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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how religious arguments, concepts and viewpoints were used as instruments to instruct soldiers and dehumanise enemies in the first English Civil War (1642-1646). I argue that religion had an important role in encouraging soldiers, enforcing military discipline and creating group cohesion and comradery. Furthermore, I suggest that religion was used to delegitimise the enemy and thus prepare the soldiers to fight their fellow countrymen in an efficient and bloody manner.

The differences between the ways in which the King and Parliament understood religious warfare form the main argument of the thesis. The Royalist ministers and Puritan preachers had quite opposite views on the use of religion as a tool of war. Whereas the King’s clergymen underlined peaceful aspects of the Christian faith and merciful and compromising attitudes of its practitioners, the Parliamentarian chaplains thundered harsh words and black-and-white images of an eschatological battle between God and the anti-Christ, which left room for neither peace nor compromise. The Royalists took the nation’s sins on their shoulders, accepting God’s wrath and judgement and praying for the calamities to end with the passive submission of a martyr. The Puritans, by contrast, portrayed themselves as actively participating in Christ’s battles against the Devil as saints. They did not hesitate to frame the conflict in religious terms and use the martial aspects of the Protestant faith to advance their cause.

I examine printed sermons and pamphlets to produce a comprehensive view on the public press and its significance in propagating these different ideas about the relationship between religion and war. The more radical, revolutionary approach of the Parliamentarian ministers and authors is evident from the beginning of the conflict, and I suggest that, even though the pinnacle of religious-martial education was reached when the New Model Army was formed in 1645, in itself it was not exceptional in its religious character compared to earlier Parliamentarian armies. The Royalist clergymen, for their part, were equally constant in combatting the sins of the King’s soldiers instead of preparing them to fight the war.

Similar differences manifested in the dehumanisation of the enemy. On the one hand, the Puritan ministers stressed the judgemental, uncompromising work that they had to do in order to wash the nation’s sins away with blood. They juxtaposed the King’s men with the Catholic Irish, who had rebelled in 1641 and who had been very harshly treated both in publications and in battle. On the other hand, the Royalists were hesitant to condemn the Parliamentarians to an equal extent; they were rather trying to reclaim the Parliamentarians from their revolt back to the good graces of the King by offering mercy and pardon in exchange for repentance.

The thesis re-evaluates the role of religion in the English Civil War by focusing on military preaching and publishing. In this way it contributes to the debates about the significance of religion in the political and societal landscapes of the period. Furthermore, I seek to show that religion was an important instrument of war, whose different uses by the Royalists and Parliamentarians played a part in how the conflict proceeded and culminated.
## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................................................... 1

Introduction ....................................................................................................................................................... 2

Part I: Instructions ........................................................................................................................................... 18

1. Discipline, Practical Instructions and Iconoclasm..................................................................................... 18

2. Prayer and Religiosity ................................................................................................................................. 40

3. Sins and Courage .......................................................................................................................................... 62

4. Saints and Martyrs...................................................................................................................................... 84

5. Military Sermons in the New Model Army ................................................................................................. 107

6. Reception of Religious Instruction ........................................................................................................... 122

Part II: Dehumanisation .................................................................................................................................. 143

7. The Irish Rebellion ....................................................................................................................................... 143

8. The Beginning of the War ........................................................................................................................... 155

9. The Popish Army of the Earl of Newcastle ............................................................................................... 171

10. The Religious Dehumanisation of the King’s Armies .......................................................................... 185

11. The Delegitimization of the Parliamentarians ......................................................................................... 204

12. Blood Guilt, Judgement, and Washing away the Nation’s Sins ............................................................... 222

13. Dehumanising Propaganda for Soldiers ................................................................................................. 241

14. The Effects of Dehumanisation: Shrewsbury, Bolton, Hopton Castle, Naseby and Basing House 251

Conclusions .................................................................................................................................................... 268

Bibliography ................................................................................................................................................... 275
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been a few years in the making. My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor, Professor Markku Peltonen. Without his endless patience, expert guidance and unstinting encouragement this dissertation would not have been completed. As a matter of fact, I would not probably even have started it if he had not supervised my MA thesis and subtly pushed me to embark upon this path. Writing a PhD is a solitary activity. However, having Markku as my mentor has made the whole effort much easier.

I also want to thank my second supervisor, Kari Saastamoinen, for his honest criticism of and thorough comments on my thesis. The feedback I received from him has been very valuable, especially in that it helped me to concentrate on the core of my research. The thesis would have turned out to be much weaker (and, at the same time, even longer) achievement without his input.

In addition to my Helsinki advisors, I am immensely grateful to my preliminary examiners, Professor Thomas Cogswell and Professor Edward Vallance, for their constructive criticism and helpful suggestions. Their advice has already proved very useful for further, post-doctoral, research on my topic.

Research is hard without financial support. Therefore, I would like to thank the Emil Aaltonen Foundation and the University of Helsinki for funding my work. I also thank my employer Kalliolan Setlementti Ry for giving me the possibility of working flexibly while completing my thesis – at times, it has been a relief to escape the English Civil War in the comfortable silence of Kalliola’s basement archive.

My peers and colleagues have been an invaluable source of help, advice and support. The members of the General History Seminar at the University of Helsinki have patiently read my drafts and commented on their merits and weaknesses. In particular, I would like to thank Cesare Cuttica and Melike Çakan for not only spending their time to help me improve my thesis but also for multiple conversations about various other matters ranging from politics to boxing. I also want to express my gratitude to my old friends from the student days, who have helped me to polish my argumentation and debating skills with topics completely unrelated to the thesis. I am especially indebted to Inka Rantakallio for giving an outsider’s opinion on the crucial parts of my work and lending her academic expertise to me for improving it.

Sometimes a break from work is necessary, preferably at regular intervals. My brothers and sisters in Fen Lan Tang Lang Men have forced me to put my mind into completely different matters and, by so doing, they have maintained my mental welfare at the cost of physical pain and effort.

Finally, I want to thank my parents for their unwavering support and faith in me throughout all these years, and my wife, Josefina, for her love, understanding and patience with my papers and books lying around in our home. Perhaps now, for a while, they will be gone.

Antti Taipale, Helsinki, the 8th of May 2021
INTRODUCTION

My thesis examines the religious instruction of soldiers and the dehumanisation of the enemy through religious imagery during the first English Civil War. The conflict between the King and Parliament was a multifaceted, political and structural issue between the governing institutions, which both necessitated and facilitated radical interpretations of the Scriptures.\(^1\) Whereas earlier scholarship has given significant attention to the emergence and evolution of these political topics and the consequences of hard-line religious interpretations presented in the public sphere, no comparable effort has been made to look at how these radical, religion-driven opinions were used as a tool of war. My work seeks to shed light on this aspect of the conflict.

In a war, a soldier should be given a cause for which to fight and advice to help him in his task. A framework must be provided within which he can locate his own side in relation to the enemy as well as their different pursuits in the war. All this must be explained to the soldiers so that they will know what is at stake in the conflict and what their role is in it. They must also be equipped for their work by providing encouragement and comfort against the stress, fear and hardships that they will encounter.\(^2\) In early modern Europe, this framework was provided by the constant warfare around the continent. Professional soldiers – those who survived – carried their valued experience from one conflict to the next, and new strategies and tactics were propagated together with advancements in maintaining armies, caring for soldiers and enforcing discipline.\(^3\) These lessons were shared across the different sides and parties of the European wars of the period. The differences between the sides, however, were the causes and ideologies that facilitated the fighting, shaped as they were by the specific political and social circumstances in different regions. Certainly there were similarities and common themes, such as religious prejudices between the Catholics and Protestants, but these were


\(^2\) This desired framework is most visible in the military articles of the period but also in the shared moral codes. See Barbara Donagan, War in England 1642–1649. Oxford University Press, 2010 (first published 2008), 125–156. For religion’s place in the framework, see Ismini Pells, Philip Skippon and the British Civil Wars. The “Christian Centurion”. Routledge, 2020. 151–154.

always formed according to each particular conflict. In the English Civil War, religion had a significant role in creating this framework for the fighting men, and it was used as a tool of guidance for the armies, even though the confessional lines were remarkably less clear than, for example, in the religious conflicts on the continent. Hence, it is also crucial to investigate religious publications from outside the traditional perspective of political and spiritual radicalism: how did they shape the narratives of war and counsel the soldiers in their battles both with the enemy and their own sins.

Religious instruction refers to attempts to influence the behaviour of soldiers with biblical interpretations and theological arguments. I focus on three points in particular. First, in order to show the wide range of religious influence, I address the issues that were perceived as crucial by the clerical and secular authorities of the armies, such as discipline, sins and courage. Second, by distinguishing the armies of the King and Parliament, I seek to argue that they interpreted the Bible very differently when choosing what type of advice to emphasize. The ministers who were loyal to the crown and the established Church of England were hesitant to offer concrete advice to the soldiers fighting for the King, whereas the Puritan preachers from both Presbyterian and Independent backgrounds did not consider it un-Christian to instruct the Parliamentarian armies to achieve better performance in the war. Third, I seek to revise the established view of the New Model Army as a radical, religious fighting force to which there was no comparison earlier in the war. On the contrary, I suggest that the very same characteristics of the New Model were already present in the earlier Parliamentarian armies in terms of religious radicalism and spiritual instruction. Thus, it is important not to compare the use of religion between the different Parliamentarian armies, but rather between them and the Royalist armies.

Additionally, I examine the religious dehumanisation of the enemy. By ‘dehumanisation’, I refer to the portrayal of a group of people in ways that make the group appear inhumane or as having less dignity and value than the audience to whom this portrayal is directed. The aim of dehumanisation was to facilitate a more efficient war effort by portraying fellow Englishmen as the dreadful others. Dehumanisation (or delegitimisation, which I use interchangeably) was a strategy that targeted one’s own party and, therefore, needs to be differentiated from mockery and ridicule of the other side, although both often shared a common language. First, I demonstrate that religion played a significant

---

4 I use the word ‘Puritan’ not in a pejorative way but rather for lack of a better word to describe the hard-line reformed Protestants who were not happy with the direction the English Church had taken under the Stuart monarchy, particularly Charles II. I hope that time and long-standing use of the word in scholarship have blunted its abusive rhetorical edge, which the 17th century Englishmen made rather clear as we will come to see. In this work, the word ‘godly’ is used interchangeably with ‘Puritan’.
part in how the enemies were described and why these descriptions were used. Second, I suggest that, comparable to the religious instruction, there were vast differences in the quality and quantity of dehumanisation between the Royalists and Parliamentarians. In general, the former were more forgiving of the enemy and did not cease to offer pardon as long as the rebels would give up their resistance. The latter, however, were waging God’s war in which there was little room for mercy or compromise. Third, I examine the important role that the Catholic Irish played in providing the English with an archetype of the enemy to be used in propaganda not only in military operations against the rebellion in Ireland but also in association with the enemies closer to home.

Religion has been at the heart of historical scholarship on the formation of the Royalists and Parliamentarians and on the Puritan overthrow of the established Church and the monarchy, so much so that the English Civil War has been called the last of the wars of religion. The period in Europe between the 1520s and 1648 witnessed multiple conflicts that could reasonably be called religious, such as the guerres de religion in France between the Catholics and Huguenots, the war and unrest in Scotland and the Low Countries that began in the later part of the 16th century, and the Thirty Years’ War in Germany. Political and religious issues were tangled in the British civil wars, producing societal division and putting pressure on tensions between different groups, exemplified by the parallel theories of a Catholic conspiracy and a Puritan plot that circulated in the 1630s and 1640s. Religious prejudice and viewpoints had a central role not only in political divisions but also in legitimating armed resistance and self-defence from tyranny. The arguments for and against the lawfulness of religious war were important in the debates concerning the justification of armed conflict: the Parliamentarians often made connections between the religious and legal causes of resistance, whereas the Royalists tried to keep the two separate in order to keep religious prestige apart from arguments for self-defence. However, the relationship between religious and mundane matters was not always that explicit even in Parliamentarian theological interpretations. Therefore, it

---

has been suggested that the godly rhetoric of war was built upon legitimate, secular causes of the conflict and that religious reasons were used to advocate the war in a spiritual rather than concrete sense: the covenant should be taken more figuratively than literally in its implications to God’s battle.\(^9\) This viewpoint has been revised by a claim that it was precisely the idea of a covenant between the Lord and his people that allowed the Puritan divines to present the conflict as a war between God and the anti-Christ, ‘to be prosecuted without mercy’.\(^10\) Hence, religion has been linked to the reasons of political division and the escalation of tensions between the parties. Moreover, it has been acknowledged that there was a religious element to the war itself, in other words, that it was not only God-approved self-defence against tyranny but rather active combat against the anti-Christ in order to bring the Kingdom of Heaven closer on earth. The significance of this element as well as its relation to concrete warfare has been a point of debate, however.

Although historians have recognised the importance of religion, they have been divided over its role in and influence on the armies. The classic interpretation has concentrated on the New Model Army and culminated in the picture of a zealous Puritan soldier who fought for religion and God as an embodiment of the spiritual as well as martial warrior. The influence of the ministers’ sermons and texts on the soldiers, especially in relation to the iconoclasm committed by the Parliamentarians, has been recognised in building this archetype.\(^11\) Furthermore, it has been pointed out that the apocalyptic rhetoric about the battle between Christ and the anti-Christ was not purely spiritual.\(^12\) It was rather a very tangible way of looking at politics and warfare, and it directly influenced how the soldiers saw themselves as legitimate actors and how they responded to military discipline.\(^13\) In this interpretation, the New Model Army is portrayed as a conscientious collective of the Saints, whose strict discipline facilitated an efficient performance on the battlefield.\(^14\)

Thus, much attention has been given to the New Model Army and its godliness and spiritual quality. However, the second wave of scholarship has proposed that this perspective should be widened to include the beginning of the war and the armies that existed before the New Model and that the role

---


\(^11\) Charles Firth, Cromwell’s Army. Methuen & Co Ltd. Fakenham, 1962 (First published 1902), 327–328.


\(^13\) Ibid. 285–288

\(^14\) Ibid. 13.
of religion should be re-examined. Mark Kishlansky has pointed out that the New Model Army was not in itself the revolutionary fighting force it has usually been portrayed as, at least not with regards to the discipline and instruction of the soldiers. Rather, it was a blend of the previous Parliamentarian armies with a similar composition, character and conduct. Other armies fought the majority of the First Civil War – the New Model Army was not formed until 1645 – and hence, concentrating solely on the New Model Army would leave the picture incomplete. Moreover, scholars such as Leo Solt and Barbara Donagan have called the role of religion into question. Evidence against the godly and disciplined behaviour of the soldiers has been interpreted as discrediting the importance of religious education. For example, the use of impressment to recruit manpower and the iconoclasm performed by the soldiers were seen as signals that no amount of religious indoctrination could erase certain ignoble traits and make the New Model Army a collective of pure warriors of faith who fought for religion and not for personal gain. Scholars have criticized that the effect of the ministers and their sermons has been taken for granted and that the enduring portrayal of the New Model Army soldiers as Bible-reading, hymn-singing saints has not been properly challenged. Although the ministers recognised certain issues in the conduct of the soldiers and tried to influence them with their sermons and to reinforce the existing framework of rules and codes, Barbara Donagan has claimed that the practical effects of this religious instruction were minor and paled in comparison to secular factors, such as discipline meted out in the military articles and the professionality of the career soldiers and officers. According to this line of interpretation, ‘faith was not a substitute for professional competence’, and there was little room for religious explanations regarding the conduct and behaviour of the soldiers.

The significance of religious instruction for the conduct and discipline of soldiers is of course hard to evaluate. It is crucial to take into account other important factors such as available manpower, material concerns, codes of conduct, and payment for the soldiers. Faith did not make a warrior, but

---

it was rather an instrument for sharpening the qualities that did. For example, without obedience to its superiors, an army is essentially not functionable. There were secular means of attaining obedience, namely military laws and articles, but it would be an oversight to leave out the effects of religious indoctrination. A soldier functioned more efficiently if he believed that his cause was just and the authority under whom he served was legitimate. This was especially important when fighting against a God-ordained sovereign, the King. In addition, religious instruction was used to reinforce military articles and to enable the soldiers to perform better in matters of morale, discipline and courage. Examining how religion was interpreted as a tool of war is important in widening our perspective on the English Civil War and the radical print culture of the period.

Recently, scholars such as Ian Gentles have done just this by stressing the importance of religion for the New Model Army and its practical effects on the soldiers, such as high morale, courage, discipline and personal conduct as well as the ruthlessness brought about by the army’s conviction of battling against the anti-Christ. This religiosity was the product of multiple factors, such as the personal piety of the leaders and chaplains of the army and the professions of humility and lay preaching. These all weight more than the negative evidence, for instance, of problems in recruitment and religious scepticism. It has been pointed out that New Model Army soldiers bore a holy fervour from their belief that they were fulfilling a task given to them by God. In addition, godly officers allegedly influenced soldiers under their command by combining their personal religiosity and military expertise. The ministers, for their part, aroused and propagated religious fervour, and their attempts to influence the war ranged from justifying the conflict to motivating and encouraging the soldiers. Again, the importance of the New Model Army has been underlined, but the role of the Puritan ministers and their radical religious interpretations for the earlier Parliamentarian armies has been neglected, although Jacqueline Eales has noted that some ministers active since the beginning of the war were helping their audience to prepare for fighting by encouraging the soldiers and legitimizing the conflict, and David Wootton has traced the origins of political radicalism to late 1642

---

22 Ibid. 87–102.
23 Ibid. 118–119.
and early 1643, springing from the need to strengthen the resolve of Parliamentarians in the face of military defeat. 26

Moreover, it is also incumbent to examine the arguments of the King’s ministers, that is, the contents of their sermons and texts. Whereas the New Model Army has drawn most of the scholarly attention, very little notice has been given to the Royalist armies’ religious education. Previous research has concentrated on the military articles, proclamations and other ‘official’ publications that decreed and regulated the practice of religion in the King’s armies, and not on the actual content of spiritual education. 27 I suggest that, in addition to the military articles, it is important to take into account other Royalist sources, such as sermons and catechisms, to attain a wider view on religious practice in the King’s armies. It is not enough to know how divine services were organized or what kind of punishment was meted out for infractions of a religious nature in order to examine how the Royalist soldiers were instructed in matters of faith and how the King’s ministers tried to influence the war effort. To be sure, Royalist sermonizing and religious texts have been examined, especially from the viewpoint of their political significance: it was the Royalist clergy who lead the attack against the Parliamentarian resistance theory with both religious and legal arguments. 28 However, insofar as the King’s ministers’ influence on and instruction to soldiers is concerned, there has been no in-depth studies on these topics.

Scholarship on religion as a tool of war and as a device for helping the soldiers of the Civil War in their grim task of fighting battles and sieges has mainly focused on the Puritan side of the conflict and on the New Model Army in particular. This narrow view has left out the earlier Parliamentarian armies and their religious education as well as those of the King. Recently, the King’s side has drawn more attention from scholars, and old interpretations have been challenged, for example, by noting that some Royalist authors used equally radical language as did the Parliamentarians. 29 It has also been proposed that warfare-related religious language was very similar between the Parliamentarians


27 Margaret Griffin, Regulating Religion and Morality in the King’s Armies, 1639–1646. Brill, 2004, 217.

28 At the beginning of the war, a debate on the lawfulness of resistance was played out in the public press, where prominent Royalist writers such as Dudley Digges, Henry Ferne and John Bramhall engaged Parliamentarian pamphleteers in a more or less civilised war with words. See Robert Wilcher, The Writing of Royalism 1628–1660. Cambridge University Press, 2009 (first published 2001), 140–145; Michael Mendle, Henry Parker and the English Civil War. The political thought of the public’s “privado”. Cambridge University Press, 2002 (first published 1995), 90–110.

and the Royalists. In this study, I seek to demonstrate that there are clear differences in both the volume and content of religious instruction and that a comparative approach between the armies and their religious education is needed to ascertain what constituted a ‘godly’ army and why such an army was more successfully constructed on the Parliamentarian side. It was not a new invention to use religious viewpoints to influence soldiers, but the considerable differences between the preaching of the King’s ministers and those of Parliament show that there were many ways to read the Bible, and even in war, not everyone was willing to resort to more violent interpretations. I suggest that, when comparing the armies of the King and Parliament, the military articles that regulated soldiers’ participation in devotional events were less important than the content of these events, that is, the sermons and literature aimed at the soldiers. This made warfare-related religious practice in Parliamentarian armies distinct and more radical in comparison to Royalist efforts. The differences manifested themselves also in the biblical images that the ministers presented as paragons and examples of a Christian soldier. For the Puritans, the role model was a Saint who, by his own active work, participated in God’s battle against the Devil. For the Royalist ministers, the ideal was that of a Martyr, who tried to appease the Lord’s wrath by patiently and pessimistically enduring the storm while trusting that dying in this suffering would award him a place in Heaven. The King did not lose the Civil War because his opponents’ soldiers had better catechisms. However, Parliamentarian publications were more successful in merging Christianity and warfare and provided a more sound and comprehensive, not to mention aggressive, theory of religious war. Investigating and comparing these publications sheds light on how belligerent religious interpretations were also used outside the political sphere and helps us understand the religious dimensions of the English Civil War better not only on the level of political rhetoric but also as a method of military guidance and education.

I also want to point out the importance of the Presbyterian ministers in pursuing religious warfare. One of the main reasons why the New Model Army has been seen as a zealous military force was its Independent character. The struggle between the Independents and Presbyterians for the control of the army has featured prominently in historians’ works. These inner tensions and their outcome had an effect on the army and its religious character, especially since the majority of its known chaplains were of Independent tendencies. However, the clearest connection between religion and warfare was made by the ministers of Presbyterian background even before the creation of the New Model Army. The Scottish Covenanters have been considered the earliest example of a godly army that

---

exercised religious discipline during the British civil wars of the 17th century, starting from the Bishops’ Wars and continuing to the Scots’ involvement in the struggle between the King and Parliament.\textsuperscript{33} I seek to demonstrate that the Presbyterian notion of waging war in religious terms had a significant influence on the Parliamentary armies of the First Civil War. The Presbyterian ministers and army chaplains were very prolific with their sermons and texts on religious war and soldiers’ education. Of course, they were not the only ones to view the conflict in religious terms, but they went the furthest in merging secular military articles and religious imagery of a godly Christian soldier. The result was a Saint in arms who fought not only for the privileges of Parliament and the rights of a subject but also for the Lord of Hosts against the representatives of the Devil himself.

The second main theme of my thesis is the role of dehumanisation in the English Civil War. In earlier scholarship, the rhetoric of religious holy war has mainly been seen in the context of political actions and justifications of the war.\textsuperscript{34} However, I examine this rhetoric as a tool of war propaganda that dehumanised opponents and made waging war and fighting battles against fellow Englishmen easier. The importance of religion in dehumanising the enemy is an aspect that has been mostly neglected in earlier scholarship. Hatred between the different groups has been presented as one significant factor in motivating the soldiers to fight in the Civil War.\textsuperscript{35} It has also been suggested that the dehumanising rhetoric of the sermons might have led the soldiers to commit atrocities, that were strongly forbidden under the pain of severe penalties in the ordinances of armies as well as in the unwritten codes of war.\textsuperscript{36} I seek to claim that the religious distinctions – based on fact or imagination – were an essential factor in portraying the enemy and his inhumanity and barbarity. The aim is to highlight the significance of religion as a tool of distancing those of one’s own side from the enemies.

Furthermore, I seek to show that there were clear distinctions between the different parties in their use of religious arguments in dehumanising the enemy. On the one hand, Parliamentary rhetoric during the war was strongly inspired by Puritan eschatological theology, and the final battle between the Saints of Christ and the armies of the anti-Christ was very prevalent in the visions of the Parliamentary preachers. On the other hand, the Royalist ministers and clerical authors, for the most


\textsuperscript{36} Vallance, ‘Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications of the English Civil War.’ 413.
part, claimed that the war was a punishment for the nation’s sins. The Parliamentarians certainly shared this view, but their conclusions differed radically. For the Royalists, it was important to focus on the sins of their own side. The war was something that had to be fought but without unnecessary bloodshed and with a mercy that befitted true Christians. The radical Parliamentarians had no such reservations, even going as far as to claim that the sins of the nation should be washed away with the blood of the enemy. Among the Royalist party, there were poets and satirists who were capable of venomous attacks against the Parliamentarians, and the King’s newsbooks were not too kind to the rebels either. In this light, it is even more astonishing that the clergy, especially in their sermons and publications to the King’s soldiers, were considerably milder and merciful than their Parliamentarian counterparts.

I will also stress the importance of anti-Catholicism in Parliamentarian propaganda. Both sides were soundly Protestant in principle, but it was Parliament that managed to present itself as a bulwark against the Catholic rebellion in Ireland. Furthermore, when the Civil War broke out in England, the Puritan ministers quickly began to dehumanise the Royalists with the same anti-Catholic descriptions as they had used of the Irish. The King never managed to convincingly present himself as a defender of the true faith despite his countless proclamations for Protestant religion – on the contrary, his side was increasingly seen as a threat to the Protestant church and as an advocate of Catholicism.

Historians have examined the religious dimensions of propaganda that was directed against the Earl of Newcastle’s army fighting for the King. Accordingly, it has been suggested that, in Parliamentarian publications, this army was treated the same way as the Irish Rebels mainly because the Earl’s army contained numerous English Catholics. Thus, the distrust and fear of the Catholic Irish were extended to the English Catholics on the basis of their common religion, and this propaganda allowed the Parliamentarian preachers to present the conflict as a religious war. Charles Carlton has pointed out that not only did Parliamentarian propaganda make a connection between the Irish rebels and the King’s English supporters but the Royalists were guilty of this juxtaposition as well, equating the Parliamentarians with the Irish. However, the view that fellow Englishmen were treated as barbarous others like the Irish has also been challenged. Moreover, religion has been considered as

38 Of the atrocities towards the Irish and of their exceptionality as an enemy to the Protestant English, see Micheál Ó Siochru, ‘Atrocity, Codes of Conduct and the Irish in the British Civil Wars 1641–1653.’ *Past & Present*, No. 195 (May 2007).
40 Carlton, *Going to the Wars*, 37.
merely one of the reasons why the Irish were seen as the ultimate evil in the Civil War. Scholars, such as Barbara Donagan, Kathleen M. Noonan and Mark Stoyle have pointed out qualities other than Catholicism that were used to delegitimize the Irish. These qualities, including ethnicity, for instance, played a crucial part in depicting the Irish as dangerous others. In addition to ethnic and religious reasons, the Irish were also criticised for their actions, such as being disloyal and rebellious subjects. It has been suggested that the portrayals of the Irish were used in the highly polarized discourse in England along the party divides: the Puritans underlined the religious viewpoint, the King’s side the disloyalty. These factors explain why the Irish were seen as the worst of the worst in the British conflicts of the 1640s.

My examination concentrates on the use of this image of the Irish as it was projected on the enemies, who, for the most part, were not Irish themselves. Here, the role of religion is remarkable. As mentioned, the dehumanisation of the Irish themselves was not purely religious. However, in the public press, their Catholic faith was central in explaining the instigation of the Rebellion and their violent actions towards Protestant settlers. Moreover, the fear of Irish troops coming from Ireland was directly related to their Catholic beliefs and the threat that they presented to the true Protestant religion – it was not related to their purported backwardness and barbarousness. The latter two qualities, inherent as they were portrayed to be to people born in Ireland, were not easily transferred to English enemies. Thus, religion was most often used to make the distinction between the good and the bad Englishmen.

I suggest that the preceding Irish Rebellion and the harsh treatment of Catholic Irish insurgents in the news, pamphlets and sermons was largely a model for the later dehumanisation of enemies in the Civil War, particularly in Parliamentarian propaganda, which described the Royalists in much the same terms as the Irish Rebels. The Irish Rebels and Newcastle’s soldiers were indeed juxtaposed in Parliamentarian propaganda, but I intend to show that this juxtaposition was applied to the whole Royalist party, not just the Earl’s army. I also suggest that the actual religious convictions of the dehumanised party were not important in constructing propaganda and the portrayal of the enemy. Despite the Protestant faith of the Royalist majority, they were identified with the Catholic Irish

---

42 Donagan, ‘Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War’, 93–94.
rebels. The facts were not as important as what was conveyed – in this case, vilifying the King’s entire party and propagating fear in order to mobilise support for Parliament’s cause in addition to making the enemy more inhuman and, thus, easier to go to battle against. My claim is that the religious otherness of the Irish was transferred to describe the English Royalist participants of the Civil War. This portrayal was utilized in accordance with the military situation: for instance, when Newcastle’s army was annihilated at Marston Moor, other armies were soon after presented as ‘popishly affected’. Moreover, despite Royalist attempts at tarnishing the Parliamentarians with the atrocities of the rebellion, there were striking differences between the King and Parliament, both in volume and in content, in their use of the Irish for propaganda purposes.

I also address another religious factor of dehumanisation, namely blood guilt. The notion of innocent blood demanding compensation has been seen as one of the most important justifications for the regicide of Charles I.45 Another dimension is its implications to political radicalism in general. For instance, it has been suggested that, during the First Civil War, Puritan ministers raised the issue of blood guilt even though Parliament was more reserved in its official publications.46 However, there were close connections between the ministers and the politicians, and it has been claimed that it was possible to interpret certain opinions heard from the pulpit as official policy.47 For example, Christopher Love’s uncompromising sermon featuring the blood of the guilty during the peace negotiations at Uxbridge in 1645 possibly represented the views of certain politicians and helped cause the disruption of the talks and even prevented any possible agreement.48

In addition to the use of blood guilt in political and legal discussions, I suggest that it is important to assess its role in the delegitimization of the enemy during the First Civil War because it was precisely in the context of an actual battle where the Englishmen – also the later radicals in the New Model Army – first came across religious justification for killing. The blood guilt of the enemy was preached mainly to the soldiers of the Parliamentarian armies. As in other cases, there are clear dissimilarities in how the ministers of the different sides portrayed the enemy. Whereas the King’s ministers
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48 Ibid. 296–297.
highlighted the role of the nation’s sins and personal repentance, the Puritan preachers put the responsibility of the calamities of war squarely on the Royalist enemies. In other words, the Parliamentarian ministers wanted to wash away the nation’s sins with the blood of the enemy by shedding it on the battlefield. The Royalists, for the most part, harboured the attitude of a martyr and submitted to divine punishment without trying to blame the enemy.

Although my work focuses more on what was said and written and why rather than on what was actually understood and put into practice, the purported effects of religious instruction and dehumanisation are beneficial to examine. The sources often mention the religious fervour and zeal of the soldiers and refer to actions performed for religious reasons. They also acknowledge atrocities that were justified by religious arguments. While I do not claim that these descriptions are necessarily truthful – that the reasons and motives attributed to religion were actually religious – they clearly suggest that contemporaries themselves thought that religious instruction and delegitimization could be effective.\(^49\) Hence, I explore not only the content of these instructions and dehumanisation but also the claims of what was achieved by following the religious instigations. Faith in the effects of religious indoctrination was important in constructing theories of religiously sanctioned warfare and a crucial reason why these constructions existed at all. My approach also highlights the differences between the Royalists and Parliamentarians concerning the desirable and approved use of religion as a tool of war. The purported effects of religious instruction and delegitimization should be seen, among other things, as attempts to strengthen the justification of this indoctrination. In other words, it was not enough to preach to the soldiers to make them behave in a certain way. Positive examples of the benefits of that behaviour also had to be provided.

My work uses mostly printed, published sources from the period because I want to present the quantity as well as the quality of this discourse in the first part of the 1640s. The volume and accessibility of the printed material was high: there were no other means of conveying information comparable to the publishing press, and its influence was unparalleled.\(^50\) Access to printed pamphlets was not only the privilege of the wealthy, but all social classes could experience the propagation of information.\(^51\) Print was used nation-wide to raise support for both sides by recruiting soldiers and

\(^{49}\) It is also true that religious reasons for certain acts were sometimes attributed to one party (particularly the Puritans) in order to make them appear as radical zealots for propaganda purposes. For this type of delegitimization, see Glenn Burgess, ‘Wars of Religion and Royalist Political Thought’ in Prior and Burgess (eds.), *England’s Wars of Religion, Revisited*, 169–192.

\(^{50}\) This has been acknowledged by, for instance, Amos Tubb in his article ‘Printing the regicide of Charles I’, 504.

encouraging them to join different military enterprises.\textsuperscript{52} Published literature by the army personnel, such as military chaplains and officers, was also crucial.\textsuperscript{53} Administering the armies required dealing with masses of people whose literacy was not very high, but there were methods of propagating information about military articles to illiterate audiences as well.\textsuperscript{54}

Moreover, by focusing on printed sources, it is possible to compare how the different sides wanted to portray themselves since the print culture of the Civil War was very much about appearances.\textsuperscript{55} If there were differences in the content of Parliamentarian publications compared to Royalist publications, there were also differences in their attitudes towards the press and publishing. It has been suggested that, in general, the Royalists were less keen on engaging their political opponents in the public press.\textsuperscript{56} They were not, however, hesitant to guide their own soldiers by instructional material such as prayer books. The content of these books and pamphlets again reveal how the Royalist ministers, at least officially, wanted the King’s soldiers to pursue military ends to the conflict.

Religious viewpoints influenced Civil War radicalism and were brought to the public sphere by the publishing press. For example, millenarianism, waiting for the second coming of Christ, was not very common in England earlier, but it was propagated to the masses by printed books in the 1640s.\textsuperscript{57} The dividing issues between the parties as well as the derogatory names ‘Roundhead’ and ‘Cavalier’ started to become commonplace in pamphlets.\textsuperscript{58} The war party in Parliament, which advocated a military solution to the crisis, consisted not only of politicians but also of clergymen, such as Hugh Peters and John Goodwin.\textsuperscript{59} These Puritan ministers both expanded the possible political options by

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid. 345–346.
\textsuperscript{53} Peacey, \textit{Politicians and Pamphleteers}, 108–110.
\textsuperscript{54} In this work, catechisms and sermons are particularly highlighted as important methods of instruction. Even though I examine the printed and published versions, it is necessary to acknowledge the oral tradition behind these means of conveying information to an audience. For catechisms, see Ian Green, \textit{The Christian’s ABC. Catechisms and Catechizing in England c. 1530–1740}. Oxford University Press, 1996, 13–44. For sermons and sermonizing, see Arnold Hunt, \textit{The Art of Hearing. English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590–1640}. Cambridge University Press, 2014 (first published 2010), passim.
\textsuperscript{55} There were many motives for publishing war related pamphlets, ranging from justifying one’s own actions to producing entertainment for the public. Nicole Greenspan has written about popular literature and its effects in portraying the war in the public sphere. See Nicole Greenspan, ‘War.’ in Joad Raymond (ed.), \textit{The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture Volume I. Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660}. Oxford University Press, 2011, 320–335.
\textsuperscript{56} Peacey, \textit{Politicians and Pamphleteers}, 307–308.
\textsuperscript{57} Como, \textit{Radical Parliamentarians and the English Civil War}, 77–79.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid. 111.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid. 144–149.
discussing more radical alternatives in their pamphlets and outright preached against possible settlements with the King.60

I follow Jason Peacey’s and David Como’s recent studies on print culture and its centrality in Civil War propaganda and radicalism by taking my cue from the notions of distinct belligerent parties and their influence on the politics of the Civil War through the public press. However, instead of politicians, I examine soldiers and the ideas of religious warfare put forward by the ministers. In other words, my work focuses on the different interpretations of the war and how it should be conducted according to both moderate and radical religious viewpoints. I suggest that the notions of religious radicalism can be applied, in addition to politics, to military guidance as well. Some of the Puritan clergy attempted a radical reformation of the armies and religious instruction of the soldiers, and they held a conviction that these issues were crucial for benefitting from the fortunes of war. Illuminating the striking contrast that this attitude presented to the preaching and guidance of the Royalist ministers, and how these different views on Christian warfare were propagated in the public press, are amongst the key contributions I attempt to make.

The first part of my thesis focuses on the religious instruction given to the soldiers of the different armies through sermons and other publications, such as prayer manuals and catechisms. The intention of this guidance was to introduce a Christian way of waging war, but there were different opinions on what that actually was. First, I examine the emphases that the different sides put on topics such as the causes for fighting, methods of praying, signs of religiosity, the toleration of sins and encouragement in the face of possible death. I seek to demonstrate that the Royalists and Parliamentarians had distinct priorities regarding which religious viewpoints to underline, in addition to interpreting some issues, for example iconoclasm, very differently. I then move on to show how these differences crystallized into a Saint, a Puritan soldier who obeyed God’s will in active pursuit of victory, and into a Martyr, whose laudable qualities included suffering for the nation’s sins and whose most powerful weapon was passive prayer. Finally, I address religious military education during the whole First English Civil War and argue that the creation of the New Model Army did not result in any profound change in the quality of religious instruction.

In the second part of this thesis, I concentrate on a more specific variant of instruction: the dehumanisation of the enemy. First, I seek to establish that the rebellion in Ireland in 1641 and the impact that it had on the treatment of the Catholic Irish in the public press formed a benchmark for

60 Ibid. 154–155, 166.
the delegitimization of the different parties of the Civil War and that religious differences were very important in this process. I then suggest that the actions of the Royalists in particular were measured against the Irish rebels, and that this constituted a powerful propaganda weapon for Parliament. My argument is that, similarly to instruction, religious dehumanisation was more common and aggressive on the Parliamentarian side of the conflict, whereas the Royalist ministers criticised Puritan harshness and preached for forgiveness and mercy. Thus, the Parliamentarian clerics managed to interpret the Bible in a way that was less at odds with the tangible realities of being a soldier in the Civil War. This religious dehumanisation culminated in blaming the Royalists for the sin of blood guilt, shedding the blood of innocents and thus drawing the wrath of God over England.
PART I: INSTRUCTIONS

1. DISCIPLINE, PRACTICAL INSTRUCTIONS AND ICONOCLASM

Counselling the armies and highlighting the essential attributes and qualities needed for the war was very important from a military point of view. These were all highly secular matters that were, naturally, dealt with in the articles of war, in training and by the instructions of the military authorities. For instance, the Earl of Essex, having just assumed the command of the Parliamentary war effort in September 1642, gave a speech to the soldiers in which he stressed the importance of these secular issues, such as the fair conduct of officers, the careful exercising and instruction of the soldiers, discipline, avoiding the plundering and spoiling of civilians and, as a religious duty, respecting the Sabbath.61 However, the ministers also saw it worthwhile to instruct the soldiers on these topics from religious viewpoints in order to make them better and more disciplined in their profession, and sometimes this was acknowledged by the career soldiers as well.62 The Parliamentary preachers in particular touched upon the very same issues as did the secular authorities and reinforced the connection between religion and warfare. In this chapter, I address the different type of practical instruction given by the King’s ministers and the Parliamentary preachers. The latter demonstrated a more tangible approach to warfare and better knowledge of its requirements, whereas the former looked at the issues more from the point of their own religious ideals, which were not always compatible with harsh reality. There were instances that underlined the King’s ministers’ inexperience of war, such as certain remarks regarding pillaging, but there were also attempts to address the problems that were typical to the Royalist armies, for example duelling. The Puritans forcefully emphasised military discipline and obedience to commanders, although they had, somewhat paradoxically, forsaken the King’s authority. Finally, I examine iconoclasm as an activity of the soldiers that was both instigated and curbed by the clerical authorities. It was seen as necessary for the Puritan reformation but, at the same time, detrimental to army discipline. Thus, it presented a dilemma for the Parliamentary armies, while also portraying the power of religious instigation.

61 A Worthy Speech Spoken by His Excellence The Earle of Essex. In the Head of his Armie, before his Arrivall at Worcester, on Saturday last, being the 24. of September, 1642... London, 1642, A3r-A4v.
62 Henry Hexham was an English professional soldier in the United Provinces and wrote about his experiences there. In his military manual, when addressing gentleman soldiers, he brought up biblical references to underline the importance of obedience, discipline and good, Christian conduct. Henry Hexham, The Principles of the Art Militarie, Practised in the Warres of the United Netherlands. Represented by Figure, the Word of Command, and Demonstration. London, 1637, 6–7.
The Parliamentarian clergy did not hesitate to counsel armies, and they had certainly some experience and acquired knowledge about the topics they wrote of. A Puritan minister thought himself a warrior saint who did not have any doubts that he was involved in godly work, and it was his job to instruct the soldiers to perform better. A good example of this Richard Ward, who was a minister in Stansted Mountfitchet in Essex and the author of the military pamphlet *The Anatomy of Warre*. For the most part, his treatise, published in November 1642, dealt with questions of the lawfulness of war and of civil war in particular, but it also addressed a few attributes that made up a good soldier and gave advice to those in that profession. According to Ward, the necessary requirements for a soldier in war were a willingness to fight, obedience to commanders and fear of disgrace and shame, which would prevent him from running away. Ward also gave counsel on military matters, such as to make good use of a victory and, in the case of a defeat, retreating in order to fight another day. These were all quite concrete and understandable concerns, and *The Anatomy of Warre* gave much attention to strictly military issues. For example, it highlighted the importance of experience and stressed that a few veteran soldiers were more important and efficient than a larger group of raw recruits. Already in 1642, Parliamentarian ministers such as Ward could seamlessly combine their role as clergymen with the role of military instructor, and this familiarity with martial topics was an important factor that distinguished the Puritans from the King’s ministers.

Robert Ram, a Presbyterian army chaplain and the author of one of the most important religious-martial texts of the war, *The Souldiers Catechisme*, addressed the topics of instruction and the soldiers’ beneficial attributes in his pamphlet that was published in the spring of 1644. Skill and
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64 Ibid. 15–16.
65 Ibid. 19.
66 Robert Ram was a minister of Spalding and later a chaplain to Edward Rossiter’s cavalry regiment in the Parliament’s Eastern Association. He was a staunch Presbyterian who had first-hand experience of the war even before his commission in the army. In 1643, he was taken prisoner by the Cavaliers of the neighbouring town of Croyland, allegedly because he had earlier sent them a letter urging them not to resist the Parliament, arguing solidly that the town was not defensible against the forces that could be raised against it. Thus, he and some other prominent Parliamentarians of Spalding were captured by a raiding party and taken to Croyland, where they were kept in rough conditions. The town was besieged by the Parliamentarian army, and the captives were tied to the bulwarks, standing there and being shot at by their own side who mistook them for Royalists. Miraculously, despite being targets for several hours, none of them were harmed, which was taken as a sign from God. Ram claimed that, while they were tied on top of the breastworks, they had to listen to the ‘abhominable swearing’ of the Cavaliers, and even the minister of the town, M. Styles, seemingly participated in that ungodly activity. Ram also mentioned that Mr. Jackson, who had caused people to rise against Parliament by his passionate preaching, said that the Royalists’ cause was God’s, who fought for them. In the end, the regiments of colonels Hobert, Irby and Cromwell took Croyland and set the prisoners free. After that ordeal, it is probably no surprise that Ram did not have too kind an attitude towards the Royalists. *Divers Remarkable Passages of Gods Good Providence in the wonderfull preservation and deliverance of John Harington Esqu. Mr. Robert Ram Minister...* London, 1643, passim.
cunning were, in his opinion, very much needed in a soldier, because David had acknowledged that
the Lord had taught his hands to war and his fingers to fight in Psalms 144:1. Regarding pure
application, Ram required great wisdom and experience from commanders and considerable skill and
dexterity from common soldiers: ‘they must know how to handle their Armes, how to keep Ranks
&c.’ He also advised his readers how to make soldiers skilful. According to him, officers should
diligently exercise their men, who in turn, should try to learn. Both officers and common soldiers
should read and observe what earlier, eminent soldiers had written about warfare. Alongside these
purely secular considerations, Ram also recommended that every soldier pray to God for
instructions.67 These might have been quite superficial pieces of advice, but they show that the Puritan
army chaplain had thought these matters through outside his own religious framework – for example,
by recommending secular military manuals for reading – and that he had no scruples about waging
war in an efficient and bloody manner. As long as the soldiers were on the right side, fighting for
God, they needed not trouble themselves with the lawfulness of their actions or of the war in general.
In this godly struggle, it was no sin for a soldier to do his best in his bloody profession, and there was
a lot to learn from secular texts and by exercising rigorously. Thus, traditional Christian hesitations
about the lawfulness of war were put to rest by the Parliamentarian preachers, who instead highlighted
religion as a tool, not a hindrance, for warfare.

Even the Parliamentarian career soldiers saw worth in religious viewpoints when instructing their
men. Philip Skippon, a famous Parliamentarian career officer and the author of many religious
treatises, gave very detailed guidance in his third book The Christian Centurians Observations. His
practical advice made use of religion and even evoked personal honour. In addition to instructing
officers and soldiers about tangible matters such as giving and receiving orders and how guard duty
was to be arranged, Skippon also recommended mental preparations. He stressed that it was better to
lose one’s life in an honourable fight than to let down one’s own army. For soldiers readying
themselves for dangerous missions, he recommended meditation and exhortation to give them
courage and surety of God’s assistance and deliverance. He asked the Lord for encouragement,
strength, preservation and prosperity to those fighting for Him and His cause.68

Contemporary authors were aware of the possibility of influencing the behaviour of others by one’s
own example, and the model of a pious soldier was seen to be crucial in the relationship between
officers and men in armies. The benefits of that religious example included, for instance, stricter

obedience to military articles. Another clergyman turned military author, Donald Lupton, wrote *A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike*, a military manual dedicated to the Earl of Essex. Lupton had served as a chaplain with English soldiers in Germany in the 1620s and had, according to his own words, many years’ experience of armies.\(^6^9\) He drew from this first-hand experience in writing on how muskets should replace pikes because they were more effective in contemporary warfare. Moreover, he also discussed soldiering in general. One of the issues he brought up was discipline, which did not only apply to military articles. Lupton pointed out the power of example, especially in the relationship between a commander and a soldier. If the former was a good Christian, the latter might follow his lead.\(^7^0\) This would not only nourish the godly community but also reinforce discipline in the army.

Discipline was essential for the usefulness of an army and Parliamentarian authors understood this well. They often exhorted the soldiers to obey the officers and reinforced military articles and laws by religious viewpoints. They also emphasised that it was crucial to finish the job at hand instead of pursuing one’s own short-term goals. Ward’s *Anatomy of Warre* dealt with these concrete problems, advising soldiers not to start pillaging too soon if they didn’t want their enemies to have time to regroup and not to pursue fleeing enemies too eagerly so that their own formation would not become scattered.\(^7^1\) This counsel was very useful when it came to actual battles, and it seems that at least Cromwell’s famous Ironsides took it to heart. There are plenty of examples from the Civil War battles, in which the Parliamentarian cavalry performed in a more disciplined manner than their Royalist counterparts.\(^7^2\) The tangible lessons from the war itself were the same for both sides – especially the lesson on how formidable a weapon disciplined cavalry could be. Thus, there had to be other explanations for how the Parliamentarian horsemen managed to observe Ward’s theses while the Royalist cavalry did not. Perhaps such explanations can be found in religious indoctrination that even gave concrete advice on matters of war.

\(^6^9\) Donald Lupton, *A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike*... London, 1642, dedication, A4v.
\(^7^0\) Ibid. 10–11.
\(^7^1\) Ward, *The Anatomy of Warre*, 18.
Parliamentarian religious instruction was generally more thorough and to the point than the Royalist efforts. For example, pamphleteer John Price’s *A Spirituall Snapsacke For the Parliament Souldiers* of May 1643 gave a detailed explanation of *Luke 3:14*: ‘Do violence to no man, accuse no man falsely, and be content with your wages’. Since the average soldier was probably unlettered and even less familiar with theological questions, it was far better to explain the meaning of biblical comparisons and instructions in detail. This ensured that the interpretation among the men was the correct one from the viewpoint of the army. Price’s reading was strongly related to army discipline and the obedience of soldiers. According to him, ‘do violence to no man’ meant that one should have both courage and meekness, and stoutness and tenderness, in order to fight under Christ’s banner. The former attributes were essential for confronting enemies, and the latter for the formation of unity and bonds between officers and soldiers. Price criticised the soldiers who had fled from the battle at Edgehill: had the soldiers and commanders had more courage and resolution, and the officers more tenderness and the spirit of love, fewer soldiers would have deserted the battle. ‘Accuse no man falsely’ addressed a common problem among soldiers, which was accusing civilians of malignancy so that they could be plundered with a pretence. This probably referred to unfortunate events in which soldiers had attacked houses under the pretence of that their owners were Papists. The last point of advice, ‘be content with your wages’, not only referred to regular pay but also, and especially, to a spiritual reward. A Christian soldier should not fight for his own ends but for the cause of Christ, which was to be accepted as enough of a reward in itself. With regard to secular wages, Price criticised officers who cheated men from their pay in order to make money. This was comparable to stealing from Christ himself.73

Ram strongly underlined the importance of soldiers’ obedience towards their superiors, which referred not only to the discipline required by the military structure of the armies but also to the God-ordained hierarchy that was violated only with hazard to one’s conscience.74 This interpretation reinforced both the pious community of the Puritan soldiers and their discipline. There was a clear hierarchy even in godly armies, and that hierarchy was based on the Lord’s will. Militant Puritan ministers reinforced the chain of command and strengthened discipline and obedience towards superiors by religious arguments. It was, however, somewhat paradoxical for a chaplain to preach for armed disobedience against the King all the while advocating for complete obedience to those higher
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74 Ibid. 26.
up in military rankings. Be that as it may, Parliamentarian preachers such as Ram went to great lengths to address the problems of discipline in armies. The Souldiers Catechisme commented on mutiny and running away from the colours, which were major concerns in the military articles as well. Essex’s Lawes and Ordinances declared that being present at or assisting in mutinous assemblies was punishable on pain of death, as was uttering seditious words. Whoever heard mutinous talk but did not report it to their commanders were inflicted with a ‘heavy punishment’. Abandoning one’s colours and fleeing from a battle was punishable on pain of death, too. Ram wrote that mutineers were ‘as dangerous Cattle as can belong to an Army’ and would ‘hardly ever prove good Souldiers’. According to him, they deserved severe punishment and to be cashiered from the army. Running away from the colours was even worse. Ram was aware of the penalty decrees in the military articles, and he stated that soldiers who fled the battlefield were to suffer death ‘and surely, they well deserve it’. Fleeing the battlefield was offensive both to God and man since those who ran away abandoned the Lord’s cause. Ram was also worried about the bad example that deserters set, which could even overthrow an army. Naturally, fleeing from the enemy was something that armies could not tolerate, and the problem was addressed by several Parliamentarian ministers, such as Ram, Samuel Kem, and Matthew Newcomen, who argued that breaking the Covenant was such a sin that it made soldiers turn their backs to the enemy.

The Souldiers Catechisme was not only about condemning poor soldiers, however. Ram also cared for the men and wrote that they had to be encouraged and rewarded for their godly service. The maintenance of armies in the early modern era was difficult and soldiers often endured hunger and arrears of pay. Ram perceived that the men needed more than the Holy Spirit to help them bear the hardships of campaigning. Thus, he wrote that they should be well maintained, ‘for no man goeth on warfare at his own charges’. He was also worried about the fate of veterans who had suffered serious injuries fighting for Parliament’s cause. ‘They that have received any hurt or losse by the warres, ought to be liberally provided for, and comfortably maintained all their dayes, by them that sent them

75 Barbara Donagan has noted this discrepancy. She has maintained that the arguments of the ministers might have been important in the former case but not so in the latter: military articles and the officers reinforcing them were more crucial for army discipline. Donagan, ‘Did Ministers Matter?’, 144–147.
76 Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better Conduct of the Army, By His Excellency The Earl of Essex... Together with a Declaration Of the Lords and Commons in Parliament. London, 1643. ‘Of Duties towards Superiours and Commanders’ VI, VIII and IX, A3v.
77 Ibid. ‘Of Duties in Action’ II, Bv.
78 Ram, The Souldiers Catechisme. 1644, 27.
79 Samuel Kem, Orders given out; the Word, Stand Fast. As it was lately delivered in a farewell Sermon by Major Samuel Kem, to the Officers and Souldiers of his Regiment in Bristoll. Novemb. 8. 1646. London, 1646, 3–5.
80 Matthew Newcomen, A Sermon, Tending To set forth the Right Use of the Disasters that befall our Armies. Preached Before the Honourable Houses of Parliament... London, 1644, 32–33.
forth.' The carrot was used in addition to the stick in instructing soldiers and encouraging them in their endeavours. A good officer – and army chaplain – knew when to use strict disciplinary actions and when to use other, less rigorous methods to attain the desired results.

Ram’s catechism was strongly tied to the actual military laws of Parliamentarian armies. The sinful offences and dangerous infractions that The Souldiers Catechisme pointed out had their counterparts in the military articles. There was a clear attempt to reinforce these secular rules by religious arguments. The making of a Puritan soldier involved not only propagating his godly cause and saintly mission but also ensuring that his undesired behaviour was curbed by military laws as well as by the ministers’ influence. As noted, Ram was certainly not the only minister who gave military advice and underlined the importance of discipline. The Parliamentarians doing this were often military chaplains turned martial authors or professional soldiers, who had, by their own experiences, noticed the value of religious counselling for soldiers. Knowledge and experience of war helped shape this advice into a proper and useful form for fighting men. Religious instruction did not have the same level or volume in the Royalist armies – not even after the King’s chaplains had an excellent example, Ram’s catechism, to use as a blueprint. Moreover, Royalist advice was mostly given by ministers who did not have a similar military background as did their Parliamentarian counterparts.

This is not to say that the Royalist clergy did not attempt to instruct the King’s men in the ways of war and to mitigate the problems that the lack of discipline created. For instance, in the first Royalist praying manual published in the late summer or early autumn of 1642 and dedicated to the use of Sir Ralph Dutton’s regiment, a chaplain known by the initials W. C. gave some counsel to the soldiers, although it was quite meagre compared to the other contents of the book – the prayer for the soldiers consisted of two pages in a book that had near one hundred. The prayer reminded the reader of the lawfulness of being a soldier and asked for courage against foes both spiritual and in the flesh. It also requested faithfulness in serving God and the King, and, maybe the most substantial part of the prayer, advised a soldier to do violence to no man, nor accuse anyone falsely and to be content with his wages. This counsel, already familiar from Price’s Spirituall Snapsacke, featured prominently in
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82 This regiment was one of the earliest formed by the Royalists, it participated in the battle of Edgehill and in the advance on London after the battle. See John Barratt, Cavalier Capital Oxford in the English Civil War 1642–1646. Helion & Company Limited, 2015, 63.
83 It is possible that this chaplain was William Chillingworth, a Royalist theologian who was a vocal proponent of the King’s supremacy and served in Sir Ralph Hopton’s army – one of those few Royalist chaplains who might have known about what he was writing from experience.
the sermons and texts of military chaplains during the Civil War. Unlike Price, however, W. C. did not give any context or explanation of these words, portraying perfectly the inadequacies of the Royalist religious instruction. One would expect that a simple soldier needed some clarification of the advice, particularly in reconciling the apparent discrepancy between doing no violence and being a man of war. By contrast, the part about being content with one’s wages sounded loud and clear in the ears of contemporary observers. While some of the soldiers, often officers and cavalry, served out of loyalty, and some regimental commanders even used their own money to keep their men paid and fed, a huge number of soldiers in armies were in it for financial gains, which were not always much or worth the risk. It was very important for the motivation of the men to keep the pay steady because its failure led to discontent and mutiny. Thus, advice from a religious authority telling soldiers to be content with their wages – even when there were none – was a very tangible piece of instruction even if it didn’t always help in controlling the men. Discipline was an important matter, and the Royalist ministers had to stress it as well.

The King’s chaplain Humphrey Peake discussed the value of discipline in Meditations upon a Seige, published in 1646 when the war was, unfortunately for the Royalists, all but over. When a breach in the defences was made and it had to be entered – which was often dangerous or even deadly business – Peake stressed the soldiers’ discipline and obedience to their commanders, juxtaposing it to obedience to God, which was even more important, although punishment for disobedience to the Lord was not as clear and immediate as that meted out by the military articles:

> And the discipline of warre requires that it be rigorously inflicted, lest that disobedience be drawne into example; but the punishment of our disobedience to God being invisible, and the time uncertaine when it shall be inflicted, encourages sond men to be over-indulgent to themselves, when they see they cannot serve God but with losse and danger. 87

Fear of punishment was thus a trusted method of preventing lapses in discipline, but its impact was less effective against spiritual infractions – lamenting it was of course a natural thing to do for the
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85 For the soldiers and their recruitment into the armies, see, for example Carlton, Going to the Wars, 67–68. Also Donagan, War in England, 218–224.
86 There are instances in which even a minister’s authority and words were not enough to control groups of soldiers gone rogue. See A True Relation of the Carriage of a Party of Horse, At Medborne in the County of Leicester: As it was given in to the Committee of Leicester, on Thursday the 9th. of April, 1646. London, 1646. In another case, the money-hungry soldiers were only pacified by the use of violence. A Parliamentary commander Sydenham Poyntz demonstrated his prowess against six or seven mutineers: ‘when I had wounded two of them, then the rest fell downe upon their knees & layd down their swords & muskets & craved pardon.’ A Continuation Of A Journall of Passages of the Parliament of Scotland And other Papers from the Scotts Quarters. Containing some Passages... London, 1646, 7–8.
87 Humphrey Peake, Meditations upon a Seige [sic]. (Probably) Oxford, 1646, 64–68.
Royalist divines, for they were usually worried more about the moral issues than of the matters of war, as we shall see later. Peake certainly noted that the lack of discipline was a problem, but he did not address how that problem could be remedied, except by fear of punishment.

Another topic that Peake wrote about and that was closely related to the soldiers’ discipline was pillaging and the robbing prisoners and civilians. After a successful storming, it was common for the victorious army to claim the property of both the surviving enemies and the civilians – and sometimes their lives too.\(^{88}\) In the context of a storming, this was often seen as the right of the victorious party, especially when allowed by the commander. Wanton looting against orders was frowned upon, however, and pillaging in general was often prohibited by the military articles because it understandably made the army lose support among the common people.\(^{89}\) Thus, pillaging was in the grey area of lawfulness, and many clerical authors, especially Parliamentarian ones, condemned it altogether. Therefore, it is interesting that Peake did not condemn this practice but instead gave advice to those who had lost their valuables: ‘A sufficient warning to us, not to set our hearts, and our affections upon the things of this world, whose purchase is so troublesome, and so dangerous, and whose tenure so uncertaine.’ A place in heaven did not depend on poverty or prosperity, and earthly valuables might even have diverted a person from his proper path. Thus, it was better to focus on true riches, the promise of everlasting life.\(^{90}\) Even more interestingly, Peake defended soldiers who stripped the enemy and civilians and took their clothes for their own use. In such cases the common soldier was to be excused because he was not usually well provisioned, and his pay was often late and used for other purposes than purchasing apparel. Therefore, the victim should take his vanity and his prosperous lifestyle into account, attributes that had made him unaccustomed to going barefoot.\(^{91}\) Peake’s only objection to theft after storming was in connection to torture and its use for the discovery of hidden goods. This was utterly unlawful in his opinion. The proper way to steal valuables from another person was ‘with pitty, and compassion, and leave him whom thou doest pillage somewhat, that he may blesse thee when thou art gone, and say, sure it was God sent thee to him, and he had not

---

\(^{88}\) An account was written of the siege of Sherborn Castle, which presented a threat to the defenders. In order to be threatening, it must have been plausible. ‘If he [the Royalist commander of the castle] refuse, you will finde (so full of Revenge are our Soldiers against the Cabs in the Castle) that they will spare the life of none if they be put to Storm, and much ado we shall have to save them if it be Surrendred.’ A True Relation of The taking of Sherborn-Castle. With Six hundred Prisoners, One thousand Arms, and great store of other Provisions. London, 1645, 5.

\(^{89}\) Sometimes there was no stopping the soldiers from looting, like in Hereford in 1645; ‘The garrison thus by policy and force surprised without remedy was plundered, neither could the commanders rhetorice or threat prevail with the soldiier to keepe their hands from pillage.’ A New Tricke to take Townes: Or, The just and perfect Relation of the sudden surprisal of Hereford; Taken December 18. 1645. London, 1645, 8.

\(^{90}\) Peake, Meditations upon a Seige, 134–136.

\(^{91}\) Ibid. 142–144.
found so much mercie with another man’.\(^92\) Probably only few of the soldiers who robbed civilians took this lesson to heart, and even fewer of the victims blessed the soldiers.

Peake’s approach to plundering was exceptional. A critical stance against the taking of spoils was common in Civil War publications. Plundering disrupted the functions of society and generated unrest and animosity towards the armies. Hence it eroded the support for all parties.\(^93\) The King desperately needed to appear as the protector of his subjects in Royalist propaganda, and two proclamations were added in the reprint of his articles of war, one of which was against plundering and robbing, which was punishable on pain of death in the actual articles.\(^94\) The proclamation commanded officers to proceed against the offenders of the article ‘without Favour or Connivence, and to cause him or them to be executed accordingly without Mercy’.\(^95\) Even in his speeches to his Parliament in Oxford, Charles appeared to be worried about the hardships that the conflict had inflicted on his subjects; ‘I foresaw[…] the great inconveniences My best Subjects would suffer even by My owne Army, raised and kept for their preservation and protection; for I was not so ill a Souldier, as not to foresee how impossible it was to keep a strict Discipline.’\(^96\)

Thus, Peake was an exception, and the King’s ministers were more often in line with the critical approach to plundering. One of them was Charles’s chaplain and a prolific writer, Henry Ferne, whose pamphlet, *The Camp at Gilgal*, was published for the spiritual education of the King’s army as one of the most prominent martial-religious Royalist publications. Ferne distinguished in his text the occasions in which spoils could be taken, from whom and how. He allowed the plundering of a lawful enemy and of dead enemies in a battlefield. However, the plundering of civilians in towns and in the countryside was another matter. That kind of spoiling was to be done in an orderly manner by a lawful command, not for the private gains of individual soldiers. He told his audience to ‘consider what disservice you doe His Majesty, if under colour of spoyling Rebellious enimies, his peaceable

---

\(^{92}\) Ibid. 137–141.  
\(^{93}\) The famous Leveller and Parliamentarian army officer John Lilburne warned against the consequences of plundering and wrote that an important issue for an army general was ‘to have a special care to pay his Souldiers, that so they may constantly be able to pay their Quarters, the doing of which hath infininty gained the Country’. He concluded: ‘I am confidently persuaded, the readiest way to make the people yours, is to inable the Souldiers to pay their quarters’. A *More full Relation of the great Battell fought between Sir Tho: Fairfax, and Goring, on Thursday last, 1645…* London, 1645, 8.  
\(^{94}\) *Military Orders and Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two Proclamations…* Oxford, 1642, 5.  
\(^{95}\) Ibid. 15–18.  
\(^{96}\) *Two Speeches Delivered by His Majesty, to the Members of Both Houses of Parliament Assembled at Oxford. The first upon the Twenty second of January. The second upon the Seventh of Feb. 1643.* Oxford, 1644, 2.
Subjects be plundered by you’. 97 This was the preferred attitude of the Puritan ministers too, as a pastor in Rotherham, John Shawe, presented in a sermon: ‘this smoking, pillaging, plundering, for your own private gaine; without either just and publique command and authority, or publique good. It was called stealing the last yeer, and deserved hanging and damming, what is it now?’ 98 Robert Ram held that a soldier should be religious and that those who plundered and stole were offenders against this rule. He warned that whoever did wrong was to receive the same wrong irrespective of the quality of the guilty persons. 99 Philip Skippon emphatically lamented the bad financial condition of the armies in The Christian Centurians Observations, but he claimed that their bad state was not a reason to inflict the same problems to others: ‘yet their forcing us thus, can no more warrant me to wrong the Land then another mans stealing from me can warrant me to steale from him or others.’ 100 The Parliamentarian authors were unanimous in their stance against pillaging.

In general, Royalist ministers were hesitant to use religion as a tool for giving military advice to soldiers. Thomas Swadlin, 101 for example, the author of The Soldiers Catechisme for the King’s army and the satirical version of Ram’s catechism, concentrated more on regulating the morality of the Royalists and making them appear better than they were than on reinforcing military issues with religious viewpoints. He was worried that the execution of putting down the rebellion did not meet Christian standards and forbade the shedding of more blood than was necessary: ‘If the Enemies yeild you must spare them.’ He also instructed not to slay innocent civilians, such as weak women, aged men and young children. Finally, he commanded that torture was not to be used on those who had to be killed, ‘For Cruelty provokes God to anger’. Interestingly, Swadlin admitted that there were certain occasions in which ‘Torments may be used’. According to him, torture was legal as a means to find out the truth, to retaliate, to punish intolerable wrongs and for breaches of faith. This was Swadlin at his most bloodthirsty, even though his contemporaries probably saw nothing unusual in his opinion of torture. Finally, the author criticised the Parliamentarian conduct of war for lacking such aforementioned proper codes, and he challenged his enemies to bring forth the name of a woman, old man or child who had been put to death by Royalists or the name of soldier that had been refused

98 John Shawe, Two Clean Birds, Or, The cleansing of the Leper. As it was unfolded in a Sermon, Preached before the Right Honourable, Ferdinando Lord Fairfax... 1642. York, 1644, 22.
99 Ram, The Souldiers Catechisme, 1644, 19.
100 Philip Skippon, The Christian Centurians Observations, 263.
101 Thomas Swadlin was a Royalist minister who wrote a catechism for the King’s soldiers in response to Ram’s Souldiers Catechisme. Moreover, he wrote a version of Ram’s original catechism in which he mocked the Parliamentarians and tried to explain their errors in resisting the King.
quarter by the King’s men.\textsuperscript{102} It was probably Swadlin’s ignorance of how the war had been waged by both sides that led him to defend his party with such na\textipa{"	exti{"	exti{"i}}}ve an argument. In the summer of 1645, it was public knowledge that both the Royalists and the Parliamentarians had committed atrocities, and while propaganda battles about the extent of these atrocities were being fought, only a few people would be so oblivious as to deny them altogether.

Swadlin addressed discipline in his satirical version of Parliament’s catechism. However, it was written more with the intention of turning the rebels into obedient subjects of the King than to give military advice. Rather predictably, Swadlin saw the King as the highest power in the realm. Hence, he wrote that it was impossible for the Parliamentarians to deny \textit{Romans 13}, which professes submission to the higher powers. The King, inseparable in his power and person, was the highest power in the kingdom and was thus to be obeyed. Echoing the Parliamentarian view that those not with God were against him, Swadlin argued that all neutrals were enemies of God and the King and deserved neither respect nor protection.\textsuperscript{103} Military obedience to one’s superiors was also important – except in the Parliamentarian army, where it was commendable to hinder its war effort by disobedience. He wrote that soldiers should honour their commanders as superiors who have been ‘set over them by the Providence of God, if by the Authority of the King; Else to have nothing to do with them.’ Moreover, they had to be ‘exactly obedient to their Commanders[…] if sent by the King’. He claimed that soldiers prone to mutinying\textsuperscript{104} deserved a severe punishment, but he added a condition: ‘unlesse they run from Rebels to their Soveraigne’. The soldiers who ran away from their colours were to suffer death just as martial law decreed, ‘unless the Colours be Rebellious’. In that case it showed ‘a relenting spirit which pleads for mercy’, and it was then ‘a commendable virtue, and pleasing both to God and man’. Running from Parliament to the King was like running from the devil to God, and it gave a good example for others to return to the King’s good graces.\textsuperscript{105} ‘There was an element of repentance followed by mercy, that was absent from the Parliamentarian ministers’ publications. Moreover, although Swadlin admitted the importance of discipline – and even reinforced it with reference to the military articles – he was seemingly more concerned about making the Parliamentarians consider their resistance to the King and to regret it. Granted, that was the purpose of this satirical catechism, but Swadlin’s tendency to address his enemies even in cases in

\textsuperscript{102} Thomas Swadlin, \textit{The Soldiers Catechisme for The King’s Armie; Wherein His 1 Cause is justified, and his enemies condemned. 2 Soldier is instructed, and the Rebell reclaimed…} Oxford, 1645, 11–12.

