁵¹

We cannot know exactly how collections like *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* were compiled, but both demonstrate consciousness among printers that there was a market for such material, as well as connections between Royalist writers. Texts may have been presented for printing or have emerged through the porous boundaries that ostensibly separated private circulation from wider, print publication. Cleveland's 'Chronostichon' appears in both collections and there is good evidence that Royalist schoolmaster Francis Gregory is the author of one elegy to Charles in *Vaticinium Votivum*, 'On the Martyrdom Of His Late Majestie'. Gregory also contributed a poem, 'Dread Sir', to the second edition of *Eikon Basilike* and David Harper has painstakingly traced Gregory's connections with William Dugard, the printer of this edition. Dugard also printed works on grammar by Gregory, and Harper notes Gregory's claiming of his authorship of both poems in the subsequent safety of Restoration England.⁵² There is a measure of organisational coherence across at least the first half of *Vaticinium Votivum*, which suggests the anonymous compiler/author of *Vaticinium Votivum* had some overview of the collection. It also includes several anonymous elegies and other works commemorating Charles, two elegies for royalist leader Lord Capel, and a short poem referencing Charles I's arrival in the Isle of Wight in 1647, which appears to have been written before the regicide, as well as a Latin 'Epicedeum' attributed to a G.F. Overall it bears out Norbrook's characterisation of it as 'militantly royalist'.

⁵¹ David Harper, 'Francis Gregory and the Defense of the King's Book' in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 106, No. 1 37-61 (March 2012), p. 40; Madan, *A New Bibliography* p. 116.

⁵² Harper, 'Francis Gregory' pp. 37–38, 43–44.

The title *Vaticinium Votivum* may be loosely interpreted as involving prediction and prophecy (vaticinium = vaticination) and a vow (votivus), suggesting the author is using the collection to predict the ultimate royalist victory and associated revenge on the regicides, as well as making a vow to its inevitable fulfilment. The motif of prophecy is echoed across the collection, with pages devoted to the well-known prophecy of Paulus Grebnerus, which first appeared in print in England in 1582, and which raised the ire of Parliamentarian and astrologer William Lilly. The ostensible compiler names himself as author of the title poem, ‘Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum’, which appears both in the original Latin, which he states he had presented to Charles II ‘his now Majestie’ (A1r) on a previous visit prior to the regicide, as well as in a subsequent English translation. The dedicatory letter is addressed to Charles II. With false modesty the narrator casts himself in the role of Palaemon, who was an ancient Greek sea-god who came to the aid of sailors in distress and the reference presumably alludes to the prince’s sailing with the royal fleet and his subsequent return to Holland, and thence, as the poet tells us, to his mother in France (B6r). He can also be linked with the chivalric tradition, through the knight Palaemon in Chaucer’s ‘The Knight’s Tale’, in an appeal to a probably limited, coterie audience of Royalists, thus emphasising their nobility.⁵³

Throughout *Vaticinium Votivum* writers constantly draw on images of martyrdom and of the crucifixion, linked to extravagant panegyric and eulogy of the dead king as the fount of both private virtue and exemplary kingship. Additionally, they use elegies for the polemical vilification of the regicides as damned murderers and hypocrites, who have spread chaos and disruption in the three kingdoms through their anarchy. As will be seen, this is not as developed as in *Monumentum Regale*, and there is less overt emphasis on the linking of the regicides with the ‘popular’ and with rebels such as Watt Tyler and Jack Cade than will be

⁵³ William Lilly, *Monarchy or No Monarchy in England: Grebner his prophecy* (London, 1651) ESTC R5905570.

found in the later collection. Given the probably limited readership of *Vaticinium Votivum*, and the links the compiler and/or the eponymous Palaemon claims to have with the court in exile and, it seems likely, with wider royalist networks, such an understanding would be taken for granted. There is, however, a strong emphasis on the need - and especially on Charles II's part, the duty - to seek vengeance, both for Charles I and for the other royal martyrs commemorated here. Indeed, the allusions to prophecy make the claim that vengeance will be had, however desperate or unlikely this claim may have appeared to defeated Royalists in the aftermath of the regicide. The publication of *Vaticinium Votivum* can be seen in this light as a reflection of the need to hold Royalists together in their darkest hour, and to cling on to the idea of a new future through memorialising the past.

As Royalists faced final defeat and the unprecedented trial and execution of the king, they were already looking for consolation and hope. The dedication of the collection to 'His now Majestie' serves as a call to arms and in the title poem 'Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum' Prince Charles is portrayed as an epic hero who, like Odysseus, journeys from place to place. He encounters inhuman monsters and fierce foes: 'Trust'ing to th' mercie of the Ocean more | Than those Land-Monsters which hee left on Shore' (B6r). His (ultimately fruitless) voyage to England with the royal fleet is portrayed in an epic simile extended over more than twenty lines. This evokes sea-gods ('tritons', 'nymphs', 'tridented Neptune' and the mourning Palaemon himself: B7v – B8r) and depicts the Prince triumphing over nature as he leads his fleet:

And thus re'entring with his Roial Train
Hee plows the fertile Furrow of the Main
And with low-bended knees, but lofty eies
Implore's high Heaven to bless his Enterprize. (B7r)

The prince is thus – somewhat ironically in view of Charles II's subsequent reputation - linked with religious devotion and humility in the mould of his father, as well as with traditional heroic attributes. This is followed later in the poem by a portrayal of his imagined

or anticipated triumph over Parliament. Using motifs that will also be found in *Monumentum Regale*, the poet writes in a grandiose epic manner, describing the rebels in ways that contrast them with the prince: ‘So may those Gobling Ghosts, those Beasts of Prey | Sneak to their sootie Hen-roofs, and withdraw | At thy dread looks’ (C2r). The dismissive ‘Hen-roofs’ alludes to the low social status of supporters of Parliament, as does the deliberately animalistic description ‘Accursed Band-Dogs’ (C3r) while the scornfully alliterative ‘Gobling Ghosts’ again links those fighting the king with hell and the underworld. This is followed by the anthropomorphic portrayal of the nation in the grip of a monstrous and violent childbirth:

Since the griev’d Realm doth groan, and groan agen,
Big with those Monsters in the shape of men:
Whose violent pangs, and long convulsion-fits
Have half bereft, and robb’d her of her wits (C3v)

The images of ‘violent pangs’ and ‘convulsion-fits’ render England a victim. These, and the reference to ‘teeming-throws’ (C3v), suggest an apocalyptic landscape haunted by a strange and fearful birth and the poet links unnatural fertility to his enemies. The poem ends with the association of Parliament’s supporters with the common people, the many-headed monster, or ‘abortive Hydra’s of an Headless State’ (C3v), an image that will be developed further in *Monumentum Regale*.⁵⁴ Against these upstarts the poet concludes that ‘the hour’s at hand’ to ‘powr down vengeance on their Crimes’ (C4r), reinforcing the use of elegy to damn the regicides.

Paradoxically, the imperative for vengeance and the representation of Charles II as the chivalric, revenging hero are simultaneously highlighted and softened in ‘Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum’, as the writer draws on demotic and lurid imagery, but also appeals to elements of epic and of romance, a genre strongly associated with royalism. Revenge is

⁵⁴ Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, 1991), p. 181.

romanticised, connected to the Chaucerian hero Palaemon, and distanced by a self-consciously epic style, albeit one that can descend into bathos, such as this example from the elegy ‘Caroli’: ‘My dwindling-dwarf-like-Fancie swell’s not big | Nor know’s to wear a borrowed Periwig | Of Metaphors’ (D6v). The elevated style and social exclusivity of the collection is reinforced by the inclusion of Latin epigrams and verse in fashionable French, appropriate to a more educated audience and gesturing to the royalist court in exile in Paris, to where Prince Charles had travelled after the failure of the invasion, before returning to The Hague where he received news of the regicide. However, as the compiler knew when he assembled *Vaticinium Votivum* a little over a month after the regicide, the hour for immediate revenge had passed, as had the possibility of the Prince of Wales invading with a new fleet. Royalists now faced utter defeat. Why then put the anglicised version of ‘Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum’ at the head of the collection? The answer to this question lies in the need to not only lament the king, but to the performance of rage and defiance and the assertion that revenge will come – and it will need not only the Royalists themselves but also the new king to commit themselves to this. Royalists need both comfort and hope: as Potter suggests, writers ‘direct purely elegiac sentiments towards Charles [I], while focusing the energetic, celebratory, ‘manly’ tone on his successor’. This can be seen in the letter to Charles II prefacing *Vaticinium Votivum*.⁵⁵

The letter to Charles II invokes the epic muse and flatters him with a ‘serious Praier for the Advance of Your Sacred Majestie’ (A3v). This is followed by a Latin Proemium or song of praise to the new king characterised as ‘Rex sacer’, the sacred king (A4v), and as the only one who, in ironic inversion of Parliament’s claims to ground its power in the people, offers safety to them (‘sola Salus Populi’: A4v). The next text is an ode in French, perhaps

⁵⁵ Potter, *Secret Rites* p. 192.

reflecting the international shock the regicide was met with. It explicitly calls upon Charles to avenge his father:

Va donc, que le ciel te prospere,
Contre ces Titans inhumains,
Et consacre tes jeunes Mains
A venger le sang de ton pere. (A5r)

Go then, may heaven prosper you,
Against these inhuman Titans,
And consecrate your young Hands
To avenge the blood of your father.

Revenge is placed as the unavoidable consequence of mourning: the anthology aims to rally the new king to action against the new regime, and in the process to bring together at least a small coterie of Royalists, who are resolved to act. The new king's duty is characterised as religious, under the protection of heaven ('ciel') and seen as sacred ('consacre'). The ode consciously displays the poet's erudition, recalling classical mythology, invoking the gods as protectors of innocence ('Dieux, protecteurs de l'innocence': A5r) and referencing Zeus and his thunderbolts ('votre Tonnerre': A5r). In contrast, the regicides are 'Titans', the gods who rebelled and were consigned to punishment in Tartarus and referred to throughout the ode as malicious (A5r) and hypocritical, cloaking themselves in the guise of saints: 'Dessous le visage de Saints | Vous cachez un Coeur Hypocrite' (A6v). The placing of this ode, as well as the letter to Charles II and the 'Proemium' before the English translation of the title poem, all point to a clear message to the new king that vengeance is both necessary and inevitable, and in keeping with God's designs.

In *Vaticinium Votivum* the compiler uses the trauma of the regicide to overtly yoke elegy to vengeance, both heavenly and earthly, in the belief that, in Hirst's words, 'the headsman had struck at a divine order'.⁵⁶ The insistence on vengeance is strongly linked to the use of prophecy and its connotations of inevitability, through the (mis)use of 'The

⁵⁶ Hirst, *England in Conflict* p. 254.

prophecies of Paulus Grebnerus concerning these Times' (C5r-v), as well as references to revenge, which are scattered through the collection. Both Parliamentarians and Royalists drew on prophecy to boost support, with the two most famous figures, who clashed frequently, being Parliamentarian William Lilly, and his Royalist opponent George Wharton.⁵⁷ Keith Thomas argues that 'the real boost to ancient prophecy ... came with the Civil War, when Galfridian (where animals represent human figures) prophecies joined astrological prognostication and religious revelation to place an unprecedented amount of prophetic advice before the lay public'.⁵⁸ In 1644 Lilly had issued *A Prophecy of the White King and the Dreadful Dead Man explained*, which drew on an ancient prophecy supposedly discovered in 1138; he claimed it sold 1,800 copies in three days, and Thomas notes that subsequent printer's bills show a later collection sold 4,500 copies in three impressions. The prophecy was widely taken to suggest the end of the monarchy and, as Harry Rusche states, the 'White King was, of course, immediately identified as Charles I by the seventeenth-century reader'.⁵⁹ Lilly was thus well-placed to challenge the use of the 'prophecies of Paulus Grebnerus concerning these Times' in *Vaticinium Votivum* to assert future royalist victory. He subsequently did so in his anthology of prophecies, *Monarchy or No Monarchy in England*.⁶⁰

Paul Grebnerus' prophecy had been presented to Elizabeth I in 1583. Like all prophecy it was subject to varying and partisan interpretation: after the defeat of the king it was 'recognised as a forecast of the King's death but taken by Presbyterians to indicate the

⁵⁷ Harry Rusche, 'Merlini Anglici: Astrology and Propaganda from 1644 to 1651', *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 80, 322 - 333 (Apr. 1965), pp. 323–324.

⁵⁸ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Penguin 1973, 1991), p. 485.

⁵⁹ Harry Rusche, 'Prophecies and Propaganda, 1641 to 1651' in *The English Historical Review*, Oct 1969, Vol. 84, No. 333 Oct. 1969, 752-770 (p. 757).

⁶⁰ William Lilly, *A Prophecy of the White King and the Dreadful Dead-man explained* (London, 1644) ESTC R4060; William Lilly, *Monarchy*; ODNB, *William Lilly*, <<https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/16661>> [accessed August 2020]; Thomas, *Religion* p. 489.

return of Charles II'.⁶¹ It is used in the latter sense in *Vaticinium Votivum* where the author re-prints a version of the prophecy, followed by a poetic commentary. The commentary evokes anarchy and chaos using images of floods and dismisses the regicides as 'promiscuous Hodg-podge Powers' who 'oppose, | Like high-swoln floods that River whence they rode' (C6v). He mourns the dead king, before asserting the truth of 'blest Grebner'(C6r) and anticipates the rebirth of Britain as Charles II 'like the Bridegroom of the daie | Shalt gil'd sad Britain with thy glorious ray' (C6v). Rusche suggests that 'the impact of the pro-royalist version of the Grebner prophecy.... must have been enormously effective' given the virulence of Lilly's attack on its accuracy. He also adds that factually Lilly was correct: the version in *Vaticinium Votivum*, which is also found in another royalist tract *A brief description of the Future History of Europe*, is partly forged, thus enabling it to relate to England, rather than Sweden.⁶² It served well, however, to elevate Charles II as the destined avenger and to assure readers of the ultimate fall of the new regime.

Following the introductory poems and the prophecy, *Vaticinium Votivum* also contains an elegy in both Latin and English, 'To the Sacred Memorie of that late High and Mightie Monarch, Charls 1' and three more elegies in English to Charles I, including Cleveland's 'Chronostichon', the anonymous 'Memoriae Sacrum Optimi Maximi Caroli 1' and Gregory's 'On the Martyrdom Of His Late Majestie'. There is also a sonnet in French, 'Sur la mort de Charles I', as well as two elegies to Lord Capel, and one to Royalist Francis Villiers, who was killed in fighting near Kingston Upon Thames in July 1648. There is perhaps less sense of a controlling editor in this latter part of the collection, but the reading of these elegies is framed by the stress laid on prophecy and prediction, and they hence reflect in

⁶¹ Tim Thornton, *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern Britain* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006) p. 57.

⁶² *A Brief Description of the Future History of Europe* ESTC R9126; Paul Grebnerus, *The Prophecie of Paulus Grebnerus concerning these Times* ESTC R211120; Rusche, 'Prophecies' pp. 766–767; Thomas, *Religion*, p. 488.

different ways the messages of grief, defiance and the desperate certainty that revenge will come that can be found in a wide spectrum of royalist elegies. The authors personalise their grief, drawing on elegiac lament and addressing both the dead king and the embattled royalist community directly. Thus the author of ‘Caroli’ apologises to Charles for the inadequacy of his ‘ruder Vers’ and stresses his ‘true grief’ and ‘Loial breath’ which ‘still waited on your Service’ (D6v), while acknowledging Charles’s martyrdom: ‘Thou blest Martyr, who hath here laid down, | And chang’d a temporal for a Glorious Crown’ (D7v).⁶³ Gregory similarly draws on the sense of an embattled and necessarily secretive community in ‘On the Martyrdom of his Late Majestie’. In the opening lines he appeals directly to his fellow mourners, evoking the tragedy of the king’s death:

Com, come, let’s mourn; all eies, that see this Daie
Melt into showers, and Weep yourselves awaie:
O that each Private head could yield a Flood
Of Tears, whilst Britain’s Head stream’s out his Blood (F2v)

The image of tears is conventional in elegiac lament but is linked to the allusions to rivers and to increasingly apocalyptic visions of floods, which will also be seen in *Monumentum Regale*. The use of direct address in the opening line paradoxically serves to imply a closed community of mourners, while looking beyond that community to call on the nation to express a sense of general outrage. Gregory’s portrayal of shock and disbelief is compounded by his admission that words are inadequate, that ‘Tongues cannot speak; this Grief know’s no such vent | Nothing but Silence, can be Eloquent’ (F2v), and by repeated rhetorical questions to his readers and, increasingly, to Charles himself. The intensity of his grief is emphasised by the frequent use of the familiar pronoun, such as ‘Thou Meeker Moses’ or ‘Thou, thine own Soul’s Monarch’. Gregory’s repeated use of ‘thou’ invokes his commitment to serving the king, but also implies personal loss and conveys a sense of intimacy.

⁶³ Potter, *Secret Rites* p. 173.

A sense of rage is further built up through the consciously dramatic re-creation of the trial of the king. He is portrayed as an innocent victim, in contrast to the recurring comparison of the regicides with wild animals: a ‘silent lamb’ surrounded by ‘wolves’ (F3v). The drama explicitly links the regicide to the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, reinforcing the myth of Charles the martyr and tragic hero, asking the reader to visualise the scene which is described as ‘like the Passion-Tragedie’ (F3v). Gregory alludes to the ‘Pharisees’ and Bradshaw, the President at the trial, is compared to Pontius Pilate or worse: ‘Here Bradshaw, Pilate there: This makes them twain | Pilate for fear, Bradshaw condemned for Gain. | Wretch! Could’st not thou bee rich, till Charles was dead?’ (F4r). He continues to pile on these allusions, with reference to Charles’s ‘calvarie’, and calling him ‘our Martyr’ (F4r) and ‘a saint in heaven’ (F5r). The insistence on Charles’s status as martyr, echoing *Eikon Basilike*, obviously aims at inciting outrage among a royalist readership; it also allows Gregory to obliquely imply the downfall of the regicides amid social chaos, when ‘Church and State do shake’ (G5r). In addition, there is the familiar attack on parliamentary political and religious hypocrisy: ‘is this your Glorious King? | Did you by Oaths your God, and country mock, | Pretend a Crown and yet prepare a Block?’ (F4v). In the context of a collection prophesying vengeance the message is clear but, given the defeat Royalists had suffered, it expresses a wish or a fantasy, rather than a potential reality.

If the *Vaticinium Votivum* could be said to be aimed at a small, more select group of committed and socially superior Royalists, *Monumentum Regale*, some of whose texts were also published in single broadsheet, straddles a divide between the erudite and the more popular or demotic. This is epitomised in the inclusion of Cleveland’s ‘Chronostichon’ in both collections. Cleveland draws on the lament and sense of horror common to these collections, and this is reinforced by the repetition at the start of each stanza of Charles’ name in capitals. In addition, as Bianca Calabresi points out, at least some editions of *Monumentum*

Regale (she cites the edition in the Beinecke Library) emphasise Charles's martyrdom through rubrication – the use of red ink. On the front cover 'A Tombe' and the king's name (A1r) are printed in 'sanguineous ink' and stand out in red. References in 'Chronostichon' to Charles's name and to 'blood' and 'Bleeding Bodies' (A2v-A3r) – the blood of murder, of sacrifice and of martyrdom - are also rubricated. This technique is also used on the front cover of Dugard's edition of *Eikon Basilike*, and in John Gauden's *The Bloody Court*, which is printed in red ink throughout.⁶⁴

Cleveland brings together Royalists' visceral sense of loathing for the regicides, condensing motifs of murder, blood and treason to de-humanise them and link them with the disorder and anarchy of the people. Drawing on the image of the many headed monster, he evokes fear of the mob and of the lower classes, and asserts to his readers the rightness of the established political and religious hierarchy to which they belong:

Charles our Dread Sovereign murther'd at His Gate
Fell Feinds! Dire Hydra's of a Stiff-neck't State!
Strange Body-Politick! Whose members spread,
And Monster-like, swell bigger than their Head. (A3r)

The alliterative 'fell feinds' reiterates the theme of godlessness, while the reference to Hydra sets Charles's death in a classical and heroic context, but also in the context of royalist fears of Hydra, 'the many-headed monster', and its challenge to what rulers saw as the natural hierarchies of society. The inherent paradox in the image – the regicides are both many-headed and losing their heads - is drawn out by Hill's comment:

The idea that to be many-headed is the same as to be headless is easier to conceive metaphorically than literally. It relates to the theory of degree, to the conception of a graded society in which the feudal household and the family workshop or farm were the basic units. The many-headed monster was composed of masterless men, for whom no one responsible answered.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Calabresi, "His Idoliz'd Book" in Brayman et al eds. *The Book in History, The Book as History* pp. 211–213, 219–221.

⁶⁵ Hill, *Change and Continuity* pp. 182–3.

Royalist fear of rebellion and anarchy goes back to early in the Civil War period, but also to Elizabethan and Jacobean times. Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker have shown how Francis Bacon developed a theory of the ‘monstrous’ or the ‘multitudes’, in which he included rioters, slaves, thieves and protesters against enclosures, and contrasted them with Hercules the exemplary ‘deliverer’ and defender of social order.⁶⁶ Walter Raleigh, in the *History of the World*, refers to Hercules as the slayer of thieves and tyrants and portrays him as the symbol of ‘power and order’; later, rulers placed the ‘image of Hercules on money, on seals, in pictures, sculptures and palaces, and on arches of triumph’.⁶⁷ Cleveland is thus invoking for beleaguered Royalists a fantasy of revenge: the Hydra was killed by Hercules, and swelling ‘bigger than their Head’ suggests the regicides too will lose control and a new Hercules will triumph. Elegiac mourning is thus increasingly linked to overt propagandising: if it is God’s will that Charles should die a martyr, it is also his will that those responsible for challenging the social order should face the consequences.

The fear of ‘popularity’ found in these elegies reflects *Eikon Basilike*: Charles I, like his father before him, had been acutely aware of its dangers. Cust cites his final letter to his son at the end of *Eikon Basilike*, arguing that nor ‘would the events of this black Parliament have been such (however much biased by Factions in the Elections) if it had been preserved from the insolencies of popular dictates and tumultuary impressions’ (p. 162).⁶⁸ Cleveland draws on these ‘insolencies’ and links the fear of anarchy with the diseased or unnatural state of the ‘Body-Politick’, using the commonplace and widely accepted image of the king as the head of the nation as appointed by God. This image of a hierarchical society endured into

⁶⁶ Francis Bacon, *An Advertisement Touching an Holy War* ed. by Laurence Lampert (Indiana: 2000); Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra* (London and New York: Verso 2000), p. 2, Chapter 2, especially pp. 36–40.

⁶⁷ Sir Walter Raleigh, *The Historie of the World* (London, 1614) ESTC S116300.

⁶⁸ Cust, *Charles I* pp. 22–25, p. 342.

early modern England and had been reinforced by James I's assertion of the divine right of kings.⁶⁹ Charles himself emphasises this in his final letter to his son:

The settled Laws of these Kingdoms, to which you are rightly heir, are the most excellent rules you can govern by; which by an admirable temperament give very much to Subjects industry, libertie, and happiness; and yet reserve enough to the Majestie and Prerogative of any King, who owns his people as Subjects, not as slaves; whose subjection, as it preserves their prospertie, peace, and safetie; so it will never diminish your Rights, nor their ingenuous Liberties. (p. 162)

It is notable that Charles reaffirms the notion of the 'Body-Politick', with the people as 'Subjects not slaves', and grounds this in tradition ('settled Laws') while asserting his 'Majestie and Prerogative'. He also refers to the 'Kingdoms', and the theme of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland and their unity is one that Cleveland returns to, describing Charles as 'King of three Realms' (A3r). The image is also used by Henry King in 'A Deep Groan' who describes how 'Three kingdoms necks have felt the Axe in thee' (C1v). Cleveland's elegy to Charles becomes mourning not just for the king himself, but for the kingdoms, as he stresses the disorder that has followed from the regicide, using similar images of mutilation:

The Blow struck Britain blind, each well-set Limbe,
By Dislocation was lop't off in Him.
And though Shee yet live's, Shee live's but to condole
Three Bleeding Bodies left without a Soul. (A3r)

Vaticinium Votivum draws on traditional elements of elegy: eulogy and lament for the dead, and the performance of what is presented as collective, national grief centred on the figure of Charles the martyr. Yet it is also 'militantly royalist', expressing sentiments of revenge and hope aimed at holding beleaguered Royalists together in their worst hour. With its nightmarish vision of the social and religious dislocation of the 'Body-Politick', *Vaticinium Votivum* reflects the fulfilment of the worst fears of the author of 'Englands Sad

⁶⁹ James I 'Basilikon Doron' in *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James* (London, 1616) ESTC S122229.

Elegie' seven years earlier. At the same time, its expression of grief is matched by the underlying fantasy of vengeance reinforced by the prophetic motif which runs through it. It both mourns the king and looks for renewal in his son, while engaging in sustained and vitriolic polemic. The boundaries of elegy are strained by this polemic, yet its underlying flexibility is retained as writers seek to engage with the trauma of the regicide. The chapter now moves on to consider the extent to which this uneasy balance is maintained in a later collection, *Monumentum Regale*.

Collections of royalist laments: *Monumentum Regale*

The publication of *Monumentum Regale* some two months after *Vaticinium Votivum* (Thomason's copy is dated 14th June 1649) testifies to the continuing public interest in the regicide, which both printers and Royalists could draw on. This section asks to what extent and in what ways *Monumentum Regale* uses elegy to build on and develop the themes and methods of the writers in *Vaticinium Votivum*. The collection will be explored through an examination of the anonymous 'An Elegie On The Meekest of Men, The most glorious of Princes, The most Constant of Martyrs, Charles I'. This was also anonymously published as a single broadsheet and should not be confused with the almost identically named 'An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs' by Cleveland, also in *Monumentum Regale*. This will be followed by a consideration of Henry King's 'A Deep Groan', which was also published separately and again anonymously, in a reflection of a widening market and, perhaps, of royalist writers' increasing willingness to go into print.

A consideration of *Monumentum Regale* suggests that as a collection it was compiled by assembling texts unified by theme and ideology; there is little sense of an at least partially controlling voice, such as the eponymous Palaemon. It is marked, as is *Vaticinium Votivum*, by widely shared sentiments of grief, rage and disbelief, and by the political imperative to unify grieving Royalists through the 'othering' of the regicides and, indeed, of the

parliamentary cause as a whole. It is argued here that writers develop still further the vilification of the regicides. They and their supporters are characterised as godless and sometimes, in the use of anti-semitic and Islamophobic tropes, as pagan, and are dehumanised throughout the collection by being compared to wild beasts. In addition, the writers again draw on and mould to their purposes a range of images and motifs rooted in a horror of the ‘popular’ and ‘the many-headed monster’. This fear finds expression in both scornful reference to the lowly origins of the regicides, and repeated invocation of the archetypal rebels Wat Tyler and Jack Cade. The king’s execution, as in *Vaticinium Votivum*, is linked to notions of the anarchy and social breakdown which the regicides have brought about. This is portrayed through key sets of images, including apocalyptic references to floods, fire and even earthquakes, and a re-working of images of rivers and the importance of maintaining channels in them, metaphors for political balance already extant in previous royalist writing. At the same time, writers continue to balance such polemic with eulogy of the dead king, and with mourning that expresses what Potter describes sardonically as their need to control ‘the expression of supposedly uncontrollable grief’.⁷⁰

‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ reveals a sense of shock and despair, but grief is mixed with rage and a cold determination to vindicate the royalist project from its inception, and to damn the regicides. Addressed to ‘Most cruell Men’ (A3v) the author immediately seeks to draw readers in, challenging the new regime in a series of rhetorical questions evoking Charles’s royal blood – the blood of a martyr – and dramatising and confronting the enormity of what has been done:

Can you a winged souls swift flight restrain,
And lure her to her widowed home again?
Or bound the wanderings of the floating blood?
And to his purple channell charm his flood? (A3v)

⁷⁰ Potter, *Secret Rites* pp. 186–187.

There is shock and disbelief in the repeated questions, as the writer dwells on the physical details of the execution and conveys a strong sense of loss which suggests that the poem remains within the bounds of elegiac form. This is reinforced by their description of being ‘widowed’, which evokes an intimate relationship with the dead king, while the soul’s ‘swift flight’ references Charles’s inevitable ascent to heaven. This performance of grief – what Puttenham called the ‘lamenting of deaths’(G4r) - is reinforced later in the poem with images familiar from elegies throughout the Civil War, such as the writer’s allusion to ‘the People’s louder groan’ (A4v), and the use of the pathetic fallacy to convey the writer’s sense of despair: ‘cloud that outs not light, but overcasts’ (B1r).⁷¹ In addition, he draws on metaphors of inundation and flooding, and the allusion to the maintaining or potential loss of control of channels is significant. Images of uncontrolled natural forces pervade these elegies and are closely linked to royalist concerns to portray the regicide and its consequences as disastrous. Wilcher, writing on the earliest draft of John Denham’s ‘Cooper’s Hill’ (probably written autumn 1641), notes how Charles is described as ‘unwilling yet to be devorc’t | From his lov’d channell’. He also comments that ‘inundation as a metaphor of royal power was a commonplace’ when those whom he identifies as ‘constitutional royalists’ were still seeking to avoid war and bring about settlement between King and Parliament. As hostilities broke out in August 1642 Denham was ‘warning about the danger of flooding when the river of kingship is forced into a new or too narrow channel’.⁷² Royalist Hester Pulter in ‘The Complaint of the Thames’, lamenting the king’s imprisonment at Holmby during 1647, similarly draws on these images. The Thames itself is personified, and threatens to ‘leave my channel once again’ (l.16) and that she ‘triumphant with my watery train | Will make this city

⁷¹ George Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesie* (London, 1589) ESTC S123166.

⁷² Sir John Denham, *The poetical works of Sir John Denham*, ed. by T. H. Banks (New Haven and London: 2nd edn Archon Books, 1969); Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, pp. 83, 88, 132.

quagmires once again' (ll.29-30).⁷³ By 1649 the image is used in 'An Elegie On The Meekest of Men' to argue that it is the regicides who have exceeded all boundaries, thus underlining their illegitimacy: the 'floating blood' of Charles elevates him as a martyr, but has also let loose a flood that threatens to overwhelm the nation.

The writer's portrait of the disaster the regicides have unleashed upon the kingdom is sustained through continuing images of storms, including references to 'tempestuous times' and 'foaming billows 'gaisnt his Throne' (B1r). In contrast, an extended epic simile depicts Charles as heroically struggling to hold the kingdom together:

But like a pilot huddled up i'the dark,
Himself surpris'd, and his unfurnish'd bark,
Whom unexpected tempests do constrain,
And from His harbour drive into the main. (B1v)

The motif of the pilot battling the storm and being pushed from the safety of the harbour positions Charles and the defeated Royalists as the defenders of peace and law. It also, however, emphasises their weakness. Hyde, writing in *The History of the Great Rebellion* many years later, describes Charles's execution as 'the most execrable murder that ever was committed since that of our blessed Saviour' and refers to the 'saint-like behaviour of that blessed martyr'. The repeated stress in Royalist elegies on Charles's martyrdom reinforces his sanctity but also portrays him as a passive figure. Here, however, the sanctification of Charles is accompanied by direct diatribe challenging the new regime not only as bloodthirsty, but also treasonous and illegitimate, echoing the sentiments of *Eikon Basilike* and of the many elegies written in the immediate aftermath of the regicide.⁷⁴ Thus, the writer refers to 'curious Treason [which] thirsts your princes blood' (A3v) and personifies

⁷³ Hester Pulter, *Poems, Emblems and The Unfortunate Florinda* ed. and 'Introduction' by Alice Eardley (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014), pp. 58-65.

⁷⁴ Edward Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921; first published 1702 – 4), Vol. 4. p. 488.

ravenous Murder in the person of the regicides: ‘No Epicure like thriving Murder’s found’ (A4r). The regicides are consistently compared to wild animals, being likened to ‘Caesar’s lion, who his teacher tore’ (A3v) and described as seekers after ‘the largest prey’ (A4r). Later in the poem he refers to them as ‘haughty Tygers’ challenging the ‘Lyons’ – signifying their rightful rulers - and states a ‘Rebell is a tiger without faith’ (A5r). Overall, the polemic already found in *Vaticinium Votivum* is heightened.

Invective is sustained throughout the poem and expresses the rage Royalists experienced even as it pushes at the boundaries of elegiac lamentation and grief. It also serves a wider purpose, which can be identified throughout these elegies, which is to link the regicides in particular, and the parliamentary cause in general, not simply with violence and murder, but with an extended defence of the royalist project, of the established church, of the divine right of kings and of the need to maintain social and religious hierarchy in the face of the anarchy and breakdown – themes which go back to debates that began in the run up to the war. These messages, echoing *Eikon Basilike*, find expression in some key presumptions: that the regicides, like Rainsborough before them, are working hand in hand with the devil; that they are linked with the common people; and that they can be associated with traditional rebels against the crown, Wat Tyler and Jack Cade.

The association of the regicides with the devil and damnation is found throughout ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ and in other elegies. The poet proclaims them of ‘worse design’ than Satan, comparing them to ‘the first murderer, the guilty Cain’ (A4v), and linking them to a satanic ceremony where ‘black incense’ is strewn ‘their altars round’ (A4v). John Bradshaw, presiding over the trial, is presented as both a social upstart trying to hide his lowly origins in ‘richer’ clothing, and as the devil on his throne:

This needy Oratour, now richer drest
And higher plac’d, is Image still at best:
Who though from hell, he his glib dictates hold,
As Satan talk’t i’th idols tongues of old. (A4v)

The placing of Bradshaw, like Satan, on an imagined throne evokes the wickedness of the regicides for readers; it also implies their underlying fragility suggesting their power is illusory, 'Image still at best'. In addition, the plural 'tongues of old' can be related to royalist characterisations of the divisiveness of parliamentary discourse through the metaphors of Babel. Sharon Achinstein observes that 'to many, the English Revolution was Babel' and that 'the metaphor of Babel was used in royalist civil war pamphlets to register horror at the fact of political disagreements'. Indeed, this reflects the central paradox of royalist publishing: their dislike of what they regarded as the illegitimate activities of their opponents, and their need to combat them. The poet also draws on the figure of the Parliament of hell that Achinstein, again, has identified as being used by all sides in the Civil War and after (including by Milton in *Paradise Lost Book 2* with the debate of the fallen angels), but particularly by Royalists. The court itself is described as a parody: a 'mock Tribunal', 'a pageant court' (A4r) and the ironic use of pageant, more associated with the ceremonial of the royal court, stresses the falsity and hypocrisy of those who dared, in their 'insolence' (A4v) to put Charles on trial. Again, there is the implied suggestion that these usurpers cannot prevail, and that right will ultimately triumph.⁷⁵

The sinfulness of the regicides and their religious apostasy is closely linked to ideas of social breakdown, of the world being 'turned upside down'. Interestingly, the author contrasts the regicides with previous pretenders and usurpers of the crown: they whose 'claim did for succession call'. In contrast, the regicides promote something worse - no king or social hierarchy, but anarchy: 'the desperate Rebell strikes at sway, | Not for who shall succeed, but that none may' (A4r). This is linked to the idea that the traditional rulers are being usurped by those of lesser blood, ushering in anarchy that will 'hatch a chaos, then

⁷⁵ Achinstein, *Revolutionary Reader* pp. 72–73, 182–193; John Milton, *Paradise Lost, Book 2* ll. 1–390 ed. by Alastair Fowler (London: Longman, 1968). pp. 90–108.

create a world' (A4r). There is scornful reference to the 'rough unpractis'd home-spun colonies | Of Russet Courtiers' (B2v), in a clear attack on the origins of those like Cromwell, whose social standing before his election to Parliament has been described as 'ambiguous but with every sign of deterioration'.⁷⁶ In addition, there is the suggestion that market relations – what Marx and Engels were later to characterise as the tearing asunder of 'motley feudal ties' and the reduction of ties between men to 'callous cash payment' - are prevailing over society's natural rulers: 'Place and preferment passe their market curse, | Not to the worthiest men, but strongest purse' (A6v).⁷⁷

Hyperbole serves to reinforce the royalist fear – or myth – that Parliament aimed not merely at asserting what it saw as its ancient rights, but at overturning the social order to the harm of all. This is reinforced by the pervasive references to those whom for Royalists were the archetypes of popular rebellion and of the 'many-headed monster': Jack Cade the leader of the revolt of 1450 (depicted by Shakespeare in *Henry VI Part 2*, Act 4) and Watt Tyler, leader of the Peasants Revolt of 1381:

Nor prize the shame of finding former sin
At the sad rate of wading further in.
But haste returns as vigorous as mistake,
And hate the gastly dream the more they wake:
No longer brook a Tyler or a Cade,
Those dung-hill tyrants whom themselves have made. (A5v)

In bastardised reference to Macbeth, who was 'in blood | Stepped in so far, that, should I wade no more | Returning were as tedious as go o'er' (*Macbeth*, Act 3, Scene 4 ll. 136 – 138), the regicides are damned, both pulled into a cycle of violence they have lost control of and simultaneously glorying in their deeds. The naming of rebels who rose against

⁷⁶ J.C. Davies, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder Headline, 2001), p. 16.

⁷⁷ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 'The Communist Manifesto' in *Marx Engels: Selected Works* (London, New York and Moscow: Lawrence and Wishart, 1968, 1973), p. 38.

the crown and paid for it with their lives again suggests the hope that the regicides too will suffer earthly, as well as divine, retribution.

The comparison of the regicides with Tyler and Cade had its antecedents in royalist mythology, and its use in ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ and in Henry King’s ‘A Deep Groan’, which is considered below, builds on and develops the link between the regicides and the ‘many headed monster’. Cust notes that in a masque presented at Whitehall in 1637, *Britannia Triumphans*, London is reduced to ‘a horrid hell’ by leaders of popular rebellions, Jack Straw, John Cade and Robert Kett.⁷⁸ An extended attack on puritans and puritanism, *A Satyre Against Separatists* (printed November 1642) links the attacks of the puritans (both Presbyterians and Independents) on the Church of England to anarchy and rebellion, and cites how the Church is ‘scorn’d by ev’ry Cade | And ev’ry Tyler’ (B7r) when reason, learning and hospitality are despised.⁷⁹ The following year, in Book 2 of his unfinished epic, *The Civil War*, Abraham Cowley visits the underworld where the figure of Rebellion herself, a monster ‘with Double Face’, torments a range of rebels including the ‘Kets, Cades and Tylers’.⁸⁰ The frequent references to images of past rebellion can also be found in pamphlets as well as in the elegies considered here. An anonymous royalist pamphlet, *Animadversions Upon Those Notes Which The Late Observator hath published* (July 1643) had attacked Henry Parker’s *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers* (July 1642). Parker had located the origin of power ‘in the people’ and argued that the ‘Paramount Law’ is *Salus Populi*.⁸¹ The author of the *Animadversions* warns Parker:

⁷⁸ Cust, *Charles I*, p. 154.

⁷⁹ Abraham Cowley? /Peter Hausted?, *A satyre against separatists* (London, 11642) ESTC R21706.

⁸⁰ Abraham Cowley ‘The Civil War’ in *Collected Works of Abraham Cowley, Volume 1 and 2* ed. Thomas Calhoun and others (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989); Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* pp. 126–127, 189.

⁸¹ *Animadversions Upon Those Notes Which The Late Observator hath published* (London, 1642/1643) ESTC R203309; Henry Parker, *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers* (London, 1642) ESTC R181442; Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, pp. 141–143.

And if the observatour bee a gentleman, he should tender how he should hath recourse to nature in point of right, lest he give occasion to some Wat Tyler's chaplain to preach againe upon that text
'When Adam delve and Eve span
Who then was the gentleman'
He may find a goodly sermon on that text, set down by John Stow in Richard II, and such doctrine delivered upon it, the use, of which, would shake his title to his inheritance and the name of gentleman. (A3r–A3v)

The recital of the famous rhyme reportedly spoken by preacher John Ball on Blackheath in 1381, with its implications of social levelling and the threat this represented to both property and social hierarchy, clearly echoes royalist concerns, as does the reference to 'Wat Tyler's chaplain'. Ironically, Parker was no anarchist or Leveller: 'an avid defender of parliamentary liberties', he subsequently condemned John Lilburne's attack on judges at the latter's trial in 1650 as dangerous.⁸² Moreover, neither the regicides nor the new regime were indifferent to the dangers of 'levelling'. Ireton had argued against Rainsborough's proposals at the Putney debates in 1647 for the extension of the franchise on the grounds that 'no person has a right to an interest or share in the disposing of the affairs of the kingdom ... that has not a fixed, permanent interest in this kingdom'.⁸³ His cousin, the regicide John Hutchinson, was praised by the latter's wife Lucy for having 'impal'd' the garden from 'the common ground' (Elegy 7, l.11), notwithstanding longstanding national conflicts over enclosures.⁸⁴ Cromwell himself crushed the mutinies at Burford within four months of the regicide.⁸⁵ However, this conscious demonisation of the regicides feeds directly into the message that social breakdown was what was intended from the start by supporters of Parliament.

⁸² Achinstein, *Revolutionary Reader* pp. 47–48.

⁸³ Geoffrey Robertson, *The Levellers: The Putney Debates* (London and New York: Verso, 2007), p. 69–70.

⁸⁴ Lucy Hutchinson, in David Norbrook, 'Lucy Hutchinson's 'Elegies' and the situation of the Republican Woman Writer' in *English Literary Renaissance* (27:3) 1997, 468–521.

⁸⁵ Rees, *Leveller Revolution* pp. 296–299.

The loss of order and stability heralded by the regicide is reinforced by directly paralleling sections of ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ with sections in *Eikon Basilike* in which Charles gives his own account of significant episodes from the history of the Civil War. These references are woven amid substantial use of the praise and panegyric expected in elegy, exemplifying his virtues as a Christian and a ruler, and indeed at times go beyond Charles’s own self-justifying commentary in *Eikon Basilike*. Thus, for example, his extended expressions of regret over his failure to save Strafford (*Eikon*, pp. 6–9), and his documented continuing and permanent sense of guilt in this respect are elided in favour of an attack on ‘usurping lords’ and an evocation of mob action by the ‘throng’ (A6r/v).⁸⁶ The reference to Charles’s arrival in Parliament in January 1642 to arrest the five members, while brief, echoes his unconvincing and self-justificatory account of his actions (*Eikon*, pp. 11–13): their arrest is legitimate as they ‘hung Reforming out, but ruine in’ while Charles did not wish to ‘crush it, but debate’ (A7r).

The themes of betrayal and the casting of the king’s enemies as ‘other’ run through the elegy. The poet references the perfidy of both the Irish, who are compared, like the regicides, to ‘ven’mous beasts’ and the Scots, who ‘more slippery prove than Punick faith | When they can trade their King and beat a price | For’s Bloud’ (B2r). He evokes the crucifixion and Judas’s betrayal of Christ for a ‘price’, as well as the actions of the Scots in making agreements with Parliament, and their sale of Charles to Parliament for £400,000 after the battle of Naseby.⁸⁷ The allusion to ‘Punick faith’ links the regicides to both pagan religion and to the Roman view of the Carthaginians as treacherous and perfidious. This is reinforced by the anti-semitism underlying the writer’s reference to Judas (reminiscent of Gregory’s to ‘Pharisees’ in ‘On the Martyrdom of his Late Majestie’) in the description of the

⁸⁶ See Cust, *Charles I* on Charles’ sense of guilt pp. 287–8.

⁸⁷ Braddick, *God’s Fury* pp. 473–474; Cust, *Charles I* pp. 34–35, 420, 423; Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* p. 249.

regicides as worse than Jews: ‘Those Jews then these lesse knew they did amisse’ (A8v), again referencing the crucifixion and amplifying the Christian image Charles presents of himself in *Eikon Basilike* in contrast to the rebels. In addition, it amplifies the common royalist complaint that Charles was treated worse than Christ because he was executed by his own people.

Finally, ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ describes Charles’s execution as a ‘vigorous Resignation, not a Death’(B3r), and finishes with a call for future vengeance:

When his unlimited forgiveness flies
High as His Blood’s shrill voice, and tousing cryes,
Not spun in scanty half denying prayers
But legacie obliging to his heirs (B3r)

The dismissal of prayers as ‘scanty’ and inadequate to the occasion points towards active resistance to the new regime, as do the ‘tousing cryes’, while the reference to blood echoes both Charles’s death and his status as a martyr. It also suggests, as *Vaticinium Votivum* did before, that such vengeance is the duty of the new, uncrowned king, Charles II. The king had ended *Eikon Basilike* with a letter to his heir, which included the oblique comment that in the future ‘your subjects (by their miseries) will have learned That Religion to their God, and Loyalty to their King, cannot be parted without both their sin and their infelicity’, and clearly pointed to future revenge (*Eikon*, p. 170). Emily King describes *Eikon Basilike* as ‘engaging in a rhetoric of vengeful pacifism’; and she is surely right to argue that subsequent texts ‘evinced a greater investment in spectacular moments of comeuppance as a means by which to combat the government’s narrative’ and what she describes as the ‘new national memory’.⁸⁸ Both a eulogy and a lament, ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’ is also a call for vengeance.

⁸⁸ Emily King, *Civil Vengeance* p. 127.

Deep-seated loathing for the regicides is also found in Henry King's 'A Deep Groan' and his tone and his re-working of familiar metaphors and motifs give it an apocalyptic feel. In the process he pushes the resources of elegy to extremes, such that the weight of his cursing risks rendering the performance of grief inefficacious. King repeatedly eulogises Charles, lauding him as 'the best of Monarchs, [who] butcher'd lies | The Glory of all Martyrologies' (C4v). He draws on this to call for revenge, and for the restoration of Charles II in lurid terms, dwelling on the punishment his enemies will suffer:

Thus thou our Martyr died'st; but oh! We stand
A Ransome for another Charles his Hand.
One that will write thy Chronicle in Red,
And dip his Pen in what thy Foes have bled. (C4v)

King's tone is anticipatory as he relishes the thought of revenge, dwelling on references to blood and violence. He explicitly compares Charles to 'early martyrs' who 'Embraced their flames with such a quiet smile' (C4r) and to Christ himself, with a description of Charles's 'Thornie Crown' (C3v). This is reinforced by the reference to spectators at the execution dipping their handkerchiefs in Charles's blood.⁸⁹ In the process he reasserts the continuity of the royal line, and the elegy, like 'the king's book, become[s] part of a political manifesto justifying the royalist cause' as Lacey puts it.⁹⁰ King, even more than the anonymous author of 'An Elegie On The Meekest of Men', draws on hyperbole and violent language to express rage and disbelief as he visualises future acts of revenge, the heroic new Charles at their centre. If elegy is fragmented and pushed to its limits here, it is barely re-assembled as he gloats over how 'Treas'nous Heads' will 'Purple Caldrons drench' (C4v) and uses ritualised cursing: 'on thy loathsome Murderers shall dwell | A plague-sore, blayn and rotten ulcers smell' (C3r). The invocation and almost tautological repetition of

⁸⁹ Diane Purkiss, *The English Civil War: a people's history* (London, Harper Perennial, 2006) p. 560.

⁹⁰ Lacey, 'Elegies' p. 230

images of disease (a blayn or blain refers to a swelling or a sore) can be seen as a failed and ineffacious performative: such calls for revenge in 1649 represent the violent fantasising of despairing and bitter royalists such as King. This is reinforced by repeated references to the regicide as murder and treason: ‘massacre’, ‘Butcherie’ and ‘Treason sublim’d’, to cite a few examples (C1v; C2r). The regicides are traitors and, as in ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’, compared to wild animals: ‘Bloud-thirsty tygers’ (C2v).

King parallels the state of the nation in the aftermath of the regicide with natural disasters. Again, however, he goes further than the author of ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’. Rather than rivers going out of their proper channels, he uses apocalyptic images of floods, directly reflecting *Eikon Basilike*, where Charles argues:

As it is one of the most convincing Arguments that there is a God, while his power sets bounds to the raging of the Sea; so ‘tis no less, that he restrains the madness of the People. Nor doth anything portend more Gods displeasure against a Nation, then when he suffers the confluence and clamours of the Vulgar to passe all boundaries of Laws and reverence to Authority. (*Eikon*, p. 14)

Charles here brings together his image of himself as appointed by divine right, his commitment to religious and social hierarchy and his distaste for, and fear of, ‘the Vulgar’. These sentiments are echoed by King, who writes of ‘Inundations’ and uses epic images of apocalypse, drawing on a series of violent and frightening images to evoke a menacing atmosphere:

W’are sunk to sense; and on the Ruine gaze,
As on a curled Comets firie blaze:
And earth-quakes fright us, when the teeming earth
Rends ope her bowels for a fatal birth;
As Inundations seize our trembling eyes;
Whose rolling billows over Kingdomes rise. (C1r–v)

As war approached in 1642 S.H. had feared for ‘Flourishing England now on fire’ (C1r) in *This Last Ages Looking Glasse: or Englands sad elegie*. For King what S.H. feared has now come to pass, with the references to flooding which threatens to drown the kingdom

and to comets, traditional precursors of disaster, and to earthquakes.⁹¹ In addition, birth is linked not to new life but to death and the ‘fatal birth’ of monsters, alluding perhaps to Edmund Spenser’s *Error* in Canto I of ‘The Faerie Queene’. It is also an image Milton uses twenty years later when writing of the genesis of Sin and Death in *Paradise Lost*.⁹² The use of ‘teeming’ is also significant: it suggests prolific fertility (OED), but when linked with the ‘fatal birth’ it has connotations of nature being not merely productive but potentially out of control. In addition, there is perhaps an overtly masculine shrinking from the female connotations of birth and unnatural fertility. It is also linked to King’s antagonism towards the ‘popular’ and the mob: the ‘tumultuous impressions’ Charles refers to in *Eikon Basilike* and royalist fears of anarchy and the loss of the ‘natural’ social and religious hierarchy and order.

King, even more than other elegists in *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*, wants to link the regicides with the overturning of the natural hierarchy. ‘A Deep Groan’ drips with contempt and fear towards the regicides and their low social background. He describes them as a ‘caitiffe crew’ (C2v), the alliteration underlining his scorn. His sense of shock and disdain is reflected in his exclamation: ‘For such a Varlet-Brood to tear down all | And make a common football of the crown’ (C3v). ‘varlet’, like ‘caitiffe’ associates the regicides with servants and commoners, while ‘brood’, like ‘teeming’, has animalistic and female connotations of weakness and lack of control. In addition, King also refers to rebels: in this case, to John of Leyden, the anabaptist leader who proclaimed himself King of New Jerusalem in Munster, and was eventually tortured to death there in 1536:

Time may be when that John-a-Leyden King
His Quarters to this tombe an Offring bring,

⁹¹ For comets, see for example: *Hamlet*, Act 1, Scene 1, ll. 111–124; *Julius Caesar*, Act 2, Scene 2, lines 30–31.

⁹² John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 2 pp. 126–7 ll. 745–814; Edmund Spenser ‘The Faerie Queene’ in J.C Smith and E. De Selincourt eds., *Spenser: Poetical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), Canto I, verses 14–26.