\textsuperscript{103} Thomas Swadlin, \textit{The Soldiers Catechisme for the Parliaments Army}. 1645, 6–9.

\textsuperscript{104} Incidently, in Swadlin’s catechism the question had the word ‘martyring’ instead of the word ‘mutining’, maybe as an indicator of where the author’s thoughts were turned to. As shall be suggested later, a martyr was an ideal character for the Royalists, comparable with a saint that the Parliamentarians tried to emulate.

\textsuperscript{105} Swadlin, \textit{The Soldiers Catechisme for the Parliaments Army}, 38–39.
which he should have addressed the King’s men portrayed the deficiencies of the Royalist religious instruction.

Ferne’s religious military manual, *The Camp at Gilgal*, contained instructions for one disciplinary problem that was missing from the Parliamentarian publications: duelling. Royalist officers were prone to uphold their honour by challenging each other to duels over perceived slights, and this mentality presented problems for the unity of the army. Thus, military articles tried to reduce this behaviour by strongly punishing it, and quarrels between officers were also treated in sermons. 106 Five of the articles in the Royalist military orders issued in 1642 dealt with duelling, and since the total number of articles was around eighty, 107 it was a large percentage. If we add the articles that forbade drawing swords in a quarrel, thus not necessarily meaning a duel but rather a common brawl, the total is even higher. In later Royalist orders, the number of articles that dealt with duelling was six. Since Parliamentarian military orders contained one article against duelling, we can see that regulating it was more important for the Royalists, maybe because the practice was more widespread in the King’s armies. Ferne tried to curb this behaviour by writing of true Christian valour, which was totally different from the drunken bravery and the false notion of honour that made men fight duels. Fighting a single combat against an enemy opponent to avoid greater bloodshed was acceptable, but ‘a challenge to a private Duell upon a private quarrell comes from an heart very unchristian’. The soldiers were not supposed to fight each other but the enemy, and violence for a private cause – which duels very much were – was of course unlawful in itself. Ferne thought that religion could be used to guide the soldiers’ courage towards more productive enterprises, he even spelled this out:

I have spoken all this to you of regulating your Valour by Religion and Reason, not to straiten it, but that, as you have it grounded upon a good Cause, so you may use it in order to the advancement of that Cause, not mispending it in Quarrels and Duels, but upon the Enemy in a just Encounter. 108

Again, this was an attempt to change the behaviour of the soldiers for the better by reinforcing existing secular rules and regulations with religious ones. It also touched a problem that was heavily a Royalist one. The Parliamentarian side concentrated far less on duelling both in their military articles and in the sermons and writings of their ministers.

106 ‘Where there is Faction, Envy, and Emulation amongst great Officers, it portends Destruction, and Dissipation; The God of heaven and earth ever blesse this Army from it.’ The author criticized how some tried to express their courage by fighting duels and quarrelling, which did not reflect true Christian valour. John Bramhall, *A Sermon Preached in Yorke Minster, Before his Excellency the Marques of Newcastle*. York, 1644, 8, 10.

107 Reprints had occasionally more articles added. The original was printed in York, and it had 80, but a reprint from the same year in Oxford had 82.

In addition to being worried about duelling, Ferne addressed one important, concrete job in armies: standing watch. He reminded soldiers that the lives of their fellow men were in their hands as they stood guard and that this great charge should not be performed negligently. Because excesses and drunkenness made it harder to be alert, Ferne took the opportunity to warn soldiers against these sins as well, and he reminded them that the penalty for sleeping while on the watch was death.109 This was the case in both the Royalist and Parliamentarian articles of war, because alert watchmen were crucial to the functioning of an army. It was a tangible issue to be addressed (as was admittedly duelling in the Royalist armies), but compared to the guidance given by Puritan ministers, Ferne’s military instruction was lacking in both quality and quantity.

The disparity between the religious education of the King’s and Parliament’s armies is easily seen when comparing Ram’s and Swadlin’s catechisms. The former concentrated strictly on the Parliamentarian armies, telling the soldiers why they fought and in what manner they should conduct the war. Ram gave them advice, sought to reinforce military articles by religious arguments, and even encouraged and sanctified certain dubious actions such as iconoclasm. In essence, the Puritan ministers knew who they were addressing and how they should do so. They had to earn the soldiers’ respect and discuss concrete issues that had an impact on the men’s lives. Many a preacher fought in battles and had intimate knowledge about war and the condition of the armies. Swadlin ridiculed Ram for being a sword-divine, saying that he was ‘better in a Martiall then a Theologicall way’,110 but that was precisely the strength of the Parliamentarian preachers. The Royalist divines, on the contrary, rarely lowered themselves to the level of the King’s soldiers and their everyday lives and hardships. Instead, they engaged in debates and arguments on how very wrong the rebellion against Charles was. Even when Swadlin’s catechism was written and dedicated to the King’s army, claiming to justify the Royalist cause and condemn that of their enemies, to instruct the soldiers and reclaim the rebels, it only seemed to concentrate on topics concerning the enemy: denouncing its cause and trying to make the Parliamentarian soldiers to change sides. Right from the beginning of his catechism, Swadlin delved deep into arguing against Parliamentarian authors rather than giving advice to the King’s armies. It was hardly useful to tell the Royalists about the lawful way to resist their sovereign, the differences between mixed and absolute monarchy and the unlawfulness of the Solemn League and Covenant. Hence, what Swadlin was doing – instead of addressing and instructing the King’s troops – was trying to make the Puritans see the error of their ways. This intention was evident in the questions Swadlin posed concerning the Covenant. After establishing its unlawfulness and

109 Ibid. 33–34.
110 Swadlin, The Soldiers Catechisme for the Parliaments Army, 41.
ungodliness, he asked, ‘what shall we then doe now that we have sworne?’ Other questions followed, showing clearly that Swadlin was addressing a repentant Parliamentarian asking for advice, not a Royalist soldier preparing to die for his King. ‘I am bound in Conscience to performe that which I have so solemnly vowed, How else shall my Conscience be satisfyed?’ It was indeed the purpose of Swadlin to convert the reader to the King’s cause: ‘If your affirmative evidence be as good as your negative, you have not only disheartened me from them at Westminster, but you have also heartened me for the King: (and I hope many more with me).’ Swadlin admitted as much in the prologue of his pamphlet, where he wrote that ‘this truth (and it is nothing else but truth) may reduce those whom his [Ram’s] Falsehood hath seduced’ and that he strove ‘To reclame my Countrymen to their ancient obedience’. This was hardly the way to instruct the Royalist soldiers and try to use religion to reinforce discipline.

If duelling was mainly a Royalist problem, iconoclasm was mostly perpetrated by the Parliamentarians. This phenomenon deserves a more thorough examination because it was one of the issues in which the border between secular and spiritual matters was breached and the opinions between the Parliamentarians and the Royalists differed entirely. Moreover, iconoclasm caused problems for the discipline of the Puritan armies: the discrepancy between having a hierarchical structure of command in an army and allowing the soldiers to perform zealous actions against a religious authority was something that the ministers had to address. The armies’ discipline, politics and religion were all tangled together in this issue. Julie Spraggon has identified two different branches of iconoclasm: official, controlled Parliamentarian-sanctioned iconoclasm and soldiers’ unofficial and uncontrolled iconoclasm. The major difference between these was the extent – or rather, the excess – to which the soldiers went in their fury during unofficial iconoclasm: beside the objects and items that Parliament had judged to be sacrilegious and therefore had to be destroyed, soldiers broke and defaced sculptures of kings and other secular persons, ripped apart church records and burned bibles. If iconoclasm was an important means for the godly members of Parliament to advance the Reformation, it was also important to the godly soldiers for exactly the same reason. The soldiers who were not inspired to fight for religious matters participated in iconoclasm because it was
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111 Swadlin, The Soldiers Catechisme for The King’s Armie, 5.
112 Ibid. 6.
113 Ibid. 7.
114 Ibid. 9.
115 Ibid. Dedication, A3v.
117 Ibid. 210–211.
anti-religious and anti-Catholic. Such violence by the illiterate or semi-literate could be seen as directed against the ‘means of oppression’: written records and religious hierarchy. Vandalism towards the statues of kings could be explained by the fact that, after all, Parliamentarian soldiers were fighting against the King even if their propaganda told otherwise. Thus, the reasons for iconoclasm and its targets and perpetrators were varied, but it was a formidable example of the power of a tumultuous activity that had to be directed towards the right course and controlled so as not to present problems for the discipline and social order or the army. Hence, the military chaplains were concerned about it and both exhorted the activity and tried to restrain it. However, it has been suggested that the religious fury of the godly who participated in iconoclasm was not curbed by the attempts of the ministers but rather by the enforcement of military and civil law. Departing from this explanation, I seek to demonstrate that the very same military laws were actually used to exhort iconoclasm, and the ministers also more often urged their audience to attack holy places than told them not to do so. There were strong political motives and legitimation behind the desecrating of churches, motives and legitimation that were inherently entangled in the Puritan faith and anti-Catholicism. An ordinance of Parliament was a secular law, but there could be important religious factors at play in issuing ordinances. Iconoclasm, therefore, cannot be defined only as an extra-legal activity, nor can religious motivations be excluded when considering the reasons for this particular phenomenon.

Iconoclasm was not a new thing since it had occasionally occurred in earlier disturbances during Charles’s reign. These instances were praised during the Civil War. For example, a Presbyterian minister and an army chaplain Thomas Case mentioned events from the Bishops’ Wars, in which a few English soldiers had participated in iconoclasm and mutiny against their commanders. He considered this to be an example of workings of God upon the soldier’s spirit. He praised their activity, ‘pulling up of railes[...] calling upon idle ministers to preach[...] threatening scandalous Priests[...] letting out the stremee of that severity they used against Papists onely, and their popish commanders’, and he recognised that this was the work of God. Case also advocated iconoclasm in another sermon in which he stressed the importance of reformation. This included eradicating ‘Popery by the very root’, by attacking its altars, crosses, crucifixes and all the usual suspects of

119 Ibid. 209–210. See also Donagan, ‘Did Ministers Matter?’, 141–142.
120 Donagan, ‘Did Ministers Matter?’, 144.
Popish influence.\textsuperscript{122} This was not uncommon by any means: exhortations to perform activities of iconoclasm were heard from nonconformist ministers before the Civil War. A good example is another Presbyterian military chaplain, Stephen Marshall. In a fast sermon given to the House of Commons in December 1641, he discussed God’s wrath over England and the means to turn it away. One of these was ‘breaking down all the Images and relics of Idolatry’, another was to punish all wrongdoers, God’s enemies, who were mainly responsible for kindling His wrath. There was to be no mercy for those appointed by God for punishment.\textsuperscript{123} These tenets lived long in the religious dogmas of the Parliamentarian armies.

Puritan preachers exhorted their audiences to commit iconoclasm on many occasions. Thomas Coleman, in his sermon at St Margaret’s Church in September 1643, raised the biblical example of Jehoash, who had broken down monuments of idolatry and slain the priests of Baal.\textsuperscript{124} A member of the Assembly of Divines, Thomas Hill, preached to both Houses of Parliament in August 1644, lamenting that the previous reformations had left behind so much ‘Babylonish stuffe’, ‘which now hath occasioned great trouble’. He also suggested getting rid of ceremonies, altars and crucifixes.\textsuperscript{125} At the beginning of the war, Parliament had tried to prevent tumultuous attacks on churches and other property, mostly because this disordered activity threatened established social hierarchy.\textsuperscript{126} However, a year later in August 1643, Parliament published an ordinance that explicitly ordered ‘all monuments of superstition or idolatry’ to be removed from churches and demolished. This included altars, rails, crucifixes, crosses and images of saints or other holy persons. This was done because it was thought to be pleasing to God and conducive the Reformation.\textsuperscript{127} The ordinance indicates that attitudes were hardening after the war had been going on for some time, although, considering how crucial reformation and other religious issues were for the Parliamentarian cause and propaganda, the publishing of this ordinance was probably only a matter of time, especially since the influence of godly reformers in Parliament was considerable.\textsuperscript{128} Another ordinance, calling for the speedy


\textsuperscript{123} Stephen Marshall, \textit{Reformation and Desolation: Or, A Sermon tending to the Discovery of the Symptomes of a People to whom God will by no means be reconciled}. London, 1642, 51–52.

\textsuperscript{124} Thomas Coleman, \textit{A Sermon Preached at St. Margarets Westminster, at the publique entering into the Covenant}. London, 1643, 21–22.

\textsuperscript{125} Thomas Hill, \textit{The Season for Englands Selfe-Reflection, and Advancing Temple-work: Discovered in a Sermon preached to the two Houses of Parliament}. London, 1644, 36.

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Orders of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, For the Regulating of those Souldiers that are gon, and are to goe, under The Command of his Excellency, Robert Earle of Essex}. London, 1642.

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{An Ordinance of The Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament; For the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry}. London, 1643, 3–5.

\textsuperscript{128} Spraggon, \textit{Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War}, 60.
demolition of the aforementioned images and superstitious items, but this time also including organs, was published in May 1644,\textsuperscript{129} and these ordinances were reprinted together in 1645.\textsuperscript{130} Even as late as early 1645, there were demands of iconoclasm in sermons. A Parliamentarian preacher of Windsor garrison, Christopher Love, gave a sermon at Uxbridge in which he advised not to make peace with ‘malignants’, and he also touched the subject of the destruction of holy utensils in churches. According to Love, destroying idolatrous monuments was a sign that God was healing the land of the misery of the Civil War.

The Lord is then healing a land, when the people abandon and abolish all the Monuments of Idolatry and superstition with a Spirit of indignation[... ] The wholesome Orders of Parliament, for the abolishing of Crosses, Crucifixes, Superstitious Pictures, Vestures, with abundance of such like trumpery, is an undoubted argument that God is beginning to heal us.\textsuperscript{131}

On the one hand, iconoclasm in the kingdoms of Charles I may have started as a spontaneous phenomenon against unwanted religious influences. On the other hand it may have begun as a way of rebelling against traditional hierarchical structures. A few years into the English Civil War, however, it had become an important sign of Parliament’s outward righteousness and a major point of attack against the established Church of England by the ascending hard-line Protestantism, which was also keen on draping the conflict in religious clothing and to tying the end of the war to a necessary Puritan reformation.

Robert Ram defended iconoclasm in \textit{The Souldiers Catechisme}. There must still have been some doubts about the lawfulness of demolishing crosses and holy items despite the ordinances of Parliament, for Ram instructed that, although ‘nothing ought to be done in a tumultuous manner’, God had put the Sword of Reformation into the soldiers’ hands, and it was not wrong that ‘they should cancell and demolish those Monuments of Superstition and Idolatry, especially seeing the Magistrate and the Minister that should have done it formerly, neglected it’. Maybe Ram was not content with the slow pace with which the appointed persons put Parliament’s ordinance into effect. If so, one can clearly discern an argument for the transfer of power from a political institution to the army and its godly soldiers, an argument that appeared again when Ram wrote about the tearing and burning of the Books of Common Prayer. According to him, it was likely that ‘God hath stirred up the spirits of

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Two Ordinances of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, For the speedy Demolishing of all Organs, Images, and all manner of Superstitious Monuments}. London, 1644.

\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Two Ordinances of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament: For the speedie Demolishing of all Organs, Images, and all manner of Superstitious Monuments in all Cathedrall, Parish-Churches and Chappells...} London, 1645.

some honest souldiers to be his Instruments for the destruction of that Idoll.’ It was also the duty of Parliamentarian soldiers ‘to remove all scandalous things they meet with, having covenanted, and ingaged themselves in the work of Reformation’. However, this unofficial activity was a double-edged sword, for reasons related both to public stability and to notions about hierarchy and Parliament being the supreme power. Ram had affirmed that Parliament was the highest power in *The Souldiers Catechisme*, but he also acknowledged the possibility of God intervening directly in matters via soldiers. This, of course, only boosted the confidence of the Parliamentarian armies, which were seen to be in the process of doing great deeds for the Lord.

The Royalist ministers opposed attacks on churches. In the satirical catechism for the Parliamentarian army, Thomas Swadlin criticised iconoclasm. According to him, it was ‘very ill done’ and he lamented the destruction of ‘harmlesse and honourable Monuments of Antiquity, and badges of Christianity’. Also the tearing and burning of the Book of Common Prayer was condemned, and Swadlin ventured a guess that ‘the God of the Aire stirred up the spirits of some seditious Souldiers to be his Instruments for the dest ruction of such a Master-peice of Devotion and Religion’. He criticised Parliamentarian soldiers for ‘having Covenanted and engaged themselves in this unhappy worke of extirpating our Religion’.

The military significance of iconoclasm was questionable at best since it could be detrimental to the discipline of the armies. In this specific topic, the Royalists seemed to have been more practically minded. Most of the King’s ministers were content with condemning the iconoclasm of Parliamentarian soldiers, but some considered practical applications too. Humphrey Peake, in *Meditations upon a Seige*, touched upon the subject, no doubt influenced by the years of war that had proved that wholly secular considerations often had to come before religious ones. Iconoclasm and the defiling of holy places had usually no military value, but Peake thought that one similar issue was so important that it warranted its own paragraph, titled ‘Of pulling downe Churches or Chappels’. In this paragraph, Peake discussed what should be done to a church or other place of worship that was not situated inside the defence works during a siege. Because churches were usually built very tall, they offered enemy sharpshooters an advantageous position, and they were easily defended against sallies too. Thus, in the hands of a besieger, a church was definitely a military problem to the defenders of a garrison. Peake thought that it was a lesser evil to tear down the place of worship than to allow it to be ‘made an instument of villanie’. However, it should be carefully considered whether

this was absolutely necessary, and only then should one proceed to demolish the building with ‘feare and trembling’ and promises to God to build a new place of worship when the siege was over.\textsuperscript{135} This portrayed the reverence of the King’s ministers towards holy places, which was quite far from the Puritan preachers’ attitude.

The Royalists’ concern for churches and their holy paraphernalia can be discerned from the terms of surrender of the King’s different strongholds in the late stages of the war. In Chester, when the Royalist garrison capitulated, it was agreed ‘That no Church within the City, or Evidences, or Writings, belonging to the same, shall be defaced’.\textsuperscript{136} This was a bit less than what the Royalist commander Lord Byron had offered, but a concession nonetheless.\textsuperscript{137} When Exeter surrendered to Fairfax’s army in April 1646, the articles stated ‘That the Cathedrall Church, nor any other Church within the City shall be defaced, or any thing belonging thereunto spoyled or taken away by any Souldier or Person of either side whatsoever’.\textsuperscript{138} The same was true when the King’s capital Oxford capitulated. The churches were given protection in the articles: ‘all Churches, Chappels, Colledges, Halls, Libraries, Schools, and publike Buildings, within, or belonging to the City or University, or to Christs Church, or the several Colledges or Halls thereof, shall be preserved from defacing and spoil.’\textsuperscript{139} It is telling that the Royalists negotiators thought about protecting churches from iconoclasm. The Parliamentarian commanders, for their part, were probably ready to make these militarily insignificant concessions in order to complete the sieges sooner.

Parliamentarian iconoclasm can be set in context by examining the military articles of the period. The first English articles during the period were published in 1639 by the Earl of Arundel for the Bishops’ Wars. They explicitly made it unlawful to ‘profane, rob, or abuse any Church, Chappel, or other place of Gods publick worship; or any thing that is in them, or belonging to them’.\textsuperscript{140} This did not stop iconoclastic attacks on churches during the campaign, however, even though they were strictly
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forbidden under the King. The Earl of Northumberland followed Arundel at the head of the Royal army’s northern operations, and he issued his own articles, which provided the model for later Parliamentarian articles with only a few major changes, one of which concerned this particular offence. Northumberland’s ordinances punished ‘all those who abuse and profane places and utensils dedicated to Gods publike worship, or wrong his Ministers’ with the loss of pay or another punishment at discretion.\textsuperscript{141} Thus, iconoclasm was still disallowed. However, when the Civil War in England started, the articles about this particular offence started to be more ambiguous. Those issued by the Earl of Warwick – and the Earl of Essex after him – were formulated thus: ‘all such who shall violate Places of publike worship, shall undergoe severe censure’\textsuperscript{142} Therefore, these articles allowed more freedom to commit iconoclasm than did Arundel’s or even Northumberland’s articles, for the removal and destruction of ‘superstitious idols’ would not probably have been counted as violating a place of public worship, but rather to the contrary. Of course, Parliament later sanctioned certain actions against religious ornaments, as previously discussed. And, despite Ram’s caveat that nothing should be done in a tumultuous manner, it seems that the influence of religious propaganda was a large factor behind the unofficial iconoclasm of the soldiers.

The differences in the religious instruction directed at the soldiers of both armies exemplarily illustrate how the Puritan ministers had a more insightful approach to war than the Royalists. The Parliamentarian ministers had actual experience of being, and sometimes even of fighting, in a battle. By contrast, while there are references to more militant ministers among the King’s armies as Ram’s ordeal in Croyland suggests,\textsuperscript{143} the clergymen who wrote and published the Royalist pamphlets were pursuing theological and academic questions and had no deeper understanding of or even interest in the hard life of a common soldier. Hence, when they actually got to the business of instructing the Royalists, their advice was based more on the personal preferences of the minister in question and on the Bible rather than on the realities of the military profession. Moreover, the King’s ministers were hesitant to give the soldiers militarily significant advice because of their religious convictions. For most of the Royalist clergy, war was not a Christian pursuit but rather on the contrary. It was not the

\textsuperscript{141} Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better conduct of the Service in the Northern parts. By His Excellence The Earle of Northumberland. London, 1640. Under the ‘duties to God’, A4v.

\textsuperscript{142} Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better Conduct of the Army by His Excellency The Earle of Warwick... London, 1642. The pagination does not start until page 17, and if followed, it is slightly off because the first page would be number 5. 1642, 7.

\textsuperscript{143} There are other references as well. For example, Sherland Adams, a Royalist minister of Treeton in the county of York, was accused of giving sermons that animated the audience to commit hostile actions towards those loyal to Parliament. These actions ranged from taking part in skirmishes to giving sermons in which the Parliamentarians were called rebels. See Nicholas Ardron, The Ploughmans Vindication Or a Confutation of some passages preached in divers Sermons By Sherland Adams Sometimes Minister of Treeton in the County of Yorke... London, 1646, 32–40.
place of God’s ministers to preach for war.144 This attitude will reveal itself more in the coming chapters, but, in summary, the shortcomings of the Royalist religious-martial instruction were due to the want of experience and the lack of desire to give such advice. The Parliamentarian preachers, by contrast, could quite seamlessly combine the Holy Scripture with the important, tangible issues of war that had emerged during the years of fighting. For the godly, war was a religious pursuit, and they understood the laws and nature of it. Thus, they could use their knowledge of the Bible to merge religious overtones into secular military issues, adding the weight of spiritual obligation to laws and ordinances of war and instructing the soldiers to put their trust in God in making changes, not in enduring martyrdom.

This zeal was manifest not only in advice on important matters of war but also in exhortations to iconoclasm. This Puritan phenomenon was part of the radical politics of the Civil War since Parliament gave ordinances to regulate it. But judging by the articles of war and publications for soldiers that concerned iconoclasm, it can be suggested that it was also a military matter. For the Parliamentarian military chaplains, iconoclasm was another way of portraying the godliness of the army and the shared personal piety of its soldiers. By attacking ‘Popish’ paraphernalia, the completion of the reformation came closer, and ministers such as Ram transferred the responsibility of action from the politicians to the soldiers. Hence, advice on iconoclasm was a significant part of the guidance given to Parliamentarian soldiers, and it demonstrated how religious matters shaped the war effort.
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144 Like Ram’s report on his captivity and Ardron’s aforementioned pamphlet suggest, most of the evidence on the militant activity of Royalist ministers can be drawn from Parliamentarian sources. This tells not only of the value of portrayals of un-clerical behaviour in propaganda but also that even the Parliamentarians had hesitations when it came to the clergy’s role in war. For an account on Royalist ministers’ activities for the King’s war effort, see Fiona McCall, *Baal’s Priests. The Loyalist Clergy and the English Revolution*. Routledge, 2020 (first published 2013), 103–111.
2. PRAYER AND RELIGIOSITY

Thus far, I have examined how the soldiers were instructed to carry out the war in a disciplinary manner. One of the key components of discipline and desirable conduct was religiosity. In addition to framing the Civil War in these religious overtones, the ministers advised the soldiers to behave accordingly as if it was the Lord’s battle they were fighting as members of His army. In this chapter, I suggest that this outward sign of religiosity and its propagation by the preachers merged into a coherent whole together with other religious instruction in the Parliamentarian armies, such as advice on how to pray.145 By contrast, although praying was often encouraged in the Royalist armies, it did not have the same weight and reason behind it, nor did it contribute to creating a united, religious core of soldiers and officers. Traces of passivity and pessimism were present in the religious instruction of the King’s armies, which manifested in the form of submitting to one’s preordained fate without trying to make it better. While a Puritan prayed because he was a religious man and tried to call for God’s aid in his endeavours and struggles in which he was actively participating on the Lord’s behalf, a Royalist who prayed was more dismal and pessimistic. The King’s ministers humbled themselves and begged God for deliverance without encouraging the soldiers to actively pursue that deliverance through their own actions. Trust in God and in his providence can be noticed in two totally different interpretations: on the one hand, throwing oneself completely at the mercy of God and praying for the calamities to end and, on the other hand, asking God for strength and help to pursue the means that would ensure victory in the conflict. This dichotomy was also present in giving thanks for success and acknowledging God’s role in victories. There was an active component in Puritan thanksgiving that both admitted that success came from God and at the same time encouraged soldiers to work for deliverance. The Royalists did only the former. In addition, it is important to note the difference in the delivery of these instructions for prayer. Whereas the Royalist side was very prolific in publishing prayer manuals that consisted of several different prayers for different situations, Parliamentarian authors and ministers were more interested in spelling out the benefits of praying to the soldiers. Surely, it was more efficient to hear from a religious authority exactly why one should pray and what was in it for a common soldier than to get a long list of different prayers.

145 It is worth noting that spiritual issues were crucial for many soldiers and that the proximity of death made men wrestle with their fears in ways that were not necessarily compatible with Christian dogmas. There were superstitions going around in the armies, and organised faith saw it fit to intervene in them. Belief in the supernatural was best directed toward the established religion. For example, the Puritan pastor John Eachard lamented that there was ‘a strong delusion that goes among ill soldierrds, that Amulets or Charms, or enchantment will make them shot-free’. He claimed that it only made them an abomination to the Lord and counselled that by faith in the blood of the Lamb could one make oneself not only shot-free but also devil-free. John Eachard, Good Newes for all Christian Souldiers. Or The way to overcome the Devill by the bloud of the Lambe. London, 1645, 28–29.
that did not necessarily have to do with the concrete problems that one was facing. This difference is evident and quite important in explaining how and why Royalist religious instruction was superficial compared to the Puritan method and did not give the soldiers similar spiritual tools to use in their everyday adversities.

Furthermore, I seek to demonstrate that Parliamentarian and Royalist prayers differed a great deal from each other when it came to their content. Parliamentarian authors had a more hands-on approach to warfare, and they seemed to have a better understanding of the substantial problems of being both a soldier and a Christian and how to combine the two roles. This fundamental conflict existed of course in every human profession in which sin could not be avoided. It was, however, heightened by the demands of works of violence and by the toll it took on those doing the job. Swearing, cursing and drunkenness were common among soldiers as methods of dealing with frustration, fear, stress and other feelings that arose from situations uncomfortable to the human psyche. These were, theologically speaking, sins that had to be weeded out. While Royalist manuals, for the most part, concentrated on begging for forgiveness from sins and acknowledging them to be a major cause of the present conflict, Parliamentarian authors went further and actually instructed their audience to be better soldiers and better Christians in fighting God’s battles. There was also a merciful strain in the Royalist writings that was absent from the Parliamentarian side. Where the King’s clergymen beseeched God to lead the lost, errant rebels back to the King’s good graces, the Puritan ministers saw the Civil War as God-ordained and the enemy as beyond redemption. It is arguable that this stricter line helped soldiers, for it made the conflict easier to grasp and to process and the enemy easier to use violence against.

I also suggest that religious piety and zeal was not at all unique to the New Model Army. On the contrary, the earlier Parliamentarian armies had their share of religious soldiers who recited prayers and sang psalms. Their needs had to be met by the military chaplains, whose spiritual instructions and demands for godliness and religiosity were promulgated to the armies from the beginning of the war. Religiosity was seen as an important quality for a soldier, and this was recognised very early in the conflict. Thus, Parliamentarian ministers tried to emphasise this to the armies using the same methods and arguments that they later used in the New Model Army.

However, the King’s side was the first to publish a prayer manual for the soldiers. In *A Manuall of Prayers*, the author W. C. perceptively noted that soldiers were not ‘at leasure for long Prayers’ and he preferred to keep them short, leaving longer ones to ‘the defacers of Organs, which they supply with their vaine breath’. This was obvious criticism of Puritan iconoclasm that a member of the
established Church of England could not tolerate. However, the Royalist chaplain did not differ from his Parliamentarian counterparts in all his opinions. According to him, ‘Prayer in warre is as necessary as powder’. He elaborated this by writing that ‘God cannot (that is he will not) help if we pray not; noe more then give victory if wee fight not: loe here are two swords, use both; and the one shall returne into your owne bosome, and the other turne into the bosome of your enemies’. For these reasons, he had compiled this prayer manual for use in Sir Ralph Dutton’s regiment. Praying was important for soldiers, not only for those in arms for Parliament (although the author noted their tendency for longer prayers) but for the King’s troops too. However, the method of praying and the content of instruction were quite different between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians.

For a prayer book compiled for soldiers, *A Manuall of Prayers* consisted of a surprising amount of prayers that were not in any way related to war or to the soldier’s profession, but supposedly could be used in any situation by any person. There was, for example, a prayer against hypocrisy, a prayer for humiliation, a prayer of a sinner and a prayer for the peace of the Church, to mention just a few. There were also prayers for the different days of the week and for the different parts of the day. The very last prayer was for grace against swearing. Only the latter half of the manual contained prayers related to war. In them, the author asked the King’s rebellious enemies to be vanquished, and that the supplicant would be saved from his enemies after he was punished for his sins by them. He also prayed for the enemies, that they would be given peace and true love, remission from their sins – especially of the rebellion – and that they would pacify their minds towards the Royalists. These were gentle words compared to what the Parliamentarian military chaplains thundered, and they are a reminder of how the Royalist ministers saw the enemy. The King’s chaplain thought that the rebellion had arisen because of the sins of the English and that it was a just punishment by God. Thus, he rather begged the Lord for deliverance than exhorted the soldiers to fight the enemy.

Apparently, the manual was popular and useful, at least for the Royalist clergy and the more religious-minded officers, for there appeared a second edition in – probably the early summer of –
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147 Ibid. To the reader, A8r–A8v.
148 Ibid. A prayer for the King, E7r–E7v.
149 Ibid. A prayer in time of Warre, E8r.
150 Ibid. A prayer for our Enemies, Fr–F2r.
151 A sign of its importance was *Iniunctions Concerning the Garrison of Oxford*, a pamphlet regulating the religious practice of the soldiers in the King’s capital city. The 12th injunction stated that ‘the Chaplaines may use some of those Occasionall Prayers lately published in that Manuall of Prayers, fitted to these Calamitous times’. *Iniunctions Concerning the Garrison of Oxford, In Order to Religion*. Oxford, 1645, 4. It is to be noted, however, that Margaret Griffin believes that this reference pointed to one of Brian Duppa’s works, probably *Private Formes of Prayer*, which was published the same year. Since Griffin did not note W. C.’s manuals in her research and also did not take the similar written form of
1643, this time collected ‘For the use of Gentlemen Soldiers’. It had a new set of prayers, which, as the ones in the previous manual, did not address the soldier or his profession too closely, despite the dedication. Most of the prayers were for the King and his health, but at the end of the book, there were a few more useful ones for the soldiers. One prayer tried to make sure a soldier was ready if his time came, another asked for good fortune and a happy ending to a dangerous endeavour and a third gave thanks to God after victory in battle. There was even a prayer allegedly used by Constantine the Great with his legions, taken from Eusebius’s *Vita Constantini*, with the Emperor’s name replaced with ‘King Charles’. None of these contained concrete instructions even on the meagre scale of the previous manual.

It is plausible that the King himself had a hand in the content of these manuals. Another Royalist pamphlet ‘used in His Majesties Chappel, and in His Armies’, *A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings*, was published in September 1643 and is attributed to Brian Duppa, a Royalist bishop. While we can only make educated guesses about how much influence Charles had on W. C.’s former two manuals of prayer, *A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings* was published on the King’s explicit command. Thus, we can assuredly state that it represented the official Royalist line regarding religious instruction in the King’s armies. The pamphlet consisted, as the name suggests, of a few prayers, most of which gave thanks for victories in battle. Some of these prayers were published also in *Mercurius Davidicus*, a short pamphlet containing thanksgivings for the victories of the King and pleas of protection and providence for Charles. As the King himself ordered the publishing of *Mercurius Davidicus* too, it is tempting to guess that he himself was very involved in the spiritual education of his soldiers. If that was the case, it might be one of the factors in explaining why the religious instruction on warfare was so different between Parliament’s party and the King’s.
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153 Ibid. A prayer for good successe at the going forth of a party, H8r–Ir.
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The conciliatory tone, present in the earlier Royalist manuals, was still present in Duppa’s pamphlet. The very first prayer was for the preservation of the King and for the peace of the kingdom. It asked for the healing of the nation’s wounds, the end of divisions and unity of the Church. It should be noted that the part of this prayer that was meant to be spoken aloud very closely resembled the one that was found in W. C.’s first manual under the heading of ‘A Septenary of Prayers for divers purposes’, but it was revised for a more militant tone. For example, where *A Manuall of Prayers* asked for God to send help to the King, *A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings* added ‘and to His Armies’. Hence, there probably was a connection between these manuals, and that connection could have well included the King himself. Furthermore, Duppa’s pamphlet was more specific with its portrayal of the enemy. While *A Manuall of Prayers* asked that the enemy would have no advantage over the King nor that the wicked would approach him to hurt him, *A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings* prayed for the Lord to ‘Confound the designes of all those that are risen up against Him. And let not their rebellious wickednesse approach neere to hurt him’. We can thus see that the opponent was no more portrayed vaguely as ‘the enemy’ or ‘the wicked’, but rather as a rebellious person who had risen up against the King.

The second prayer, thanksgiving for ‘the victory’ at Edgehill, continued in a placatory tone, hoping that the rebels would see the light and submit to their rightful sovereign in order to avoid bloodshed and to restore peace in England. Attaining peace and unity was still more important for the Royalist ministers than the battle between God and the Devil, which had far less room for a compromise or bloodless solution. In giving thanks for the victory in the north, the prayer asked that the enemy would be scourged into obedience by frequent overthrows and that this would at last tame these enemies to desire peace. Hence, despite the heavy-handed methods involved, the Royalist aim was still to invite these wayward sons back into the flock.

Duppa continued with the themes of thanksgiving and peace in his second prayer manual, too. *Private Formes of Prayer* was published in 1645, collecting Duppa’s other, earlier prayers as well. There were a lot of new ones in comparison to *A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings*, but they continued with the same topics: giving thanks for victories, praying for the royal family and asking God for peace. Five of the nineteen prayers were of thanksgiving for particular victories: in addition
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161 The battle, according to modern scholarship, was a draw and ended in a stalemate, though both sides claimed victory in their propaganda.
163 Ibid. 6.
to the three found in earlier publications (for the victories at Edgehill and in the north and west) there were prayers of thanksgiving for the relief of Newark and the city of Hereford. Four prayers concerned the Queen (a thanksgiving for the Queen’s safe return and a prayer for the safe delivery of her child) and the King (for the King and for the good success of the King). Two were clearly for the ending of the war (prayers for peace and for the ending of the present troubles), but there were a lot of references to peaceful, merciful solutions to the conflict in other prayers as well. For example, in a prayer titled ‘used by His Majesty at His entrance in State into the Cathedrall Church of Exeeter, after He had defeated the Earle of Essex his Forces in Cornwall’, the King asked God to ‘forgive them who have thus risen up against me, and doe thou yet turne their hearts both unto Thee and to Mee’. This was spoken clearly in the voice of Charles himself and thus highlighted the official Royalist position on the matter.

It seems that, for the King’s ministers, praying was the chief action in securing the support of God for their cause. This explains the abundance of prayers – in Private Formes of Prayer, the prayer for the good success of the King was even printed twice. Since, in the first part of the pamphlet, there was yet another prayer for the King (different from the one with the same title in the second part), Charles should have been well covered. In addition, there were prayers for the Church, for the clergy and one to be used in times of war. None of these captured the active and instructive tone of the Parliamentarian religious manuals. Duppa said it himself in a prayer for the clergy: ‘Fight thou for them whose Armes are their Teares and Prayers.’ The Royalist ministers would just not preach for war. In their understanding, Christ was the prince of peace and his people should act alike. It was an abomination that a clergyman would exhort people to fight, especially against their God-anointed sovereign, and this distaste for militant preachers was evident. We will come to that later when discussing the potential consequences of this religious indoctrination, but for now, it is sufficient to say that, for most of the Royalist clergy, the only permitted arms were tears and prayers.

164 Brian Duppa, Private Formes of Prayer fit for these sad times. Also A Collection of all the Prayers Printed since these Troubles began. Oxford, 1645, 37.
165 Many a Royalist publication contained a prayer for the King, even if the publication itself did not necessitate one. An early example is from July 1642 by one Edward Browne. His short pamphlet collected verses from the Bible that instruct one to obey and honour the King and not to speak evil of him. Edward Browne, Rules for Kings, and Good Counsell for Subjects: Being a collection of certaine places of holy Scripture... London, 1642. Some short prayers were even published as a single page. For example, the Royalist victory in Newark warranted a thanksgiving prayer that was printed and published in Oxford. It concentrated on the person of the King, and a prayer was added for the Queen’s safe delivery as well. A Forme of Thanksgiving for the late Defeat given unto the Rebells at Newarke. Oxford, 1644.
166 Duppa, Private Formes of Prayer, 19.
167 Surely there were exceptions to this rule, such as George Wilde, a chaplain to the King, who gave a sermon in Oxford in March 1643: ‘the Incence at the Altar burns the sweeter for the Gunpowder in the Field. The smoak of the Canon is good or bad, as the cause is so; and that which proves a stench, an odious stench in the nostrils of the Almighty, when it is fired to blow up a State, when it is fairly exercised to defend Religion, then it smels like the precious Oyntment upon
The last prayer manual published for the King’s armies still portrayed these same deficiencies. *Certain Prayers fitted to Severall Occasions* was published in August 1645, ‘to be used in his Majesties Armies, and Garrisons’. It contained a lot of prayers with familiar Royalist themes, such as the King (which was actually the same one Duppa had used), his son prince Charles and peace. There were also more military prayers, such as a prayer to be said before the marching of an army, a prayer for the soldiers, a prayer before battle and a prayer for a besieged place, for example. Just like the earlier manuals, *Certain Prayers fitted to Severall Occasions* asked for God’s help and gave all the glory and thanks to Him for His assistance. The supplicant was instructed to pray for protection and strength for the soldiers and for the safety of the King. As was usual for Royalist publications, the manual conveyed a very moderate and conciliatory tone: in the prayer for peace, for example, it was asked that the Lord would unite all the people of England under their king through love. This hope for peace was echoed in other prayers as well, such as in the prayer to be said at the setting forth of an army, in the prayer for the King as well as in the prayer for times of danger.

Acknowledging God’s role in victory was an important part of outward religiosity and by no means only a Royalist phenomenon. However, the King’s ministers took it quite far to the point of exaggeration. A good example is Duppa’s *Private Formes of Prayer*, which had a total of five prayers of thanksgiving for specific victories (at Edgehill, ‘in the North’, ‘in the West’, at Newark and the deliverance of Hereford). Since *Private Formes of Prayer* was published in 1645, roughly three years after the battle of Edgehill, it would seem that the Royalists had had enough time already to thank the Lord for their success there. Putting so much effort in composing different prayers for different victories spoke more of an obsessive need to fulfill of compulsory religious requirements than of real fervour. The Royalists observed forms, and they did it to the letter. The King’s ministers concentrated more on composing yet another prayer for giving thanks for a victory than on explaining to the soldiers what was important in these prayers. One exception, once again, was Henry Ferne.

In *The Camp at Gilgal*, Ferne established that having a good cause was not enough for winning battles as a large number of biblical events attested. These examples related huge losses inflicted to armies who fought for God’s cause but did not act like his people should. This was why Ferne feared there
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was too much security and confidence in the Royalist armies, and he reminded his readers that a rightful cause and loyalty towards the sovereign did not guarantee victory unless one also worshipped God properly and was righteous in one’s actions. Humility and seeking of God’s counsel helped, not vain confidence in the armies of the flesh.173 ‘Valour, and strength, and number of men be the ordinary and secondary means of victory, yet the Issue and successe of the Battell is indeed given by a hand from Heaven; the Arme of flesh is to be used, not trusted in.’ The soldiers should not be led into battle with oaths and curses but in the name of the Lord of Hosts, Ferne wrote. This would ensure that divine providence was on their side. If they lost the battle, however, they should not look only at outward disadvantages such as a smaller number of troops or tactical blunders and mistakes. One should accept that there was something wrong within one’s own army, something that drove God’s providence away. It might have been not showing proper gratitude to the Lord for earlier successes, or too strong a trust in secular advantages, or perhaps some notorious profaneness among the soldiers. Whatever it was, it was imperative to find out and make right if one wanted to have God walking in the camp again. In the case of victory, Ferne once more portrayed the peaceful temper typical of Royalist writers. Every thanks and all the glory should of course be directed to God, who alone gave victory, but the author also advised that the victory should be celebrated in moderation, refraining from cruelty and rapine, slaughter and spoil. To stress this, he presented some pertinent examples from the Bible.174 Hence, Ferne was making it very clear why Royalist soldiers should put their trust in God, and why they should give thanks to Him.

As previously suggested, guidance on why to pray was more crucial than guidance on the exact words to be used. The most detailed Royalist advice on prayer was written by Ferne. He recommended three particular duties for Royalist soldiers to be observed for their own protection: the true fear of God, a dependence on His protection, and daily prayer.

These will preserve & keep you from falling presumptuously into those former Evils of a lewd conversation, and from sinking desperately under the Evils and Dangers of War; you will find the direction and comfort of them in all the imployments you are put to; when you stand upon the Watch[...] when you are called to a triall of your valour against the Enemy, when you are now to Enter the Battle, when you have the issue of it, either in Ill Successe, or in Victory.

Ferne used very concrete examples to highlight the benefits of these religious duties. The fear of God was often mentioned together with the soldier’s profession, since men participating in battles had to

174 Ibid. 38–43.
often deal with all kinds of threats to their confidence. His reasoning was that, if one feared God, one needed not fear anything else. If one did not fear God, however, one could suddenly become afraid of the large armies of the enemy or of the height of their walls. A soldier could appear fearful even because he had consumed strong alcohol ‘wherewith some Souldiers foolishly arme themselves, when they go upon service’, Ferne added, portraying some personal knowledge about the soldiers’ everyday life. They should not only be confident but also dependent on God’s providence and protection. Fear of God should draw people to the Lord because He did have the power to save in addition to the power to destroy. God’s power of protection was called upon by prayer, of which Ferne wrote:

You shew your dependance upon that protection, and doe returne unto him his daily worship, acknowledging him to be your God, by begging of him what you stand in need of, as forgivenes of sinnes, grace, food, and preservation, by giving him thanks for the good things you daily receive from his gratious and powerfull hand of Providence, opened to you to feed you, and stretched over you to protect and defend you.

Moreover, prayer was a means to keep soldiers busy, for their duties often allowed them too much time to spend idly. It was, however, acceptable to take a break from worship if a necessary military task demanded it, as long as the soldier in question returned to his spiritual service afterwards. Ferne claimed that the professions of a soldier and a mariner were the most dangerous ones, and therefore the powers of prayer were most sorely needed in them.175

Another of those few Royalist ministers who gave concrete advice on religious duties and praying was John Bramhall, a chaplain to the Earl of Newcastle. He encouraged his audience to put their faith in the Lord, not in corporeal armies or weapons. Touching on the subject of the lawfulness of waging war, Bramhall stated that ‘It is not the having of Arm, nor the using of Arms, but the relying upon our Arms, and placing our confidence in our Arms, which is forbidden’.176 It was imperative to trust only in God to give victory, not in the armies themselves: ‘It is better therefore to trust in the Lord, then to put any confidence in Man.’177 Thus, if God alone gave victory, it was necessary to ensure that God was on one’s side. That was done by prayer, but ‘He that will pray aright for Victory over his Enemies, must first endeavouer to conquer his own corruptions’. Thanking God for his help and giving him all the glory from a victory in battle was at least as important: ‘Let us therefore pray with due submission, and when God hath granted our request, let us give all the glory to Him.’ Bramhall
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practised what he preached by reminding his audience that the sole purpose of his sermon was to give thanks ‘for a late victory obtained in the West parts of this County, by His Majesties Army under the Conduct of his Excellence the Earle of Newcastle, against the Lord Fairfax, and the Northern Rebels’. At the end of his sermon he repeated his thanks once again and beseeched for more victories for the King’s army.

As we have seen, one specific Royalist phenomenon was to add prayers to manuals and catechisms. It seemed to be important for the King’s ministers to invent prayers and devotions for every conceivable occasion: in Ferne’s case, there was a prayer for the morning, a prayer for the evening, prayers used after defeat and victory and a prayer for occasional devotions. A prayer for the King was often included separately, but Ferne had incorporated requests for the protection of the sovereign in the other invocations as well. Ferne’s invocations in The Camp at Gilgal were no different from general Royalist prayers. There were a few harsh verses from the Bible, for example Psalm 59:5: ‘Stand up, O Lord of Hoasts, and be not mercifull unto them that offend of malitious wickednes’. Such bloodthirstyness was not included in the actual prayers, however, and Ferne ended his pamphlet in ‘The Vote of the People for Peace’ in which he had gathered suitable verses from the Scriptures. A further example of the Royalist tendency to publish prayers and peaceful content within them was Swadlin’s catechism for the King’s soldiers, which had one – in addition to the Lord’s Prayer – that was called The Souldiers Prayer which asked for pity ‘that we may rather spare then spoile’. Incidentally, this prayer was quite identical to The Soldiers Prayer that Swadlin had written earlier and that had been published in 1643 in A Manuall of Devotions. Two years of fighting had not made it any more bloodthirsty or unforgiving. He also had included another prayer in his satirical version of Ram’s catechism, in which he asked for protection for the King and for the repentance of the rebels. Whereas the Parliamentarians used religion to try to make changes, the Royalists were happy to just pray for peace and to return to the old order under the King.

For Parliamentarian preachers, the principles behind the outward appearances of piety were more important than the form of these appearances. In other words, when discussing the role and effect of religious instruction and upbringing, it was more useful to concentrate on why and how this was
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justified and made tangible for the soldiers than it was to count how many prayers were contained in each manual. It was not the strict form and content of a certain prayer that made the difference, it was the fact that a person prayed and comprehended why he did so. The Royalists understood this less well. Hence, we can see that, even after years of fighting, the Royalist clergy did not yield to preach in favour of the war, nor did they give detailed instructions on how prayers were to be used for the benefit of the soldiers. They also did not, with few exceptions, have a similar understanding of the supplicant’s active role in influencing his fate through his own actions.

Martial prayer was, however, very important to the Parliamentarians from early on. Richard Ward gave very precise advice on praying in *The Anatomy of Warre*. He advised his readers to ask the Lord to be their captain in war and to fight for them. In addition, he told them to pray for wisdom, prudence, fortitude and courage for the officers, for obedience for the soldiers and for preserving them from sins and wickedness. He also asked for strength in battle. These prayers, in order to be effective, had to proceed from a pure mind and heart and from strong faith. The supplicant had to be assured that the Lord heard the prayer and would answer it. Furthermore, God was to be given thanks for his assistance.184

Ward also articulated the difference between Parliamentarian and Royalist religious indoctrination. At the end of his pamphlet, he clarified his position on the matter in a way that explains how differently the Puritans saw providence and the means to attain it in comparison to the King’s ministers. He claimed ‘that victory in warre comes only from God; and therefore all Military meanes are vaine, none being able to preserve us from warre’. However, he then revised his claim:

> To neglect the meanes wholly, is to tempt Gods Providence, and to trust in the meanes, is to distrust Gods Providence; and therefore we must observe, how meanes profit, and how not[…] Military meanes will help us, as they are meanes ordained by God, for the removal of the malady of warre, if we use them in the feare of the Lord.

These means did not help if God was disrespected or neglected, but when He was not, military means were the tool for God to make his will to be done in the world.185 The same was explained by a member of the Assembly of Divines, pastor Christopher Tesdale: ‘Faith and dependence upon God doth not evacuate our own indeavours, prayer doth not justifie the neglect, but presupposeth the use of all other meanes which God shall put into our hands; we may put forth the arme of flesh, but must
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not rely upon it.' Tesdale understood that, even though only God gave victory, there had to be an active pursuit of it – prayer was not enough:

You must not thinke your worke done when your prayers are ended, you must then act over your prayers, and live over your prayers: the Sermon ended say not it is done, that part is wanting yet, and rests in thee, thy life must be the reall Sermon.

For his part, Stephen Marshall strongly criticised those who only prayed and left the hard work to others:

Indeed in the true notion and interpretation of prayer, it is nothing but the craving of Gods blessing upon our endeavours in those things which he hath appointed us to do, toward the obtaining of any mercy [...] how sadly would it [conscience] speak to many, who can abundantly satisfie themselves with joyning in a few dry prayers for the Church, and in the meane while they grudge the bestowing of any other cost?

The Lord was responsible for the success of His cause, but those who did not advance it were harshly condemned: ‘let all such hypocrites know, that God will indeed doe his work without them, and their formall prayers will returne, not with comfort into their bosomes, but with vengeance upon their heads.’ This strong demand for active participation in bringing about God’s deliverance was what separated Puritan ministers from most of the Royalists. Religiosity was for the Puritans a vigorous pursuit of goals that were perceived as God-ordained. Although thanks were always given to the Lord for his mercies and deliverance, Parliamentarian ministers often told their audience to strive towards outwards signs of God’s favour. Whereas praying was enough for a Royalist, with only a few exceptions like Ferne and Bramhall, for a Puritan, there had to be an active fulfilment of those prayers.

*The Souldier’s Pocket Bible*, published in August 1643, also underlined the importance of prayer. It was a pamphlet that separately compiled all the passages from the Bible that related to a specific topic. These addressed a large amount of the soldier’s Christian duties and were presented in a clear manner, similar to the language used in military articles. Therefore, they were easy to grasp and use for instruction, and as the title page claimed, purposely so: ‘Scriptures are reduced to severall heads, and fitly applyed to the Souldiers severall occasions, and so may supply the want of the whole
Bible, which a Souldier cannot conveniently carry about him.'

In addition to other concrete advice to Parliamentarian soldiers, *The Souldier’s Pocket Bible* encouraged soldiers to pray before going to a battle. This instruction was reinforced with suitable passages from the Bible. Again, the act of prayer was more important than its contents. Hence, there were rarely any specific prayers written in the Parliamentarian religious manuals. Instead, instructing the soldiers to pray was only one piece of advice among many others, some of which were more suitable to the practicalities of war than others. What the manuals and pamphlets did was to create a coherent, religious framework for the soldiers operating in the armies. A soldier was told what to do in simple and effective terms, and both his spiritual duties and war-related tasks were spelled out in this way. Hence, religious devotion, or at least the outward signs of it, became a necessity for a Parliamentarian soldier, whereas the men fighting for the King received only spiritual litanies compiled by his ministers, who, in most cases, had not served in the armies and did not understand the practical duties and needs of the soldiers.

When there was a pre-formulated prayer given in a Parliamentarian publication, it often touched upon a soldier’s life more intimately than did the prayers of the Royalists, which concentrated on the welfare of the King and the Royal family as well as abundant thanksgivings. For example, *The Christian Souldiers Magazine* contained a prayer ‘purposely penned for the use and helpe of such Souldiers on whom the Lord hath not bestowed that gracious Spirit of Supplications’. It asked God to teach the ways of war and give strength and courage in His cause. It also lamented the innocent blood that had been shed by malignants and prayed for the chance to be an instrument of revenge and punishment against wrongdoers. Peace was to be had, but only after the execution of judgement. The prayer displayed the active zeal of the Puritans and a more comprehensive approach to the matters of war than the Royalist supplications. Moreover, it suggested that the enemy was guilty of the troubles of the Civil War.

The first actual religious manual for Parliamentarian use already highlighted these different attitudes towards prayer. John Price’s *A Spirituall Snapsacke For the Parliament Souldiers* departed both in content and in approach from the aforementioned Royalist texts. The godly ministers were much more
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warlike than the mostly apologetic Royalist clergy. They were also willing to put more effort into educating the men. Writing down prayers for the soldiers to recite was not enough to offer them concrete assistance. There had to be clear examples of what was expected of them and what would not be tolerated. The Puritan ministers also felt that the soldiers should be aware of the consequences of their actions, God’s reward for those who did the right thing and the punishment for those who did not.

Price was very clear about the benefits of prayer for warfare. He vividly described the battle of Edgehill and the role God played in that particular clash:

How did God the Father protect you with his attributes? How did God the Sonne surround you[...] with his merits? And intrench you with his bloud? How did God the Holy Ghost cheer you with his comforts? Working your hearts to a holy extasie of joy, making you[...] to forget your selves, and upon the discharge of your Muskets to cry out in holy and spirituall rapture. Now for Jesus Christ, now for thy Gospell, now let's see what prayer can do.193

It was the prayer that gave victory and deliverance and also nourished the community of soldiers: ‘the Spirit of Prayer and Supplication is abundantly poured forth upon all the Saints in your behalfe’. Unlike the Royalist clergy, the Puritan ministers and authors were trying to create an atmosphere of religious courage and comfort in the armies, which manifested itself in the active pursuit of deliverance. In this endeavor, prayers were an important tool. Price concluded with words that summed up the Puritan narrative of religious warfare: ‘Thus you have a good first cause, and Secondly, a sure life Guard you have, God, his Angells, his Promises; the Prayers of the Saints, and all providences for your incouragement.’194

There was not a single prayer for the enemy in Price’s pamphlet. He even went so far as to suggest that it was not because of Parliament’s sins that the enemy had a quarrel with it. Rather, it was precisely because the Saints were not profligate or idolatrous that the enemy was so intent on seeking their destruction. According to A Spirituall Snapsacke, God was only angry at the enemy: ‘Your enemies are a people most ripe for judgement, they doe as it were invite the Sickle of Gods wrath to cut them downe.’195 Again, the duty of judgement and the act of punishing the enemies for their sins were highlighted. This attitude presented a striking contrast to the peace-seeking prayers of the Royalists.
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There were many issues that were remedied by prayer, such as the lack of courage. Late in the year 1642, an Independent minister, William Bridge, preached to the Parliamentary volunteers of the city of Norwich and Great Yarmouth. The sermon focused mostly on courage: one important way of attaining the right kind of valour was by praying. Bridge was very specific in describing the benefits of prayer:

> In prayer your heart shall be composed; for prayer is a soul-composing duty. In prayer you shall meet with the Captain of your Salvation; and he will leade up your hearts that are ready to run away. In prayer you shall bring your souls to this frame, quietly to resign up your selves, and cause, and successse unto God, and a man is never more courageous than in that frame.

Bridge also distinguished between merely begging God for deliverance and asking for his help in a difficult task. He advised that, when meeting obstacles,

> Then say within your selves, it is true indeed, to attain to such an event; certainly it will be hard, notwithstanding I know that my cause is good, my work is good, the people good; and therefore, though the difficulties and temptations be never so great, I will give my selfe to prayer, and praying courage is good courage.\(^{196}\)

For some Puritans, the prayer was a concrete weapon in the war. A few of the preachers even discussed the tangible effects of prayers in their sermons. ‘I am perswaded that prayers have done as much as weapons in subduing our enemies: The Churches prayers have been as prevalent as our Souldiers Swords’, claimed Nehemiah Barnet, a minister at Lancaster.\(^ {197}\) One John Tombes preached in Bristol in early 1643, emphasising the importance of faith as a weapon: ‘And let me tell you, that faith is as good as a whole Army, yea it is more then great forces, By it the Saints have obtained victories[...] The truth is: Faith is our greatest strength.’\(^ {198}\) There was a clear pursuit of combining religion and warfare in the godly armies, a combination that transcended simple prayers for help and deliverance. Faith and prayers were a concrete weapon of war, and they were treated as such.

A pastor of Pencomb, John Greene, gave a sermon to the House of Commons in April 1644 in which he clearly spelled out the benefits of prayer. According to him, prayer was help of a far larger scale than any secular means. It was also fast – whereas the mustering of soldiers took time, prayer was
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instant— and invisible. There was no way that the enemy could know about the contents of these secret messages sent to God. There was no issue that a prayer could not solve: it gave victory, it recovered lost battles, and it made empty all the plots and plans of the enemy.\(^{199}\) Later, Stephen Marshall echoed these benefits of prayer in his sermon to the House of Commons. According to him, the Parliament’s armies were carried by the wings of countless prayers,\(^{200}\) and it was indeed the power of supplication that had saved the Parliament’s cause when Bristol and other cities and garrisons were lost to the Royalists. Like Greene, Marshall also spelled out concrete reasons why prayer was the ultimate help. These were its versatility against any problem and its power no matter how strong those problems might be. There was not a distance that could not be covered by prayer, and it helped instantly. Considering how powerful a prayer was, Marshall even suggested that, if all the garrisons were ‘stocked and stored with praying Saints, nothing would be too hard for them: you would, if you rightly consider this, be more carefull to keep them all in a posture of prayer, then in a posture of defence’.\(^{201}\) Sinners who prayed, however, could not attain the benefits of prayer: ‘they are the prayers of his Saints, and of his Saints onely, which he regards.’\(^{202}\) Marshall, as many other Puritans, not only saw that it was important to pray, he also stressed that it was equally crucial to act upon one’s prayers. ‘When we have prayed’, he explained in the sermon *Meroz Cursed*, ‘wee must remember, that though prayer be the great means, yet prayer is not all the means.’ Contrary to Royalist passive supplication, the Puritans saw praying as a way to sanctify their concrete pursuits. Thus, Marshall claimed ‘other means are fruitlesse without prayer, and prayer not seconded with the use of other means, where they may be had, prevails not’.\(^{203}\)

Greene and Marshall portrayed the strength of Parliamentarian religiosity compellingly: Puritan ministers were capable of clarifying the practical benefits of religion in an easy and understandable way. For them, it was not important to formulate exactly what a supplicant should say when praying. It was more crucial to tell that supplicant why he was praying and what were the expected results of his efforts. Moreover, one should be active in pursuing the desired effect.

The changing fortunes of the war can be seen in the texts of the ministers. *The Souldier's Pocket Bible* reflected the realities of war: during the time of its publication in August 1643, Parliament did not
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have all things going its way. It had lost Bristol to the Royalists in July, and the Earl of Newcastle had been victorious against the Parliamentarians in the north. In this situation, it was felt important to remind the soldiers that setbacks were a part of God’s plan and not a reason to give up hope or the cause. The author did just that, explaining that a soldier must consider that God’s people sometimes have the worst in battle, but even if that happened, the misfortune came from the Lord. This was usually because of the iniquities of God’s people, and therefore they had to search out their sins. One such sin in particular was putting too much trust in one’s own strength and arms and too little faith in God’s power.204

However, despite adversities, God was with His people. His help came when there was no help in sight, when one’s own forces were at their weakest, and the enemy at its strongest. According to a sermon by a Scottish minister, Alexander Henderson, God would sometimes even take His favour away from His people on purpose so that the fortunes and pride of the enemy would rise, and their eventual fall would then be even more pronounced. ‘For in that nick of time, is the hand & power of God most discernable to his own glory, then is the confusion of the enemy most terrible, then is the deliverance of the Godly most wonderfull, and comfortable.’205 This promise of salvation was introduced to make the soldiers more resilient against the hardships and losses that they would have to face sooner or later. If there was an attempt to build a religious framework for soldiering, it had to cover all aspects of a soldier’s life, including defeats and losses. Losing a battle was a military disaster, but it also had its effect on morale. Therefore, it was imperative to try to explain losses as having their roots in the men themselves, not in the enemy. They themselves were responsible: they could abstain from sin, live as a Saint should, and the wrath of God would pass. When victory in battle would again emerge, they had to give all the glory to the Lord.206

The godly ministers had to explain the changing fortunes of war to the soldiers as well as to the politicians. The ultimate answer was God, but there was always something that the people could do to earn salvation. A Presbyterian minister and military chaplain, Obadiah Sedgwick, gave a thanksgiving sermon in the House of Commons in April 1644 following the victory of Sir William Waller’s army over that of the Royalist commander Sir Ralph Hopton. This success followed Parliament’s defeat at Newark, which had been a humiliating experience. Hence, Sedgwick wrote, the army ‘did set a solemn day of Humiliation apart to wrastle with God, before they contended with
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his enemies[...] They Fasted and Prayed, and fought, and now they are victorious.’ This was one of many examples of actual events that influenced sermons: the lesson was that defeat was due to sin, and if sins were overcome, the enemies were too. It was imperative not to take pride in victory – if the soldiers were not humble, God would humiliate them by making their enemies prosper. If, however, the army was modest in victory, it was a mighty prospect: ‘an Humbling Army, a praying Army, a God-trusting Army, that is the Army which is able (in some sense) to overcome God, that is the Army which is most likely to overcome men.’207 As a lesson, Sedgwick reminded his audience that this salvation should not be ascribed to the wisdom of men or to the strength of the army but to God alone. One should therefore live better, learn to put one’s confidence in the Lord and rejoice in fear: ‘Victories must make us thankful, but they must not make us secure.’208

If the King’s ministers were, for the most part, oblivious to the realities of war, Parliament could use authors that had first-hand experience of the armed conflicts of the age. Moreover, these individuals stressed the importance of prayer and, thus, brought their authority to strengthen the religious instruction of the Parliamentarian armies. One of these authors was Philip Skippon. In True Treasure, Skippon mentioned praying as a vital component in educating soldiers. He was keen on creating and nourishing the community of godly soldiers, and the power of prayer could work for that end too.209 Skippon stressed the importance of prayer and meditation in many situations, such as before marching, while marching, when resting and in every employment, but especially on watch. Before any hazardous task, it was beneficial to seek God for courage and comfort as well as for strength to succeed in the endeavour. Skippon explained that submitting completely to God and strictly following daily prayers and devotions made one ‘be more throughly confirmed, to betake himselfe to those particular promises, which in this respect assure him in Christ[...] the good things he so much craves’. The product of this practice, in theory, was a perfect Christian soldier: ‘Thus fitted by Gods good grace, in his onely name and strength, to discharge his duty without backwardnesse, feare or shrinking, bravely and resolutely; not giving over till he hath done his part fully, leaving the rest to the Lords disposing freely’. In addition, a soldier ought,

In receiving and executing commands in sailing, marching, quartering, watching, &c. to be willing, forward, carefull, unwearied, with few words, without arguing, with setled countenance and carriage
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beseemingly; towards others to behave himselfe reservedly, modestly, quietly, friendly, submissively, respectively, fairly, inoffensively.\textsuperscript{210}

There is little doubt that the value of religious instruction in producing godly soldiers was recognised, and Skippon’s example shows that not only ministers were of this opinion. \textit{True Treasure} placed men into different categories according to their godliness. Skippon advised that these groups should be edified slightly differently except for the lowest group, ‘those dogges and swine, to whom these pears may not be given, nor bread cast’. Even worldly, vain and wicked people could get something out of spiritual discourses, which would make them improve themselves as Christians, but only with the last group, those who truly feared God, was it suitable to go further and break off worldly discussion altogether in favour of more pious matters.\textsuperscript{211} The aim of this was not only to improve one’s personal devotion but also to strengthen it in others.

Not surprisingly, \textit{The Souldiers Catechisme} praised religiosity as one of the key attributes of a soldier. Ram wanted to make sure that the men fighting for Parliament were, for the most part, as he proclaimed them to be: ‘our Commanders are men of dis-ingaged and Publique Spirits’, ‘our men generally are so full of courage and resolution’, and ‘we have so many godly and religious Souldiers in our Armies’.\textsuperscript{212} The chaplain went straight to the point: the principal things required in a soldier were, in his opinion, religiosity and godliness, courage and valour and, lastly, skill in the military profession. The reason for the importance of religiosity was based on the Scriptures, naturally, but Ram also saw the more mundane needs of a soldier. Since, in their profession, death was always near and since they stood in a continual need of divine assistance, being religious had its merits. ‘A well ordered Camp is a Schoole of Vertue, wherein is taught... Preparation for death’, Ram stated.\textsuperscript{213} ‘There are no atheists in foxholes’, as an anonymous but well-known aphorism states, and despite its rather absolute tone, there may be some truth to the statement. Marching against a firing block of musketeers or receiving a charge from armoured, pistol and sword wielding horsemen, must have been a fearful experience to the Civil War soldiers. A way to cope with that fear was to believe in divine protection or at least to accept that one’s fate was preordained. In battle, there was only so much an individual could do to ensure his survival. Therefore, Ram stressed that it was harmful to put too much trust in the ‘arme of flesh’, which is why he highlighted the importance of religiosity for a soldier.
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Likewise, the experienced military chaplain Donald Lupton mentioned religiosity as an important attribute for a soldier in *A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike*. This quality was echoed by William Barriffe, a Parliamentarian army officer and military author whose *Military Discipline* was published for the first time in 1635. *Military Discipline* proved to be so popular that several editions were printed, even some unauthorized ones. In an edition published in 1643, Barriffe quoted Xenophon, who was not only an ancient Greek historian but also a mercenary. Xenophon had declared that soldiers who served God and were obedient to their officers ‘may boldly, and courageously fight with their enemies, not doubting victory’. Questions of life and death are often hard for humans to manage, and trusting one’s well-being, health and even life to a higher power can give a soldier comfort, resolve and courage when it comes to answering such questions in the quiet moments before a battle. The Parliamentarian ministers not only understood this but they also managed to convey it to their audience in a simple and clear manner.

Ram advocated prayer in his catechism. According to him, one of the encouraging signs of Parliament’s good cause was that the course was ‘followed with the Prayers and humiliations of all the faithfull in the Land’. Ram repeated as much when he listed encouraging characteristics of the Parliamentarian soldiers. The war was ‘surrounded with the prayers and blessings of all the good people of the Land’. Moreover, it was important for the soldiers to pray too. ‘Every soouldier should seeke to God by prayer, that he would instruct and teach them: for it is the blessing of God that makes men to profit in any profession’, Ram advised his audience.

As I have suggested, both Presbyterians and Independents emphasised religion and the importance of religiosity in their pursuit of military victory. A pamphlet by W. L., trying to mitigate the growing disagreements between the Puritan groups and to propagate the inclusion of Independents in the New Model Army, contained the following description of the Independent soldiers:

> They have through Gods assistance behaved themselves in the Field, and in the face of the Enemie very gallantly[…] certainly these men that are consciencious, that abhor oaths, blasphemies, and prophanenesse,
should not only be admitted, but required and desired to assist the State, if for nothing else, yet because they will fight. 220

Their good Christian manners and ability to fight were stressed here by W. L., as was their God-inspired courage. The product was a religious warrior who wrestled with God as well as fought with the enemy. The author asked his readers to bless exemplary commanders and soldiers and not to be envious of their zeal. 221 Another author who touched upon the growing disagreements between Presbyterians and Independents, 222 the Scottish minister Samuel Rutherford, agreed that the Saints were the best warriors: ‘It is true, the Godly are fittest to bee souldiers, and faith hath more true courage for the warre then thousands of men.’ 223 This was one thing that the two major parties of the Puritan faith agreed on: religiosity was important for a soldier, and spiritual methods should be employed in warlike pursuits in addition to secular ones.

In their sermons and books, Parliamentarian chaplains and officers certainly encouraged their soldiers to pray and practice religiosity. Many Parliamentarian authorities explicitly stated that religiosity was a very important quality in a soldier, and they also tried to cultivate such godliness by instructions and exhortations to pray. Praying was not only asking God for desirable things, such as victory or protection, however. Puritan authors were also quite precise in describing the benefits of prayer. These included, for instance, the encouragement and reinforcement of a godly community among soldiers. In addition, Parliamentarian ministers reminded their audience that prayer needed an active component to be heard and answered: things that were asked had to be pursued in a concrete manner. Royalist ministers, by contrast, were more concerned about composing suitable prayers for every possible occasion than about instructing soldiers of the benefits of this outward sign of religiosity. As it were, most of their prayers did not necessarily even deal with the war, let alone the soldiers’ hardships – they concentrated on the King and the health and well-being of the Royal family, on sins and even on peace. There are indications that king Charles himself had a hand in creating spiritual instructions for his soldiers – not only their forms, but their content too. Thus, both the emphasis on the Royal family and the lack of an active pursuit of religious war in Royalist prayer manuals and spiritual advice can possibly be explained by the King’s personal involvement. It seems that, with a few exceptions, such as Ferne and Bramhall, Charles and the Royalist clergy thought that the possible
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benefits of praying were dependent on the will of God. Praying for military success was enough in their opinion because God had heard their plea and would either grant it or refuse it. This was again a sign of passivity. The godly ministers, while acknowledging that everything was preordained by God, could still advise their soldiers to actively use the religious tools at their disposal to make a difference and influence their own fate.
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3. SINS AND COURAGE

While the soldiers were engaged in battles and sieges, the ministers waged another war against sin. This was crucial because not only were moral infractions detrimental to one’s chances of getting to heaven, they were also seen as a cause and reason for the present conflict in England. This view was quite prevalent even among the laity. For instance, a gentleman George Smith wrote a pamphlet called *Englands Pressures* in which he argued that men’s sins were punished by wicked actions, such as the calamities of the Civil War.\(^{225}\) Therefore, it was imperative to weed out sins that were rampant in the armies. Both Parliamentarian and Royalist ministers took this issue seriously and recognised the same moral problems among soldiers.\(^{226}\) Many sins were listed by Richard Ward in *The Anatomy of Warre*. He asked the Lord to preserve both commanders and soldiers ‘from all wickednesse and impiety, especially from those heinous offences which too frequently follow the Camp and accompany wars; as namely, blasphemy, fornication, rapes, drunkennesse, gaming, jarres, contentions, theft, pilfering, &c’.\(^{227}\) Some of these were crimes, some were lesser offences that would probably disrupt the order of an army if widespread, and some were infractions only in a religious sense. All the same, for the religiously minded, these were sins that had to be erased because they drew the punishment of God over England. While the Royalists acknowledged the same problems, their conclusions differed. Royalist ministers again emphasised passive submission to God’s wrath and lamented the sins of the nation in general, irrespective of the military situation – the Civil War in itself was the Lord’s punishment for the English. The Parliamentarians, however, concentrated on the sins of their soldiers only when they experienced setbacks and losses, and with their characteristic active vigour. The men could influence their own fate by their own actions, not by passively praying for forgiveness.

Another issue that was often brought up in connection to sin was courage. It was generally thought that sin made men cowards. Hence, there was a strong connection between the weeding out of sin and encouraging soldiers. However, there were differences in motives between the Parliamentarian and Royalist clergymen. The aim of the Puritan ministers was to encourage soldiers in their military endeavours, whereas the Royalist clergy had moral reformation in mind when warning of the detrimental effect that sin had on courage.
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\(^{225}\) George Smith, *Englands Pressures: Or, the Peoples Complaint...* London, 1645, 16.

\(^{226}\) The ministers recognized sin not only in soldiers. For instance, many a sermon was given in Parliament asking the members and the people in general to abstain from sinning so that God would not withdraw his providence. In one sermon, Stephen Marshall recognized the very sins that stood out in the armies too, such as drinking, blaspheming and swearing. See Stephen Marshall, *The Song of Moses the Servant of God, And the Song of the Lambe: Opened In a Sermon preached to the Honorable House of Commons, at their late solemn day of Thanksgiving, June 15. 1643...* London, 1643, 38.

Thus, there certainly were differences between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians in dealing with infractions. Some sins were treated more extensively by one party than by the other. Causes for this may have been that certain armies suffered more from a certain type of behaviour or, which is more likely, the commanders had personal convictions that influenced their attitude towards some sins more than others. I suggest that the distinct approaches between the Puritans and the King’s ministers reflected different levels of understanding of the concrete demands of war and the pursuit of different ends. For example, there was a highly idealized attempt at curbing swearing in the Royalist armies because it was against the Christian moral code, and this specific issue was extensively treated by the King’s ministers. The Puritans did not tolerate swearing and blasphemying any more than the Royalists, but they did not give it attention that was out of proportion to its significance. For them, the question was more about winning the war, and swearing had very little to do with it.

A Manuall of Prayers was very illustrative of the concept of sin propagated by the Royalists, in which the war was a result of the iniquities of the English. It contained the prayer of a sinner that asked for deliverance from sins and vices.²²⁸ In a prayer for a time of war, the Lord was asked to spare the Royalists from deserved punishment, which was a clear indicator that the conflict was seen as an embodiment of God’s wrath upon the English for their moral lapses.²²⁹ In the next prayer, it was confirmed that ‘by our many iniquities wee have deserved warre’.²³⁰ There was also a form of confession to a priest that contained penances such as prayer, watching, fasting and alms.²³¹ Thus, the sins of the Royalists were very prominently treated in their prayer manual. More significantly, it was established that the Civil War was actually their own fault, and whatever suffering the King’s men went through was because of their own sins.

Another interesting point in the manual is the very last prayer, grace against swearing. The Lord himself was asked to watch that no unnecessary swearing came out of the mouths of his humble servants.²³² Margaret Griffin has suggested that the King himself was the cause of meticulous campaigning against swearing in the Royalist armies, which manifested itself in two proclamations against this particular sin in addition to military articles that made ‘unlawful oaths’ punishable: swearing was personally odious to the King, and he took an active part in trying to eradicate it from the Royalist armies.²³³ Thus, it is easy to see that this last prayer of A Manuall of Prayers was in such

²²⁸ W. C., A Manuall of Prayers. 1642. A Prayer of a sinner, C6r–C7r.
²²⁹ Ibid. A prayer in time of Warre, E8r.
²³⁰ Ibid. A prayer For Peace, E8v–Fr.
²³¹ Ibid. A forme of confessing to the Priest when the conscience is burthened, F4v–F6r.
²³² Ibid. A Prayer for grace against swearing, F6v–F7v.
²³³ Griffin, Regulating Religion and Morality in the King’s Armies, 27–31.
a prominent place for a reason. While religion was used as an instrument of making soldiers better in their profession, it was also used as a tool for instructing men to behave themselves in a way that had no military significance, but that satisfied the personal piety of the King himself.\textsuperscript{234} There is more proof of this as we shall see next.

In the second edition of \textit{A Manuall of Prayers}, the same offences were given much attention: the last seven pages were dedicated to swearing and cursing. The author appeared to be very worried about the souls of the soldiers, for he gave instructions on a very specific level to refrain from at least certain oaths, two of which ‘usurpe the bloud and woundes of Christ’. He also listed nine sins of England that had, in addition to seven deadly ones, provoked God’s judgement. These were atheism, rebellion, sacrilege, profaneness, schism, self-love, swearing, usury and uncharitableness. The emphasis seemed to be on swearing, however, as the author concluded: ‘He that sweares, pawnes his soule; he that forswears himselfe, forfaits it.’\textsuperscript{235} However, we can learn that, despite the Royalist clergy’s best efforts, swearing was not weeded out since two prayer manuals published about a year apart both address the problem rather extensively. The importance that the King’s ministers placed on curbing ‘unlawful oaths’ pointed to the direction of Charles’s personal involvement, or at least to a conscious decision to please the monarch.\textsuperscript{236}

Cursing and blaspheming were given a disproportionate amount of attention in Royalist religious education to create a holy Christian community in an army. A minister, William Strode, gave a sermon against swearing before the King himself in Oxford, and it was published by Charles’s command. Strode touched upon the subject of a holy military camp: ‘When the Lord of Hosts led forth his people to War, the Camp was not onely the schoole of holinesse[...] but also the Schoole of Cleanliness.’ Swearing, of course, violated this since it was, according to Strode, a greater sin than theft or adultery. Blaspheming and swearing offended God himself whereas theft and adultery only offended one's fellow man.\textsuperscript{237} Henry Ferne, in \textit{The Camp at Gilgal}, lamented that anyone that passed the guards of the camp would frequently hear ‘Oathes and Curses by that great and holy name’, as if

\textsuperscript{234} Undoubtedly, propaganda considerations were also involved in the Royalist campaign against swearing. Parliamentarian publications often described a ‘drunken, roaring and swearing Cavalier’, which naturally was a liability to the King’s public image. This was a concrete concern and a tangible propaganda factor, but it still did not make the Royalist soldiers any better in their profession.

\textsuperscript{235} W. C., \textit{A Manuall of Prayers}. 1643. Considerations of Swearing and Cursing, I3v–I6v.

\textsuperscript{236} W. C.’s two prayer manuals, and the attention they give to swearing and blaspheming, are further evidence of the solidity of Griffin’s thesis, even though these sources have escaped her own notice.

\textsuperscript{237} William Strode, \textit{A Sermon concerning Swearing, Preached before the King’s Maiesty, In Christ-Church Oxon; May the 12. 1644}. Oxford, 1644, 22–23.
the soldiers could not speak one to another or officers give commands without swearing profanely. It was contagious, and Ferne blamed the commanders for setting a bad example for their men:

If any of your Commanders be so farre from executing His Majesties orders against this or any other Profaneness, that they give you example rather for it, you must know it will not excuse you, but aggravate the sinne so much the more, in them for giving the example, in you for the imitation.  

The military articles of the Royalist armies made these transgressions unlawful from the earliest ordinances. Blaspheming the holy trinity was punishable by drilling through the offender’s tongue with a red hot iron, unlawful oaths and execrations by the loss of pay and other punishments at discretion. The articles of late 1643 expanded these older regulations, stating that the use of unlawful oaths had to be proved either by the offender’s own confession or by the testimony of two witnesses, in which case the offender lost 12 pennies for the first offence, and endured the same loss of pay and 12 hours of imprisonment for the second.

The King himself published proclamations against the swearing and profanations of his soldiers, which showed the importance of these moral regulations in Royalist religious instruction. The first of these proclamations was published in June 1643, and it commanded all the officers of the King’s army to duly execute all the articles against blasphemy, swearing, drunkenness and whoredom, and to see that divine service and sermons were regularly attended, as the articles decreed upon pain of punishment. This very same proclamation also regulated the work of chaplains of the army, telling them how often they were to preach and administer spiritual guidance to soldiers. Lastly, it charged the chaplains or some other approved person to read the military orders publicly every second Sunday. This lent religious weight and prestige to the military orders of the King. In spite of this, the proclamation did not have the anticipated effect because the King issued another in April 1644. This time, Charles insisted that swearing and cursing should be curbed by the use of exemplary punishments on the offenders to the terror of others. Moreover, he charged all commanders and officers to be good examples to their men by abstaining from profanations. The King saw these ‘horrible Oathes and Execrations’ to be a cause of God’s wrath against the nation. In his distaste of swearing, he went so far as to require the Major and Justices of the Peace in Oxford to issue
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239 *Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majestie, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army*. York, 1642, 2.
240 *Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two Proclamations...* Oxford, 1643, 2.
241 *By the King. A Proclamation for the inhibiting all manner of Oathes, other Abuses and Prophanations by any of His Majesties Army...* Oxford, 1643.
punishment to civilians too, if they were caught in the act. This was based on a statute ‘for the prevention and Reformation of Prophane Swearing and Cursing’ given by Charles’s father, James I.242 The last time the King himself intervened in his army’s moral upbringing was in November 1645 in injunctions issued in Oxford, ‘for the advancement of Piety and Religion within Our Garrisons and Armies’. These injunctions mainly concerned how the practice of religion should be arranged in the garrison of Oxford, but they also touched upon ‘the Horrid Sinnes of Swearing, Blasphemy, and Drunkennesse’, which had provoked God to withhold his blessings from the Royalists. The King repeated his command that all officers and soldiers guilty of these sins should receive punishment according to the military articles.243

Thus, the Royalist clergy and the King himself used a lot of time and commitment to curb swearing in the armies. Such religious education could have been put to more practical use considering the demands of the war. It is very likely that the best efforts of Charles and his ministers did not help much in weeding out swearing among the Royalist soldiers, for commands and proclamations against unlawful oaths were issued one after another right until the end of the First Civil War. Moreover, the Parliamentarian propaganda portrayal of a swearing, debauched Cavalier, although obviously exaggerated, probably contained some truth – and was thus something that the Royalists wanted to dispel to enhance their public image. However, managing to prohibit swearing among soldiers was likely to be as unrealistic then as it is now. Despite this, the Royalist ministers really concentrated on the task, which underlines the impracticality of their religious advice considering warfare. Another peculiar trait of the King’s ministers was to focus on the sins of their own party and lament God’s wrath due to these iniquities.

This was exemplified by Brian Duppa’s prayer manuals. In A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings, the conflict was portrayed as a direct punishment for the nation’s sins and its people’s ingratitude for the many blessings that God had bestowed upon England: ‘Therfore hast thou recompenced our waies upon our own heads, and suffered our destruction to proceed from our selves: our wickednesse doth correct us, our back-sliding doth reprove us, and our iniquity is become our ruine.’ Duppa acknowledged that the punishment was deserved, but still prayed for God’s mercy and forgiveness.244
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242 By the King. A Proclamation for the further restraint of Prophane Swearing and Cursing, and the better observing of Prayer and Preaching in His Majesties Armies, and the City of Oxford... Oxford, 1644
244 Duppa, A Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings, 11–12.
The second prayer manual by Duppa, *Private Formes of Prayer*, continued in the similar tone. Duppa confessed the sins of the Royalists, which were many and varied. Rash oaths, blasphemies and other execrations were condemned as well as drunkenness, cruelty and mercilessness, rapine, defrauding the soldier of his pay, and not loving the enemy, to mention only those that were directly related to the soldiers’ profession. Duppa asked for forgiveness for these sins: ‘spare us, Lord, spare thy people, that these sinnes rise not up against us.’ The thought that the war was the result of God’s judgement was not unique – after all, even Parliamentarian ministers presented this opinion – but rather the emphasis that the Royalists placed on their own sins and the power of God as the sole redeeming factor. There was nothing a good member of the Church of England could do but to pray and suffer. It was up to the Lord to help if He was willing, and the guilt of the Royalists was not channelled towards more productive ways of expression, such as guiding them to vigorously pursue a military victory in order to attain the favour and forgiveness of God.

Henry Ferne’s *The Camp at Gilgal* addressed sins that seemed to reflect either widespread issues in the King’s armies or Charles’s particular dislikes, such as swearing and drinking. Some sins also had their counterparts in the Royalist military articles. Reinforcing certain secular laws with religious ones was, therefore, not a purely Parliamentarian phenomenon.

There are some sinnes, done in the body, which make the Souldier unable to goe through with his service [...] which weaken the constitution of the body [...] such as drunkennesse, rioting, whordome, and the like uncleannesse; but these and all other wickednesse and sinnes of profanenesse, as swearing, cursing, blasphemy, bloodshed, oppression, doe not only make you loosers in the spirituall warfair, and give you up to your ghostly enimies, but also cut you off from Gods protection and blessing, exposing you naked and unarmed to all the dangers of Warre.

This was a very clear warning about the concrete consequences of sin, and it put a strong emphasis on spiritual warfare, which was waged at the same time as the physical war. Ferne had no doubts about the effects of these sins on the Royal armies. He brought up ‘the sinfull uncleanenes’ of whoredom, drunkenness and cursing as important moral issues. Interestingly, he mentioned that if there were ‘Midianitish women’ – that is, prostitutes – among the soldiers, ‘the Magistrate or Officer may take notice of it and punish it’. However, the military articles issued by the King in the summer

---

246 Ibid. 9.
248 Ibid. 14.
of 1642,\textsuperscript{249} which were in force during the publication of Ferne’s book, did not make it unlawful to
have women in the camp, nor did the second set of Royalist articles issued to the Earl of Newcastle’s
northern army later the same year.\textsuperscript{250} It was only the third set of military orders, which were published
in 1643 or early 1644,\textsuperscript{251} that decreed ‘No Whore shall be suffered to be in the Leaguer’ (but wives
were allowed).\textsuperscript{252} Hence, having morally questionable camp followers around must have been
something that was in a grey area from the perspective of military discipline until the last set of
Royalist regulations, but certainly not from the viewpoint of the King’s ministers, such as Ferne, who
wanted to put an end to the adulterous behaviour of the soldiers.\textsuperscript{253}

There is, however, a document that has escaped the attention of earlier scholarship on the Royalist
military articles. It is a printed pamphlet, dated to 1642, that mainly decreed how much Royalist
soldiers should be paid, but it also included a few orders and an oath to be given in the King’s service.
These orders were not military articles per se, for they did not specify a punishment for infractions
other than references to the laws of martial discipline and the decision of the council of war. However,
the following statement is to be found in them: ‘Women, especially Harlots, shall not be admitted to
follow our army; neither shall any soouldier or officer without licence from the Colonell of his
Regiment, or the Generall himselfe, presume to have his wife with him on a march, as he will answer
the contrary at the discretion of the Councell of Warre’.\textsuperscript{254} If this is indeed where the prohibition of
women in the army derived from, it gives us an interesting glimpse into the moral regulation of the
Royalist armies. It seems that administering an army did not rely solely on published articles, but

\textsuperscript{249} Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majestie... York, 1642. Reprinted in Oxford and Bristol in 1643 with
the addition of two proclamations against the plundering and buying and selling of arms and horses. The Oxford reprint
also included instructions for musters and arms. Military Orders, And Articles, established by His Maiestie, For the better
Ordering and Government of his Maesties Armie. With the Oath which every soouldier is to take... Oxford, 1643. Military
Orders And Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two
Proclamations... Bristol, 1643.

\textsuperscript{250} Orders and Institutions of War, Made and ordained by His Majesty, And by Him delivered to His Generall His Excellencethe Earle of Newcastle. 1642.

\textsuperscript{251} Griffin, Regulating Religion and Morality in the King’s Armies, 92–93.

\textsuperscript{252} Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two Proclamations... Oxford, 1643, 18. The reprint was published in 1644. Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two Proclamations... Oxford, 1644.

\textsuperscript{253} Griffin has given several estimations on why the earlier set of military articles did not regulate these affairs: either
the author of these first Royalist articles might have thought that these issues were best handled by other types of
authority; or the author himself had no interest in these infractions; or maybe the author had been working on the basis
of the Earl of Holland’s articles from the Bishops’ Wars, which did not include regulations for this type of sins. See Griffin,
Regulating Religion and Morality in the King’s Armies, 103–104.

\textsuperscript{254} A true Abstract of a List, In which is set down the several entertainments allowed by His Majesty to the Officers and
other soouldiers of His Army... London, 1642, 8.
official orders could be found in other publications too, such as declarations of Parliament, proclamations and injunctions of the King, and these kinds of lists for the governance of pay in armies.

Therefore, we can see that both the King and his chaplains went to great lengths to achieve moral reformation among the Royalist soldiers. We can also see that the issues they concentrated on (with few exceptions such as drinking) were quite secondary when it came to waging war. Combating the sins in the armies seems to have been more important to the Royalist high command. The King and his ministers tried – perhaps very unrealistically – to create a godly army by painstakingly regulating the language of its soldiers, which would have, if achieved, taken the Lord’s wrath away from the royal army and brought it success. It is telling that, after all the military articles and proclamations issued since the beginning of the war, which made swearing and prophane oaths unlawful, the King still had to bear with these sins at the end of 1645. Whereas the Puritan preachers did not completely stop admonishing the soldiers for little infractions such as swearing, on the whole they concentrated on larger issues and on creating a godly army. The result was signified by their success on the battlefield, not by making the soldiers give up using blasphemous oaths now and then. Encouraging the men was crucial, and the Parliamentarian ministers channelled abstaining from sins into a militarily productive action more effectively. Thus, their approach to sin was completely different, as we shall see.

When the Parliamentarians dealt with the subjects of swearing and blaspheming, it was often in conjunction with a warning of the example of the Royalists. For instance, the Earl of Warwick gave a speech to his army in November 1642 in which he strongly cautioned against swearing. The reasons for this were purely religious, but the Earl highlighted the enemies’ behaviour to drive home his point.

> Thinke what you have undertooke of the Cause you are to fight in, thinke against whome, the blody and inhumane Papists, they that keepe your deare Anointed King from you, those blaspheming and tiranous Cavaliers, that destroyes and brings to utter ruine every place where they come.

Naturally there were exceptions. One of these – though not a clergyman – was William Meeke, who warned of false security and prophane celebration after the war was all but won. His message was that, if the people did not stop sinning, God would punish them and England. He also warned the soldiers in particular, ‘that if thus they continue in their vaine, idle, and ungodly courses, when the Lord hath performed his whole worke by them against the Papists, and popishly affected persons, that then he will cast them (his rod) into the fire.’ William Meeke, *The Faithfull Scout: Giving an Alarume to Yorkshire, (especially to the East-Ryding) and all other places at this time freed from the misery of Warre...* York, 1646, 47–51, 100–101.
The message was further strengthened by enclosing ‘a true relation’ of the sad fate of a cursing Royalist. 256 For the Parliamentarians, curbing the swearing of the soldiers was an important distinctive feature from the Royalists and, as such, inherently tied to the realities of the war. For the King’s ministers, the sin itself mattered more than its practical applications.

In general, the Parliamentarian authors had a more pragmatic approach to the sins of the soldiers. For example, Philip Skippon treated some common vices of the armies in *A Salve for Every Sore*. According to him, the most common sins were the following: ‘Adultery, and all other uncleannesse, injuring others, wrath, contention, lying, evill speaking, swearing, being among many other the common crying sinnes of our calling.’ 257 These common sins of the soldier’s profession were mentioned also in Skippon’s *True Treasure*, but not in detail. 258 He advised his audience to seek pardon for the sins they had committed and to ask for deliverance and preservation from the sins that they were most prone to commit. 259 These were matters that many a minister had dealt with before. Skippon, however, gave them the attention they deserved – not needlessly making them the most crucial issue in the religious upbringing of a Christian soldier but rather mentioning them as sins to be avoided in the pursuit of godliness. These sins did not stem from any concrete military concern but were only mentioned because they were not rare among the soldiers. Hence, their role was not unnecessarily enlarged, as when, for example, the Royalists attempted to curb swearing.

However, there were also some very tangible problems that the armies faced, and they could be addressed by reinforcing proper military conduct with the prestige of religious arguments. In *The Christian Centurians Observations*, Skippon educated Christian soldiers, and his advice was strongly related to sins that were to be avoided. The quote from *Luke 3:14* 260 was used once again when discussing these. It is remarkable that Skippon mainly addressed officers, not only the common rank and file who were most often the target of moral upbringing. He spoke for the common soldiers, whose pay was withheld or not paid in full or on time. He also mentioned false mustering, taking fabricated names or names of those long since dead in the company rolls to profit from the payment designed to these non-existent men. Usually, the rank and file troops were blamed for swearing and other infractions but here Skippon addressed his peers, the commanders. 261 He wanted to emphasize

256 A Most Worthy Speech, Spoken by the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Warwicke; In the Head of his Army, November, 22... London, 1642, 4–6.
259 Ibid. 26–30.
260 ‘Do violence to no man, neither accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages.’
the importance of setting an example. It was hardly effective to tell soldiers to behave godly and to avoid sin while detaining their payment and cheating with muster rolls for one’s own benefit. This example was very important in making an army function both in military and spiritual challenges. To be fair, Skippon also considered the problems that the officers faced: for example, sometimes they were denied their proper pay and were thus unable to pay their soldiers, unless it came from their own purses. He confessed that ‘our condition by their ill payment is extreame hard and uncomfortable that puts upon us a necessity of doing ill to help our selves, or to suffer much in our outward estate for wel-doing’. In spite of this, there was no argument for doing wrong. Skippon claimed he would rather die poor and honest but with a good reputation than miserable and wicked and badly esteemed. Despite adversaries, a true Christian soldier should put his trust in God and have faith that the Lord will help him. Military men should get their appointed pay to be content with their wages, but even if they did not, there was no warrant to carry out any unlawful action such as plundering civilians. ‘The worst of suffering is to be chosen before the best of sinne’, Skippon wrote, and added that God’s help and blessing were hindered by the soldiers’ profaneness and distrust.262

Financial problems were important matters in the armies, as a letter from Thomas Fairfax attested:

I am sorry Money is so slowly sent to the Army; indeed our soldiers hath been put to hard Service and strict obedience; but if they want Pay, both these will be neglected, and nothing carries on our businesse with more advantage, then keeping our Souldiers from doing violence.263

In the brigade of Major General Massey, the financial situation was so dire that the military articles had to be used in all severity: ‘And although that we cannot pay our men as is meet, yet hath there no execution of justice bin wanting to any offender’.264 Thus, even the godly suffered from the lack of money. This also shows that the sins Skippon addressed had concrete effects on the armies. Cheating the men from their wages, or mutinying because payment was not on time, were more severe infractions from a military perspective than was swearing.

Skippon’s emphatic attitude was probably formed during his long career as a soldier. This was echoed by the military chaplain Donald Lupton, who wrote almost apologetically about soldiers’ sins in A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike. He conceded that soldiers were often guilty of sins such as swearing,

262 Ibid. 262–271.
263 Two Letters: The One, Sent to the Right Honorable, the Lord Fairfax, from Sir Tho: Fairfax his Son, Commander in Chief of the Parliaments Forces; Concerning his besieging Sherborn... London, 1645, 4.
264 Truth Discovered From the West, Concerning the carriage of Major Generall Massies Brigade there. Certified lately in a Letter to a Merchant in London. 1646, 4.
raping, drunkenness and even murder. However, these infractions were all committed by persons of other professions as well, and no other occupation had stricter laws against misbehaviour since the consequences of acting against military articles were severe and often fatal. Thus, there was a system of keeping soldiers disciplined, and the misdeeds that occurred could not be counted against the entire profession and its legitimacy. Moreover, the hard facts of a soldier’s life influenced his behaviour. The proximity to death ‘is and hath been a main incitement to goodnesse’ and ensured that a soldier conducted himself religiously and virtuously, at least in the best of cases. There was also the power of example. Those of a higher rank should be models for those who followed them. Lupton gave concrete advice on how to control soldiers’ vices: military articles, the example of superiors, and heightened conscience and knowledge of one’s mortality.

Robert Ram made an effort to combine the moral condemnation of the soldiers’ common sins with the prohibition of these sins by military law. If a good soldier was godly, courageous and skilful, bad soldiers had identifiable characteristics as well. In particular, Ram mentioned whoring and (moral) uncleanliness, swearing and blaspheming, drunkenness, plundering and stealing as the sins that mainly concerned soldiers and prevented them from being exemplary and good. The Souldiers Catechisme forbade these things on biblical account, but the Parliamentarian military articles also prohibited them. The first military laws published for Parliamentarian Civil War armies, by the Earl of Essex in September 1642, addressed all of these and meted out quite severe punishments. These were not only dead letters, the punishments were put to use in some cases. For instance, the newspaper Perfect Occurrences from May 1646 related how an adulterer (supposedly having three wives) was to be whipped out of the army as were his wives. A sergeant who was guilty of blaspheming and swearing was sentenced to have his tongue bored through. In the disordered brigade of Major General Massey, there were death sentences, the mutilation of tongues and cashiering in addition to
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265 Lupton, A Warre-like Treatise of the Pike, 2–6.
266 Ibid. 14–15.
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268 Ram, The Souldiers Catechisme. 1644, 19.
269 For adultery and fornication, ‘with discrezione according to the qualitie of the offence’; for blasphemy, ‘upon paine to have his Tongue boared with a red-hot iron’; for cursing, ‘with losse of Pay, and other punishment at discretion’; for drunkenness, ‘with losse of place’ (if officer) or ‘with such penalties as a Court-marshall shall thinke fit’ (if common soldier); theft and robbery (exceeding the value of 12 pence) ‘with death’; wasting the countryside and wronging ploughmen as well as spoiling fields and burning houses and pillaging without licence, ‘upon paine of death’. Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better Conduct of the Army by His Excellency The Earle of Essex... London, 1642. The pagination only starts from page 17 and, if followed, is slightly off, for the first page would be number 5. 11–12, 7, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21. The Earl of Warwick issued virtually identical articles in November 1642, with the same problem with pagination. Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better Conduct of the Army by His Excellency The Earle of Warwick... London, 1642.
270 Perfect Occurrences Of Both Houses of Parliament, and Martiall Affairs. The Two and Twentie Week, ending Friday the 29. of May. 1646. London, 1646, X3r.
imprisonment, to the extent that it was lamented that ‘more severity cannot be used in the strictest Army, then is amongst us against offenders’. 271

The harshest penalty was for theft, which was handled under the heading ‘Of Duties Morall’ together with adultery and drunkenness. Thievery in the context of military operations, such as pillaging without licence, was forbidden upon pain of death, which left some leeway for the officers not to execute the punishment if the circumstances warranted. However, The Souldiers Catechisme did not encourage pillaging as did the Royalist Meditations Upon a Seige, and it did not have the conditional ‘without licence’ like the military articles had. The revised Parliamentarian military articles issued by the Earl of Essex were based on previous ones and contained the same prohibitions and penalties. 272

The important thing, however, was that the issues Ram and the other Puritan ministers saw as counterproductive in making a good Christian soldier were explicitly prohibited in the military articles of the Parliamentarian armies. 273

Despite these prohibitions, ‘many lewd and wicked men’ remained in the armies. According to Ram, the problem was a lack of good material. There were not enough godly officers and honest, religious men, but rather too many impressed ‘scumme and refuse of men’. In addition, order and discipline was not executed strictly enough. Still, the author saw that the Lord’s work that they were doing was proceeding because there were also many good Christians engaged in the cause, and God often used even wicked men as tools of his providence. 274 Thus, Ram confessed that there was undesired behaviour among soldiers, but he still claimed that Parliament was fighting for the right cause on God’s side. This perfectly portrayed the Puritan attitude towards sin. Transgressions were certainly condemned, and there were many attempts at weeding them out, but on the whole, they did not fatally hinder God’s battle. Royalist pessimism was absent from Ram’s catechism as it was in other Puritan publications. Even sermons that were given at a time when the military situation was precarious contained exhortations to improve the situation by one’s own actions, as we shall see next.

271 Truth Discovered From the West, Concerning the carriage of Major Generall Massies Brigade there. 1646, 4–6.
272 Lawes and Ordinances of Warre, Established for the better Conduct of the Army, by His Excellency The Earl of Essex... Together with a Declaration Of the Lords and Commons in Parliament. London, 1643.
273 These articles were often reinforced by proclamations, such as were issued in May 1645: ‘May the sixth, was Proclamation made, That it should be death for any man to plunder, at which, our old Horse-Dragoons, somewhat guilty, made answer, If the Parliament would pay truly, let them hang duly.’ The author then proceeded to tell that he had not heard any complaints of plundering afterwards. There were thus many methods to deal with undesired behaviour: military law, proper pay, and religious instruction were all used to curb the infractions of the soldiers. See A Narration of the Expedition to Taunton; The Raising the Siege before it, and the Condition of our Forces, and the Enemies, at this present in the West... London, 1645, 3.
The change in military situation seemingly influenced the godly preachers more heavily than it did the Royalist ones, who were pessimistic despite the fluctuations of war. Sins were not crucial in the Parliamentarian ministers’ writings and sermons except in certain cases. One of these cases was during the late summer of 1644. Despite Parliament’s victory at Marston Moor in July, their military situation was not so good in southern England. The army of the Earl of Essex was surrounded by the Royalists in Cornwall. On 13 August, designated to be a special day for humiliation, two sermons were preached to the two Houses of Parliament. Both agreed that the Parliamentarians’ sins had brought misfortune to their armies. A member of the Assembly of Divines, Thomas Hill, lamented that these sins had protracted the conflict despite attempts of pacification and the successes of the Parliamentarian armies. These successes had not been followed up properly, there had not been enough will behind the pursuit of peace, and disunity and disagreements had often prevented effective actions. At the bottom of these secular issues were sins, and these were not the sins of the enemy. Hill advised his audience to look to their own heart and to consider their evil ways to rectify the situation. This was what the Puritan ministers had warned about in thanksgiving sermons after the victory of Marston Moor. Richard Vines, another member of the Assembly of Divines, had told both Houses to give all the glory from the victory to God and to ‘fortifie their hearts against the evils that follow good successes’.

The second preacher of the day and also a member of the Assembly of Divines, Herbert Palmer, said that they had gathered in prayer, fasting and humiliation especially for the blessing on the army of Essex. ‘We must lament and be humbled for their sins as well as our own; and so for the sins of the other Armies’, Palmer preached, and he mentioned sins such as private quarrels and pursuits, rapine and spoiling, drunkenness, profaneness and whoring, as well as carnal confidence in physical means of warfare. It was, however, not enough to pray, fast and be humbled to alleviate the pressure of God’s vengeance, which again reflects the Puritan idea of actively seeking change. ‘We know that prayer is vaine that is not seconded with endeavours’, Palmer said and exhorted for reform in the armies and for relinquishing all wickedness. ‘If they [Puritan soldiers] prove cowards or treacherous, or that God give their enemies the upper hand of them, we can thanke or blame none more then our selves’, he criticised and claimed that there was ‘notorious wickedness’ in Parliamentarian armies

275 Thomas Hill, *The Season for Englands Selfe-Reflection, and Advancing Temple-work: Discovered In a Sermon Preached To the two Houses of Parliament...* London, 1644, 18–21.
276 Richard Vines, *Magnalia Dei ab Aquilone; Set Forth In a Sermon Preached Before The Right Honourable the Lords and Commons, at St Margarets Westminster...* London, 1644, 20–21.
which prevented them from attaining as frequent victories as those godly armies of the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{278} It seems that Palmer was a strong advocate for strict military discipline and argued that God also, not only the secular authorities, was angry if the articles were not followed. He advised that commanders should not be afraid to be severe in purging armies because it was better to be scared of God than of men. The Lord’s command was to observe military discipline and to see that justice was done, and hence he concluded that ‘never be more allowable to feare them [the men] more then God, and to please them with displeasing of God’.\textsuperscript{279}

These sins had concrete effects on military success, but there was always the possibility of redemption. ‘How much Vengeance did God take upon our Untowardnesse within a few Months. Our Armies broken in the West, and broken in the North, Bristoll lost, and Glocester and Hull besieged’, Palmer reminded the Houses of the misfortunes of the year 1643, which had been remedied by the Solemn League and Covenant.\textsuperscript{280} Another minister, Matthew Newcomen, gave a sermon to the Houses in September 1644 on the surrender of Essex’s army in Cornwall. The sins of the Parliamentarians featured heavily as a cause of military disaster. There was to be no victory if God was angered by vain confidence in armies, and even a right cause would not help then. The victory at Marston Moor had made the Parliamentarians proud, and in their pride they had underestimated the enemy. Moreover, humble fasts had become more of a formality than an actual zealous event and if the worshippers’ hearts were not truly in it, deliverance was not to be expected.\textsuperscript{281} Sins were the most important reason for military losses. No other factors were to blame, one should always turn to oneself to examine one’s conduct and behaviour:

\begin{quote}
And therefore let All of us, Parliament-men, Commanders, Souldiers, Citizens, Ministers, People, All of us, o let us search our selves, and enquire in our several Orbes and Activities what our ways have been, that so, if possible, we may find out what and where this sinne is.
\end{quote}

Newcomen claimed that, if he was preaching to the soldiers, he would tell them to look to their own sins, such as drunkenness, blasphemy and rapine, and clear their conscience. In this way, the armies would return to God’s favour and victories would follow.\textsuperscript{282} Thomas Coleman, a minister who preached that same day, singled out three particular explanations for the defeat of the Parliamentarian army, namely the profaneness of the soldiers, their selfish ends and pursuits, and even wilful tactical
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blunders. These sins made the soldiers turn their backs to the enemy. Parliament also had to look to its own sins: Coleman accused the Houses of being inactive in the work of religion and careless with punishing delinquents. Moreover, he suggested that better care should be taken regarding the losses that the war had inflicted on people.\footnote{Thomas Coleman, \textit{Gods unusuall Answer To a Solemne Fast. Or, Some Obervations upon the late sad successe in the West, upon the day immediately following our Publique Humiliation.} London, 1644, 13–16.} The defeat in the west was God’s direct answer to the prayers of blessings for the army of Essex.\footnote{Ibid. 5.} In the eyes of the Puritan clergy, this showed that outward appearances of religiosity were not enough to secure God’s providence.

The surrender of Essex’s army in Cornwall was a perfect example of how actual events influenced religious instruction and how the defeat of a supposedly godly army could be explained. Furthermore, it again showed the active Puritan spirit of influencing one’s own fate. The ministers’ sermons were not about submitting passively to God’s fury. They clearly distinguished different reasons that had caused the setbacks and advised their audience to address these reasons. ‘God is oft corrective, never destructive’, Coleman encouraged, and he counselled that, despite the setback, Parliament still had the right cause, and God was on their side.\footnote{Ibid. 26–27.}

Even though the Parliamentarians were sinners like everyone else, they still were fighting the Lord’s battle. They just had to be better Christians and fix the issues that had made God to turn his back on them. For the godly, sins were something that one had to actively fight against. The best way to do so was to concentrate on winning the war because the success of the armies showed that they were in the right. A good example of the Puritan attitude was an ordinance of Parliament given in February 1645. It expressed concern over the national sins of England and urged the people to repent and humble themselves. Moreover, it singled out two sins in particular from a larger group of common ones such as blaspheming, gaming and excess drinking: idolatry and bloodshed. Both of these were something that could be actively fought against: idolatry by iconoclasm and bloodshed by vengeance.\footnote{An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. \textit{Being An Exhortation to all His Majesties good Subjects in the Kingdome of England, and Dominion of Wales, to the duty of Repentance.} London, 1645.} These methods featured prominently in Puritan preachers’ sermons and transferred the guilt of sin to the enemy, which again reinforced the religious motives for waging the war. For the Royalists, fighting against sin was equally important, but it manifested itself in correcting the language of the soldiers as well as in other small issues that had no real military significance. They often tried to seek forgiveness by praying to God and by submitting to the punishment that the Lord had ordered, not by actively working to achieve success, an outward sign of salvation. Moreover, the
Royalists did not use sin as a weapon of war: they could and did lament ‘the heinous sin of rebellion’ but rarely was the suggested remedy harsh judgement and the shedding of the blood of the rebels. The King’s ministers were more interested in the sins of their own party than those of the enemy.

Military chaplains often associated sin with the lack of courage. They tried to encourage soldiers in their dangerous work. However, there were two kinds of courage, and the clergy, especially the Parliamentarian ministers, made a clear difference between them: rash, foolish bravery and the Christian, calculated valour that stemmed from a relationship with God. That distinction not only highlighted the spiritual nature of the conflict and the godly qualities of the Puritan soldiers participating in it, but it also strengthened the division between the Saints and the King’s men. The latter were, sometimes even by the Royalist ministers, admonished for their reckless bravery that was strictly tied to their sinful behaviour and was not Christian in origin. Hence, the ministers made a clear connection between eliminating the sins of the soldiers and encouraging them. It can be argued that the King’s ministers, for the most part tried to erase sinful behaviour from among the Royalist soldiers, whereas the Parliamentarian preachers concentrated on nourishing the right kind of bravery in the Puritan soldiers.

One method of curbing the soldiers’ sinful activities was by making them afraid of the consequences in life after death. This was what Humphrey Peake did in *Meditations Upon a Seige*. The Royalist minister lamented the soldiers’ swearing, drunkenness and other common outrages and hoped that, instead of these morally questionable actions, the soldiers would turn their minds more to God. Since, as the author knew very well, soldiers were often in mortal danger, it was careless for them to meddle with the location of their afterlife in not paying attention to avoid sin. Or, to put it bluntly, ‘having been instructed as a Christian how much more miserie attends them in another life whose actions are so disorder’d, it is almost past beleife, that men should be so stupid in the midst of danger, and so regardlesse of their charge’.  

Peake stressed the importance of courage in vital actions of warfare, and the means of attaining the right kind of valour. He advised not to mistake rashness for valour and foolhardiness for courage: ‘Fortitude is not blinde, nor a just resolution void of judgement.’ According to him, ‘a well resolved man should know no other feare but the feare of God’.  

The fear of death had a negative effect on courage, but a good soldier – and a good Christian – who lived a good and virtuous life was able to resist the vices that made death a terrible prospect: ‘His discourse of reason is weake, and his spirit weaker, that cannot fortifie himself against it, especially, if he have
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the great help of a well led life to build upon, and the conscience of his pious care to decline those vices, which make death terrible to a wicked man. Since the fear of God would keep soldiers from sin, they did not have to fear death.

As Peake’s example indicates, the Royalist ministers recognised the importance of courage for the soldiers and also the detrimental effects of sin. John Bramhall preached about true courage, which had its roots in religion: ‘the feare of God is the best armour against the feare of man’. Moral reformation was again demanded, for true courage was Christian courage and was not displayed by those who tried to express their courage ‘by roaring and blaspheming over their cup, by unseasonable duells and quarells, by muttering against their Commanders, by tyrannising over their inferiours, by trampling under foot all Lawes both of God and man’. Such actions were cowardice, rather, and Bramhall’s definition, not by accident, included many of the vices generally associated with the Royalists, such as duelling, swearing and drinking. There was a clear intention to erase the sinful behaviour of the Cavaliers in order to attain the true courage that would win the war. It is interesting that both Bramhall and Peake – two of only a few Royalist authors who wrote instructions for soldiers against fear – brought up the fear of God. It is tempting to see this emphasis as another example of Royalist passivity and pessimism. There certainly was a logical point in arguing that the fear of God helped against the fear of death, but it also contained a submissive element that encouraged the observance of moral norms out of dread and anxiety. Certainly, Parliamentarian instruction contained these same strands of thought, as we shall see, but in general it approached the problem from a positive angle. ‘Make your peace with God to prepare for death’ was probably more comforting than ‘be afraid of God to prepare for death’ as well as allowing a more active pursuit of attaining courage. It seems that, for Royalist ministers, the main goal was not to encourage soldiers but rather to succeed in a moral reformation of the King’s armies, and being brave in the face of death was only a by-product of abstaining from sin. The way the King’s ministers treated sins indicates that the eradication of certain moral infractions was a high priority for the Royalist clergy, and underlining the fear of God should be seen in this context in addition to being an instrument of giving courage.

From a Christian standpoint, the fear of death had much to do with religion. Believers were scared into submission by the narrative of everlasting punishment for sins. A Puritan pastor of Darsham, John Eachard, personified this fear into Satan, who fought against all men by the fear of death and hell. Eachard presented the blood of the Lamb, Christ’s sacrifice for the sins of men and his example
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of conquering death as encouraging factors. Belief in this sacrifice cleansed men from their sins and made it unnecessary to fear death, the devil or man. Eachard preached of sins such as whoredom and drinking and explicitly connected these with the bravery of the soldiers: ‘For whoredom & drunkenness make men an evil conscience, and an evil conscience make men fearfull.’ Even though the soldiers thought that wine would make them valiant, Eachard strongly dispelled the idea.

An instructional pamphlet for the Puritan soldiers, The Christian Souldiers Magazine, dealt with courage quite extensively and echoed Eachard’s claim of the necessity of disposing of sin. Moreover, it gave tangible advice to soldiers on how to get rid of their fear. They should think about the joys of Heaven, which far surpassed those of Earth. A spiritually pure warrior of God was expected to behave in such a way that he could enjoy those blessings after dying for the cause of the Lord, in other words, to avoid sins in order to achieve a clear conscience. One could also examine one’s fears and overcome them by rational thinking. The only thing a Christian should be afraid of was God. Nothing else was so terrifying in comparison. Finally, it was important to get rid of sin, for it brought fear with it. The fact that this type of advice was published for the Parliamentarian soldiers denotes how sin played a big part in trying to encourage the Puritan armies.

This issue had already been treated in May 1642 by Simeon Ashe, a Presbyterian minister, who would later join the Parliament’s army as a chaplain to Lord Mandeville’s (later Earl of Manchester, commander of the army of the Eastern Association) regiment of foot and who would ride among the soldiers exhorting them at the battle of Edgehill. His sermon, Good Courage Discovered, prominently featured the benefits of and the ways to attaining courage. According to Ashe, ‘those who are commended for the most valiant Champions, and the stoutest soldiers in the Campe of Christ, that they were the most timorous in matter of sinne, and most cautious in references to God, that they might not in any kind offend His Majesty’. He also made a sharp distinction between the two kinds of courage:

Shall I thinke that a man that will sweare, and roare, and curse, and pox, and plague[...] shall I thinke that this man of Beliall hath Christian courage? Hee may have morall magnanimity, as an heathen, as a Romane, but he wants the courage of a Saint, that courage which my Text cals for.
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Thus, the different kinds of courage were explicitly tied to sin. True Christian courage was devoid of sin, whereas the other kind of bravery was nourished by it: ‘there is a devilish, wretched resolutelys in the bosomes of some to hold on in sinne; not withstanding divine reprehensions, convictions, threatnings, and executions; which is as much opposite to true courage, as the greatest cowardliness in the world.’295 This same true religious courage was propagated by a member of the Assembly of Divines, Gaspar Hickes, who declared that God, as the Lord of Hosts, made some of his servants brave warriors and that there was a difference between holy valour and the more base fortitude of lesser men. This latter, unholy courage made men more prone to do harm, degenerated into rage and manifested in murder and revenge. The defining factor between the right and wrong types of courage, as well as between courage and cowardice, was sin.296

Like Ashe and Hickes, William Bridge discussed the right kind of courage in his sermon published in early 1643. He not only emphasised Christian courage that stemmed from the avoidance of sin but also quite explicitly juxtaposed the wrong kind of courage and the Royalists. The words he used were from the second book of Samuel, 10:12: ‘Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God, and the Lord do that which seemeth him good.’ Bridge was not seeking common bravery. Moral boldness and natural audacity were the qualities of heathens and beasts respectively. The right kind of courage was also different from ‘vaunting, bragging, boasting Cavalierisme; which hath no true courage’. Bridge wanted his audience to show Christian courage: ‘It is that gracious disposition of heart, whereby a man being called by God unto any service, he does adventure upon difficulties; either in doing good, or enduring evill, and that without fear.’ Sin was again the defining factor:

> There is a sinfull desperatenesse whereby men are apt and ready to rush upon all that is evill; and are sinfully bold, and they thinke him a foole or a child that will not drink and be drunke, and whore, and run into all kinde of evill: this is not good courage.297

Bridge also had tangible advice for attaining Christian courage. One had to make sure God was with him and should only attempt tasks with His promise of assistance. One should also avoid things that could trouble one’s spirit, namely idleness, worldliness, and false courage. Sins were naturally to be kept away:

297 Bridge, A Sermon Preached unto the Voluntiers, 3–8.
Be sure of this that you keep your conscience clear: A bad conscience is very timorous, the righteous are as bold as a Lion, but the unrighteous that have any conscience left are as fearfull as a Doe, be sure therefore that you keep your conscience cleer.

Furthermore, Bridge reminded his audience of the miracles performed by God in 1642, which indicated that Providence was working for Parliament. His last piece of advice was praying. Bridge spoke in simple terms to simple men, but there was no doubt that abstaining from sin was quite important in encouraging these volunteers:

Your cause is good, for that must needs be good that Religion maketh so; your enemies are weake, for they must needs be weake that sin makes weak; your victory is certain, which the Scripture promiseth, and first or last the victory shall be to you.

Since sin was seen as detrimental to courage, fear of sin could be used to lessen the fear of dying. A collection of sermons by a nonconformist minister Tobias Crisp illustrated how pervasive the role of religion was in the instruction of soldiers. According to Crisp, no weapon against the church of Christ prospered and, therefore, the members of that church should not be afraid. The souls of the Saints were safe, for if they were killed in a battle, they were taken to heaven.

When a man shall stand in the face of an enemy, and the bullets flie about him on every side; if when he shall thus think with himself, What if one of these should hit me, what shall become of me? Whither should I go? If he can but say in true faith, Heaven is mine, and Christ is mine, I shall go presently unto God my Father[…] I cannot have a better turn done unto me, then by one of these messengers, to be sent presently thither.

Crisp reinforced the notion that a soldier should be religious and have true Protestant faith. Those who were not members of Christ’s party faced only hell. However, even a true believer could not be free of sin. Thus, Crisp suggested that death was nothing to be feared, because it terminated once and for all the possibility of doing sin:

Now the sword that enters into the hearts of the Believers, and members of Christ, that sword at one thrust perfectly cures all the ulcers of sinfulnesse, that there shall never arise any more after that; Now what hurt is there in that spear, that cures in stead of killing?
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Philip Skippon also wrote much about courage. For an experienced professional soldier, conquering one’s fear was a top priority. Skippon certainly had recognised this need during his long career, and he also acknowledged that religious instruction was a convenient method of dealing with a lack of courage and fear of death. According to him, death was a most natural thing appointed by God to all men. The time and manner of it was predestined, and no one could deliver himself from it. Hence, because death was unavoidable, one should not fear it but rather embrace it when the time came because it freed one from sin and all worldly concerns and troubles and was the beginning of eternal life in heaven.301 One can easily enough see how creating and strengthening this kind of mindset could be beneficial for people in professions in which the danger of encountering deadly violence was continuously present. Skippon instructed soldiers to turn to God when going against their enemies or in other perilous tasks. God either assisted his people or, if he had decreed otherwise, gave them a good death and took their souls to his kingdom. Thus, no matter what the outcome was, there were benefits for the Christian soldier in every alternative.302 Later Skippon expanded this advice, making death and preparation for it some of the central points of *True Treasure*. He urged his readers to be good Christians, to pray sincerely and often and to avoid sin in order to make one’s peace with God. The latter was crucial because the sin

will or may most violate his sweet peace with his sweet God, most trouble his mind, terrifie his conscience, makes him most fear Gods displeasure for the present, and would most affright his soul if he were ready to dye, and had not assurance they were pardoned.

As Skippon put it: ‘Thus dying to sinne, and living to grace daily, the sting of death which is sin unrepentent of, may be plucked out thoroughly, so shall death have no power to hurt me.’ Avoiding sin was beneficial for courage: ‘the cure of the feare of death is furthered by it; for having peace with God through Jesus Christ, neither sinne nor affliction, nor death, nor devill, nor hell, shall ever be able to harme us’.303 Hence, even a professional soldier such as Skippon made use of religious methods of encouragement that heavily featured abstinance from sin. In *The Souldiers Catechisme*, Ram echoed this viewpoint. If one’s conscience was clear and one had made his peace with God, it was easier to operate in deadly situations without the weight of sin on one’s shoulders.304

In *A Spirituall Snapsacke*, the problem of sin was spelled out at the beginning: ‘Man is borne to sorrow, because borne in sinne, and his insensible security is his chiefest misery; common Souldiers
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and common Saylors are most commonly under the shadow of death.’\textsuperscript{305} The pamphlet exhorted Parliamentarian soldiers to pay attention to spiritual warfare as well as physical and to wear armour against the enemies of one’s soul. Making peace with God involved a good conscience, which in turn helped against the fear of death.

You are in danger of Death every moment, you know you walke in the Valley of the shadow thereof, if you have noe Interest in Christ, your case is sad, if you have, and yet a guilty Conscience of a loose and carelesse and negligent life and Conversation; alas! How can you expire, and breath out your soules into the hands of God with a cheerefull and comfortable Spirit?\textsuperscript{306}

The approaches to sin in the armies highlighted the distinct methods of religious instruction that the Parliamentarians and Royalists used. As in other topics of spiritual guidance, the Puritans succeeded in combining shared theological premises, such as the concept of sin, with a tangible military concern. They paid attention to meaningful infractions and reinforced the prohibition of these with religious viewpoints. They encouraged the soldiers and gave them concrete advice to help them wrestle with their fear of death. Even when they acknowledged that military defeats were due to their own sins, the ministers exhorted their audience to actively pursue a change for the better, and they never stopped reminding their soldiers that their cause was right. The Royalists, by contrast, were more concerned with their own sins than with the effects of sin on their armies’ performance in the war. Their solution was praying for forgiveness, not vigorous spiritual combat that manifested itself in active works of war. Minor moral infractions, such as swearing, were seen as huge problems, and furthermore, these sins were not addressed as much as a detriment to the army’s success as they were a personal distaste of the King and his chaplains. Hence, their connection with the realities of war were shaky at best, even though their value for propaganda purposes cannot be denied.
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4. SAINTS AND MARTYRS

The Civil War was a calamitous event that had to be justified to the people and especially to the soldiers fighting it. In the upheaval of the established social order, God was brought forward as a reason and cause, and the Lord featured heavily as an explanatory factor in the sermons and literature intended for the soldiers. This was true especially of the Puritan clergy. Even before the war in England had really started, Parliamentarian ministers tried to portray the looming conflict in religious terms, and they continued this portrayal all the way through the first Civil War. For them, there was no question about the legitimacy of rising up in arms against their sovereign. From the very beginning, they equated Parliament’s cause with that of God. The Royalist authors, for their part, were more concerned about the legal issues of armed resistance against a lawful monarch. God had a place in the King’s cause as well, but in a significantly different form.

From these different religious viewpoints, it is possible to discern certain images that contemporaries used to idealize and portray the men fighting on both sides of the conflict. These can be summed up in two distinct categories: saints and martyrs. The former was far more widely used by those fighting for Parliament to signify a soldier that fought for God’s cause against the forces of the anti-Christ. It was an active vocation, in which a Puritan soldier threw himself at the mercy of the Lord by seeking his approval, signified by success in battles. The belief in one’s personal part as a member of God’s army in the eschatological war being fought reinforced the conviction that the Puritan soldier was on the right side and benefited from divine providence.

The opposite role, that of a martyr, was often used by Royalist clerics to describe those fighting for the King. Whereas Parliamentarian sainthood was constructed as an active role with a clear purpose that could be attained by one’s own actions, martyrdom was more passive and submissive. Accepting God’s judgement on one’s own fate was crucial to both viewpoints, but a Saint vigorously tried to make that fate beneficial for himself through his own activity. Martyrs were advised only to pray, and their consolation was that, if they fell in battle, they would be received in heaven. There was no active component in Royalist martyrdom, and while the King’s armies and some of their commanders did not lack initiative, bravery or purpose, the ministers preaching for the King’s cause failed to give religious inspiration and motivation to the soldiers at the same level as the Puritan ministers’ preaching did.307

307 Here it should be mentioned, for clarity’s sake, that the type of martyrdom that the Royalists advocated was naturally based on early Christian martyrs who endured violent deaths because of their faith. Although the concept of martyrdom evolved as competing traditions emerged, the most prominent feature was still dying for the cause, not the cause that
The idea of sainthood was already explored before the Civil War started in England. It highlighted several issues that were seen as crucial to soldiers, such as good courage, preparation for death, and abstaining from sin. Here we can see how the Saint was imagined and portrayed long before the New Model Army came into existence, and we can also see the template for constructing the notion of active sainthood that the Puritan ministers used and the Royalists did not.

Sir Simon Harcourt was a soldier and an officer, having made his career in the United Provinces. Later, he served the King in both Bishops’ Wars and in Ireland against the rebels there. In March 1642, he died of wounds that he had received in an attack against Carrickmain Castle. His funeral was held in Dublin on 31 March, where Edward Dunstervill, a Bachelor of Divinity, took the opportunity to preach about the qualities of a good soldier to his audience in mourning.

Dunstervill underlined Harcourt’s devotion to religious pursuits and his faithfulness to God and his own conscience. Indeed, the minister even testified that, just before he was wounded, Sir Simon had reproached a soldier for swearing. In the sermon, Harcourt was compared to the biblical king Josiah, a godly prince who was slain by enemy archers. According to Dunstervill, God honoured his saints who were wounded and died in the Lord’s cause. The example of the death of godly men in battle despite their religiosity, such as Josiah and Harcourt, could discourage some men, and to these Dunstervill had advice: ‘God hath made you men, quit yourselves like men, for shame feare not to bee made honourable: besides consider how Christ was smitten wounded and slaine for thy sake, why then will you feare to suffer the hazard of wound or of life for his sake.’ As the chance of dying in battle was high (and even higher chance of dying from disease, infectious wounds and other common plights in an army), Dunstervill exhorted every soldier and officer to prepare themselves spiritually before taking to the field, to make their peace with God. Because of his dangerous occupation, it was imperative for a soldier to have a good conscience, a strong belief that, if killed, he would be received by Christ in heaven. It was not only for himself that a soldier should avoid sin, however. According to Dunstervill, a cursing, swearing soldier could bring a curse over an entire army, even if he fought courageously. Thus, good, godly men and religious commanders were very important to an army, and

lead to death. Therefore, this has to be distinguished from the more modern discourses of martyrdom, which highlight active militancy and fighting without regard for one’s own life. Royalist martyrdom was passive suffering, not active pursuing. For early modern concepts of martyrdom in England, see Thomas S. Freeman, ‘“Imitatio Christi with a Vengeance”: the Politicisation of Martyrdom in Early Modern England’ in Thomas S. Freeman and Thomas F. Mayer (eds.), Martyrs and Martyrdom in England c. 1400–1700. The Boydell Press, 2007, 51–54.
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he lamented hearing rumours of sin and negligence among soldiers, such as not humbling oneself on fast days, drunkenness and an abundance of oaths.\textsuperscript{310}

Dunstervill’s sermon can be seen, in addition to honouring the fallen colonel, as a classic example of religious instructional rhetoric to soldiers. Dunstervill preached about Sir Simon’s religious qualities and noted the importance of those qualities for an individual soldier as well as for the army as a whole. Furthermore, he gave substantial advice to his audience on how to attain sainthood. A soldier had to understand that he was fighting the Lord’s battle, and dying in the field was honourable and glorious, not something to be feared. One also had to cultivate one’s religiosity by preparing oneself for death and by avoiding sin, which could bring misfortune over oneself and the entire army.

This example of a sermon on military affairs illustrates that, even before the Civil War began, local ministers were not unfamiliar with themes such as sainthood and the cause of God. They recognised certain inconveniences that were common to soldiers, such as fear, and tried to address these problems with religious indoctrination. Next, I turn to England to examine how this religious indoctrination was developed in the emerging conflict between the King and Parliament, and how the image of a warrior saint was cultivated mainly by the latter side.

The eschatological nature of the impending war was stressed by the Puritan clergy. At the same time as Harcourt’s funeral sermon in March, another sermon was given in London by Mr. John Spencer, a ‘Sometime Groom to a Nobleman’. Not much is known of him, but he had published a treatise the previous year that defended lay preaching, which probably explains how a groom ended up preaching in a parish church.\textsuperscript{311} The topic of Spencer’s sermon was spiritual warfare. He established that God’s people were Christ’s soldiers and that they should be prepared to fight because God intended it. A battle between the church and the Devil required soldiers to fight for the Lord.\textsuperscript{312} These soldiers were the Saints of God, whose first weapon was their holy and godly life.\textsuperscript{313} In the struggle against the anti-Christ, they had to be ready to lose their estates, liberty, and even their lives for Jesus and his cause.\textsuperscript{314} The different sides were clearly established: ‘if thou be not Christs, thou must of necessity be the devils souldier’, Spencer wrote, and added that ‘if you be souldiers of the devil, you fight
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against Jesus Christ’.  

Hence, he was busy setting the stage for the conflict between the King and Parliament, and the latter made use of these theological arguments in the armed struggle. It is possible that Spencer was later a chaplain in the New Model Army, where he would probably have continued to uphold his thesis about the Saints of God fighting against the Antichristian enemy.

Stephen Marshall also constructed this notion of sainthood in his sermon *Meroz Cursed*. The sermon proved to be so popular that reprints were published during the war years until 1645, which can be taken to signify, along with its commercial value, the importance of its content. Marshall wrote that those who joined in God’s cause were blessed, and the cause itself was good, noble and successful. ‘The Church is our Mother, and all the Saints are our Brethren’ he claimed before portraying the current situation in Ireland as an eschatological conflict fought between Christ and the anti-Christ:

> How many are there who have as it were entred their names into the Dragons muster-book, openly bidding defiance against the Church of Christ, in every good cause? Who walke Antipodes against the cause of God, like Antiochus, making war against the Saints, like the little horne in Daniel, wearing out the Saints of the most high in all places where they can prevail?

He tried to propagate godliness among his audience, to make them fit to serve the church. The Lord’s instruments had to be godly, he claimed, for ‘men are never numbred among the Lambs followers, their names are not entred into his List, until they be Saints’. Although the real fighting was yet confined to Ireland, Marshall saw that there was a possibility that the Lord had need of his chosen people elsewhere in the future:

> And in whatsoever else the Lord and his Church may have any need of you, remember that Gods blessing is upon them that come to helpe him: and that Meroz, and with Meroz all others are cursed, who come not out to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

The same themes were propagated by Simeon Ashe, who preached before the commanders of the military forces of London in May 1642. From his sermon, just as from the sermons of Spencer and Marshall, we can see how certain characteristics of the looming conflict were portrayed to the soldiers who would be fighting it. His sermon is also a perfect example of how religion was seamlessly introduced as a method of guidance for the soldiers. In addition to encouraging the men and giving
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them advice, Ashe also gave them a reason to fight and constructed a godly community among them, reinforcing their personal ties to each other and their commitment to God’s cause. Everything was connected in the Puritan idea of war.

Ashe preached on *Psalm 31:24*, ‘Bee of good courage, and hee shall strengthen thine heart, and wait I say on the Lord’. The crucial thing here, besides rather self-evident advice to soldiers about the importance of courage, was how Ashe envisioned the audience for whom this passage was intended: ‘The Persons counselled, they are Saints’.\(^{320}\) This Christian courage was different from the fortitude expressed by heathens. It rose from the love of God, it was directed towards obedience to the Christian guidance of the Bible, and its end was God – the aim and purpose of every act and undertaking. The people who displayed this kind of courage were the people of God, namely saints.\(^{321}\) Against them were arrayed the armies of devils, lusts, and men and women of the world, all of whom assaulted good Christians. Courage was needed in this fight.\(^{322}\) A swearing, cursing man of Belial might have had moral courage but never Christian courage. Ashe was speaking to ‘men that must labour to be men valiant, as becommeth Saints’.\(^{323}\)

Ashe claimed that showing Christian courage would make one favoured by God. Then the Lord himself would be with His soldier no matter how difficult the situation. The certainty of knowing this was a large part of courage, which would then hearten a soldier fighting for the cause of God (and for Church, the honour of the King, and the peace and prosperity of the Kingdom, Ashe added). This soldier of God would be relentless in his endeavours, keep himself from ‘conscience-wasting, and scandalous miscarriages’, daunt his enemies with his courage and propagate it and its effects with his friends.\(^{324}\)

There were many means of attaining this kind of courage, and Ashe preached about these methods to his audience in detail. A right cause and good conscience were crucial, for the knowledge of and belief in God’s perpetual presence could make the saints courageous and confident. This presence, however, could only be ensured by making sure not to waver in the cause of God. A soldier had to understand that he should fight with a good conscience and for a just cause. If one was not prepared to defend one’s cause, he was prone to lose it. The example of Christ was helpful, Ashe claimed. It was worthwhile to consider often the many sufferings of Jesus if one happened to be a hungry, tired
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soldier. By doing this, little misfortunes such as cold weather, scorching heat, wounds, broken bones, and insufficient diet would not discourage him. The clergyman also recognised the importance of comradery, for he commended mutual Christian communion to his hearers and unity and love between them to reinforce their shared godly identity. This love should reach far and wide. Ashe gave an example: according to him, women were ‘the more feeble, the more fearefull Sexe’ but a woman was ready to do anything to save her child. ‘Love doth it’, he concluded. There was also a promise of reward. Those who worked for the Lord could expect his assistance and good success as well as compensation. Furthermore, when seeking Christian courage, a soldier should meditate on the miracles that God had performed on the battlefield. There had been accidents with exploding muskets and gunpowder barrels, and according to Ashe, divine providence had prevented the bodily harm of the people involved. Thinking of these examples of God’s guiding and protecting hand would increase one’s courage and allow one to show it valiantly in whatever endeavour was at hand.  

Thus, Ashe was trying to establish that Parliamentary efforts were godly and that the people involved were saints working for the Lord. He also tried to give his audience concrete tools to construct this saintly identity. To that end, he gave tangible advice on how to develop and sustain Christian courage, which not only had its benefits as an encouraging factor but also reinforced the idea of God’s people in juxtaposition to those without right valour and only heathen audacity. The portrayal of Christian courage was seen as proof of divine providence and hence formed a positive loop, in which the courage of a soldier was strengthened by the strong belief that God was with him, which in turn allowed him to perform actions that required bravery and rewarded him with increased faith in what he was doing. The importance of a solid cause in a just war under a lawful authority could not be neglected, especially when there were doubts about the legitimacy of Parliament’s actions against the King. And even if some soldiers in the audience did not take heed to these words, religion was certainly a tool that could be used to nourish qualities that would be useful to an army on an individual level as well as in helping create a saintly community of soldiers.

We can see that the Puritan ministers constructed the eschatological framework for the emerging conflict at a very early stage. We can also see that these ministers, such as Marshall and Ashe, were later very active in the Parliamentarian war effort. This was true of Thomas Case as well, who attended the battle of Edgehill as a military chaplain.  His book, based on his sermons, was published on 20 August 1642, only two days before the King raised his royal standard in Nottingham.
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and the war officially began. In the dedication, Case warned against indecisiveness in the cause of the Lord and likened neutrals to the enemies of Christ: ‘He that is not with me, is against me.’ His sermon was instrumental in constructing Parliamentarian sainthood and stressing the religious nature of the conflict: the battle was for God’s cause against the anti-Christ.

The persecution of God’s people featured strongly in Case’s pamphlet. Not until God’s enemies had committed their sins fully were the punishment and revenge laid upon them. These sins had usually much to do with persecuting the people of God. For example, the Lord had stirred up the spirit of the reformers to protest against the Antichristian Papacy, and because of this, the Saints of God were persecuted lately. It was the duty of the Saints to wait for God even – and especially – when ‘under the pressures and oppressions of wicked men’. Salvation was coming for those with patience.

According to Case, the age of the downfall of the anti-Christ was at hand. He interpreted the Book of Revelation to calculate that the Romish beast was soon going to fall and that the Saints and people of God would be triumphant. It was, however, first necessary to arrange the ruin of the anti-Christ in England because ‘he must dye abroad[...] before he die at Rome in Saint Peters chaire’. Case stressed that the looming conflict was just and that it would be fought for God’s cause. ‘But if you will remember what an eminent and mighty arme God put forth in calling this Parliament together[...] can ye think God hath done all this to let England perish?’ Case reminded and encouraged his audience:

> Though you have no equall power to encounter your enemies in battell; yet your God is the Lord of Hosts, and if he doe but give the word, he can have Armies enough to attend him to the battell[...] your prayers will doe more than your enemies weapons, for prayer will bring God, the Lord of Hosts into the Army, and then woe be to them; the victory is yours.