And that Be-Munstered Rabble may have eyes
To read the price of their dear Butcheries. (C3r)

King thus links violent social rebellion with religious heresy and again there is a sense of anticipation as he visualises the (hanging, drawing and) quartering of the regicides, as they in turn are butchered – a fate which of course befell some of them at the Restoration.⁹³ Emily King argues that the reference to the Anabaptist John of Leyden, who reigned for a year, is ‘a transparent threat to Cromwell and his associates’ and suggests that King is drawing on the insistence in royalist texts that ‘God is luring the republican government into a false sense of security’. However, while there is some truth in this, it seems to owe more to King’s use of elegy to express his longing for revenge, and his conviction that justice will come.⁹⁴

The de-humanisation and ‘othering’ of the regicides, as in ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men’, is achieved both through the comparison of them to wild animals and the use of anti-semitic and Islamophobic tropes. The actions of the ‘Bedlane Rabble’ (bedlane possibly being a rendering of Bedlam) are linked to ‘the actions of the Jews’ and Bradshaw is specifically compared to Pontius Pilate (C2v), thus linking the regicides with the anti-semitic belief in collective Jewish guilt for the crucifixion. In addition, King piles on condemnation with a recital of the names of heathen gods, which culminates in him asking ‘can [The Bible’s Cover serve Alcoran’ (C3r), identifying the regicides with Muslims. These repeated references to Jews and Muslims serve to re-emphasise the way the regicides have placed themselves outside Christian society and morality, in contrast to the Christian rule England enjoyed under Charles. King even has recourse to referencing the fourth century bishop Athanasius, who fought for the developing Christian orthodoxy against Arianism and heresy, identifying him with the royalist cause (C4r).⁹⁵ Indeed, in the vehemence of his rage against

⁹³ Geoffrey Robertson, *The Tyrannicide Brief* (London: Vintage Books, 2006), pp. 333–338.

⁹⁴ Emily King, *Civil Vengeance* p. 130.

⁹⁵ Diarmaid McCulloch, *A History of Christianity* (London: Penguin Books, 2010), pp. 216–219.

the regicides, he perhaps proves the paradox identified by Lacey that ‘if Charles is remembered as a saint, martyr and hero, then the instruments of martyrdom cannot be ignored’.⁹⁶

References to the mutilation of the body and the use of visceral, violent images throughout *Monumentum Regale*, combined with the personification of the three kingdoms convey a sense of abandonment. When considering the two elegies explored here, as well as Cleveland’s ‘Chronostichon’ which straddles *Monumentum Regale* and *Vaticinium Votivum*, each one expresses in their own way the shock, rage and despair felt by Royalists, though ‘Chronostichon’ is far shorter than the other two. In the case of all three writers, tones of rage, sorrow and despair are evident. *Monumentum Regale* is characterised by clear, unifying themes and motifs that go beyond the shock of the regicide, and which hold it together thematically and ideologically, though there is little sense of conscious organisation to the collection. All three poets seek to shore up Royalists and royalism in the face of defeat, by asserting the centrality of kingship and of religious and social hierarchy, and the need for such bulwarks to defend the three kingdoms in the face of anarchy and violence. To sustain this polemic, both King and the anonymous author of ‘An Elegie on The Meekest of Men’ ground it in a teleological reaching back in history, to depict Parliament as committed from the beginning to the undermining of the social and religious order. Additionally, they all characterise the regicides in animalistic terms as beasts and murderers, often referencing their – fictitious - lower-class origins. In contrast, they elevate Charles in sacred terms, perpetuating the myths he wove about himself in *Eikon Basilike*. In this process they elide both past dissension among royalists, as well the vicious factions grouped around Hyde in The Hague and Queen Henrietta Maria and the Louvre group in Paris respectively, as they debated how to take the royalist cause forward after the regicide. As Lacey comments,

⁹⁶ Lacey, ‘Elegies’ p. 228.

‘Charles’s innocence is absolute’ and the representation of Charles as saint and martyr allows them to express, for themselves and their readers their hopes – or fantasies – of revenge.⁹⁷

Conclusion

Elegies in both *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* display considerable homogeneity of purpose and a shared ideological coherence, despite much uncertainty about the ways they were compiled and organised. Both collections form part of a burgeoning market that reflects the sense of shock the unprecedented nature of the regicide had unleashed, and that reverberated beyond core supporters of the king. Printers, whether committed Royalists like Dugard who printed the second edition of *Eikon Basilike* or anonymous individuals alert to opportunity, were quick to capitalise on this market, as networks of royalist writers re-emerged to express a shared sense of outrage and grief, whatever the extent of their roles in the move to publication. This was reflected in the many editions of *Eikon Basilike* printed, and in the range of published memorial writings of which *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* form a part.

In both collections writers use elegy to lament the dead king and his ‘martyrdom’ and to call for vengeance, seeking to damn the regicides and the parliamentary project, drawing on *Eikon Basilike* and on motifs and images familiar from earlier writing. Their urgent and often fantasy driven calls for revenge are centred around the projection of Charles II as a heroic male figure who will come to their rescue – calls which frequently seem aimed at bringing Royalists together for comfort in the face of defeat. In this process, their language becomes increasingly vitriolic, and this is particularly marked in *Monumentum Regale*. Indeed, despite the presumably higher cost of collections and the erudition of writers such as King or Cleveland, the tone and language of the elegies considered here are not so different

⁹⁷ Sean Kelsey ‘The king’s book: *Eikon Basilike* and the English Revolution of 1649’ in *The English Revolution c. 1590 – 1720: Politics, Religion and Communities* ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 158–161; Lacey, ‘Elegies’ p. 236.

from that of many of the other elegies published singly and in broadsheet, in the wake of the regicide. There is little that separates the venom of King's references to ulcers and sores from *A Flattering Elegie's* images of farting and excrement, where the author describes the devil as venting from his gut an 'ill look't vermine with a fiery snowt' (A2v) in disgust at the regicides.⁹⁸

Potter has pointed out that all 'elegies face the same problems: how to prove one's sincerity in a formal genre', as well as 'how to control the expression of one's supposedly uncontrollable grief'.⁹⁹ There seems no doubt that many writers felt – as well as performed – a strong sense of grief, and they drew on the traditional uses of funeral elegy both to eulogise the king and to mourn him and express their sorrow, while conventionally accepting God's will. The injunction not to speak ill of the dead is amply illustrated in the presentation of Charles as an exemplar of virtue on earth, as well as one whose salvation and place in heaven is assured as a saint and a martyr to his conscience. In this respect post-regicide elegy, with its intense focus on Charles himself (consider, for instance, the rubricated repetition of his name in 'Chronostichon'), has reverted to a more traditional form, though the projection of him as a tragic hero does not always sit easily with the quietism and passivity of his portrayal as a martyr and a saint. A contrast may be drawn with those elegies commemorating Lucas and Lisle examined in the previous chapter, where praise for the two men, and evocation of their purported honour and chivalry, passes quickly into rage and polemic.

However, despite the extensive use of praise and panegyric, elegies in both *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* are highly polemical and channel their grief and disbelief through expressions of rage and a reaching for vengeance. Polemic and the use of the genre for political ends had always been present in funeral elegy, as the elegies to

⁹⁸ *A Flattering Elegie* is discussed by Emily King, *Civil Vengeance* pp. 128–129 and by Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, pp. 297–298.

⁹⁹ Potter, *Secret Rites* pp. 186–187.

Prince Henry and Sir Philip demonstrated, and the capacity of elegy to incorporate satire and polemic had developed over the course of the Civil War. This had become more overt, as can be seen in the bile directed at Rainsborough in mock-elegies by Royalists, or the furious rhetoric of those commemorating Lucas and Lisle. In the elegies to Charles I in *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale* the performance of grief is inextricably mixed with the desire for revenge, the rehearsal of the rightness of the royalist cause and the calculated othering of the regicides and the parliamentary cause. They offer an assertion of traditional notions of the 'Body-Politick', headed by king and church, reinforcing social and religious hierarchies, and an implied elevation of heroic, male virtue in their search for vengeance. In this process, the regicides themselves are cast – inaccurately in terms of their own social standing – as anarchists intent on destruction of the kingdom and linked in hostile terms to both Judaism and Islam, as well as being dehumanised as wild beasts in thrall to the 'many-headed monster'. The vitriol generated in these works is such that they push at the boundaries of elegy and leave open the question as to whether elegy survives as a form.

The elegies to Charles I can be seen to represent a culmination of tendencies already present in funeral elegy, rather than as wholly splintering it as a genre. The regicide was undoubtedly traumatic for Royalists facing unthinkable defeat. Their response incorporates what Raymond characterises as the atoms of elegy and partially reassembles it. It also takes elegy in a direction which is ever more overtly political, and writers struggle at times to balance this with lament for the dead King. These tensions are evident in the elegies in *Vaticinium Votivum* and *Monumentum Regale*. However, while at times it seems that polemic and rage-filled calls for vengeance will take over, these elegies do not as a whole 'go beyond the rules of the form' though they certainly put it under pressure. They do, however, leave open the question of where elegy could go after this, or whether it had reached an impasse.

The next chapter moves on to explore the elegies of two women, Royalist Hester Pulter and Republican Lucy Hutchinson, both of whom were writing in the shadow of defeat. Pulter, like her male counterparts discussed in this chapter confronts the regicide and the defeat of the Royalist cause. Hutchinson, in contrast, faces the end of the republican cause in the aftermath of the Restoration and her husband's death in prison. The chapter will consider the factors shaping the writing of both women and how they draw upon different elegiac traditions.

Chapter 3

Women writing in defeat: the elegies of Hester Pulter and Lucy Hutchinson

Introduction

This chapter explores elegies by two women writing in the face of defeat and asks how they use elegy in ways that may be different to their male counterparts. For Hester Pulter this defeat was encapsulated in the executions of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle at the end of the siege of Colchester in 1648 and – like other Royalists – in the disbelief and horror she felt following the regicide in 1649. In contrast, Lucy Hutchinson wrote her elegies in the 1660s, following the Restoration, the demise of the parliamentary cause and the death in prison of her husband, the regicide Colonel John Hutchinson. In different ways both women experienced political isolation in the wake of defeat, as well as a strong sense of personal abandonment and, in Hutchinson's case, the trauma brought about by the loss of her husband. This section explores how the two women drew on both the complex and evolving practices of funeral elegy, and on the elegiac forms and motifs rooted in pastoral and love elegy. In this process, it considers how their isolation may have influenced their uses of what was already a flexible and evolving genre.

Pulter and Hutchinson were privileged, highly educated women, who were nonetheless living in contexts which positioned their writing and its potential for circulation in ways different to that of their male contemporaries. The chapter will consider the ways in which they may have been both constrained and liberated by their situations, and by the expectations placed on them as women and as writers. Both Pulter and Hutchinson would be aware that publication could have been seen as failing to conform to notions of female propriety and neither woman published in print during their lifetime, but this does not mean they necessarily lacked an audience for their work, which is an important issue when considering why they wrote and how freely they were able to express their thoughts. In

addition, Sarah Ross has pointed to the blurring of what constitutes both ‘public’ and ‘private’ and to the complexity of the relationship between print and manuscript, as well as to the need to attend to the ways in which poetry was circulated and the circumstances in which it was read.¹ Erica Longfellow has challenged understandings of early modern behaviour which inappropriately impose modern definitions of what is deemed public or private. As she argues:

The women and men of the early seventeenth century certainly had models of an interior life: they spent time alone, if possible, they read silently and responded to their reading in journal writing, they practised meditation, and they prayed alone. However, they did not always wholly refer to these parts of their lives as private or conceive of them as something wholly separate from their communal existence, nor did they see them as an area of life protected from state control or community interference.²

Longfellow has warned that ‘gendered assumptions about public and private behaviour.... hold true only some of the time and only for some early modern texts’ and this is important when considering how Pulten or Hutchinson may have been received by readers.³ She also points to how for London joiner, Nehemiah Wallington, ‘although writing was his most solitary activity, it was framed in a context that expected a reader’.⁴ At the beginning of his *Notebook*, Wallington explains to the ‘Christian Reader the Cause of writing this Book’. After his death the book ‘was passed among family and friends’ and, as Longfellow argues, like ‘so many spiritual journals, the book and its deeply personal musings were meant to be used by the community’.⁵ Was the survival of the work of Pulten and Hutchinson a mere accident, or did they too look to future readers?

¹ Sarah Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics in Seventeenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 9–10.

² Erica Longfellow, Public, Private and the Household in Early Seventeenth Century England in *The Journal of British Studies* 45 (April 2006) p. 322-23.

³ Erica Longfellow, *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 204.

⁴ Longfellow, ‘Public, Private’ pp. 322.

⁵ Longfellow, ‘Public, Private’ pp. 322-323; Nehemiah Wallington, *Notebook*, ca. 1654, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.436 fol. 4v.

At the same time, writers throughout the period continued to be constrained by fear of censorship or worse and would have had an interest in controlling the circulation of their writing. It would have been politically dangerous for Hutchinson's work to go into print in Restoration England, given the statutes against treason, though there is evidence that her work circulated in manuscript and that she was part of the literary circle grouped around her patron, the leading politician Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey. In contrast, circulation of Pulter's writing, as discussed below, seems to have been confined to her family. Her work has survived in a single manuscript containing her poetry, 'Poems Breathed Forth by the Noble Hadassah' and the unfinished prose romance 'The Unfortunate Florinda', which was probably put together between 1655 and 1660 and is preserved in Leeds University Library. It has subsequently been collected in a modern edition by Alice Eardley.⁶

Hester Pulter: Royalist elegist

Pulter produced a substantial body of poetry and the overtly royalist elegies which are the focus here form a small part of her work. They include an elegy to royalist 'heroes' and 'martyrs' Lucas and Lisle, following their execution at Colchester in 1648, and several poems and elegies mourning King Charles I in the wake of the regicide. This section asks how she uses these elegies both for lament and for wide royalist purposes. It explores how and in what ways she moves beyond the models of funeral elegy she inherited from patterns developed during the Civil War, and melds these with lyrical and pastoral traditions.

Much of Pulter's work is suffused with melancholy reflections on mortality and death, perhaps reflecting her sense of isolation and the deaths of several of her children: it includes

⁶ Leeds, Brotherton Collection MS Lt q 32 *Poems breathed forth by the noble Hadassas, a collection of poetry, c.1645-1665*; Hester Pulter, *Poems, Emblems and The Unfortunate Florinda* ed. and 'Introduction' by Alice Eardley (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014). All subsequent reference to the poems and the 'Introduction' will be to this edition'. ODNB *Annesley*, < <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/562>> [accessed 21st January 2022].

two elegies mourning her daughter, Jane Pulter, who died of smallpox in 1645 aged twenty, ‘Upon the Death of My Dear and Lovely Daughter’ (pp. 80-82) and ‘On the Same’ (pp. 82-83). She consistently presents herself as a woman who is isolated (for example, in ‘Why must I thus forever be confined’ where she complains of being ‘shut up in a countrey grange’, pp. 166–169, l.18). She certainly appears to have spent extensive periods of time pregnant and bringing up a large family at Broadfield, the family seat in Hertfordshire. This section considers how her mourning for Lucas and Lisle and for the dead king can be understood in the light of her physical and emotional isolation and will draw on Freud’s distinction between mourning and melancholy, which Peter Sacks uses in *The English Elegy*.⁷

Pulter came from a well-connected family with strong royalist connections. She was the daughter of Sir James Ley, later the first Earl of Marlborough and a member of James I’s Privy Council. Royalist Arthur Lord Capel, the subject of elegies following his execution in March 1649 in the wake of the regicide, was a relative of her husband, Arthur Pulter, as well as a neighbour in Hertfordshire. However, as Ross observes ‘most of her closest relatives were, at points, in active opposition to the king’. Her sister Margaret Ley was married to a Lieutenant Colonel in the parliamentary army, and they were friends and neighbours of Republican John Milton, author of ‘Sonnet X To the Lady Margaret Ley’.⁸ Mark Robson, who brought Pulter’s works to light in 1996 when working with Leeds University Library, suggests the ‘connection that her sister Margaret had to the London literary world through Milton might have been a route for Hester to keep in touch with the poetry of the period’.⁹

⁷ Eardley, ‘Introduction’ pp. 1.16; Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement and Other Works* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953–1974), pp. 244–245; Peter M Sacks, *The English Elegy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985), p. 3.

⁸ Eardley, ‘Introduction’ pp. 15, 18–20; Sarah Ross, ‘Tears, Bezoars and Blazing Comets: Gender and Politics in Hester Pulter’s Civil War Lyrics’ in *Literature Compass* Vol. 2 (2005), p. 2.

⁹ Mark Robson in ODNB, *Hester Pulter* <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/68094>> [accessed 3rd March 2021].

Eardley describes her lack of contact with ‘literary or intellectual individuals or circles of any note’. However, Eardley also points out that the evidence suggests ‘there were times in her life when she more freely associated with her extended family and their intellectual circles’. Ross concurs that it seems she did visit relatives in London, where her writing may have passed beyond her immediate circle and brought her into contact with the political developments and arguments of the time. Nonetheless, her relative isolation, combined with family connections who were politically unsympathetic, leaves open the questions of how the apparently private nature of her writing shapes her use of overtly political elegy and for what purposes she may have been writing.¹⁰

Pulter’s writing during the 1640s and 50s makes her royalist sympathies apparent, often vehemently so, as Eardley observes.¹¹ She wrote several poems commenting on events during the Civil Wars. She praises Charles I in ‘On the King’ (p. 120) and laments his imprisonment in both ‘Upon the Imprisonment of His Sacred Majesty, That Unparalleled Prince, King Charles First’ (pp. 105-106) and ‘The Complaint of Thames, 1647, When the best of Kings Was Imprisoned by the Worst of Rebels at Holmsby’ (pp. 58-65), drawing on pastoral motifs, portraying a shepherd (Amintas) and nymph (Chloris), allusions to Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria.¹² In the 1650s, her Emblem poems portrayed Cromwell and the Interregnum negatively, and the enduring intensity of her hatred can also be seen in her unforgiving, late poem on the destruction after the Restoration of the effigy to the Earl of Essex, ‘On the Fall of That Grand Rebel the Earl of Essex, His Effigies in Henry 7th’s Chapel

¹⁰ Eardley, ‘Introduction’, pp. 17-19; Alice Eardley, “‘Shut up in a Countrey Grange’: The Provenance of Lady Hester Pulter’s Poetry and Prose and Women’s Literary History’ *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 80, No. 2 345–59 (Summer 2017), p. 349; Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, p. 137; *The Pulter Project* <<http://pulterproject.northwestern.edu/about-hester-pulter-and-the-manuscript.html#manuscript>> [accessed 3rd March 2021].

¹¹ Eardley, “‘Shut up in a Countrey Grange”, pp. 346, 352.

¹² Pulter, *Poems, Emblems* footnotes, pp. 34, 59.

in Westminster Abbey' (pp. 176–8). Pulter refers to Essex as a 'fierce monster' (l. 1) and a 'half-beast' (l. 13), rejoicing in his death in 1646 and the previous attack on the effigy (ll. 31–2) by a former royalist soldier, shortly after the funeral. To reinforce her hatred she, like Henry King in his elegy 'On the Earl of Essex', mocks him as a cuckold with a 'horned scull' (l. 16), a reflection on Essex's failed marriages.¹³

Pulter was clearly alert to the concerns of the male writers of royalist elegy, and to the images and motifs they draw on. Her 'Elegy On those Two Unparalleled Friends, Sir G [George] Lucas and Sir C [Charles] Lisle' (pp. 73–77) has many parallels with the models of elegy that Royalists had developed over the course of the Civil Wars. She adheres to the elegiac conventions of praise and panegyric, idealising the dead men as royalist martyrs and rejoicing in their salvation. The opening rhetorical questions express shock, characterising the two men as chivalric warriors and heroes: 'Is Lisle and Lucas slain? Oh say not so; | Who could kill love and valour at a blow?' (ll.1–2). Both men are referred to as 'gallants' (l.14) and as 'undaunted, loving heroes' (l.55) and compared to classical male heroes, those 'two famous thunderbolts of war' (l.58), the two Roman generals Cornelius Scipio Major and Minor. In addition, Pulter finds some consolation in celebrating their resurrection and eternal life, as well as their earthly fame:

But these victorious souls live now above,
And gloriously go on in endless love,
While their fair frames, which here did close their lives,
Shall live in fame till they in glory rise. (ll. 81–84)

Pulter implicitly assumes the two men's salvation, the Protestant belief that the living cannot know the fate of the dead notwithstanding. However, like others eulogising Lucas and

¹³ Michael Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Penguin Books, 2009), pp. 478–79; Rachel Dunn, "'Breaking a Tradition": Hester Pulter and the English Emblem Book' in *The Seventeenth Century* 30, No. 1 55–73 (2015), pp. 61–62; Henry King, *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 99.

Lisle, she gives little space to hyperbolic praise and visions of the two men enjoying eternal life. Instead, the poem quickly turns to polemic that is very familiar, as supporters of Parliament are linked to the ‘horrid Hydra’ (l. 5), the ‘many-headed monster’. This is reinforced by the description of the committee of officers which condemned Lucas and Lisle, led by Thomas Fairfax and including Thomas Rainsborough and Henry Ireton, as a ‘cursed rabble [that] made these gallants fall’ (l.24), linking them - inaccurately in terms of their actual social standing – with the common people. Henry King in ‘An Elegy on Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle’ had similarly characterised them as ‘wretched Agents for a Kingdoms fall; | Who yet yourselves the Modell Army call’ (ll. 75-6).¹⁴ Like King, Pulter expresses rage and disbelief and a vitriolic hatred of, and contempt for, both Parliament and the common people.

Pulter’s affinities with male, royalist writers and her antagonism to the ‘popular’ are reinforced by her use of anti-semitic and Islamophobic tropes to condemn the parliamentary cause and religious independency: ‘But Jews, Turks, atheists, Independents, all | That cursed rabble made these gallants fall’ (ll. 23–24). The use of these tropes again recalls the writing of King, who damned the regicides in ‘A Deep Groan’, linking them to the actions of the common people, the ‘Bedlane Rabble’ and to Pontius Pilate (C2v). Like King, Pulter stresses religious orthodoxy and Charles’s role as Head of the Church of England. She portrays supporters of Parliament as bloodthirsty savages who are ‘drunk with Christian blood’ (l.49), led by Cromwell ‘that old vulture’ and ‘his preying brood’ (l.49). This fuels her calls for vengeance, drawing on what Sacks describes as ritualised ‘elegiac cursing’, though, ironically, she has to ascribe the heroic status of Hercules, who died poisoned by Nessus’ shirt, to Lucas and Lisle’s judges: ‘Like mad Alcides, let them rave and roar, | And as they

¹⁴ Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, 1991), p. 181; King, *Poems*, pp. 101–110.

have been three kingdoms' sore annoyers, | Let them, like him, at last be self-destroyers' (ll.52–54).¹⁵ The killers of Lucas and Lisle – and ultimately the parliamentary cause – are later condemned to hell, floating on Styx (l.67) and lost 'in Oblivion's horrid womb' (l.70). The reference to oblivion is significant: as Mary Carruthers notes, memory was linked to the medieval concept of Prudence and the exercise of virtue by the individual, and such understandings still haunted the seventeenth century.¹⁶ These men, who had lost all virtue and forgotten themselves, were doomed to oblivion. Ironically, both Cromwell's government in 1652, and subsequently the Restoration monarchy in 1660 enacted official Acts of Oblivion in attempts to obscure recent history.¹⁷ Pulter herself is determined not to forget.

Pulter uses her elegy to damn those she saw as the murderers of Lucas and Lisle and to call for revenge, drawing on the same tropes as male writers. Eardley suggests that her 'outspokenness may, in part, have been motivated by the frustration of being in such an isolated position' and that 'Pulter is left shouting into the void. As a result, we get some sense that, for her, writing had a cathartic and not just a social or public purpose'.¹⁸ There is certainly frustration. However, this is matched by a sense that Pulter is more concerned with proclaiming her grief and rage, rather than seeking consolation or a purging of emotions. This mix of private rage and lament combined with a desire to intervene in the public debate is also found in the elegies she wrote lamenting Charles I: 'On the Unparalleled Prince Charles

¹⁵ Sacks, p. 21.

¹⁶ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory* 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p.86.

¹⁷ Charles II, 1660: 'An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.', in *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*, ed. John Raithby (s.l, 1819), 226-234: *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp226-234> [accessed 21 March 2021]; 'February 1652: An Act of General Pardon and Oblivion.', in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, ed. C H Firth and R S Rait (London, 1911), 565-577. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp565-577> [accessed 21 March 2021].

¹⁸ Eardley, "'Shut up in a Countrey Grange'", p. 357.

the First, His Horrid Murder' (pp.76–79), the brief 'On the Horrid Murder of That Incomparable Prince, King Charles the First' (p.106) and 'On the Same [2]' (p.107).

Pulter's elegies to Charles I both draw on the tropes used by male writers and begin to re-shape them. The 'On the unparalleled Prince Charles the First, His Horrid Murder' and 'On the Same' both end with thoughts of ultimate, God-given vengeance and with the promised restoration of Charles II – a key message in royalist elegies of Charles I. 'On the unparalleled Prince Charles the First' prophesies the kingdom will turn to hell 'Unless our God doth a second Charles illustrate | (Which oh deny not), all our hopes are frustrate' (ll. 34–36). More certainly and less fearfully, 'On the Same' concludes with 'a voice from heaven' that 'said "weep no more, | Nor my heroic champion's death deplore; | A second Charles shall all thy joys restore"' (ll.43–45). This anticipation of future triumph is accompanied by the vilification of the regicides as 'monsters' (l.6) and 'horrid villains' (l.12), and the repeated use of an anti-semitic trope, mixed with a rhetorical question that reinforces a sense of disbelief: 'How could they do it? Sure they were afraid | And therefore called in Jews into their aid, | Who their redeemer and their king betrayed' (ll.8–10). 'On that unparalleled Prince Charles the First' also links the regicides and the parliamentary cause to the overturning of the natural hierarchy, evoking the violence and chaos of the destruction of Troy ('Ilium', l.12). England is damned by the regicide and 'Anarchical confusion doth surround | This fatal isle, and devils here will dwell, | As anciently, and turn this place to hell' (ll.32–34), the reference to anarchy again linking to a fear of the 'popular' and the mob. Thus, in these elegies Pulter is clearly echoing some of the key messages found in both her elegy to Lucas and Lisle, and in those of other Royalists commemorating Charles I, using elegy to paint Parliament and the regicides as both illegitimate and violent, set against the image of Charles the martyr.

Pulter uses conventional praise and panegyric to paint an idealised portrait of the king, drawing on Charles's presentation of himself as a martyr in *Eikon Basilike*, explicitly referring in 'On that unparalleled Prince' to 'our martyred sovereign' (l.24).¹⁹ She also uses extended images of Charles as the sun, a traditional symbol of royalty, drawing on her knowledge of astronomy: as Jayne Archer and Sarah Hutton have demonstrated, she had a strong interest in natural philosophy and the natural sciences.²⁰ However, Pulter lacks the triumphalist tone of assertions by male writers in characterising Charles's ascent to heaven. The sun is in eclipse, in 'darkness' (l.13), as the natural order is overturned, and the loss of light symbolises his execution:

But should the sun forsake the line ecliptic
 Then total nature would be epileptic.
 Just so our case since royal Charles did die:
 In horrid, trembling trances now we lie. (ll. 5–8)

The odd, halting rhythm of 'ecliptic'/'epileptic' echoes the disruption and disease in the natural order as represented by the regicide, with the sun leaving its orbit and being linked to madness and mental disturbance. Similar use of images of light is made in 'On the Same', where Charles smiles down from heaven (l.5) but his 'radiant fulgor' (brilliant or dazzling light) is hidden (l.28). There is a sense of doom and melancholy and an impression of internalised anguish ('trembling trances') which signals that Pulter is moving away from the patterns of royalist funeral elegy she inherited. While she continues to use elegy for polemical purposes and to draw on the tropes used by other, male Royalists expressing both lamentation and rage, she also conveys an impression of personal distress that leaves her trapped in something akin to Freud's definition of melancholy, and the idea that the

¹⁹ Charles I/John Gauden, *Eikon Basilike The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty In His Solitudes and Sufferings* ed. Edward Philip Knachel, (New York, Cornell University Press, 1966; first published London, 1649).

²⁰ Jayne Archer, 'A "Perfect Circle"? Alchemy in the Poetry of Hester Pulter' in *Literature Compass* Vol. 2 2005 1– 14; Sarah Hutton, 'Hester Pulter (c. 1596—1678). A Woman Poet and the New Astronomy' in *Études Épistémè* 14 (2008).

melancholic is trapped ‘clinging to the [love] object’.²¹ This can also be viewed through what Emma Raynor has characterised as “sto(ne)cism”: ‘the metamorphic change which sees a female character or speaker respond to adverse worldly circumstances by turning to stone, by becoming a statue’. Evoking the myth of Niobe, who was turned to stone by Zeus, who had been moved to pity by her weeping for the loss of her children (who had been shot by Artemis and Apollo, in punishment for her pride), Raynor discusses Pulter’s elegies to her lost children, and argues that ‘Pulter succeeds in extending women’s ritual mourning work into a chronic form of melancholy’. In Pulter’s royalist elegies this sense of melancholy, that at times approaches desperation, is in an uneasy balance with royalist polemic.²²

Both ‘On the Horrid Murder of That Incomparable Prince, King Charles I’ and ‘On the Same’ are pervaded by grief, lament and a sense of loss and illustrate Ross’s argument that Pulter draws on a ‘female aesthetic’ of weeping and that in her political elegies ‘a re-action of sighs and tears constitutes a form of political action’.²³ In the short ‘On the Horrid Murder’ Pulter commands the reader, both using and challenging the impact of conventional mourning as depicted in images of tears: ‘Let none presume to weep; tears are too weak | Such unparralled [sic] loss as this to speak.’ (ll.1–2). The direct tone perhaps reflects the influence of John Donne.

The enormity of Charles’s execution is maintained throughout the poem, and the inadequacy of conventional responses to his fate is repeatedly stressed: ‘Let us (ay me) no more drop tears, but eyes’ and ‘Nor let none dare to sigh, or strike their breast | To show a grief that so transcends the rest’ (ll.7-8). The poem concludes on this note, calling for her

²¹ Sigmund Freud, *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume XIV, *On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement and Other Works* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953 – 1974), pp. 244–245.

²² Emma Raynor, ‘Monumental Female Melancholy in John Webster and Hester Pulter’ in *Studies in English Literature 1500 – 1900* Vol. 60 No. 1 67–89, (2020), pp. 68, 83.

²³ Emma Raynor, ‘Monumental Female Melancholy’ p. 79; Ross, ‘Tears, Bezoars’ p. 6.

reader to ‘suspire our souls, weep out our eyes’ (ll.11- 12). The deliberate hyperbole and performance of grief challenge the reader – if any - to match the writer’s sorrow. At the same time, Pulter reinforces royalist portrayals of Parliament as bent on destroying natural social hierarchy, and her disdain for the common people underlines the intensity of her grief. Royalists are beyond tears: only ‘Poor village girls do so express their grief’ (l.3) and ‘Plebeians so each vulgar loss deplore [lament]’ (l.9). As Coussens argues, Pulter distances herself from the ‘public’ grief of the ‘common people’ and constructs ‘a specifically aristocratic response ... placing herself above the “poor village girls” and stressing her own feminine humility and silence’.²⁴ It is a politicised and defiant silence, but also one that distances her, conveying a sense of helplessness and isolation. In this context, Raynor’s use of the myth of Niobe resonates. Like Niobe, Pulter is afflicted with ‘speechlessness and silence’; but at the same time, she remains defiant, invoking ‘a female melancholy that draws into its stony contours the laudable qualities of endurance, heroism, and fortitude’.²⁵ On the margins of public political debate, she nonetheless asserts her right to participate in it.

The enormity of the regicide is further explored in ‘On the Same’ where she portrays it as an emblem of social and religious breakdown: ‘Seeing now the very soul of this sad isle | (At which trembling seizes my soul) is dead | And with our sacred sovereign [‘s] spirit’s fled | To heaven’ (ll.2–5). The images of tears and lament affirm Pulter’s shock and anger and re-emphasise her personal sorrow. Her repetition of ‘soul’ ties her fate to that of the nation. However, the inwardness of ‘trembling’, as before, stands out and reinforces her sense of isolation. This theme is maintained as Pulter, like other royalist writers, links the regicide with the subsequent execution in March 1649 of her neighbour Arthur Lord Capel. Mourning

²⁴ Catherine Coussens, “‘Virtue’s Commonwealth’: Gendering the Royalist Cultural Rebellion in the English Interregnum (1649 – 1660)’ in *Cankaya Universitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakultesi, Journal of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. 6 (2006), pp. 28–29.

²⁵ Raynor, ‘Monumental Female Melancholy’ pp. 82-83.

the latter's death, she yet insists on the greater grief of Charles's execution and she again rejects tears as inadequate. Robert Wilcher has shown how images of flooding and inundation, examined in the previous chapter, became a staple of royalist writing as they sought to depict the damage the parliamentary cause was doing.²⁶ Pulter draws on similar images here:

Thy loss, heroic kinsman, wounded deep,
Had we power left to sigh or weep;
Senseless we were of private desolation,
Just like a flood after an inundation. (ll.18–21)

The lyricism of Pulter's lament and the use of 'desolation' and 'senseless' convey a sense of helplessness which can be balanced against the rage she and other royalist writers commemorating Charles I demonstrate elsewhere. Such lyricism is extended throughout 'On the Same', as Capel's virtues are out-shone by those of the dead king, who is shown in images of light and alchemical transformation: 'Mercury surrounds the purest gold, | And Phoebus' beams doth Hermes' light enfold, | Hiding his radiant fulgor from our sight;' (ll.26–28). The allusions to gold and flashing light ('fulgor'), combined with the reference to the sun ('Phoebus'), a common symbol of the monarch, symbolise Charles's transcendence. The dead king is transformed by philosophical Mercury, the agent of alchemical change, and his status as a martyr who 'tramplest over Death and Adverse Fate' is asserted. As Eardley argues, Pulter 'draws on an established practice of reading alchemical processes, which were thought to separate superior substances from the inferior with which they were contaminated, as metaphors for the death and resurrection of Christ and ultimately for the purification of the human soul'.²⁷ In this way, Pulter elevates Charles and he and Capel are assured of their immortality, mourned by the tears of the church (the 'spouse of Christ', l.39) and those of

²⁶ Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 83, 88, 132.

²⁷ Eardley, 'Introduction', pp. 10–12; Pulter, *Poems, Emblems* footnote p.108.

Pulter herself. Overall, Pulter balances between using the elegy to pursue familiar royalist themes of anger, disbelief and revenge and drawing lyrically on themes of bitter loss and melancholy. Writing in semi-isolation at Broadfield and unable as a woman to intervene publicly, she uses elegy to convey an acute sense of despair and a knowledge of her own, enforced passivity.

Pulter draws on the flexibility of the elegiac genre to move away from the patterns of royalist funeral elegy by male writers. This is strongly marked in a second elegy, ‘On That Unparalleled Prince Charles I, His Horrid Murder’, which reflects her internalised sense of despair. The elegy again uses extended clusters of images of light and its absence, drawing on a central image of Charles as the sun and the source of light and life. This is reinforced by the hyperbole that dramatises his execution as a disaster of historical and cosmic proportions:

Coy Asoph may her sparkling splendour hide
Four hundred years, yet we no change abide,
And sad Electra may her beauties turn
Away from us, yet none but Ilium burn (ll. 9–12)

Comets such Asoph, which was named by the Emperor Julian who predicted its four-hundred-year course, were well known precursors of disaster, while the tragic sack of Troy and the tales of Electra transforming into either a comet or one of the Pleiades resonate throughout classical literature and hence the education Pulter received. Rather than immediately turning to polemic, however, she pursues the metaphor of Charles as source of life and of the natural order: ‘If the sun in darkness be involved, | Old Nature’s fabric would soon be dissolved’ (ll. 13–14). The extended image is repeated throughout the rest of the poem:

But if the sun should lose his heat and light
We should be invaded with death and night.
So since our martyred sovereign’s spirits fled
Our light, and life, our hopes, and joys are dead. (ll. 21–24)

The stark series of contrasts ('heat and light', 'death and night') point to Pulter's sense of despair, and to her flat conclusion that everything worth living for is 'dead'. While she uses the elegy to invoke the royalist motif of martyrdom and, later, to evoke 'chaos' and the 'Anarchical confusion' (ll.29, 32) that the country is now enveloped in, her call for revenge lacks the vitriol and conviction of earlier, male elegists. Even her appeal for a new start with a 'second Charles' (l. 45) conveys a sense of longing and abandonment and a nostalgia for a dead political order. Consequently, she remains trapped in melancholy and appears to achieve little sense of consolation or closure.

Nostalgia plays a strong role in Pulter's elegy and is reinforced by her use of lyrical motifs, and by what Ross describes as 'the politicised tropes of pastoral retirement'.²⁸ Her earlier Civil War poems used the names of nymphs and shepherds to bewail the plight of the king and of Henrietta Maria. While lyrical, Pulter's poems on Lucas and Lisle and on Charles I make less use of explicitly pastoral motifs, but they can be found in other poems, such as the brief lines 'Like lily leaves sprinkled with damask rose' (p. 79), where she describes the 'Stately hart to death pursued' (l. 2). The hunted hart was a well-known symbol of Charles I. She also draws on the pastoral associations of gardens. Ross points out that in 'The Invitation into the Countrey to my dear daughters' she invites her daughters to escape the corruption of London under parliamentary rule and urges them to return home to the garden of Broadfield with its 'sweet favorius gales' and 'new blowne roses' (ll. 66–68). Ironically, however, the garden itself is shown to be another lost Eden and corruption has now impacted on the rural and pastoral idyll of the country home (ll. 74–92). Both James Loxley and Lois Potter have argued such retirement to the countryside was ultimately both passive and feminising, while Potter suggests Charles's martyr status was ultimately 'an embarrassment'. For Pulter, however, it appears to be both a compulsion and a source of lyrical melancholy that threads

²⁸ Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, pp. 138, 140–144.

through her elegies to the martyred king, both reinforcing her anger and disbelief and undercutting them, through a sense that her despair is being expressed in a void.²⁹

Overall, Pulter's use of elegy in mourning the royalist martyrs and in particular Charles I is ambiguous. She uses elements of funeral elegy, as do other royalist writers, for the purposes of expressing her rage and despair at the course the war had taken. There is a strong sense of anger that is rooted in her royalist convictions that Parliament – and especially the regicides – had overstepped the bounds of the natural order and plunged the country into anarchy. This finds expression in a defence of social hierarchy that shows deep distrust and class hatred for the 'popular'. At the same time, Pulter moves away from such polemic: her calls for revenge are muted and more hopeful than convincing. Instead, she draws on lyrical traditions and evokes images of pastoral elegy that reinforce her enforced passivity. Confined largely to her home, with little chance of a readership extending far beyond her own family, she expresses her grief and frustration to herself. At the same time, however, she can also mute her anger, and subsume it in the evocation of an idealised and ultimately nostalgic vision of King Charles and royalist rule as the centre of a divinely ordered world – but one she has lost and now mourns, lacking consolation. Her use of elegy thus begins to bring together both the increasingly politicised conventions of funeral elegy as it had developed over the course of the 1640s with lyrical and pastoral elements. Writing in parallel with other royalist authors, she expresses their anger and sense of disbelief and despair. In this process, she partly reassembles elegy, as Joad Raymond puts it, and her

²⁹ James Loxley 'Unfettered Organs: the Polemical Voices of Katherine Philips' in E. Clarke and D. Clarke, *This Double Voice: Gendered Writing in Early Modern England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan 2000), pp. 230–48; Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature 1641 – 1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 212.

writing reflects both the trauma of the wars and regicide, but also a sense of personal anguish and isolation that re-casts elegy in a feminised mould.³⁰

Lucy Hutchinson and the uses of Memory

This section asks how Lucy Hutchinson uses her elegies to articulate her despair at the political defeat of the republican cause, the return of the monarchy and the subsequent death in prison of her husband, the regicide John Hutchinson. It explores how she draws on the different elegiac traditions she inherited, and how she shapes them as a woman to express both her personal anguish, and the political rage she experiences as she contemplates the Restoration regime of Charles II. It further considers how she uses key sets of images and motifs and evokes wider literary and cultural traditions to mourn her husband and the cause they shared. These include the evocation of memory palaces, a trope which would have been familiar to her from seventeenth century understandings of the ancient ‘arts of memory’, and of the importance of memory as fundamental both to our sense of ourselves, and to the leading of a well-regulated and prudent Christian life. As David Norbrook notes, Hutchinson was close to the Congregationalist divine John Owen, whose sermons she attended in 1673, and as a convinced Calvinist she would in theory subscribe to Protestant teaching about the necessity of accepting of God’s will, and of not seeking to know or shape her husband’s fate after death. Her struggle to mourn her husband and reconcile her grief with her rage and her religious beliefs will be at the centre of consideration as to whether and to what degree she achieves any sense of acceptance or resolution in her elegies.³¹

Hutchinson’s elegies are placed in the context of her situation, writing as a woman who paradoxically both defers to and transgresses her position as a woman. Her elegies use

³⁰ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 214.

³¹ David Norbrook, ‘Introduction’ to Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder* (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers 2001), p. xix; ODNB, *Lucy Hutchinson* <<https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.bbk.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/14285>> [accessed 8th June 2021].

tightly controlled language to express strong, challenging emotions – rage and despair, guilt, desolation, defiance of those who brought her husband to his death and bodily and sexual loss. In the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* she shows herself to have been highly forceful, but at the same time she faces the question as to how far, as a respectable woman, she can openly express strong emotions and in particular a sense of erotic loss in her elegies. As N.H Keeble observes, she praises Elizabeth I for ‘submission’ to her male councillors and positions herself rhetorically as the Colonel’s ‘shadow’. Her letter to her patron Arthur Annesley, dedicating her translation of Lucretius to him, apologises for her writing.³² Hutchinson’s performance of personal grief and political rage is thus fraught with contradiction, as she moves from ostensible self-abnegation to the political and linguistic forcefulness which shape her use of elegy. This positions her, as much as her husband, at the centre of the elegies.

Hutchinson was writing in political and personal isolation in the wake of the defeat that the end of the Commonwealth and the Restoration of Charles II represented for Republicans, and was under suspicion, following her husband’s arrest for alleged involvement in plotting and his subsequent death. The Act of Indemnity and Oblivion of 1660 officially imposed forgetfulness of the previous twenty years - the Civil War, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate - and threatened that anyone who ‘shall presume maliciously to call or allege of, or object against any other person or persons any name or names, or other words of reproach tending to revive the memory of the late differences or the occasions whereof’ would be punished with fines.³³ Largely unenforceable, it was in practice ignored both by Royalists seeking restitution and revenge, and, in different and necessarily

³² Lucy Hutchinson, *Translation of Lucretius: ‘De rerum natura’* ed. Hugh de Quehen (London: Duckworth 1996), pp. 23–27; Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* ed. and ‘Introduction’ by N.H Keeble, transcribed from manuscript held in Nottingham Country Archives (London: Phoenix Press 2000), pp. xxv, 51.

³³ Charles II, 1660: ‘An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion’.

more oblique ways, by those such as Lucy Hutchinson and John Milton who sought to defy such prescriptions and preserve the memory of the ‘good old cause’ in the face of a legally enforceable politics of forgetting. At the same time, this political polarisation came up against what Keeble describes as a ‘perplexing tangle of loyalties ...[where] ... social, neighbourly, familial and personal ties are frequently in conflict with, and may over-ride, commitment to one side or another’. Hutchinson, like Hester Pulter and many others, had connections on both sides of the conflict in the Civil Wars, and she drew on them to try and save her husband, though not without a sense of both guilt and desperation, which Norbrook has explored at length, and which is reflected in her elegies.³⁴

Hutchinson was the daughter of Sir Allen Apsley, Lieutenant of the Tower of London; her brother, also Sir Allen Apsley, fought with the King during the war and was Governor of Barnstaple until its surrender in 1646. In contrast, John Hutchinson, who was the cousin of leading Parliamentarian Henry Ireton, had been governor of Nottingham and of Nottingham Castle for Parliament, and later signed the death warrant for Charles I. Critical of the Interregnum regime, the Hutchinsons had retired to the family estate at Owthorpe in Nottinghamshire during the 1650s. The Colonel escaped arrest and execution in 1660 in part because of his wife’s interventions with royalist relatives, including her brother. However, he was arrested in 1663 on suspicion of involvement in the Derwentdale Plot and died while in prison in Sandown Castle in 1664, his wife’s efforts at lobbying for his release having been rejected. Hutchinson subsequently found herself in financial difficulties: she sold her husband’s estate at Lowesby in Leicestershire and, in 1672, sold Owthorpe, the family home,

³⁴ David Norbrook, ‘Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration’, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 75 No 2 (2010), 232–282; David Norbrook, ‘the Republican Woman Writer’, p. 476; Norbrook, ‘Lucy Hutchinson’s ‘Elegies’ and the situation of the Republican Woman Writer’ in *English Literary Renaissance* (27:3) 1997, 468–521. The elegies will henceforth be referred to by the number given in Norbrook’s text.

to her husband's half-brother Charles Hutchinson, though it seems she continued to live there at least some of the time.³⁵

Hutchinson's elegies are marked by her extensive reading of both the classics and the Bible. Her commonplace book shows her to have had a wide range of literary interests and she drew on a range of forms including anti-aubade, epitaph, spiritual journey, portrait, country house poem, blazon, song, emblem and complaint, employing, as Elizabeth Scott-Baumann observes, multiple metrical forms.³⁶ In addition to the elegies and the *Memoirs* and her translation of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, she wrote a poetic retelling of Genesis, published as *Order and Disorder*, which shows the influence of her strongly held Calvinism. The elegies were preserved in manuscript and have been edited by David Norbrook, who argues that Hutchinson wrote both the elegies and the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* contemporaneously and that with one possible exception they were complete by 1671.³⁷ They probably circulated in manuscript, though Ross suggests the audience for the elegies may have been more restricted than the wider readership attested to by multiple copies of both her translation of *De rerum natura* and of *Order and Disorder*.³⁸ There are some difficulties in considering the structure of the cycle of elegies. Norbrook, following F.E. Hutchinson, points out that the manuscript is not in Lucy Hutchinson's own hand and the 'illiterate spellings' don't accord with what we know of such a scholarly woman: there are

³⁵ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, p. 79; Keeble, 'Introduction' to *Memoirs*, p. xxvii; ODNB, *Lucy Hutchinson*.

³⁶ Hutchinson, *Commonplace Book* (DD/HU1 c. 1650 – 1660 in Nottingham Country Archives); Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, *Forms of Engagement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 11.

³⁷ Hutchinson, *Elegies* (DD/HU2 in Nottingham Country Archives); Norbrook, 'the Republican Woman Writer', p. 470; Lucy Hutchinson, *Order and Disorder* ed. David Norbrook (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).

³⁸ Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, p. 24.

missing lines, and the metre can be suspect. There is, however, a clear sense of organisation to the poems that brings together both personal and political memory.³⁹

The elegies combine personal grief and rage with political fury and despair. For Hutchinson memorialisation is both a political and a psychological necessity, that paradoxically brings more pain than consolation. In writing as a Republican, she is laying a claim to a genre, which Nigel Smith has argued had become a royalist domain over the 1640s and 1650s but had also sucked in all elegiac energy in the wake of the regicide. Contrary to Smith, it is argued here that she reclaims elegy to convey deeply felt political anger and despair in the wake of the Restoration and the end of her hopes as a Republican, as well as the intense personal and erotic loss the death of her husband represented.⁴⁰ Hutchinson thus uses her elegy for a complex set of purposes. In the first place, her rage and despair are directed at the Restoration regime, which she subjects to vehement attack, and at those who betrayed the ‘good old cause’. This attack is inextricably linked with an idealised portrait of the Colonel, who represents all that was noble about the republican and independent cause. Secondly, the elegies present Hutchinson’s overwhelming sense of personal and erotic lack, where her desire to abnegate herself in the light of his loss is paradoxically balanced against her need to rage and cry out. She thus places herself at the centre of the elegies, and re-shapes the genre in ways different to her male predecessors. Finally, the elegies display a strong sense of nostalgia for an idealised past. The opening of Hutchinson’s first elegy brings these purposes together, as she challenges her readers and rejects their pity, dramatising her own, metaphorical death:

Leave of yee pittying friends; leave of in vaine
Do you perswade the dead to live againe
In uaine to me the comforts are applied
For, ‘twas not he; twas only I that died. (Elegy 1, ll. 1-4)

³⁹ Norbrook, ‘the Republican Woman Writer’, p. 485.

⁴⁰ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 287–294.

The imperatives, combined with mainly monosyllabic words and the sharp, brittle contrasts ('vaine'/'again', 'he'/'I') reinforced by the caesura she employs in line 4, evoke a sense of rage and despair. This is reflected in her attack on the literal and moral decay of the Restoration regime, and the 'loathsome dunghill' (l. 34) that is the court of Charles II, with its reputation for sexual license and decadence. This is contrasted with the inherent moral superiority of the Colonel, which allows him, unlike 'fooles', to see through 'The groues the palaces The pleasant Pooles' (ll. 31-32), the pastoral connotations of 'groues' and 'pooles' hiding the reality of the new regime whose members 'By lusts enslaued in sadder [Thralldome] lay' (l. 56).

Hutchinson's polemical attacks on the Restoration regime are sustained throughout the elegies. They highlight the ungodly character of the new order which, in a mirror-image of royalist attacks on the regicides, is presented as inverting nature. Hutchinson's use of images of light and dark is complex and, as will be seen below, she associates the Colonel with the light of heaven and truth. However, she also uses these images in a less conventional way and in both 'To the Sun Shineing into her Chamber' (Elegy 2) and 'Another on The Sun Shine' (Elegy 3) light – and particularly the light of the sun – is associated with pain and with the restored regime itself. In contrast, Hutchinson seeks to hide away and abnegate herself in darkness and shadow, even as she proclaims her grief and her anger. Erin Murphy points out that 'Restoration rhetoric' typically depicted Charles II as the sun and employed puns on sun/son. In 'Another on The Sun Shine' Hutchinson reviles the hypocrisy of the 'Gawdy Masker' (l. 11), personifying the sun and explicitly linking it with the callousness and contempt of a courtier at the Restoration court: 'And for all This veildest not Thy Radiant Head | But comest as a gay courtier to deride | Reuines we would in Silent Shadowes hid' (ll.