Thus, Case claimed that unwavering faith in God’s assistance and prayer were important to the success of the present endeavour. The nature of the concrete enemy was still vague, however, for he exhorted people to ‘pray for the King, his Queen, and Children, the Parliament and Kingdom; while our enemies look on, and all they can doe is to curse and swear’. Rather than defining the wicked men – which Case did in broad terms only, naming the usual suspects such as the Popish and the
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Irish—Case’s work was about ensuring that his audience understood that Parliament stood for Christ and his cause and that there were certain signs of Providence to be interpreted and actions to be done in order to be reckoned among the Saints. This was echoed in another sermon by Case, in which he exclaimed: ‘The swarms of that Babylonish brood of Jesuits, Priests, and Papists, who ly in their Trenches ready to surprize us upon advantage[…] these, I say it is to be feared, do exceed the number of the Assyrian Army: The God of Angels make you like the Angel of God, to smite them all’, though he added that this violence should target popery rather than the Papists and ministry rather that scandalous ministers. However, the message about the religious nature of the conflict was evident, and it was repeated by the Puritans again and again throughout the war.

Since it was established that the conflict was to be waged for the cause of God by his saints, Case expressed this active sainthood in his printed sermon. According to him, it was not enough to resist with tears and sighs, which was precisely what the Royalist ministers offered as a solution. ‘I tell you, you must suffer greater matters, you must resist to bloud. Ye have not yet resisted unto bloud’, he argued and warned that the sins of the enemy were still increasing. Persecution was the forerunner of deliverance, Case exclaimed, and mentioned Luther as an example of a true Saint of God who fought against the antichristian Papists. Even though Case advised the saints to wait for God and his deliverance from evil, it was important to show personal effort too. The ingredients in waiting were faith, patience, diligence and activity. ‘He that waiteth for a mercie, must serve Gods providence in the use of all the means which God hath sanctified for the accomplishment thereof[…] Waiting without diligence is nothing but slothfulnesse and security.’ Case exhorted his audience to help the Lord against the mighty and to enlarge Sion ‘either by command, authority, learning, riches, counsel, encouragements or prayers’. ‘Prepare to meet your enemies’, he said, ‘with all kind of artillery both

333 Case did write a lot about the enemy, but in such ambiguous words that it was possible to create one’s own interpretations within certain boundaries. This was quite clever, for in summer of 1642 the upcoming military conflict was not that certain regarding the participants, sides, and most importantly, the outcome. Suffice it to say that the enemies were those who were behind every woe of the kingdom, real or imagined, while on the other side were suffering Protestants, the people of God and the Saints. In the end the enemies were to be destroyed. See ibid. 100–111.
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of nature and grace’. Hence, Case explicitly clarified that, in the war against the Antichrist, a saint had to be active and had to propagate and advance the cause of God by his own actions.

Equating God’s cause with that of Parliament was naturally important in the debate over the lawfulness of the Civil War in general. Kingship was seen as divinely ordained, and it was not evident whether those rising in arms against their sovereign would escape judgement and punishment in the next life. Hence, there were many doubts about Parliament’s cause, and it fell on the shoulders of the ministers to dispel these fears. This was mostly done, as Case’s example showed, by portraying Parliament’s war as God’s war. This was also the view of Richard Ward in *The Anatomy of Warre*. From the very beginning, Ward admitted his loyalties, stating that Parliament’s wars were lawful because their cause was religion and ‘the Republiques good’ and the lawful authority of ‘the greatest magistrates’ was behind them. He argued that it was lawful for Christians to make war under the Gospel, and he justified this with divine encouragement:

> That which God perswades unto, and which is done by the inspiration and assistance of his holy Spirit, is lawfull; but God often perswades and exhorts the Saints to make warre, and is said to be present with them by his spirit, and to give victory unto them; and therefore warre is lawfull.

He also claimed that ‘That which the Saints doe by faith is lawfull unto them, but by faith they make warre[...] therefore warre is lawfull unto them’. It seems that Ward noted early on that the conflict did not only have a religious quality to it but that it also had the possibility of obtaining a holy cause that would both inspire soldiers and legitimize their warlike actions by faith. The concept of a rightful war waged at the command of divine authority might not have been new, but the Puritan theologians grasped it firmly for the purposes of the English Civil War. As one godly minister, Lewis Hughes, commented, the devil and the Papists were opposing Christ and Parliament:

> Now the Devill and the Pope do see, that by the blessing of God on this Parliament, their kingdom shall go down, and the kingdom of Christ shall be established in this Land. Therefore they (I mean the Devill and the Pope) do stir up all their friends, the luke-warm Protestants, whom Christ hath threatened to spew out of his mouth, to joyn with their best friends, the Papists, against the Parliament.
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This eschatological interpretation of the war was fuelled by anti-Catholicism in the Puritan ministers’ explanations of the causes and reasons for Parliament’s resistance to the King.

Jeremiah Burroughs, an Independent minister, put it this way in his sermon: ‘those who have a special interest in this God[…] they should have spirits full of courage, and fortitude[…] he [God] loves to see the shine of his wisdom upon the spirits of his Saints[…] He is the Lord of Hosts, he loves to see a spirit of valour, a spirit of magnanimity in them.’ For Burroughs, as for many other Parliamentarian preachers, the conflict was clearly between the saints and those who opposed God. ‘And is it not this the vomit of our adversaries at this day, who are drunke with malice and rage against us, yea, against Christ himself and his Saints?’, he asked. According to Burroughs, there were two captains in the world, under whose command everybody served, namely the Lord of Hosts and the Devil. All wicked men were under the latter, but the Saints were honoured to serve God. The Saints were warriors, for God bred up ‘all his children to bee Souldiers, there are none in heaven but were bred Souldiers, & as they grew up were brought up in military discipline’. Those soldiers that God chose to participate in his battles were called God’s sanctified ones. Burroughs established the religious quality of the conflict as he expressed the spiritual requirements of these godly soldiers:

Those are fittest to venture their lives in fight, who are able to see beyond life, to see what is on the other side of the shore of this mortality, even eternall life and glory: All the Saints, especially in these days, should be ful of spirit, strong in the might of the Lord, because Jesus Christ is about to pul down that great enemy of his, That man of sin, and in his conquest, he is said to come with his garments dipt in blood.

As the Lord of Hosts, God was able to maintain and strengthen the armies that fought for his cause. Burroughs emphasised that God was present in his people’s struggle and especially in his soldiers’ battles.

This doctrine of the cause of God was propagated directly to Parliamentarian soldiers in addition to both Houses and the general public. John Shawe instructed soldiers in his sermon to the army of Lord Ferdinando Fairfax. Shawe declared that the soldiers should be holy and that they should take God with them as they went into battle. Sin was to be left behind, and the cause had to be right as was now
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the case with Parliament and the Puritan religion.\textsuperscript{349} In the sermon, Shawe advised the soldiers to take Christ as their general and reminded them that their calling was lawful if it was for the advancement of true religion, not for the pursuit of the own ends.\textsuperscript{350}

A godly preacher, William Bridge, tried to motivate the soldiers in their cause, making sure they believed it to be both religiously and secularly sanctioned. He told them that they were bulwarks of England under God and that the Protestant religion, and thus their service, was very honourable. The worst thing that could happen was death, but it was not to be feared. Bridge quoted Seneca, remarking that it was better to die for the cause of God on a battlefield than to die of sickness in one’s bed. For those who were afraid of taking up arms against the King (although he claimed to be sure that there were no such thoughts in any of his hearers), he justified the taking up of arms for the defence of the Kingdom without the King’s command. Parliament was allowed to defend itself, and the biblical example of David and Saul proved as much.\textsuperscript{351} He also presented the message of the lawful war of God’s armies to the Parliamentarian soldiers while addressing the officers of Norfolk in the dedication of his pamphlet published in the summer of 1643. Bridge proclaimed the soldiers’ profession to be honourable and reminded them that the task – destroying Jesuits and their nests – was good. The cause was lawful by the authority of Parliament. Its armies marched under ‘as many prayers as ever English Armies did’, for God and the country.\textsuperscript{352}

The religious community that the ministers wanted to propagate and nourish within the Parliamentarian armies was not only a theological matter. It would be a simplification to draw conclusions from what the godly preachers exclaimed about the dual – spiritual and concrete – nature of the conflict. What was thundered from the pulpit did not necessarily portray the soldiers’ thoughts on the war. For most of them, the tangible threat of their enemies in the flesh was probably more horrifying than some vague images of Satan and his angels. Neither did proclamations of an army of saints make the army any more saintly than other armies. However, in the case of Puritan religious thought, there were clear instructions to foster the communities of godly men in the Parliamentarian armies. From early on, godly ministers and authors tried to create the brotherhood of the saints among the soldiers, and not only by underlining the eschatological nature of the Civil War but also by giving concrete advice to the armies.
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The good, religious cause was propagated in John Price’s religious manual *A Spirituall Snapsacke For the Parliament Souldiers*. In the dedication to the Earl of Essex, Price clearly envisioned his preferred audience, hoping that ‘this small Snapsacke, upon the strictest search of your dilligent Sentinels, and approbation thereof, may freely passe among your Common Souldiers’.353

A good cause was even more important for the Parliamentarians than it was for the Royalists because it was arguably harder to justify armed resistance against the King. *A Spirituall Snapsacke* reflected this and bespoke of its author’s knowledge of the pamphlets and tracts that address this issue. He mentioned, for example, John Goodwin’s *Anti-cavalierisme*354 as a justification of defensive arms against which were only such people as Papists, atheists, prelates, delinquents and prophane wretches. A Parliamentarian soldier fought for God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, who worked in the hearts of the Saints. At the time, Price still professed that this soldier fought for the King too, ‘for his authority, which is greater then his personall Commands’. Charles had to be saved from his malignant counsellors.355

Price addressed the cause of the Parliamentarian war effort and also advised soldiers on how to forge religious bonds between each other. It was, first of all, intended for those soldiers who had a ‘spiritual palate’, whose delight was God’s word. The author was clearly aware of the markedly different qualities of the men when it came to their spirituality and faith. Price actually admitted that the godliness he sought was rare among common soldiers, and God’s ordinances were not obeyed in the soldiers’ march. Thus, this pamphlet was very important for the religious instruction and comfort of the men, who were subject to many hardships and troubles, such as cold, hunger, wounds and sores. As the author himself wrote, ‘in outward troubles inward comfort refresheth the minde’.356

Price suggested praying to deal with such problems. Prayer was necessary to attain certain blessings from the Lord, such as skill, courage and valour, and to make hardships easier to deal with. Moreover, it could foster unity among the soldiers, a religious harmony that strengthened the bonds of sainthood. According to Price, the spirits of prayer and supplication and of faith and confidence were something that could be propagated unto others in order to strengthen their morale and give them tools to deal
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with certain psychological problems they might encounter. These religious bonds were seen as crucial by Parliamentarians in ensuring that their armies fought for lawful causes in the Christian way and in unity. Spiritual, religious guidance was a tool for fostering the community and the brotherhood of Parliamentarian soldiers, and it was used early in the war by the godly clergy.

One person of particular interest in underlining the importance of setting an example in a godly community was Philip Skippon. He recognised the power of an example and sought to propagate it to his audience. In the hierarchical structure of an army, it was important for officers to behave in a way that the rank and file could take as a model and adjust their own conduct accordingly. Skippon stressed the importance of outward appearances and guided his readers ‘In the Leaguer to carry our selves as in the sight of God in all Christian wisdome, sincerely and with all circumspection before men worthily’. In addition, he instructed people to edify others in all places and occasions and by every possible means. Setting an example was something that other Parliamentarian writers and ministers had emphasised in the context of military community. It can easily be seen as constituting the saintly brotherhood that the New Model Army was so famous for. It was not only inclusive but also exclusive: Skippon advised that it was good ‘To eschew evill company continually’. Apparently, some people were so wicked that they were best left to their own devices. These people included, for example, atheists and idolaters, sectaries, swearers and blasphemers, traitors, Cavaliers, drunkards, idle persons, whores and those who enjoyed their services.

In *The Christian Centurians Observations*, Skippon continued to stress the importance of examples. The Bible contained stories about several soldiers, and Skippon presented these as exemplary cases of godly persons, illustrating the qualities that made these men special. This way, his audience could notice the attributes and actions that were regarded as useful for those aspiring to be saints in arms. David was the first example of praying to, and trusting in, God in difficult situations. Another Israelite from the Old Testament, Joshua, was the second example. He was a portrait of humbleness and fear of God as well as strictness in punishing vice and obedience to the Lord of Hosts in his military pursuits. The Centurion of Capernaum was the third example, whose love and care for his servant and whose humility as well as his great faith were praised. The last exemplary soldier was Cornelius, who was reported as being devoted and charitable, a just man and eager to hear the word of God, whose minister’s company he immensely enjoyed. Finally, Skippon gave advice to the soldiers from
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Luke 3:14: ‘Do violence to no man, neither accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages.’

These examples of godly soldiers were provided for inspiration to Skippon’s audience. Their commendable virtues were praised in order to underline their importance also in the conflict at hand.

Like his previous books, *The Christian Centurians Observations* contained advice on how one should carry oneself in a military camp. This time Skippon stressed the dutiful performance of religious tasks, such as prayer, meditation, the reading of Scripture and singing of psalms. It was permissible to break off from devotions when one’s secular calling and its necessities demanded, but one should resume them when the time and situation allowed. He advised soldiers to be obedient to their commanders, officers to be serious with their subordinates and everyone to be friendly to their equals. Tasks should be pursued earnestly and cheerfully, and commands given thoroughly and plainly. The bad influence of swearers, drunkards, gamblers and whore-masters was to be minimized by avoiding their company. Moreover, one should personally fight against sin in one’s own heart while cultivating virtues within it. Free time was seen as detrimental to morale, and Skippon suggested ‘lawful recreation’ for moments of leisure, such as manly exercises, the reading of moral authors (Plutarch and Caesar were given as examples) and the viewing of trenches and siege works in order to enable a soldier to do his job better. The author, very mindful of how the bond between soldiers and officers was created and strengthened, saw from his own experience that religion was well suited as a tool for constructing comradery. Not only was the example of a commander as a higher ranking soldier necessary for transforming an army into a brotherhood of Puritan warriors of faith but the example of a commander as a godly Christian saint as well.

Skippon reminded his readers that Parliament was fighting not only for secular reasons but also for God’s cause. The Lord required all good Christians to take part in this work, which had to be performed in a zealous manner, courageously, faithfully, diligently and humbly – namely, in a good Christian way, displaying every virtuous quality that made a soldier pleasing to God. It was important to back up these claims with concrete benefits, and Skippon mentioned God’s protection of those who had fought for his cause and the martyrdom of his people who had fallen in battle. Parliament’s enemies were also Christ’s enemies: idolatrous, blasphemous sinners who mocked Puritan prayers and services, defiled places of worship, killed and tormented God’s servants and robbed, spoiled and ravished around the country. It was a holy duty to oppose them by all means necessary. Skippon followed the Puritan narrative of tying the conflict to religion, legitimising it by proclaiming God’s
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will and trying to influence soldiers by appealing to biblical arguments. There was the side of God and the side of God’s enemies in the Puritan justification of the war, and this dichotomy was propagated throughout the conflict by the ministers. For instance, one Jeremiah Leech gave a sermon in which he made a clear distinction between God’s side and that of his enemies. Being on the right side was naturally the only path to victory, and for a good Christian, there was really no alternative to fighting against those who opposed God.363 Theologically speaking, then, Parliament’s war was both lawful and necessary. This was certainly encouraging to the soldiers, but there was another side to Puritan militarism: an unwillingness to accept compromises. If the cause was God’s, then no man could call it finished. As Christopher Tesdale, a member of the Assembly of Divines, put it, ‘better have a holy and a just warre, than an irreligious, dis-honourable and unsafe Peace; better want the peace of the Gospel, then not have with it the Gospel of Peace’.364 At the moment, the army of the Earl of Essex was being encircled by the King in Cornwall, and Tesdale probably saw a need to strengthen Parliament’s resolve in the face of a military setback.

Ram’s Souldiers Catechisme was influential in propagating God’s cause to the soldiers. Even in 1644, with two years of the Civil War already fought, Ram thought it necessary to stress the lawfulness of the soldier’s profession and to point out that there was no discrepancy between being a Christian and a soldier. According to him, Jesus’s words from Matthew 5:39 about turning the other cheek were only meant to forbid private revenge and resistance. Therefore, being a soldier for Parliament was lawful, especially as he fought for King and Parliament, ‘to recover the King out of the hands of a Popish Malignant Company’ and ‘in the defence and maintenance of the True Protestant Religion’, which was now oppressed and in danger of being completely suppressed in favour of the Popish religion, advocated by the armies raised against Parliament – armies of Christ’s enemies, who were waging war against the church and God’s people in the name of the King. Ram also compared Parliament’s resistance of the King to that of the Scots during the Bishops’ Wars – it was not rebellion but justified by an act of Parliament.365 This was simple and clear language for a soldier, and the catechism’s structure made it even more understandable: the questions were short and to the point, the answers were concise, and the different arguments were separated by numbers. Thus, for instance, it was easy to remember that there were ten arguments in justification of the lawfulness of being a Christian soldier. Ram claimed that The Souldiers Catechisme was written ‘for the Incouragement and Instruction of all that have taken up Armes in this Cause of God and his People; especially the
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common Souldiers’. He had his target audience clearly marked out, and he was capable enough of conveying his message in an appropriate form for just that particular audience.

The Souldiers Catechisme portrayed the conflict as religious and was therefore an important factor in bringing this clerical viewpoint to the soldiers. According to Ram, five of Parliament’s eight chief aims in the war were religious in nature. The first was ‘the pulling down of Babylon’ and the fourth was ‘the advancement of Christs Kingdome’, both of which were vague but conveyed the message that the conflict had dimensions other than purely secular ones. In addition to the preservation of the gospel, Ram demanded the suppression of the Antichristian prelacy and the reformation of the corrupt clergy.366 As Ram saw it, God’s anger over England bore eschatological significance – the devil and his instruments were awakening, and the enemies’ iniquity was at its full measure. Moreover, he had calculated that a cycle of a hundred years had produced huge alterations in the church. These were signs of the need for reformation, a prerequisite for the peace of England.367

These Parliamentarian war aims constituted a good cause, which was, within a religious framework, a major advantage. In addition to motivating the soldiers to fight, they could also be used as a self-strengthening device. A good cause brought God to be involved, and the resulting success could be seen as a divine sign of the goodness of the cause. Thus, the cycle was complete, and it nourished the motivation and morale of the Parliamentarian armies as victories began to accumulate. Ram was instrumental in building this framework in The Souldiers Catechisme. He wrote that a good cause always had God on its side, and to prove that Parliament’s cause was good, he mentioned the victories they had already obtained. He also claimed that the Solemn League and Covenant was a sign that they were on the right side.368 The Covenant was the beginning of the reformation in England and a deadly blow to Popery. Since it had been taken, Parliament’s cause had prospered, and Ram compiled a list of victories as an argument of God’s divine power intervening on their behalf.369 The aim was to make the soldiers ‘so well assured of the goodnesse of their Cause, that they will live and die in it’.370

Ram was also interested in creating and upholding the community among the soldiers. In The Souldiers Catechisme, Ram gave advice on how officers and soldiers should interact with one
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another. This was crucial in an army, for there had to be certain family-like bonds of friendship but also a clear and strictly enforced hierarchy between the ranks. Hence, Ram asked commanders and officers to behave lovingly towards their men, remembering that soldiers were people, not animals. They had to be discreet and just but without too much familiarity in order to avoid breeding contempt. First and foremost, they had to be religious, so that the example they set was one of virtue and godliness. These pieces of advice had their counterparts in the military articles. Being just involved not defrauding the soldiers of their pay, which was punishable by cashiering. Moreover, officers were in charge of seeing that God was properly honoured and that sermons and prayers were attended.\textsuperscript{371} Soldiers, for their part, had to acknowledge and honour their officers as superiors and had to ‘account them as men set over them by the providence of God and wisdome of the State’. This meant that they must be extremely obedient and disciplined. Ram wrote that soldiers, of all professions, were most strictly tied to obedience, even for their conscience’s sake.\textsuperscript{372}

Thus, \textit{The Souldiers Catechisme} framed a structure in which the soldiers could view the conflict and their place in it. The pamphlet solidified the position of the soldiers as Christians in a lawful battle against the Antichristian Papacy. Their calling was legitimate, and their cause was good. Their success was a sure sign of this. The profession of the Parliamentarian soldier was an honourable one: at the conclusion of his catechism, Ram stated, ‘They that fight against the Churches Enemies, are Gods helpers against the mighty[...] They are the instruments of Justice, and the Executioners of Gods Judgements’\textsuperscript{373}. This moral inspiration might have had a significant effect on godly soldiers in Parliament’s armies who found themselves fighting not only for the liberties of the subject and the privileges of Parliament but also for the reformation of the entire nation, for the advancement of the Kingdom of God and for the pulling down of the anti-Christ forever. They could see themselves as tools of God and instruments of his divine wrath, and what they did was justice, the execution of judgement against wrongdoers. This was something the King could not offer, although some Royalist divines did try to frame the conflict in religious terms as we shall see.

Thus far, I have examined how Parliamentarian sainthood was constructed by the Puritan clergy, how it was used to advance the war effort, and how God’s cause was propagated to the soldiers. During the conflict, Royalist divines also employed a religious label for those waging war for the King, but whereas the character of Parliamentarian sainthood was active performance that strove to make a difference by one’s own actions, Royalist martyrdom was passive and pessimistic, and it lacked an
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incentive for personal influence. It accepted God’s preordination of events, but while the Puritans transformed that knowledge into human action, the King’s clergymen waited passively for divine intervention. This attitude is well portrayed by an anonymous Royalist description of the siege of Basing House, which was published before the garrison’s eventual fall in autumn 1645. At the time, Basing House had endured sieges that had led the author to write thus:

In vain it therefore were to Villify the enemy; blaming his valor or descretion, Or yet to say the care and diligence of the Lord Marquisse Governour, the skill and valour of the Officers, the courage and obedience of the Souldiers, (though all these did their parts) had thus preserved the place, in vain we watch and ward, except God keepe the House. Let no man therefore speake himselfe an instrument, onely in giving thankes that God had made him so.374

This was hardly an encouragement for the soldiers to make a difference through their own actions. Rather, it was submitting to a fate ordained by God. The only consolation that the Royalist divines offered to the King’s soldiers was that they would be received in heaven after being slain in battle. The reward for their troubles would be death, not any temporal prize, as Robert Mossom suggested in his sermon in York in November 1642:

If yee now tread in His [the King] steps, follow His Example, in being ready to sacrifice your owne Lives, for the Honour of your King, and the Peace of your Countrey, if yee dye in the enterprise, your Deaths shall not be Mortes, but Immortalitates, having made your peace with God, an eternall Reward shall attend your Temporall Deaths.375

He also proclaimed eternal life to the Earl of Newcastle in the dedication of his second sermon: ‘So that, should you sacrifice your self in affection to your King and Countrey; your Honorable Death shall be a means to procure you a glorious Life, and an eternitie of happinesse shall crown your fidelity to your Prince.’376

Martyrdom was portrayed early in the war as the modus operandi of the Royalist soldiers. Thomas Barton, a rector of Westmeston and a loyal minister of the Church of England, gave a sermon before the King in Oxford in May 1643. Despite dedicating the printed version to Thomas Covert, a lieutenant colonel in the King’s army, it was not in the least militant in tone, but rather peaceful and conciliatory, qualities that later Royalist authors echoed in their writings. From the beginning of the
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sermon, Barton beseeched his audience to be patient in their ordeals. He mentioned martyrdom and counselled, ‘The more then we suffer, we are furthered the more’. If ‘the malignants’ happened to win, Barton asked, what were these torments and this misery compared to the eternal joy that awaited? In the printed sermon he had added an advertisement for those who were disaffected with the Royalist cause. Barton reminded readers that the King was merciful and ‘Soe mindefull also of His Subjects that twice a day he prayes, and constantly for them. For the loyall that they may persevere, for the other, that they might be undeceived.’ It is, therefore, easy to see that the themes of reclaiming the rebels and enduring the afflictions and even martyrdom inflicted by the enemy were stated in Royalist doctrine early on. Even though the soldiers may have felt the conflict intensifying as it went on, and even though the atrocities became more common and severe, the King’s ministers still preached for forgiveness and mercy.

Even more militant Royalist ministers, such as John Bramhall, preached about martyrdom. In January 1644, he gave a sermon in York that was intended to prepare Newcastle’s soldiers to fight the Scots. At the end of the sermon, Bramhall evoked martyrdom. He exhorted his audience to have that indomitable spirit of a soldier who, even if his legs have been cut off in battle, still wants to jump into the fray for his cause. Schism, slavery and beggary were, in Bramhall’s opinion, worse than death, thereby ‘It is a sweet and comely thing for a man to die for his Country, and for his Religion’.

Underlining the possibility of dying for one’s cause was a Royalist tendency, and Bramhall’s sermon was no exception: ‘How gloriously they returne Conquerers from the battel? Or how blessedly they die Martyrs in the battell? If they overcome, they are crowned with a Lawrell Garland, If they die, with a crown of Martyrdome, saith Saint Bernard.’ In August of the same year, one Paul Gosnold echoed similar opinions in his fast sermon given in Oxford: ‘whosoever out of a conscientious regard had to his duty, obliged by the lawes of God and men, shall loose his life in the service of the King, I dare not deny that man the honour of a Martyr.’

There was an element of self-flagellation in Royalist sermons that was absent from their Parliamentarian counterparts. The King’s ministers saw the conflict neither as a religious war between light and darkness nor as an eschatological battle of the end times. Thus, they rarely highlighted
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fighting for God’s cause, for they were confident enough that the King’s cause was justified and lawful. When they did address the religious reasons of the Civil War, they claimed that the conflict had started because of the divine wrath over England, and all the hardships and afflictions were to be endured patiently. Bramhall saw the King and his party as the people of God who never lacked enemies in this world. Those enemies, however, were ‘the hammers that naile us closer to our God’, the tools of God’s judgement to make his people better. According to Bramhall, the Lord preserved his people from these enemies as well as confused the enemy. This confusion either made them repent or, if their malignancy was too great, lead them on to their utter ruin and destruction. This positive Royalist thinking was he exception, for their writings were often pessimistic and dismal. A good comparison is a sermon by the King’s minister William Chillingworth, printed in the summer of 1644. The author wrote that he saw in the enemy the pretence of reformation pursued by devilish means, whereas in the Royalists he saw no zeal for the reformation of the things that had made God angry at England. Chillingworth was afraid that both sides were an instrument of God for executing justice against each other. Thus, no matter what the outcome was, it was no good for England.

Thomas Swadlin also constructed this portrayal of Royalist martyrdom in his writings. His satirical version of the soldiers’ catechism for Parliament is a perfect example of a passive, reactive mentality. In it, he praises Protestants who fought on the other – the Royalist – side as the worthiest of men, who maintained the cause of Christ against antichristian influence. Moreover, he claimed that they were clear of all the blood that had been shed and that they were on the highway to martyrdom. According to Swadlin, those fighting for the King were, for the most part, humane, Christian and merciful, lovers of God and of the power of goodness, and – following the personal distaste of Charles – keen to have cursers and blasphemers punished. Despite these qualities, the Royalists suffered because the Lord had seen it proper to use the rebels as the rod of His indignation. This divine wrath was due to ‘An unholy Covenant’, ‘An ungodly Rebellion’, ‘An unparallelld extirpating of Episcopacy Root and Branch’ and ‘An unholy, ungodly, and unparallelld seperating the King from his Queene, and robbing him of his Children’. Swadlin argued that God sometimes made use of
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the wicked to serve His providence as the rod of His displeasure, and threw the rod into the fire when He was done.\textsuperscript{388} ‘They are the Instruments of our Injustice, though the Rod of Gods Judgements, as Nebuchadnazer was.’\textsuperscript{389} Hence Swadlin deemed it proper to remind the King’s soldiers of the promise that whoever lost his life in the cause of Christ and his Gospel would be a great gainer in the afterlife, and he suggested that they witness ‘those State-loyall, and Common-prayer-booke Martyrs at Bristol, and London; they are translated from men to Saints’\textsuperscript{390} In the epilogue of his satirical catechism, which he dedicated to Sir John Heydon, a high ranking officer of the Royalist army, Swadlin professed his desire to serve the King and all those who served him. He assured his readers that if they died ‘in this service of the Truth’, they were on the way to martyrdom.\textsuperscript{391} Even in \textit{The Soldiers Catechisme}, written for the Royalist soldiers, Swadlin highlighted that whoever fought and died for the King was a martyr.\textsuperscript{392} Thus, the Royalist clergy saw God’s wrath through pessimistic eyes – they could not appease it except by submitting to it completely, preparing for martyrdom and waiting for the Lord’s anger to pass.

The last prayer manual published for the King’s armies in 1645 depicted this same portrayal of the King’s soldiers. \textit{Certain Prayers fitted to Severall Occasions} was a passive and pessimistic publication that followed the Royalist tradition of seeing their side as innocent victims who begged God for mercy but who would not exhort themselves to work for their own salvation. Again, this went so far as to mention martyrdom in the prayer before battle: ‘grant that we may either come off with victory, and live thy Servants, or expect our Garland in the next life, and dye thy Martyrs.’\textsuperscript{393} Other Royalist publications at the end of the war were not more cheerful. Humphrey Peake probably saw, while writing \textit{Meditations upon a Seige}, that the King’s hopes of military victory were crushed and that the Royalist cause was lost. Hence he wrote that, despite every precaution, God might allow a soldier to die because His judgements and paths were unsearchable. Peake still had faith in God’s wisdom and goodness and claimed that he would be happy if he could glorify the Lord whether by life or by death. Although God’s judgements were unknown, even a defeated Royalist should not despair. ‘If when I have lived a Christian, I must afterwards dy a Martyr. I am sure that to such a life, & such a death there is a crowne reserved, which, if I have but patience and constancie to hold out unto the end, I shall not misse of.’\textsuperscript{394}
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One of the most vocal critics of violent Puritan sermons, Edward Symmons, treated martyrdom in his *Scripture Vindicated*. According to him, Royalists should even seek ‘to be murdered and martyred by these sanguinarious and bloody men’. The more the King’s men made visible the wickedness and hypocrisy of the Puritans the more cruel and hateful the enemy would become. This hate might lead to the suffering and even death of Royalists, but this was for the better, according to Symmons, for there was a possibility that the seduced would see their error and turn back from their wrong path before it was too late. ‘Christ bought us of his Fathers Iustice, (out of the Devills hands,) with the price of his bloud; and to the end, that we by our bloud (if occasion be’) might be meanes to redeeme others’, Symmons consoled his audience. Thus, the mercifullness of the King’s ministers extended to giving their own lives to save the soul of the enemy’s. This was undoubtedly very Christian, but it did not help in actual warfare.\(^{395}\)

Dying as a martyr in the King’s service was a prominent theme in the works of Royalist preachers, found in sermons and other publications. It can be argued that the ‘martyr’ was for the Royalists what the ‘saint’ was for the Parliamentarians, a religiously constructed identity that ministers wanted to associate their soldiers with. Portraying soldiers who fought for Charles as good Christians who would become martyrs in the case of their death was comparable to portraying the Puritan soldiers as saints who fought for the cause of Christ. But whereas being a martyr was a passive role in which unjust suffering and death were glorified, being a saint was a more proactive part that bestowed divine honours to a person in this life as opposed to the next. In addition, if one wanted to be a saint, one had to rigorously pursue activities that advanced the Kingdom of God upon England. It was not enough to simply die fighting on the right side. Hence, the role of a saint was much more advantageous to take up in the context of war than the role of a passive, suffering martyr.

There was also no comparative Royalist effort to create a godly community of soldiers with a religious cause and instruction. Puritan ministers could effectively and seamlessly connect warfare and religion in a way that was beneficial to the war effort – there was no discrepancy in the violent tasks of the Saints of God and their role as good Christians. The godly community of soldiers had to participate diligently in God’s battle against His enemies. The religious education offered by Royalist ministers distinguished between a soldier and a Christian, and thus, could not offer the King’s men more than the promise of a martyr’s garland. There was no eschatological conflict, no war between God and the
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anti-Christ that the Royalists were fighting. There were only the sins of England weighing heavily on
the nation, and there was no active escape from God’s judgement.
In this chapter, I examine a few sermons preached to the New Model Army at the end of the first Civil War. My purpose is not only to show how Puritan ministers instructed this allegedly godly army to stand in contrast to Royalist efforts but also to suggest that the very same elements of advice had been given to earlier Parliamentarian forces too. The same arguments, justifications and instructions presented at the beginning of the war, which I have discussed in the previous chapters, were also preached in these later Puritan sermons. Hence, if evaluated only by the quality and quantity of received religious advice, the New Model Army soldiers were not necessarily any better off than were those of, for instance, the Eastern Association. The labels ‘religious’ and ‘godly’ that have been used of the New Model Army could as well have been used of the earlier Parliamentarian armies.

The ministers put very high hopes in the New Model Army as a collective of saints. Regardless of the narrative of it being despised, ridiculed and laughed at by its enemies, the army allegedly attained its victories by the providence of God. In the dedication of his printed sermon, originally given to Fairfax and the other officers of the New Model Army, William Dell, a Puritan minister, called them ‘instruments in the hand of God, for the subduing that malignant power that rose up against the State and Saints of God; yea, instruments of Gods own chusing and calling forth to his foot, for this great and glorious service’. The important characteristics of the army were its unity, the humility and faith of its soldiers, their spirit of prayer, God’s special presence among them and, lastly, their loyalty to the state.

This narrative of an army of saviours was seen to be preserved as an example for later generations, as a report from Fairfax’s army testified: ‘Then will the Parents tell their children the memorable Stories of this Army, and the wonderfull workings of God by this Arme of Flesh, and how freely these their Noble Ancestors hazarde d themselves for their Countries Peace and Freedome.’ In August 1645, Thomas Case likened the army to the army of Israel under Joshua. It was a strong inst
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when God was with His people, everything was possible. ‘The Lord of Hosts can make better Souldiers in a few days, then the Prince of Orange can do in many yeers’, Case boasted.399

The New Model Army was even praised in secular accounts as God’s instrument. The Speaker of the House of Commons, William Lenthall, received the following relation: ‘Since this Army came out into the Field, God hath done great things by it; I have been an eye-witness of them all; but in my judgement, this of Sherborn Castle (if God deliver it into our hands) as I hope he will within few hours, is not the least.’400 A captain in the New Model Army, John Blackwell, also apparently believed that he and his fellow soldiers were God’s tools:

Wee doe, doe you also blesse God, who hath raised up a poore company of men to do him such service, Men who were by some thought not fit to be tolerated in the Kingdome, but faithfull to God and those who have employed them, without any other ends then Gods glory, and the publique welfare of this poore Kingdome.401

John Rushworth, who became a historian and politician after the Civil War, worked in the New Model Army as a secretary to its general, Sir Thomas Fairfax, and wrote in September 1645 that ‘there is that seeking of God, by our Commanders and Souldiers, by prayer and fasting, and that unitie of spirit amongst them’.402 When the New Model Army regained Abbington in early 1646, Colonel Payne wrote, in his account, how God had given the men such spirits that they would have rather lost their lives than the town.403 In addition, there were positive reports from military chaplains working in the army. Hugh Peters wrote a narration of the taking of Dartmouth in which he informed that ‘here [in the New Model Army] men grow religious, and more spirituall thriving, then in any place of the Kingdome’. He claimed he had more than ordinary cause to praise God for being a member of that army, and its civility compared to the enemy’s debauchery had much promoted Parliament’s conquests.404
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Apparently, at least for some soldiers, a cause had emerged that they were happy to fight for, and an occupation they felt comfortable in. This transformation into professional soldiers had taken place in the earlier Parliamentarian armies but manifested itself in formation of the New Model Army. Major General Skippon gave a speech to the officers and soldiers in April 1645 and trusted that whoever was discharged would do so honourably. A report told that ‘the Souldiers they generally exsprest their joy at the close of every Speech, without any reluctancie in any of them[…] And farther, Whereas divers Inferiour Officers went off upon the Reduction, they have listed themselves as common Souldiers’, and declared this a work of God.\textsuperscript{405} This account was told also in John Vicars’s \textit{Parliamentary Chronicle}.\textsuperscript{406} To be sure, Skippon’s professional skills and the respect he commanded among the soldiers as well as the promises of monetary compensations and of paying off arrears, were crucial in attaining this fortunate result in negotiations, but nonetheless it appears that there were many who were interested in continuing the war for Parliament’s cause.\textsuperscript{407}

A perfect example of the instructional sermons that were given to the soldiers of the New Model Army was preached at the siege of Newark on 27 March 1646. This example consists of two sermons from that day on humiliation in the army. One of the sermons was preached by Robert Ram. The other was given by Edward Reyner, a preacher of the city of Lincoln, who had no military background. Therefore, here is an opportunity to compare the preaching of a chaplain of the New Model Army to the sermon of a clergyman who had no actual experience of battle. I suggest that it was mostly this martial knowledge that allowed the godly ministers to shape their words in a way that resonated with their audiences, who were fighting men in a violent environment. The soldiers needed someone who understood this environment and its laws and who had experienced the same hardships as they had. Ram was one such preacher who had very intimate knowledge of the darker side of human nature, having been held captive by the Royalists and, after that, worked as a chaplain in one of the most active regiments of the Parliamentarian armies. There were certainly clergymen who went through thick and thin with the soldiers in the Royalist armies as well, but their voices were not heard in official publications, their sermons were absent from the pulpit of St Mary’s in Oxford, and their preaching must have been muted under the pressure of official Royalist sermons, only to appear in
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the scattered references of their political or clerical opponents. In Puritan thought, religion and war mixed together seamlessly. It is telling that both Ram’s and Reyner’s sermons were printed with a similar approval from the Independent minister Joseph Caryl: ‘I Have perused this Sermon, tending much to the Advancement of Military Holiness and Orders (with these) the success of this present Warre; and doe therefore conceive them very usefull for the publike, especially the Armies.’

This is an explicit statement of the usefulness of these kind of sermons for the armies because they advanced both the spiritual quality of the soldiers as well as their obedience to military orders, which together contributed to military success. Parliament understood this link between religion and instruction and nourished it in its official publications.

Ram's sermon was based on Luke 3:14, that often cited verse of John the Baptist giving advice to soldiers on how they should conduct themselves in their profession: ‘Do violence to no man, neither accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages.’ The knowledge Ram had of a soldier’s life was evident: he claimed that John’s advice was hinting ‘at the usul miscarriages that martail men are prone to’ and that it aimed at regulating ‘these new converted Souldiers, instructing them how they should behave themselves in this calling’. It is also clear that he considered himself one of the soldiers from the way he addressed his audience: ‘Gentlemen, and fellow Souldiers, that are come together this day.’ This indicated a mutual understanding between the army and its chaplains and thus implied that the sermons were written with the needs of the soldiers in mind, who repaid that care by taking the advice to heart.

Ram still considered it important to preach to soldiers about the lawfulness of their profession as he had done in his catechism. This time, however, he did not simply state it by biblical examples. Ram pointed out some issues that had emerged after the war was all but over, as was the case in March 1646. According to him, the states needed soldiers to prevent oppression, to defend liberties and religion, and to bring offenders to justice. This last task was seemingly important, for he continued: ‘The Prophet speaking of the activeness of Gods people, against the Churches Enemies, how they should have a two edged Sword in their hands, to execute vengeance and punishments, To binde Kings in Chaines, and Nobles in Fetters, saith in the close of all, This honour have all his Saints.’

It was certainly no coincidence that Ram had chosen words that spoke of the Saints chaining up kings,
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and neither was it that he chose to underline the judgemental task of God’s people. The Civil War had been a catastrophic event, and now it was time to identify and punish the guilty. This judgemental task had been mentioned in *The Souldiers Catechisme* too, but with the end of the war in sight, these demands mattered much more.

Ram argued not only that Christians could lawfully be soldiers but also that they were the best possible soldiers if they so chose. This was because the Holy Ghost himself gave advice and direction to the godly: for marching, quartering, and for other practical issues. They were most courageous, in the manner of true Christian valour, because they were sure of their cause. Moreover, they did not engage in unlawful pursuits and always behaved themselves like good men, obeying orders and commands. In a word, they were as John the Baptist wanted soldiers to be: ‘They dare not do any violence or wrong, nor accuse any man falsely, they will be contented with their Wages.’ Therefore, it followed that God was with them. ‘And how hath the Lord prospered our New Modell?’ Ram exclaimed. While the Lord’s Providence was upon the army, it had to give something in return to God. Ram denied that it was forbidden to fight for religion. According to him, it was rather necessary by reason and by God’s explicit command. There were precedents from other countries, where true religion was defended against ‘Idolatrous Princes’. Moreover, all aspects of a nation, its wealth, peace, honour, strength and prosperity, derived from the truth of its religion, and hence, ‘there cannot be a better cause in the World to fight for, then Religion’. It has long been debated whether the English Civil War was a war of religion, with many fine arguments from both sides of the historiographical discussion, but we can safely say that, for at least some of its participants, it was precisely that.

Ram again addressed his audience as ‘fellow Souldiers’ when he came to the application of his sermon. The important issues from earlier religious instruction were still valid for the New Model Army. Encouragement seemed to be foremost in Ram’s mind, for he started with the *Second Book of Samuel, 10:12*: ‘Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the Cities of our God, and the Lord do that which seemeth him good’ – again a verse often heard during the war. He wanted to remind the soldiers that there were many reasons to be valiant in God’s service: the cause was just and good, the enemies were God’s enemies, God had already abundantly blessed the armies of Parliament, and last but not least, there was a reward to be expected in this life as well as in the next.
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In addition to encouraging his fellow soldiers, Ram tried to curb their sinful behaviour. Here again we have to take into account the importance of community of which the military chaplain was a part. It was far more effective to present one’s views as a more or less esteemed member of one’s community than it was to present them as commands from a lofty clerical position, as was often the case with the Royalists. Shared difficulties meant mutual respect and in the Parliamentarian armies, it was not uncommon for officers to march on foot beside their men to foster that relationship.\footnote{For example, as did the Earl of Manchester in the summer of 1644. See A Particular Relation Of the most Remarkable Occurrences From the United Forces in the North... London, 1644. 1. Also, another account of the Parliamentarian army at Taunton described like this: ‘Let God have the Glory, our Colonells and Officers the praise; who of my knowledge, have marcht two or three days on Foot, and never took their Horse, but still in the head of their Regiments. Gave good encouragement by their own examples.’ A Narration of the Expedition to Taunton; The Raising the Siege before it, and the Condition of our Forces, and the Enemies, at this present in the West... London, 1645, 6.} It was easier to listen and maybe even to take to heart advice given by someone who commanded respect as a peer. Ram tried to use that respect to morally edify the soldiers because he, quite rightly, saw that some evils were too common among them. There was a certain similarity between him and John the Baptist, perhaps not by accident. Both John and Ram laboured to rectify the soldiers’ misbehaviours and to reform them. It was important, Ram stressed, that soldiers were good Christians. He had already explained that godly men could be soldiers, and now he tried to prove that soldiers should be godly. The Lord of Hosts was their general, and from that it followed that everything in the army should be holy. Every sin – Ram mentioned drunkenness, whoring, gaming, swearing and mutinying – was noticed by God, who would leave the military camp and withdraw his help from the army if He deemed the soldiers unholy. As we already know, this was a serious matter because only God could grant victory and deliverance from enemies.\footnote{Ram, A Sermon Preached at Balderton, 12–13.}

A soldier’s profession was no excuse for sinful behaviour. On the contrary, being a soldier meant that unlawful and evil activities should be avoided at all costs, even more strictly than in other vocations. This was because soldiers were constantly in mortal danger, and therefore they should be continuously prepared for it. Ram reminded his audience what a sad thing it was to die without pardon of sins and how important it was to make peace with God before taking on any dangerous endeavours. Another crucial reason to be in good terms with the Lord was that the soldiers sorely needed His presence and assistance. Ram repeated the often-heard claim that armies and preparations, skill and courage, were nothing without the blessing of God. Profane soldiers, who did not behave themselves like godly men, did not receive that blessing and they should not expect any help during battles. He cleverly brought up the current situation they were in: Newark had been besieged by the Parliamentarians twice already, and it had not fallen. Ram said that the sinfulness of the soldiers could
cause the failure of the third siege as well. ‘The wickednesse of Souldiers, and the sins of a Camp, will provoke the Lord to forsake them and it’, he thundered and reminded that godless men were not likely the instruments of God. Soldiers, however, should be both instruments of God and of justice, and it was not possible to punish wrongdoers if the punishers themselves were guilty of wickedness and violence.\textsuperscript{415} Again we can discern here the forcefully highlighted role of soldiers as tools of judgement.

At the end of his sermon, Ram gave more specific advice to the officers and the soldiers. This advice illustrated what the ministers wanted an army to be and how it was often presented in Parliamentarian propaganda. Of course, the veracity of these claims can be questioned already on the basis that Ram – and other preachers – lamented the sinful behaviour of the soldiers to the extent that he feared it would lead to the failure of the siege of Newark. This religious reformation, then, was not thorough, and the audience had to be reminded of their spiritual obligations. Religiosity was still very important as was the godly community and union between soldiers. To that end, Ram counselled the army to take care of the quality of its men.

Ram advised the commanders to have piety and fear God. In addition to that, they should be an example to their men in sobriety, chastity and holiness. Here, Ram recognized the power of an example – if a person of authority was drunk, he could hardly forbid his soldiers to drink. Instead, he should use his power to restrain wickedness, punish wrongdoers as the military articles decreed and uphold discipline with his authority. This was easier if he could choose what kind of soldiers were allowed in his ranks. Ram recommended that honest and godly men were the best sort, and said that ‘one such is worth a hundred that have nothing of God in them’.\textsuperscript{416} It is tempting to think that some officers took this advice seriously and picked, as far as they were able, godly persons when they were forming their regiments. Of course, the regiments would have been quite undersized if they had not recruited liberally, but we still can see here a clear piece of advice to commanders from a clerical authority: pick religious persons because they will be good soldiers. This was not a requirement in Royalist armies, nor was it even a recommendation.

To the common soldier, Ram directed John the Baptist’s counsel. They should do violence to no man, that is, use no cruelty nor injustice, and should not oppress men or make them afraid. As for accusing no one falsely, he commanded them not to slander their superiors nor do wrong to fellow soldiers
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with false reports. He also forbade accusing innocent men of offences, probably referring to cases in which soldiers had pillaged a person’s house on the pretence that the person was a malignant. The last piece of advice, on being content with one’s wages, referred to the prohibition of mutinying, plundering, the detainment of pay, and frauds. A soldier should be content with what little he received, but it was also important that he received the little that was due to him and in full.\(^{417}\)

All the familiar elements of *The Souldiers Catechisme* were present in this later sermon of Ram. His service in the army had taught him to tailor and direct his advice according to each specific audience: the soldiers received different counsel than the officers. He also addressed them clearly and set himself among them as equal. He gave solid, concrete pieces of advice that did not need to be searched for between the lines. Ram simply told the men what they should do and how they should conduct themselves. He also explained to them why it all was important and what would happen if they did not pay attention to their sins and the holiness of the camp. If they took his advice, they would surely be victorious. Ram addressed the soldiers, asking them to put the things he had mentioned into practice: ‘which if we do, I dare promise that Newark will soone be ours, and we shall suddenly see our desires upon all our Enemies: The Lord of Hosts will encamp with us, fight for us, cover our heads in the day of Battell, and make us both valiant and victorious.’\(^{418}\) Ultimately, the siege lasted until May and ended only when the King himself commanded the Royalist garrison to surrender.

Thus, Ram’s sermon did not differ in quality from his previous writings nor from the works of many other Parliamentarian authors. The only difference in comparison to *The Souldiers Catechisme* was the more forceful stress that he placed on the soldiers’ and the army’s task of judgement. Parliament was clearly winning the war, and this brought up questions about responsibility and punishment. This was an illustrative example of how the changing political and military situation could directly influence the content of sermons.

Ram, as the chaplain of the army, gave an instructional sermon at its finest. Thus, it is beneficial to compare it to a sermon given on the same day to the same audience by a minister with no military background, Edward Reyner. The dedication of Reyner’s sermon offers interesting glimpses at the life of a preacher. For example, he lamented that the publishing of the sermon had been very painful for him since he felt his abilities were best expressed in the pulpit and not in the press.\(^{419}\) Reyner also
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\(^{419}\) This seemed to be true for many a Parliamentarian preacher. For instance, Nehemiah Barnet, a minister at Lancaster, wrote in the preface of his sermon, published in early 1646, that ‘those small abilities God hath given me to profit others, are rather in the Pulpit, then the Presse’. Barnet also compared preaching and printing and saw positive sides in both
illustrated the subjects and certain prominent tendencies of the Civil War sermons. He wrote that ‘the subject of this discourse is now become very trite, and worn I suppose almost out of request; of which so much hath been already said, as nothing can be added’. Hence, preachers were aware of certain trends in the content of sermons. Since this was a military sermon, given to soldiers, we can safely assume that many similar ones were preached even to the point of boredom. This of course strengthens the argument that at least the Parliamentarian armies went to great lengths in instructing their soldiers, repeating the same message over and over again, indoctrinating the men to be godly and holy and to avoid sin.

Reyner’s sermon was dedicated to colonel Rossiter, to whom and whose soldiers it was originally preached, ‘to bring God and you near together, even God into your Camp, and your Camp unto God; to direct and excite your duty to God, to draw down and ingage Gods presence with you, and that the Countries Cause and Cure... may prosper in your hands’. The author also took the liberty to write very highly of the colonel and his past accomplishments, and he expressed hope that the colonel would strive forward on that same path even more forcefully. Although Reyner denied that his praises for Rossiter were meant to flatter him, there is no doubt that appreciating a commander and his godliness was seen as an effective way to reinforce Christian behaviour in the soldiery as a whole and to strengthen the portrayal of the army as an instrument of God. More often than not, Parliamentarian military sermons were dedicated to the high ranking officers of the army that they were preached to, and this can be viewed, among other things, as a means to influence them and make use of their authority to proceed with the moral reformation of the soldiers. This religious regulation was, as the dedication expressed and even the title of the sermon spelled out, the main point in Reyner’s work. It is necessary to keep in mind that reinforcing the significance of religious matters was not only important because it was thought to be crucial for warfare, it was also the raison d’être for the chaplains. Reyner spelled out their function in an army in his sermon: ‘To this end [making the army holy] God appointed the Priests to go along with Israels army[...] as well to instruct and excite them to their duty towards God, as to encourage them to fight the Lords battels against his and their enemies.’

There is no doubt that most of the religious fervour of the ministers was genuine and
they really believed what they were saying, but they certainly had no qualms with highlighting their own purpose at the same time.

The verse for that day of humiliation was Deuteronomy 23:14, ‘For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy Camp to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee: therefore shall thy Camp be holy, that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee’. The verse was originally addressed to the war host of Israel, and Reyner took that and applied it to the New Model Army as well. He himself mentioned that this was not a new invention – for example, Ram preached of the holiness of the military camp in his sermon the same day – but it was apparently something that needed to be stressed. The behaviour of the soldiers was of interest to many a minister, and ultimately this behaviour was linked to the military success of an army. The more sins and wickedness there were, the slimmer were their chances of victory.

This is not to say that these instructions did not have practical purposes. For instance, after establishing that both the camp and the soldiers should be holy, Reyner gave the command to have an iron instrument with which to dig a hole in which to bury excrements, which, if left unburied, would defile the place. This was certainly important from a hygienic perspective. Sanitary conditions in 17th century armies being far from ideal, all manner of diseases were more dangerous to soldiers than the battles themselves. Hence, religious commandments could be used to influence secular and natural behaviour, which experience had shown should be conducted in a certain manner to minimize risks – contemporaries of course did not know exactly how diseases spread, but they could see and guess that certain actions were prone to cause certain consequences. Reyner also quoted Numbers 5:2, where God commanded Moses to drive out of the camp all lepers ‘and whosoever is defiled by the dead’. The reason given was to stop them from defacing the camp in which the Lord himself dwelled, but we can also discern quite practical motives for this action. Thus, the demand for purity concerned not only the souls of men, but their bodies too.423

Certainly, religious reasons were foremost in Reyner’s mind for keeping the camp holy. The Lord himself was present in the camp only if it was holy, and while He was in the camp, He delivered His people from their enemies and delivered those enemies into the hands of His people. These were the reasons to keep God around, and they would only succeed by avoiding sin and wickedness. The Lord saw every little unclean thing, Reyner reminded his audience, and such things would drive him away. ‘It is the duty and glory of an army to be holy’, the preacher emphasised, and although these
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commands were given to the camp of Israel, they were in force ‘for the morall-regulating of all armies, especially those which fight the Lords battels, or under his banner; and go forth in his Name against their enemies’. The comparison to biblical Israel was not a coincidence, but a deliberate juxtaposition to legitimise Parliament’s cause.424

However, Reyner was not completely unrealistic in his hopes nor oblivious to the grim reality that affected all armies. He clarified that he did not mean that ‘all and every one in an army is truly Godly, for the best Armies that ever were, were never so good’. It was enough ‘when the Commanders (some of them at least) and a considerable part among the Souldiers are holy’. According to him, this was the case in the New Model Army, ‘wherein are so many reall godly Men, Commanders in chief, officers and souldiers’.425 There were sins, however, which he was aware of, such as swearing, cursing, blaspheming, oppressing, robbing, drinking and committing uncleanness. A soldier had no special permission to be guilty of these offences even if the military articles did not punish them or were not yet set up. God’s law was in force everywhere and at all times.426 Reyner echoed Ram in suspecting that the enduring defence of Newark was not so much due to the strong fortifications of the Royalists but rather to the sins of the besieging army. He exhorted his audience to make their peace with God and to trust only in His help in order to force the garrison to surrender. There was no difference here between a military chaplain and a civilian preacher. Reyner wrote:

> Let us petition the Lord for a good choice both of officers and souldiers, such as will fight for conscience sake, and for good Discipline, that sin may be severely punished in the Camp: and for good Ministers to go along with the Army, and sound their Trumpets. Oh! that we could pray our Army into a posture of Reformation.427

He later elaborated on the role of the clergy, advising the army to get good ministers to teach soldiers their duties (incidentally, those that are found in Luke 3:14 that Ram had often quoted) and to have daily exercises of piety in the camp, praying and reading the Bible. Good officers and good soldiers were to be chosen for the army, and Reyner set the responsibility for this on the commander in chief. Moreover, he stressed the role of discipline – it had to be strict, and examples had to be made so that ‘the rest may see or heare, and feare’. Discipline was the soul of an army, and it had to be upheld continuously.428 We can compare this to Ram’s sermon in which he advised officers to pick godly
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men as soldiers as far as they were able and told them to uphold military discipline by their own example as well as by executing punishments if needed. The contents were quite identical, and, considering the dedication in which Reyner mentioned that these issues had been quite extensively treated, it is safe to say that at least the Parliamentarian armies heard this kind of advice on a regular basis.

Reyner also had a few clear pieces of advice for the men. He preached words of instruction to them, or a lesson, as he called it. There were two pieces of counsel: be earnest with God and advance holiness in the camp. The former referred to having God present in all military motions and designs: Reyner made the familiar claims that the Lord would give encouragement, strength, protection and prosperity and that the soldiers could expect victory if they kept God close. The second lesson was more specific and dealt with the actual duties of soldiers in advancing holiness. Reyner warned against the sins of covetousness and injustice, being greedy for pay, and oppressing, pillaging and taking unlawful spoils. Swearing, cursing, drunkenness and adultery were mentioned too, as were more serious issues for the army, such as communicating intelligence to the enemy, mutinying, changing side (quite remarkably, Reyner was one of the few clergymen who mentioned this problem), and lack of discipline. There were, of course, also duties to God that had to be followed: neglect of piety and confidence in the ‘arme of flesh’ were examples of not fulfilling these duties. The author presented both the stick and the carrot as reasons to follow his advice: on the one hand, God would surely depart from the army if He saw unclean activity; on the other hand, those whom He accepted were likely to be used as His instruments of special service.429

At the end of his sermon, he presented special advice to the commanders and soldiers in a similar way to Ram’s sermon. The content of this advice was quite alike too. Reyner told the commanders to be zealous for God and to be examples to the common soldiers. They had to be ‘a Terror to evildoers’ and use martial discipline to make the men afraid of breaking the law, but also to take care of the soldiers and make them pursue godliness and reformation by their own religious, honourable and virtuous actions as a model. To the common soldiers, Reyner said they should keep watch over each other in order to spot sinful activity, such as drinking or mutinying – which was probably not popular advice among the men – and form comradery not only in exercising but also in praying and other holy activity. According to Reyner, a soldier was always short of two things: money and time. Hence, he should spend both well, not in playing cards or other wickedness but rather in the pursuit of God and holiness. He recommended singing psalms instead of base ballads, talking of spiritual things, and
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praying rather than playing. Because a soldier was continuously in danger, he should be sure of his place in the afterlife, and by following these instructions, he could be sure both of the well-being of his soul and of the success of the army.  

Hence, Reyner indeed instructed soldiers outside of the narrow scope of moral offences too, and many of the issues that he brought up had their counterparts in military articles as well as in Ram’s sermon. This was more than most of the Royalist ministers did, but we can discern differences in the form of the sermons of these two Parliamentarian preachers. These differences can be summed as follows: in Ram’s sermon, the central person was the soldier, whereas in Reyner’s it was God. Ram was able to preach to his audience from their viewpoint and to present the religious demands directed at the soldiers as concerning ‘us’, not ‘them’. His ability to stand in his audience’s shoes as a fellow soldier must have helped – he had, after all, done just that in *The Souldiers Catechisme*, in which he took the role of an uncertain soldier asking questions and seeking encouragement, comfort and instruction. Reyner did not, understandably, attain the same familiarity. He preached of God who acted according to the sins or merits of men, and the central theme was what he would do, not what they should do. This may seem like a minor difference, but considering the tightly knit community of military men, whose bonds had developed in shared battles and hardships, it was valuable to be able to present instructions from their viewpoint as a peer. Such was the job of army chaplains, and the resulting work was propagated much stronger by Parliament than it was by the King’s side.

The other sermons given to the New Model Army soldiers echoed the same concerns as Ram’s and Reyner’s. William Beech, a Presbyterian chaplain, preached to the soldiers at Basing House in autumn 1645.  

That sermon was printed only a few days later in October, and it is a perfect example of how a dehumanising image of the enemy was created. I deal with that aspect in the second part of my thesis. Here, I concentrate on the advice Beech gave to the soldiers. The siege of Basing House mirrored that of Newark in that it was a strongly fortified garrison which Parliamentarian armies had unsuccessfully tried to take several times. Unlike Newark, however, Basing House did not surrender, and its defenders paid a heavy price for their defiance.

At the end of his sermon, Beech asked his audience to take his words as military instruction. As mentioned, he was a minister in the army, so it is probable that he was as familiar as Ram with the hardships of the men and the common problems that hindered the New Model’s war effort. As the
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first beneficial issue, he presented courage, which was to be attained by knowledge of the good cause at hand, by trust in the Lord’s providence and by acknowledging of His power in deciding the outcome of the war. True courage was not based on the number of men in an army, but rather on these religious points, and as such, this was quite typical advice that a chaplain would give.432

The next piece of instruction was to use cunning and subtlety, strategies of snares and ambushes. This was even commanded by Christ. The enemy was, according to Beech, subtle because he served ‘a cunning master’. Hence, it was permissible to answer in kind, with martial craft and cunning. However, there were certain limits, as Beech claimed: ‘True it is, we must keep promise with our enemies, though they faulter, and prove base and treacherous to us, we must not promise to save them, and then destroy them; we must not agree to receive them to protection, and afterwards work their confusion.’433

The last and most important piece of advice to the soldiers was to be religious. He refuted the claim that religion would make men cowards and argued, in a familiar way, that it actually created true valour. It also taught how to be merciful to the enemy and made the soldiers and armies depend on God, not on the ‘arme of flesh’, which was another recurring theme of Parliamentarian militant theology. Religion also helped one keep away sins that were odious to God: rapine, uncleanness, drunkenness and swearing were a few that Beech saw it proper to mention. He asked the soldiers to curb their lewdness so that God had no reason to turn against them. Interestingly, Beech thought that the previous miscarriages of officers and soldiers had brought a curse upon the former armies of Parliament. He used this claim to warn the men not to repeat the same mistakes again. According to him, there were bad signs around: many men in the New Model Army were out to bring ruin upon themselves and the kingdom, not to help with the destruction of God’s enemies. As was common for army chaplains, Beech also saw these moral infractions as serious offences against God, which would have equally serious consequences if not curbed and repented of. He ended his sermon in propounding two patterns, commendations for religion and for faith, to be imitated by the soldiers.434

From these exemplary sermons it is possible to see the similarity with which Puritan ministers treated matters of religion and warfare in the New Model Army and in previous Parliamentarian armies. From the beginning of the war, Parliamentarian chaplains had preached on religiosity, courage, God’s
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cause and sins, combining these different topics into one coherent piece of military education. There was no real change in these topics or in the interaction between them when the New Model Army was formed. The religious framework that the Puritan ministers had constructed during the early years of the Civil War was still in place, and the soldiers were exhorted to exemplary conduct, abstaining from excesses and sins, and nourishing the community of the saints. Previous scholarship has highlighted the role of Independents in the army, but its religious character, as far as military instructions are concerned, was not that simple. Since both Ram and Beech were Presbyterians and the former’s sermon was approved by the Independent Joseph Caryl, it can be argued that, in military matters, the two parties were in accordance. Ram and the other Presbyterians were instrumental in creating the imagined community of the Army of Saints and preaching for religious war. Most importantly, as this chapter demonstrates, that strategy continued during the early years of the New Model Army. Thus, for military purposes, the role of the Presbyterian chaplains was at least as important, if not more so, than that of the Independents. The army’s later radicalism and its political implications are a different matter altogether, but from the viewpoint of religious war and spiritual advice for it, the huge differences were not between the Presbyterian and Independent ministers but rather those between the chaplains of the King and of Parliament.
6. RECEPTION OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

After all these examples of religious indoctrination it is proper to ask: what did it matter? Did it reach its intended audience or was it only used in written contests between the Puritan and Royalist clergy? Can we discern any tangible effects of these sermons and pamphlets on the soldiers? It is hard and often impossible to track down the effects of religious instruction and motivation. One cannot get inside a common soldier’s head to know what drove him to fight, to follow military articles and to submit to army discipline. For most people, the reasons were various, ranging from personal gains to forced impressment and from fear of punishment to group cohesion, and it would be quite wrong to dismiss all other grounds in favour of one. However, the instructional work done by the clergy should not be underestimated either but be understood as a factor in relation to these others.

In this chapter, I examine the narratives of the effects of religion on soldiers. Many individual commentators reported on zeal and piety in the armies, which manifested themselves in the singing of psalms, praying and iconoclasm. Based on the volume of sources, outward signs of religiosity were more common in Parliamentarian armies and were often mentioned as important factors in reported battles. On the contrary, the King’s ministers criticised Puritan preachers for instigating the soldiers to fight and corrupting the Bible’s peaceful message for their own ends. The obvious propaganda value of these descriptions must be acknowledged here. Royalists portrayed Parliamentarians as religious zealots because they, quite rightly, understood that not everyone was drawn to radicalism. Against this, the Royalists portrayed the King’s side as traditional and orderly. However, it is clear, based on their own publications that the godly Parliamentarians were not only framed as religious radicals, in comparison to the King’s ministers they certainly deserved the title. I have already discussed how different the religious advice to soldiers was between the Royalists and Parliamentarians. Here, I seek to demonstrate that even the purported effects of that advice were markedly different. Furthermore, I argue that the King’s ministers had a very different attitude towards religious instruction for war than the Puritans. The praise that the latter gave to Parliamentarian soldiers when they portrayed godly behaviour contrasted markedly to the horror that the Royalist clergy experienced when encountering the zealous Puritan soldiers.

While we cannot read the minds of ordinary soldiers long since dead, we can read and evaluate the descriptions of the events left by their contemporaries and trace the influence that this religious indoctrination supposedly had. Nehemiah Wharton’s published letters are an important source on the
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religiosity of the Parliamentarian soldiers. He was a sergeant in the army of the Earl of Essex and portrayed the common soldier’s life in his writings, which described godly ministers encouraging the men, creating unity between them and exhorting them to iconoclasm. In September 1642, he wrote:

Sabbath day morning Mr. Marshall, that worthy champion of Christ, preached unto us. After noone Mr. Ash, by relation, but as yet I have not seen him. These with their sermons have already subdued and satisfied more malignante spirits amongst us than a thousand armed men could have done, so that we have great hope of a blessed union.436

According to Wharton, religion could bring soldiers of different personalities and motivations together under one common cause and dispel doubts and hesitation about the reasons for fighting the war. Moreover, he highlighted the importance of ministers for the soldiers’ courage. ‘Our men are very courageous, and that they may so continue we desire, according to promise, a supply of faithfull able ministers, which we exceedingly want.’ He also acknowledged the role of preachers in preparing the men for the possibility of death: ‘Mr. Obbadiah Sedgwick preached unto us, whom the Lord extraordinarily assisted, so that his doctrine wrought wonderfully upon many of us, and doubtless hath fitted many of us for death, which we all shortly expect.’437

A letter by ‘A Worthy Divine’ from October related actions by the army of Essex and described how the Puritan ministers earned the respect of common soldiers by facing the same dangers as they did:

Mr. Ash was marvellously preserved from the cruelty of foure Cavaleers which set upon him, one of them cut off his hat and raised his haire with his sword, but never touched his skin, God hath bought most of our Ministers this night to Warwick, Mr. Ash amongst the rest, and Mr. Marshall, whose danger was no lesse.

The unnamed cleric continued by relating how he himself had encouraged the soldiers in the battle.438

On some occasions, the preachers even lead the soldiers into the fray:

Regiment of the London gray Coates[…] came in about five of the clocke in the evening, led on courageously by a godly Minister, the Earle of Stratfoords Chaplaine, in the absence of their Commander; and upon the first onset kil’d 12. of them [the Royalists], and caused them to retreat.439

436 Nehemiah Wharton, Letters from a subaltern officer of the Earl of Essex’s Army, written in the summer and autumn of 1642. London, 1854, 16.
437 Ibid. 11, 23.
439 Exploits Discovered, In A Declaration Of some more proceedings of Serjeant Major Chudley, Generall of the Forces under the Earle of Stamford: Against Sir Ralph Hopton. London, 1643, 4.
The chaplain in question was probably John Sedgwick, who had stood with the soldiers at Edgehill.\footnote{Laurence, Parliamentary Army Chaplains, 171–172.} On another occasion, an unnamed minister rode among the Parliamentarian soldiers of the Earl of Bedfort with a Bible in his hand.\footnote{The Newest and Truest, And most unpartiall Relation of all the late Occurrence which hath happened at Sherbourne-Castle, and thereabouts. London, 1642, 1.} The preachers seemed to be an encouraging inspiration for many a Puritan soldier as was the religiosity that they nourished. A Parliamentarian commander besieging the Royalist castle of Banbury, Colonel Nathaniel Whetham, wrote that God had preserved his men from the many shots of the Royalists and reported that his soldiers were ‘through Gods mercy being supported with courage, as ever I saw them in any service’\footnote{A Letter: Being A full Relation of the siege of Banbury Castle by that valiant and faithfull commander, Colonell Whetham Governour of Northampton, now Commander in chiefe in that service. London, 1644, 6.}.