34 – 36).⁴¹ Unlike the male Royalists writing in the wake of the regicide, who seem to take pride in proclaiming their hatred and desire for revenge, Hutchinson conveys little relish for such rhetoric, despite her bitter scorn for her enemies, and seeks refuge in the shadows. Nonetheless, in ‘To the Sun Shineing into her Chamber’ Hutchinson directly accuses the ‘alseeing Sun’ (l. 6) of complicity in the end of the Commonwealth and in the advent of royalist revenge, and links light with Charles II and with tyranny and hell:

Goe guild the tyrants bloody Throne
Cast lustre on the Strumpets face
Reveale Their glories in full grace
And let The Great ones by Thy Light
Act crimes which Used to black The Night (Elegy 2, ll. 16–20)

Hutchinson again inverts the traditional associations of light and associates it with the open decadence and sexual license of the Restoration court where crimes are openly committed. The reference to ‘guild’ may echo Lady Macbeth’s murderous ‘I’ll gild the faces of the grooms withal | For it must seem their guilt’ (Act 2 Scene 2, ll. 57–58). The ‘tyrants bloody throne’ can be compared with Milton’s depiction in *Paradise Lost* of Satan, the ‘great Sultan’ (Book I l. 348), who is seated on ‘a throne of royal state’ (Book II, l. 1). The comparison of Charles II and the Restoration court with Satan and the satanic court by Milton and Hutchinson is plain. The two poets shared a patron in the form of the Earl of Anglesey, who had intervened to save Milton from prison in 1660, and it is likely Hutchinson would have been aware of *Paradise Lost*, which was first published in 1667 but was in circulation earlier.⁴²

⁴¹ Erin Murphy, *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth Century English Literature* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011), pp. 156–7.

⁴² Germaine Greer, ‘Horror like Thunder’ *London Review of Books* Volume 23, No. 12 2001 <<https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v23/n12/germaine-greer/horror-like-thunder>> [accessed 26th November 2021]; John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler (London: Longman, 1968, 1971). Further references will be given using this edition.

Hutchinson also uses her elegies to convey a strong sense of betrayal, reflecting her isolation in the 1660s as former friends made their peace with the new regime. Thus, the sun is bitterly implicated in the betrayals of ‘noble Patriots’ and watches over them as they to ‘Prison and Exile were led away’ (Elegy 2, ll. 6, 10). Similarly, in ‘Another on The Sun Shine’ she suggests that the ‘Thankless’ people of England have turned on those who sought to save them:

Thou saw'st the league of God himself dissould
Which a whole nation in one curse Involved
Thou sawst a Thankless people slaughtering those
Whose noble blood redeemed them from their foes (Elegy 3, ll. 27-30)

The Colonel's nobility is sharply contrasted to those who betrayed him, and he is represented as the exemplar of the faithful soldier. The references to ‘blood’ and ‘redeemed’ clearly associate him with martyrdom, and with Christ, ironically echoing elegies written by Royalists sanctifying Charles I after the regicide. The lines implicitly suggest the Colonel is one of the Calvinist elect, reflecting the Hutchinsons' view of themselves as part of a godly minority, as well as portraying the Colonel's loyalty to his own lineage and obligations. The couplets are balanced and controlled, but the elegy is not consolatory and is rather an expression of rage and incomprehension, as Hutchinson grapples with the paradox of God's purposes and with the pain of loss and betrayal.

Hutchinson's use of elegy for direct polemic is inextricably linked with conventional elegiac idealisation and praise of her dead husband, and with her need to vindicate his status as a hero and martyr at the hands of the Restoration regime. Less overtly, it should also be seen as defence against those Republicans and former allies who saw the Colonel's actions in 1660 and his public repentance of regicide as less than noble. Norbrook cites sharp criticism of him from Republicans Edmund Ludlow and Algernon Sidney, for example, and there is also the suggestion that Hutchinson is countering her own guilt in working for his pardon

after the Restoration.⁴³ She places the Colonel himself at the centre of the 'Portrait' Elegies, 4 to 6, and these 'pictures' of the Colonel - one at least, in Norbrook's view, referring to an actual portrait by Robert Walker - portray him in various guises, as soldier, as prisoner and as jailed martyr.⁴⁴ The title of Elegy 4, 'Upon two pictures one a gallant man drest up in armour The other the Same Honorable Person looking through a Prison Greate and leaneing on a Bible' highlights the injustice of the Colonel's fate by contrasting his martyrdom with his nobility, and Hutchinson proceeds through a series of contrasts between the Colonel and his enemies designed to exemplify his virtues: 'Such killing weapons too he wore | Not to destroy but to restore' (ll. 9-10). The pun on 'restore'/Restoration reinforces her sense of injustice and, ironically, the virtue and superiority of Colonel Hutchinson, the regicide and Parliamentarian, is evoked through images of royalty, though this may be undercut by an unstated parallel with Christ, also a 'true-borne Prince' who was martyred for others. Regal images recur throughout the elegies. In Elegy 4 she proclaims, 'No Vulgar hands Sett on his Crowne | Nor could They cast his Empire down' (ll. 2-4), and in Elegy 5, 'On the Picture in Armour', Hutchinson refers to his 'Majestick greatnesse'. In Elegy 12, 'Musings in my evening Walkes at O', these images are extended to Hutchinson herself as she 'converses' with his memory and describes how his 'glories were my [Crowne]' (l. 49). Her re-purposing of such specifically royalist terminology contributes a strong tone of defiance to her writing, as well as glorifying her husband.

Hutchinson's use of images that evoke royalty are connected to architecture and to a reclaiming of images of the body politic for the defeated Independents. As Sarah Covington points out, Parliamentarians including Cromwell 'repeatedly return to architectural analogies

⁴³ Norbrook, 'Memoirs and Oblivion', pp. 244-245.

⁴⁴ Norbrook, 'the Republican Woman Writer', p. 494.

as the most effective way of describing the new republican order that was emerging'.⁴⁵ Used by Hutchinson, they again emphasise the Colonel's heroic and soldierly attributes and underline her defiance in the face of loss and defeat. In Elegy 5, 'On the Picture in Armour', she uses the extended metaphor of a building and the traditional allegory of reason as a fort or defence against chaos to stress the Colonel's nobility and his rectitude in the face of persecution:

That well-made head Enclos'd a royall court
where reason kept a strongly guarded fort
While his whole fabrique was a pallace built
For seuerall Princes matchlesse Courage dwelt
Within the generous neuer fainting heart. (Elegy 5, ll. 19–23)

Margaret Healy has pointed to the motif of the body 'as a fortified (materially and/or spiritually) yet vulnerable enclosure - castle, ship, city or temple - threatened constantly by "enimie" incursions'. The stress on the Colonel's strength as well as the chivalric reference to him as a knight of 'matchlesse Courage' highlights his status as a member of the gentry, an issue important to Hutchinson, who despatched her two eldest sons and a mourning coach and horses to fetch her husband's body and bring it to the church at Owthorpe, where he is buried. His tomb is inscribed with the epitaph she wrote in his memory. Susan Wiseman has noted that Hutchinson was ensuring that her husband was given a full heraldic funeral consonant with his lineage, asserting he was not a traitor and that his memory should be honoured.⁴⁶

Hutchinson also uses these three 'Portrait' elegies to assert the godliness of their cause, and to depict the Colonel as enduring the patient suffering of a Protestant martyr. In 'On the Picture of the Prisoner' (Elegy 6) he is shown wearing his armour, but there is more

⁴⁵ Sarah Covington, *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor in Seventeenth Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 43–4.

⁴⁶ Margaret Healy, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave 2001), p. 18; Susan Wiseman, at London Renaissance Seminar, February 2015.

focus on his life as a prisoner, his suffering and the inevitability of his salvation than on his military achievements during the Civil War. Hutchinson seems to identify herself with his suffering and exalts how ‘Close prison meant his Innocence to Conceale | The glories of his Suffering grace reveale’ (ll. 12–13), describing the ‘sweete Humility’ with which he ‘begun th’ascent | To perfect Selfe deniall’ (ll. 36-37). Covington, commenting on *Foxe’s Actes and Monuments*, argues that Foxe’s martyrs ‘behave with fortitude’ and ‘his martyrs nevertheless earn their ultimate status as the godly elect through the testimony of a bodily suffering made intensely visible, and transcendent.’⁴⁷ While the Colonel was poorly treated, rather than tortured or put to death, he is similarly depicted as patiently enduring the treatment he experienced at Sandown Castle.

Hutchinson’s evocation of suffering and of martyrdom allows her to assert the conviction of the godly that their cause was, and remained, God’s cause, and that it would ultimately triumph. As she insists ‘The lord himselfe derides Their secret mines | And workes his good Through Their ill designs’ (Elegy 6, ll. 11-12). Later in the same elegy, she compares the Colonel to ‘great Sampson’ (l. 67) as he triumphs over the Philistines - a reflection, perhaps, of Milton’s *Samson Agonistes*. There is a sense of hope here, that is inspired by his past triumphs and his ability to rise above his enemies, though that hope resides mainly in her conviction that he is one of the saved for whom ‘death it Selfe vnlockt Heauens splendid gate’ (l. 52). Indeed, the clarity of Hutchinson’s Calvinism inevitably leads her to assert his salvation; like Peter he is ‘a rock of Vertuious Courage’ (Elegy 5, l. 51). While her sense of baffled rage and despair in the face of personal loss and political defeat remains, Hutchinson also seeks hope in her memories, and in the assertion of the Colonel’s virtues. However, she does not find it.

⁴⁷ Covington, *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor*, p. 15.

The tension in Hutchinson's portrayals of her husband reflects what Laqueur describes as 'the tension between memory and history'. The Colonel and his political struggle were part of what Laqueur refers to as 'a place that at one moment was the venue for something - horrible, magnificent, world historical - that cries out to be remembered'. Yet at the same time that place 'exists in time, which inexorably washes it of the marks it bore'.⁴⁸ In the face of official silence and hostility that sought to wash away the struggles of the previous years, Hutchinson strains to preserve their memory. In different ways she circles round these portraits of the Colonel, so as to fix his memory; yet in some ways that memory is not fully realised and is distanced by the use of relatively abstract imagery. Despite Elegies 4 to 6, being focused on portraits, the description is impersonal and highly conventional: the Colonel is 'a Gallant man drest vp in Armour' (Elegy 4), and she describes 'That face | Where glorious fiercenesse dwelt with Charming grace' (Elegy 5, ll. 1-2). Paradoxically, the act of writing, of repeatedly evoking his memory brings home both the distance between memory and lived reality, and the difficulty of representing the former in words. Repetition is a convention of elegy, as Peter Sacks observes, yet repetition and continuing memorialisation of her subject do not bring her any sense of resolution, either personal or political. Instead, she is trapped in an angry melancholy, unable to fully mourn her husband or to achieve any sense of peace.⁴⁹ Ostensibly describing her husband, Hutchinson's 'portrait elegies' in fact evoke how she is both haunted and tormented by her memories and the contradictions they force on her, even as she seeks to impose order on them.

Ultimately Hutchinson herself is at the centre of her elegies, notwithstanding her presentation of herself as her husband's 'shadow'. In her much-discussed passage in the *Memoirs* she asserts that her moral and emotional survival is and was dependent on their

⁴⁸ Thomas Laqueur, 'Introduction' to 'Special Issue: Grounds for Remembering', *Representations* 69 University of California Press, 2000, p.1.

⁴⁹ Sacks, p. 18-26.

relationship, and his death has effaced her, so that she ‘when he was removed, was only filled with a dark mist, and could never again take in any delightful object, nor return any shining representation ... So, his shadow, she waited on him everywhere, till he was taken into that region of light which admits of none, and then she vanished into nothing’.⁵⁰ Keeble has pointed to the ‘metaphors of self-negation and self-dissolution’ in this passage and argues that ‘Lucy Hutchinson’s conception of the feminine gender role was entirely traditional’. This is reflected in the images of self-abnegation she uses here, of vanishing into a ‘dark mist’. Ross also refers to Hutchinson’s sense of ‘unwavering patriarchal hierarchy’ in the Elegies.⁵¹ However, it is important not to underplay the way Hutchinson and other women of the period both conform to conventional notions of their role and simultaneously employ what Patricia Pender has described as a ‘modesty trope’ to justify their writing. This was also a rhetorical device employed by male writers: Pender points to Milton’s use of it in the invocation to *Paradise Lost, Book IX* as ‘Nor skilled nor studious’ (l.42), for example. She suggests, however, that it conveys his ‘colossal ambition’, whereas Hutchinson makes rhetorical use of the trope, both drawing on it to efface herself and simultaneously undermining it.⁵² Her use of the third person in the *Memoirs* and her conscious use of this trope, both here and in the elegies, allow her to explore not only the contested arenas of the Civil War and what followed, and her husband’s role in it, but to insert herself at the centre of her writing.

Apologetics by women writers were highly conventional: Elizabeth Jocelin in *The Mothers Legacie* (1624) and Dorothy Leigh in *The Mother’s Blessing* (1616) both justify

⁵⁰ Hutchinson, *Memoirs* p. 51.

⁵¹ NH Keeble, ‘The Colonel’s Shadow: Lucy Hutchinson, Women’s Writing and the Civil War’ in *Literature and the English Civil War* ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990), p. 244; Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, p. 182.

⁵² Patricia Pender, *Early Modern Women’s Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (Basingstoke and York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012) p. 7.

their writing in terms of a mother's zeal and love for their children.⁵³ Margaret Cavendish, writing her autobiography *A True Relation of My Birth* in the 1650s, simultaneously apologises for and defends her writing, hoping that 'my readers will not think me vain for writing my life, since there have been many that have done the like, as Caesar, Ovid, and many more, both men and women, and I know no reason why I may not do it as well as they'.⁵⁴ Hutchinson does not openly defend her writing, as Cavendish does, and consistently defers to male superiority. However, like Cavendish and the other women referred to above, she draws on 'modesty tropes [that] function as 'authorial alibis' in the sense that they provide 'an excuse, a pretext, a plea of ignorance' to early modern strictures against women's authorship (OED)'.⁵⁵ In the process she positions not only her husband but also herself at the centre of the elegies and uses them to express a complex set of emotions in the performance of her grief.

Hutchinson brings together private sorrow and political anger in her condemnation of political persecution that denied her husband a public funeral. She demands that the sun 'keepe away Thy prying beames' while she is 'Wayling a Publick funeral (Elegy 2, ll. 21, 24). As before, her demand to be left in the dark away from 'Thy prying beames' sharply inverts the usually positive connotation of '[sun] beames', while the use of 'prying', with its connotations of dishonesty as well as intrusion, bitterly implicate the sun - or nature itself - in the betrayals of the past, shifting across private and public memories. Images of light and of seeing, far from representing clarity or truth, are implicated in these betrayals. The contrast

⁵³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs* p. 70; Elizabeth Jocelin, *The Mother's Legacy to her Unborn Child* ed Jean Le Drew Metcalfe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000); Dorothy Leigh, *The Mother's Blessing* (London, 1616) ESTC S93440; Patricia Pender, *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (Basingstoke and York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

⁵⁴ Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, to which is Added the True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life* (JC Nimmo, 1886), p. 317.

⁵⁵ Pender, p. 3

between these images and the necessarily concealed tears ‘which in Secrett fall’ (l. 23) imply that the only way she can deal with her memories is to abnegate herself. Again, there is a clear contrast with the openly public elegy of the 1640s, where rage and increasingly the call for revenge become ever more apparent. Paradoxically, however, it also places her anger and pain before us, while apparently maintaining the appropriately retiring, modest behaviour of a woman in such circumstances.

In Elegies 8 and 9, ‘The Night’ and ‘Another Night’, Hutchinson characterises her own existence and, by extension, her world as plunged into a state of spiritual and political darkness by the absence of the Colonel and what he represented. Using images of light and dark more conventionally than in the elegies addressing the sun, she describes ‘Night’ as the ‘emblame both of death and hell’ which ‘alsoe in her Soule did dwell’ (Elegy 8, ll. 9, 11). Thus, both elegies open with images of the world shrouded in darkness, with the sun and the light concealed:

Heauens Glories was wrapped up in shrowds
Earth which no more derived from Thence
A warme and cheering Influence
Lay could beneath The weeping Clouds (Elegy 8, ll. 1–4)

Night tooke the alternate reigne and hurld
Concealing Mists about The world
Which ouer all these glories lay
That shind in the Presedent day (Elegy 9, ll. 1–4)

Hutchinson draws on sharp contrasts between the metaphorical warmth of the sun and the symbolic cold and death (‘shrowds’) she and England now experience and lament. Similarly, the light of the sun in ‘Another Night’ is concealed by mist, while she looks back nostalgically at the achievements of the parliamentary and independent cause (‘glories’). She both mistrusts and shrinks from the light as too much to bear. Yet the sun, even as she rejects it, is also ‘Heauens glorious Eie which all the world surveys’ (Elegy 3, l. 1). In ‘On the picture of the Prisoner’ the Colonel’s memory is linked with the light of heaven:

Opening that book when They had shut their Locks
Hee Their found liuing streames and diamond rocks
Which in his darkest solitude shot rayes
That shamd the splendour of the brightest days (Elegy 6, ll. 19-22)

The elegy thus reinforces her sense of the Colonel's firm attachment to God's truth and is a vindication and defence of his political stance through a conventional linking of light with truth. Hutchinson draws extensively throughout the elegies on what Norbrook refers to as 'a Christianised version of neo-platonic imagery in which earthly life is seen as a mere reflection of the heavenly', which he argues pervades both the elegies and the Memoirs.⁵⁶ The image of the Colonel in 'darkest solitude' finding hope in his faith and in the light of the 'book' – presumably the Bible - evokes the Christian and Neo-Platonist movement towards heaven. As in 'Night' and 'Another Night', that truth is hidden in darkness or in mist. The 'diamond rocks' may be an echo of Tasso's *Jerusalem Liberated* (Canto 3, Stanza 51). They can also be linked to the associations of diamond: Charles Hamilton describes 'the invincibility and magic power lapidaries assigned to the diamond'. He notes that Arthur in Spenser's *The Faerie Queen* carries a diamond shield 'which reveals falsity and repels pagan horses and soldiers' and has linked this to references to diamond shields in both Tasso and in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*.⁵⁷ Hutchinson does not, however, find any comfort in her assertion of her husband's faith and constancy, and she performs her memories to keep them alive, rather than to move on from them. In Elegy 9, 'Another Night', she rejects the comfort of memory:

Here Saide Shee my lifes taper burned
But ah now to cold ashes turnd
In vaine do I lost Joys repeate
This painted fire giues me no heate (Elegy 9, ll. 49–52)

⁵⁶ Norbrook, 'The Republican Woman Writer', p. 471.

⁵⁷ Albert Charles Hamilton, *The Spenser Encyclopaedia* (Toronto: Toronto University Press 1990), p. 673; Torquato Tasso, *Jerusalem Delivered* ed. Anthony M Esolen (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), p. 66; Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso* trans. Guido Waldman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

The melancholy tone and the use of tetrameter give this elegy the fatalistic feel of a ballad, and the characteristic use of contrasting images of heat and cold reinforces Hutchinson's sense of despair while the allusion to 'painted' with its overtones of falsity implies a rejection of consolation. Her sense of mortal loss is perhaps the most striking aspect of the elegies, as the suggestion they might bring comfort or relief is rejected.

Hutchinson places her sense of physical and erotic loss at the centre of her elegies, in a sharp move away from the impersonal portrayals of dead heroes in earlier elegy. In a paradoxical move for a puritan woman, she draws on the erotic masculine poetry of Donne's 'Songs and Sonnets', whose influence on Hutchinson's elegies has been explored by Ross and Scott-Baumann.⁵⁸ A further consideration of 'To the Sun Shineing into her Chamber' (Elegy 2) and 'Another on The Sun Shine' (Elegy 3), with their equivocal images of the sun, recalls Donne's 'The Sunne Rising', which is in itself an ironic comment on the imagery of Petrarchan love poetry where the sun, rather than being an emblem of erotic love intrudes on the lovers.⁵⁹ Like Donne, Hutchinson plays upon images of light and dark and employs the same concept of intrusion and thwarted sexuality. She uses a similarly direct tone as she addresses the sun peremptorily: 'Bright [day] starre look not in at me' (Elegy 2), which recalls Donne's 'Busie old foole, unruly Sunne'. Donne, however, draws attention to his sexual fulfilment. Hutchinson, in contrast, highlights her sense of sexual loss, dramatising her grief with her use of the imperative and of stark monosyllables. Such 'ceremonious dramatization' as Sacks describes it allows her to hide behind a show of female propriety and this is continued throughout the poem as she continues to play on deliberately unconventional images of the sun.⁶⁰ In Elegy 9, 'Another Night', her description of how the Colonel's 'thick

⁵⁸ Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, pp. 176, 178; Scott-Baumann, pp. 113–116, 125–137.

⁵⁹ John Donne, *John Donne: The Major Works* ed. John Carey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). All subsequent references to Donne will be to this edition.

⁶⁰ Sacks, p. 19.

bright hare flowed in loose Curle | And each locke bound a Captiue Girle' (ll. 33-34), with its possible allusion to Donne's 'The Relique', again links him with light, but also underscores a sense of physical loss. In 'The Night' Hutchinson places her grief at the centre of the poem, alluding to the 'teare-floods' of Donne's 'A Valediction Forbidding Mourning':

Woes sault floods quencht her inward light
ore all her heauen darknesse spread
Fretting remorse and guilty dread
Added a horror to her Night (Elegy 8, ll. 13–16)

The immensity of Hutchinson's grief and sense of sexual loss is reflected in her lament with its reference to the overwhelming 'sault-floods' of seas or oceans, while the affirmative verb 'quencht' reinforces a sense of active malice on the part of her foes. And while Donne explicitly promises to return to his lover, with his extended conceit of compasses whose foot 'growes erect, as that comes home' (l. 32), Hutchinson knows there is no return for the Colonel, though she insists he is now in heaven, his 'Natiue pallace' (l. 40). This does not, however, assuage her physical and sexual longing, and 'The Night' develops the theme of bodily loss through a series of extended rhetorical questions in stanzas 8 to 11, which recall the Colonel's physical presence:

Where is that hand that dried my teares
Those lipps that did my sorrows Charme
Where is that kind Encircling arme
That held mee upe amidst all fears (Elegy 8, ll. 25–28)

The plaintive questioning suggests the intimacy of the Hutchinsons' marriage and perhaps their courtship, which Hutchinson describes in her *Memoirs* and there is a strong impression of physical closeness, with the references to his 'hand' and 'lipps'; in the other stanzas she also alludes to his 'kind and constant breast' (l. 22) and his 'Soft powerful breath' (l. 29). She follows this, however, by stressing her own sense of abandonment: 'Those lipps and hands long Since were Could' (l. 33).

Hutchinson's acute sense of loss and despair are underlined by a strong element of nostalgia, and she uses elegy to create an idealised portrait of her past life and marriage, which betrays a yearning for a time when Independents and Republicans could dream of a better world. This nostalgic vision is contrasted to the trauma and desolation of the corrupt world of the Restoration she is now living in. It is a nostalgia that is not rooted in an explicitly political vision, such as royalist evocations of a golden age where king, church and hierarchy were unchallenged. Instead it finds expression in elegies that focus on different places from her past, including the house and gardens of her family home at Owthorpe in Nottinghamshire, often drawing on pastoral motifs and descriptions of landscapes in ways unused by the male writers of the 1640s. These places can be seen as memory palaces which evoke her lost past in a very personal way that takes elegy in a new direction. This is clear in the two elegies centred on the garden at Owthorpe, 'To the Gardin att O' (Elegy 7), and 'Musings in my evening Walkes at O' (Elegy 12) and 'On my Visitt to WS which I dreamt of That Night' (Elegy 11).

Hutchinson uses her dream-visit to WS, the unidentified and now deserted house which she had frequented in earlier days, to reinforce the contrast between her idealised past and her present desolation. Her movement through the house ironically mirrors the process described by writers in the memory treatises of the later Middle Ages and early Renaissance, which Frances Yates and others have explored. However, instead of the bright, arresting and at times lurid images set in significant places that the classical and medieval arts of memory recommended, she encounters decay. Where Augustine described 'treasuries of innumerable images of all kinds of objects', for Hutchinson the palace of memory is a storehouse of regret and misery.⁶¹ The 'empty mansion' stands both for Hutchinson herself and for the loss of her

⁶¹ Saint Augustine, *Confessions* ed. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1991), p. 214; Paolo Rossi, *Logic and the art of memory* trans. Stephen Clucas (London:

husband and the hopes they shared. This is reinforced by the sense of erotic loss in her ironic echo of Donne's 'A Valediction Forbidding Mourning' as she reflects on 'hauing a vast circle run | Hither I came and where I first begun | To respire loue resolved to sigh away my breath'. Unlike Donne, however, the Colonel does not return home, and as she recalls her walk through the house the images, drawing on the pastoral tradition, are bleak and reflect her sense of loss:

These naked walls stript of all ornament
Did once a Thousand pleasant Things present
Here warre the Gardins the well painted groues
Where Nimps and Shepherds treated gentile loue
The arras Storries did our fances rayse
To what The Poets fained of Golden days
When Innocence chast loue and Constant truth
Shind in the conuerse of untanted Youth (Elegy 11, ll. 15–22)

Hutchinson's garden setting and her use of mythical, pastoral figures such 'Nimps and Shepherds' sit squarely in the pastoral and elegiac traditions, which reach back to Theocritus and Virgil, the poets of 'Golden days', as well as to later poets such as Spenser or Milton.⁶² The 'gentile loue' and 'Innocence' of the nymphs and shepherds symbolises the Hutchinsons' marriage and their disappearance is emblematic of her lost hopes. Their love is implicitly contrasted with the corruption of Restoration culture, and the sexual license associated with the court of Charles II, thus bringing together personal and political themes in the elegy.

Hutchinson's education and extensive reading would certainly have made her familiar with the traditions of the pastoral. Norbrook has pointed to her use of the name Philocles to refer to her husband, and its associations with the pastoral and, possibly, with sacrifice.⁶³ She would also have been aware of how earlier poets had used the pastoral for the purposes of political critique, including for example, Milton's attack on corrupt churchmen in 'Lycidas'

Continuum 2000, first published 1960), Chapter 1; Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992; first published 1966), Chapters 1 and 4.

⁶² Sacks, Chapter 1.

⁶³ Norbrook, 'the Republican Woman Writer', pp. 480, 508.

where the swain's mourning is succeeded by the Pilot's bitter condemnation of those clergy who 'for their bellies sake | Creep and intrude and climb into the fold' (ll. 114–115).⁶⁴ The lost idyllic pastoral images in 'On my Visitt to WS which I dreamt of That Night' are deliberately juxtaposed to the state of abandonment that the house and England, of which it is a microcosm, are now in, inextricably mixing personal anguish with political despair. The abruptness of 'stript' highlights the sudden and violent change in the political climate, and this is reinforced by the bareness of the 'naked' walls. The contrast of these bleak descriptions with the nostalgia of the pastoral images carries an ironic undertone that reinforces Hutchinson's sense of alienation, and her refusal to succumb to pious mourning and a consolation she does not feel. Indeed, her apparent inability to escape her memories and find some equivocal refuge in nostalgia could be linked with trauma. As Jill Bennett argues, traumatic or extreme affective experience 'resists ... processing': we can't assimilate it into cognitive systems, or to thought, or indeed to memory, and it is subject to unconscious and uncontrolled repetition.⁶⁵

The use of pastoral motifs in 'On my Visitt to WS' is undercut by an underlying awareness of the fragility of the pastoral vision. Sacks points to Milton's evocation of pastoral convention in 'Lycidas' as the swain questions the sinking of the ship. Sacks argues there 'is no sympathy here between the nymphs and a drowning man. Worse yet, they play while he sinks', and points to Milton's subsequent distancing of the reader from the genre.⁶⁶ Hutchinson similarly draws on the enfeeblement of pastoral images: the nymphs and shepherds in 'On my Visitt to WS' are less callous than Milton's nymphs, but more

⁶⁴ John Milton, 'Lycidas' in *Complete Shorter Poems* ed. Stella P Revard and Barbara K Lewalski (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2009), pp. 74-80. All subsequent references will be to this edition.

⁶⁵ Jill Bennett, 'The Aesthetics of Sense Memory' in Susannah Radstone and Katharine Hodgkin (eds), *Memory Cultures - Memory, Subjectivity and Recognition* (London: Transaction Publishing; 2006), p. 27.

⁶⁶ Sacks, p. 107.

ineffectual. They have simply vanished, and Hutchinson stares at a bare wall, which comes to epitomise her inability to process her memories or to find comfort in them. There is also the suggestion that what she remembers was deceptive, or at least fragile: the ‘Storries’, she implies, raised our ‘fances’ but the imagined golden age - past and future - was never achieved, and the ‘Actors’ have now left the ‘empty stage’. The use of the theatrical metaphor again carries a hint of fragility and of lost illusion, as Hutchinson’s recall of the past fails to provide present comfort.

Hutchinson’s sense of abandonment is further highlighted through her use, as before, of images emphasising the loss of light and warmth which again move the reader away from the impersonality of much earlier elegy. Here the sun is representative of a lost hope: Hutchinson is the sun that ‘did once in Splendour burne’ but is now ‘dimme’ and ‘expiring’ (ll. 27 – 28). She, like the empty, lifeless house, is cold and her ‘Joys Stand Still like streame with Ice Congeald’ (l. 34). In contrast, the Colonel brought ‘life, light & fire’ to her (l. 32). The images provide no sense that Hutchinson is reconciled to her fate, or that she can bring herself to an understanding of memory that it is linked to Christian acceptance or consolation, and the elegy finishes as she returns to the empty room. Recollection of the past has brought her no sense of relief, and, in a characteristic use of metonymy, Hutchinson becomes the memory palace, referring to herself as a ‘Polluted Palace’ (l. 53). Her desolation is further highlighted by the bare room with ‘no tapestrey’ and the decay and neglect suggested by the cobwebs, that ‘come from the Spiders dusty loome’ (ll. 43–44). Milton’s Pilot was able to command the shepherds to ‘Weep no more’ (l. 165), and the closing lines of ‘Lycidas’ suggest the swain’s ability to find a new future in ‘Fresh Woods and pastures New’ (l. 193). Hutchinson, however, suggests that while hope may come with ‘New inhabitants’, who ‘may restore | The grace and beauty This Place had before’ (ll. 51–52), it will not come for her.

Hutchinson uses place and the evocation of landscape to anchor her memories, and this is reflected in ‘To the Gardin att O’ (Elegy 7) and ‘Musings in my evening Walkes at O’ (Elegy 12), which are both set in the garden of Owthorpe. However, her nostalgia is rooted in paradox: Owthorpe was the scene of a happier past, where she and the Colonel spent much of their marriage and brought up their children, yet her memories bring her pain, rather than comfort and the garden becomes a symbol of a lost Eden. Steeped in biblical culture and writing in the same years in which Milton published *Paradise Lost*, Hutchinson could not fail to be conscious of the obvious resonances of gardens, specifically of Eden, and the political uses to which such images could be put. She may also have seen herself as Eve: Scott-Baumann has pointed to the inclusion (probably by Julius Hutchinson) in the manuscript of the elegies of some lines from *Order and Disorder*, in which Eve looks back at Eden ‘our nere, to be reentered paradise’. Scott Baumann draws on Norbrook’s detailed consideration of the different ways in which Hutchinson sought to protect her husband in the wake of the Restoration and suggests that Hutchinson experienced a sense of guilt at having betrayed her husband, as Eve did Adam - in Hutchinson’s case by ‘trying to vindicate [his] reputation’. As she acknowledges, however, it is impossible to know who exactly penned the letter in which he supposedly recanted.⁶⁷ Certainly, in the ‘garden poems’ Owthorpe, with its garden and the surrounding landscape, is indeed a lost Eden, and her assertion of its centrality underlines what she has lost, rather than bringing her comfort.

The use of landscape, including gardens, for reflection remained important in early modern Britain and shapes how Hutchinson moulds her elegy to reflect her personal loss and devastation. Roy Strong argues that the Renaissance Garden was, in essence, the ‘royalist garden’, but this is refuted by Alexandra Walsham, who argues that both ‘republicans and royalists, puritans and Anglicans, embraced and adapted it for their own needs’. Indeed,

⁶⁷ Norbrook, ‘Memoirs and Oblivion’ p.246; Scott-Baumann, p.165–167.

Andrew Marvell portrays Cromwell planting the bergamot in his 'private gardens' in 'An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland' (ll. 29-3320).⁶⁸ For Hutchinson, the garden at Owthorpe is a repository of what was virtuous and loving in the Colonel's life, as well as emblematic of hers and England's loss and she seeks to use her memories of an idyllic past to reconcile herself with the present.⁶⁹ However, in both 'To the Gardin att O' (Elegy 7) and 'Musings in my evening Walkes at O' (Elegy 12) Hutchinson's evocation of her memories brings pain rather than relief. Kate Chedgzoy argues that Hutchinson 'describes the experience of walking in the garden as a process of moving round a memory-place that forces her to recollect her losses one by one'.⁷⁰ This, however, implies a degree of passivity in Hutchinson; it is more the case that she both actively desires to recall her memories, and that she deliberately calls them forth in attempt to keep him and their cause alive. Paradoxically, however, such recollection brings pain and despair, not consolation. In 'To the Gardin att O' she moves from the 'shining frutetrees' (l. 12) to the 'flowers ... Chargd with weeping dew' (l. 18) to the 'Spreading weeds' (l. 27). In each case nostalgia is overcome by a sense of loss and decay. The fruit trees are gone with him and in the Colonel's absence the weeds flourish. The flowers which 'shrink back into their beds' (l. 19) retreat into an imagined state of chastity, deprived of their sexuality: as she notes 'my poore Virgins hang their drooping heads'. If, as Ross suggests, these 'poore Virgins' also represent her daughters it is as if a curse has descended on the whole family, depriving them not only of sexuality but

⁶⁸ Andrew Marvell, *The Poems of Andrew Marvell* ed. Nigel Smith (London and New York: revised edition 2007) pp. 273-278.

⁶⁹ Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames and Hudson 1979, 1998), pp. 9-11, 199-202; Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 317.

⁷⁰ Kate Chedgzoy, *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2007), p. 158.

threatening an end to the family line. There is also a strong suggestion of her own erotic loss, as she refers to him who ‘Gave my youth lustre and becoming grace’ (l. 16).⁷¹

Hutchinson makes similar use of the garden as a place of nostalgic meditation as she walks round it in ‘Musings in my evening Walkes at O’. Images of cold and dark, familiar from other elegies, recur as she describes how ‘Ore those cold ashes and dried bones | I weepe my life away’ (ll. 2–3) and refers to her ‘darke Soule’ (l. 6). Ironically, the poem may also be linked with Royalist Katherine Philips’ pastoral elegy for friendship, ‘Orinda to Lucasia’: Ross places both poems in the context of authors’ ‘reworking of rural retreat’.⁷² However, in contrast to Philip’s brooks that ‘murmer and demand the day’ (l.12) the landscape Hutchinson portrays is sickening and out of control. Hutchinson alludes to a ‘gennerous Plant’ that is doomed to grow in ‘an infectious ayre’ (ll. 33, 35) and presents the Colonel as the presiding genius of the place without whom it will inevitably decay:

the murmuring springs rise and complaine
Then shrink into The earth again
Least They foule mixtures should endure
Since he whoe kept Their Channells pure
No more on their greene bankes appears (Elegy 12, ll. 17–20)

Hutchinson has co-opted here the royalist use of images of channels and rivers out of control, and mixed them with images of pollution, undercutting the idyllic, pastoral connotations of the ‘greene bankes’. The springs, like Hutchinson, seek to hide themselves away even as they proclaim their loss. The tone is despairing, and she again conveys a sense of isolation and openly admits that recalling her memories brings her no comfort and that ‘past Joyes highten present woes’ (l. 54). The poem ends with a fierce, political attack on the new regime and on those ‘flatterers’ (l. 69) who betrayed her:

No frinds to Comfort me abide
They flowed out with my ebbing tide
The proud my humble state dispise

⁷¹ Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics*, p. 181.

⁷² Ross, *Women, Poetry and Politics* p. 186 – 7.

My sorrow glads my enemies (Elegy 12, ll. 61–64)

The sharp use of contrast and the bleak tone again reinforce Hutchinson's bitterness and lack of hope. The simple, terse rhymes reflect someone lacking the resources to move on. Displaying no sense of consolation, the elegy is simultaneously quietly raging and despairing: memory provides little comfort for Hutchinson, yet its pain is what sustains her, even as she clings to belief in a providential God and the memory of a better past.

Hutchinson recasts elegy as personal lament in her work, and her loneliness and nostalgia are reinforced by the way she places the Colonel of her memories at the centre of the garden poems, as he was of her life. Citing the books she used to read, which no longer delight her in his absence, she describes him as the 'Sollace of my life while he | Was my Instructor & approved | The pleasant lines I chose and loved' (Elegy 12, ll. 37-39). The portrayal of the Colonel as her 'Instructor' in the peaceful domestic setting idealise him in his traditional role as head of the household and point to her overt adherence to the traditional hierarchy of the sexes, even as she undermines this through her own self-dramatisation. The image of a ruler or benevolent superior as a gardener was a well-established motif: Duncan rewarding Macbeth for his loyalty tells him 'I have begun to plant thee and will labor | To make thee full of growing' (*Macbeth* Act 1 Scene 4, l. 28-9). In addition, the depiction of the Colonel as instructor can also be linked to the motif of Adam, the gardener who educated Eve. Similarly, in 'To the Gardin att O' the Colonel is both gardener and Adam to Hutchinson's Eve, who 'plant'd in me all that yelded prayse'. His death leaves the garden 'desolate', and the 'young trees which sade and fading stand' have 'Dried up Since They lost his refreshing hand' (Elegy 7, ll. 23–24), mirroring Hutchinson's own desolation.

Royalists used elegy to express nostalgia for an imagined golden age when monarchy, church and the social order were respected, and to call for its return. The nostalgia Hutchinson expresses in her elegies for her past life with the Colonel is also a nostalgia for a

privileged existence and way of life, her political radicalism notwithstanding. Her account of their life at Owthorpe presents it in idyllic tones, and in ‘To the Gardin att O’ she proudly evokes the way the Colonel had ‘impal’d’ the garden from ‘the common ground’.⁷³ The contested and often traumatic process of enclosure, which has been explored by Nicola Whyte and others, is subsumed within an idealised sense of memory which lacks the pain Hutchinson portrays elsewhere.⁷⁴ In addition, she makes no reference to how her husband’s activities may have been received by the local inhabitants and those who lived on the land around Owthorpe. Her lost Eden was also one which increasingly limited the rights of others, and memory here is an idealised fiction, whose contours remain unexplored. Norbrook refers to her description of a pamphlet Lucy and her husband possessed - probably a tract by Gerald Winstanley or another Digger – which refers to ‘inferior levellers’, who ‘prayed to be allowed to cultivate wastes and common lands’.⁷⁵ This illuminates an antagonism to Hutchinson’s social inferiors that recalls Pulteney’s characterisation of ‘village girls’ and ‘Plebeians’ in ‘On the Horrid Murder of That Incomparable Prince, King Charles the First’ and places her elegies within clear class boundaries.

Hutchinson’s idealised portrait of Owthorpe stands as a symbol of their marriage and family, but its memory serves to remind us of the loss of class and economic status that accompanied the Colonel’s death, as well as reinforcing her sense of desolation. In addition, she draws on the tradition of country house poems, such as Ben Jonson’s ‘To Penhurst’, which celebrates the family home of the Sidney family. Scott Bauman, drawing on Raymond Williams, has discussed Hutchinson’s ‘garden elegies’ in this context and argues that ‘the

⁷³ Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, p. 255.

⁷⁴ Nicola Whyte, *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory* (Oxford: Windgather Press 2009), pp. 93–4; Nicola Whyte, <<https://manyheadedmonster.com/2013/07/12/nicola-whyte-landscape-history-from-below>> (accessed 29th August 2021).

⁷⁵ Norbrook, ‘the Republican Woman Writer’, p. 476.

order of the garden at Owthorpe evokes the mastery of the landowner and his ability to create an Edenic haven. After the gardener's death, the garden no longer represents the ordered paradise he created, but instead the "disordred passions" of Lucy Hutchinson's grieving mind'.⁷⁶

Hutchinson's evocation of memory in her elegies sets them apart from the angry but largely impersonal elegies of male writers, Royalist or Parliamentarian, or even the melancholy of Pulter. While her passions may be, as she describes them, 'disordred' (Elegy 7, l. 32), there is a stark contrast between the intensity and complexity of her emotions and the highly ordered and controlled writing that characterises the elegies. A sense of paradox is present throughout, as she seeks to both keep the memory of the Colonel and their cause alive and to find consolation. Yet the act of remembering, whether through visualising his portrait or visiting the garden at Owthorpe, does not bring consolation but evokes despair, rage and an overwhelming sense of personal and sexual loss. Indeed, the emotions she presents bear more resemblance to what Stephen Greenblatt describes as 'compulsive memory' and convey an almost obsessive inability to forget. Hutchinson looks for self-abnegation and relief; but at the same time she knows that, as Greenblatt, (writing on *Hamlet* and citing Aristotle), puts it she is 'contemplating a mental image or phantasm that is in fact a memory – the remembrance of something that belongs irrevocably to the past – and not something that fully exists in the present'.⁷⁷

Wiseman has argued that 'Lucy Hutchinson's failure to resolve her own crisis by memorialising her husband casts a reflected doubt on the power of elegy to act as a

⁷⁶ Ben Jonson, 'To Penshurst' in *The Complete Works of Ben Jonson* ed. David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Scott-Bauman, p.147; Raymond Williams, *The City and The Country* (London: The Hogarth Press 1985) pp. 28-33.

⁷⁷ Aristotle, in Jonathan Barnes (ed.) *The Complete works of Aristotle* 2 vols (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1984, reprinted 1995) Vol 1, p. 716; Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* ((Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press 2001), pp. 214–215.

monument'.⁷⁸ It is certainly true that Hutchinson ultimately fails to find consolation or catharsis in her elegy. Yet perhaps consolation and a monument are not what she seeks. Rather, her elegies go beyond pious mourning, and in this process she reclaims the elegiac form from royalism. She drew consciously on Protestant injunctions to remember the dead appropriately. In 'To My Children', the letter introducing the *Memoirs*, she writes of 'studying which way to moderate my woe', and of the need to keep to the facts without embellishment (pp. 16-17). Yet in the elegies her woe is not in any sense moderated, and her attachment to the physical is palpable in her evocation of sexual and erotic loss. Above all, Hutchinson creates herself as the subject of her elegies, even as she seeks to place her husband and their joint political struggle at their centre and refuses to accept a royalist version of their life and history.

Conclusion

Hester Pulter and Lucy Hutchinson wrote elegy at a time when the world they grew up in was, as the words of the ballad suggested, 'turned upside down'.⁷⁹ For Pulter, the intransigent Royalist, it was a world in which order and decency, as represented by the monarchy, the established church and the social hierarchy, had been overturned, the process culminating in the regicide and the advent of the Commonwealth and the Interregnum. Hutchinson, in contrast, mourns her husband on a deeply personal level that encompasses intense emotional and physical loss, as well as expressing her despair and rage at the end to republican and independent dreams and the return of the Stuarts. Highly educated and steeped in contemporary literary culture but lacking a public voice even as they sought to intervene in public affairs, both women drew on traditions of elegy that had developed over the previous century, including both pastoral elegy and funeral elegy, but had subsequently

⁷⁸ Susan Wiseman, *Conspiracy and Virtue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 226.

⁷⁹ *The World turned upside down* (London, 1646) ESTC R210437.

been shaped by the traumas spanning the period from the early 1640s to the Restoration and beyond.

Over the course of the Civil Wars and their aftermath funeral elegy had become more overtly polemical and sometimes satirical, and both Pulter and Hutchinson draw on this, and on the increasing use of elegy for political comment and intervention. They also make use of elegiac conventions: lamenting the dead and expressing their sorrow; using praise and eulogy; and celebrating their subjects as heroes who are receiving their just rewards in heaven, implicitly assuming their salvation. Pulter, like many of those mourning the regicide, moves rapidly from praise of the fallen to condemning those who executed them, presenting the latter as wild beasts, and characterising them as anarchists and heathens. In contrast, Hutchinson, while launching sharp polemical attacks on the Restoration regime and its supporters as decadent and tyrannical, focuses more on the Christian virtues of her dead husband. Despite his military background and status, there is less focus on the Colonel as a hero or warrior and he is presented, like Charles I in Pulter's elegies, as a Christian martyr who suffers patiently, drawing on his innate virtues and fortitude. Nonetheless, both women draw on some features of funeral elegy in its polemical form, commenting sharply on the public, political considerations that the men's deaths raised, despite the limited readership they had access to.

The political and personal isolation of both Pulter and Hutchinson informs their writing of elegy and places them, as much as the dead, at the centre of their elegies in a way that is not to be found in the elegies written by male writers during the 1640s and following the regicide. This is particularly true of Hutchinson, whose anguish and acute sense of physical and sexual loss is deeply personal. Her elegies are pervaded with a sense of despair in which personal loss and political defeat are entwined and for which she can find little, if any, consolation. Indeed, it is debatable whether she seeks consolation, rather than a venting

of rage and despair as she laments her husband. Pulter too expresses anger and despair in mourning those elevated as royalist heroes and martyrs. However, her calls for revenge on the regicides are weak and unconvincing, despite the vehemence of her royalism, and she does not share the violent rage and desperate search for revenge that increasingly dominates royalist elegy after the regicide. Like Hutchinson, she seems to find, or indeed seek, little consolation in her mourning. Instead, she expresses a sense of deep melancholy and frustration which are rooted in her emotional and physical isolation, and which leave her frozen in her grief, an epitome of the 'marmorized female melancholic'.⁸⁰

Both women express nostalgia for better times in the past, that can be linked with their experience of loss and defeat and their sense of their own social position. Pulter looks back to a golden age when the 'natural' social order was in place, unchallenged by those she presents as intent on overturning that order and bringing in chaos. Hutchinson draws on her memories of places she associates with a better, idealised past, particularly the gardens at Owthorpe, to express her nostalgia for these times. Both women move, in differing ways, beyond the conventions of funeral elegy, drawing on motifs associated with pastoral elegy, with Pulter's lyricism reinforcing the sense of melancholy and lament of her elegies, while Hutchinson draws more explicitly on pastoral images, with allusions to features of pastoral elegy such as nymphs and garden settings. They serve, however, to emphasise her desolation rather than any sense of closure.

Neither woman achieves any sense of consolation, yet they re-make elegy for their own purposes. Pulter's elegies are rooted in a deep personal sense of melancholy and despair, reflecting her personal and political isolation as a woman. Hutchinson, while also experiencing despair and isolation, uses her elegies to express rage, physical and personal anguish and erotic loss in her elegies, rather than resignation or melancholy. There is no

⁸⁰ Rayner, 'Monumental Melancholy', p. 69.

consolation for the death of her husband, and her hatred of the restored regime recurs throughout the elegies. In this way she re-makes elegy in a republican and female form.

Conclusion

Those writing elegy in the years 1640 to 1670 drew on a long-established and complex set of literary conventions, deriving from both the models established by the largely public and often impersonal funeral elegies honouring Sir Philip Sidney and Prince Henry and from traditions of pastoral elegy and of poems of personal and erotic loss. However, writers also faced a period of violent and traumatic change and this thesis started by asking what it meant to write elegy over these years and how this shaped elegy as a genre. Implicit within this is the question of the extent to which elegy survives as a genre or is so transformed as to be unrecognisable. Nigel Smith's argument that the regicide drained the energy from funeral elegy as a genre has been influential in popularising the view that elegy had exhausted itself.¹ In addition, it is also useful to consider Peter Sacks' view that, while the fortunes of pastoral elegy ebbed dramatically after 'Lycidas', this 'does not mean there were no convincing elegies between Milton's and Shelley's. It simply means that such intervening successes were not strictly pastoral elegies'.² It is the contention of this thesis that elegy did survive into the 1670s, albeit in changed, hybrid forms that were shaped, as Joad Raymond suggests, by the traumas of the period and that drew together different strands in the elegiac tradition, including the pastoral.³

It is certainly the case that elegy becomes increasingly polemical and propaganda-driven over this period. Always open to political intervention, funeral elegy is drawn on throughout the Civil Wars by those on all sides of the conflict in ways that become more overt. While ostensibly respecting elegiac conventions such as praise, panegyric and conventional mourning and lament, writers increasingly use elegy to attack their opponents in

¹ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 287-88.

² Peter M Sacks, *The English Elegy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985), p 118.

³ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 214.

ever more vitriolic terms that move away from the Christian injunction not to speak ill of the dead. In this process, the boundaries of elegy are pushed to their limits. Thus, the grudging respect allied with criticism given to Strafford by his enemies, or, arguably, that of Henry King writing on Essex in 1646, is replaced in the late 1640s by the angry polemics from Royalists in the elegies to Lucas and Lisle, which devote as much space to attacking Parliament as to lauding the two men. Both men become ciphers in this propaganda war and are celebrated as warriors and elevated as ideal masculine heroes, in stark contrast to what Parliament saw as their lack of honour in taking up arms, following earlier commitments not to. In contrast, Sir Thomas Fairfax and Thomas Rainsborough are attacked by Royalists as traitors and Rainsborough is persistently linked with Satan and with hell, and there is little or no attempt to avoid speaking ill of the dead. Indeed, these elegies, and the mock elegies supposedly written by Rainsborough admitting his 'guilt', are barely elegiac at times.

This process of vilification culminates in a plethora of post-regicide elegies, as Royalists contemplated an unthinkable defeat, and printers took advantage of the shock waves the regicide generated to intervene in a growing market and build on the success of *Eikon Basilike*. Many of the elegies mourning Charles I, including the collections considered here, reflect genuine and sometimes personal sorrow as well as a strong sense of disbelief and in some ways, they return to a more conventional model of elegy. This is reflected in hyperbolic praise and laments for the dead king, as well as celebration of his ascent to heaven as a martyr. At the same time however, Royalists use these elegies for violent and rage-driven political attacks, which don't simply focus on individuals but seek to damn the parliamentary cause by associating it with anarchism and social breakdown, linking the regicides to rebels and pagans. In their calls for vengeance there is a sense of desperation, as well a strong sense of nostalgia for an imagined golden past with the kingdom at peace and social and religious hierarchies intact. Indeed, these elegies seem designed not only to vent rage and sorrow but to

bring together the embattled royalist community for comfort, eliding political differences. Elegy is thus used for multiple purposes.

Elegies by Parliamentarians in the 1640s are less vitriolic, and while pushing elegy towards polemic and satire also draw on the traditions of funeral elegy. In addition, while attacking Royalists, Parliamentarians use elegy for intervention within their own side, as well mourning dead heroes such as the Earl of Essex and Thomas Rainsborough. Thus, the Presbyterians or the 'peace party' organised around the death and funeral of the Earl of Essex to glorify his military prowess and to attack Cromwell and the Independents and those associated with the 'war party'. Parliamentarian elegies to Rainsborough similarly celebrate his virtues as a warrior and a leader in conventional elegiac terms, and at the same time use their work to explicitly intervene in internal debate over Charles' future. Indeed, there is, as Smith suggests, greater use of panegyric in much parliamentary elegy.⁴

For Royalists, the immediate development of elegy lay in the rage driven publications that followed the regicide. More interesting, however, is the use women writers, Royalist Pulter and Republican Hutchinson, made of elegy and how, in different ways, they brought together different elements of the genre and transformed it. Elegies throughout the 1640s, whether royalist or parliamentary in sympathy, are largely if not all by men and consciously written with a public audience of some kind in mind. In many cases, this is for print publication, but even where Royalists preferred to circulate their work in manuscript, they would be aware of a smaller, coterie audience and the messages they wished to convey. For women, the situation was very different and it was not generally seen as acceptable for respectable women to go into print. It was not until 1664 that Katherine Philips' poems were printed, and then ostensibly against her will, though this may have been a conventional

⁴ Smith, *Literature and Revolution* p. 293.

apologetic.⁵ Neither Pulter nor Hutchinson published their work, though Hutchinson's writing circulated in manuscript. In many ways constrained by these limitations and by the personal and political isolation they both experienced, this also allowed both women to develop elegy as a genre and to draw on elements of pastoral and erotic elegy as well as on funeral elegy, while injecting strongly personal sentiments into their work. At the same time, their isolation limited how their work might influence the future transformation of the genre.