A good example of iconoclasm committed by Parliamentarian soldiers as well as the effects of religious instigation can be found in Wharton’s letters. The first letter, dated August 1642, described how Parliamentarian soldiers pillaged the house of a supposed papist in Acton and, after that, entered the church to destroy painted glass windows and altar rails. The next day, they listened to a sermon by Christopher Love and brought the altar rails from Chiswick and they burned them. After that, they marched to Uxbridge, where they burned the rails and the service book, and to Wendover, where they were refreshed, and, rather predictably, burned the altar rails. They also caused a sad accident at Wendover when a soldier, ‘forgettinge he was charged with a bullet, shot a maide through the head, and she immediately died’.\footnote{Wharton, Letters from a subaltern officer of the Earl of Essex’s Army, 4–7.} Iconoclasm occurred also in Oxford in the early stages of the war. The Puritan soldiers under the command of Lord Saye and Sele occupied the city in September 1642 and searched different locations for weapons. At the same time they attacked churches, which is related thus: ‘some Souldiers entred into St Michaels Church at Service time, and required the Surplice, and Masse-booke, as they called it, but were kept off by the Women and others: Divers Country Churches about, have also bin entred into, and the Surplices taken away.’ Such actions were seemingly not popular among civilians, who took a stance against iconoclasm. ‘They shot down with much adoe, the head of the Virgin Mary over the doore, which much moved the people. Thence they went to Allsoules-Gate, to shoot at the Statue over it but were set upon by two or three hundred men and women, who with stones beate them all off.’\footnote{A Perfect Diurnall of The Passages Of the Souldiers, that are under the Command Of the Lord Say in Oxford. From the 9th of Septem. to the 6th of Octob. London, 1642, 3.}

Such religious interest and fervour displayed by common soldiers took place even before the New Model Army was created. Thus, zealous Puritan soldiers were not exclusive to Fairfax’s army. For
instance, already in August 1642, when the clashes between the King’s soldiers and those of Parliament were but skirmishes, there were references of piety among the latter. ‘Such was the courage and resolution of our Company, that after they had planted their Ordnance, they would not depart that place but lay all that night upon the Hill, fasting and in the cold, and spent the time in prayers and singing of Psalms.’ This description was something that could have been written about the New Model Army, but these were trained bands who had probably not yet even seen a real battle, let alone fought in one. In Manchester in September 1642, the besieged Parliamentarians ‘from first to last had prayers and singing of Psalms dayly at the street ends’. The author of the relation, ‘a godly Minister in the said towne’, was probably partial in his judgement of the Parliamentarians: ‘most of our Souldiers being Religious honest men, of a civill and Inoffensive conversation’. However, it is plausible that this kind of religious activity happened to some extent since there are many individual narratives that describe it. In Worcester in September, Parliamentarian officers were so eager to get to the enemy that they ‘onely stayed to sing a Psalme’ before marching. In the following month, the Parliamentarian dragoons under Colonel Brown defeated a group of Royalists. They concluded their pursuit of the enemy by glorifying God for the victory and singing psalms of thanksgiving. In 1643 in Lincolnshire, the religious enthusiasm of the Parliamentarian soldiers was narrated in the following manner: ‘so soone as our men had knowledge of the enemies coming they were very full of joy and resolution, thinking it a great mercy that they should fight with him. Our men went on in several bodies singing Psalmes.’ The same year in Lancashire the soldiers were not any less invigorated:

When we were within half a mile of them, we committed our selves to Gods protection, and began our work with publike prayers for his blessing upon us: And those done, we speeded unto the Enemy, with such Resolution and Courage in all the Captains, and Common Souldiers[...] that they had made hast to have saluted their friends, then to have encountred their enemies.

445 A Perfect Relation of All the passages and proceedings of the Marquesse Hartford, the Lord Paulet. And the rest of the Cavelleers that were with them in Wels... London, 1642, 6. The same event is described in A Relation Of all the passages and proceedings in Somersetshire, and Bristoll, with their valiant Resolution to fight for the King and Parliament. London, 1642.
446 A true and faithfull Relation of the besieging of the Towne of Manchester in Lancashire upon Saturday the 24. of September. 1642, 6.
447 A True Relation Of the Late Battaile Before Worcester, taken on Sunday last, Sept. 25. by a Gentleman of the Innes of Court, (now in his Excellences Armie) from the mouthes of Master Nathaniel Fynes... London, 1642, single sheet.
448 An Exact Relation of A famous Battell fought on Monday last the tenth of October, 1642... London, 1642, 3.
449 A True Relation of the Late Fight Betweene the Right Honourable the Earle of Manchesters Forces, and the Marquesse of Newcastles Forces, on Wednesday the II. day of this instant October, 1643... London, 1643, 6.
450 A True Relation of The great Victory, Obtained by Gods Providence, by the Parliaments Forces in Lancashire, Against the Forces raised by the King, in the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland. London, 1643, 5.
In the siege of Reading in April 1643, the Parliamentarian soldiers were in great danger but were also confident of God’s presence and protection, and thus they were so full of courage that they wished for the enemy’s attack more than they feared it. When the assault came, the author ‘could heare nothing but encouraging words from the Souldiers one to another, some saying God fighteth for us; God will preserve us, God will make good his promise to us[...] And when the Enemy fled, very many cryed out, let God have all the Glory.’

Another letter, published in November 1643, described the siege at Thurland Castle, which the Royalist tried to break. The Parliamentarian soldiers ‘committed ourselves to Gods protection, and began our work with publike prayers for his blessing upon us’. After the battle was done, ‘all our men with a great shout cryed out, Glory be to God’. Hence, even in the first stages of the war, the Parliamentarian armies were described as being very religious, and this outward portrayal of piety seemed to be common to the Parliamentarian armies even before the New Model.

There are also references to ministers working among soldiers, preparing them spiritually for the coming battles. Simeon Ashe, a chaplain of the Earl of Manchester in the Army of the Eastern Association, was prolific in writing letters and news that shed light on the proceedings of the army. In July 1644, his account of the battle of Marston Moor was published. After the battle, he wrote, the Earl himself was riding about in the army, praising the soldiers’ performance and exhorting them to give thanks and all the glory to God, which they accordingly did. He also mentioned Puritan soldiers singing psalms before the battle as the cannons exchanged fire. Later that same year, Ashe penned an account of the second battle of Newbury, defending the Earl whose passivity had allegedly cost the Parliamentarians the victory. In that pamphlet he mentioned how he himself, ‘with other Ministers who attended the Campe, did our duty by prayer and exhortation, to prepare them for the expected battle’. This seems to have worked for Fairfax’s army, for one B. W. wrote an account of its proceedings in the autumn of 1644. The soldiers had set apart two days for humiliation and prayer,

452 A True Relation of The great Victory, Obtained by Gods Providence, by the Parliaments Forces in Lancashire, Against the Forces raised by the King, in the counties of Westmerland and Cumberland. London, 1643, 5–6.
453 Simeon Ashe, A Continuation of True Intelligence From the English and Scottish Forces in the North, for the service of King and Parliament, and now beleaguering York, from the 16th of June, to Wednesday the 10th of July, 1644. London, 1644, 7.
454 Simeon Ashe, A Continuation of True Intelligence From the Armies in the North, from the 10. day to the 27. of this instant July, 1644. London, 1644, 3.
455 Simeon Ashe, A True Relation of the most Chiefe Occurrences, at, and since the late Battell at Newbery, until the disjunction of the three Armies... London, 1644, 8.
and when they continued their march, there was ‘nothing but praying and singing; not one oath that I heard in all the way’. It was not so blessed everywhere, however. B. W. wished for:

The Book set forth by Ordinance of Parliament, be read once a Week in our Army, for regulating our forces, and the punishing of offences both in Commanders and soldiers, may be more use of. For in some places it hath not been set forward, neither Protestation, nor Covenant[...] I could desire that commanders would endeavour to reform themselves, and then our Armies would be better reformed[...] So should our campes be purged, then we should carry none of our Achans into the campe.

During the siege of Bridgewater in summer 1645, before storming the garrison, Parliamentarian preachers encouraged the soldiers, advising them ‘to look upon Christ in all their actions, and to be valiant in his Cause’. Also, when the Parliamentarians stormed Dartmouth, the soldiers were very cheerful, for ‘Mr. Dell, and Mr. Peters preached to them, & put much life into them’. This was confirmed by the commander of the army, Thomas Fairfax, in his letter (which Peters himself delivered) to Parliament. It stated that the preacher ‘was present upon the place, and did much encourage the Souldiers to do their Duties’. In Torrington, Peters preached to the country people and soldiers from a balcony since the church had been blown up. Apparently, he had a huge audience and ‘made a great impression upon the hearts of the people’.

Hugh Peters, an Independent chaplain in Parliament’s army, was very active in supporting the Puritan cause in various ways and is an excellent example of a clergyman whose efforts had tangible effects on the war, such as raising money for the armies. Financial issues were among the most crucial ones: unpaid dues could easily make an army essentially incapable of effective action, and greed for financial gain sometimes overrode military considerations. That is why raising money was

\[\text{456 B. W., To The Faithfull And True-hearted Covenanters, which Are The Noble Philadelphians. A Diurnall, Of the Desires and Indeavours of one that earnestly desires the advancement of the Cause of Christ. London, 1644, 8.}\]
\[\text{457 Ibid. 14.}\]
\[\text{458 A Fuller Relation from Bridgewater Since the last fight: Therein is declared the fierce and terrible storming of the Town, by firing it in three several places, and the necessity thereof. London, 1645, 3–4.}\]
\[\text{459 A Full and Exact Relation Of the Storming and Taking of Dartmouth, With above Five hundred Prisoners, Sixty peece of Ordnance, great store of Ammunition and Ships belonging to the said Town. London, 1646, 5.}\]
\[\text{460 Sir Thomas Fairfax Letter To Both Houses of Parliament; More exactly and fully relating the Storming and Taking of Dartmouth, with the Castle, Forts, Officers in chief, and Souldiers therein: Sent by Mr. Peters. London, 1646, 7.}\]
\[\text{461 Two Letters Sent To the Honorable William Lenthal Esq; Speaker of the Honorable House of Commons. The one, concerning the great Victory Obtained at Cardiffe… London, 1646, 7. The same relation is printed in The Moderate Messenger: Impartially Communicating Martiall Affaires to the Kingdome of England. From Tuesday, Feb. 24 to Tuesday, March 3. 1646, 29.}\]
\[\text{462 This happened in a skirmish at Bovey Tracey where Royalist officers were surprised in a house. They apparently threw silver out of the windows, ‘which the foot Souldiers were so busie about the getting their shares, that the officers escaped in the mean time over the River’. A True Relation of the Fight at Bovy-Tracy, Between the Parliaments Forces under the command of Sir Tho: Fairfax, and three Regiments of the Kings Horse. London, 1646, 4–5. Of the general financial problems that hampered the effectiveness of armies, see, for example, An Exact Relation of The whole}\]
important, and Puritan ministers were directly told to participate in this kind of secular activity,\textsuperscript{463} which was done also by preachers other than Peters.\textsuperscript{464} Sometimes, the ministers even preached to Parliament and asked them to pay attention to the army’s finances.\textsuperscript{465} In western England, Peters stirred the people to send relief to the suffering Protestants in Ireland. He was rumoured to have collected a sum of fifteen hundred pounds for that purpose. As the newsletter \textit{Mercurius Candidus} stated, ‘Mr. Peters Preaching was very operative towards the raising of the Money’, and he had also otherwise laboured to persuade people to assist their brethren in faith in Ireland.\textsuperscript{466} In addition, he had ‘stirred them [the soldiers] up to faithfull service, putting them in mind, that it was the Cause of Christ, which they had now engaged themselves in, desiring them to be true and faithfull to the Trust reposed in them, and to goe on with undantied spirits, and gallants resolutions’.\textsuperscript{467} Not only did religious viewpoints influence Peters’ audience, however. He also claimed to have read captured Royalist letters to the locals, which referred to ten thousand Irish soldiers ready enter England. His oratory ‘had such successe, that the arguments I used unto them, and what I read was received with divers acclamations’.\textsuperscript{468}

Peters’ influence was also acknowledged by the Royalist press. \textit{Mercurius Academicus} informed its readers in February 1646 that ‘Master Peters the mad Preacher hath been a principall Instrument in promoting the grand Rebellion’ and, afterwards, ridiculed his sermon given in London.\textsuperscript{469} It seems that the soldiers of the New Model Army enjoyed the sermons (and not only those preached by Peters). When John Saltmarsh, William Dell and William Sedgwick preached to the army in May 1646, ‘many souldiers were at each sermon, divers of them climbing up into trees to hear[...] and it is
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\textit{Proceedings of Gallant Col. Mitton in North-Wales, as is assured under the hands of several Commanders of Note.} London, 1646, 3–4. Apparently, in Ireland, the situation was so severe that some soldiers threatened to change sides and join the Irish rebels, which indicated that even joining with the dehumanised enemy was better than starving without pay. John Booker, \textit{Lieutenant Colonell John Booker being sent out of the Province of Munster by the Right Honourable the Lord of Inchiquine Lord President, and the Councell of Warre there...} 1646.

\textsuperscript{463} The Mayor of London required every minister to influence their congregations ‘to helpe the Lord against the mighty, with their prayers, and all other helps of money, armes, horses, men, or other provisions’. \textit{A full and true Relation Of the great Defeat given to Sir Ralph Hopton By Sir William Waller: Certified by several Letters from Sir William Wallers quarters...} London, 1644, A4r–A4v.

\textsuperscript{464} For example, Christopher Tesdale preached on the importance of financial issues: ‘But now our armes cannot move without their nerves, money is the sinew of warre; there must be not onely praying and fighting, but paying too.’ Tesdale, \textit{Hierusalem: Or a Vision of Peace}, 18.

\textsuperscript{465} Herbert Palmer, \textit{The Duty & Honour of Church-Restorers: Set forth in a Sermon preached to the Honourable House of Commons, Septemb. 30. 1646...} London, 1646, 30.

\textsuperscript{466} \textit{Mercurius Candidus. Communicating the Weekly Newes to the Kingdome of England. From Wednesday, Novemb. 11. to Friday, Novemb. 20th. 1646...} London, 1646, 5.

\textsuperscript{467} \textit{A Declaration Of The gallant Service performed by the thrice worthy and faithfull Minister of the Gospell of Jesus Christ, Mr. Hugh Peters, In the West of England...} London, 1646, 3–4.

\textsuperscript{468} \textit{Master Peters Messuage From Sir Thomas Fairfax, Delivered in both Houses of the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled: With the whole state of the West...} London, 1646, 3–4.

\textsuperscript{469} \textit{Mercurius Academicus. The eleventh Weeke. Monday. February 23. 1645 [i.e. 1646], Pr–Pv.}
very observable to consider the love and unity which is amongst the soldiery, Presbytery and Independency making no breach."  

It goes without saying that not everyone was a man of faith even in Parliament’s armies. By contrast, some soldiers might even have been hostile to the religious indoctrination present in many a military camp. For instance, a Parliamentarian newsheet, Britaines Remembrancer from March 1644, reported that one major of a horse regiment had mocked soldiers singing psalms, saying ‘Pox light on all these Roundheads, they think to go to Heaven by singing of Psalms’. The author of the pamphlet was desiring more throughout reformation, so this ‘and many examples of the like nature in the Armie of the Parliament’ could be examined critically. However, it is plausible that this kind of hostile attitude towards religion was manifested even in the armies of Parliament.

There are plenty of military sermons that have survived in printed and published form, and it is possible to see what kind of spiritual education the soldiers received from them. The same cannot be said about songs and psalms that apparently were popular in the armies. At least secular songs were probably transmitted only orally, and thus their content lost after those who knew them passed away. Some did survive in print, however, and it is fascinating to examine how even Puritan songs contained advice on crucial issues of war. In March 1644, A Spirituall Song of Comfort by one William Starbuck was published. Each verse of the song had a biblical reference, and they propagated precisely the things that the Puritan ministers stressed in their sermons: a just cause, God’s help, trusting in the Lord instead of in worldly advantages, praying and disregarding the nuisances common to a soldier’s life. The pamphlet exhorted its readers to actively sing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs as an encouragement in the cause of Christ. Hence, it is possible that the famous psalm-singing of the Puritan soldiers was not only an outward sign of piety, but they repeated and circulated the same messages that were given to the soldiers by the clergy.

There are considerably fewer references to the activities of Royalist chaplains than there are of Puritan chaplains, and most of such references are found in Parliamentarian sources. To be sure, there were preachers in the King’s armies assigned to their regiments. In this respect, it was no different from

470 Perfect Occurrences Of Both Houses of Parliament, and Martilll Affairs. The Two and Twentie Week, ending Friday the 29. of May. 1646, 4.
471 Britaines Remembrancer: Of the most remarkable Passages in both Kingdomes. From Tuesday the 19. of Mar. to Tuesday the 26. of Mar. 1644, 15.
472 William Starbuck, A Spirituall Song of Comfort Or Incouragement to the Souldiers that now are gone forth in the Cause of Christ, 1644, single sheet.
473 Their pay is stipulated in A true Abstract of a List, In which is set down the several entertainments allowed by His Majesty to the Officers and other soldiery of His Army. London, 1642, 5. Furthermore, a proclamation of the King himself
the Parliamentarian army’s structure. One pamphlet highlighted how the King’s ministers were
expected to give encouragement and a sense of purpose: ‘I think, the Kings chief Confidence lyes not
in his forces strength, so much, as in the fury of his daring Cavalliers, to whom he is exhorted to give
a firme Belieff, and a faithfull adherence, by the Clergy about him.’474 They were also active in more
concrete pursuits and, thus, comparable to Hugh Peters’ efforts in raising money. A Parliamentarian
newssheet narrated that the chaplain of the Marquess of Hertford had been captured while executing
the Commission of Array in Sommersetshire.475 Another pamphlet described how the minister of the
town of Southam was ‘a man of very evill and dissolute conversation, and had sustained in his house
many Cavalieres at his owne charges’. The Parliamentarians searched the minister’s house and found
muskets, powder and ammunition there.476 Reputedly, some Royalist ministers had even more warlike
roles. One Thomas Ellis related how Prince Rupert’s chaplain, a Scotsman named Askin, threatened
a Parliamentarian soldier with a pistol and actually pulled the trigger, but the bullet only went through
the brim of his hat and did no harm.477 The veracity of this story can be doubted, written as it was to
illustrate God’s providence (and probably to make the Prince appear in a bad light), but this unclerical
action warranted reference. All such reports suggest that the King’s ministers participated in the same
kind of activities as their Parliamentarian counterparts. However, there were other narratives as well.
A letter purportedly from the King’s army (said to have been intercepted by Parliamentarian scouts)
portrayed the Royalists and their religiosity in a more negative light. ‘We have no strength at all of
our own; and there is so much profanenesse and irreligion, so much violence and oppression amongst
us, that I know not how to expect any assistance from above, that God can blesse the proceedings of
so wicked an Armie, whose sinnes increase with our punishments’, the author, John Crofts, lamented,
painting a stark contrast to the religious harmony of the Parliamentarian armies.478 An account of the
capture, imprisonment and eventual death of William Chillingworth, by Puritan preacher Francis
Cheynell, related that the Royalist minister had a huge role in military affairs but also that he
conducted this work badly. Chillingworth’s comrades, Royalist officers had allegedly blamed him of
managing ‘martiall affaires, in which hee hath no experience, by the strength of his own wit and

decreed in detail their responsibilities, such as reading divine service twice per day and preaching every Sunday. By the
King. A Proclamation for the inhibiting all manner of Oathes, 1643.
474
A Most True Relation of the Present State of His Majesties Army; Wherein also the truth of that Declaration published
by the Parliament, of their happy Victory in the Battaile at Keynton... London, 1642, A3r.
475
A Continuation Of certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament, & divers other parts of
the Kingdom, from the 10 of October, to the 14. London, 1642, A3r–A3v.
476
A true and perfect Diurnall Of all the chiefe passages in Lancashire, From the 3. of July to the 9. London, 1642, 3.
477
Valour Crowned. Or A Relation of the Valiant Proceedings of the Parliament Forces in the Closse at Lichfield, Against
478
The copy of a letter sent from the Kings Army to a Gentleman of worth and qualitie in Suffolk: Shewing the present
condition of the Kings Army, intercepted August 28... 1644, A2v.
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reason’. Cheynell was – or appeared to be – gracious to his dead enemy and pointed out whether the failure of the defence works designed by Chillingworth was the fault of officers and soldiers who manned the walls.\textsuperscript{479} Be that as it may, Parliamentarian sources on the military activities of the King’s ministers are anything but flattering.

The war efforts of the King’s ministers, as they are derived from Parliamentarian sources, remain unclear.\textsuperscript{480} However, regarding certain matters, Royalists came out in their own words. Puritan religiosity and zeal were often the target of criticism by the Royalist clergy. Thus, it is likely that Puritan spiritual instruction for war was abhorred by Royalist ministers in general. There are instances of Royalists coming out in print complaining how Puritan ministers influenced simple souls with their malignant lies and wrong interpretations of Scripture. For instance, the King’s minister Lionel Gatford published a sermon, \textit{An Exhortation to Peace}, and used its preface to complain that ‘Priests of Mars[…] daily wrest and pervert the Word of truth to encourage to warre’. He purposely avoided judging them with too harsh words because he was presenting a call for peace.\textsuperscript{481} However, he continued criticising Puritan preachers in the actual sermon, writing that ‘the bloody reformers of these times cry up the laying of the foundation of their reformation of Gods publike worship in service in nothing but blood’.\textsuperscript{482} It seemed that Gatford was worried about the lack of official hierarchy in Puritan circles, for he told of some soldiers who had claimed they did not use the Lord’s Prayer at all but only prayed as the spirit taught them. He doubted it was the spirit of God because it would never disdain the Lord’s Prayer, and it would speak for peace. Soldiers should pray, according to Gatford, but should not strike more sparks to fan the flames of war. They should rather look forward to that time when they could perform their devotions peacefully.\textsuperscript{483} The Royalist author recognized certain Parliamentarian preachers and the core verses of their warlike sermons, and he explained those verses and their proper meaning, trying to show his readers that the Puritans were in error. Of course, this made little impact on the intended audience of the Parliamentarian sermons, but it demonstrated that the problem of preaching for war – and possibly its effects – were understood in Royalist circles. In Gatford’s opinion, ministers should gave sermons for peace, and it was only under certain

\textsuperscript{479} Francis Cheynell, \textit{Chillingworthi Novissima. Or, the Sickness, Heresy, Death, and Buriall of William Chillingworth}. London, 1644, B4v–Cr.
\textsuperscript{480} Even after the Restoration, Royalist ministers who had experienced the war first hand were reluctant of revealing their own involvement in it. In these later days the horror of religious radicalism was added to the traditional condemnation of the Christian ministers’ war efforts. Hence, the surviving ministers kept their silence about the possible personal contributions to the Royal cause in the 1640s, even if they were anxious to claim some compensation of their loyal service. See McCall, \textit{Baal’s Priests}, 104–108.
\textsuperscript{481} Lionel Gatford, \textit{An Exhortation to Peace: with an intimation of the prime enemies thereof, lately delivered in a sermon}. London, 1643, preface, Ar–A4v.
\textsuperscript{482} Ibid. 8.
\textsuperscript{483} Ibid. 11–12.
circumstances that warlike preaching was lawful: ‘shew how ill-beseeming and incongruous, if not wicked and pernicious; it is for us Preachers of the Gospell [...] to encourage to warres, unless we have some speciall calling from God thereunto.’ Such a special calling, however, was at the heart of Puritan theology of war.

A Royalist pamphlet titled *The Round-heads Remembrancer*, from May 1643, detailed Sir Ralph Hopton’s victories against the Parliamentarians in Cornwall. The anonymous author complained of the Puritan manner of attributing everything to God and religion. Hence, that habit was seen to be in contrast to Royalist practice and shows how at least some contemporaries thought Parliamentarian preachers to be very religious, even excessively so:

> Nothing is more frequent with the Agents in this Rebellion, then to fasten their Treasons on God and Religion. If they plunder and rob a mans house, those stoln goods are presently the gifts of God. If they fight and are beaten, then either they deny it, and give thanks for a victory; or else confesse some small losse, which God sent to them by his speciall Providence to draw the Cavaleirs into further destruction.

The author referred to overstatements by Puritan preachers, such as Burroughs and Sedgwick, who had evoked quite grandiose language after only minor victories, comparing these successes to the Israelites’ passage through the Red Sea or to the pulling down of the walls of Jericho. He mockingly wrote ‘if at any time they prosper and prevaile over the Kings forces by stealing on them in their beds, by a perfidious Treaty, or some other worse meanes, then each thread and particle of their successse is the Wonderfull worke of God’. It seemed that the Royalists were well aware of the religious practices of the Parliamentarian soldiers, for *The Round-heads Remembrancer* detailed a fast sermon given by a Puritan preacher two days before the battle. The preacher had prayed for good success for the Parliamentarian army and lifted the spirits of the soldiers, according to the author, ‘when Rebels fast they are commonly most confident’. The same pamphlet also included an allegedly Parliamentarian letter that had been intercepted on its way to London. It asked for experienced religious soldiers from the capital because ‘The Volunteers will not do the worke’. A letter, written to the Puritan minister Stephen Marshall and published in May 1643, criticised the involvement of Parliamentarian preachers in the war. It addressed Marshall: ‘Sir, you have approved of these wars;

---
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nay, being a Chaplaine to this Army, have animated our brethren in these wars.\textsuperscript{488} It is to be noted that Marshall was aware of the criticism levelled at him, and he commented on his career in the army: ‘my Office in the Armie (which was not to fight, nor meddle in the Councell of War, but onely to teach them how to behave themselves according to the Word, that God might be with them).\textsuperscript{489} Mercurius Academicus, the Royalist newspaper, criticised ‘the fighting Preacher’, a man named Ford who was a Captain under Colonel Bingham. This dual role did not stop Ford from preaching to the parishioners of Winborne, Dorsetshire.\textsuperscript{490} Religious suspicions sometimes had significant consequences, as a Royalist apology for the surrender of Bridgewater narrated. The author, colonel Edmond Wyndham, defended himself against the criticism levelled at him for the loss. He therefore had a strong motive to present his account in a specific way. According to him, a large number of soldiers defending Bridgewater had formerly served in Parliament’s armies. Thus, when the attack came, they purposely shot over the enemy or shot without bullets, and they defended their actions after the surrender by calling Royalist officers Papists and asking them, ‘whether they believed that they would fight against the Parliament to defend Papist Rogues’.\textsuperscript{491} Hence, the reported religiosity of the Parliamentarian armies was not purely the product of Puritan propaganda that wanted to portray the soldiers as better Christians than they actually were. Even Royalists acknowledged their spiritual character, even as they derided and criticised it.

A more extensive example of these opposing viewpoints to religious war was given by Edward Symmons, a chaplain of the life-guard of the Prince of Wales, who published a pamphlet that criticised Stephen Marshall’s Meroz Cursed (against which also Gatford spoke in An Exhortation to Peace). Marshall’s sermon had been given already in 1642, before the hostilities began, and proved to be highly popular since it was republished several times during the war.\textsuperscript{492} Symmons’s answer came in late 1644, and it was prompted by his meeting with captured Puritan soldiers. When Symmons questioned these soldiers about their reasons to rise in a rebellion against the King, they answered that they had taken up arms against the anti-Christ and popery because ‘tis prophesied in the Revelation, that the Whore of Babylon shall be destroyed with fire and sword, and what doe you
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know, but this is the time of her ruine, and that we are the men that must help to pull her downe’. They also told Symmons that all ‘truly godly divines’, such as Marshall, were of the opinion that the anti-Christ was in England as well as in Rome, and that bishops and their adherents, including the ‘Popish’ soldiers of the King, were ‘Babylonish and Antichristian’. It was their duty as godly Protestants to fight against the Devil, they claimed, and the warrants for their action were the command of Parliament, the motion of God’s spirit in his people, and the example of all Puritan ministers in leading, encouraging and stirring them up. As a proper argumentative Royalist divine, Symmons tried to reason with the prisoners, showing them the verses in question from the Bible and trying to make them see the error of their interpretation. The Puritans, however, did not waver in their opinion that had been sparked by Marshall’s sermon. Symmons, who had a huge appreciation for Marshall, did not believe them at first, but after discovering the sermon in question, he had to pen an answer to it with a heavy heart.

The answer Symmons gave was very thorough, as was usual for Royalist divines. As we have seen, they rather gladly engaged themselves in debates with their Parliamentarian counterparts, and Symmons was no exception. He criticized Marshall for referring wrongly to the Bible: it was the time of the gospel in which they were now living, and there should be blesses instead of curses. Symmons also censured the Puritan minister for fighting alongside soldiers instead of only teaching and instructing them. More militant participation in the war seems to have been common for some chaplains, especially on the Parliamentarian side. However, since it was quite abnormal and even horrendous for a clergyman to fight in battle, we can estimate that such rumours were spread for propaganda purposes too. Symmons accepted the unreliable nature of his sources:

I have heard some of his friends, (Clergy men of that Faction) whether truly or falsely, I cannot tell, glory much in his activity and valour that way; How like a Couragious Captaine, he went before the Souldiers into the Field: incouraged them by his owne example to the Battell: yea brought up the Rere, Charged himselfe at Edgehill.

He also confessed hearing others say that Marshall and other Parliamentarian ministers ‘themselves got up upon an Hill a mile or two off, whence with their Prospective glasses, they beheld the fighting’. It did not matter to Symmons, however, which relation was true. If fighting was unlawful for a minister, he asked, was not provoking others to fight unlawful too, ‘for most men do interpret, that to do any evil against others, to execute indeed what one can wish in words, is no lesse then to fight
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with them’. If a minister joined an army to teach God’s word to the soldiers, he should not be preaching for war but rather for peace, and he should bless enemy as well as respect and obey the King.495

The content and effect of Marshall’s sermons were quite the opposite in the Parliamentarian armies. Symmons explicitly stated that the Parliamentarian soldiers learned to call the Royalists by dehumanising language because of Marshall’s sermon and others like it. According to the author, the Puritan soldiers were taught that the killing of helpless enemies was work most acceptable to God, and he also could relate that some of that party thought that they could not in good conscience give quarter to those for the King, nor accept any from them.496 These claims were, of course, out of proportion with regard to a single sermon, but there is no reason to believe the sincerity of Symmons or the soldiers he interviewed in believing to this effect. His opinion was that the Puritan preachers were indeed mostly to blame for the war:

And the very truth is, these very men have beene the cheifest exciters unto, and promoters of this most accursed and unnaturall Rebellion, which worke or imploymcnt of theirs, hath wrought a very Metamorphosis in many of their owne natures and dispositions; divers whom I have knowne to be[…] of most milde and compassionate spirits[…] are now become most savage and bloudy.497

Symmons’s book directed strong criticism towards Puritan preachers and clearly formulated the stance of Royalist ministers towards the use of religion in instructing soldiers for war. It also showed how powerful the effects of Puritan instruction could be on contemporaries. According to Symmons and many others, the fiery oratory of the Parliamentarian preachers really made the soldiers more zealous and bloodthirsty. Since this kind of behaviour was not Christian by any means, in the opinion of the Royalist clergy, the King’s ministers tried to cultivate moral reforms among their armies instead of paying attention to the actual warfare. Fighting a battle was a bloody affair, however, no matter how one looked at it, and it is easy to see how the ‘less Christian’ sermons of the Parliamentarian preachers were received by soldiers with more enthusiasm, and how they benefited their audience more in the violent profession of a soldier.

The effects of religious instruction and exhortation were a product of deliberate plans when the New Model Army was formed. According to the Parliamentary chronicler John Vicars:
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they took special care of the Spiritual Discipline thereof, by sufficient and able Preachers to goe along with
them [...] the House of Commons, therefore, Ordered that the Assembly of divines should nominate and
present to Sir Thomas Fairfax, such pious and learned Preachers as they knew every way fit and able for
that service.  

There was also great interest in the newly modelled army and its character outside the immediate
Parliamentarian circles. For example, a pamphlet was published in March 1645 by one John Brandon,
a veteran commander in several brigades during the Civil War, according to his own words. The
pamphlet was dedicated to Parliament, and the author hoped that it would help them regulate the army
properly. His plans were a bit grandiose, suggesting, for example, that the proper size of the army
should be 100 000 soldiers in total (the strength of the combined Parliamentarian army at Marston
Moor, the largest battle of the Civil War, was a bit more than 20 000 men), but he also stressed the
importance of the religiosity of the officers, ‘so as they may take no place of honour upon them for
any by or mercinary ends, but to joy in that God has pleas’d to make them Instruments as in
maintaining his Cause, & to be Circumspect, as they may do no unjust act’. The pamphlet was
popular enough – or Brandon was persistent enough – to warrant a second edition, which was
published already in April and was otherwise the same except for the title page. The title of the
pamphlet was now The Reformed Army, and it was claimed that it had been ‘Seene and allowed by
the Right Honourable, the Lords, and Commons, in Parliament, and published for the good of the
Kingdome in generall’. Be that as it may, the importance of religion in the New Model Army was
acknowledged both by those close to Parliament and those outside the decision making process.

Parliamentarians knew precisely what they wanted to accomplish by ordering certain ministers to act
as chaplains of the army. Spiritual discipline reinforced the martial discipline of the soldiers as well
as bound them together in a common purpose, and the aforementioned references show that this was
not merely propaganda, but there were tangible results to the religious indoctrination. Attributing the
success of the New Model Army to spiritual instruction is, of course, an overstatement, but there is
some truth to Vicars’s question, ‘is not such an Army like to thrive... where piety and probity, as well
as courage and magnanimity is so piously and prudently endeavoured?’ There were a lot of
necessary qualities to a good soldier and to a functioning, united army. Religiosity and its by-product
of a discipline-reinforcing, encouraging, uniting and cause-giving factor were not the least of these
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qualities, and it was important for the Parliamentarian war effort that this was understood and put to efficient use.

The godly armies not only professed and practised religion but they also displayed their faith very publicly. Earlier scholarship has brought to our attention the banners of companies and regiments, which usually included a motto of some sort, either political or religious. For Parliamentarian soldiers, these were usually of the latter, especially since banners normally bore the personal colours of commanding officers, and the officers in the New Model Army were very religious more often than not. The words on these banners were, for example, ‘Let God arise and let his enemies be scattered’ (of a cavalry officer John Fiennes, younger brother of the more famous Nathaniel Fiennes), ‘If God is with us who can be against us?’ (of a captain James Berry), and ‘Pray and fight: Jehovah helps, and he will continue to help’ (of Philip Skippon, a major-general of The New Model Army infantry). These banners were a source of pre-combat motivation for the officers and proclaimed their unwavering certainty of being on God’s side in the conflict.\(^{502}\)

Another way to proudly proclaim religious fervour was by battle cries. As did standards and banners, these cries also had a practical purpose: to tell one’s own soldiers apart from the enemies in the chaotic situation of a battle. These words were often used in conjunction with physical signs to distinguish one’s own troops, and they were subject to change if the enemy had somehow managed to figure out the words. A Parliamentarian newssheet, *The Citties weekly Post*, wrote about the battle of Torrington in February 1646:

> Our first word was Emanuell, God with us, and a Furbush in our Hatts; theirs, We are with you, and an Handcharchiffe tyed about their right Arms, but in regard they had taken some few of our men prisoners, and got the word and Signall, the word at this onset was Truely, and a Handcarchiffe or white marke in our Hats.\(^{503}\)

The consequences of forgetting the words of one’s own side could be, if not always fatal, serious enough to warrant attention. For example, in a skirmish in Leicestershire in March 1643, the only Parliamentarian losses were four wounded men, ‘whereof one was casually hurt by Colonell Grey,

---


503 *The Citties weekly Post Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies to the Kingdome. Num. 10. From Tuesday the 17. of February to Tuesday the 24. of February. 1646*. 4. John Vicars gave this latter word in the form ‘Truth’ in his Parliamentarian Chronicle. See Vicars, *Magnalia Dei Anglicana*, 368.
because he forgot our Word, which was God prosper us, the enemies word being, For the King’. 504

As we can see from the example above, the words of the Royalist battle cries concentrated mostly on the Royal family. 505 The Parliamentarians, as was expected, almost exclusively invoked God with their words, and when they did not, their battle cries still had religious overtones. In the first battle of Newbury, for example, the words were ‘Religion’ for the Earl of Essex’s army and ‘Queen Mary in the field’ for the King’s. 506 In the last siege of Bristol in 1645, the New Model Army soldiers shouted ‘David’ and ‘The Lord of Hosts’. 507 The Lancashire Royalists retained the Queen’s name in their words, ‘In with Queen Mary’, while their Parliamentarian counterparts used ‘God with us’ 508 – the latter was to be the most common Puritan war cry during the Civil War. It was used in the battle of Marston Moor, where even the Royalists’ words were related to religion (‘God and the King’) 509, in the siege of Plymouth in late 1643 (where the Royalists used ‘The Towne is ours’), 510 and even earlier by the army of sir William Waller in his campaign in Hampshire in the beginning of 1643. Other words were mentioned during that campaign as well, all of them very godly (‘Jesus help us’ and ‘Glory be to God’). 511 The words changed often in Waller’s army, for one captain John Jones reported in a letter, in March 1644, that their ‘last field word was Jesus Blessee Us’, while the Royalist word was ‘God and the Cause’. 512 A similar word, ‘God and a good cause’, was used by the Royalists at the siege of Nantwich in January 1644. 513 There was more variance in the theme of the words of the
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King’s soldiers. In Naseby, those words were ‘Queen Mary’\(^{514}\) (whereas the New Model Army used ‘God is our strength’)\(^{515}\) and at the battle of Langport later that same summer, the Royalists shouted ‘Bristoll’ as opposed to the familiar Parliamentarian ‘God with Us’\(^{516}\). At their last desperate battle at Stow-on-the-Wold, on the 21\(^{st}\) of March 1646, the King’s soldiers used ‘Patrick and George’ and the Parliamentarians ‘God be our guide’\(^{517}\).

The godly saw these words as direct appeals to God, as prayer-like invocations of His Providence and protection. A Presbyterian minister, Obadiah Sedgwick, who had served in Parliament’s army in 1642 and preached to its soldiers at Edgehill, gave a thanksgiving sermon before the Commons at Westminster in April 1644 for the victory of the battle of Cheriton. In the sermon, Sedgwick explained the importance of the battle cries from a theological point of view. According to him, both sides in the battle had appealed to God. The Royalists’ words were ‘God is for Us’, while the Parliamentarians used their usual ‘God is with Us’. ‘That each Army by the words they gave out, did put themselves upon God that day; and entitled themselves, with his Name, and his cause, and his service.’ As the battle ended with a victory for Parliament, Sedgwick interpreted this to mean that God had decided to support their cause: ‘And verily brethren, the Lord himself in that day of our battle, seemed to decide the great doubt, and to resolve the question, which side was right; whose cause was his: who were for him, and who against him.’ Victory, after both sides had appealed to God, told the Puritan minister that the Lord had indeed intervened on behalf of those who were fighting for his cause.\(^{518}\)

Moreover, not only did preachers make a connection between the words and their meaning. New Model Army general Fairfax, according to the Parliamentarian chronicler John Vicars, gave a speech to his soldiers before the battle of Naseby and reminded the men of the content of their words:

> Bee strong and courageous[...] bee not afraid nor dismayed for the Kings Army, not for all the multitude of his Horse and Riders that are come together; for (according to our Signall-word) there are moe with us (wee
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having God our Friend) than are with them. With them is but an arm of flesh, but with us is the Lord our God, to help us and to fight our battails.\footnote{\textit{Vicars, Magnalia Dei Anglicana}, 160.}

As mentioned before, the Parliamentarian words at Naseby were ‘God is our strength’, and it seems that Fairfax had chosen these words to remind his soldiers of the religious nature of their struggle and of God’s help in vanquishing the opposing armies, who relied only on physical arms and manpower. Since all the Parliamentarian words were religious in nature, we can safely assume that they were seen as more than a signal, as Sedgwick and Fairfax indicated. There was a purpose, founded no doubt on real belief, to call on God’s support for the army in every possible way. This showcased both how religious beliefs influenced concrete Parliamentarian war efforts and how they set their armies in stark contrast to the King’s armies, which had more varied themes in their signal words.

Therefore, the answer to the question concerning the effect of religious instruction can only be speculative. Numerous sermons and texts exhorted soldiers to works of iconoclasm or taught them to be good Christian warrior saints. We also have a lot of evidence of the supposed effects of this exhortation: narratives and reports of iconoclasm and of pious soldiers singing psalms and praying. Of course, the largest number of these accounts came from the Puritan clergy, who certainly had reason to make their soldiers appear godly. It is evident that these preachers wanted to stress their own importance and role in the war between Christ and the anti-Christ. Draping the conflict in religious robes could very well stem from real belief as much as from more mundane concerns, but we do not possess definitive means of finding out what the true reason was. Neither can we know whether the soldiers, if they acted as they were reported to have done, observed the religious instruction because of the encouragement and exhortation of the preachers or if they had other motives. It is quite certain that they several motives, but to what degree may we present religious instruction as belonging to those motives is another matter.

What we do have, however, are sources from different authors on the different sides of the conflict that portray quite convincingly that there were differences between Parliamentarian and Royalist soldiers in how they related to religion and how they used it as a tool of warfare. Contemporaries surely had their own reasons to present matters in a certain way, reasons that did not necessarily have anything to do with the issues of spiritual guidance and faith. Still, it can be suggested that, even if the Puritan clergy did embellish their role in making Parliamentarian soldiers godly, the Royalist ministers seemed to agree with the major role of their enemies, judging by the criticism of godly
preachers and their actions in the armies. Since both sides acknowledged the Puritan religious influence on soldiers, it can be assumed that it was, to some extent, a real phenomenon or at least one possible reason for the different behaviour of the soldiers serving in the opposing armies. Religious instruction did not probably win the war for Parliament any more than any other single issue that had an effect on its outcome, and it did not make all the Puritan soldiers pious and godly saints who would have followed the military articles as well as their chaplains’ exhortations to the letter. It was, however, markedly different among the Royalists from what it was among the Parliamentarians, and it also seems that the general attitudes within the two camps towards these spiritual matters were not similar. There had to be a reason why some Puritan soldiers displayed religious fervour in a way that had no counterpart in the Royalist armies, and it is only proper to bring forth as a possible cause the very thing that was designed to produce this effect: religion.

It is also worthwhile to note that the difference in the spirituality of the soldiers in the King’s and Parliament’s armies might have not resulted from the differences in religious instruction but rather because highly religious people volunteered for the Parliamentarian armies more willingly than for the Royalists’. Thus, religious indoctrination was not the cause of the spiritual qualities of Parliament’s soldiers but a by-product of it. This is something hinted at by the Puritan minister Richard Baxter in his autobiography, Reliquiae Baxterianae. Baxter had a long career in the armies of Parliament, preaching to officers and soldiers, and he must have therefore been intimately familiar with these military matters. According to him, it was ‘principally the differences about Religious Matters that filled up the Parliaments Armies, and put the Resolution and Valour into their Soldiers, which carried them on in another manner than mercenary Soldiers are carried on’. He confessed that not everyone was this pious, but ‘the generality of the People[...] who were then called Puritans’ and who rigorously participated in religious activities and abstained from sins, ‘the main Body of this sort of Men, both Preachers and People, adhered to the Parliament’. By contrast, those ‘that were not so precise and strict against an Oath, or Gaming, or Plays, or Drinking’ and were not too troubled with spiritual matters and derided those who were, ‘the main Body of these were against the Parliament’. Thus, Baxter explained this difference in the quality of men by ‘natural dispositions and Interests’.520 This distinction also explained, in Baxter’s opinion, why ‘the ignorant sort of the Country’ flocked to the Parliament’s armies instead of the King’s. It was ‘meerly because they heard Men swear for the Common Prayer and Bishops, an heard other pray that were against them’. The behaviour of the religious Puritan soldiers seemed to be a great factor for Baxter in explaining the choice of sides, and
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the Royalists’ sin and debauchery made them more odious to the general population. Thus, he summed, ‘all the sober Men that I was acquainted with, who were against the Parliament, were wont to say, [The King hath the better Cause, but the Parliament hath the better Men]’.

---
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PART II: DEHUMANISATION

7. THE IRISH REBELLION

The Irish Rebellion, undeniably one of the most important political events that led up to the War of the Three Kingdoms, began in October 1641. The atrocities towards Protestant settlers, which were propagated by the public press, caused immense panic and hysteria in England.\(^{522}\) It was, however, not only scaremongering: these events and the publications narrating them were important benchmarks for dehumanisation in the coming Civil War. The delegitimization of the Irish provides a strong, comparable example in light of which to view how the English Catholics and the Irish who took part in the war, primarily in the King’s army, were described. I seek to demonstrate that the treatment of the Irish in the public press stemmed mainly from religion. In sermons as well as in newssheets, religious aspects were highlighted: the rebellion was a Popish plot against not only the King but also the true Protestant religion. The rebels were portrayed as inhuman barbarians and uncivilised savages, who were instigated and guided in their rebellion by Catholic priests and Jesuits. Secular authorities adopted this religious dehumanising language – not only a few zealous Puritan preachers were willing to rain fire and brimstone upon the Irish but also the newssheets, petitions and even Parliament’s declarations used very harsh language in their condemnation of the Rebellion. Finally, I suggest that those who would later take sides with Parliament were both faster with and more severe in their reactions towards the atrocities than the King, which heightened their mistrust towards him and facilitated the eventual juxtaposition between the Irish and the Royalists.

The role of the Catholic faith in instigating the rebellion was emphasised by the English clergy. A Puritan minister and later chaplain to the Earl of Essex’s regiment of horse, Cornelius Burges, preached to the House of Commons about the Popish traitors and their doctrine on 5 November 1641. He told his audience that God abhorred priests and Jesuits, traitors and rebels, and since there was nothing else to expect from agents of Rome than rage, cruelty and rebellion, they should not be trusted nor tolerated, and laws against the Catholics should certainly not be mitigated.\(^{523}\) Treason was inherent in the Catholic religion, ‘their very Religion itself leads them unto it’. Furthermore, the priests were responsible for infusing these religious principles into the people and urging them to action. Allegedly, the Catholics were constantly plotting to destroy the King and the Protestant
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religion and to expose Britain to foreign enemies.\(^{524}\) Puritan ministers were afraid of a Catholic doctrine that decreed that no faith should be kept with heretics. This gave Protestant authors a strong propaganda weapon, and they used it to stress how malicious and untrustworthy Catholics were. Their fear was that the Catholics would renounce themselves from their oath of allegiance to a Protestant ruler because that would not be treasonous from the Catholic point of view and indeed even a laudable action which would be rewarded.

Numerous ministers pointed out this potential disloyalty. John Goodwin, an Independent divine, preached in his parish church of St. Stephens in that same November to promote sending relief to the Protestants in Ireland. Catholics could be dangerous subjects, Goodwin claimed: ‘It is the inspiration of their Religion and teachers, that it is no lesse than damnable sinne, and to be punished with Hellfire, once to doubt or question whether it be meritorious or no, to murder Kings and Princes, when the advancement of the Catholique cause requireth it.’\(^{525}\) The idea that the Pope could inspire Catholics to murder their Protestant ruler was horrifying to the English and one of the reasons why the Catholics were not seen and treated as loyal subjects.

Goodwin did not only fear for the King’s life but he also recognised the danger to all Protestants and even to their faith. He appealed to his audience:

> Redeeme the lives and liberties and estates of your poore Brethren the Protestants in Ireland[...] out of the mercilesse hand of those cruell, blood thirstie and implacable enemies both theirs and your’s, that Butcherly, and bloody faction of Rome, who are now gathered together like an Army of chased Beares, and fierce Lyons against them, in an heate and ecstacie of revenge and being led on by that Prince of darknesse, that great roaring Lyon the Devill.

The enemy, ‘that faction of Hell, the Romish party’ and ‘an Army of Lyons’ was ‘of a bloody, barbarous, and revengefull spirit: all mercie, pittie, and compassion, yea humanitie it selfe is hid from their eyes’. This is a very clear example of depicting the enemy as inhuman by using religious connotations. Catholics were ‘under a vow, to make as cleere riddance of Protestants and Protestant Religion out of the Kingdome, as their lying Legend reports that their Saint Patrick made of Serpents & Toades’.\(^{526}\) The Protestants’ holy, pure and true faith and religion was the reason for this enmity. Goodwin stressed that the cause for which they were now engaged was ‘cleerely and intirely’ their

\(^{524}\) Ibid. 20.


\(^{526}\) Ibid. 26–28.
religion. Thus, Goodwin depicted bloody, barbarous Papists led by the Devil himself, cruelly murdering innocent Protestants because of religion.

The antichristian nature of the enemy and an eschatological view of the rebellion were propagated often and clearly for a Protestant audience. The attacks were not only against the English or Scots as foreigners but also and especially against the true Protestant religion. The dean of Kilmore, Henry Jones, was convinced that the rebellion in Ireland was ‘a most bloudy and Antichristian combination and plot hatched[…] intending the utter extirpation of the reformed Religion and the professors of it’, and that it was instigated by ‘Popish Priests, Friers, and Jesuites’ and born ‘out of that ancient and known hatred the Church of Rome beareth to the reformed Religion’. According to Jones, even barbarians and heathens could not perpetrate such cruelties. He listed extensively what horrors the Irish had done to Protestants, to churches and sacred items such as the Bible, and even to cattle, commenting that the cruelties were ‘more than barbarous, dayly exercised upon us by those inhumane, blood-sucking Tygers’ In another pamphlet, Jones presented the same accusations of ‘lurking Jesuits’ and ‘disloyall and perfidious Romanists’, who had ‘gathered together a multitude of desperate savage barbarous fellowes’ to start the rebellion. The cause was, again, ‘not only private discontent of some particular men, but universall, Romish, and devillish’, of rebellious people prone to ‘disloyall ingratitude and heathenish immanity’. Jones linked the uprising with Catholicism and condemned it forcefully:

Their pretended Catholike cause, which already appeareth to be the mother of treason, and rebellion, the sin of witchcraft, murder, and all other abominations, and will shortly appear, even to themselves to be the daughter of Antichrist, and Antichristianisme, must by an inevitable divine decree, be convinced by fire, and sword.

James Cranford, a godly minister and a lecturer at St Christopher-le-Stocks in London, reinforced this narrative by editing a pamphlet, The teares of Ireland, which summarised many previously published accounts of atrocities into one collection. In the preface, Cranford claimed that the Pope was the anti-Christ whose Catholic soldiers had slain a great number of people through the years. He
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reminded his readers that the people who had been declared heretics by the Pope could be killed, and he warned that, after Ireland, England would be next to experience religious massacres. His words were a powerful example of rhetoric used to portray the enemy: ‘Enter in and behold, the miseries of Ireland, and if thou findest cruelties unexampled, remember they are Papists, and have, as I am informed, ten thousand Priests in the head of their armies, who besides their tyranny towards our bodies would [...] send our souls in fiery chariots into hell!’ Cranford used familiar characterisations of ‘blody men only skilfull to destroy, whose Religion is founded in bloud’, of ‘blody Papists with their vizards puld off, and now acting their plots like incarnate Devils’, and of ‘blody Tigres and Vultures these Popish spirits’.

Thus, for many a Protestant clergyman, the Irish Rebellion was an example of a Popish plots come to fruition, of antichristian designs to attack and extirpate Protestantism and its practitioners. The Irish were nothing short of inhuman barbarians and savage beasts, incited to cruel atrocities by their own men of faith. The Catholic religion with its hellish doctrines was the reason and cause of this horrible disloyalty. However, presenting the Irish Catholics as traitors, risen up in arms because of their religion, was problematic. Since waging war for religion was condemnable, for the obvious reason of the Irish being depicted as doing so, the English clergy could not directly enforce a Protestant military response on religious grounds. Moreover, if the Catholic religion made men guilty of bloody actions by the instigation of its priests, it was hardly proper for a minister to exhort towards a military response. This discrepancy did not stop Puritan ministers, however. John Brinsley, a pastor of Somerleiton, held a series of weekly sermons in the beginning of 1642 in the church of Great Yarmouth. In these sermons he compared the situation in England and Ireland to troubles in biblical Israel. ‘A seditious party of Romish confederates’ wanted to root out ‘the true Religion of God’ in Ireland. For the cure, he proposed that the only way was to subdue the ‘professed enemies to our Religion’, and he clarified that ‘the way is to bring them under, to cast the shoe over them, putting a yoak upon their necks’. This was not to be done in an unchristian way. Brinsley emphasised that he did not intend to stir up any ‘exercises of savage cruelty’ or ‘to repay them in their own coyne, as to return cruelty, for cruelty’. He left judging and punishment ‘to the wisdom of Superiours’.
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Some ministers were more outspoken than Brinsley and presented clearly what they wanted to accomplish. G. S., a ‘minister of Gods word in Ireland’, wrote a pamphlet ‘to excite The English Nation to relieve our poore Wives and Children[...]. And in exchange to send aid of men, and meanes forthwith to quell their boundlesse insolencies’. The pamphlet was standard anti-Catholic propaganda about popish priests directing the Rebellion and ordering the atrocities. G. S. had no scruples about expressing his solution to the problem: ‘Reward them (we pray) as Iehu did Baals priests; Or deale with them as Samuel dealt with Agag. Hew these trayterous Agags in pieces before the Lord.Severity is but Iustice, when Lenity puts all in hazard.’

John Geree, another minister who raised support for the Protestant cause and a pastor of Tewkesbury in Gloucestershire, preached in July 1642 for charity and help for the Protestants in Ireland, who were murdered and tortured by ‘Antichristian, bloody, unjust, filthy, barbarous Irish Rebells, many of whom have deserved an hundred deaths’. His purpose was to get his parishioners to participate in the effort to quench the Rebellion, either ‘with your purses or your persons’. He condemned neutrality and stated that whoever was not with Christ was against him and sided with the rebels and the anti-Christ. This uncompromising stance was later often seen in the Civil War.

Certainly not only the clergymen were responsible for dehumanising the Irish. Many secular pamphlets covered the situation in Ireland, the Protestant plight, and the cruelty, inhumanity and bestiality of the rebels, echoing the sermons and their religious contents. For instance, one news sheet contained a report of a Scottish volunteer force fighting against ‘the Papists, and that Rebellious nest of Vipers in Ireland’ who were plotting ‘the utter demolition of Christianity’. The ‘Inhumanity and tyrannical cruelty’ of ‘wicked, cruell, impious, Savage, inhumane, irreligious, and Tyrannical Rebels’ was emphasised, while it was stated that the Scots ‘did slay whomsoever they did meet, and supposed to be Rebels’ – even their prisoners. Another pamphlet, probably reporting of the same events, described the enemy as ‘wicked, ungodly, and irreligious’, a ‘hellish company’ of ‘unmercilesse [sic] wolves’. After describing the Rebels’ cruelty towards Protestant civilians, the writer reported that the Irish were eventually surrounded by an army of English and Scots, and ‘were every man of them put
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to the sword, as a just recompence for their rebellion cruelty, to the number of 2500. men. A report of the proceedings of the English army in Ireland mentioned a ‘cruell and most inhumane Adversary’, and was full of accounts of the army ‘burning houses, and killing such Rebels as they found stragling in the way’, ‘killing and hanging Rebels, and burning of houses’, ‘burning houses and killing stragling Rebels’, which made the message very clear: the ‘inhuman antichristian barbarians’ were to be stopped by any means necessary.

Most pamphlets continued to advocate this narrative and underline the role of Catholic priests in the Rebellion. It was ‘a hellish Plot’, ‘the devilish Rebellion in Ireland’ by ‘the Pope and Popish faction’, ‘ravening Wolves’. The uprising was incited by ‘the Priests, Fryers and Jesuites, these great Incendaries of Christendome’ for ‘bloody purposes to the English Nation and Religion’. Another pamphlet described the same: ‘the Jesuits those firebrands of hell, the Popish Priests were the plotters of this and other Treasons, which can at their pleasure absolve subjects of their obedience to their princes, and give power to murther, and depose Kings.’ The role of priests and Jesuits was stressed further: ‘The Priests and Jesuits commonly anoint the rebells with their sacrament of the unction, before they goe to murther and rob, assuring them that for their meritorious service, if they chance to dye or bee killed, they shall escape Purgatory and goe to heaven immediately.’ An author going by the initials M. S. agreed that the ‘Jesuites, Fryers, Priests, and Ghostly Fathers’ had convinced the Irish that it was ‘a meritorious act, to massacre the English heretiques’ and that their souls would go straight to Paradise, if they were killed.

The Irish to whom the atrocities were attributed were described as tools of the Catholic clergy, ‘sons of Beliall, barbarous inhumane Kernes (men who were never acquainted with civilitie or humanitie, who were born to do slaughter and execution) onely to rob, pillage, and spoil, strip and murther the poore English Protestants’. Their inherent barbarity and inhumanity were set in contrast not only to civilised Englishmen but also to traditional foreign enemies:
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The Irish is well known to be a people both proud and envious, for the commonalty they are for the most part ignorant and illiterate, lazy and poor, and will rather beg than work, and therefore fit subjects for the Jesuits, to spur upon such bloody Actions, for Ignorance is without mercy, for never was it heard or knowne, that ever Turk or Infidell did ever use a Christian so unmercifully as they have used the English protestants.550

The Irish were portrayed as savages and monsters. The author M. S. specified the racial characteristics of the common Irish (they were sordid, lazy and heartless, but once trained, excellent soldiers)551 and described Catholics as ‘rather Devils then men’,552 wolves553 and monsters,554 all common dehumanising expressions. All of these were used often as were mentions of the bestial, natural characteristics of the Irish.555 The message was clear – the people of Ireland were not like the decent Protestants of England. They were inhumane people who were more like infidels and heathens than Christians. Hence, even though some of the qualities attributed to the Irish appeared to be quite secular, there was a clear religious overtone to this dehumanisation. This overtone was represented by the portrayal of the priests who were said to have guided the barbarians into attacks against the Protestants and by the notion of an almost innate hatred of the Irish towards good Christians and their civilised values and refined customs, which were contrasted sharply with bestial images and descriptions of the Irish.

These accounts and stories should certainly not be taken at face value. Some of the narratives and reports were obviously exaggerated. Even some contemporaries recognised the unreliable nature of these sources and criticized pamphlets of spreading false rumours and false information about the events in Ireland.556 However, the dehumanising rhetoric in the pamphlets is not related to their factual reliability. Even when one pamphlet noted that ‘many false and uncertain Reports of the State of Ireland hath much abused the truth of things’ it still referred to the ‘most inhumane and barbarous cruelty’ of the Papists.557 It is telling that, when military articles of the rebels were published in
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London, containing explicit prohibitions of attacking Protestant houses or doing violence to women, the title page\footnote{Covers were the essential selling point of pamphlets, reflecting what the authors and publishers thought that their audience wanted to read. These discrepancies can thus be partly explained by economic factors. See Braddick, God's Fury, England's Fire, 175.} of the publication still claimed to have ‘discovered their treacherous practizes under the pretence of Religion, and their bloody Actions full of Cruelty and Barbarisme’.\footnote{A Declaration Sent to the King of France and Spayne, From the Catholiques or Rebells in Ireland: With a manifesto of the Covenant or Oath they have made and taken for the defence of the Catholique League. London, 1642.} This reflected the anti-Irish atmosphere in England and the effect dehumanising publications had had on the general population.

This effect was clearly seen in many a publication. For example, a petition to the Houses of Parliament by several lords and gentlemen of Ireland referred to unparalleled inhumanities committed by ‘monsters’, ‘barbarous Irish Rebells’, and asked for a relief force to be sent speedily to pacify the situation.\footnote{Admirable News From Ireland Both good and true: viz. First, A humble Petition to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, of divers Lords, Knights, and Gentlemen of the Kingdome of Ireland. London, 1642, 1–2.} A proclamation of the Lords Justices in early 1642 placed the blame of the rebellion on hatred felt towards the Protestants English as well as on the ‘inbred ingratitude and disloyalty’. There were references to ‘barbarous cruelties’ and ‘execrable inhumanities’ as well as ‘abominable Treasons and Rebellion’ by ‘notorious, ungrateful, wicked, vile and unnaturall Traytors and Rebells’\footnote{A Proclamation of the Lords Iustices for the apprehension of the chiefe Rebels: And the Reward for taking any of them. London, 1642, 2–9.}. Petitions to the King followed the same model. For example, a petition by ‘the distressed Protestants in Your Majesties Kingdome of Ireland’ complained of ‘a most heavie and cruell tyranny[…] by the rebellious Papists’ and the ‘inhumane cruelties’ of ‘such barbarous monsters’. The petitioners asked for speedy aid, but in such a manner, that would not put the King into danger.\footnote{Lamentable News from Ireland. With The Humble Petition of Your Majesties most fait hfull and loyall Subjects, The distressed Protestants in Your Majesties Kingdom of Ireland. London, 1642, A2r–A4r.} Charles answered his anxious subjects on 1 January 1642. He spoke of ‘lewd and wicked persons’ who had committed ‘wicked disloyaltie and horrible acts’. The King declared them ‘Rebels and Traitours’ and required authorities to ‘prosecute the said Rebels and Traitours with fire and sword’ unless they repented and laid down their weapons.\footnote{By the King. Whereas divers lewd and wicked persons have of late risen in Rebellion… London, 1642, single sheet.}

Parliament in England was certainly well provided with news from Ireland. In both Houses, accounts and letters were read that related massacres and other cruelties and that dehumanised the Irish and Catholics. After one particularly detailed letter that was apparently read at least twice (to both Houses) on 14 December 1641, the Commons wanted to petition the King to remove the reprieve of seven
condemned Catholic priests to allow their execution.\textsuperscript{564} This wish was echoed in a petition to the House of Lords on 19 January by a few inhabitants of the County of Essex.\textsuperscript{565} The King was slow to consent to the capital punishment, however, and told Parliament on 14 February that he was ‘resolved, that the seven condemned Priests shall be immediately banished’.\textsuperscript{566} It was too late for two of the priests, however, and the remaining five were executed later in 1642.\textsuperscript{567}

Such information about the events in Ireland, no matter how exaggerated it might have been, affected not only the political decisions to execute Catholics but it also affected official Parliamentarian language. The Grand Remonstrance, a list of grievances presented to the King on 1 December 1641 and subsequently printed for all to see, claimed that a Catholic conspiracy aimed at suppressing of the true Protestant faith was behind all the late troubles and that it was instigated by the Papists, corrupted clergy and malignant counsellors.\textsuperscript{568} It blamed Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford, whose ‘malignant party’\textsuperscript{569} of ‘evil counsellors and powerful delinquents’\textsuperscript{570} with their ‘evil intentions and malicious designs’\textsuperscript{571} were dangerous to Parliament and religion. These ‘divellish designes’ had been implemented in Ireland, where only God’s providence had prevented the total subversion of the government and the rooting out of religion.\textsuperscript{572} While not dehumanising per se, The Grand Remonstrance legitimised labelling the conflict in Ireland as a Popish Catholic uprising and assured that Parliament was championing the Protestant cause in the matter.

There were economic considerations involved as well. In December 1641, the ‘Aldermen, Common-Councel-men, Subsidy-men, and other Inhabitants of the Citie of London’ presented their humble petition to the Commons. The familiar characterizations of the Irish rebels and their ‘barbarous, savage, cruell, and inhumane actions’ were repeated. The petition intended to hasten Parliament into sending relief to Ireland because the petitioners were concerned that ‘many great Debts there’ that were owed to them would be lost.\textsuperscript{573} In another petition, the apprentices of London were worried
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about debts owed to their masters by Protestants in Ireland who were troubled by the Catholics, ‘whose Rebellious Actions are so inhumane, that it would draw teares from an adamantine eye, to thinke of their bloody, and Tyrannicall proceedings’. The apprentices were also concerned about Jesuits and asked that not too much clemency in sparing them would be shown. They also directly accused archbishop Laud and other bishops of being the first cause of troubles in Scotland and the chief and sole cause of the Irish Rebellion.574

The King and Parliament debated the invasion of Ireland and there were differences in tone regarding the rebels. The King was more moderate in his choice of words than his opponents. On 8 April 1642, the King wrote a message to Parliament about going to Ireland to supress the Rebellion and ‘to chastise those wicked and detestible Rebels (odious to God and all good men)’.575 Later, answering Parliament’s petition presented to him on 18 April, Charles spoke of ‘barbarous Rebels’576, while Parliament was much more eloquent about the ‘cruell and bloody designe of the Papists’ who were out to ‘root out and destroy the Reformed Religion’.577 In a message on 13 August, just before the Civil War started in England, the King mentioned only the ‘horrid and bloody Rebellion’. Parliament, by contrast, gave a full account of ‘Popish and Prelaticall Councells’, the ‘bloody and barbarous Rebellion in Ireland’, ‘Papist Traytors’ who ‘most impudently stiled themselves the Queenes Army’, and ‘Barbarous Irish Rebels’, who were to assist the ‘Northerne Cavaliers’ by the schemes of ‘those horrid Traitors, those Monsters of men’.578 This description made use of the portrayal of the Irish enemy in association with the English enemies.

The Royalists and the Irish were connected from early on. One pamphlet described the alleged landing of a Royalist lord, George Digby, in Ireland with an army in May 1642. The pamphleteer wrote that Digby and ‘the rest of these his Rebellious Confederates have joyned themselves unto the Rebels now in Ireland’, and having arrived they marched towards Dublin ‘and in their march they gave most cruell and bloudy testimonies of their divellish and inhumane intentions’. The author described atrocities committed by Digby and his troops that were similar to those attributed to the Irish. ‘It was strange unto all our English Nation, that that nobly descended Lord George Digby should bid his farewell to
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his Religion, and Allegiance unto this Kingdom.\textsuperscript{579} Hence, even before the first shots of the English Civil War had been fired, there were strong tendencies on Parliament’s side to juxtapose the Irish rebels and the English Royalists. This, I suggest, was one of the central themes in Parliamentarian dehumanising propaganda during the Civil War.

Dehumanising, anti-Catholic and anti-Irish language was widely used in publications ranging from news sheets to sermons and even to official documents. The Catholic Irish were portrayed as barbarous and inhuman, instigated into atrocities by the devilish priests of the Church of Rome. The major causes of the violence were attributed to religious factors, as was the fear used to incite the English into action against the Rebellion – it was the true Protestant religion that was under attack by the forces of the anti-Christ. Thus, religion was an important tool for constructing otherness and delegitimising the enemy as well as justifying armed conflict, even if the Irish were criticised for it. It is worth noting that most of the Protestant ministers who condemned the Irish rebels were Puritan divines who would side with Parliament in the coming Civil War. Moreover, Parliamentarians continued publishing about the events in Ireland during the war years.\textsuperscript{580} This is not to say that those who were to be Royalists approved of what was happening nor that they were not willing to resort to heavy handed measures against the Irish rebels. However, the mantle of the Protestant champion was seized by Parliament for good. The King was ready to pursue ends with all the means he deemed necessary. He might condemn the rebels’ actions and later make deals with them with no religious objections. This inconstancy alienated his more principled subjects and ensured that, not only could his enemies use more radical rhetoric, they also had pretence to shift the target of their rhetoric from the Irish to English foes. Moreover, the Royalists had a clear chain of command represented by the King and his declarations and proclamations. Parliament’s supporters could be more heterogeneous in their opinions, for they had no comparable central authority or even central policy on the issues at hand. Thus, the supporters of Parliament could represent diverse opinions, even very hard-line ones, while the King could not, for the people in question were still his subjects (and possible allies against
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Parliament). This more tolerant approach to the Catholics was one of the reasons why the Royalist party was portrayed as posing the same danger to England as the rebels in Ireland. Indeed, as we will see, the King’s armies were not only compared to Popish soldiers, they were presented as such in propaganda.
8. THE BEGINNING OF THE WAR

In this chapter, I examine how Parliamentarian claims of fighting in the defence of the true Protestant religion against Rome and its adherents were applied to the political and military situation in England at the beginning of the Civil War. I suggest that the Parliamentarians were both more active and radical in their published attacks than the Royalists, who were hesitant to even answer, let alone to use dehumanising language. Because of this reluctance, Puritan authors could not only condemn the rebellion in Ireland but could also encourage the uprising in England, as contradictory as this was. This discrepancy and the problem of fighting for religion was addressed by only a few godly ministers, and their voices were drowned in the general clamour that used the fear of the Catholic Irish to attack the Royalists and to legitimise the armed resistance.