Pulter and Hutchinson were negotiating their standing as women and as authors, while writing in a complex genre that critics agree had come under huge pressure over the Civil Wars and that had been largely used by male writers.⁶ There has been extensive debate as to how and to what extent elegy, and indeed literary culture, changed over the course of the Civil Wars and the Interregnum. However, Smith's argument that elegy became a royalist preserve in the 1640s and 1650s, as against republican panegyric, fails to account for Hutchinson's anguished elegies to her husband in the 1660s. In addition, his speculations on the possible future of lyric poetry, including elegy, focuses on what male poets (Marvell, Wither and Milton) might have done had the parliamentary cause triumphed, leaving open the question of how he might have placed Hutchinson's elegies within this framework. Neither does Smith consider the different ways in which Royalist Pulter used elegy when contrasted with her male contemporaries.

Pulter's royalist elegies convey a personal as much as a political sense of despair and rage. Those of Lucy Hutchinson reflect both her rage and despair at the Restoration monarchy and its decadence and corruption as well as her intense sense of personal and erotic loss following the death of her husband. She draws upon the capacity of funeral elegy for

⁵ ODNB, *Katherine Philips* < <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22124> > [accessed 1st March 2022].

⁶ Covington, *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor*, p. 2; Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering*, p.214; Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 287, 293.

both satire and polemic in characterising those who have betrayed the country and the cause of the Independents. She also repeatedly eulogises him and, rather than focusing on lurid images of violent revenge or portraying her husband as an epic hero, she presents him as bathed in the light of heaven. At the same time, she both evokes and doubts the capacity of pastoral motifs to encompass her grief and sense of desolation and loss: the house she visits is abandoned, the nymphs fled, and the gardens of Owthorpe are decaying. If her elegies suggest she achieves no ultimate consolation, and indeed that she does not seek this, they also testify to her achievement in bringing the elements of funeral and pastoral elegy together. Had they not remained hidden for two hundred years or more who knows where they might have taken elegy.

Appendix: Table of Post-Regicide Elegies

	What is included	Comment
Anon. <i>Vaticinium Votivum Or Palaemon's Prophetick Prayer</i> (London 1649) Translation = wished for prediction	Epigram in Latin Letter to Charles II in English Proemium in Latin to Charles II Ode in French: 'Au Roy de la grand Bretagne Charles II' Latin dedication, dated 1647 to Charles I on the Isle of Wight Latin dedication, dated 1648 to Charles I on the Isle of Wight Poem in English: 'Upon His Maiesties Arrival at the Isle of Wight' Title poem in Latin: 'Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum' Title poem in English: 'Palaemonis Vaticinium Votivum' Advert in English for 'The Prophecie of Paulus Grebnerus concerning these Times', followed by the (purported) text of the prophecy and a paraphrase of the prophecy, all in English Latin elegy: 'Aeternae Memoriae Caroli' English elegy translating previous: 'To the Sacred Memorie of that late High and Mightie Monarch, Charles the First' Sonnet in French: 'Sur la mort de Charles I' Epigrams to Charles I in Latin Elegy/Poem in English: 'Memoriae Sacrum Optimi Maximi Caroli I' Elegy/Poem in English: 'Chronostichon' Two Elegies/Obsequies in English on Arthur Lord Capel Dedication in Latin to Baron Capel Dedication in Latin to Francis Villiers Obsequy/elegy in English to Francis Villiers Elegy/Poem in English: 'On the Martyrdom Of His Late Majestie' Other Latin texts	Mixed languages: Latin, French, English 'Chronostichon' is also found in <i>Monumentum Regale</i> and is attributed to Cleveland 'On the Martyrdom Of His Late Majestie' has been identified as being by Royalist schoolmaster Francis Gregory Elegies to Lord Capel (executed shortly after Charles) are also found in <i>The Princely Pellican</i>

<p>John Cleveland: <i>Monumentum Regale</i> (London: 1649) At least two editions: attributed to Cleveland, though not acknowledged on cover, or identified as the author of any of the elegies.</p>	<p>Epitaph Elegy/Poem: ‘Chronostichon’ Elegy: ‘An Elegie On The Meekest of Men, The most glorious of Princes, The most Constant of Martyrs, Charles I’ Elegy: ‘Caroli’ Elegy: ‘A Deep Groan, Fetch’d At the Funerall of that incomparable and Glorious Monarch, Charles the First’ Elegy: ‘An Elegie Upon King Charles the First, Murthered publickly by His Subjects’ Elegy: ‘An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs, Charles the I. &c’ An Epitaph</p>	<p>‘Chronostichon’ is also in <i>Vaticinium Votivum</i> and is to be found in <i>Poems by John Cleaveland</i> (London: 1665) as are ‘An Elegie On The best of Men, And meekest of Martyrs’ and ‘An Elegie Upon King Charles the First, Murthered publickly by His Subjects’. ‘A Deep Groan(e)’ is unacknowledged here but is by Henry King `and also published separately. The epitaph is signed A.B: possibly Alexander Broome, or a placeholder</p>
<p>John Quarles: <i>Regale Lectum Miseriae or a Kingly Bed of Sorrow</i> (London: 1649) Re-published 1660, 1679</p>	<p>Dedicated to Charles I’s daughter, Elizabeth Poem: ‘A Dreame’ Elegy: ‘An Elegy upon that never to be forgotten Charles I’ <i>An Epitaph</i> An Elegy on Lord Capel ‘A curse against the enemies of Peace’ ‘Farewell to England’ Poem on Charles I</p>	<p>Lord Capel is also commemorated in <i>Vaticinium Votivum</i> and in <i>The Princely Pellican</i>. Re-published at the Restoration and also in 1679, at the outset of the Popish plot and the Exclusion crisis.</p>
<p>Thomas Forde: <i>Virtus Rediviva Or A Penegyrick on Charles I</i> (London: 1660)</p>	<p>Mainly prose Elegy on Charles I Two previous elegies dated 1657 and 1658 on the anniversary of the regicide</p>	<p>Restoration publication.</p>
<p><i>The Princely Pellican</i> (London: 1649) Prose plus some poetry</p>	<p>Extended prose Poem: ‘Albion’s Niobe’ Poem: ‘A Crowne, A Crime: the Monarch Martyr’ Latin poems Elegy to the Duke of Hamilton Elegy to the Earl of Holland Elegy to Lord Capel</p>	<p>Lord Capel is also commemorated in <i>Vaticinium Votivum</i> and in Quarles’ <i>Regale Lectum Miseriae</i>. ‘A Crowne, A Crime: the Monarch Martyr’ was also published separately.</p>
<p>Elegies published as single broadsheets</p>	<p><i>A Crowne, A Crime: the Monarch Martyr</i> (1649)</p>	<p>Also in <i>The Princely Pellican</i> Also in <i>Monumentum Regale</i></p>

but also in collections	<p><i>An Elegie on the meekest of men, the most glorious of princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles I (1649)</i></p> <p>Henry King <i>A Deepe Groane, fetch'd at the Funerall of that incomparable and Glorious Monarch. Charles the First</i></p>	Also in <i>Monumentum Regale</i>
Sample of elegies published as single broadsheets	<p><i>A coffin for King Charles a crowne for Cromwell: a pit for the people (1649)</i></p> <p><i>A flattering elegie upon the death of King Charles the cleane contrary way: with a parallel something significant (1649)</i></p> <p><i>An elegy, sacred to the memory of our most gracious sovereign Lord King Charles who was most barbarously murdered by the sectaries of the army January 30. MDXxix (1649)</i></p> <p><i>An Elegy upon the death of King Charles (1649)</i></p> <p><i>An Elegie upon the Death of Our Dread Soveraign Lord King Charls the Martyr (1649)</i></p> <p><i>Balaam's Ass</i></p> <p><i>Royall meditations for Easter. (1650)</i></p> <p>Anon. <i>The Monument of Charles I</i> <i>Two elegeis The one on His late Majestie. The other on Arthur Lord Capel (London:1649)</i></p> <p><i>Upon the suns shining so clearly at the time of the King's death (1649)</i></p> <p><i>Loyalties tears flowing after the blood of the royal sufferer, Charles the I. &c. (1649)</i></p>	

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alexander, William, Earl of Stirling *An elegie on the death of Prince Henrie* (Edinburgh, 1613) ESTC S117775

Allen, William *A faithful Memorial of that Remarkable Meeting of many Officers of the Army* (London, 1659) ESTC R9713

Alleyn, Thomas *An Elegie upon the Death of that Renowned Heroe Coll. Rainsborrow* (London, 1648) ESTC R211070

Animadversions Upon Those Notes Which The Late Observer hath published (London, 1642/1643) ESTC R203309

An Answer to the Lord Digbies speech in the House of Commons to the bill of attainder of the Earle of Strafford, the 21th of Aprill 1641 (London, 1641) ESTC R11361

Ariosto, Ludovico *Orlando Furioso* trans. Guido Waldman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Aristotle, *The Complete works of Aristotle* 2 vols ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1984, reprinted 1995)

Ashburnham, John [?], *The princely pellican* (London, 1649) ESTC R203211

Austen, Ralph *A treatise of fruit-trees shewing the manner of grafting, setting, pruning, and ordering of them in all respects* (Oxford, 1653) ESTC R12161

Babington, Gervase, *The Workes of the Right Reverend Father in God* (London, 1622, 1637) ESTC S115825

Bacon, Francis *An Advertisement Touching an Holy War*, ed. Laurence Lampert (Indiana: 2000)

Bamford, F (ed) *A Royalist's Notebook: the commonplace book of Sir John Oglander* (1936)

Baxter, Richard *Reliquiae Baxterianae, or, Mr. Richard Baxters narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times* (London, 1696) ESTC R16109

B.J *The Poets Knavery Discovered, in all their lying pamphlets* (London, 1642) ESTC R18881.

B.J *A mournfull elegie, in pious and perpetuall memory of the most honourable, Robert, Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R232169

B.R *Lachrymae Musarum: the tears of the muses* (London, 1649) ESTC R2243

A briefe and compendious narrative of the renowned Robert, Earle of Essex, his pedigree, and his valiant acts, performed when he was generall of the Parliaments army. (London, 1646) ESTC R201158

A brief description of the future history of Europe, from Anno 1650 to An. 1710 (London, 1650) ESTC R9126

Bronte, Charlotte *Jane Eyre* ed. Stevie Davies (London: Penguin Books, 2006)

Brooke, Christopher *Two elegies consecrated to the neuer-dying memorie of the most worthily admired; most hartily loued; and generally bewailed prince; Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S166715

Burnet, Gilbert *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald* (London, 1677)

Cavendish, Margaret Duchess of Newcastle *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, to which is Added the True Relation of My Birth, Breeding and Life* (JC Nimmo, 1886)

Chapman, George *An epicede or funerall song on the most disastrous death, of the highborne prince of men, Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S107694

Charles I/Gauden, John *Eikon Basilike The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty In His Solitudes and Sufferings* (London 1649; New York, Cornell University Press, ed. Edward Philip Knachel: 1966)

Churchyard, Thomas *The Epitaph of Sir Philip Sidney Knight* (London, 1586)

Cleveland, John *Majestas Intemerata. Or the immortalitie of the King* (London, 1649) ESTC R209208

— *Monumentum Regale: or a tombe, erected for that incomparable and glorious monarch, Charles the First King of Great Britane, France and Ireland, &c. In select elegies, epitaphs, and poems* (London, 1649) ESTC R208853

— *Poems by John Cleaveland* (London, 1665)

— *The Poems of John Cleaveland* ed. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1967)

C.N *Carmen Elegiacum: Englands Elegie or Lamentation* (London, April 1643) ESTC R5991

A coffin for King Charles a crowne for Cromwell: a pit for the people (London, 1649) ESTC R211109

Colonell Rainsborowes Ghost Or A true relation of the manner of his Death, who was murdered in his bedchamber at Doncaster (London, 1648) ESTC R211071

Coperario, John *Songs of mourning bewailing the vntimely death of Prince Henry. Worded by Tho. Campion. And set forth to bee sung with one voyce to the lute, or violl* (London, 1613) ESTC S107170

Cowley, Abraham *Collected Works of Abraham Cowley, Volume 1* ed. Thomas Calhoun, Laurence Heyworth and Allan Pritchard (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989)

— Cowley?/Peter Hausted?, *A satyre against separatists* (London, 1642) ESTC R21706

Crook, Samuel *Ta Diapheronta or Divine Characters in Two Parts* (London, 1658) ESTC R231884

Curelly, Laurent *An Anatomy of a radical English Newspaper: The Moderate* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017)

A Description of the passage of the late Earle of Strafford over the River Styx with the conference betwixt him Charon and William Noy (1641) ESTC R9191

Day, Angel *Upon the life and death of the most worthy and thrise-renowmed knight Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1586?) ESTC S105214

Denham, Sir John *The poetical works of Sir John Denham*, ed. by T. H. Banks (New Haven and London: 2nd edn Archon Books, 1969)

Digby, George Earl of Bristol *The Lord Digbies speech in the House of Commons To the Bill of Attainder, of the Earle of Strafford, the 21 of April 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R477141

Donne, John *Letters to Several Persons of Honour* (London, 1651) ESTC R12703

— *Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne 8 Vols.* ed. Gary Stringer (Indiana University Press, 1995)

The downfall of greatnesse. For the losse of goodnesse (London, 1641) ESTC R204322

The Earle of Straffords Ghost (London, 1644) ESTC R7062

The Earle of Strafford His Elegiack Poem (London, 1641) ESTC R41946

Edwards, Thomas *Gangraena: or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time* (London, 1646)

An Elegie on the Death of that most Noble and Heroic Knight, Sir Charles Lucas (London, 1648) ESTC R210902

An Elegie on the meekest of men, the most glorious of princes, the most constant of martyrs, Charles I (London, 1649) ESTC R15458

An Elegie on the most Barbarous Unparalled Unsoldierly Murder Committed at Colchester, upon the persons of the two most incomparable Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle (London, 1648) ESTC R205178

An Elegie on the most incomparable Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle (London, 1648)
ESTC R210944

An Elegie upon the Death of Our Dread Sovereign Lord King Charls the Martyr (London, 1649) ESTC R211177

An elegy, sacred to the memory of our most gracious sovereign Lord King Charles who was most barbarously murdered by the sectaries of the army January 30. MDXxix (London, 1649)
ESTC R211198

An elegy upon that renowned hero and cavalier, the Lord Capel (London, 1649) ESTC R211063

An Elegy upon the death of King Charles (1649) ESTC R38485

Englands Sorrow for the losse of their late Generall (London, 1646) ESTC R210630

Evanck, Daniel *The noble order, or The honour which God conferr's on them that honour His* (London, 1646) ESTC R200556

Evanck, Daniel *Justa honoraria: or, Funeral rites in honor to the great memorial of my deceased master, the Right Honorable, Robert Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC RO201160.

Evelyn, Sir John, *Sir John Evelyn his report from the committee appointed to consider of the printing of the Lord Digbys speech concerning the bill of attainder of the Earl of Strafford whereunto is added the order for the burning of the said speech* (London, 1641) ESTC R593

The Famous Tragedie of Charles I (1649) ESTC R3816

Fairfax, Sir Thomas *A Letter Concerning the surrender of Colchester: the Grounds and Reasons of putting to death Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle* (London, 1648) ESTC R202094

Falkland, Viscount Lucius Cary, *A Speech made to the House of Commons concerning Episcopacy* (London, 1641) ESTC R8460

Felltham, Owen *Resolves: Divine, Moral, Political: the eighth impression* (London, 1661)
ESTC R215049

Filmer, Robert *Patriarcha and Other Writing*, edited by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge University Press, 1991)

A flattering elegie upon the death of King Charles the cleane contrary way: with a parallel something significant (London?], 1649) ESTC R15469

A full and exact relation of the horrid murder committed upon the body of col. Rainsborough (1648) ESTC R205507

- Fuller, Thomas *The Holy State* (Cambridge, 1648) ESTC R228850
- Forde, Thomas *Virtus Redidiva. Or a Panegyrick on the late King Charls the 1* (London, 1660) ESTC R200917
- Foxe, John *Acts and Monuments* 8 Vols new edition ed. Ed Cattley and Stephen Reed, (Oxford: Wentworth Press, 2016; first edition George Townsend 1837)
- A funerall elegie upon the deplorable and much-lamented death of the Right Honourable Robert Deveruex [sic] late Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210638
- The funerals of the high and mighty Prince Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S103976
- Gauden, John *The Bloody Court or Fatal Tribunal* (London, 1660) ESTC R225669
- G. C. *An elegie upon the most lamented death of the Right Honourable and truly valiant, Robert Earle of Essex* (1646)
- Good Admonition Or keep they head on thy shoulders and I will keep mine* (London, 1642) ESTC R216265
- Gratarolus, Gulielmus Bergomatis *The Castel of Memory* Englished by Willyam Fulvvod (London, 1562) ESTC S117976
- Great Strafford's Farewell* (London, 1641) ESTC R26761
- Grebnerus, Paul *The Prophecie of Paulus Grebnerus concerning these Times* (London, 1649) ESTC R211120
- Gregory, Francis *The last counsel of a martyred King to his son* (London, 1660) ESTC R208700
- Herbert, Thomas *An elegie upon the death of Thomas, Earle of Strafford, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland who was beheaded upon Tower-Hill* (London, 1641) ESTC R10577
- Heywood, Thomas *A funereall elegie upon the death of the late most hopeful and illustrious Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S123365
- Hooke, Robert *The Posthumous works of Robert Hooke* (London: 1705) ESTC TT1737
- H.S *This last ages looking-glasse: or Englands sad elligie* (York, 1642) ESTC R4702
- Hutchinson, Lucy text of the elegies in David Norbrook, 'Lucy Hutchinson's 'Elegies' and the situation of the Republican Woman Writer' in *English Literary Renaissance* (27:3) 1997, 468 – 521 <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43447764>> [accessed 20th November 2020]
- *Commonplace Book* (DD/HU1 c. 1650 – 1660 in Nottingham Country Archives)
- *Elegies* (DD/HU2 in Nottingham Country Archives)

- *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* (London: Phoenix Press 2000; ed. N.H Keeble, transcribed from manuscript held in Nottingham Country Archives)
- *On The Principles of the Christian Religion Addressed to her daughter And On Theology* (London,1817)
- *Order and Disorder* ed. David Norbrook (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2001)
- *Religious Exercizes* (DD/HU3 c. 1650 – 1660 in Nottingham Country Archives in Nottingham County Archives)
- *Translation of Lucretius: 'De rerum natura'* ed. Hugh de Quehen (London: Duckworth, 1996)

Hyde, Edward Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

An Ironicall Expostulation (London, 1648) ESTC R205800

‘A letter from Doncaster’, in *Packets of Letters from Scotland and the North Parts of England*, no. 34 (7th November 1648) ESTC P1054

A mournfull elegy upon the three renowned worthies Duke Hamilton, the Earle of Holland and, the ever to be honoured Lord Capel (London, 1649) ESTC R211063

A New Elegie In Memory of the Right Valiant, and most Renowned Souldier, Col Rainsborough, late Admirall of the narrow Seas (London, 1648) ESTC R211069

In Memoriam Thomae Rainsbrough, Pro Popolo, & Parlamento (London, 1648) ESTC R211066

James 1 ‘Basilikon Doron’ in *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince, James* (London, 1616) ESTC S122229

Jocelin, Elizabeth *The Mother’s Legacy to her Unborn Child* ed Jean Le Drew Metcalfe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000)

Jonson, Ben *The Complete Works of Ben Jonson* ed. David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Josselin, Ralph *The Diary of Ralph Josselin* ed. Alan Macfarlane (London: for The British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1976)

Journal of the House of Commons (London: HMSO 1802) on *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/>

Journal of the House of Lords (London: HMSO 1767 – 1830) on *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/>

King Charles his speech made upon the scaffold at Whitehall Gate, immediately before his execution, on Tuesday the 30. of Jan. 1648 (London, 1649) ESTC R508023

King, Henry *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester* ed. Margaret Crum (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)

Lachrymae Musarum (London, 1649) ESTC R2243

Lant, Thomas *Sequitur celebritas et pompa funeris* (London, 1588) ESTC S101077

The last damnable designs of Cromwell and Ireton and their Junto or Caball (1649) ESTC 196 R211

Leigh, Dorothy *The Mother's Blessing* (London, 1616) ESTC S93440

Lemnius, Levinus, *Touchstone of Complexions* (London, 1576) ESTC S93449

Lilly, William *A Prophecy of the White King and the Dreadful Dead-man explained* (London, 1644) ESTC R4060

Lilly, William, *Monarchy or No Monarchy in England: Grebner his prophecy* (London, 1651) ESTC R5905570

London's Teares upon the never too much to be lamented death of our late worthy Member of the House of Commons, Sr Richard Wiseman (London, 1642) ESTC R210707

Loyalties tears flowing after the blood of the royal sufferer, Charles the I. &c. (1649) ESTC R206043

Marvell, Andrew *The Poems of Andrew Marvell* ed. Nigel Smith (London and New York: revised edition 2007)

Mercer, William *An elegie vpon the death of the right honorable, most noble, worthily-renowned, and truly valiant lord, Robert, Earle of Essex & Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210635

Mercurius Elencticus 5 ESTC P469276

Mercurius Militaris or The Armies Schout 4 (London, 1648) ESTC P1193

Mill, Henry *A funerall elegy upon the most honored upon Earth, and now glorious in Heaven, His Excellency Robert Devereux Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210641

Millman, Jill and Gillian Wright *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Poetry* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005)

Milton, John *Complete Shorter Poems* ed. Stella P Revard and Barbara K Lewalski (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2009)

— *Paradise Lost* ed. Alistair Fowler (London: Longman 1968, 1971)

— *Prose Works* Volume 3 (Menston England: Scholar Press, 1967)

Newes from Rome (London, 1641) ESTC R12317

Obsequies on that unexemplar champion of chivalrie and perfect pattern of true prowess, Arthur, Lord Capell (London, 1649) ESTC R211056

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* trans, Mary M Innes (London: Penguin Books, 1955, 1977)

Paulden, Thomas *Pontefract Castle. An Account of how it was taken: And how General Rainsborough was surprised in his Quarters at Doncaster, Anno 1648* (1702) ESTC T160621

Parker, Henry *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers* (London, 1642) ESTC R181442

A perfect relation of the memorable funerall of the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Essex (London, 1646) ESTC R201161

Philanactos, Demophilus *Two Epitaphs occasioned by the Death of Sr Charles Lucas and Sr George Lisle basely assassinated at Colchester* (London, 1648) ESTC R203844

Philanar and Misostratus *Hipp-anthropos* (London, 1648) ESTC R205800

Philipot, Thomas *A Congratulatory Elegie offered to the Earl of Essex* (London, 1641) ESTC R10826

— *An elegie offer'd up to the memory of His Excellencie Robert Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R40096

— *Capellus virbius, sive redivivus: or, A monument erected in severall elegies to the memory of the right honourable and noble Arthur Lord Capell, Baron of Hadham* (London, 1662) R230086

Philips, John *The Life and Death of Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1587) ESTC S105020

Philips, Katherine *The Collected Works of Katherine Philips The Matchless Orinda Volume 1 The Poems* ed. Patrick Thomas (Essex: Stump Cross Books, 1990)

Philocrates, *The loyall sacrifice presented in the lives and deaths of those two eminent-heroick patternes, for valour, discipline, and fidelity; the generally beloved and bemoaned, Sir Charles Lucas, and Sir George Lisle, knights* (London, 1648) ESTC R202768

Philomusus, F.H *An elegie, and epitaph, consecrated to the ever-sacred memory of that most illustrious, and incomparable monarch, Charles. Together with an elegy and epitaph upon the truly lamented death of that excellent patterne of perfect magnanimity, virtue, valour, and loyalty, Arthur Lord Capell* (London, 1649) ESTC R2265

Price, Daniel *Lamentations for the death of the late illustrious Prince Henry: and the dissolution of his religious familie* (London, 1613) ESTC S115213

A Printed paper cald The Lord Digbies speech to the bill of attainder of the Earle of Strafford torne in peices and blowne away (London, 1641) ESTC R26904

A Protestation against a foolish, ridiculous and scandalous speech pretended to be spoken by Thomas Wentworth, late Earle of Strafford, to certaine lords before his comming out of the tower (London, 1641) ESTC R20408

Pulter, Lady Hester *Poems, Emblems and The Unfortunate Florinda* ed. Alice Eardley (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Victoria University in the University of Toronto, 2014)

— ca. 1644 – 1667 *Hester Pulter's Poetry and Prose* Leeds University Library Brotherton Collection MS Lt q 32

Puttenham, George *The Art of English Poesie* (London, 1589) ESTC S123166

Quarles, John *Regale Lectum Miseriae Or A Kingly Bed of Misery* (London, 1649, 1658/9, 1679) ESTC R230768

Raleigh, Sir Walter *The Historie of the World* (London, 1614) ESTC S116300

A Remonstrance of his excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax Lord Generall of the Parliaments Forces and of the generall councill of officers ESTC R200486

A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom (London, 1641) ESTC R490080

Ricraft, Josiah *A funeral elegy upon the most honored upon Earth, and now glorious in Heaven His Excellency Robert Devereux Earl of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210596

— *A Nosegay of rank Smelling Flowers* (London, 1646) ESTC R200808.