The fear of Catholicism can clearly be seen in speeches claimed to be given in Parliament and published in early 1642. One, by an esquire John Browne, warned of Papist treachery especially in the county of Dorset, where the Royalist lord Digby had a house that was allegedly protected by a large number of well-armed Catholic households.\(^{581}\) Browne advocated for disarming the Catholics and searching their houses, and he was seconded by one Edward Bagshaw, who strongly supported taking the weapons away. The Irish Rebellion had revealed the untrustworthiness of the Papists and their cruelty towards Protestants. Bagshaw warned that England would not be safe until ‘the Grand Authors of all mischief, the Priests and Iesuits, resident in any parts of this Kingdome be not searched out, and executed according to the Lawes, or banished for ever’.\(^{582}\)

In the summer of 1642, the pamphlet war intensified in England while the political crisis deepened. The King had left London and was rallying support in the north of England. Parliament, concerned for its safety while rumours of an Irish army of the King coming to England circulated, was preparing for war as well. An important part of these preparations was the delegitimization of the King’s cause while avoiding attacking Charles directly. Thus, the declarations of Parliament blamed the King’s ‘malignant counsellors’ for plotting Catholic conspiracies. For example, a declaration on 13 July stated the evil intent of these ‘wicked counsellors’ ‘in seeking to destroy and extinguish the true Protestant Religion, the Libertie, and Laws of the Kingdom’.\(^{583}\) The declaration reported on the war
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preparations of the King’s army, in which ‘there are divers papists and other persons of desperate fortune, and condition, ready to execute any violence, rapine, and oppression’. The emerging conflict was ‘In favour of the papists at home, the Rebels in Ireland, the forraign enemies of our Religion and peace.’\textsuperscript{584} Thus, religion was one of the chief factors in explaining the motives and reasoning of Parliament’s enemies in propaganda. In addition to Papists, other enemy groups mentioned regularly were ambitious and popishly affected clergymen, delinquents afraid of the justice of Parliament and ill-affected persons of nobility and gentry.\textsuperscript{585} ‘These enemies allegedly worked together in order to ruin Parliament, which was the only true bulwark against the threat to religion, laws and liberties. A declaration of Parliament on 9 August expressed its concern of ‘their wicked and Trayterous designes’ and warned that, ‘if by this meanes the power of the sword should come into the hands of Papists and their Adherents, nothing can be expected but the miserable ruine and desolation of the Kingdom, and the bloody massacre of the Protestants’.\textsuperscript{586}

Compared to the King’s proclamation that was published on 9 August, the declaration of Parliament displayed significant differences in tone. Charles blamed ‘some few Malignant persons’ of treason and rebellion and declared the commander in chief of the Parliament’s army, the Earl of Essex, and his subordinates, traitors and rebels, unless they would immediately cease their rebellious activity. The King offered his mercy and pardon to all the common soldiers of Parliament’s army if they laid down their weapons and returned to their homes. If not, they too would be proceeded against as traitors and rebels.\textsuperscript{587} The King’s proclamation contained no dehumanising language but rather an offer of free and full pardon. In their reply on 16 August, Parliament declared that the King’s proclamation was a ‘libellous and scandalous Paper[...] venom of those Trayterous Councellors about his Majestie’, without leaving out a reminder of their ‘wicked design to alter Religion, and to introduce Popery, Superstition, and Ignorance’. This being the case, the Lords and Commons declared ‘that all they who have advised, contrived, abetted, or countenanced, or hereafter shall abet and countenance the said Proclamation, to be Traitors, and enemies to God, the King, and Kingdom, and to be guilty of the highest degree of Treason that can be committed against the King and Kingdome.’

\textsuperscript{584} Ibid. 6–7.
\textsuperscript{585} For these enemy groups, see, for example, \textit{A Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, Setting forth the Grounds and Reasons, That necessitate them at this time to take up defensive Arms for the Preservation of his Maiesties Person... August 3. London, 1642; A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament Whereby the good Subjects of this Kingdom may better discerne their owne danger... August 20. 1642. London, 1642; A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. Setting forth the innumerable plots & stratagems which the malignant party of this Kingdome have lately used... Septem. 24. London, 1642.}
\textsuperscript{586} \textit{A Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, For the raising of all power, and force, as well as Trained Bands as others, in several Counties of this Kingdom. London, 1642, 4–5.}
\textsuperscript{587} \textit{By the King. A Proclamation for the suppressing of the present Rebellion, under the Command of Robert Earle of Essex: And the gracious offer of His Majesties free Pardon... York, 1642, single sheet.}
They also noted that the King had been slow to declare anything against the Irish rebels since the rebellion began in late October and the King had only pronounced them to be traitors in January.588

A remonstrance published in August declared who the malignant party and the enemies of Parliament were and why these enemies should be fought against by all good Protestants. The remonstrance started with a few biblical analogies: evil persons were Egyptian pharaohs who were trying to keep the good Israelites in detested bondage. These pharaohs were the ‘Court-parasites’ who gave intelligence to foreign princes; the Papists who wanted to subvert religion; the ‘Bishops, and Prelatichall Clergie’ who brought superstition ceremonies into the Church; the judges and courts of the kingdom that persecuted godly ministers; and the ‘Projecters and Monopolizers’ who had committed wicked misdemeanours and were afraid to face the justice of Parliament. This malignant party of ‘Romish Locusts’ was a ‘herd of wolves and bears’.589 The declaration of Parliament on 20 August spoke of wicked counsellors as well but also of ‘Papists, and that corrupt and superstitious part of the Clergy that were running towards Popery’. It mentioned that one M. Marwood’s house had been robbed and his wife had been called a Protestant whore and a Puritan by the ‘Popish Cavaliers’, whose ‘hatred of Religion was it that provoked them to such ignominious language’.590

Another account of the same event repeated the same abuse thrown at Mrs. Marwood and claimed that the ‘malignants’ had threatened to ‘pillage and destroy all Round-heads’. The same report also made the connection between Catholics and Royalists: ‘we observe the King hath sent out warrant to call to the service all Recusants Horse and Armes, and many Recusants, to make themselves capable of commands do resort to Church.’591 A supplication to the King in July also made this juxtaposition. The townsfolk of Hull declared themselves for Parliament and begged Charles to desist from his intended war. ‘We and all the world do know the Cruelty and Tyranny of that party that sideth with you, whose religion is founded upon blood, and holds it meritorious to destroy us (Hereticks as they falsely call us)’, the supplicants announced, and they declared that ‘we adhere to your Parliament, rather than to You, seduced by Jesuiticall Counsell and Caveliers, and in these Resolves we will live and dye for our Religion’s sake’.592 Moreover, the connection between the Irish and the Royalists

588 Two Declarations of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, The one concerning His Majesties late Proclamation for the suppressing of the present Rebellion... August 16. London, 1642, 3–5.
589 A New Remonstrance Wherein is declared who are the malignant party of this Kingdome, and Enemies to the high Court of Parliament. London, 1642, A2r–A4v.
590 A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parlament Whereby the good Subjects of this Kingdome may better discerne their owne danger, and be stirred up with more earnestnesse to Assist... London, 1642, A2v–A3r.
591 A Full Relation Of all the late proceedin gs of His Majesties Army in the County of Yorke: with the present state and condition of things there. London, 1642, A2v–A3v.
was made explicit early on. A letter printed together with Parliament’s remonstrance and declaration in August expressed the suspicion that ‘they [the Royalists] are inclinable to shew as much mercy as the Rebels in Ireland’. The King’s soldiers were juxtaposed not only with the English Catholics but also deliberately likened to the Irish.

The dehumanisation of Catholics had consequences. On 29 August, Parliament published a declaration that condemned the late violent attacks of its soldiers on the houses of people who were suspected of being Papists and decreed that house searches had to be authorized. This declaration was ordered to be circulated in the army. Of course, one should not immediately assume that this tumultuous activity was committed because of hatred towards the Papists caused by dehumanising texts or even that the persons attacked were Catholic at all. Most probably, a few soldiers saw an opportunity for personal gain by robbing civilian houses under the pretence of them being nests of popery. However, this showed how the Catholics were seen as a legitimate, easy target for theft and other crimes. The dehumanising literature must have had a strong influence on this sentiment. The general antipathy towards Catholics is illustrated by the fact that not only Puritan soldiers but also the common people proceeded to attack them. In Colchester, Parliamentarian soldiers were actually forced to intervene in a civilian attack on alleged Papists. They de-escalated the situation by thanking the people for their service in the fight against popery before asking them to depart. Sometimes, common people encouraged soldiers, as in Leeds where Master Benson was plundered and his house destroyed under the pretence of him being the principal secretary of the Royalists in York.

The King, too was so worried about these tumultuous attacks to the extent that he gave a speech that touched upon the topic at the head of his army on 21 October. The different sides were in accordance in this matter: Charles condemned the attacks and commanded his soldiers to ‘march peaceably and quietly, as a defending party, not a provoking’ one, and he ordered the men not to trouble the civilian populace. He also commanded them explicitly to ‘not plunder or pillage under the pretence of Papist houses, till there be notice given, that they may legally, not riotously be examined and detected’.
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594 A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, That whatsoever Souldier or Souldiers shall breake open, pillage or ransacke any mans House, under colour that they are Papists... London, 1642, A2r–A2v.

595 A Message Sent to the Parliament from The Members of the House of Commons at Colchester, informing them of the Passages there... London, 1642, 1–4.


597 His Maiesties Declaration and Manifestation to all His Souldiers, by Himselfe declared in the Head of His Army. Oxford, 1642, 5.
Social order was important to the King as well as to Parliament, and it was plain that the war and the delegitimization of certain groups had disrupted this. The Royalists were certainly not innocent of this questionable behaviour towards civilians. There were many reports of attacks on ‘poor Protestants’ by the ‘wicked Cavaliers’. These reports were an attempt to delegitimise the King’s soldiers, but they also narrated the outrages and atrocities that the common people had to endure.

Little skirmishes had been going on throughout the summer, but when the King raised his standard in Nottingham on 22 August, the war had truly begun. This affected sermons and publications: their language became harsher, and the enemy to whom it referred was expressed in more explicit terms. Religion was brought forward as a cause for fighting, as a means of comparison to biblical events, and as a tool for dehumanising the enemy. A fast sermon by an Independent minister William Carter in the House of Commons in the end of August reflected this. Carter compared Parliament’s struggle to Israel’s fight against the Benjamines. He stressed the importance of a religious reform in order to assure military success in God’s work: ‘God hath call’d you to the purging of the Land of those Locusts and Caterpillars, I meane the Romish factours now amongst us.’ Carter also mentioned the Northern Army of a biblical prophecy: ‘This Army we see was a multitude of Locusts, and such like things.’ In addition to referring to the King’s army, this analogy also had a wider explanation. ‘It is a Prophecie of the mischiefe done to the whole world, especially to Europe, by Popish vermine.’

‘Locusts’ was a term commonly used by the godly preachers to dehumanise the enemy. The propaganda contained many slanderous words that referred to animals. At first glance, these may appear purely secular, but they often had religious connections. Some of them were drawn directly from biblical stories, as, for example, locusts and caterpillars. Others were used in the Bible to denote wicked people. Parliamentarian propaganda made use of these terms extensively. For example, the minister of Nedham, Matthew Newcomen, preached to the Commons in late 1642 and used rhetoric that was a good example of dehumanisation. He explained why enemies were usually likened to
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599 Of these passages, see for instance A True Relation of the Barbarous Crueltie of divers of the bloody Caveleers. London, 1642 (published on the 11th of August) and A True Relation Of His Majesties coming to Coventry Upon Saturday last and how the Citizens of Coventrie shut up the Gates against him. London, 1642 (published on the 24th of August). Both pamphlets presented the King’s soldiers as robbers and plunderers of the civilian population. The latter also described a hunt for Popish malignants in detail.


601 He was asked to give a copy of his sermon to the Committee for Religion, for them to ‘consider by it, how to prepare and provide for the extirpation of Popery’. Matthew Newcomen, The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries:
animals: ‘And as full of cruelty as craft, therefore in scripture proclaimed bloudy as well as deceitfull
men. And in that respect compared to Lyons, Bulls, Doggs, Vnicorns, Wolves: the Churches enemies
are men of cruell bloudy dispositions.’

These enemies were Papists and Jesuits who were said
to be plotting the gradual destruction of true reformed Religion. A pastor, John Shaw, also
discussed the comparison between men and animals in a sermon to Ferdinando Fairfax’s army in
February 1643. According to Shaw, ‘when God would set out the basenesse of wicked men, he cals
them Wolves, Lions, Bears, Foxes, Spiders, Cocatirises, Smoak, Dung’. Furthermore, it was ‘the
filthiness of sinne’ that made men and women like beasts. ‘Its far better to be a Beast, then to bee
like a Beast by living in beastly filthy sinnes: when a Beast dyes it ends but when a wicked man dyes,
he begins his everlasting misery’, he concluded.

The religious quality of certain beasts was common knowledge to contemporaries. Of course, some
of the animals mentioned were quite fearsome even without any biblical comparisons or stories as
background, but the ministers thought that, when portraying the enemy as uncivilized or even bestial,
the message had to be reinforced with religious viewpoints. Francis Cheynell gave a sermon to the
House of Lords in March 1645, in which he followed Shaw by comparing beasts and men. A wicked
man was like a chimera because it had the ill qualities of more than one beast. Thus, a wicked man
was ‘more Beastly then any one beast whatsoever’. He was ‘disfigured and deformed with the basest
qualities of severall Beasts, as if he were a kinde of universall Beast, or had the Quintessence of
Bestiality within him, like the fourth Beast in the seventh of Daniel; or that Antichristian Beast’. Even
a man of honour could have many beastly qualities that made him wicked, such as the cruelty of
wolves, bears and tigers. Cheynell claimed that, according to the ancient historian Diodorus Siculus,
the Irish of old wore animal hides, ‘a proper covering for such savage Beasts’. He went on to say that
‘the Irish Rebels who rage at this very day, are of the old strain, too like their bloody and inhumane
Progenitours; who fed upon the paps of women, feasted themselves upon young children, and offered
mans flesh (as the Rebels do now offer Protestants flesh) to the devil himself’. The Irish were
juxtaposed with wolves for mythical reasons: ‘Certainly these Irish Papists, these pure Romane
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Discovered in A Sermon Preached at St. Margarets in Westminster... Novemb. S. 1642. London, 1643, the permission to
print the sermon, Av.

602 Ibid. 10.
603 Ibid. 13.
604 Ibid. 23.
605 Shaw, Two Clean Birds, 4.
606 Ibid. 10.
607 Or the other way around: sometimes the enemy, who had different religious beliefs, was portrayed as bestial. One
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Catholikes, have (as they say the first Founders of Rome, Remus and Romulus, did) sucked Wolves milk, they are of such a Wolvish disposition.’ Foxes and serpents symbolised not only prudence and wisdom but also craft and subtlety, which were negative traits because ‘subtilty is not the wisdom, but the poyson of the Serpent’. In the Bible, Herod is called a fox, because he subjected religion to his carnal policies. Cheynell warned that the enemy was looking for an advantage, and if honourable men would comply due to reasons of state, it would lead to danger. Hence, it was best to avoid plotting foxes.608 The King’s men were compared to beasts of burden. ‘The Royalist is a strong Asse’, Cheynell wrote, ‘he takes up the heaviest burthen, enough to load his conscience, break his brains and his back, it is well if it break his heart’. Royalists were ‘undeniably brutish, and intolerably base’ for betraying their country and enslaving their posterity for their own short-term advancement. In the end, they would be enslaved too because they had mistaken slavery for liberty. Certain sins made men more like animals, such as greed and selfishness in the case of Royalists. Other groups had other traits:

Consider how dishonourable a thing it is, for men in Honour, to be transformed into Swine, Goats, Doggs, Vipers; I cannot stand to name the severall Beasts, onely remember that Dutch drunkennesse, Spanish pride, Irish crueltie, French wantonness, Italian, I had almost said English Atheism, will transform men into Beasts.

As these ‘beasts’ did not plan their actions or foresee their consequences, they were easily duped to serve the malignant and wicked, even the anti-Christ himself. ‘They who adhere to the Antichristian faction, in minde and heart[...] are to be ranked among the Beasts’, Cheynell claimed.609

Thus, propaganda that refers to enemies as animals cannot always be taken as purely secular dehumanisation, especially when preached by a clergyman. The qualities that made people appear bestial were often considered sinful. Cheynell drew a lot of his information from earlier authors, and he confessed as much in the dedication of his sermon, in which he listed some bestial traits ‘set forth to the life by Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostome, Augustine, Aristotle, Pliny, Atheneus, Elian, Gesner, and the rest’.610 The simple act of labelling enemies as animals had connotations that were deeply embedded in the Christian tradition.
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Constructing the context of the conflict and the holy duty of the Parliamentarian soldiers was very important in the early stages of the war. This usually included the dehumanisation of the enemy. For instance, a sermon given by one Thomas Wilson in September 1642 presented the qualities of the Church’s enemies. They were impious, prayerless, full of cursing and idolatrous, and as such, they were ‘a seed of evil doers, to be utterly destroyed, both man and woman’ like the biblical Canaanites.611 Wilson named Archbishop William Laud as one such enemy: ‘How manifest is this, in the Arch-B. W. L. and the rest of the Prelates[...] When wicked men flourish, it is an evidence they shall perish[...] it is that they shall be destroyed for ever.’612 Not only were those who actively opposed the godly wicked, but also neutrals and idolaters.613 The King was indirectly criticised by calling his counsellors frogs who provoked war by croaking and who came ‘out of the mouth of the dragon, out of the mouth of the beast and the false Prophet, they are spirits of devils.’ It was the duty of the righteous to destroy these evil persons, or else God would be angry with England.614 Thus, Parliament had a duty of national interest. It was a ‘high, an Angelicall work’, a ‘holy, a divine work’, a work ‘for the King and the Kingdome’ as well as for ‘Christ and his Kingdome’.615 From early on, Parliament established its divine purpose to fight God’s battles with mundane weapons if need be. Moreover, the eschatological nature of the conflict was underlined, like the Puritan minister Lewis Hughes did in his pamphlet Signes from Heaven. After mentioning several events that had furthered the downfall of the anti-Christ, Hughes warned his enemies:

So I say to the Papists, and to all that do joyn with them against the Parliament, (take heed to your selves what you intend to do or speak against the Parliament, refrain your selves and let it alone: for if it be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, you cannot destroy it) lest you be found fighters against God, and so come to Armageddon.616

Apparently, Hughes’s interpretations of the Book of Revelation were popular, because he published another pamphlet, A Looking-Glasse for all True Hearted Christians, that had the same contents, albeit in a different order.617
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In October 1642, with the King’s army marching towards London, Parliament published a declaration. It contained a report of a plot by the Catholic Royalist Sir John Hinderson, who was accused of an attempt to assassinate Sir John Hotham and also to blow up a magazine of the Parliament’s army. The claim that the priests, Jesuits and the Pope’s nuncios dominated the King’s council was not new, but the delegitimization of his soldiers had begun in earnest.618 ‘If the Kings army prevail’, the declaration stated, ‘good Subjects can expect nothing, but that their Lands and fortunes will be exposed to the malice and rapine of those ravenous soldiery, who often talke of cutting the throats of honest and religious men’. To combat these ‘evil’ Royalists, the declaration set ‘the Army raised by the Parliament [...] better armed, full paid, restrained from disorders and rapine as much as may be[...] but above all, well encouraged and instructed in the goodnesse of the cause by the labour of many godly and painfull Divines’.619 Thus, even at the beginning of the Civil War, the clergy instructed and encouraged soldiers in the Parliamentarian armies. We should probably take references to fully paid, disciplined soldiers with a grain of salt, but what is remarkable is their characterisation as soldiers instructed by preaching and the characterisation of their enemies as ones who cut the throats of religious men. There could hardly have been a more explicit confrontation.

A Parliamentarian news sheet *Special Passages* followed the same lines as the official declarations. It reported that the King ‘hath let loose the Raines of the Papists (whose mercy is cruelty) and who goe upon such Principles and grounds are solely for the extirpation of the contrary Religion’. It was rumoured that ‘his Maiestie hath such numbers of Irish Rebells and Papists about him as not to be beleived’.620 *Special Passages* also noted that the King had allowed the Papists to raise forces contrary to his promises.621 An account of the Royalists’ actions in Kingston had an exaggerated number of this foreign element in the King’s armies, putting it at ‘4000. Welch and Irish Souldiers, who make such spoile: that it is impossible that any forraigne enemy had the heart to doe the like.’ There was also ‘following his Majesties army a number of Irish and Welsh women which are of a
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most barbarous behaviour, they threaten and put their knives to their wives and Childrens throates’. The dehumanisation of the King’s soldiers was one thing, but verbal attacks on their camp followers was quite another. The stories of Irish women following the Royalist armies were probably one reason for the atrocity in the aftermath of the battle of Naseby, which I will address later.

The King’s speeches before battles were again a stark contrast to Parliamentarian language about Popish plots and malicious enemy soldiers. Charles concentrated on professing his devotion to the Protestant religion, the rights and privileges of Parliament and the liberties of his subjects – in other words, a reaction to Parliamentarian attacks. The King tried to parry the slashes of common opinion that had already turned heavily in his disfavour. He refrained from dehumanising enemies, but he touched upon that subject by complaining how his soldiers were called Cavaliers and Royalists ‘in a disgracefull manner’. The King encouraged his men to ‘shew your selves, therefore now couragious cavaliers, and beat backe all opprobrious speeches and aspersions cast upon you by the Enemy’.

Complaining about Parliamentarian polemical attacks and insisting on their falsity was the King’s strategy in publicity control as was abstaining from significant attacks of his own. This is curious, for it ensured that Parliament had a clear advantage in constructing a distinctive enemy group and someone to blame for all the late troubles. This pattern was evident in the press battles during the Civil War. Parliamentarians were active and vocal in their attacks. Royalist, by contrast, were passive and their contribution was, at best, reactionary. For instance, the narratives of the battle of Edgehill and reactions to it clearly indicated the differences between Parliamentarian and Royalist attitudes towards public propaganda attacks.

The two field armies met on 23 October at Edgehill. The King’s account was published on 8 November. Naturally, it claimed that the Royalists had won and inflicted greater casualties. It failed to mention that the Royalist cavalrmen had looted a baggage train, but instead asserted that they were chasing fleeing enemy troops. Of the enemy, a single word was used, ‘rebels’, without any derogatory adjectives. The Parliamentarian account by Captain Nathaniel Fiennes, published a day later, also claimed victory. Moreover, it went into more detail concerning the Royalist cavalry. According to Fiennes, they had fallen ‘upon our Carriages, most barbarously massacred a number of
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poor Wagoners and Carters that had no arms to defend themselves’. Noteworthy also is the use of ‘bloody Cavelliers’ in the title. Chaplain Thomas Case’s account later in November was more outspoken. It contained the familiar claims of a Jesuit plot in Ireland and of the Papists trying the same in England with the King’s permission. It also repeated Fiennes’s account of Prince Rupert’s cavalry, which ‘fell to plundering our Waggons, killing our Waggoners, and murthering of poore Countrey women and children’. According to Case, the King’s soldiers were ‘most being Papists, fighting for their Religion, which their Commanders told them was now at stake’. After the battle, Parliament issued a declaration that spoke of ‘divers Rebells, Traytors, and other ill-affected people, in pursuit of a wicked designe, to alter Religion, and subvert the Lawes and Libertie of the Kingdome’. It also granted permission to its forces to ‘invade, resist, represse, subdue, pursue, kil & slay, and put to execution of death, and by all means to destroy as enemies of the Kingdome’ the said ‘rebels and traitors’. Destroying the enemy featured very prominently in Parliamentarian rhetoric right from the beginning of the conflict as did the religious quality of the war.

An interesting exchange followed the battle, one that illuminated certain characteristic tendencies of both sides. Prince Rupert himself came out with a pamphlet to answer the rumours of the unsuitable conduct of his cavalry. The pamphlet conveyed how Royalist grandees may have largely felt about the publishing press and the emerging culture of two-directional communication between a ruler and his subjects. This may explain some of the reclusiveness of the Royalists to engage in the pamphlet war. ‘It will seeme strange’, wrote the Prince, ‘to see mee in Print, my knowne disposition being so contrary to this scribling Age; and sure I had not put my selfe upon a Declaration, if in common prudence I could have done otherwise.’ Rupert lamented ‘malicious lying Pamphlets’ against him, but the last straw seemed to have been Lord Wharton telling ‘the whole City of London’ at Guild Hall and ‘all the World’ in print about ‘the barbarousnesse & inhumanity of Prince Rupert and his Troops’. The Prince dismissed this as pure slander, underlining the valour of his troops. He judged a man to be no soldier or gentleman who would kill or even strike a woman or a child, and challenged his accusers to present proof of these charges, although he also admitted that horrible things can happen in a battle and that he himself cannot be sure if any civilians were harmed or not. Moreover, he accused Parliament’s soldiers of barbarous treatment of the Royalists and complained that calling the
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King’s party ‘Popish Cavaliers’ was nothing more than slander. The pamphlet was a good example of Royalist reactionary policy towards printed propaganda, very different from Parliamentary publications. In December, an author G. H. published a direct answer to Rupert’s declaration, ‘that mighty Mars of the Malignants’. It repeated the accusations against which the Prince had defended himself, with the characteristic vigour and eloquence of Parliamentary dehumanising rhetoric: ‘The said Prince and his Troopers[...] in the heat and fury of the fight they fell to pillaging the Waggons, where surely some boyes and women[...] were barbarously murdered.’ Although possibly ‘more hath been imputed to the Prince himselfe then he hath committed’, continued G. H., there was no way of redeeming his soldiers, ‘whose rapacity and barbarisme no Tartars have ever equalled’. In answering the Prince’s complaint of the treatment of Royalists, G. H. said that they were ‘Wilde Beasts, that it were very fit should be chain’d up, lest they should destroy us’. The willingness of the two parties to engage in battle in the public press and the language used were hardly equal.

We can see major differences in the reports of the events. While the King’s side reported things matter-of-factly and selectively, Parliamentary accounts are more descriptive of the enemy and its norm-challenging conduct. We do not know whether Rupert’s cavalry murdered civilians, but Parliament’s reports wanted to portray it that way. We know for sure that most of the King’s soldiers were not Catholic but, again, pamphlets in London claimed they were. Parliamentarians made a conscious effort to label the King’s troops something that they mostly were not. This was a part of the vocal and active Parliamentary propaganda with which Royalist efforts could not compete. The published words of Prince Rupert and the King himself were far from the rhetoric of Parliamentary authors, who made an explicit connection between the Royalists and the Irish rebels. This forced the King to react, but it was indeed a reaction, and Charles did not really succeed in taking the fight to the Parliamentary side.

A major problem for the King was his ambivalent attitude towards Catholics. He had published a declaration in October, in which he claimed that the malignant party had not only made battle with him but had also poisoned the hearts of his good subjects to think that he favoured Catholicism and employed many Catholics in his army. Charles professed that there could be no doubt of his devotion to the true Protestant faith, but he admitted that, with such ‘hardnesse and straights the malice and fury of these men have driven Us to’, it was only right that he should receive the loyalty of any good subject, ‘whatsoever their Religion is’. Moreover, the King assured that ‘all men know the great
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number of Papists which serve in their [Parliament’s] Army, Commanders, and others, the great Industry they have used to corrupt the Loyalty and Affection of all Our Subjects of that Religion’ and declared, somewhat controversially, that ‘neither the weaknesse of Our own condition, nor the other Arts used against Us, could prevaile with Us to invite those of that Religion to come to Our succour or to recall Our Proclamation which forbad them to do so’. Charles ‘was confident’ – while again admitting to have employed ‘some few’ ‘in this great necessity’ – ‘that a far greater number of that Religion is in the Army of the Rebells, then in Our own’. 632 Henry Ferne, a Royalist divine, wrote in The Resolving of Conscience that the King exercised extreme caution when resorting to Popish soldiers. The enemy had forced the King’s hand in this matter, for without the hostile Parliamentarian armies, there would be no need for the King to use Catholic soldiers.633

Parliament answered with a declaration of its own on 23 December. It claimed that ‘we have just cause to believe that our late Declaration of the 15 of October is sufficient to prove, That the aspersion of favouring Papists, and employing them in the Kings Army, the same being there not only barely alleadged, but the evidence proving the same, and the persons so employed particularly set down’. Parliament strongly condemned malicious scandals in the King’s declaration and continued to blame his Majesty’s ‘lewd and wicked Counsell’. As proof of Papists in the King’s army, a list of named Catholics and their rank and position in the army was included. The publication mentioned that Papists were raising an army in the North, and it recounted the Earl of Newcastle’s declaration that confessed that he had taken Popish recusants under his command. Parliament claimed that there were no Papists in its army, unless ‘by the cunning and malicious practise of our enemies conveyed thither, under the mask and profession of Protestants, to corrupt[...] the good affection of others’. 634 Allegedly, the King’s army was raised to destroy his subjects’ rights and privileges, and its soldiers were mostly of the Popish religion. The forces in the North under Newcastle and the forces in Wales under Lord Herbert were also claimed to mostly ‘consist of Papists’. The declaration again linked the Royalists with Irish rebels: ‘that by the power of these Forces, the Intention is not onely to subvert Parliaments, and the Laws, but to follow the Examples of their Brethren in Iniquity, the Rebels in Ireland, to pull up the Protestant Religion by the roots, and in the place thereof, to plant their own Idolatry and Superstition’.635 In early December, the Committee of the House of Commons had

632 His Maiesties Declaration, To all His loving Subjects, After His late victory against the Rebells on Sunday the 23 of October. Oxford, 1642, 3–4.
633 Henry Ferne, The Resolving of Conscience upon this Question. Cambridge, 1642, 43–44.
634 A Declaration of The Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. In Answer to His Majesties Declaration, Intituled His Maiesties Declaration to all His loving subjects, after His late Victory against the Rebels. London, 1642, 3–5.
635 Ibid. 11–12.
authorized a relation of the King’s army to be printed. It contained the familiar accusation that many Papists served in the King’s army as commanders. It also included an account by an unnamed person who apparently had deserted the King’s service. He wrote that he had seen ‘Papists swarme so in His Maiesties Army... against whose religion he had so much protested, for their more than Jewish cruelty, and worse than Turkish villany, to the poore Irish Protestants’. He also mentioned ‘the Irish ranne-gates, that still follow His Army upon all removalls, I way averr the boldlyer, because I oft had seen it, of men, women, and Children, there is still at least three hundred; all waiting for imployment in any gainefull way: which made me (though no Coward) feare to ma

636 Already at the beginning of the war, the King’s cause had irreparably been tangled with popery in Parliamentarian propaganda. Declarations and resolutions continued to be published with the narrative of Popish soldiers in arms for the suppression of the true religion.637

If official Parliamentarian language became harsher after actual battles had been fought in England, the godly preachers were also stirred by the battle of Edgehill and began to pronouncedly stress the religious nature of the conflict. The effect of this to dehumanisation was twofold. First, the whole war was portrayed as a battle between Christ and the Devil. This was the larger setting, whereas the second, more specific narrative emphasized the need to fight against Catholics and their supposed influence on the Church of England. Certainly, these claims overlapped and were often referred to interchangeably. A good example of these distinctive narratives were two sermons given in late 1642. The first was preached by Thomas Case to the House of Commons in October (which was not printed ‘through many occasions and hinderances’ until 1644). Case underlined that Parliament was engaged in the cause of God and fought the battles of the Lord of Hosts. The battles they had won were due to God’s involvement.638 The victory of Edgehill in particular had been a ‘rich return of prayer’ and deliverance.639 Case claimed that the enemies of the Church were also the enemies of God, ‘Sons of Belial, that are risen up against the peace and safety of the Kingdome’. According to Case, their doom had ‘long since past and shall be in due time executed’.640 He used colourful language to describe Royalists, comparing them to Rehum and Shimshai, the biblical archetypes of malignant councellors,641 and calling them, in addition to ‘Sons of Belial’, ‘the Seed of the Serpent’.642

636 A Most True Relation of the present state of His Majesties Army. London, 1642, A2r, A4v.
637 For example, The Parliaments Resolution To the Citizens of London, concerning His Majesties proceedings. London, 1642.
638 Thomas Case, Gods Rising, His Enemies Scattering; Delivered in a Sermon Before the Honourable House of Commons, At their Solemne Fast, 26. Octob. 1642. London, 1644, dedication, A2v–A3r.
639 Ibid. 49.
640 Ibid. 8.
641 Ibid. 11–12.
642 Ibid. 13.
monsters,643 and ‘Fratricidious[...] and Patricidious Caines of our times’.644 These ‘incarnate Divels’, these ‘haters of God’ had grown to such cruelty that even the Turks and infidels would not be at their level.645 Case claimed that ‘They will rage and storm, plunder and imprison, deflowre virgins, ravish women, murder, burn, destroy, and exercise all the cruelty, and villany that the wit of malice can invent; lie, swear, and forswear, curse, blaspheme, and even dare the God of heaven to do his worst.’646 These enemies were to be slain when it was time for God to rise, and there was no escape:

For you know in war the Routing of the Enemie is the first degree of their ruine; when they begin to fly they begin to fall; when once they turne the back, and break their ranks, they can make no resistance, and then the Armies of God, and the God of Armies pursues them, slaying and beating them down with a great destruction.647

The second preacher, John Goodwin, had published a prologue to his sermon, titled The Butchers Blessing, on 4 November. It strove to engage all the inhabitants of London ‘for the preservation and defence [...] against that whirlwind of cruelty and blood, which rends and teares the Kingdom in pieces where it falls’. Goodwin argued that London was ‘the principall shield and Buckler of that Religion which they labour to destroy’ as well as ‘the chiefe protection and safeguard of that Honourable Assembly and Court of Parliament’. He emphasized the enemies’ wickedness, using names like ‘Sonnes of Belial’ and ‘men of wickednesse’, not to mention ‘Romish Cavaliers’ on the title page. The Catholic connection was evident. Goodwin wrote:

They might seed fat upon the sweet bread of Romish superstitions and Doctrines. They might have Organs and Altars, Cringings and Crouchings, they might have Copes and Surplisses, Waters and Tapers Crucifixes and Crosses, Pilgrimages and Pictures, with all the accoutrements, and the whole prophane glory of the Romish Sinagogue. Were it not for you, they might have Lucifer put agaime into Heaven, and Angels of light thrown downe into Hell instead of him.648

If the King had reached London, it would probably have meant the end of the Civil War and of many prominent Parliamentarians as well. Thus, it is no wonder that Goodwin used the tone that he did. However, this all contributed to the picture of Royalists as devilish Cavaliers, men of blood and sons of Belial. Moreover, the Parliamentarian tendency to juxtapose Catholics and Irish rebels with the
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King’s men was an important factor in dehumanisation. While it concerned pretty much all the King’s armies, there were different cases and levels of delegitimization. Next, I will examine how Parliamentarian propaganda presented the northern Royalist army of the Earl of Newcastle.
9. THE POPISH ARMY OF THE EARL OF NEWCASTLE

Not only was the King’s own field army suspected of containing lots of Catholic soldiers, but other Royalist provincial armies were also accused of being thoroughly Papist. The pinnacle of Parliamentarian religious delegitimization targeted the Earl of Newcastle’s northern army. In this chapter I address how the Earl’s army was treated in the Parliamentarian press from its formation to its eventual destruction at the battle of Marston Moor. The aim of this specific case is to show how Royalists and Catholics were equated in propaganda and what its grim consequences were.

Parliamentarian propaganda took its time in presenting the Earl’s army as a malicious gathering of Papists, even though in the summer of 1642, the Parliamentarians were already worried about him and other ‘enemies to the peace of the Kingdome’. On 22 July, Parliament’s resolution addressed the gathering of the King’s forces in the north. It complained about armed men committing outrages and acts of hostility and traitorous designs of the malignant party. The Earl of Newcastle was mentioned as having the command of a garrison, but nothing was related of the quality of his soldiers yet. Sir John Hotham’s resolution was a bit more specific. According to him, Newcastle and ‘some other Cavaleers’ forced colliers to work on a fortification at the mouth of Tyne, ‘using them very rigorously [...] then discharg’d them with little or no satisfaction’. There was no indication of the religious preferences of Newcastle’s men, although they are implicitly labelled as wicked persons since they made colliers work so hard. Even a report of a skirmish between the Earl’s men and those of Sir John published in September did not mention that there were Catholics in Newcastle’s army.

A reason for this may be that, the beginning of the war, the King tried to clearly distance himself from the Catholic population for propaganda purposes. On 10 August, Charles issued a proclamation, in which he expressly commanded that ‘no Popish Recusant, nor any other, who shall refuse to take the two Oathes of Allegiance and Supremacie, shall serve Him in His Army’. Later in the same month,
he also instructed his commissioners of Array – loyal men responsible for raising his army in the counties – to ‘disarme all Popish Recusants, and all such other dangerous and ill-affected Persons, and Brownists, Anabaptists, and other Sectaries, as well Clergymen, as others, as have testified, or shall testify their ill disposition to the peace and Government of the Kingdome’. Furthermore, the military articles issued to Newcastle’s army, *Orders and Institutions of War*, explicitly declared that ‘no Papist of what degree or quality soever shall be admitted to serve in our Army’.

Margaret Griffin, in her research on Civil War military articles, has suggested that the word ‘Papist’ here does not mean Roman Catholic but a Catholic person who was not willing to take the Oath of Allegiance. *Orders and Institutions of War* was published on 17 November, but on 23 September Charles had written to Newcastle:

> This rebellion is grown to that height, that I must not look of what opinion men are who at this time are willing and able to serve me. Therefore I do not only permit but command you to make use of all my loving subjects’ services, without examining their consciences – more than their loyalty to me – as you shall find most to conduce to the upholding of my just legal power.

Therefore, ‘Papist’ mentioned in *Orders and Institutions of War* had to signify something other than Catholic, if Charles is given the benefit of the doubt and it is not assumed that his open professions were deliberately in contrast to his actions. Joyce L. Malcolm has considered the possibility that Catholics who took an active role in Charles’s service early in the war were given a special dispensation from their church to permit them to subscribe to these oaths. If a Catholic person was allowed to take the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, he could not be prevented from serving in the army, according to the King’s proclamation. Contemporaries themselves were of several opinions on this matter: a declaration of Parliament on 3 August complained of evil counsellors and ill-affected persons:

> Papists many of them, or very late Converts, by taking the Oaths of Supremacie and Allegiance, for which, they may very well have a dispensation, or indulgence, to be enabled thereby to promote so great a service
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for the popish cause, as to destroy the two Houses of Parliament, and through their sides, the Protestant 
Religion.\textsuperscript{660}

Another Parliamentarian declaration, dated 20 August, stated that ‘the papists are so fervent, that they 
not onely send in horse and Armes, but the better to qualifie their persons for this present service, 
many heretofore constant Recusants doe now resort to Church, and takes the oaths of Supremacy and 
Allegiance’.\textsuperscript{661} Thus, despite continuous professions to not admit Papists, the King began to employ 
Catholics in his armies. This recruitment of recusants was largely resorted to because of the 
disappointing results in recruiting soldiers from the Protestant population in August and early 
September.\textsuperscript{662} The Catholic minority was more willing to fight for the King than the Protestant 
majority, whose allegiance was more easily divided.

In a declaration published on 23 October, Parliament complained about Papists in the King’s army 
under the cover of being Protestants. Such pretending, they claimed, went as far as going to church 
and attending sermons as well as taking the Oath of Allegiance. According to the declaration, 
Catholics who would not do this were not accepted in the army. The declaration also mentioned how 
Lord Herbert – ‘a notorious Papist’ – was arming and employing Catholics, and it featured the Earl 
of Newcastle and ‘the Army of Papists, which they intend to raise’. It added that ‘the King hath 
received about him diverse Papists of Ireland, some of which are indited of high Treason’.\textsuperscript{663} Another 
declaration on 23 November called for the suppression of ‘the Popish and malignant party in those 
Northern parts, and in particular those now in the city of York’.\textsuperscript{664} A Parliamentarian news sheet 
reported that the Queen would soon arrive in Northern England, where Royalists were raising troops 
to guard her. The newsheet stated that this army ‘must be called the Catholique Army’. The same 
sheet mentioned that the Earl of Newcastle had granted commissions to several Papists and that there 
was a plan to ‘bring in forraigne Forces to Newcastle to ioyne with the Papists Army there now in 
raysing’\textsuperscript{665}.

\textsuperscript{660}\textit{A Declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, Setting forth the Grounds and Reasons, That 
necessitate them at this time to take up defensive Arms for the Preservation of his Maiesties Person...} London, 1642, 
A4v.

\textsuperscript{661}\textit{A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parlament Whereby the good Subjects of this Kingdome may 
better discerne their owne danger, and be stirred up with more earnestnesse to Assist the Parliament....} London, 1642, 
A2v–A3r.

\textsuperscript{662} Malcolm, ‘A King in Search of Soldiers’, 270.

\textsuperscript{663}\textit{A Declaration and Protestation of the Lords and Commons in  Parlament, to this Kingdome, and to the whole world. 
Wherein (amongst diverse of his Majesties late illegall proceedings) is discovered...} London, 1642, A2v–A3v.

\textsuperscript{664}\textit{The Declaration of the Lords and Commons Now assembled in Parliament, for the suppressing of divers Papists, and 
other malignant persons.} London, 1642, A2v.

\textsuperscript{665} \textit{Special Passages, No 11. From 18th to 25th of October.} London, 1642, 91–95.
Parliamentarian reports of the King’s armies kept the fear of Catholics alive and nourished it. One account, published on 19 December, related a miserable story of an honest citizen of London, master Boys, who was taken captive by colonel Aston, the governor of Redding and ‘a notorious Papist’. After abusing him by calling him a Roundhead and a Parliament dog, the colonel sentenced him to death without any proof against him. Master Boys behaved himself so courageously and innocently at the place of execution that the provost-martial in charge of the execution chose to be hanged with him. This fictitious story presented the Catholics as cruel enemies and urged the people of the capital ‘to discover some person about London who holds intelligence at Court, that Lex Talionis may be executed upon him’. The pamphlet also mentioned the Earl of Newcastle’s army of 7000 soldiers, out of whom full 4000 were claimed to be recusants, and the rest were ‘Church papists, and persons popishly affected’. The army was called ‘the Catholique Army’, and it was more to be looked after than the southern army of Cavaliers in the King’s personal command (although, it was ‘trembling to make mention of the number of the Irish Rebels, and other Papists in the Kings Army’). The author lamented that the King, who had at first prohibited Catholics from serving in his army, was now inviting them and giving them high command. He also repeated the familiar accusations of the Catholic plots intended to introduce Popery and to extirpate the Protestant religion.666 Another account from December portrayed the Earl of Newcastle as ‘That wicked and Trayterous Conspirator’ and referred to his army as ‘the Papisticall Army’.667 An anonymous report on 23 December used terms such as ‘Popish army’ and ‘a great Recusant’ (meaning captain Sir William Riddel) and complained about the heavy taxes that the Earl of Newcastle levied, the barbarous plundering of civilians and the plan of the Popish army to destroy Protestant religion.668 An interesting comparison to this is a report by Sir Henry Foulis, who served in the northern Parliamentarian army under Lord Ferdinando Fairfax. Even though he described the battle of Tadcaster as bloody, Sir Henry refrained from commenting on the religious qualities of his opponents. He spoke of the Earl of Newcastle politely as ‘my Lord’ and mentioned that the Earl had gallantly spent the night in the field with his soldiers after the battle.669 It is important to remember that not everyone dehumanised their enemy nor forgot military courtesy between enemies, particularly when writing under one's own name.670

666 A True Relation Of the putting to death one Master Boys. London, 1642, 1–3.
667 A most true Relation Of the great and bloody Battell Fought by Capt. Hotham with 1000. Foote four Troops of Horse, and two pieces of Ordnance Decemb. 3. against the Earl of New-castle... London, 1642, A2r, A3r.
668 A True Relation of the Fight at Sherburn, in the County of Yorke, &c. London, 1642, 2–4.
670 There were, to be sure, reports written under the names of the authors that contained slanderous language. Not everyone was as polite as Sir Henry nor willing to express their views anonymously. See, for instance, Thomas Jesland, A True and Full Relation, of the Troubles in Lancashire; between the Lord Strange, now Earl of Derby; And the well-affected people of that Countie. London, 1642.
The Earl of Newcastle answered these accusations in December with a declaration in which he blamed the Parliamentarian troops under Sir John Hotham of pillaging and plundering. However, Newcastle admitted that he ‘had been necessitated to take under my command and conduct diverse Popish Recusants in these Northern pars’. He claimed that it was not the King’s intention to admit any of them into his service, but since Parliament ‘for many moneth have had great numbers under their pay, both English, French and other Nations, whom at the time of their enrolment (and ever since) they did know to have been professed Papists’, Charles had been forced to do the same. 671 ‘But His Majesty was very cauteous and tender in this point, and certainly would not have looked towards it, if the other Party had not first assumed that liberty to themselves, from which by the Law of the Land he saw himselfe no way barred.’ For his part, the Earl promised that ‘for these few Recusants under my command, I shall use all possible care, that they do nothing against the Laws of this Kingdome, for I have received them not for their Religion, but for the Allegiance which they professe’. 672 In a later copy, printed in 1643, the phrase ‘to so gratious a King’ was added, probably in order to dispel any uncertainties about to whom the Catholic soldiers professed their allegiance. 673 It was the subject’s loyalty, not his conscience, that was important for the King.

The Earl also felt it necessary to defend his admission of recusants by comparing Catholics who did not take the Oath of Allegiance to Protestants who did. Many such Catholics were loyal subjects and kept the Oath they had never taken, while some Protestants ‘most manifestly violated’ it. 674 Therefore, it seems that the Earl not only accepted Catholics in his army but also did not force them to take the Oath. The Earl’s declaration seemed to use the words ‘Papist’ and ‘Recusant’ interchangeably, but it is worth noting that, every time the King’s army was mentioned directly, only the latter term was used, although the declaration did not otherwise seem to imply any pejorative – or other – significance between the choice of words. In actuality, such a significance certainly existed. It may be that the Earl of Newcastle wanted to refer to his Catholic soldiers and officers with the more respectful term ‘Recusant’.

The Earl’s declaration was answered by an anonymous author in January 1643. The pamphlet raised the concern of authorising Irish Catholics to gather an army and sending it to fight in Scotland and

671 The Parliamentarian armies employing French Catholics was a common accusation from the Royalists, but it should generally be seen as a form of defence against criticism of employing Catholics in the armies of the King. The argument stated that, if Parliament could do it, so could the King. See, for instance, A Briefe Relation of The Remarkeable occurrences in the Northerne parts. 1643, 11–12.
673 A Declaration Made by the Earle of New-Castle, Governour of the Towne and County of New-Castle. 1643, 8.
674 A Declaration Made by the Earl of New-Castle. 1642, 7.
England to destroy the Protestant religion.\textsuperscript{675} The author repeated familiar accusations against the Catholics: that they could, at any time, renounce their allegiance to the sovereign if the Pope commanded them to do so and that they were all taught to hate the Protestant religion and Parliament.\textsuperscript{676} Thus, it was impossible for Catholic subjects to be as loyal as Protestants, and the Earl of Newcastle had made a grave mistake in arming them. As for the accusation of Popish troops serving in Parliamentarian armies, the pamphlet stated that there certainly were not whole regiments or companies that consisted of Catholics, but it admitted that some private Papists might have gotten in ‘through negligence, or by friendship’. This was, however, completely different from ‘exciting and authorizing all the Papists in the North and other places fit to beare Armes, to take up Armes for the destruction of the Protestants and suppression of Religion, Lawes, and Liberties established in the Land’.\textsuperscript{677} The idea of armed, militant Catholics was intolerable to Puritans. Due to the atmosphere of sectarian hate, this idea also seemed impossible to many Protestants who were not hard-liners in religious matters but who considered Parliament the lesser evil. Thus, the decision to openly admit Catholics into the army may have cost the Royalists more than they gained.

How many Catholics then served under the Earl’s command? Was ‘Popish army’ an appropriate nickname for Newcastle’s army? P. R. Newman has suggested that Catholics indeed constituted a large minority of officers in Newcastle’s army. On the level of the regimental command (colonels) of the Royalist army in the six northern counties of England, as many as 40 percent were Catholic.\textsuperscript{678} This does not take into account the common soldiers, of course, but the notoriety of the ‘Popish army’ was probably more due to its officers who were usually well-known persons in their home counties. Thus, it was easy to see how news of suspected Catholics serving in the Earl’s army spread fast to Parliamentarian consciousness and propaganda.\textsuperscript{679} According to Newman, the North of England was ‘remarkable for its high Roman Catholic activism’,\textsuperscript{680} and the same claim was presented in contemporary Parliamentary propaganda, such as John Vicars’s \textit{Parliamentary chronicle}, which stated that, in ‘two Counties [Lancashire and Yorkshire], there are more Papists, as it is verily beleeeved, then in all England beside.’\textsuperscript{681} Apparently, the attendance of the local militia in a muster at Yorkshire in August 1642 was lacking, but ‘the county’s catholics appeared as ordered’, which would

\textsuperscript{675} A \textit{Confutation Of the Earle of Newcastles Reasons For taking under his Command and conduct divers Popish Recusants in the Northerne parts...} London, 1643, 4–5.
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lend support to the argument that the Catholics of Northern England were interested in supporting their King militarily.\footnote{Malcolm, ‘A King in Search of Soldiers’, 259.} It is thus probable that the Earl’s army had more Catholic soldiers in it than any other army of the English Civil War, but certainly they were not a majority.

The Popish quality of Newcastle’s army was strongly propagated by the main local opponent of the Earl, Lord Ferdinando Fairfax. He wrote to London in December 1642 describing the opposing army mostly as ‘enemies’ but also as the ‘Popish Army’ that was ‘plentifully supplyed from his Majesty and the Popish and malignant party’.\footnote{Ferdinando Fairfax, A Happy Victory Obtained by The Lord Fairefax and Captaine Hotham. London, 1642, A4r.} A second letter by Lord Fairfax was read in the Houses on 4 January 1643. It had a somewhat harsher tone, speaking of the ‘malicious and bloody enemy’ and the ‘popish army’ that commits ‘horrible plunders, and spoyls’. Fairfax also mentioned that Newcastle had granted commissions to ‘sundry convict Recusants’.\footnote{A Second Letter From the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax, of his late prosperous proceedings against the Earle of New-Castle, and his Popish Army in Yorke-shire. London, 1643, A2r–A3r.} A third letter by Lord Fairfax was read in the Houses of Parliament at the end of January. It recounted how some Catholics had been caught and imprisoned and that the strength of Newcastle consisted much of ‘Papists and Popish affected’. It also contained an observation that claimed that religion was openly under attack by the Papists, who wanted to ‘subvert Gods true Religion’ and ‘introduce popish Idolatry, and Superstition’. The observation complained that the Popish Army had terrified and driven away Protestant ministers and people from frequenting their churches. Lastly, it brought up the situation in Ireland, where it was said that Papists had almost effected the subversion of the law in order to establish Popery.\footnote{The Good and Prosperous Successe of the Parliaments Forces in York-Shire: Against the Earle of New-Castle And his Popish Adherents. London, 1643, A2r–A2v, A4r–A4v.}

The Papists and popishly affected were not the only group in the Earl’s army who were described in a negative light. In a letter to William Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, in May 1643, Lord Fairfax complained of Newcastle’s Royalists breaking a treaty, of spoiling, pillaging and ‘cruelly using the well-affected party’. When relating the pillage of the town Otley, he mentioned that many of the participants were French, who not only caused material damage but also ‘barbarously used some honest women of that town’.\footnote{A Miraculous Victory Obtained by the Right Honorable, Ferdinando Lord Fairfax, against the Army under the Command of the Earl of New-Castle at Wakefield in York-Shire. London, 1643, 3. The letter was also reprinted in a virtually identical publication, except for the title. See A Fuller Relation of that Miraculous Victory Which it pleased God to give unto the Parliaments Forces under the Command of the Right Honourable the Lord Fairefax... London, 1643.} French mercenaries, brought over by the Queen, were mentioned along with ‘the Popish army about Yorke’ in a report of the battle at Barnham-Moor.\footnote{Another miraculous Victorie obtained by The Lord Fairfax, against the Earl of Newcastle, at Barnham-Moore. London, 1643, A3r.}
‘A substantial number’ of French troopers and officers were in the cavalry regiment of Henrietta Maria. Hence, the Irish were not the only foreign Catholic group in the Civil War.

In a warrant given in February 1643 to the magisters and ministers of West Riding of Yorkshire, Fairfax again mentioned the army of Papists and accused Newcastle of raising it against the laws of the land. He also complained about Newcastle’s soldiers killing religious Protestant subjects, banishing and imprisoning zealous ministers, and spoiling and plundering. The Earl of Newcastle answered Fairfax, blaming him for trying to mask his rebellion by accusing innocents of disturbing public peace. According to Newcastle, Fairfax’s accusations were mere slander, but because of the eminent position of Lord Fairfax, and for the vindication of the Earl’s own honour, he was compelled to answer – hesitantly, as the Royalist grandees often did. He did not deny that he had in his army ‘some of the Romish Communion’, but only ‘an handful in comparison of the whole Body of it, I beleev not above one of fifty’. As for the killing of Protestant subjects, he claimed it was only self-defence, and put the guilt of spilt blood on ‘the authors and fomentors of these horrid distractions’, since ‘they that take the Sword (without a lawful calling) shall perish by the Sword’. The Earl defended the banishment and imprisonment of Puritan ministers by claiming that some preachers had crossed the line ‘when a man may frequent their Sermons a whole yeare, and heare nothing but incentives to War, shedding the Blood of the ungodly’. This certainly revealed how Royalists viewed Puritan preaching, and judging by the examples in this work, they were not completely wrong in their assessment. The Earl claimed that Parliamentarian soldiers were even more liable of plundering and spoiling the county than the Royalists. They had ‘spared no Age, neither the venerable Old Man, nor the innocent Childe; No orders of Men, the long Robe as well as the short hath felt their fury; No Sex, not Women, no not women in Childbed, whom common humanity should protect’. He also complained of iconoclasm in the churches, ‘which the Heathens durst not violate, are by them prophaned’. This was the Earl of Newcastle’s attempt at delegitimising his opponents, and as we can see, it was considerably milder and much more reactionary than Parliament’s pamphlet assault. Fairfax and Newcastle continued their exchange in public press during the spring and summer of 1643. The former did not abandon his use of the characterization ‘Army of Papists’, nor did he
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stop complaining about the conduct of the Earl’s soldiers towards civilians.\(^\text{693}\) The latter called Fairfax an usurper and intruder due to his military action against the King.\(^\text{694}\) The exchange began to become personal: it was showing less intent in delegitimising the opponent and more in a contest of pride.

All this delegitimization in the press contributed to the public image of the Earl’s army. It was clearly labelled as a group of Papists, that wanted to destroy the true Protestant religion. An ordinance on 20 September 1643 declared that the county of Lincolnshire was to be added to the Eastern Association for the mutual defence against ‘the Popish Northerne Army’.\(^\text{695}\) Moreover, Newcastle’s men were explicitly linked to the Irish rebels. In February 1643, Parliament gave a declaration to vindicate Fairfax and others fighting against the Earl of Newcastle. In the declaration, it was stated that the Earl, ‘out of a wicked Designe to suppresse the Protestant Religion, and to advance the Popish Idolatry and superstition, hath raysed and Armed a great number of Papists’. The clear parallel with the Irish emerged when Parliament declared that all means might be used against the ‘Army of Papists[...] which evidently threatens Ruine and Resolution to our Religion, Lawes and Liberties, and will (if not prevented) make us undergoe those Cruelties, Rapines, Spoyling, and Murthinger, that our Brethren of Ireland, have suffered by the Popish Rebels there’.\(^\text{696}\) If a Royalist army employed Catholics, it was a Popish army, and it was thus able and willing to commit each and every kind of outrage attributed to the Popish rebels in Ireland. ‘The Popish army’ had entered the official vocabulary of the Parliamentarians and it stayed there, contributing forcefully to how the enemy was perceived. If Irish rebels were the worst of the worst and to be killed without mercy, there was a clear purpose of equating the Earl of Newcastle’s army with them.

Some Parliamentarians went so far as to declare that Royalists were worse than Catholics. Thomas Coleman, a Puritan minister, wrote a pamphlet about the providence that had protected Hull. He did not spare his words targeting the enemy:

> Those unworthy Royalists, who never thinke they doe any thing royally, but when they make Rome blush, with being more superstitious and idolatrous then she is: or when they make beasts blush, with being more


\(^\text{694}\) *The Answer of His Excellency The Earle of Newcastle, To a late Declaration of the Lord Fairefax*. York, 1643, 4.


\(^\text{696}\) *A Declaration Of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament: For the Vindication of Ferdinando Lord Fairfax, and others imployed in their service against the Earle of New-Castle, and his Army of Papists...*. London, 1643, A2r–A3v.
savage and cruel then they: or make Pagans and Heathens blush, in being more unjust and unhonest then they: or make the devil and hell blush, to see them more zealous and deep blasphemers, then they.\(^{697}\)

He was also horrified to report that ‘God hath given them over to act all wickedness with greediness and impudence, so far as they have a famous whore, a minion to one of their Lords, who goes openly among them with her pistols, & bears the name of one that has a troop’.\(^{698}\)

In the summer of 1643, an exchange took place that exemplified how even professions of loyalty to the Protestant faith were often interpreted in the complete opposite manner. Newcastle had summoned the town of Manchester to surrender and complained in a declaration how his army was most ignominiously scandalized with the title of Papists even though he and his men were hazarding their lives to protect the true Protestant religion.\(^{699}\) The town replied that the inhabitants had every right to defend their religion, the King’s rights and the privileges of Parliament against the Papists and other malignants and that the true Protestant religion could not in any case be defended ‘by so great a company of Papists, as have been, and now are in Arms under such protection [of the King]’.\(^{700}\) This resolute answer, together with Newcastle’s complaint of scandalous titles used of his army, attracted the interest of London pamphleteers, and on 4 August an observation was published regarding Newcastle’s demands, ‘written by a Worthy Member of the House of Commons, and appointed to be printed’. The anonymous author attacked the Earl who had ‘put into his Army a multitude of those men, who are the sons of the Scarlet Whoore, which is drunke with the blood of the Saints, and who are Burgesses of that city, wherein will be found the blood of all that are slain upon the earth’. It was ‘a popish and Scarlet Army’ and an idolatrous one, too. The author compared the Papists to Egyptians, who did not look ‘to the holy one of Israell, neither seeke the Lord’. Thus, it was impossible for the Papists to fight for the preservation of the true Protestant religion. Indeed, it was quite the opposite:

> In their Massacres (rather than Warrs) in Ireland they [the Catholics] profest to fight for the Catholique, (or Antichristian) cause. And in their councell here, for raising sums to maintain the late Warrs against the Scots, they professed that the War concern’d them not only as Subjects, but as Catholikes, and now to make up a right popish warr throughout all the three Kingdoms, without question they fight (as the Earl himselfe confesseth) not for the Protestant Religion but for Popery.

---


\(^{698}\) Ibid. 14.

\(^{699}\) *A Declaration and Summons Sent by the Earl of Newcastle, to the Town of Manchester, to lay down their Arms.* London, 1643, 4.

\(^{700}\) Ibid. 6–7.
Finally, the writer proclaimed that surrendering to the Popish Army would have catastrophic consequences: ‘but this is certayne, that if a peece of ground be forced, husbanded, and improved, by Romish Principles, or persons, that ground will easily turne into a field of blood, little favour is to be expected from that nature, which is animated & actuated by the dragon, who was a murderer from the begining.’ It is impossible to tell whether the author of the pamphlet was a member of Parliament, as the title suggests, or whether the title was invented to propagate pamphlet’s credibility. In any case, many members would have had this kind of opinion of the King’s Northern Army.

Creating a propaganda image of the enemy and fighting a successful war were two different things, however, and the latter presented some demands that were sometimes at odds with the process of delegitimization. A report was published in early 1644 of the siege of Newcastle by the Scottish army and the passages of Lord Fairfax and his troops. The report claimed, as usual, that Parliament was fighting against Papists and prelates. However, it also related that, after Fairfax’s army appeared in front of Whitby, a town which was held by a strong garrison of the Earl of Newcastle, ‘the Enemy [...] surrendred up the Towne [...] and joyned themselves with the Lord Fairfax’. One can easily discern that either the qualities of the enemy were not totally unredeemable since they were allowed to join the opposite army, or, more probably, those qualities were not necessarily taken at face value by those who wrote about them. In the spring of 1644, the war in England had gone on almost two years. People from commanders to soldiers had switched sides, and especially common infantrymen who fought for money or because of impressment instead of any ideology were liable to desert one cause and take up the next based on the fortunes of the war. This presented some problems for delegitimization, but certain groups were still largely outside these practical considerations, mainly the Irish.

However, the accusations against the Earl’s army continued to be published. On 5 June 1644, a pamphlet ‘by a York-Shire Gentleman’ harshly criticised the oath Newcastle had imposed on the people of Yorkshire. This criticism soon transformed into full-blown dehumanisation of the Earl’s army. According to the author, ‘most of the Captaines and Souldiers [of the Royalist northern army] are Tygers and Beares for cruelty, bores for wast and devastations, Swine for Drunkenesse, Goats and Stallions for Lust’. He lamented the influence the Papists had on the army and remarked that Newcastle was using too soft an expression when the Earl spoke of the Romish Communion instead

701 Some Notable Observations upon the late Summons By the Earl of Newcastle, of the Town of Manchester. London, 1643, 4–8.
702 A Full Relation of The Scots besidding Newcastle, and their taking the Glasse houses, and other Forts. London, 1644, A2v.
of the Papists. ‘It was not for the King they drew their Swords, but for the Queene, and for their own Religion, and preservation’, the author concluded. Later in the same month, a report of northern affairs concerning Hull was published. The defiant stand of the city against Royalist attempts was taken as an example of God’s providence and protection. The pamphlet stated that ‘this was the beginning of this miserable War, the Viperous birth of the Malignant and Popish partie, which ere it be long will eat through the bowels of the Dam, as they themselves, like so many vipers have digged through the sides of their mother the Kingdom of England that hath bred & brought them up’. When reporting the plundering by Newcastle’s soldiers the pamphlet mentioned that ‘there goes with this Armie almost 1000 bloody women, many of whose faces and actions do make them too much to resemble the Poets hellish Harpies, far more cruel than the men, for they glean after them, and spare none’. The pamphlet concluded with expectations of the arrival of more Irish rebels and a call to the Protestants of England to unite ‘for the cutting off of the Antichristian crew of Papists and Rebells’ and to keep the King ‘out of the hands of English and Outlandish Papists, and Irish Rebells’. The same old fear was again repeated: ‘the Romish Foxes, and their wiles hatcht in the bottomlesse pit, whereby they seek to divide the King and State, that the Pope may over-rule’.

The battle of Marston Moor on 2 July destroyed Newcastle’s army in a crushing victory for the armies fighting for Parliament. It was a massacre of the Royalist troops, of Newcastle’s infantry, ‘the Whitecoats’, in particular, who were surrounded and shot to death ‘by an enemy with an absolute intent to kill them, or as many of them as they could’. It was not a heroic, self-sacrificing rear guard action, but a desperate last stand of trapped soldiers trying to fight their way out. This interpretation of the battle is based on narratives such as Memorie of the Somervilles, a history of the Scottish baronial house by the 11th Lord Somerville, and The Autobiography of Alice Thornton, a Royalist lady from Yorkshire who herself experienced those tumultuous times. According to Somerville, ‘every man fell in the same order and rank wherein he had foughten’. Mrs. Thornton was more eloquent, claiming that ‘all the brave white cots foote that stood the last man till they were murthered
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and destroyed’. She added that there were ‘many thousands valiant, brave, stout men, killed and inhumanly butchered’. 709

Was the massacre a result of the dehumanisation directed at Newcastle’s army? It was arguably an exceptional case in the context of the Civil War in which a large number of soldiers was killed in the field of battle without surrendering or escaping. There were reports that the Whitecoats refused quarter offered to them, but these sources were Parliamentarian and thus had cause to appear gracious. 710 The Royalists were even portrayed in a rather presentable light by Captain Camby, then a trooper under Cromwell, who was in the thick of the battle. Camby ‘never in all the fights he was in, met with such resolute brave fellows, or whom he pitied so much’, and he ‘saved two or three against their wills’. 711 Another Parliamentarian captain who was present, W. H., reported in his account that, ‘as for the enemy the truth is they behaved themselves with more valour and resolution then ever man saw coincident with so bad a cause’. 712 However, these gracious narratives were published after the battle, not before, when the dehumanisation of the Earl’s army was intended to facilitate more effective operations against it. Thus, this dehumanisation possibly incited the Parliamentarian armies to slaughter their enemies in the battle.

After the battle, thanksgiving sermons were preached in the Parliamentarian regions. One of these was given in Hull by reverend Joshua Whitton. He had no compassion for the defeated enemy – after all, the war was still ongoing. Whitton characterised the Royalists as ‘men of skill, men of will, yea, and men of ill too; men of cruelty, men of bloud, men as yet not satiated with the bloud of the Saints, many of them forraigne and savage beasts, in the shapes of men: others of them bloudy, obstinate, and malicious Papists.’ According to Whitton, most of them were ‘desperately wicked, whom Sathan hath principled to make haste for hell’. He also addressed swearing, the known vice of the Cavaliers: ‘They will vow, curse & swear, and for fear that God should forget to punish their sin, they desire him to damne them’. 713 In addition, he likened the Royalists with the biblical enemies of Israel, the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Moabites and Egyptians. 714 ‘Such as these are an abominable
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people’, Whitton said. He lamented how Lancashire had suffered ‘from that Country-plundering army, did ever the Heathen in excess of wine, revelling, banquetting, in lasciviousnesse, or lawlesse lusts exceed them: have they not ravished women, defiled Virgins?’ Furthermore, idolatry – ‘when a man worships the true God after a false manner’ – was strictly condemned. 715 Another thanksgiving sermon for the victory was given on 18 July at St. Margaret’s in Westminster by Richard Vines, minister at Weddington and a member of the Assembly of Divines. He claimed that the victory was due to God’s power and deliverance, and the enemies were on so high levels of insolence and cruelty that they would have exceeded cruelty itself. 716 Vines also compared the enemy to foxes and wolves, who appeared to have a similar character. However, he reminded his hearers that, although the battle was won, the war still continued: ‘Ianus temple is not yet shut, the sword is still waken, and we know not how long a time the commission that God hath given to it is yet in force’. 717 Parliamentarians had taken up the sword by God’s command, and it was still not sated.

The dehumanisation of Newcastle’s army went on for two years and culminated in its defeat and destruction at Marston Moor. Rumours of ‘the Popish Army’ – based, as has been shown, on the religious commitment of many of Newcastle’s officers – circulated and constructed a certain, specific picture of an enemy group as opposed to vague references to ‘malignants’. In the thanksgiving sermons given after the battle, it was claimed that this enemy group was still present despite the annihilation of the Earl’s army. Hence, the portrayal of this enemy shifted according to the military situation. However, at the same time as Newcastle’s army was targeted with harsh slander, the rest of the King’s armies were also being delegitimised, and it is now to this development that my thesis turns to. Afterwards, I will examine how Royalists wrote about their enemies and how unbalanced the propaganda was between the two parties.
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10. THE RELIGIOUS DEHUMANISATION OF THE KING’S ARMIES

We have seen how the Puritan authors’ treatment of the Irish rebels was soon aimed at the Royalists and specifically at the Earl of Newcastle’s army. However, the rest of the King’s armies received their share of venomous language directed at them, and in this chapter I examine how the shifting military situation affected the portrayal of the Royalists. I also address the name ‘cavalier’, which was a derogatory term signifying the King’s soldier.