— *A survey of Englands champions and truths faithfull patriots* (London, 1647) ESTC R29299

Rowland, William *An elegie upon the death of the right Honourable & most renowned, Robert Devereux Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R210643

Royall meditations for Easter. Or Enthuziasmes on the death and passion of our late Lord and sovraigne King Charles the First, of sacred memory ([n.p], 1650) ESTC R182934

R. SA *A True and Perfect Relation of the answers and replies of Thomas Earl of Strafford* (1647) ESTC R225858

Saint Augustine, *Confessions* ed. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

A Short and true relation of the life and death of Sir Thomas Wentworth (London, 1641)
ESTC 35187

Shute, Nathaniel *The Crowne of Charitie* (London, 1626) ESTC S117282

Spenser, Edmund *Spencer: Poetical Works* ed. J.C Smith and E. De Selincourt,
(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912, 1977)

S.T *True and exact relation of the taking of Colchester: Sent in a Letter from an Officer of
the Army* (London, 1648) ESTC R183138

St John, Oliver *An argument of law concerning the bill of attainder of high-treason of
Thomas, Earle of Strafford, at a conference in a committee of both Houses of Parliament by
Mr. St. John, His Majesties Solicitor Generall* (London, 1641) ESTC 006110368

The Stationers' Company Registers or Entry Books of Copies 1554-1842
Stevenson, Jane and Peter Davidson *Early Modern Women Poets - An Anthology* (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2001)

Sylvester, Josuah *Lachrimae lachrimarum. or The distillation of teares shede for the
vntymely death of the incomparable prince Panaretus* (London, 1612) ESTC S118066

Tasso, Torquato *Jerusalem Delivered* ed. Anthony M Esolen (John Hopkins University Press,
2000)

*The Remonstrance of his Excellency Thomas Fairfax, Lord General of the Parliaments
Forces and of the General Council of Offices of November 1648* (London, 1648)

This Last Ages Looking Glasse: or Englands Sad Elegie (York, 1642) ESTC R4702

Thoroton, Robert *History of Nottinghamshire* 1677, 3 Vols, republished with Large Additions
by John Throsby (London: 1797)

T. J *An Elegie Upon the Honourable Colonel Thomas Rainsbrough, butchered at Doncaster*
(London, 1648) R211064

Tourneur, Cyril *A griefe on the death of Prince Henrie Expressed in a broken elegie
according to the nature of such a sorrow* (London, 1613) ESTC S125557

Twiss, Thomas *An elegy vpon the unhappy losse of the noble Earle of Essex* (London, 1646)
ESTC R201159

Two elegies, The one on His late Majestie. The other on Arthur Lord Capel (London, 1649)
ESTC R205639

Vaticinium votivum or, Palæmon's prophetick prayer ESTC R204106

Vines, Richard *The Hearse of the renowned, the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Essex and Ewe* (London, 1646) ESTC R39739

Wallington, Nehemiah *Notebook*, ca. 1654, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.436

Webster, John *A monumental column, erected to the liuing memory of the euer-glorious Henry Prince of Wales* (London, 1613) ESTC S101831

Webster, John *The Duchess of Malfi* ed. Brian Gibbons (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama 2014 – fifth edn)

Wentworth, Thomas Earl of Strafford, (attributed) *The Earle of Strafford his ellegiack poem* (London, 1641) ESTC R41946

— *The Earle of Straffords speech on the scaffold before he was beheaded on Tower-hill, the 12 of May 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R235657

— *The Earle of Straffords speech on the scaffold before he was beheaded on Tower-hill, the 12 of May 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R18835

— *Great Straffords farewell to the world, or, His ultimum vale to all earthly glory written by his owne hand in the Tower, and left behinde him for his friends or foes to peruse and consider* (London, 1641) ESTC R26761

— *The last speech of Thomas Wentworth, late Earle of Strafford to the Lords and gentlemen in the tower, who accompanied him to the place of execution with his last speech on the scaffold, May the 12th 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R184659

— *The Last Speeches of Thomas Wentworth* (London, 1641) ESTC R231586

— [Disputed] *The two last speeches of Thomas Wentworth, late Earle of Strafford, and deputy of Ireland The one in the Tower, the other on the scaffold on Tower-Hill, May the 12th 1641* (London, 1641) ESTC R469224

Whetstone, George *Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1587) ESTC S111735

Wild, John *An elegie upon the Earle of Essex's funeral* (1646) ESTC R201170

Willis, John *The Art of memory as it Dependeth upon places and ideas* (London, 1621; re-published by Da Capo Press Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd Amsterdam and New York 1973)

Willis, John *Mnemonica: Or the Art of Memory, Drained out of the Pure Fountains of Art & Nature* (London: 1661) ESTC R24570

The World turned upside down (London, 1646) ESTC R210437

W.P *The Apprentices lamentation together, with a dolefull elegie upon the manner of the death of that worthy, and valorous Knight Sr. Richard Wiseman* (London, 1642) ESTC

R210701

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)

Adamson, J.S.A 'The Baronial Context of the English Civil War' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol 40 (1990), 3-120

Amussen, Susan D, 'The Irrelevance of Revisionism: Gender, politics and Society in Early Modern England', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, Volume 78, No. 4 (2015), 683-701

Anderson, Penelope *Friendships' Shadows: Women's friendships and the politics of betrayal in England 1640 - 1705* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012)

Archer, Ian 'The Arts and Acts of memorialization in early modern London' in J.F Merritt *Imagining Early Modern London* (Cambridge: University Press 2001)

Archer, Jayne 'A 'Perfect Circle'? Alchemy in the Poetry of Hester Pulter' in *Literature Compass* Vol. 2 2005, 1 – 14

Attie, Katherine Bootle 'Enclosure Polemics and the Garden in the 1650s' in *Studies in English Literature*, 1500-1900 (Vol. 51, No. 1 2011), 135-157

Baker, David and Willy Maley *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Barker, Juliet *England Arise: The People, The King and The Great Revolt of 1381* (Boston: Little, Brown Group: 2014)

Beacher, Donald and Grant Williams (eds) *Ars Reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture* (Toronto: CRRS Publications 2009)

Belzoni, Lima *The Gallery of Memory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001)

Bennett, Jill 'The Aesthetics of Sense Memory' in Radstone, Susannah and Katharine Hodgkin (eds) *Memory Cultures - Memory, Subjectivity and Recognition* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2003)

Braddick, Michael *The Freedom of the People: John Lilburne and the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)

— *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (London: Penguin Books, 2009; first published Allen Lane: 2008)

Brady, Andrea 'Dying With Honour: Literary Propaganda and the Second English Civil War', *The Journal of Military History*, Volume 70, Number 1 (2006), 9 –30

— *English Funerary Elegy in the Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)

Brayman, Heidi, Jesse M Lander and Zachary Lesser (eds.) *The Book in History, The Book as History: New Intersections of the Material Text* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press: 2016)

Buxton, John ‘The Mourning for Sidney’ in *Renaissance Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1989), 46 – 56

Calabresi, Bianca “‘His Idoliz’d Book’: Milton, Blood and Rubrication’ in *The Book in History, The Book as History: New Intersections of the Material Text* ed. by Heidi Brayman and others (New Haven and London: Yale University Press: 2016)

Canny, Nicholas ‘The attempted Anglicisation of Ireland’ in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* ed. J.F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996)

Carlton, Charles I: *The Personal Monarch* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983)

— *Going to the Wars: Experiences of the British Civil Wars 1638 – 1651* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Carruthers, Mary *The Book of Memory* 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Chedgzoy, Kate *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Clarke, Danielle *The Politics of Early Modern Women’s Writing* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2001)

Clarke, E and D Clarke ‘*This Double Voice*’: *Gendered Writing in Early Modern England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan 2000)

Clarke, Susan A ‘Royalists write the death of Lord Hastings: Post-Regicide Funerary Propaganda’ in *Parergon*, Volume 22, Number 2 (July 2005) 113-130

Cliffe, TJ *Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry During and After the Civil Wars* (London and New York: Routledge, 1988)

Cliffe, TJ *The Puritan Gentry Beseiged 1650 – 1700* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993)

Clymer, Lorna ‘The Funeral Elegy in Early Modern Britain: A Brief History’ in *The Oxford Handbook of The Elegy* ed. Karen Weisman (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 2010)

Cogswell, Thomas ‘Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture’, *Huntington Library Quarterly: The Remapping of English Political History, 1500-1640* Vol. 60, No. 3 (1997), 303-326

Como, David R ‘Censorship and Ideological Escalation in the English Civil War’, *Journal for British Studies*, Vol 51, No 4 (2012), 820–857

— *Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018)

Corns, Thomas *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Coussens, Catherine “‘Virtue’s Commonwealth’: Gendering the Royalist Cultural Rebellion in the English Interregnum (1649 – 1660)’ in *Cankaya Universitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakultesi, Journal of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. 6 (2006) 19–31 <<https://www.academia.edu/853452>> [accessed 5th March 2021]

Covington, Sarah “‘Realms so barbarous and cruell’: Writing, Violence in Early Modern England and Ireland’, *History* (July 2014), 487 – 504

— *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor in Seventeenth Century England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Crawford, Patricia “Charles Stuart that man of blood”, *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 16 (1977), 41-61

Cust, Richard *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2005)

— ‘Wentworth’s ‘change of sides’ in the 1620s’ in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* ed. J.F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Davies, J.C *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Hodder Headline, 2001)

Davies, Natalie Zemon and Randolph Starn ‘Introduction’ to ‘Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory’ *Representations* 26 (1989), 1-6

Donagan, Barbara ‘Atrocity, War Crime and Treason in the English Civil War’, *The American Historical Review*, Volume 99, Number 4 (1994), 1137–1166

Dolan, Frances “Hester Pulter’s Renaissance” in *English Literary Renaissance* 50, no. 1 (2020) 32– 9

Dunn, Rachel “‘Breaking a Tradition’: Hester Pulter and the English Emblem Book’ in *The Seventeenth Century* 30, No. (2015), 55– 3

Edwards, Thomas *Gangraena: or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time* (London, 1646) ESTC R9639

Engels, William ‘Mnemonic Criticism and Renaissance Literature: A Manifesto’, *Connotations* 1.1 (1991), 12–33

Engels, William E, Rory Loughnane and Grant Williams eds. *The Memory Arts in Renaissance England: A Critical Anthology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2016)

Eardley, Alice “‘Shut up in a Countrey Grange’: The Provenance of Lady Hester Pulter’s Poetry and Prose and Women’s Literary History’ *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 80, no. 2 (Summer 2017), 345–59

Ezell Margaret J. M, ‘The Laughing Tortoise: Speculations on Manuscript Sources and Women’s Book History’ in *English Literary Renaissance: Studies in English Manuscripts*, (Spring 2008, Vol. 38, No. 2) 331-355

Fleming, Juliet *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (London: Reaktion Books 2001)

Foucault, Michael: *Language, Counter-memory, Practice* ed. Donald Bouchard (New York: Cornell University Press, 1977)

Fraser, Nancy ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy’, *Social Text*, No. 25/26 (1990), 56–80

Freud, Sigmund *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement and Other Works* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1953–1974)

Gardiner, Samuel *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906)

Gentles, Ian ‘Political Funerals during the English Revolution’ in *London and the Civil War* ed. Stephen Porter (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan 1996)

Gentles, Ian, John Morrill and Blair Worden *Soldiers, writers and statesman of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1998)

— *The New Model Army* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1992)

German, Lindsey and John Rees, *A People’s History of London* (London and New York: Verso 2012)

Gittings, Clare *Death, Burial and the Individual* (London: Routledge: 1984)

Goldring, Elizabeth “‘So Just a Sorrow so well expressed’: Henry Prince of Wales and the Art of Commemoration’ in Timothy Wilks *Prince Henry Revived* (London: Southampton University and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007)

Gray, Catharine *Women Writers and Public Debate in 17th Century Britain* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Greenblatt, Stephen *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001)

Greer, Germain 'Horror like Thunder' <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v23/n12/germaine-greer/horror-like-thunder>

Grundy, Isabel and Susan Wiseman eds. *Women, Writing, History 1640 – 1740* (London: BT Batsford Ltd, 1992)

Hagar, Alan 'The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader' *ELH* No.1 (Spring 1981), 1–16

Hamilton, Albert Charles *The Spenser Encyclopedia* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1990)

Hammons, Pamela S, Professor Allyson M Posca, and Professor Abby Zanger *Gender, Sexuality, and Material Objects in English Renaissance Verse* (Oxford and New York: Routledge, 2016; first published Ashgate Publishing, 2010)

Harding, Vanessa 'City, capital and metropolis: the changing shape of seventeenth century London' in *Imagining Early Modern London* ed, J.F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

— *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London: 1500–1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Hardison, O.B *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1962)

Harper, David A 'Francis Gregory and the Defense of the King's Book' in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, Vol. 106, No. 1 (March 2012), (The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Bibliographical Society of America), 37-61

Harris, Johanna and Elizabeth Scott-Baumann *The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558 - 1680* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

Harris, Tim *Rebellion: Britain's First Stuart Kings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Healy, Margaret *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001)

Healy, Thomas *Andrew Marvell* (London: Routledge, 2015)

Healy, Thomas and Jonathan Sawday eds. *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

Hill, Christopher *Change and Continuity in 17th Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974, 1991)

— *The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution* (London; Allen Lane Penguin Press, 1993)

- Hintzman, Douglas L 'Robert Hooke's Model of Memory' in *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 2003, 10 (1), 3–14
- Hirst, Derek *Authority and Conflict: England 1603 – 1658* (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1986)
- *England in Conflict: 1603 – 1660* (London: Edward Arnold 1999)
- Hobbs, Mary *Early Seventeenth Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992)
- Hodgkin, Katherine and Susannah Radstone *Regimes of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2002)
- <http://bulkleyblog.blogspot.co.uk/2011/11/stephen-bulkley-senior-and-senior-and.html>
- Holmes, Clive *Why was Charles I Executed?* (London and New York: Hambledon Continuum, 2006)
- 'The Trial and Execution of Charles I' in *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (June 2010), 289-316
- Hutton, Ronald *Charles the Second* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985)
- Hutton, Sarah 'Hester Pulter (c. 1596—1678). A Woman Poet and the New Astronomy' in *Études Épistémè* 14 (2008),
- Hughes, Ann *Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- *Gender and the English Revolution* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012)
- Herford CH and Percy Simpson eds., *Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1925)
- Ivic, Christopher and Grant Williams eds. *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and culture: Lethe's Legacies* (London: Routledge, 2004)
- Jones, L.S *Colonel Thomas Rainsborough: Wapping's Most Famous Solider* (London: History of Wapping Trust, 1991)
- Jonson, Ben *The Complete Works of Ben Jonson* ed. David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Jupp, Peter C and Clare Gittings *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)
- Kay, Dennis *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

— *Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1987)

Kearney, Hugh *Strafford in Ireland 1633 - 1641: a study in Absolutism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959, 1989)

Keeble, N.H (ed) *The Cultural Identity of Seventeenth-Century Women, A Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994)

Kelsey, Sean ‘A Riposte to Clive Holmes: “The Trial and Execution of Charles I”’ in *History* (August 2018), 525-544

— ‘The Trial of Charles I’ in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 118, No. 477 (June 2003), 583-616 544

Kendall, Lyle H ‘Notes on Some Works Attributed to George Wither’, *The Review of English Studies* (Oct.1954, Vol. 5, No. 20), 390-394

Kenyon, P.J *The Stuart Constitution 1603 – 1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1966)

Kilburn, Terence and Anthony Milton ‘The Public Context of the Trial and Execution of Strafford’ in J.F Merritt *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996)

King, Emily L *Civil Vengeance: Literature, Culture and Early Modern Revenge* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2019)

Kishlansky, Mark *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin Books 1996)

Knott, John R *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature 1563 – 1694* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1993)

Lacey, Andrew ‘Elegies and Commemorative Verse in Honour of Charles the Martyr’ in Jason Peacey, *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001)

— *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003)

Lake, Peter and Kevin Sharpe, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (California: Stanford University Press, 1993)

Laqueur, Thomas ‘Introduction’ to ‘Special Issue: Grounds for Remembering’ (*Representations* 69 University of California Press, Winter 2000), 1–8

Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker *The Many-Headed Hydra* (London and New York: Verso 2000)

- Lindley, Keith *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997)
- Llewellyn, Nigel *The Art of Death* (London: Reaktion Books, 1991)
- Longfellow, Erica Public, Private and the Household in Early Seventeenth Century England in *The Journal of British Studies* 45 (April 2006), 313-334
- *Women and Religious Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Love, Harold *Scribal Publication in seventeenth century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993)
- Low, Anthony ‘Hamlet and the Ghost of Purgatory’ in *English Literary Renaissance* 29 (1999), 443-467
- Loxley, James *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Basingstoke and New York: Macmillan 1997)
- ‘Unfettered Organs: the Polemical Voices of Katherine Philips’ in E Clarke and D Clarke, *This Double Voice’: Gendered Writing in Early Modern England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan 2000)
- Marvell, ‘Villiers and Royalist Verse’ in *Notes and Queries* Vol. 41, Issue 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994)
- Madan, Francis *A New Bibliography of The Eikon Basilike of Charles I* (Oxford: Bernard Quaritch, 1950)
- Maguire, Nancy Klein ‘The Theatrical Mask/Masque of Politics: The Case of Charles I’ in *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (1989), 1 – 22
- Manning, Brian *1649: The Crisis of the English revolution* (London: Bookmarks 1992)
- *The English People and the English Revolution* 2nd edn. (London: Bookmarks, 1991)
- Marotti, Arthur F *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric* (London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995)
- ‘Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658’ in Special Number *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 1991, Vol. 21, (1991), 1-26
- Marshall, Peter *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels ‘The Communist Manifesto’ in *Marx, Engels: Selected Works* (London, New York and Moscow: Lawrence and Wishart, 1968, 1973).
- McCulloch, Diarmaid *A History of Christianity* (London: Penguin Books, 2010)

McElligott, Jason and David Smith (eds) *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

— *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Merritt, J.F (ed) *Imagining Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

— *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

— *Westminster 1640 – 1660: A royal city in time of revolution* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press: 2013)

Molekemp, Femke *Women and the Bible in Early Modern England: Religious Reading and Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Monta, Susannah Brietz *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005)

Murphy, Erin *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth Century English Literature* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011)

Nora, Pierre 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire' (in *Representations* 26 (University of California Press, Spring 1989), 7-24

Norbrook, David 'Lucy Hutchinson's 'Elegies' and the situation of the Republican Woman Writer' in *English Literary Renaissance* (27:3,1997), 468–521

— 'Lucy Hutchinson versus Edmund Waller: an unpublished reply to Waller's Panegyric to My Lord Protector', in *The Seventeenth Century* Volume 11 Issue 1 (1996), 61-86

— 'Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 75 No 2 (2010), 232 – 282

— 'Some Notes on the Canon of George Wither' in *Notes and Queries*, Volume 43, Issue 3 (1996), 251-384

— *Writing the English Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999, 2000)

Peacey, Jason *Politicians and Pamphleteers: propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited: 2004)

— *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001)

Pender, Patricia *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (Basingstoke and York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

- Pigman III, GW *Grief and the English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Porter, Stephen (ed.) *London and the Civil War* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1996)
- Potter, Lois *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature 1641 – 1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Power, Henry ‘Teares break off my verse: the Virgilian incompleteness of Abraham Cowley’s *The Civil War*’ in *Translation and Literature* Vol. 16 No. 2 (2007), 141–159
- Purkiss, Diane *The English Civil War: A People’s History* (London: Harper Perennial, 2006)
- Radstone, Susannah and Katharine Hodgkin (eds) *Memory Cultures - Memory, Subjectivity and Recognition* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2003)
- Raymond, Joad *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering* (Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- ‘Popular representations of Charles I’ in Thomas Corns (ed.) *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641 – 1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1996)
- Rayner, Emma ‘Monumental Female Melancholy in John Webster and Hester Pulter’ in *Studies in English Literature 1500 – 1900* Vol. 60 No. 1 (2020), 67–89
- Raylor, Timothy *Cavaliers, Clubs and Literary Culture* (Newark and London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994)
- Rees, John *The Leveller Revolution* (London: Verso, 2016)
- Richardson, G and Ridley GM *Freedom and the English Revolution: essays in History and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986)
- Ricoeur, Paul *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004)
- Roberts, Dunstan ‘On the expurgation of Traditional Prayer Books (c 1535 - 1600)’ in *Reformation* Volume 15 (2010), 23-49
- Robertson, Geoffrey presents *The Levellers: The Putney Debates* (London and New York: Verso, 2007)
- Robson, Mark ‘Reading Hester Pulter Reading’ in *Literature Compass* Vol. 2 (2005), 1–12
- Rosendale, Timothy *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2007)

Ross, Sarah CE *Women, Poetry and Politics in Seventeenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

— ‘Tears, Bezoars and Blazing Comets: Gender and Politics in Hester Pulter's Civil War Lyrics’ in *Literature Compass* Vol. 2 (2005), 1–14

Rossi, Paolo *Logic and the art of memory* trans. Stephen Clucas (London: Continuum 2000, first published 1960)

Rusche, Harry ‘Merlini Anglici: Astrology and Propaganda from 1644 to 1651’ in *The English Historical Review* Vol. 80, No. 315 (Apr. 1965), 322-333

— ‘Prophecies and Propaganda, 1641 to 1651’ in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 84, No. 333 (Oct. 1969), 752- 770

Rushworth, John 'The articles against Strafford', in *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State: Volume 8, 1640-41* (London, 1721), pp. 61-101. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/rushworth-papers/vol8/pp61-101> [accessed 30 December 2018]

Russell, Conrad ‘The Nature of a Parliament in Early Stuart England’ in H. Tomlinson ed. *Before the English Civil War* (London: Macmillan1983)

Sacks, Peter M *The English Elegy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985)

Schmidt, Charles and Eckhard Kessler *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

Scott-Baumann, Elizabeth *Forms of Engagement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Sharpe, J.A “‘Last Dying Speeches’”: Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in the Seventeenth Century’, in *Past and Present*, No. 107 (1985), 144–167

Sharpe, Kevin *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1989)

— *Remapping Early Modern England: the culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Skerpan-Wheeler, Elizabeth ‘Eikon Basilike and the rhetoric of self-representation’ in Thomas Corns, *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Slaughter, Stanley *Thomas Rainborowe: Dangerous Radical* (2015)

Smith, Nigel *Andrew Marvell: the chameleon* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2012)

— *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640 - 1660* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994)

Snow, Vernon *The Life of Robert Devereux, the third Earl of Essex 1591 – 1646* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970)

Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80 ed. John Raithby (online edition; originally published by Great Britain Record Commission)

Strong, Roy *The Renaissance Garden in England* 2nd edn. (London: Thames and Hudson 1998)

Stubbs, John *Donne: the reformed soul* (London: Penguin 2007)

Suzuki, Mihoko ‘What’s Political in Seventeenth-Century Women’s Political Writing’ in *Literature Compass* 6/4 (Blackwell Publishing, 2009), 927 – 941

The Pulter Project <http://pulterproject.northwestern.edu/about-hester-pulter-and-the-manuscript.html>

Thomas, Keith *In Pursuit of Civility* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2018)

— *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Penguin 1973, 1991)

Thornton, Tim *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern Britain* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press 2006)

Tinniswood, Adrian *The Rainborowes: Pirates, Puritans and a Family’s quest for the Promised Land* (London: Vintage 2014)

— *The Verneys: A True Story of Love, War and Madness in Seventeenth Century England* (London: Vintage Books 2007)

Underdown, David *Pride’s Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (London: George Allen and Unwin 1971, revised edition 1985)

Hirst, Derik *Revel, Riot, And Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1997)

Walsham, Alexandra *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Watkins, Carl *The Undiscovered Country: Journeys among the dead* (London: The Bodley Head 2013)

Watt, Tessa *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550 – 1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Weisman, Karen ed. *The Oxford Handbook of The Elegy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010)

White, Jason C ‘Militant Protestants in the Jacobean Period, 1603 – 1625’ in *History* Vol.94 No. 2 (April 2009), 154–175

Wilcher, Robert *The Writing of Royalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

- ‘What Was the King's Book for? The Evolution of 'Eikon Basilike'', in *The Yearbook of English Studies*, Vol. 21, Politics, Patronage and Literature in England 1558-1658 (1991), 218 – 228

Whyte, Nicola *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory* (Oxford: Windgather Press, 2009)

- Landscape history from below <<https://manyheadedmonster.com/2013/07/12/nicola-whyte-landscape-history-from-below>> (accessed 29th August 2021)

Willis, Rachel ‘Sacrificial Kings and Martyred Rebels: Charles and Rainborowe Beatified’, *Études Épistémè* 20 (2011)

Wilks, Timothy *Prince Henry Revived* (London: Southampton Solent University and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007)

Williams, Raymond *The Country and the City* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1985)

Wiseman, Susan *Conspiracy and Virtue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

- *Early modern women and the poem* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013)

Worden, Blair *The English Civil Wars: 1640 – 1660* (London: Phoenix, 1988)

Wrigley, E.A and R.S Schofield ‘English Population History from Family Reconstitution: Summary Results 1600 – 1799’, *Population Studies*, Vol 37 No.2 (1983), 157 - 184

Yates, Frances *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992; first published London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966)