The word ‘cavalier’ was used by Parliamentarians to delegitimize Royalists. A pamphlet entitled The Debauched Cavalleer, by George Lawrence and Christopher Love,718 likened the Royalists, ‘viprous brood of prodigious Incendiaries’, to the biblical Midianites, who had risen up against Israel. The authors discussed the word ‘cavalier’ and confessed that the name itself was honourable, but ‘these unworthy miscreants have made the very name a reproach’. The authors condemned the Cavaliers’ swearing and their oppression of people. The alleged cooperation with the Papists was naturally mentioned in a negative light as well as the spiritual uncleanness that reigned in their ‘Pseudo-Catholique Army’. The pamphlet attacked these ‘men of violence and blood’: ‘You shall see what slaughters your God will make; he is whetting his glittering sword[...] the sickle of Gods wrath will soone cut them downe, they shall wither like the grasse, be scattered like chaste before the winde, and consumed like stubble before the everlasting burnings.’ The Royalists were ‘the greatest enemies to Christ that ever this land bred; they have lifted up swords against him, drank healths to the confusion of him, they defile his Name, abhor his Worship, throw out his Ordinances, oppose his Gospel, maligne his people, and would lay all his honour in the dust’. In this war between good and evil, ‘cursed be hee that keepeth back (in this case especially) his sword from blood’. The urge to violence against Royalists was clear: ‘You have that marke to shoot at, at which God is aiming to have his arrowes stick in their sides, and be drunk in their blood.’719

John Goodwin’s Anti-Cavalierisme was published in October 1642, and it contributed to the view that the Puritans were fighting God’s battles. It also dehumanised the Royalists: it was ‘for the suppressing of that Butcherly brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries’.720 Goodwin called his enemies the

718 Love was a Puritan preacher who had already given a sermon in defence of the war against the King and would later be a chaplain in the Parliament’s army. See Laurence, Parliamentary Army Chaplains, 149. Lawrence also probably served in the army. See Vernon, E. C. “Lawrence, George [bap. 1613, d. 1691x8], clergyman and ejected minister.” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 23 Sep. 2004; Accessed 19 May. 2020.
720 John Goodwin, Anti-Cavalierisme, or, Truth Pleading As well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this present War, for the suppressing of that Butcherly brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries... London, 1642, title page.
'Legion of Devils', the ‘garbage of the Land’ and a ‘bloody and butcherly Generation, commonly knowne by the name of Cavaliers’, as well as Jesuits, Papists and Atheists. These people were trying to put Lucifer into heaven and cover the land with antichristian darkness.\textsuperscript{721} Goodwin exhorted all good people to fight for God or to support that fight with money and prayers.\textsuperscript{722} The Irish Rebellion was used as an example of the future to come if ‘the Sons of Belial’ were not stopped.\textsuperscript{723} Goodwin claimed that the downfall of the anti-Christ was drawing near. In Roman times, there was a special necessity to allow the anti-Christ to enter the world, for which reason the Christian martyrs had not offered resistance back then. Now, resistance was needed since it was the time for the Devil to fall.\textsuperscript{724} The soldiers of the anti-Christ, ‘sworne Sword-men of the devill’, ‘the devils Saints’ and ‘the Children of the Whore’,\textsuperscript{725} were out to do all kinds of mischief, since ‘the rage of their lusts[...] is as barbarous and cruell, as the rage of their crueltie it selfe’. After describing the danger that the Cavaliers posed to the wives and daughters of Parliamentarians, Goodwin juxtaposed the Royalists with ‘their Brethren in Ireland, baptised into th[e] same spirit of blood and abhomination’ and related an often told Irish atrocity, according to which ‘an inhumane monster’ smashed young children against walls.\textsuperscript{726}

The Cavaliers were framed into a distinct enemy group in the Parliamentarian press. They were portrayed in a certain way both in appearance and behaviour, and they were often associated with the Catholic religion. An anonymous pamphlet in November 1642 satirized the Cavaliers’ motivations and behaviour. It claimed that the Royalists were throat-cutting highwaymen and only interested in their own profit, whoring and drinking: ‘We desire nothing but to cut throats, take purses, ravish maids, plunder houses, murder Roundheads, defie the Parliament, and like Phaeton, set all the world on fire.’\textsuperscript{727} The pamphlet also included quite graphic narratives of the Cavaliers’ designs for the women of London and for the local Parliamentarians, whose bodies were to be torn to pieces and the country was to be fertilized with their blood. It made the religious connection by claiming that the seven deadly sins were the ‘very form, essence and being’ of the Cavaliers and that they were being ‘led on by Robin the devill, or by the devill and Prince Robert’.\textsuperscript{728} Another pamphlet suggested that the Cavaliers took an oath by which they swore to protect the Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{729} The Cavaliers
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Catechisme, published in May 1643, claimed that the Cavalier ‘was a member of the Church of Rome, and consequently a limb of Antichrist, an enemy to all goodnesse, the child of the divell, an inheriter of the kingdome of darkness’. Loyalty to the Pope, treason against the King, fornication, adultery, rapine, swearing and idolatry were singled out as the commandments that the Cavaliers were supposed to keep.730 A Parliamentarian answer to a Royalist satirist John Taylor described the Cavaliers’ appearance as inhumane: they were ‘shag pole locusts’ who had ‘haire like women, faces like men, and teeth like a Lyon[...] all like deformed monsters’. The pamphlet ended in a warning regarding men with a long hair: ‘all that weare long hair are not Locusts; as also, all that weare not long hair, are not Round-heads, yet is long hair the visible sign or mark to distinguish a Locust.’731

Since ‘Cavalier’ had no religious significance as a word, such significance had to be invented. The Cavaliers were juxtaposed not only with Irish Catholics but also with other religious groups. For example, in March 1644, the pamphlet XXXIII. Religions, Sects, Societies, And Factions, Of the Cavaliers presented a list of religions that the Royalist supposedly practiced.732 The second edition of the pamphlet followed in August, called The Cavaliers Bible, and the third edition was published in the summer of 1645, entitled XXXVI. Severall Religions, Held And maintained by the Cavaliers.733 Judging by the number of editions, it was a popular publication that presented the ‘Religions, Sects, Societies, and Factions, of the Cavaliers now in arms against the Parliament’.734 The pamphlet mentioned, among more obscure sects, the Jesuits, malignants and priests, and in later editions the Irish rebels, the French and Spanish factions and bishops. All these groups were described in a few lines and connected to the Royalist in their vices. XXXIII. Religions claimed that there was no reason for those of the true Protestant religion ‘to be at peace with such as these; and submit to what Discipline they will give us; who minde whoring, swearing, Idolatry; drunkennesse, blasphemy, and all manner of vice; and prefer it before any thing that is truly good’.735 Hence, even though the word ‘cavalier’ carried no religious meaning, there were no lack of attempts to imbue it with such a meaning.

730 The Cavaliers Catechisme: Or, The Reformed Protestant catechising the Antichristian Papists, Malignants, Incendiaries, and other ill-affected Persons under the name of Cavaliers. London, 1643, A2r, A3v–A4r.
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Sometimes, a derogatory word targeted at one’s own group was used to signify the enemy. For instance, one pamphlet lamented that many publications infected and poisoned the country with their profaneness and lies. This pamphlet was published against a certain unnamed ‘ignorant foolish wicked’ text ‘of the Roundheads lately Printed’. It labelled the Roundheads as animals and monsters who were sinful vassals to the Devil. They were also persons whose hearts were filled with ‘all manner of prophanenesse, basenesse, and wickednesse, as pride, uncleannesse, adultery, fornication, idolatry, superstition, atheisme’ and so on. Their pamphlets were full of ‘prophane, foolish, uncleane words’, and they were ignorant of religion.736 The real target of the pamphlet was made clear later: ‘What is lighter then a feather?/What is heavier then leade?/A braineless Perriwigged Cavalier,/That is a true Roundhead.’ Afterwards, the pamphlet repeated the common accusations towards Royalists: drinking, whoring, cursing, favouring Popish worship, being against the King and Parliament and slandering the true worshippers of God by calling them Roundheads.737 Not only was each participant in the press battles trying to cleanse their name of stereotypical negative traits, they were also trying to transfer that name to the enemy.

Military accounts contained glimpses on how these words were used by soldiers. In addition to narrating the events, these reports also dehumanised the enemies by making them appear cruel and inhumane. For example, one account described how the Royalists of Pomfret Castle surprised a group of Parliamentarian soldiers and killed two of them despite their pleas of quarter. The rest were taken prisoners and told that ‘no death was bad enough for Round-heads’. Parliamentarians were angered and ‘resolved to burn his [the Royalist captain] house, and to use all the cruelty that may be to him, and to give no quarter to the Cavalliers in that Castle’.738 A report from Bristol accused Royalists of violating the articles of surrender ‘in a most furious and barbarous manner’.739 It likened the King’s men to wolves and claimed that Irish rebels had participated in the siege, ‘who were not in service, but only followed the Army to rob and steale’. The same was said of ‘certaine Frenchmen’. As for English Royalists, even their chaplains ‘sweare as bad as any of the souldiers’.740 The reports also blamed the Cavaliers for sexual offences and lewdness. In September 1642, it was reported that they
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‘met a maid and ravish her, & then tyed her to a tree stark naked, and stopt her mouth’. 741 Another pamphlet ridiculed the Royalists, juxtaposing their military exercises with how they conducted themselves with prostitutes. 742

The participants of the public debate about the derogatory terminology tried to shift blame to the opposing side while defending their own party. For example, a pamphlet by W. L. from May 1644 described Parliamentarians in a positive way and justified the use of the word ‘cavalier’ in reference to the King’s soldiers. According to the author, it was in no way an ignominious term but rather one of honour, and it was their inhumanity that made the name odious. He also claimed that Royalists were not called ‘King Dogs’ or ‘King Rogues’ even though the soldiers of Parliament were called ‘Parliament Dogs’, 743 ‘which plainly shewes the strength and bent of that ungodly crew, is point-blanke against the Parliament, while they account this the most hatefull and despitefull terme they can baptise them withall’. ‘Roundhead’, however, was a derogatory term used by the Royalists to vilify good men who assisted Parliament and who did not answer this reproach with similar words:

Roundhead or Roundheaded Dog, is a coat they have fitted to be of as large extent as Parliament Dog, which they’l be sure to clap upon the back of every one that either writes or speaks for, or contributes to Parliaments assistance[...] while, I say again, the Parliament party casts no terme of reproach at all upon his Majesties Armies.

This line of argument claimed that the Royalists were against Parliament but that the Parliamentarians were not against the King ‘but those sonnes of Belial about him’. 744 This description was clearly at odds with the claim that the King’s men were not reproached in any way. It was even more discrepant when later, in the same pamphlet, the Royalists were mocked harshly: they wore their hair ‘like a Locust’ and swore ‘like an impe risen out of the bottomlesse pit’. They were also ‘the scumme of the Kingdome, swearing, whoring, blood-thirsty, drunken, unclean, and blasphemous wretches’. The author expressed his doubts about the quality of peace ‘so long as the Papists, Atheists, Idolatries, and blasphemies, and cursed Cavaleers, and Delinquents, in Church and State, are so many, and so
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neere his Majesty’. Hence, even though he criticised the strong derogatory words used by Royalists, the author very clearly presented his opinion of the enemy.

The Parliamentarian press treated the Earl of Newcastle’s army severely and made it an example of rebellious Papists in arms that tried to subvert religion and the liberties of the King’s subjects. It was only to be expected that this treatment extended to the King’s armies in general. Rumours and conspiracy theories claimed that the Pope and Jesuits together with English malignants plotted an extirpation of the Protestant religion. The influence of Rome and the wickedness of the Catholics was highlighted and repeated over and over. Matthew Newcomen, for example, characterised the Church’s enemies as ‘Emissaries of Saten’ and ‘the seed of the serpent’ in his sermon in November 1642. Newcomen brought forth past wrongdoings of the Catholics and argued that their numbers had only multiplied since then. He said they still harboured malignant doctrines towards Protestants – after all, the rebellion of ‘the bloudy monsters of Ireland’ was a war against the Puritan Parliament of England. The danger of the King’s Catholic subjects turning against him at the Pope’s command was repeated, and the religious nature of the conflict was emphasised – it was for the defence of the Popish prelacy that the Royalists pursued the war in England. On 4 January 1643, a report warned of Newcastle’s army and its march towards Oxford. According to it, the King had initially denied that there were Papists in the Royal army. After Newcastle himself had declared that he countenanced Catholics taking up arms, however, ‘many notorious Papists in the Kings Army were not ashamed openly to confess themselves’. The writer was afraid that the King would be in debt to the Catholics after the war, which would mean concessions to them and the continual reception of ‘ill counsell’. Thus, he exhorted his readers to rise up against ‘the cruelty of the bloudthirsty Papists’ and Newcastle’s army. Another account of the taking of the town of Preston labelled the Royalists as ‘the Popish party’ and listed the names of killed or captured Catholic soldiers as well as one sergeant major Purvey who had ‘lately come out of Ireland’. Yet another pamphlet, published in February,
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claimed that the ‘desperate Cavaliers in the North, boyling with their lust and filthinesse, do despise Religion, and the people of God’. This was a clear reference to Newcastle’s army, but later, the enemies were referred to in more general terms such as ‘Rebels, impudent stiffnecked Papists, and popishly-affected people’, ‘scorpions’, ‘the Seperatists, the Palmer Worme; the Cavaliers the Grasse-hoppers; the Jesuits, Priests and Fryers, and other Papists, the Canker Wormes, and Monopolies the Caterpillers of the Land’, and ‘bitter furious Cavaliers[...] that plunder and kill and do what they please’. 752 In a sermon to the Parliamentarian officers and soldiers, minister John Bond urged the removal of the wicked from before the King. By ‘removing’, he meant ‘executing, banishing, cashiering, displacing, or any other kind of punishment’, and by ‘the wicked’, he meant ‘all known transgressors, and delinquents against the Law of God and man, all dangerous malignants’ as well as ‘an ambitious traitorous favourite’, ‘a rotten Priest’ and ‘a bloody, treacherous Cavalier’. 753 They were to blame for the troubles: ‘His Majesty promiseth the defence of the true protestant Religion; the Cavaleeres take in Papists, and they are the chiefe Commanders in the Army[...] His Majesty say he will deliver delinquents to punishment; the Cavaleeres promote them[...] the Cavaleeres rob, and kill, and slay against all Law.’ 754 Another, identical copy of the sermon was printed with the added title The States Stability 755 by a different publisher. 756 If the difference between the Catholics and Papists had become non-existent, the line between Catholic and Protestant Royalists had become quite vague in Parliamentarian propaganda as well, and it was not only Newcastle’s army that was accused of harbouring Papists.

To be fair, the King had dealings with the Irish as he tried to bring his rebellious kingdoms to heel. For instance, a truce in Ireland was needed so that the soldiers who had been fighting there could be transferred to England to join Charles’s armies. In Parliamentarian propaganda, this was presented as a way of bringing Irish rebels to England to extirpate the true Protestant religion. Fears of this invasion
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were heightened by the Cessation of Arms with the rebels on 15 September 1643. In October, Parliament published a declaration that claimed that the treaty served ‘for the better introduction of Popery, and extirpation of the true Protestant religion, in that [Ireland] and other of His Majesties Dominions’.\footnote{A Declaration of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. Shewing the present Designe now on foot (by virtue of a pretended Commission from His Majesty) for a Cessation of Armes... London, 1643, title page.} Compared to the Royalists’ protest of the Solemn League and Covenant, which I address in the next chapter, this criticism was more brutal. The English were reminded of ‘furious bloud-thirsty Papists’ and of their ‘bloody and treacherous Religion’, which made them ‘inhumanely cruel in shedding the Protestants blood’.\footnote{Ibid. 2–3.}

The Cessation harmed the King’s public standing. Lawrence Crawford, a colonel in Ireland who had fought against the rebels there, complained that he had to leave his service due to the Cessation, which served the Rebels better than the true Protestants. He also claimed that his regiment was going to be shipped to England to fight ‘in a most unjust warre against the Parliament there’.\footnote{Lawrence Crawford, Irelands Ingratitude to the Parliament of England. Or, A Remonstrance of Colonell Crawfords, shewing the Jesuiticall plots against the Parliament.. London, 1644, 5.} Crawford criticised the Marquess of Ormond, the commander of the English forces in Ireland, who had allegedly been lenient with the rebels in order to fight the English Parliament.\footnote{Ibid. 7–10.} Ireland had been betrayed to ‘the bloody and inhumane rebels’ who had massacred over one hundred and sixty thousand Protestants. It was the ‘Devil’s masterpiece’ that the army that had fought against the Irish and become excellent soldiers in the process was now going to be used against Parliament to serve Popery.\footnote{Ibid. 12–13.} Crawford’s case illustrated well how the King alienated some of his more principled subjects (the colonel wrote that religion was far dearer to him than his life) by the Cessation.

The ambivalence of the King’s attitude towards the Irish heightened distrust. For example, Edward Bowles, a Parliamentarian army chaplain, complained in November 1643 that Charles had first forbidden the Catholics from serving in his army but had later allowed and even encouraged them to arm themselves.\footnote{Edward Bowles, The Mysterie of Iniquitie, yet working In the Kingdomes of England, Scotland, and Ireland, for the destruction of Religion truly Protestant.. Edinburgh, 1643, 29.} This change of tone was also noted in the King’s rhetoric towards the Irish rebels. At first they were ‘wicked and detestable Rebels’, but later ‘His Romane Catholique Subjects’.\footnote{Ibid. 41–42.} We can see, then, how politics and the demands of war influenced the King’s propaganda and how the Parliamentarians did not fail to notice it. This ambivalence was used by the Puritans to condemn the
King’s Irish policy, and many hard-liners, such as the aforementioned colonel Crawford, did not see any alternative but to join the Parliamentarian war effort to prevent the destruction of the Protestant religion.

Increasingly, all kinds of foreigners were presented as serving the Royalist cause. Thomas Mocket, a Presbyterian minister, published an opinion on the King’s armies in which he related a testimony of a late minister of Annegilliffe in Ulster, John Dod. According to the testimony, the Irish rebels, Franciscans and Jesuits in Oxford were ‘all very earnest for the cause, and daily encouraging the soldiers to fight against the Round-heads’. The number of those Irish was about three thousand, and in addition, most of the King’s guard were Irish. After relating the affairs of the King’s army in Oxford, Mocket reminded his audience of Newcastle’s army:

The Army in the North, under the Earl of Newcastle, consisting for the most part of known Papists, who call themselves, The Catholike Army, The Queens forces, consisting of fugitive English, Dutch, French, Walloons, Spaniards, Danes, and Negroes, (in probability all Papists, Pagans, or Atheists) who, as report frequently goeth, hath set up, and displayed, a consecrated Banner from the Pope.

He complained about the behaviour of the soldiers in the King’s retinue: they ‘openly professe themselves to be Papists, were seen that night with Crusifixes about their necks’. In addition to religion, there were curious examples of ethnic factors of otherness too. Mocket claimed that the Royalists were not Protestants because thousands of them were Papists and they were not of the same nation as the Parliamentarians because they were Irish, French, Dutch, Walloons, Spanish, Danish and black; and even if they were all English, it was still lawful to oppose their illegal actions, even to the death. A View of the Solemn League and Covenant was a good example of how religious issues had tainted all the followers of the King. Not only the Irish rebels were a threat to England and the true Protestant religion, nor was it only the army of the Earl of Newcastle who was accused of employing Papists – the King and his soldiers on the whole came under the harsh criticism of being servants of the Pope.

In addition to common soldiers, certain Royalist grandees were presented as personifications of the enemies’ bad qualities, none more so than Prince Rupert. We have already seen criticism of the conduct of his troops at Edgehill. This only intensified as the war progressed, but from early on, one
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narrative described the Prince as a foreigner who had ‘since his coming into this Kingdom committed many outrages, And Bloody and inhumane Acts, putting to the sword both man woman and child in divers parts of this Realm’, as one pamphlet put it. Another pamphlet mentioned ‘Prince Robert with his desperate route of bloody Cavaliers’, ‘those deadly enemies to God and their Countrie’, and narrated how the Prince had charged ‘like a Devill, rather then a man’. The pamphlet also compared the ‘drinking, damming and roaring’ Royalists to Parliamentarians, who solemnly prayed, and gave thanks to God for ‘deliverance from those Cannibals’. When the Prince stormed Birmingham in spring 1643, a pamphlet complained about ‘inhuman cruelties’ exercised by the Royalists, who were ‘blaspheming, cursing, and damning themselves most hidiously’. ‘They beastly assaulted many Womens chastity[...] especially the French among them, were outrageously lascivious and letcherous’, which was behaviour usually attributed to the Royalists. The burning of the town was, however, ‘a most barbarous cruelty’ since it was done in cold blood the day after the storming. Allegedly, the Royalists had told the inhabitants that this was Prince Rupert, his merciful self, but when they came back with the Queen’s Army, ‘they would leave neither Man, Woman, nor Childe alive’. ‘Such are the Cavaliers mercies’, the author concluded. An anonymous pamphlet claimed that, in Rupert’s army, it was lawful to pillage, rob and spoil the inhabitants of the country, as well as to devour and burn crops, ‘which policy is inhumane’. The pamphlet also mentioned that adultery, fornication, rape and public blasphemy against God and religion were not restrained in the army. If the Royalists won, the government of the kingdom would be ‘not only tiranicall and papisticall but diabolicall’. The Parliaments Kalender of Black Saints described Rupert as an ‘ungratefull Viper’, a ‘Flap-Dragon’ and a ‘Butter-Box’ and warned the Prince that he might be next, referring to the fate of his dog that was killed at Marston Moor.

Rupert was also the target of religious dehumanisation. A pamphlet published on 22 April 1643 attacked the Prince and his army severely, establishing the conflict as a ‘bloody warre against the
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Saints of Jesus Christ’. The pamphlet addressed the ‘Bloody Prince, the Prince Rupert, and all the bloody Prelates and Cavaliers’ directly, advising them not to persist in their wickedness because there would be a reckoning. Rupert was compared to Doeg the Edomite from the Bible, who had killed the people of God by the order of king Saul: ‘a wicked King commands a wicked worke, and as wicked a servant obeyes him.’ This was, of course, an indirect attack on Charles himself, but yet the sharpest edge of the criticism was upon ‘the great Doeg of our Kingdome, Prince Rupert and all his blody followers’. They were claimed to have killed the ministers and people of God, the innocent, the fatherless and widows. They murdered the Saints and committed idolatry and blasphemy because it was natural for them and they enjoyed it. The author defended Parliament taking up arms since it was not to ‘disobey the King’ but to ‘defend themselves, and their posterity, from Popery, tyranny and slavery’. Moreover, the Parliamentarians’ violence was more considerate:

There is a great difference betwixt your [the Royalists] shedding of bloud; and theirs[the Parliamentarians]: for they are exceeding tender and carefull of the faithfull Ministers of God, and of his servants, and would, if it were possible, preserve them above all other, from prison and sword: but your aime is altogether against such whom you are pleased out of your divelish malice to call Round-heads, which terme shewes what you are, even such whose tongues are set on fire of hell, which doe speake worst of those of whom God speakes best.

Again, there was only one possible outcome from such a behaviour: ‘all bloody persecutors; and plotters, and workers of mischiefe against the Saints and people of God shall certainly be destroyed.’ The enemies of God’s people were the enemies of God himself, especially as their army was led by the Devil. The pamphlet was quite clear on this matter: ‘wicked and bloudy men[...] must be destroyed, even the whole Army that standeth up in this wicked warre’. The author confessed that some people in Parliament’s army were as bad as the Cavaliers and were a shame to the cause they pretended to stand for. Such people were, however, certainly a minority, whereas the majority of the Cavaliers were wicked blasphemers.

Descriptions of the Royalist leaders’ actions often included religious references and connections to the Irish or Catholics. For example, in March 1643, a report was published about ‘malignants’ such as Prince Rupert, his brother Maurice and George Digby and their failed attempt to conquer Bristol.
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(described as a ‘most hellish, cruell and bloudy plot’, ‘more damnable then the Powder Treaseon, and more barbarous and Cruell then the Massacre of France’). In addition to characterising these Royalists as ‘bloud sucking’ and ‘cruell and bloud-thirsty men’, it related how all the people ‘that had not the mark of the Beast upon them’ in Bristol would have been put to the sword if the plot had succeeded.\textsuperscript{779} Another pamphlet in April narrated how the Earl of Derby made an unsuccessful attempt on Lancaster Castle ‘with all the Papists rising wholly with him’. After the Parliamentarians had retreate to the castle, ‘the Enemie entred the Town, and killed man, woman, and children with all barbarous crueltie, dragging poore people from their houses, and cutting their throats with Butchers knives’. This narrative of the violence towards the civilians of Lancaster resembled the portrayals of the atrocities in Ireland and again placed the blame on Catholics. ‘All this crueltie arises from the Earle of Darbie, who hath taken all the great Papists into his Counsell, who before were not admitted, who have put him upon this cruell massacre, and all rise with him as one man, and if it be in their power will not leave a true Protestant in these parts.’\textsuperscript{780}

Dehumanising rhetoric was approved and sanctioned by Parliament. A good example of this was John Vicars, whose second part of the Parliamentarian chronicle, \textit{God on the Mount}, was published in October 1643. Throughout the book, he dehumanised the King’s men, using characterisations such as ‘beast-like Bears’, ‘treacherous Tragedians’ and ‘hideous hell-hounds’.\textsuperscript{781} The Irish rebels were ‘incarnate Divells’\textsuperscript{782} who were in league with the English malignant counsellors of the King.\textsuperscript{783} His later pamphlet, \textit{A Looking-glasse for Malignants}, appeared in February 1644, and it contained narratives of many incidents in which God had punished wrongdoers. The language Vicars used of these wrongdoers is telling. The Cessation was ‘hideous and hellish’ and the Irish were ‘most barbarous bloody and damnable Irish Rogues’. Archbishop Laud was described as an ‘Arch-adversary of Christ and his Cause among us, that grand Ringleader and accursed contriver of all these our present mischiefes and miseries’ and as a ‘popish Persecuter’.\textsuperscript{784} The King’s army was ‘Popish and Atheisticall’ and Laudian ministers were ‘scandalous Priests, those sonnes of Belial’.\textsuperscript{785} Furthermore, he wrote against the cursing and swearing of the Royalists, who characterised Parliamentarians as
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Roundhead dogs. The Prince Rupert was the ‘Prince of Plunderers’ and the Earl of Newcastle atheist. These religious, delegitimising characterisations were common even in official publications (*A Looking-glasse for Malignants* was approved by John White, chairman of the Parliamentarian committee for printing). A testimony to the popularity of these pamphlets was that Vicars published a sequel to his work, titled *The Looking-glasse for Malignants, Enlarged*. In its preface, he wrote that ‘The Courteous acceptance [...] of my first part of The Looking-Glasse for Malignants, hath bin a great Spur and incitement to set upon, and now to set forth this second part thereof’. The sequel comprised of anecdotes of several Cavaliers who had come to a bad end because of malignant deeds. These were reported as warning examples, but they also illustrated how venomous the language was that was used of the Royalists. For instance, both the Earl of Strafford and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who were beheaded on Parliament’s insistence and command, were treated harshly even after their death. Vicars stated that ‘the main and principal cause of their death’ were ‘their bloody treachery and inveterate malignancy against God and his most righteous cause in the Parliaments proceedings’. Not only was it about what they had done, it was also about ‘their own abominable and detestable persons’. Whoever was against Parliament deserved to die because they were also against God and his people. Even though the pamphlet ended in an appeal to God to open the eyes of the malignants so that they could see the error of their ways, it was far from the conciliatory tone of most Royalist divines. Vicars was certainly very eloquent in describing the enemies, who were ‘God-hating and Truth-contemning malignants, the Cavalierian-crew, and wretched Royalists’. According to him, legions of angels were protecting God’s ‘precious Parliamentarians, against all the most potent, and seemingly numerous perverse regall illegall powers of Atheists, Papists, Irish-Rebells and Cavalierian-Malignants’. The battle between Christ and the anti-Christ was again emphasized.

This militant, uncompromising tone was rooted in the events of the 1630s. During the King’s personal rule and under the Laudian church, there had been trials of Puritan radicals and other dissenters. These people were seen as martyrs and, more importantly, were themselves convinced of being such. They had a motive to attack the Royalist cause with a zeal and an assurance of fighting God’s battle. One
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of these men was John Bastwick. In his declaration, he sought to prove that all malignants were enemies of God (and the King). Bastwick especially attacked the prelates, whom he claimed to be frogs from the bottomless pit. More interesting, however, was his view on dehumanisation. He narrated how, in ancient times, martyrs had been clothed in the skins of wild beast so that their persecutors’ dogs would be better animated to tear them in pieces. This was comparable with how the prelates made servants of the Lord and the King’s loyal subjects ‘monstrous, ugly and deformed unto all men[…] by their Relations and Informations they clothe them with saying of them. That they are maligners and enemies of Government, troubleurs of Church and State[…] and a thousand such crimes, setting all the people against them.’ He added that, ‘in the very Court Sermons they incense the King and Nobles daily against those, they brand with the name of Puritans and Sectaries’. Bastwick’s claim that the Puritans were dehumanised was quite ironic considering the tone of the Parliamentarian propaganda and his own writings. However, the methods of delegitimizing enemies and the benefits to be had from it were not lost on contemporaries.

The concept of the enemy was fluid and changed with military and political situations. The Irish rebels’ stereotypical characteristics were projected on the Earl of Newcastle’s soldiers and to a lesser extent on the King’s men in general. However, when the Royalists lost the north and the ‘Popish army’ was no more, the same accusations were targeted on other Royalist armies. The Parliamentarian victory of Marston Moor was offset by a disaster in Cornwall, where the army of the Earl of Essex was forced to surrender in September 1644. Cornwall, like most of the western regions of England and Wales, was sympathetic to the Royalist cause, which worried Puritan ministers. One minister who expressed his concern was John Bond, a member of the Assembly of Divines, who had been a chaplain in Parliament’s western forces. The title of his sermon highlighted the importance of the west for the Parliamentarian war effort: \textit{Occasus Occidentalis: Or, Job in the West}. Bond portrayed the enemy there in familiar terms, using comparisons to animals. ‘Surely, many thousands of titular Christians in this Land, were, in times of peace, but as Wolves in a Cage, but as Lyons tamed by art; they wanted nothing but liberty and opportunity to shew their wolvish and worrying natures’, he preached, seeking to establish the inherent wicked quality of the enemy. These men did not work alone but invited other malignants to the kingdom, Bond claimed:
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These fierce Strangers have especially abounded in the West, whose shores doe day and night lie open upon both sides, South and North, to receive both French and Irish: who, together with High and Low-Germans, are let-in at those Posterne doores, to the funerals of Great Britaine, by her owne sonnes. Nay, and the Enemy tells us, that Moors and Turks shall bee called in too, rather than the Round-heads shall prevale.

Clearly, English xenophobia was here used for propaganda purposes, to make the west appear as a threat to security by explaining how all foreign enemies could make a landfall there. Bond mentioned the historical precedent of King John, who had had deals with the Kings of Africa and Morocco to aid him against his own people. He asked if it was now lawful and even ‘warrantable and necessity, not onely to arme our owne Papists, but to call in proscribed Irish Rebels, yea, Turks and Infidels, to kill and slay Christians, Protestants, Parliaments’. Furthermore, Bond criticised how the Royalists had portrayed their victories in the west: ‘they have cunningly endeavoured by the (sometimes) prosperous outward successe of the wicked, and the extraordinary heavy afflictions and defeats of the godly party in those Countries, to entitle the Lord to their side and cause, against his owne people and party.’

Bond certainly did his best to turn Parliamentarian interests towards western England. His sermon is a perfect example of the use of delegitimising propaganda that follows the changing fortunes of war. Before the battle of Marston Moor, there were few Puritan preachers concerned about the west. After the defeat of Newcastle’s army, new enemies had to be invented, and suddenly it seemed that all the Papists had moved from the north to the west. As Bond put it:

The West is now generally become a kind of Turkey[…] to all that are Christians indeed; the Ports that are in the enemies hand are as so many Algiers and Sallies, to all true protestant English Passengers; for not onely their goods, but their persons are there taken captives, and set at ransom. The In-Land places, are like the maine of Barbarie; for the poor Country-men, Yeomandry, and Artificers, are taken prisoners from their fields and shops, at the pleasure of the nefarious and necessitous soouldiers.

He also described the recruitment of those soldiers:

Others, as the Tyrants pleasure, are pressed for their service; and of these, some are againe ransomed at the will of the petty Officers; others, not able to buy their lives, are forced along to the assault or battaile, being coupled, and bound together with cords or match, like dogs for the game, or rather like oxen for the plough[…] like sheep for the slaughter.
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In addition, Bond described cruel imprisonments and claimed that those who escaped the horrible western prisons were forced to wander around aimlessly with no food nor shelter.\textsuperscript{796} The people inhabiting this country seemed dangerous to ‘the Saints’. Bond went to great lengths to discredit and vilify those participating in the King’s cause in the west. While doing so, he touched a certain widespread and lamentable subject of the Civil War, that of members of the same family on different sides of the conflict. Although he confessed that it was a phenomenon seen everywhere in England, he was keen to highlight its predominance in the west:

\begin{quote}
Though a shower of stormy divisions hath overspread the whole Land in generall, yet you see this cloud arising especially in the West; there is the father divided against the son, that is, many an old, wicked, ambitious, Machiavillian Saul, is there to be found hating his sweet and faithfull son Ionathan, for cleaving to the just and holy cause of (David,) the men after Gods owne heart.
\end{quote}

Bond used religious terminology to describe such treacherous relatives of good Protestants, ill-reputed names such as Cain, Esau and Judas and slander such as ‘Edomitish Doeg’. He concluded that the west ‘hath been the greatest Country of adventitious and[...] home-bred Crocodiles in the whole Kingdome’.\textsuperscript{797} This fantastical analysis of western England made it appear as a foreign country with a foreign religion that was hazardous to Protestants. Bond claimed that the ‘extraordinary hand of God is against the poor West above other parts and quarters of the kingdome’.\textsuperscript{798}

Swearing was one of the key points that Bond used to delegitimise the enemy. Reproaching Royalists for blasphemy was nothing new, but the same old accusations were used against new enemies. After narrating how Christ had been mocked before His crucifixion, Bond said ‘that this whole Series may bee paralleld by the taunts and blasphemies of the Westerne Enemies’. There were also other kinds of blasphemies, namely ‘horrid Oaths and execrable Curses’, and the enemy was also competent in these: ‘I dare challeng the Records of all Nations and Generations, to shew mee such affecting, studying, and buying of abominable, direfull, damning Oaths and Blasphemies, as is daily practised among them.’\textsuperscript{799} Bond was also concerned with other sinful issues in the enemies’ behaviour. He attacked the local clergy harshly, accusing them of Catholicism: ‘the multitude of their Priests, in those parts, are of the vilest of the people, in all respects, and doe send out prophaneness over all that Country; and to the servants of God they are Wolves and Butchers, rather than Shepherds’, he thundered. According to Bond, the true methods of Christian worshipping, such as the exercises of
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prayer and fasting, were denied even in private. And worse things happened in the west too: the enemy had a devious way of baiting unsuspecting worshippers to gather into churches. Then the doors would be shut, and armed soldiers would coerce the people at gun point ‘to sweare that they will fight against their Religion, Parliament, Lawes and Liberties’. This, in a place of worship, was pure blasphemy and it displayed the barbarism of the western enemy. Bond repeated the familiar claims of the enemy being in war against God and his people: ‘these men, in his Majesties name, have set up an Anti-fast, (as well as an Anti Parliament, and an Anti-Covenant) and, consequently, an Anti-God against the God of the Round-heads[...] This cruell Decree is most severely executed in the West.’800 Bond finished with a request for money and means to fight this battle for God and his kingdom. He interpreted the Civil War to be the last clash against the anti-Christ in a series of conflicts that spanned from the attack of the Spanish Armada to the Gunpowder Plot. In this manner, Bond followed the Puritan tradition of describing the war in religious terms to give weight to dehumanisation.801

Even after the battle of Naseby and the de facto crushing of the King’s cause, Parliament was still worried about the Royalist connection to the Irish. One report from October 1645 claimed that ‘most of the Kings Army are Irish and Papists, for the Protestants steale away daily’.802 It was probably true that soldiers would generally desert a hopeless cause, but the Catholics – regardless of their origin – had a better reason to fight until the end in that they could not be sure how they would be treated were they to lose. At least that was how The Cities Weekly Post described the matter. According to it, there were ‘a thousand Irish in the City [Chester], natural Irish which is as much to say the bloudiest and most barbarous Monsters in the world, and these know  that if the Towne be taken it will goe hard with them’.803 Later, the same newspaper reported that the greatest hindrance to the speedy surrender of Chester was ‘the multiplicity of Irish in the Town who cannot expect to have any quarter given them’.804 The Kingdomes Scout also agreed with this assessment: ‘were it not for the bloody Irish, and papists there, the Inhabitants and the rest would prevaile for a treaty to surrender.’805 In the end, the conditions of surrender stipulated that ‘such Irish that were borne of Irish parents, and have taken

800 Ibid. 56–59.
801 Ibid. 79–80.
802 Three Letters, Concerning his Majesties present Condition, Ine from Generall Pointz, To The Committee of Derby. And the other two From Gentlemen of quality, To Mr. William Lilly in London. London, 1645, 2.
803 The Citties weekly Post: Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies to the Kingdome. Num. 1. From Tuesday the 15. of December, to Tuesday the 22. of December. 1645, 2.
804 The Citties weekly Post: Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies to the Kingdome. Num. 3. From Tuesday the 30. of Decem. To Tuesday the 6. of January. 1646, 7.
805 The Kingdomes Scout. Perfectly communicating the Proceeding s in Parliament; And impartially relating the Affaires of the Armie; To the Kingdome. From Tuesday the 9. of Decemb. to Tuesday the 16. of Decemb. 1645, 2.
part with the Rebells in Ireland and now in the City shall be Prisoners’. It did not help the Irish that the Royalists had suggested in the first draft of the articles that everyone regardless of their nation, country or religion, should be free to go. Allegedly, the majority of the defenders in Exeter were also foreign, ‘the most of which are French, and Irish, who are most barbarous and cruel to the Inhabitants, not only by plundering and pillaging their shops, and houses, but by beating them, and ravishing divers women, killing some of the Town being but crost, and many other insolencies.’ These French and Irish were also said to be ‘most notorious Papists, and have Masse every day in the City’. Despite their different nationalities, the parties were seemingly able to communicate with each other. One Parliamentarian account claimed that ‘they can also talk one to another, they call our men Round-headed Rogues, our men return them answer’. The Irish were allegedly made to commit acts that the other Royalists did not want to perform, such as killing prisoners. An account from the siege of Ragland castle mentioned a Parliamentarian corporal who was captured by the King’s soldiers and shot to death because he had changed sides earlier. It ‘was done by an Irish Rebel, and refused by all the English and Welch Souldiers’. On rare occasions, even the Irish were mentioned with respect. Of the battle of Torrington in February 1646, it was reported that the Royalists were ‘old Cornish foot, and all Greenviles and Gorings old Souldiers, English and Irish’ and said to be ‘very resolute men’ who ‘fought valiantly’. These kind of narratives were only seldom seen, however.

In May 1646, the war was all but over. However, some preachers still reminded their audiences of how bad the enemy was. For example, George Newton, a minister of Taunton, who had probably endured at least some of the multiple sieges of the town, gave a thanksgiving sermon in which he was very critical of the Royalists, describing them in words that were often used of the Irish: ‘They are by nature full of all maliciousnesse, so full that they are like to burst with it. They are of barbarous, & bloody, and inhumane dispositions.’ Newton claimed that the enemy had no mercy and that their wickedness had extinguished their ingenuity ‘so that for rage and cruelty they are become brute creatures. And hence the Scripture likens them to beare, and bulls, & asps, and tigers, and Leviathans, 
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and other ravenous and fierce creatures.’ They also harboured a natural enmity against God’s people: ‘they hate them with a perfect hatred, and that to the very death; and therefore they will shew them no mercy.’ Newton suggested that this hatred stemmed from religion: ‘we were (as they accounted us) a strict and a precise Towne.’ ‘The rage of wicked men against the people of the Lord is such a bottomlesse and endlesse rage, because they hate them for holinesse and for religions sake’, he claimed.812 Newton underlined just how horrible a fate they had avoided by enduring the siege, for they had been ‘made a prey to the enkindled and envenom’d rage of the most bloody, savage, hardned, and remorselesse enemies, that ever drew the sword in these warres’.813 Despite all this dehumanisation, Newton was not saying that ‘these brutish creatures should be curb’d by popular and private hands, in a tumultuary way’. He suggested that they would be dealt with by the hands of the godly ministers. Too much leniency was dangerous because the enemies might still harbour devilish thoughts in their hearts despite giving professions of loyalty. It was too early to trust them, Newton said, but he did not advocate severe punishments.814

Thus, the target of Parliamentarian dehumanising propaganda shifted according to the military situation. The basic premises were the same, however: the enemy was compared to the Irish rebels and portrayed as a danger to true Protestant religion if not a straight-up soldier of the Devil himself. Next, I examine how Royalist ministers and pamphleteers approached the subject of delegitimization in comparison to the Parliamentarian effort.
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11. THE DELEGITIMIZATION OF THE PARLIAMENTARIANS

The King’s side also delegitimised their enemies. However, the efforts of the Royalist authors in this respect were different from the Parliamentarian approach. Often, they concentrated on personal attacks against Parliamentarian authors and on scholarly debates, which could be venomous but did not dehumanise the enemy as a whole. The King’s ministers did not depict an eschatological battle between the Devil and Christ in which they had a part to play, nor did they exhort their audience to crush the enemies of the Lord. On the contrary, they were highly critical of the way Puritans preached of a religious war. Thus, they could not, with a clear conscience, dehumanise the Parliamentarians since they often reproached the Puritans for their severe tone. In some cases, they even suggested that such delegitimising behaviour was contagious and caused Royalists to act in an unnecessary cruel manner against their enemies. The Royalist clergy preached mercy and forgiveness, which was not easily converted into a tool of war.

Even in April 1646, when the King was rallying his Oxford garrison in one last desperate defence, the oath that was to be taken by all the officers and soldiers in the city was not particularly severe. In the oath, Fairfax and other commanders were labelled traitors and rebels, and the Parliamentarian armies traitorous and rebellious armies and forces. The oath warranted that the Royalists should resist and destroy these forces and all armies that were to be raised against his majesty.\footnote{An Oath to be Administred Unto all Officers, Souldiers, and such other persons as are or shall be within the Garrison of Oxford. Oxford and London, 1646, 2.} This did not happen, and Oxford surrendered to the New Model Army. After the capitulation, the sermons preached in the King’s capital were naturally accommodating, but one in particular illustrated the Royalist ministers’ attitudes to dehumanising language. The sermon was given on 9 August by a minister Jasper Mayne. Since the war was all but over, Mayne preached for peace, unity and reconciliation, noting that certain language and words were to be avoided since they had had an important part in fomenting the hostilities.

I have beene able to discover no cause so pernicious for the many alienations of minde, or the many separations of Congregation from Congregation, heightned at length into the tragedy of an over-spreading Civill Warre, as certaine vaine, ridiculous, empty words, and names of distinction among us, which have sprung from some mens stricter, or looser carriage of themselves in their profession of the same Religion.

It is to be noted that Mayne merged one’s way of practicing religion with the pejorative name one was called:

\footnote{An Oath to be Administred Unto all Officers, Souldiers, and such other persons as are or shall be within the Garrison of Oxford. Oxford and London, 1646, 2.}
They of the more free, and open carriage, and behaviour, who call a severe regularity, and strictnesse of life, preciseness, and an abridgement of Christian liberty, have called those of a more reserved, and lockt up, and demure conversation, Puritans, and Round-heads[...] And they of the more strict behaviour, have equally as faulty, called those of a freer, and lesse composed conversation, Libertines, and Papists; the usual words of infamy made to signifie a Cavallier. These two words, my Brethren, have almost destroyd a flourishing Kindgome betweene them.  

Mayne underlined the significance that dehumanising language had had during the war. Therefore, he also suggested that ‘the honest, strict, regular, heedfull, conscientious man, be no longer called a Puritane[...] Nor the free, sociable, affable, open, harmlesly unscrupulous man, be any longer called a Papist, or Atheist, or by way of reproach, a Cavallier’. He added that he did not speak ‘of the adulterous, swearing, riotous, lying, drinking, covetous man; these are such, that one of the wayes to reforme them, is to call them by their right names’. For Mayne, such verbal separation was a sin, and an important cause of the late calamities in England. From his sermon, we can derive both the pejorative meaning of the words ‘roundhead’ and ‘cavalier’, and the crucial role the use of those words had in inciting the war. Mayne’s tone was conciliatory even though the sermon contained a mild criticism against the more fiery language of the godly preachers. However, at the time, the King’s cause was lost, so it was sensible for Charles’s ministers to try to adjust themselves to the new situation. Even if he had wanted to, Mayne was in no place to preach for war.

The content of Mayne’s sermon would not have been unusual even while the war was still ongoing. The King’s side customarily complained about crossing the line of propriety, like the Royalist divine Henry Ferne did in April 1643 in Conscience Satisfied. Ferne criticised sermons that equated Parliament’s cause with God’s and that were preached all around London. He also singled out a ‘Mr. Burrows’, which probably referred to the Parliamentarian preacher Jeremiah Burroughs. His criticism was, however, an academic treatise directed at men of similar background and in corresponding positions, not too unfamiliar a strategy among Royalists. For them, it was a more or
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less civilized debate with their peers, not the rabble-rousing fiery demagoguery of the Parliamentarian preachers. Another good example of Royalist polemical writing was *The Unlawfulness of Subjects taking up Armes* by Dudley Digges, a political writer, who had engaged in the public conversation about the lawfulness of the war. This last piece of his was published posthumously in late 1643. Digges answered many Parliamentarian writers (amongst whom were John Goodwin, Charles Herle, Jeremiah Burroughs and William Bridge) but only with regards to the claims they presented, not to who they were. Thus, Digges’s text was not dehumanising, even when it concluded that rebellion was treasonous – it was more or less a warning: ‘You are exhorted not to rebell, because you may be hang’d, but lest confidence in numbers should answer this objection, a stronger motive is used, you shall certainly be damn’d; It is probable, you may take the Gallowes in the way, but however Hell will be the end.’ Digges noted that the Parliamentarian preachers usually invoked the Lord of Hosts in their sermons instead of God’s more peaceful aspect and he compared fighting against episcopacy to rebelling against the lawful sovereign for the Catholic cause – something that the Royalist authors rarely stressed. This he also did without dehumanising his opponents. He only indicated parallels in the argumentation of different groups. Moreover, he saw eschatological tendencies in Parliamentarian preaching and writing, which, as we have seen, portrayed the Civil War as a battle against the anti-Christ. He drew the conclusion that reformed religion had become the ‘mother and nurse of Rebellion; it foments sedition; and advances the rvine of States’. The same tendency of arguing against the lawfulness of rebellion was brought up by Robert Mossom in his two sermons given in York in November 1642, which were published together in January 1643. A just cause and permission from the rightful authority were required to take up arms, otherwise the person was not only a rebel but a murderer too. The temporal punishment for the sin of rebellion was death, and Mossom spelled this out clearly enough, not forgetting to mention that another, eternal punishment awaited in Hell. Like Digges, Mossom presented a warning and a discourse on the unlawfulness of rebellion and not a dehumanising attack against the enemy.

Even when Royalists admitted that rebelling against the lawful sovereign was a sin, they were astonishingly careful not to attack Parliament’s side as a whole. For example, an anonymous pamphlet
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written in response to Edward Bowles’s *Plaine English* and published in Oxford in February 1643 asked those who had taken up arms to consider their actions since ‘Rebellion[...] is as the sinne of witchcraft’ and would lead to damnation.\(^{826}\) The author wrote that only a few men were actively continuing these ‘sad distractions’ for their own profit, but that many well-meaning people had been deceived into rebellion. These treacherous few kept the vast majority in their place by claiming that the King would not forgive their disloyalty. The author professed that the King would forgive them, for he was most merciful – if only the rebels put down their arms, they would be pardoned.\(^{827}\) Thus, Royalists did not pursue dehumanisation but reconciliation. The author criticised the zealous language of the Parliamentarian writers and their claim of fighting God’s war.\(^{828}\) The Royalists were not willing to step into a full-blown religious battle but preferred to side with merciful God rather than the Lord of Hosts. Their modus operandi was to make the supporters of Parliament see their error, to repent, and change sides for the King. This can be seen, for example, in the minister Peter Heylyn’s *Rebells Catechism*, which accused Parliamentarians of attacking the King both verbally and physically. Heylyn claimed that, at Edgehill, the Parliamentarian cannons had purposefully aimed at the King’s person and related, how ‘the rascal people’ were clamouring: ‘some saying openly[...] that the King was the Traitor[...] that the young Prince would govern better; and others of a more transcendent wickedness, that the King was not fit to live.’\(^{829}\) Even though Heylyn spelled out in detail the cruel punishment meted out for rebellion, his purpose was not to dehumanise Parliamentarians or to instruct the Royalist soldiers to kill them without mercy. It was rather to scare the enemy into submission.\(^{830}\) The title of *The Rebells Catechism* said as much: it was written to recall the rebels back to obedience.

The King’s ministers’ propaganda was hardly comparable to that of the Puritans. Royalist authors among the laity, however, did include elements of dehumanisation in their texts. The most prominent satirical writer on the King’s side was John Taylor, called the Water-poet, who commented sharply on contemporary events. During the Civil War, he criticized Parliamentarians in his published texts. For example, in *The Devil Turn’d Round-head*, he described how the Devil himself imitated the Roundheads in their actions and outward appearance, short-cropped hair being an object of ridicule in Royalist propaganda. The pamphlet claimed that the abhorrence of good manners and of the liturgy of the established church and the denial of good works were habits of the Roundheads even to the
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point that the Devil could learn from them. In The Noble Cavalier Caracterised, And A Rebellious Caviller Cauterised, Taylor distinguished the Caviller from the Cavalier. The latter was an obedient gentleman at the King’s service. The former, on the contrary, was a rebellious hypocrite who had treasonously risen against his sovereign, the laws and the church. These Cavillers were ‘blacke mouth’d’ and ‘venom tooth’d’ and their leaders ‘ambitious, pernicious, avaritious, malicious, seditious’. ‘Their zealous Pulpit-men’ had ‘rooted them in the rudiments of Rebellion’, and if they happened to die in action, they were to be ‘Devils Martyrs’. Taylor criticized the iconoclasm of the Parliamentarian soldiers, claiming that such ‘irreligious inhumanity would never have entred into the thought of the most savage Heathens, Pagans, Infidels, Cannibals, Atheists, Anthropophagi or Devils’. He also attacked a Parliamentarian captain, the prolific poet George Wither, who ‘hath written a pretty, foolish, witty, loyall, traiterous Booke called Campa Musae’. Wither’s book was a rather long piece of poetry that justified why he had changed sides and now fought for Parliament. It also attacked the Royalists, calling them ‘malignant counsellors’ and all the usual suspects, but not in particularly rough manner. It seems that Taylor had taken Campo Musae rather personally because he ridiculed it in another pamphlet too, published in February 1645. This was more a personal attack against Wither than a general degradation of the Parliamentarians.

Some of Taylor’s pamphlets were very outspoken in their judgement. He criticised Parliamentarian preachers for instigating rebellion, relating how he had heard a certain Mr. Anderson preaching that the Earl of Essex was Michael the Archangel and the King was the Dragon. Moreover, Taylor reproached iconoclasm, suggesting that ‘the Turkes, Pagans, and Infidels would have shewed more Civility, and lesse Barbarous savage Brutishnesse’ and claiming that the King’s forces had not in any way profaned holy places. By murdering and slaughtering, the Parliamentarians had ‘made this sometimes Kingdome of Peace, an Aceldema, or field of Blood, a very Golgotha of dead mens sculls, as if it were the slaughter house of the world, and shambles of Butcher’d mans flesh for all the Anthropophagie of man-eating Canniballs’. In addition to violence, Taylor criticised sexual practices,
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for since there was no authority and power to punish offences, the Parliamentarians ‘having freedome, as Beasts have, have done worse then Beasts would do’. 839

Thus, after a year of warfare, the King’s side also began to show dehumanising qualities in its propaganda, at least on the level of individual authors such as Taylor. Of course, most of his writings were targeted at specific people or groups, like captain Wither or the Puritan preachers and the Parliamentarian newspapers. 840 He was a satirist, and his writings were far from the sermons given by Puritan ministers, who were taking a more uncompromising and harder stance.

One exception to the rule of moderate Royalist clergymen was Griffith Williams, the bishop of Ossory. He was forced to flee to England after the Irish Rebellion and participated in the King’s cause with his pen as well as being present as a chaplain in the battle of Edgehill. The Discovery of Mysteries was published in July 1643 as a contribution to the pamphlet war, and it dealt with the lawful resistance of a sovereign by his subjects. It was, in part, written as an answer to a pamphlet by John Goodwin, entitled Os Ossorianum, which was penned to refute Williams’s earlier work, Vindiciae Regum; or, The Grand Rebellion. Vindiciae Regum had attacked ‘the Aegyptian loacusts, the emissaries of Apollyon, and the sonnes of perdition’, certain Parliamentarian preachers who were instigating armed resistance, but apart from a few specific passages, it concentrated on arguing for the King’s cause rather than dehumanising the enemy and was not comparable to dehumanising Parliamentarian works or to The Discovery of Mysteries. 841 This latter work characterised Parliamentarians as a ‘brood of vipers’, 842 ‘worse then the Iewes’ 843 and ‘the scum of all the prophanest rout, the vilest of all men, and the outcast of the People’ 844. Besides Goodwin, who was labelled a ‘poor snake’ 845 and ‘the eldest son of his dear father the devill’, 846 Williams mentioned other Puritan ministers in a less than flattering manner:

Doctor [Cornelius] Burgesse the ring-leader of all sedition, Doctor [Calybute] Downing that is reputed as variable, as was Doctor [Andrew] Perne, Master [Edmund] Calamy, that is little better, Master Harding, a
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The personal level on which Williams attacked his clerical opponents was typical for the Royalists. Williams blamed ‘agents of this faction’ for every trouble, such as the Irish Rebellion, which they had caused by threatening the Irish with forced conversions and severe punishments, thus compelling them to rebel. Williams also compared Parliamentarian ministers to ‘belloewes which blow up this fire, that threateneth the destruction of our Land’ and to ‘the red dragon in the Revelation, which gave them all his poysone’. Marshall, Bridge, Goodwin, Burroughs ‘and the rest of the Locusts’ were ‘Secretaries of the red Dragon, that warreth against the Saints’. The intention of the aforementioned preachers was to ‘seduce the People of God, and to lead them headlong into perdition’. Williams’s language approached the tone and content of some Parliamentarian sermons and pamphlets, but now the Royalists were portrayed as the saints and God’s people. However, the target of Williams criticism was rather narrow, and it consisted practically only of the Parliamentarians who had written against him. Indeed, he underlined how these certain seditious preachers seduced people in arms against their sovereign, propagated ‘palpable slanders, and abominable accusations’, and even absolved Parliamentarian prisoners of war from their oaths not to fight the King. Thus, the pamphlet is rather to be read as a personal attack than a wider dehumanisation of the enemy, although there are references that can be interpreted more broadly in this way, such as his description of a faction that has ‘shewed themselves worse Christians, lesse Subjects, and viler Traitors than all the Papists are’. 

Moreover, the appendix of the pamphlet, criticising the Sacred Vow and Covenant taken by the English Parliament in June, was rather generalising, speaking of a ‘virulent mighty faction of most malicious Traytors’ and ‘horrible practice of those rebellious bloodthirsty Souldiers that did their best to murder their owne most gracious Queene’.

Williams later criticised the Solemn League and Covenant, too. The Covenant, which brought a Scottish army to England and tipped the scales heavily against the King, was naturally not received too well among the Royalists. It is, therefore, quite astonishing that their criticism of the Covenant was so mild and the obvious propaganda gains that were to be had were not taken advantage of. For

---

847 Ibid. 21.  
848 Ibid. 37.  
849 Ibid. 42–43.  
850 Ibid. 48–49.  
851 Ibid. 69.  
852 Ibid. 57.  
853 Ibid. 102.  
854 Ibid. 111.
example, a ‘learned examination’ of the Solemn League and Covenant by Williams, published in Oxford sometime in 1644, declared that it was ‘an illegall and detestable Combination, and Association wickedly contrived against the King, his Monarchy, Crown, and Dignity, and against his Royall Power an Jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall and Temporall’. It was surprising that Williams did not condemn most severely the people behind this illegal and detestable association. As it were, the pamphlet concentrated on proving the illegality of the Covenant and censured the detestable ones with a few mild expressions of distaste, such as ‘zealous Covenanteers’, ‘Conspirators’ and ‘Traitors’, who were ‘the Causers of the Effusion of so much Christian Blood, and the destroyers of the Image of God in so many Faithfull and Innocent members of Jesus Christ’. It was, indeed, a learned examination, which was the Royalist way of engaging in the press battle. Even when a foreign army was operating inside England, it was hard to find a Royalist statement that would condemn and dehumanise it as harshly as the Parliamentarians did, who, for example, would delegitimise their enemies based merely the rumour and hearsay of a Catholic Irish invasion.

It did not escape the attention of the Royalists that Parliamentarian preachers had evoked biblical images of godly warfare in defence of the true Protestant religion. Such preaching of holy war was received with extreme criticism by the divines of the established Church of England, which, besides showing the theological differences the parties had regarding the waging of war, displayed the reactive nature of Royalist polemics. As usual, Griffith Williams led the counter-attack. In his *Jura Majestatis*, he painstakingly explained the right of kings in church and state and completely refuted the rebellion against the sovereign. He named many Puritan preachers, such as Burgess, Marshall, Case, Goodwin and Burroughs, and accused them of ‘inciting, provoking, and encouraging simple, ignorant, poore, discontented and seditious Sectaries, to be Rebels and Traytors against their owne most gracious King’. Religion, Williams claimed, was ‘the warrant of their evil doings, the packe-horse to carry, and the cloake to cover all their treacheries’. Goodwin, Burroughs and ‘the rest of our good men, zealous brethren, and powerfull Preachers doe continually cry out in our eares, it is bellum sanctum, a most just and holy warre, a warre for the Gospell and for our Lawes and Liberties, wherein whosoever dies he shall be crowned a Martyr’. This type of heavy condemnation of

---

855 Griffith Williams, *An Examination of such particulars in the Solemne League and Covenant, As concerne the Law: Proving it to be destructive of the Lawes of England both ancient and modern*. Oxford, 1644, 1.
856 Ibid. 14–15.
857 Ibid. 25.
858 Ibid. 28.
859 Ibid. 33.
860 Griffith Williams, *Jura Majestatis, The Right of Kings both in Church and State*. Oxford, 1644, 70.
861 Ibid. 139.
Parliamentarian attempts at holy war was common for the King’s ministers. According to Royalist reasoning, wars were lawful only when commanded by the supreme authority, the King. Somewhat contradictorily, this led to divinely ordained conflict in which the King could ‘draw his sword, and make it drunk in the blood of the ungodly, that have so transcendently abused both the mercies of God, & the goodnesse of the King’. Hence, even though religious war was strongly criticised, Williams acknowledged the religious elements of the King’s legitimate military pursuits, which resembled Parliamentarian claims of fighting for God’s cause.

Furthermore, Williams mirrored Parliamentarian attitudes by describing the rebels and their victories as ‘the rod of Gods fury, to correct the offences of his children’, and as punishment for the Royalists’ sins. Williams’s attitude towards the enemy had hardened, which is reflected in his very harsh language. *Jura Majestatis* was full of dehumanisation of the Parliamentarian party, describing the enemy as ‘uncircumcised Philistines’, ‘ungracious rebels, and the vessels of Gods wrath’, ‘furious fire-brands of sedition, and the malicious incendaries of Rebellion’ as well as ‘treacherous Judasses’. The Puritans’ doctrine was worse than the Jesuits, and the people of London were worse that the Jews. Even Ireland was mentioned when Williams deemed ‘this rebellion of our English, and the invasion of the Scots, ten times more odious, then the insurrection of the Irish’. After all this, it was only to be expected that the author considered it necessary ‘rather to kill our enemies the Rebells, though we should think it to be ill, then suffer them to wrong our King, and to destroy both Church and Kingdome’. The wrath of God was over the Kingdom and it could not be appeased but by an atonement with the rebels’ blood. This is also very close to the Parliamentarian idea that the sins of the English were to be forgiven only through bloodshed. Moreover, Williams was one of the few Royalist ministers who harnessed rebellion against a lawful ruler as a weapon of propaganda and as a means of dehumanising those who had risen up in arms against their King. In March 1644, in another sermon, Williams addressed the sins of murder and the shedding of innocent blood, which were unforgivable actions like rebellion, ‘which is as the sinne of Witchcraft, and spreadeth it selfe like a Gangrene, and infecteth many millions of men; and therefore the resisting of
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authority deserveth more severity and lesse clemency, then any sinne’. Whoever was guilty of these horrible sins would receive terrible punishments: ‘they shall smite them with the edge of the sword, and shall not spare them, nor have pitty, nor have mercy upon them.’

Williams claimed that death was the penalty of rebellion, set by God himself to deter Adam waverung in his obedience. Bloodthirsty men who wickedly shed the blood of innocents were detestable to God and men and, ‘without speedy repentance can receive no better reward then damnation’.

Similar thundering could allegedly be heard from Sherland Adams, a chaplain to the Earl of Newcastle. The source relating this is Parliamentarian, and its author seemed to be very partial and even harbour some personal ill will towards chaplain Adams. Nonetheless, the pamphlet claimed that Adams had preached ‘that al Puritans were swept away with the besom of destruction’. ‘And Puritan and Round-head is all one; & doth not this reach to the Parliament; are not they & their partakers, counted and called round-heads’, the author asked, describing the Royalist delegitimization. Apparently, Adams had criticised Parliamentarians, ‘saying they pillage and plunder, imprison, and other wicked acts, and pretend the Gospel for their cloak’.

Although they would condemn the wicked actions of the Parliamentarians, the Royalist ministers in general avoided preaching about judgement. Another exception, in addition to Griffith Williams in his Jura Majestatis, was Henry Killigrew, a chaplain in the King’s army. He gave a sermon in Oxford in early 1643 in which he discussed judgement and mercy. According to him, both were needed: it was honourable to be mercifull, but when the situation called for it, one had to execute justice – not only to punish wrongdoers but also to make an example so that onlookers would be afraid to transgress the law. However, Killigrew reminded his audience that there was to be no cruelty in punishment and that justice had to be executed righteously. According to him, kings and rulers were sometimes too mercifull for their own good. The sermon, as was often the case with Royalist preaching, was more of a learned discussion than an exhortation to violence. Although it mentioned that justice had to be done, it also stressed that judgement and mercy went hand in hand.

Therefore, even those who forcefully condemned Parliamentarians as rebels and took the role of judge upon themselves reminded their audience of the virtue of mercifulness. The element of repentance
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followed by forgiveness was always present in Royalist propaganda. With the exception of Williams, even the King’s most hard-line ministers portrayed themselves as a peace-loving contrast to their Parliamentarian counterparts. A good example of this is Edward Symmons, chaplain to the life-guard of the Prince of Wales, who preached to the King’s army under Prince Rupert on 19 May 1644. He stated that a rebel was an evil and wicked man. These wicked men had a seditious nature, and they did not easily repent. Their rebellion against God was soon to be a rebellion against the King. The Devil was the first to have risen against the Lord, and according to Symmons, the Parliamentarians were partakers of Satan’s diabolic nature. Symmons evoked descriptions that were familiar from the pamphlets of the opposing side, such as ‘vir Belial’, ‘serpents broode’, ‘generation of vipers’, ‘Devills Child’ and so forth. Dehumanising on a religious basis was, therefore, evident. However, Symmons toned it down by admitting that some of the soldiers of the King were as wicked as those of Parliament, and that the latter side also had some good men who were merely deceived to fight for a false cause. He claimed that the rebellion was God’s punishment for the wicked and ungodly people among the Royalists. Because of this, and also because of his claim that the enemy used ‘the wicked and deboist lives of the Cavaliers’ as an excuse and reason to rebel, he asked for a reformation of manners and abstinence from sin by more strictly following the King’s military orders and punishing transgressors according to the military articles.

The greatest sinners in England were the rebels, and Symmons’s treatment of them was different from the treatment of enemies by Parliamentarian authors. While Puritans advocated severe judgements and preaching of religious war, the Royalist minister presented himself as a merciful and peaceful clergyman. He claimed that a sharp punishment would be inflicted upon rebellious men and mentioned some biblical examples of people, who ‘breath forth nothing but warre and bloud, Kill, Slay, and Destroy, hath been their language a long time, and the way of peace they will not own.’ However, one had to remember mercy. In Symmons own words:

Perhaps now you expect that by way of use, I should stir you up to be cruell: But[...] If I should do so, I should forget my self to be a Minister of the Prince of mercie, and to be a Subject of a most mercifull King[...] And I blesse God for it, I could never yet speake that language of Kill, Slay, and Destroy, which the Ministers of the Rebells side are so skillfull in.
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Thus, a beaten enemy should be shown mercy, and it was important to distinguish between those who plotted and contrived the whole rebellion and those who were just drawn into it by seduction. Civilians had to be protected and treated in a respectful manner, and one should not do anything that was immodest, barbarous or inhuman even to the most impious rebels. Symmons apparently noted the effects of dehumanisation, for he reminded his audience that even the ancient Romans abstained from harsh words such as ‘kill him, hang him, knocke him down, rogue, villain, or the like’, for they ‘acknowledged their enemies to be men, not Tigers’. Hence, Royalists should follow their example and not be like the Parliamentarians who called the King’s men Popish dogs. ‘Be not you like them, but yeeld them still to be your Brethren, though rebellious and degenerate, and approve yourselves towards them to be Christians.’

This, we have to remember, was a sermon to the soldiers and commanders of Prince Rupert’s army. Advising the armies against dehumanising the enemy and against acts of atrocity towards even their most staunch opponents was something that one rarely heard from the Parliamentarian side. It is also important to note how Symmons not only recognized the differences between Royalist and Parliamentarian propaganda but also the effect the latter’s dehumanising language had on the war, its intensity and atrocities.

This insight could also be seen in Symmons’s other texts. His *Scripture Vindicated* heavily criticised the bloodthirsty sermons that the Puritan ministers gave, and he expressly noted how preaching was used to foment war and sedition. The example he used was Stephen Marshall’s *Meroz Cursed*, which had allegedly done much harm to the King and the kingdom. According to Symmons, the sermon was preached ‘when they were plotting how to quarrel with the King, that so they might begin this unhappy Warre’. This seemed not to be a coincidence but a planned rebellion in Symmons view:

It was not many months before they did publickly breath forth, most sulphurously in their Declarations, that Antichristian Language of kill, slay and destroy, against all that opposed them in their Rebellious courses: if these and such like particulars, concerning the time of the publication of this Sermon be remembered, it will be easily apprehended what was M. Marshalls meaning.

Another important issue was Marshall’s audience. Symmons would have understood if the sermon had been printed and propagated to the English soldiers fighting in Ireland. However, it had instead been sent to different locations around England, whose inhabitants and fighting men were not to be shipped over to fight the rebels. Marshall’s alleged purpose had been to liken the Royalists to the Babylonians and to dehumanize them:
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They wrapped them up in beasts skins, that so the dogs might be provoked ignorantly to rend and teare them[...] so doe they now endeavour, by beastly vices and false reports: to obscure the office and graces of Christs Ambasadours, that so the misled, and sedeced vulgar, might be exasperated, and encouraged to murder and destroy them.

The third important point was the effect that the sermon had had. Symmons complained that Parliament had adopted Marshall’s interpretation of the conflict being between God and the Devil. The soldiers likewise believed to have received a ‘warrant for their bloudy and rebellious way’ from the sermon, ‘from whence they have learned to account us, as they call us, Popish dogs, Brats of Babell, friends of Rome, and Lions of Anti-Christ: yea every one that is not for the Parliament[...] they look upon, as on a daughter of Babilon made to be destroyed.’ He claimed that, in many instances, the merciless actions against the Royalist had been incited by Marshall’s sermon and similar ones that propagated the idea of holy war in which God’s enemies were not to be spared.882

In his sermon, Symmons had warned Royalists not to take up the example of the Parliamentarians in bloodthirstiness. He wrote about the same problem in *Scripture Vindicated*:

> The Cavaleers learne much of their cruelty from them; for they heare and read how M. Marshall and the rest doe stirre up those on their side, to esteeme of them, and to deale with them; And they thinke, they have as good authority to account in like sort of them, and to deale accordingly with them: even to reckon of them, as of Babilonians too, and Enemies of Gods Church: specially because they do so vilifie the Religion of Christ, established amongst us: abusing and destroying the places of Gods worship.

Symmons claimed that the King’s soldiers were cruel and behaved inhumanly because of the delegitimising sermons of the godly ministers. Naturally, Symmons stressed that, even though some Royalists might indeed be cruel, it was nothing in comparison to the cruelty of their enemies.883 He went so far as to imply that the Parliamentarians were not Saints but rather belonged to the Dragon’s army because Christians should be mercifull, obedient and mild, not ‘bloudy, cruell, barbarous, cententious, rebellious, hating peace, delighting in killing, slaying, and destroying’.884 Even though the Parliamentarians were enemies of God and thirsted for the ruin of the Gospel, Symmons asked his audience to pray for them that they would see their error and repent.885 Since the Puritans thought that God’s enemies were not to be spared, the different parties could not have disagreed more.
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Another feature of Symmons’s *Militarie Sermon* is worth mentioning. He told his audience that rebellion is called witchcraft because it was easy to be seduced by its charms. This resemblance was based on the Bible, *I Samuel 15:23*, and it featured in other Royalist ministers’ sermons as well, such as those of Griffith Williams. Nathaniel Bernard – not to be confused with a Puritan minister of the same name – preached on this theme in Oxford in June 1644. In his opinion, no amount of sacrifice nor religious intention could excuse rebellion in the eyes of God since it was as witchcraft, a grave sin.

Bernard dwelt on the similarities between the two, even referring to the famous *Malleus Maleficarum*, the Hammer of Witches by Heinrich Kramer. He mentioned instruments of witchcraft, such as the profanation of the Lord’s days, churches and sacred places, the shooting at and destruction of images of Christ, and abusing and distorting holy writ. As a criticism to Parliamentarian iconoclasm, he claimed that these actions had all been committed by the rebels. All these points should have formed a good launching pad for dehumanisation, but as usual, the Royalist author failed to employ them so, that apart from a few mentions of ‘Vipers of our Kingdome’ and ‘Apostataes from God’. Bernard rather concentrated on explaining why rebellion was a sin and how it compared to witchcraft. Even when stating applications for his sermon regarding how to cure these sins, he only mentioned the faithful execution of public justice and the observance of Christ and his ways, for the rebels, who had been charmed by witchcraft, might have had a certain immunity to human means of subduing such as strikes of the sword or shots of the musket. The reason for his leniency was once again his wish that the enemies would repent and confess their mistakes. Bernard explained this in the dedication of his sermon, which concluded by asking God to ‘grant them [the Royalist martyrs] to see, their desire upon their enimies. Which is (I dare say for them) that they may repent, and live’.

Since Royalist ministers and writers, with the exception of Griffith Williams, were hesitant to dehumanise the enemy, one must turn to Parliamentarian sources to find out examples of Royalist delegitimization. These sources, like the criticism of chaplain Adams’s preaching presented above, complained about delegitimising language, which was generally absent from the Royalist publications. Certainly, these sources attempted to portray the King’s soldiers and ministers in a bad light, but they also show that, on the grass roots level, despite what the clergy might have preached,
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dehumanisation by Royalists did occur. One account, which mentioned that the King’s soldiers had killed a godly minister, described the behaviour of the Royalists thus: ‘I tremble to write of their Blasphemies, they tauntingly asked some godly people, Where is now your God (you Roundhead rogues?) you prayed to the Lord to deliver you, and you see how he hath delivered you, yee Rebels, &c.’

893 A piece of news published in October 1643, relating the events that had occurred in Exeter, described dehumanisation by the Royalists, who had called ‘divers poore people’ ‘Roundheaded Citizens, Parliament Rogues, and Parliament Dogs’ before they ‘most inhumanely cut off their eares’.

894 A pamphlet written by one John Hadfred reported ‘God’s just vengeance’ against a Cavalier, Andrew Stonsby. The Royalists, according to the pamphlet, were billeted in a house of a religious man whom they called a rogue, rascal and Roundhead while taking advantage of his goods.

During the night, the party proceeded to drink ungodly amounts of alcohol, and the aforementioned Stonsby raised a toast to the Devil, who happened to appear. Afterwards, Stonsby died ‘raging and blaspheming against God, and cursing the Roundheads’. Hadfred finished his pamphlet with a warning to the rest of the Royalists to mend their manners, for the fear of God’s vengeance falling upon them.

These accounts were obviously narrated for dehumanising purposes. However, the Royalists indeed used mocking names of the Parliamentarians, such as ‘roundhead’ and ‘Parliament dog’, because the godly authors tried to console their side against this reproach. In the dedication of his sermon, pastor John Shaw wrote that the people of God had ‘been scorned and nicknamed a long time, for Waldenses, Hussites, Lollards, Lutherans, Hugenots, Precisians, Puritans, (or all in one) Round-heads’. From the mouth of a Papist, that insult signified a true Protestant, Shaw claimed.

897 Lewis Hughes, a ‘Minister of Gods Word’, published a pamphlet in which he mentioned many cases where God had punished those who called his people Roundheads reproachfully. Incidentally, he described many of these malignants as Cavaliers.

898 In April 1643, The Round-Heads Catechisme was published in London by an unnamed author. It claimed that the ‘backbiters and slanderers’ had given this name to make the Puritans ‘as Odious as they can’ in order to work their destruction.

899 Philip Skippon gave advice
on how a soldier should comfort himself against the nicknames ‘Puritan’ and ‘Roundhead’. The definition of these words was important, and Skippon gave them such meaning that it was no longer shameful to have oneself called by them. ‘If God condemns us not, what matters the censure and reproachful nick-names of others’, Skippon asked. He went on to argue that, if avoiding sin, delighting in good, loving God’s people, praying and meditating, respecting the Sabbath, trusting in God and serving His providence were signs of a Puritan or Roundhead, he was happily one. The part of the book that dealt with this matter consisted of over fifteen pages, which implies that Skippon may have been offended by the derogatory words used by the Royalists and that he wanted to console Parliamentarians who may have felt the same. There was no shame in being a Puritan or Roundhead as long as one behaved godly in God’s cause. Reclaiming derogatory words and using them as honourable ones was one way of coping with insults. Of course, this did not lessen their dehumanising effect. Insulting people and dehumanising them were two different matters – the former was aimed at the enemy and the latter was intended for those fighting the enemy.

Such glimpses of dehumanising language were, however, absent from the sermons and pamphlets of Royalist authors. Williams was an exception to the rule of moderate Royalist writers, whose publications set the tone for the King’s propaganda. Most of them exhorted for peace like Walter Curle, a bishop of Winchester, in May 1644. He lamented that ‘men in Religion [...] they had rather there should be no Religion, then that their owne should not take place’. His sermon was about peace, ‘not only with our friends, and such as loue vs, but also with our enemies, and such as hate vs: not onely with the good, but also with the wicked’. He criticised holy war and religiously justified violence, presenting Caspar Schoppe’s anti-Protestant writings as an example and as a thinly veiled reproach towards Puritans, who were probably ‘such contentious and unquiet spirits [...] that wee can haue no peace with them’. Regardless, he suggested that peace should be sought with them, and one should be peacefully affected towards them. Another Royalist preacher, William Chillingworth, though claiming that resisting one’s superiors meant damnation, was worried about the sins of the Royalist party. He feared that the goodness of the King’s cause would be sunk under the burden of the sins of Royalist soldiers: ‘they are fearlesse towards their Enemies [...] but that they shew their courage even against God.’ According to Chillingworth, the Civil War was God’s judgement for
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the nation’s sins, and the different parties were just instruments of God’s vengeance.905 Whereas the Parliamentarians usually concluded that God’s judgement was all the reason to fight harder to attain mercy, Chillingworth did not employ this method use to exhort soldiers. He lamented the absence of unity, and dehumanising the enemy did not fit that picture. By contrast, he stressed that there had to be a just, fair and merciful war, in which the enemy was not treated as rebels and traitors but as ‘competitors in a doubtfull Title’.906 This sportsmanlike conduct was very far from the holy war rhetoric of the Parliamentarians.

The fortunes of war affected the Royalist preachers’ sermons, and their attitudes seemed to have hardened after the catastrophic loss at Marston Moor. However, they still held on to the core tenets of mercy and resignation. The Parliamentarians were portrayed as the cause of all the calamities in the land and as the enemy of peace in a sermon preached at Oxford in August 1644 by one Paul Gosnold. According to him, if God was the author of peace, then war and discord were from the Devil. Gosnold cursed the warmongers to the pits of Hell and proclaimed that they were devils on earth if there ever were any. They were ‘Sanctimonious Incendiaries’ who had ‘pretended Religion to raise and maintaine a most wicked rebellion’. They were ‘Cannibals who feed upon the flesh and are drunke with the bloud of their own brethren’ as well as ‘Catilines who seeke their private ends in the publicke disturbance, and have set the Kingdome on fire to rost their owne egges’. Still, despite the harsh language, the measures Gosnold suggested were not in line with his tone. After lamenting about ‘the Devill and his instruments’, he concluded that ‘therefore it is no breach of charity to pray against these men’.907 This was again an example of typical Royalist resignation common to the King’s preachers and chaplains. They argued that the calamities of the Civil War could only be cured by passive praying, and they were very hesitant to exhort their audience to take concrete actions. This was largely due to their aversion of Puritan sermons and preachers that they quite rightly saw as encouraging the war. It was not the traditional way of the Church, as Gosnold put it: ‘our religion of old was[…] and still is to be defended[…] not by fighting but by dying, not by cruelty, but by patience, not by wickednesse, but by faith, not by breaking out into rebellion, but by constancie in suffering.’ The Christian religion was for peace, and it was blasphemy to use it to foment war. Gosnold criticised those who, ‘with stupendious boldnesse, have pretended religion for all their barbarous and bloudy actions, and made the doating multitude believe, That all this killing and slaying is for the glory of
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God’. Since criticising the warlike preaching of the Parliamentarian clergy was one of the key weapons in the Royalist propaganda arsenal, it would not have been suitable to answer fire with fire. The King’s ministers were admirably constant in this, even if it was not necessarily the best policy on account of the war and its requirements.

The Royalist answer to Parliamentarian dehumanisation was indeed first and foremost a response. They criticised being attacked and came out in print only in reaction to the Puritan propaganda war. There were two main lines of the Royalist counter-attack: the personal criticism of certain godly ministers and a theological offensive on the foundations and principles of holy war and its legitimacy. In both of these lines, the quantity of dehumanisation was considerably less than it was in Parliamentarian publications. The King’s ministers would not preach in favour of war, and even if they acknowledged that Charles had to defend his prerogative and kingdom against the rebellion, that had to be done in a merciful, Christian manner: rather to submit than to kill the enemy.
12. BLOOD GUILT, JUDGEMENT, AND WASHING AWAY THE NATION’S SINS

The Civil War was a huge calamity to the lives of the English. The battles and consequences of the armies’ upkeep, not to mention the outright atrocities, were events that had to be blamed on someone. It was felt that the culprits had to be judged and punished. This demand for justice was irreparably tangled with the religious concept of sin and God’s punishment for it. Whereas the Royalist clergy often prayed for mercy and forgiveness for the sins of the people, stronger demands to get rid of these sins began to surface among the Parliamentarian party. The Puritans readily confessed their own transgressions and wickedness, but they also professed that the war was not about these – rather, the sins of the enemy were to blame for all the late troubles. The key to deliverance from sin was blood. If innocent blood had been spilt, the only way to wash this sin away was by the blood of the guilty. This was a theological argument for the capital punishment of those who were to blame for the Civil War and all the death and suffering that it had brought. The Puritans did not only suggest the killing of the culprits as one way to appease God. They also underlined it as a necessity. If the innocent blood was not avenged, the Lord’s wrath would stay over England. Under these circumstances, neutrality was as bad as being guilty.

There was also the eschatological viewpoint to the conflict. Puritan preachers often stressed that the Civil War was an event that heralded the second coming of Christ and the battle between God and the Devil. This narrative heightened the apocalyptic expectations of the population and the role of the clergy in guiding England and its chosen people through these difficult times. Puritans’ religious advice included exhortation to war and counsel against false peace, which pressured Parliament to settle the conflict by military means and to punish the malignants with appropriately severe judgements.

All this was applied first to Ireland. An anonymous pamphlet in 1642 stressed the importance of fighting the Lord’s battle. The blood of the innocent Protestants settlers of Ireland was crying for vengeance against the rebels, and the reader was reminded that whoever did the work of Lord negligently and kept his hand from shedding blood was cursed. Stephen Marshall preached in February 1642 of the situation in Ireland and of the appropriate answer to the rebellion. His message was the same. Whoever did not shed blood for the Lord was cursed: ‘his work was to go and embrew his hands in the bloud of men, to spill and power out the bloud of women and children, like water in
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every street. But he is a cursed man that withholds his hand from this, or that shall do it fraudulently.’

It was a violent but necessary process, Marshall exclaimed:

> What souldiers heart would not start at this, not only when he is in hot bloud to cut downe armed enemies in the field, but afterward deliberately to come into a subdued City, and take the little ones upon the speares point, to take them by the heeles and beat out their braines against the walles, what inhumanity and barbarousnesse would this be thought? Yet if this worke be to revenge Gods Church against Babylon, he is a blessed man that takes and dashes the little ones against the stones.\(^{910}\)

Even neutrals were not spared. They were counted among the enemies of God: ‘He that is not with me, is against me.’\(^{911}\) The same was soon heard of the enemies nearer to home.

John Fenwick, a Puritan merchant in Newcastle, wrote about Psalm 102 in April 1643 and about its prophecy concerning the second coming of Christ. The sign of Christ’s return was the increasing activity of the enemy, who were the usual suspects: Prelates, Priests and Jesuits, ‘like Frogs for multitude’, ‘sonnes of the Malignant Church, and Spawne of Antichrist’.\(^{912}\) These ‘antichristian vassals’ were planning to subvert the laws and religion and even bring Spanish women into England ‘to make a new brood of, and to root out the remembrance of the English and of England’. When the enemies were making themselves drunk with the blood of the Saints, it was time for Christ to come and set things right.\(^{913}\) This procedure was to be heavy-handed:

> Now if the great Generall of all the Armies staine his raymen t with the blood of the Antichristian rable, what blood-shed is to be expected? Surely it will be a bloody day. He hath to doe with great, mighty, and many enemies, Antichrist and all the rable in the West; Turke and Tartar, and all those in the East from Jave to Japan, and therefore he appeares in the field in his bloody colo urs, to fight many great and bloody Battailes.\(^{914}\)

Fenwick emphasised the bloodiness of the event: ‘There shall the Lord send a revenging sword to be bathed in their blood and make the barren mountaines fat with their stinking carcasses as dung for the earth: and this great victory say some shall be in Armageddon.’\(^{915}\)
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Fenwick reinforced the eschatological view of the conflict. Equating the Parliamentarian soldiers with the Saints who fought against the Devil himself was a familiar tool for legitimising one’s own cause and dehumanising the enemy, who was portrayed as drinking the blood of the Saints. God’s revenge for this crime would be bloody. The English Civil War took its toll on the population, and there had to be someone guilty of all the people killed. The narrative of bloody malignants included, in the end, the King too, and led Charles to the scaffold in January 1649.

During the campaign season of 1643, Puritan attitudes were hardening, perhaps because there had been a real danger of military defeat and the Parliamentarian war party was ascendant.916 The eschatological perspective on the war was no longer confined only to the radical hard-liners but was preached openly in sermons to Parliament. On 31 May, Francis Cheynell, a Presbyterian army chaplain, gave a fast sermon to the Commons. In the epistle of his sermon, Cheynell attacked Henry Ferne’s pamphlet *Conscience Satisfied*, which had defended the King’s supremacy and criticised armed resistance. Cheynell argued against the plea for peace: ‘And the good Doctor would fain perswade you and all the Commons of England, to sit still the whilst, and lose your Religion for Conscience sake; your Laws, Liberties, Estates, Lives, for Peace sake.’ He mentioned ‘the Army in the North’ and exclaimed that the purpose of his sermon was ‘to overthrow Babylon, and build up Sion’ as well as to warn of ‘the Heresie, Idolatry, Tyranny, of the Antichristian Faction, that Protestants might be more watchfull, and Popery more odious’. Moreover, he advised not to accept any conditions of peace that ‘mingle the Inventions of men with the truth of God’.917 The issue of blood was brought up, too. Cheynell urged his audience to ‘prepare for Martyrdome, we know not how soone we may be called to seale the truth with our dearest bloud’.918 Delivering England from ‘Antichristian Babylon, from the Babylonish army & the Babylonish Church’ would cost blood. The godly should not be passive but should list themselves under God, ‘whose vesture will be dipt in Anti-Christian bloud’. The Christian army should fight out of ‘Scripture motives’, not for political considerations, and it should have no scruples fighting against the Beast even though their enemies would accuse them of rebellion.919

There were also more humane viewpoints in Cheynell’s sermon: in addition to bloodshed, he advocated forced emigration as a solution to the Popish problem. He lamented that some Puritans had
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been banished to America by the ‘sons of Babylon’. He suggested an alternative: ‘let those men of iron entrailes, and brazen bowels, who are Spaniardized and Italianated, I meane Jesuited, goe live in Spaine or Italy, such Monsters are not fit for our Climate’. It was not necessary to be a Catholic in order to be counted among ‘the sons of Babylon’. It was enough that a person was a member of the ‘Popish faction’ and, as such, had received the mark of the Beast. These antichristian Protestants, ‘out of a presumptuous and malicious wickednesse’, had shed the blood of Saints while fighting in the Popish army, and the blood of England and Ireland was upon them. The demand to participate in God’s battle of the end times was echoed by Stephen Marshall in June 1643: ‘You are in part, one of the Angels, who are to poure out the viall of the wrath of God’, he thundered. As for the enemy, they were ‘the master-piece of all the Devils workmanship, the Dragons darling’ as well as ‘blasphemous and wicked, because they are set on fire, with the rage, cruelty, and treachery of Hell’. Charles Herle, a pastor of Winwick, advocated the effective pursuit of war and wondered if ‘any English Protestant can be contented to fill his hands onely with Orders and Declarations, while a Papist in the Land hath a sword in his’. There had to be vengeance and execution for sins. Blood had been spilt and the malignants were to be punished.

If peace was frowned upon, an alliance with the Scots was more favourably received. The war did not go well for Parliament in the summer of 1643, but the Solemn League and Covenant remedied the situation. Fighting God’s battle and executing punishment for the wicked featured strongly in arguments for the Covenant. In the preface of the Covenant, a prominent place was assigned to ‘calling to minde the treacherous and bloody Plots, Conspiracies, Attempts, and Practices of the Enemies of God, against the true Religion, and professors thereof’. This was repeated as a reason for taking up the Covenant in a sermon by Joseph Caryl in October. He added that they had ‘Jericho’s to reduce, and Kingdomes to subdue, under the Scepter and government of Jesus Christ[…] Justice to execute, and the mouthes of Lyons to stop[…] a violent fire to quench, A sharpe-edged
Sword to escape, popish alien-Armies to fight with’. Another sermon preached at the taking of the Covenant, by Thomas Coleman on 29 September, informed the audience of biblical examples of covenant taking. For instance, Asa had removed ‘all abominations, he was impartial, sparing neither sin, place, nor person’. King Joash and his Covenenaters ‘broke down all the monuments of idolatry’ and ‘slew Matthan Priest of Baal with the sword’, while ‘Josiah purged the whole kingdom’. The Covenant set the punishment for malignants: ‘Whosoever would not seeke the Lord God of their fathers should be slaine without sparing, be he whom he would be, small or great, man or woman.’ In addition to describing the suitable punishment, Coleman listed the guilty: atheists, Papists, oppressors, rebels and desperate Cavaliers. He reminded that God had already begun to consume His enemies, as witnessed by the raising of the siege at Gloucester and the victory in Newbury. Peace might not come quickly since it was possible that God was not sated: ‘his Sword hath not eaten flesh enough; neither are his Arrowes drunke with blood yet; with the blood of such earthly men, whom he hath appointed to destruction’. The people of God had entered the Covenant and had to fight the war to its bloody end.

The Covenant was a concrete agreement made not only between the English and the Scots but also between God and His people. Hence, the Puritans saw themselves as irrevocably engaged with God and His plans for England’s judgement and redemption. The Covenant both necessitated a certain behaviour from its participants and validated the claim of fighting God’s battle against the anti-Christ. Thus, the conflict was increasingly seen as a part of the divine plan, which unfolded according to a schedule that was predetermined by God. A fast sermon by William Bridge in November illustrated this. Bridge preached that, when God planned the salvation of his church, He first allowed many potent enemies to rise against it. Then, He raised up the Saints against these enemies. Reformation was to be furthered in this manner. Bridge described the enemy as ‘cruell and bloody enemies’, ‘cruell and beastly enemies’ and ‘unreasonale and cruell as horned beasts’, who were ‘Apostatizing enemies, and therefore if they prevale[...] are like to prove the sorest enemies that ever the English Sun did see’. An inevitable obligation in God’s battle was to shed blood: ‘Cursed is he that doth the worke of the Lord negligently: and withholdeth his hand from shedding of blood.’ Bridge
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stressed that it was not his intention to call for blood, but admitted that the reformation was not completed ‘without some kind of holy violence’. After all, the salvation of the church was only possible through the conflict between the Saints and beastly enemies, which necessitated bloodshed.

Since the conflict was a divinely ordained punishment for England’s sins, the war would not end until God was appeased. Stephen Marshall put it bluntly in his sermon to the Mayor and aldermen of London in April 1644. According to him, even if all the Royalist armies were broken and the King had signed the terms put forth by Parliament, there would not be peace until God’s quarrel with England had come to an end. The best way to pacify God’s wrath was by zeal, as exemplified by Phinehas in the Bible. Phinehas killed a male Israelite and a female Midianite while they were having sex, thus ending the plague that was tormenting the Israelites. Zealous men, then, were not above killing sinners. Marshall condemned those who opposed righteous zeal with a zeal of their own: ‘These are miserable and accursed men, these men are factors for hell, Satans Bouteses, and as the true zealots are set on fire from heaven, so these mens fire is kindled from hell.’ According to Marshall, these men lacked no hellish zeal, and if they would ever get to London, it would be a sad day indeed. Thus, he exhorted godly zeal in his audience, ‘that those delinquents upon whom God would have justice executed, may be proceeded against’. These ‘malignants’ were guilty of idolatry and bloodshed, and they had made a breach between the sovereign and his subjects. However, Marshall claimed that he was a minister of God’s mercy and therefore would not advocate such a work of judgement and severity if he were not sure that God demanded it. For Marshall, it was crucial that the Civil War be waged to its bloody end. Judgement had to be administered, however reluctant the participants were.

Punishing the guilty, or executing justice, was also a theme in a pamphlet by one W. L., published in May 1644. He lamented how miserable the kingdom would become if justice was not executed. Law, religion and safety would be in danger if their enemies were not destroyed. W. L. juxtaposed the Irish and their alleged cruel actions during the rebellion with the Royalists and claimed that, if those malignants were spared, God would not take it kindly: ‘those for the generality against whom we fight, and who are assembled by Troopes in this kingdome, are such as have shed much Protestant blod in Ireland.’ Moreover, ‘divers principall Actors in that grand and bloody rebellion[...] are now
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come over into England; and who are nearest his Majesty, and higher in his account, or principally preferred in places of trust, and Command, in this unnaturall warre, then these Irish Butchers?' He concluded that, if they were spared or pitied, ‘it were just with God to give us over as a prey to their teeth, and to become bondslaves for ever’. This was not purely rhetorical, for the author counselled against an unsound peace. Such peace was dangerous to law and religion, whereas by war, these could still be protected and preserved.

Joseph Boden, a pastor in Kent, presented similar viewpoints in June 1644. Boden repeated the familiar accusation of Rome as antichristian Babylon, and his use of dehumanising descriptions, such as ‘brood of Babylonians’, ‘Antichristian party’ and ‘Babylonian beasts’, was prevalent. However, the most prominent content of the sermon was the call to arms for God. Preaching and writing books was not enough in combating the anti-Christ. One had to use the sword too. The clergy’s duty was to exhort people to fight. The ‘People of God’, he claimed, ‘have a commission not only for a defensive, but an offensive Militia, and posture of Warre [...] I shall make bold to goe one step further, and not only to preach, but press the Saints to put on, keepe on, and use manfully weapons of offence against the brats of Babylon’. Lenity and mercy were to be avoided, for they only made the enemy more hardened in their sin. Moreover, God did not tolerate those who were lenient to his enemies. Thus, there was no other way of ‘ending the quarrell betweene Sion and Babylon [...] but by the sword’. According to Boden, all other means had proved ineffective. Hence, vengeance and justice had to be executed on ‘the Babylonians’, for it was ‘mercy to the righteous to wash their feet in the bloud of the wicked’.

As well as reinforcing the portrayal of the war as a religious conflict, Boden also implied that the King was somehow to blame: ‘Is it utterly impossible that our King should be one of those tenne, of whom we read, Revel.17.12. that have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast?’ W. L. had also expressed doubts against the King:

To the grief of our hearts we see strange effects of that Religion he maintains, the tree being knowne by its fruit, we may say he saves the Papists while he slaies the Protestant, he favours the one, and frownes upon the other; hee trusts the one, troubles the other; protects the one, persecutes the other; he advances Papists,
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and Popish Religion, or at least wise permits it, while he suppresses as much as in that prophane Army lies, every one that have anything in them more then bare Protestant profession.  

For many a Puritan, this was a war between God and the Devil, and thus, there was hardly any room for mercy or peace. Increasingly, the Royalists were seen to be guilty for the war and for the sins that had drawn the wrath of God over England. This wrath had caused all of England’s distempers, and the conflict would go on until God was appeased. Thus, religious viewpoints on national sins weighed heavily in the public discussion on the possibility of peace. Anthony Burges presented this doctrine in his sermon to the House of Commons on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot in November 1644:

Let them be punished by you, lest you be punished for them; Execute you the judgement of the Lord upon them, as ‘tis in your power, and never be quiet, till this and the other Kingdoms be free from it. Make no friendship with angry men, much lesse with bloody men; rather dye by them, then ever be reconciled with them, and know God hath promised to be avenged on that Church of Rome.

‘It is the greatest honour that ever can be put upon you’, he concluded, ‘to be instruments in destroying of her’. Nehemiah Barnet, a minister at Lancaster, also thought it necessary to get rid of the enemies before any peace could be had.

If God should let his hand rest in his bosome still, and seeme to sleepe still: then the Jesuites, and Papists, and Atheist, and all the Devills instruments would make most miserable havock in the Church of God, how would they persecute, and destroy, and teare in pieces the people of God, as so many Beares, and Lyons, and Wolves, and Tigers?

‘Till the Besome of destruction sweeps these Church and State troublers out of the Land, wee must never look for peace’, he argued. Francis Woodcock, a member of the Assembly of Divines, was not as uncompromising, but he too stressed that war was preferable to a bad peace. God’s honour was of paramount importance, and He would not accept any peace that compromised His honour. ‘Therefore should we of this Kingdom be so enamoured of our former quiet, as for the gaining of it to be content to quit our Religion, hopes of Reformation, and the execution of justice upon the capital Delinquents of the Kingdome, God would assuredly never be pleas’d with such a peace’, Woodcock.

informed the House of Commons in his sermon. Religion was more important than peace. Moreover, a false peace might be dangerous. This was also the opinion of John Vicars when he published a warning against peace at the time of the negotiations at Uxbridge in early 1645. He cautioned that the princes and Papists were not to be trusted and gave examples of the massacres of Protestants by the Catholics. Christopher Love, a Presbyterian preacher and a chaplain in the Parliamentary regiment of John Venn, reminded his audience of the Trojan horse and the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre as examples of deceptive peace. He recommended not to put too much trust in princes or treaties. ‘’Tis the sword (not disputes nor treaties) that must end this controversie, wherefore turne your plow shears into swords, and your praining books into spears, to fight the Lords battels, to avenge the blood of Saints which hath been spilt’, Love wrote, adding the words of the prophet Jeremiah: ‘Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently; and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood.’

According to Love, peace was preferable to war, but it had to be a proper one. ‘Truth and power of Religion established, all Church corruptions removed, a well ordered government setled, the Land fully secured, the blood of the innocent avenged, and those who have lent or lost any thing in any considerable way in the Kingdoms service be required and repayed’, Love demanded. Moreover, he stated that peace could not be made with the malignants: ‘men who lye under the guilt of much innocent blood, are not meet persons to be at peace with, till all the guilt of blood be expiated and avenged, either by the Sword of the Law, or law of the Sword, else a peace can neither be safe nor just.’ Love expressed his doubts that this particular treaty was any good because of the quality of the enemies: ‘Not Lovers of Peace, but still carry blood and revenge in their hearts against us[...] whiles they continue thus, we can as soon make fire and water to agree, yea[...] reconcile heaven and hell, as their spirits and ours, either they must grow better or we must grow worse, before we can agree.’
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After Marston Moor the Parliamentarian preachers increasingly brought up the question of responsibility. The punishment of the guilty was necessary, not only from a judicial point of view but also as a sacrifice to appease God’s wrath. For example, Edmund Calamy, a preacher at Aldermanbury, gave a sermon to the Commons on 22 October 1644 in which he established that all the blood of the guilty that God required to be shed was on the hands of the Parliamentarians if they spared the wicked. That was also true for lesser evils: ‘all the Bribery, all the Confenage, and all the Robberies which are committed in the Kingdom, which you can punish and doe not, these are all your sinnes.’ These sins were the cause of God’s wrath over England and required actions from Parliament: ‘the onely reason why God doth not repent of the evil of punishment is, because you doe not repent of the evill of sinnes.’ In January 1645 George Walker, a preacher, declared that God soon intended to take away all the ‘cursed Brambles’, which included not only the Papists, atheists and malignants but some sects such as the Anabaptists as well: ‘The sons of Belial are all of them as Thornes thrust away[…] and they shall bee utterly burnt with fire.’ He reminded his audience that there were some people who had been seduced into joining the evil faction, and these should be treated ‘by the hand of justice tempered with mercy’. All others, however, were to be destroyed terribly, suddenly and totally. ‘As all have a share in the persecution of the Saints, and in opposing true godlinesse, so all shall perish in the same destruction.’ The more awful the enemies were, the more horrendous was God’s punishment upon them. A member of the Assembly of Divines, Samuel Gibson, preached to the Commons in September 1645. The title of the sermon was telling, *The Ruine of the Authors and Fomentors of Civill Warres*, and Gibson was clear about the necessity of justice. According to him, war was the greatest of all evils, and civil wars were worse than foreign ones. ‘Therefore the authors and fomentors of civill warres are of all ill members and instruments the worst, and no punishment is too much for them.’ Later in the same sermon, Gibson tied his biblical examples to the events of the day: ‘Behold the men that took part with the ungodly against the righteous, and fought to shed innocent blood, they were beaten, and perished by the sword: even so let all the enemies of the King and Parliament be as that young man Absalom, and that old Fox Ahithophel, and those infatuated Israelites, that followed them.’ The enemies Gibson mentioned
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were the Papists, ‘Irish murtherers’ and ‘damme-swearers’, who were seeking to extirpate the one true religion.965

Some godly ministers were constant in their views on judgement and blood guilt. An excellent example is Thomas Case, who continuously gave sermons during the Civil War. Already in September 1643, he had preached about the sword of judgement that was at work in England. According to him, more violent means than the rod of correction were necessary to atone for the sins of the people. Chief sins among those that were mentioned were idolatry and bloodshed.966 These two sins were also the most pressing national sins according to an ordinance of Parliament given in February 1645,967 and they were mentioned by Stephen Marshall as well.968 Case was very active in demanding judgement. In April 1644, he preached a thanksgiving sermon for the victory of Sir William Waller’s army against that of Sir Ralph Hopton. Since the deliverance of God’s people and his Church had cost Jesus’s blood in His first incarnation, Case declared: ‘Now it will but cost him the blood of his cursed Enemies’. ‘Those mine enemies that would not have me reign over them, bring them hither and slay them before me’ was the advice Case took and propagated. This slaying of God’s enemies was not to be done negligently: ‘cursed bee hee that witholdeth his sword from bloud; that spares when God saith, strike; that suffers those to escape, whom God hath appointed to utter destruction.’969 The establishment of a court martial by an ordinance of Parliament in August made Case consider judgement and punishment further.970 The result was a sermon, Jehoshaphats Caveat, given to the commissioners of the said court martial on the topic of innocent blood. ‘I hope you will not be lesse active in avenging of it, then the enemies have been in spilling of it’, Case demanded. He advised the judges to be punctual: ‘If you condemme whom God would absolve, or if you obsolve whom God would condemne, you contract the guilt of blood upon your selves and Families.’ In addition to this, there was a hazard of involving England in guilt and blood.971
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Case told the judges when they should show severity or mercy. Imitating God was crucial, and Case spelled out three cases in which it was not possible to be lenient with punishment: the first was a wilful murder or even the purpose to it; the second, where there was enmity against the true religion: ‘Those mine enemies that would not have me raigne over them, bring them hither and slay them before me.’ Case was referring here to ‘Those men that rise up in cursed practices to change Religion, to bring in Idolatry and false worship; to depose Christ from his Throne, and set up Antichrist in his place […] disturb peace, set whole Kingdomes into a combustion […] make their swords drinke with innocent blood’. ‘Such a generation’, Case concluded, ‘Christ hath doomed to execution’. The third type of case that warranted no mercy was when ‘seduced and tempted malignants’ were punished, but the principal ringleaders and actors escaped. These ‘architects of evil’ had to be judged without leniency. Case again repeated that there was to be no pity for those ‘who in this bloody quarrel have laid the foundation of their Rebellion and Massacres in irreconcilable hatred to Religion and the Government of Iesus Christ’.  

He encouraged the judges by the example of Phinehas and declared that doing execution upon the enemies of Christ and the kingdom was the greatest honour there was. Case repeated this message in a sermon to the House of Commons in August 1645: ‘What can you do more answerable by way of return for the Lords sake, then to bring down his enemies, and slay them before his face? Behold, shall God for your sake, not suffer Parliament-Traitors, and Parliament-Revilers, to live, and shall Christs Traitours, and Trinity-blasphemers, escape your just and severest vengeance?’ Moreover, he was critical of the King. ‘Rome is Babylon, and all the Popish and Antichristian multitude, are Babylonians; which now in these three Kingdoms have taken up Arms against Christ, his Government and people’, Case claimed. ‘And what a sad thing is it my Brethren, to see our King in the head of an Army of Babylonians, refusing as it were to be called, the King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and chusing rather to be called, the King of Babylon.’

The pressing sins of idolatry and bloodshed were addressed by many a minister, not only by Case. In August 1644, William Reyner, a member of the Assembly of Divines, demanded judgement for the old sins of the nation: idolatry and the bloody persecution of the Saints. The ‘slaughterers of the Saints’ had to be punished, and even though he was referring to the Protestant blood shed during the earlier century, the guilt had passed on: ‘Now[…] because you cannot reach the old persecutors, doe

972 Ibid. 14–18.
973 Ibid. 28–29.
975 Ibid. 18.
justice upon their successors that have revived all their sinnes.' Anthony Burges, preaching in September, also brought up the sins of idolatry and blood and warned that, unless the guilty were punished, these sins would drown England. Unpunished sins were contagious and were counted among the sins of the people who would not execute the judgement. Burges advised for clemency and caution except in cases where there was an express command of God or evident profit of the Commonwealth: under such circumstances, even capital punishment was to be executed severely.

Spilling the blood of the wicked avenged the shedding of innocent blood. On 30 October 1644, Edmund Staunton, Pastor of Kingston-upon-Thames, preached to the Lords about a divine remedy for England’s troubles. According to Staunton, his sermon had been inspired by the ordinance of Parliament on 24 October according to which no quarter should be given to the Irish or to any papists born in Ireland who were taken prisoner in arms. The sword of the Lord was not quiet yet, although many ‘sword-quieting Remedies’ had been recommended, such as faith, prayer, humiliation and reformation. Staunton wrote that the execution of judgement had a healing virtue. ‘When all is done, Christ alone must dry up our bloody issues, and that living Corner-stone, must be our blood-stone.’ It was, indeed, the blood of the enemy that had these sword-quieting effects: ‘And though others may be hatching devilish designes for the pouring out of blood Innocent; Your Honours will ingage your Selves in due execution of Judgement; and so offer to God a sacrifice of blood nocent’, that is, the blood of the guilty.

Staunton addressed the familiar example of Phinehas, who, by executing judgement, stayed the plague that was punishing the Israelites for their sins. Staunton interpreted this plague not as a pestilence but a plague of slaughters, in which thousands of sinners were killed. Thus, it was rather a blessing than a curse: ‘as for instance, should the Parliament put to death an hundred, or but half an hundred of the Traytors and Rebels against the State in a day, it would in one sense be a sad spectacle, a kind of plague, but in another blessing in our Israel’.
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be in proportion to the crimes committed, ‘sometimes death, sometimes banishment’, and that there should be a ‘mixture of mercy with justice’. Still, he recognized that only two kinds of blood could quench the fire of civil war in England: ‘the blood of Christ and of his desperate enemies’. It was you or them, as Staunton put it, ‘in probabiliteit, either your sword must cut down them, or theirs you’. A divine, bloody remedy was needed to quell the troubles of the nation. John Langley, the minister of West-Tuderly and a member of the Assembly of Divines, agreed with Staunton in his sermon to the Commons on Christmas Day 1644. He suggested that bloodshed was the way to cure England’s miseries. ‘Like good Chirurgions, by letting out the blood of some heinous Offenders, you have assayed the stanching and stopping of that unnatural bloody issue in the Land, which hath brought it very low.’ The sermon was full of dehumanising rhetoric. The enemies of the church were likened to beasts: ‘bodyed like a Leopard, footed like a Bear, mouthed like a Lyon.’ However, the cruelty of these men exceeded that of the beasts. Langley warned that there was a large number of these wicked men, ‘many like Bees, Flyes, Grashoppers, Locusts, Cankerwormes’. These ‘malignants’ were brought forth by the halcyon days of England, and now God had raised a storm to ‘sweep away the vermine’. Langley repeated the message: ‘When your gins and snares catch any of the bloody Birds, dally not with them, blood will have blood, contract not their blood-guiltiness upon your own souls, by an unwarranted clemency and mildnesse.’ A member of the Assembly of Divines, pastor Robert Harris, put it thus: ‘this sinne, this sinne threatens this Land of ours! This blood that lyes upon the Land, the blood that was shed heretofore in the dayes of Queen Mary, that innocent blood that hath been shed since by this unhappy difference that is amongst us.’ He begged God be merciful: ‘do not charge upon us this blood, lay not to our charge this innocent blood, but accept of a Sacrifice.’ Harris also stressed the importance of the execution of justice because it was often the only way to appease God's wrath.

To be sure, there were differences of opinion among the godly preachers on who was guilty and whose blood was required to appease the wrath of God. Not everyone was ready to lay the blame on every soldier of the King. One of the more merciful ministers was John Eachard, a pastor of Darshham.
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in Suffolk. His sermon ‘for all Christian souldiers’ was published in March 1645. Eachard followed the common Puritan doctrine of seeing the Civil War as a religious conflict between God and the Devil. He held that it was time to cast out the anti-Christ. Eachard repeated the familiar claims of Parliamentarian soldiers being Christ’s soldiers, but he did not advocate washing the sins of the nation away with the blood of the guilty. For Eachard, Christ’s blood, or the blood of the Lamb, was more important in the fight against the Devil: ‘By faith in the death of Christ, which makes men conquerers over all enemies.’ Thus, he concluded that ‘all faithfull souldiers, that love not their lives unto the death, shall overcome the Devill by the bloud of the Lambe’.991

In addition to not requiring the blood of the guilty to be spilt, Eachard also spelled out the need to be merciful. God should be praised for His mercy, and this was best done by following His example and being merciful too. Eachard was quite clear on this: ‘if you be cruell, you shall be of your father in Hell.’ It was better to ‘be mercifull as your heavenly Father is mercifull, even to your enemies’. However, not everybody was deserving of that mercy. In the Bible, it was forbidden to spare God’s enemies, and it would greatly anger the Lord if His enemies were not properly punished. Who were these enemies then? Rather unsurprisingly, the answer was the Irish: ‘Rebels, Jesuites, and Papists of Ireland’ had done a lot of wickedness against the English, and for that, they were to be killed. Eachard suggested sending a herald to the enemy before every battle, asking them to deliver ‘those wicked men, which are in your Armie, or Citie, that wee may put them to death for their villanie, and put away evill from England’. If the herald received a negative answer and the enemy refused to deliver the wicked, ‘they shall maintaine murtherers, and you shall overcome them by the bloud of the Lambe; Proclaime free quarter for all true Protestants, which are forced to fight against you’. However, those Protestant who had fought and killed other Protestants were exempt from this mercy: ‘shew mercy unto your brethren, by slaying of those that have and will slay more of your brethren[...] kill them with the sword, that have killed their brethren with the sword.’ An interesting annotation in the margin of the publication indicated that Eachard had respect for the King, counselling to save his majesty’s person if Charles happened to be on the battlefield.992

These moderate voices were, however, drowned under the more severe tones of religious dehumanisation. Christopher Love brought up blood guilt in his sermon against an unsound peace at Uxbridge. He preached that dangerous opinions on the power of the King over his subjects and errors
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in the church had poisoned the Kingdom.993 There were physicians and chirurgeons who could help heal the country: the former were the members of Parliament and the latter were military men who let out the corrupt blood.994 There were certain qualities in these people, however, that hindered the deliverance. One such quality was mercifulness. Love proclaimed that ‘the more gently Malignants are handled, the worse they are, the more hurt they do, crush them, they can do you no harm’. Mercy should not get in the way of justice: ‘To them that have shewed no mercy, let judgement be shewed without mercy; quilt hath been contracted, much innocent blood hath been spilt, which must either be avenged on us, or by us.’995 God would cut down those who endangered the health of the land, and Love asked the Parliamentarian state physicians to resemble God in this account.996 The sermon was a perfect example of seeking the guilty labelling them in religious terms. It portrayed a sick kingdom that had to be healed by letting out the corrupt blood. God would not draw His wrath from England if the physicians and chirurgeons, who were supposed to heal the state, did their work with too much mercy and too little justice. The ‘malignants’ were guilty of the war. They had shed innocent blood, and for that, they had to pay with their own. Avenging blood with blood was a significant element of Puritan doctrine in the First Civil War.997 Love explicitly stated that the enemy was guilty of the war in the eyes of both men and God and that all innocent blood had to be paid by blood.998

The importance of shedding the blood of the guilty was highlighted and stressed even when the end of the First Civil War was looming in 1646. An anonymous pamphlet, The Lawes and Statutes of God, clearly strove to establish not only Parliament’s legal obligation but also its religious duty to ‘make warre against, and shed the bloud of all those wilfull murderers, that are risen up in Arms unjustly against them and Gods people in both these Kingdoms, and in Ireland’.999 The first statute
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was from *Genesis 9:6*: ‘Whosoever sheddeth mans bloud, by man shall his bloud be shed: for in the Image of God made he Man.’ This was a command of God, and if he deemed that magistrates in authority did not execute his justice, they also were responsible for bloodshed. The pamphlet made it very clear that the proper punishment was death. It was also quite explicit in naming who the guilty were:

I doe exhort all Protestant people fearing God, to se arch exactly in the holy Scriptures, whether the Lord hath not of purpose permitted these children of Babylon, the Papists in Ireland, and in these two other Kingdoms, for the ripening of their iniquities, to fall into this[...] sin of wilfull murder; to this end, that they may be cut off from the earth without mercy, for the fulfilling of the word of the Lord.

It is perhaps not too much to say that this was literature of religious genocide directed against the Catholics, which both called upon the magistrate to act so as not to partake in the guilt and exhorted to violence against ‘the wilfull murderers’.1000

The next statute, from *Numbers 35:16*, was crucial because it established that there was no escape from the penalty. ‘The Murderer shall surely be put to death’ was the author’s interpretation of the verse, and that meant that neither riches nor kindred nor any other thing could step in for justice and save the guilty from the deserved punishment:

For whatsoever any man or men may alledge, of riches, or kindred, or any other earthly thing whatsoever it be, as reasons or motives to hinder a wilful murderer of being put to death, this statute law of God, The murderer shall surely be put to death, is always to have preheminence in the hearts & spirits of all men, of what office or condition soever they be.1001

*Numbers 35:33* stated, ‘So yee shall not pollute the Land wherein yee are, for bloud it defileth the Land.; and the Land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it’. The Puritans appealed to this verse when arguing about the familiar themes of blood guilt and advising that innocent blood could only be washed away by blood of the guilty. The godly not only referred to this verse as another way of saying that murderers should be killed if God’s wrath was to be avoided, it also brought into question the land and its pollution by sin. This was a warning that everyone in an agrarian society understood, and it underlined the importance of making sure that justice was served. Blood had to answer for blood.1002

---
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The importance of stressing the religious duty of Parliament to deliver capital punishment to wrongdoers was evident in *The Lawes and Statutes of God*. The quote from *Jeremiah 48:10*, cited above, cursed those who performed the work of the Lord negligently and kept their swords from shedding blood. It was certain that God had decreed that murderers should die. Hence, those who did not obey God’s law and slay the wrongdoers were cursed and prone to suffer the Lord’s wrath. Mercy was far from the Christian virtues that the situation called for, for God had ‘pronounced a curse upon that man that shall be found to be so careless and deceitful in the work of Lord, as to keep back his sword from blood, when God doth command him to kill and destroy’. Violence was the will of God, and those who did not strive to fulfil His will would suffer a horrible fate. Because God had appointed the magistrates to punish wrongdoers, it was a crucial obligation of the authorities to supervise both themselves and their subjects in order to properly fulfil their religious duty.¹⁰⁰³

The same arguments were heard from the pulpit when the war was all but over. ‘They have shed innocent blood, precious blood, the blood of the sons of God, which God will not, nor you may not pardon’, advised Richard Heyrick, a member of the Assembly of Divines, in his sermon to the House of Commons in May 1646. According to him, these evil men had filled all the kingdoms of Britain with blood and killed Saints. They were ‘guilty of all the blood that hath been shed in this Kingdome[…] God will lay all the blood to their charge, he will not loose one drop of the blood of his Saints’.¹⁰⁰⁴ There was no room for neutrals and false friends, ‘let not your eye pity them, let not your hand spare them, execute justice to the enemies of the Common-wealth’, Heyrick exhorted.¹⁰⁰⁵

Puritan ministers were very vocal in their attempt to save England from the Lord’s wrath by punishing the guilty. Their eschatological view of the conflict contributed to the idea that the war was being fought because of the nation’s sins. Whereas Royalist ministers also acknowledged this paradigm, they were mostly concerned with the sins of their own party. The Parliamentarians, however, blamed the enemy and underlined the pursuit of punishment and the execution of judgement as a tool for war. This rhetoric attained its pinnacle in the concept of blood guilt. Demands for the blood of the guilty were vocal even among more merciful ministers of the Puritan faith. Peace and forgiveness, which were the core tenets of the Royalist clergy, were quite absent in the Parliamentarian preachers’ sermons. The enemy was claimed to be responsible for all the troubles in the land, and their killing was a proper sacrifice to God in order to make His wrath depart from over England. This was religious
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dehumanisation on quite an obvious level. The godly preachers advised not to make peace with the Royalists but to kill all culprits among them because the Lord wished them to. Only this would bring an end to the calamities in England.
13. DEHUMANISING PROPAGANDA FOR SOLDIERS

So far, I have focused on the general discussion in the public press concerning enemies, otherness and dehumanisation. The sermons given to Parliament warned its members of the dangers to the Protestant religion and to England itself presented by those loyal to the Pope or the anti-Christ, and often suggested violent solutions to the problem. The pamphlets and declarations propagated awareness of the wicked and cruel Popish plots, and malignancy of those who were in arms against Parliament. This open and vocal presentation of strong views of the enemy and the circulation of rumours of inhumane atrocities influenced public opinion and reinforced the clerical claims that the end times were actually upon England. The Puritan clergy was keen on harnessing these apocalyptic themes, which involved labelling people as either those who followed Christ and or those who were in the armies of the anti-Christ, and presenting them to the politicians and the general public.

However, it is worthwhile to concentrate also on a narrower audience whose importance was inversely proportional to its size, namely, the soldiers who fought in the war and who were the most crucial group in establishing how religious dehumanisation was used as a tool of violence. It was, after all, a different thing to convince the Lords and Commons of the eschatological nature of the conflict than it was to help soldiers overcome their innate resistance of making war with their fellow Englishmen. Although the debates in the public sphere undoubtedly influenced the opinion of those who did not themselves participate in the debates, more accurate information about the instruction and dehumanising propaganda directed at the soldiers is to be attained by concentrating on the sources that were published for the soldiers’ use. The foremost of these pamphlets of religious education were the soldiers’ catechisms.

As mentioned in the first part of my dissertation, Robert Ram’s *Souldiers Catechisme* was published in the spring of 1644, before the battle of Marston Moor. It was a valuable piece of advice for reconciling the roles of a Christian and a soldier and for reinforcing secular military laws and articles with religious arguments. In addition to guiding Parliament’s troops, however, *The Souldiers Catechisme* contained many descriptions of the enemy and its qualities. Hence, it is also an excellent source for determining the religious dehumanisation that was directed precisely at the men in arms. It was understandably crucial to teach the soldiers not only what they were fighting for but also against whom they were fighting. Describing the enemy in religious terms reinforced the eschatological nature of the conflict and the divide between the Saints and the wicked.
It is easy to discern what Ram wanted the soldiers to think about their enemies, ‘those Protestants, which fight on the other side, and joynie with the Enemies of our Religion, Parliament, and Countrey’. Ram claimed that these people were not worthy of the name of Protestants for they maintained the cause of the anti-Christ. Hence, their fate was not too inviting: ‘God will utterly undoe them’, Ram wrote, adding that they were guilty of all the blood that had been shed and that they were on their way to perdition if they did not repent. The reasons of these wicked Protestants for fighting against Parliament were multiple, ranging from innate popery and atheism to personal gain.\textsuperscript{1006} Ram described the quality of these enemies of Parliament. They were, ‘for the most part Papists and Atheists’, ‘generally the most horrible Cursers and Plasphemers in the World’, ‘for the most part, inhumane, barbarous and cruel’, and last but not least, ‘enemies to God, and the power of goodnesse’. Therefore, he concluded that God would not let them prosper but rather scattered them.\textsuperscript{1007} Here we can see the familiar themes that were used throughout the war: the inhumanity and barbarity of the enemy, their religious otherness, and a trait peculiar to the Royalists: their foul language that attained the level of blasphemy.

Previously, I highlighted the Puritan demand of the shedding of the blood of the guilty in order to atone for committed sins. Ram also saw the necessity of this action for the Civil War in which ‘Christians of the same Nation’ stained their hands in one another’s blood. He instructed the soldiers that it was not only their civic duty but also the command of God, who had called upon them ‘to avenge the blood of his Saints that hath been shed in the Land, and those many outrages which have been committed against his servants’. There was no escape from this task, as Ram reminded his audience: there was ‘an inevitable and absolute necessity of fighting laid upon the good people of the Land’. The chaplain recognised the mental problem many soldiers wrestled with, that of reconciling their duty to fight with the shared sentiments of not only humanity but of being of the same nation and religion, maybe even of the same family. Because such feelings of community and familiarity with the enemy were detrimental to the primary function of a soldier, Ram instructed the men that they should not ‘look at our enemies as Country-men or Kinsmen, or fellow-Protestants, but as the enemies of God and out Religion, and sides with Antichrist; and so our eye is not to pitie them, nor our sword to spare them’.\textsuperscript{1008} This was, again, familiar rhetoric from a Puritan clergyman, but this time, it was directed at those who were, for the most part, responsible for combating the foes of Christ and washing away the nation’s sins with the blood of the enemy. Thus, it presented an example of the
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religious instruction that the soldiers in Parliament’s armies received on how they should treat their enemies.

Ram further highlighted the judgemental duty of the soldiers in his sermon to the Parliamentarian army besieging Newark. He stressed that the soldiers were ‘Gods people, against the Churches Enemies’ and that they “should have a two edged Sword in their hands, to execute vengeance and punishments, To binde Kings in Chaines, and Nobles in Fetters’. 1009 The war was against ‘theeves and cut-throats’, ‘the Enemies of our Church and State’, 1010 who were also God’s enemies and fought against the Lord. 1011 Ram condemned the ‘Enemies the Cavaleers, for their blaspheming and outrages’, making it very clear of whom he was speaking. 1012 These people were to be punished for their evil ways, and Ram stressed that this duty specifically belonged to the soldiers: ‘Souldiers are Instruments of Justice, a kinde of Magistrates, the Sword is put into their hands to bring those to justice and condign punishment, which the civill Magistrate could not reach.’ For clarity, he repeated this point: ‘your businesse is to do what the Justice [of Peace] would not, or could not do’. 1013 Thus, punishing the enemies of God and making this task a lawful obligation of the Parliamentarian soldiers were things that Ram very forcefully emphasised both in his catechism and in his sermon.

Lowly soldiers probably had hesitations and opinions of their own that were not dispelled just because some minister told them otherwise. The enemy was not a faceless mass but rather a heterogenous group of different individuals who might even have held some reputation among the general population. Ram was clever enough to address these uncertainties as well in trying to frame the enemy in a definition that embodied as large a group as possible. For example, The Souldiers Catechisme asked if a soldier’s sword should differentiate between Royalists that had been held as honest men and others who had not. They were guilty by association, Ram answered, and hence, indistinguishable from the other enemies: ‘If they joyn themselves with the malignant Party, we cannot know them from Malignants.’ He also supposed that they were never really of a good character because ‘hypocrites commonly when they are unmaskt, prove the most dangerous enemies.’ Even the same professed religion could not make the enemy more sympathetic. Ram thought that the Royalists’ actions had shown that the true religion was not very important to them: ‘They are very simple, that expect any care of the true Religion from the Prelates and their party, who have beene the grand
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persecuters of it. Neither is it to be imagined, that men so loose, lewd, and wicked, as most of your Cavaliers are, should really intend the preservation of Religion, or any thing else that is good.’ The Earl of Newcastle and his army were singled out as an example. Ram wrote that, even though Newcastle professed that he was fighting for religion, his army was mainly popish, and the Earl himself had commented on religion as being ‘but an ayerie thing’. Also, the ‘rage and madnesse’ with which Royalists targeted Parliamentarians, who were most careful and zealous in maintaining the Protestant religion, spoke of indifference or even antipathy towards God and his cause. Therefore, no matter how one looked at it, the enemies were wicked and malignant despite their background or conduct. Ram thought that, if one fought against Parliament, one fought against God, and there was no excuse for that. Even those who tried to stay neutral in the conflict were not treated much better in The Souldiers Catechisme. According to Ram, they were ‘of base and private spirits’, ‘faint-hearted cowards’ or ‘secret enemies to God and his Cause’. Ram admitted that, even though they might not be convinced of the necessity of Parliament’s cause, neutrals were still in danger of being judged by God: ‘In Gods account all such are enemies; they that are not with him are against him.’ Hence, they were under the curse of the Lord – the very same that had been declared against Meroz in the Bible, a reference which Puritan preachers used multiple times to warn against neutrality. Neutrals deserved neither respect nor protection from the Church or Commonwealth.

The dehumanising language of The Souldiers Catechisme did not differ much from the sermons of hard-line Puritans that I have examined, but its intended audience did. Whereas most printed and published sermons were given to Parliament, pamphlets like Ram’s catechism indicate that politicians were not the only group that regularly heard delegitimising speeches. The soldiers too were raised in the conviction that theirs was the cause of God and that their enemies were not only a danger to their secular rights and liberties but also to their precious religion and the kingdom of Christ. Framing the conflict as one that was fought on a spiritual level enlarged the borders of justified warfare drawn by secular laws and articles as well as by military customs. This kind of language facilitated an atmosphere in which the killing of a fellow Englishman was more easily tolerated, even encouraged, and the personal guilt one might have felt was alleviated as a result.

Throughout this part of the thesis, I have suggested that Royalist printed propaganda did not often reach the level of delegitimization that Parliamentarian publishing did. Although the King’s ministers might have reproached the rebellion, which, from their point of view, directly attacked their lawful
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monarch and his prerogatives, they were hesitant to present the war as an eschatological conflict fought between God and the Devil. It was true that rising up in arms against the King was a sin, but that did not mean the sinners were beyond redemption. Royalist ministers rather wanted to present the war as God’s punishment for the sins of England: after a suitably long time spent suffering and repenting, everything would be back to normal. This more passive and conciliatory tone was included in the instructional material that was meant for at the King’s soldiers. Thomas Swadlin, while writing a response to Ram’s catechism, did not echo the Puritan chaplain’s eschatological views of the quality and motives of the King’s enemies. Of course, since Swadlin stated in the dedication that his aim was to reclaim his countrymen back to their obedience to their monarch, it would have been counterproductive to reproach them too strictly.\footnote{Swadlin, \textit{The Soldiers Catechisme}, Composed for The King’s Armie, dedication, A3r–A3v.} The \textit{Soldiers Catechisme} exemplified a typical Royalist attempt to delegitimise the Parliamentarians, and as such, it provides an excellent opportunity to compare the material directed at the soldiers of both sides not only for its instructional value but also for its portrayal of the enemy.

It is telling that Swadlin, in his own words, was harshly censuring those that took up arms against the King. What he actually wrote was far from Ram’s dehumanising rhetoric, however. ‘I know they are Rebels; and I feare (without Gods great mercy and their owne Repentance) they shall be tormented with the Devill and his Angels’, Swadlin warned and added, as a justification for his ‘harsh censure’, that God ‘hath threatened them that doe Rebell with Damnation[...] Nor is there one example in the whole Bible of any one Rebell that ever died in the outward possibility of Salvation’. For him, the King was an absolute monarch who was not to be lawfully resisted either by foreign or domestic forces. Swadlin’s intention was to stress the dire peril of the rebels and then make them renounce the Solemn League and Covenant and their oath of allegiance to Parliament: ‘Repent even for taking this Oath; so farre must you be from performing this oath, or else you will add sinne unto sinne, the sinne of Perjury to the sinne of Rebellion; the sinne of Murther to the sinne of Perjury; and the sinne of Obstinacie to the sinne of Murther.’\footnote{Ibid. 2–6.}

Swadlin admitted that there were certain circumstances under which it was lawful to be a soldier, and he mentioned the war against the anti-Christ to maintain the true religion as one of them. However, he did not go so far as to accuse Parliament of siding with the Devil. He only criticised Westminster for voting down the ancient religion, which had protected the kingdom from the Papists and Puritans. Hence, it was within the King’s rights to try to recover by arms the old way of worshipping. However,
the execution had to be right. Like many other Royalist ministers, Swadlin was also very careful with endorsing violence, and this presented a stark contrast to Parliamentarian preachers. Whereas Ram had told the Parliamentarian soldiers not to think of the Royalists as countrymen but rather as the enemies of God and of religion, who were not to be spared, Swadlin exhorted his audience to be merciful: ‘you shed no more bloud then Necessity enforces you; If the Enemies yeild you must spare them.’ He also challenged his readers to name any civilian or a surrendered soldier who had been put to death by the Royalists, which was either a sign of ignorance or an attempt to make the King’s men look better than they were. Whatever the reason, the tone of Swadlin’s catechism was far from the dehumanising rhetoric that Parliamentarian chaplains presented to their soldiers.

Swadlin’s other catechism, the satirical version of Ram’s, was of course different in nature to the one he wrote to the King’s soldiers. As I have established in the previous part of my thesis, Swadlin put more effort into convincing the Parliamentarians of their error than into instructing the Royalist soldiers, even in The Soldiers Catechisme for the King’s armies. His satirical catechism was meant for the same audience, those fighting against the King, in order to ridicule them, the Puritan ministers’ arguments of resistance, and Ram personally. Hence, it was not a dehumanising attempt, for they are always written for one’s own side. However, it is possible to compare the Royalist and Parliamentarian language that was used of the enemy. Swadlin had a free hand of censuring the King’s enemies and targeting them with written abuse. To what extent he went with his insults is a good indication of what Royalist ministers thought of the Puritan soldiers.

Swadlin established that the Parliamentarians fought for their own lusts. They wanted to take the crown from the King’s head and destroy the laws and liberties of England. Moreover, they were taking arms against the servants of Christ and, thus, advancing Popish religion. He blamed them for their ill will towards England and stressed the role of the Scottish ministers in provoking and giving their consent to the rebellion. Furthermore, he retained the harsh criticism Ram had directed towards those who had wanted to stay neutral in the conflict, adding only a few references to the monarch in his condemnation: ‘In Gods account and the Kings, all such are Enemies: They that are not with him are against him. They deserve neither Respect nor Protection from God or King, from Church or Common-wealth.’

Swadlin also condemned the attacks on the Church of England and on its bishops and clergy and claimed that the Puritans were trying to pull down the kingdom of

---

1018 Ibid. 9–12.
1020 Ibid. 8–9.
Describing the enemies of the King, Swadlin characterised them as ‘the most ungodly Ministers’ and ‘ungodly and Irreligious Souldiers’, adding that most of the commanders were ‘men of engaged & private spirits’ and men generally ‘so full of Cowardise and Irresolution’.

As we have seen, Parliament made more use of the propaganda value of the Irish Rebellion than the King did, but in this case, Swadlin referred to the Irish in comparison to the Parliamentarians: since there was a cessation of arms in Ireland, he took this as a sign of God telling that ‘The Papists are better Subjects then the Puritans’. This, however, was more of an insult than dehumanisation. The Royalist minister was clearly not ready nor willing to use the kind of language some Puritan preachers had used. Thus, even if he criticised Parliamentarian soldiers as ungodly and irreligious, cowards and irresolute, his intent was to offend the enemy and make them see their error, not to make the King’s soldiers think of their opponents as something less than human. This was evident from Swadlin’s refusal to go all the way in condemning the rebels to death and damnation, and it is obvious when he quoted Ram’s most bloodthirsty passage and edited it into something more suitable for the Royalist taste. Swadlin, speaking as a Parliamentarian soldier, wrote:

They [the Royalists] cannot now looke upon us as their Country-men, or Kinsemen, or Fellow-Subjects, but as indeed we are, Their Enemies, The Enemies of God and siders with Anti-Christ, if trampling upon all that is called God be a Badge of Anti-Christ[...] And therefore their Eye is not to pittie us, nor their sword to spare us[...] unlesse they will doe good for evill[...] as they have ever wont, by offering us Peace when we made ready for battell.

Ram’s version had no ‘ifs’ and ‘unlesses’. Judgement was not conditional. In Swadlin’s case, there was the element of mercy, which was present in almost all Royalist publications but absent in most Puritan pamphlets. While the Parliamentarian ministers told their soldiers that the enemy was not to be spared, the King’s preachers were quick to add that, if the enemy repented, they were to be forgiven. Swadlin seemed to think that the punishment, such as there was, was God’s responsibility. In true Royalist manner, Swadlin’s catechism concluded with a prayer, which stated that it belonged to God ‘to punish sinners and to be mercifull to them that truly repent’. He begged the Lord that the enemies of the King would repent, return to their duties of obedience and enjoy pardon from sin and punishment.
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The complete opposite to Swadlin’s conciliatory tone was a sermon given to the Parliamentarian soldiers besieging Basing House on 21 September 1645. The minister responsible for the sermon was William Beech, a Presbyterian chaplain of Parliament’s forces there. His preaching is an excellent example on how to portray the enemy in religiously dehumanising terms and how to intentionally use the Bible to juxtapose its narrative with present day events. The sermon was from *Psalms 83:9*, which deals with the important matter of treating the enemies of Israel: ‘Do unto them as unto the Midianites; as to Sisera, as to Jabin, at the brook of Kison.’ According to Beech, this was an amplification of David’s prayer to petition God to work against the enemy. There were three arguments for the Lord to intervene: God’s own glory, which would be diminished if the enemy prevailed; God’s people, against whom the enemy was fighting; and the enemy itself, its pride, hatred and cruelty as well as its cunning and multitude. These were spelled out explicitly: ‘Their hatred and conspiracie against God’ and ‘Their crueltie against the people of God’. The context of these words was clear, and Beech admitted that they could be taken ‘simply and literally’ as a contemporary exhortation against the enemies of biblical Israel. However, what the minister wanted to do was to portray the words as a prophecy: ‘I say, this is nothing else but a prophetical speech of David, as therefore David well knew, and had said, that burning coales would fall upon the wicked, and that they should be cast into the fire, and into the deepe pits that they rise not againe.’ This was directed against God’s enemies. Some enemies waged open war. Some of them – like the Papists – used secrecy to further their aims, ‘by conspiracies, poysonings, Armado’s, Powder-plots, and (as now) civill wars, and all to bring our Kingdome and Religion to utter devastation and confusion’.  

It was clear to Beech that the Bible referred to the matters at hand. Even though ‘The Edomites, the Moabites, and the Amenites are long since dead, and destroyed, I, but yet their cruelty and oppression doth yet survive, their pride and bloodthirstinesse remaine to this day; the same Tragedy is still acted, the Theater removed into another climat’. He made a direct comparison between the Royalists and the biblical Midianites, who had done great harm to Israel, and he even instructed his audience to use delegitimising language of them:

> Have not our new Midianites, Assirians, (call them what you will that’s heathenish and cruel) taking since to their assistance the French Philistims, Welsh Egiptians, Cornish Hangarims. The degenerate Ismalites of the Renegado English; have not these I say (or most of them) wrested away our lives? Our liberties? Our houses? Our all? And have they not shed our blood like water on every side of Ireland? And England too?

---

Moreover, Beech retained the familiar Parliamentarian custom of equating the Irish rebels with the Royalists, claiming that ‘the enchanted English’ had owned the guilt of the massacre of Protestant settlers in Ireland ‘and made it theirs by cessations and pardons’. He claimed that ‘these vermine’ had spoiled the land, made a multitude of widows and fatherless children, ruined cities, towns and houses and burned and spoiled in general, concluding that ‘these Midianites are very strong and numerous, and inferious to no monsters in their desires after blood’.

To be sure, Beech mentioned repentance a few times as a redeeming quality worthy of mercy. After describing who the enemies were, he explained how they would meet their prophesied destruction without repentance. This was the case with the Royalists in Basing too. ‘I say unlesse they repent, they shall assuredly perish, and come to a fearfull end’, Beech thundered. Of course, in a sermon meant for one’s own troops, the enemies’ repentance mattered little because they were not present to take advice. There was only one instance in which Beech asked his audience to be religious and to show mercy to those that were captured. However, this occasion was quite lost under the volume of dehumanising propaganda.

The Parliamentarian chaplain was more concerned about dispelling the soldiers’ fear of killing their countrymen. ‘They serpents? Surely we see no such venomous quality in them, no such hurt by them; besides, are they not (some of them) of our kindred? Of our Countrey? Nay, of our Religon?’ Beech asked, mocking his hesitant audience. He had an answer ready to these objections: ‘Are not these two Garrisons Members of Rome? Is not Basing a limb of Babylon? And have they not to friend the Monsters of cruelty [the Irish]? May it not be truly said of them, they have Jacobs voice, but Esau’s hands? The words of Saints, but the works of Satan?’ The enemy was compared to an adder that was pitied by a well-meaning countryman and taken inside from the cold. However, when recovered, the adder started to terrorise the house. Mercy was not an option in this case. Even the Israelites had killed their brethren for reasons of common justice. Now, the matter was more important, namely, religion, laws and liberties, and even the very being of the English nation. God had commanded Moses to tell the Israelites to execute vengeance upon the Midianites because of their sin, whoredom
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and idolatry. ‘So then, we have a command to vex those that seek to draw us to whoredome and Idolatry’, Beech interpreted.\textsuperscript{1032} He asked:

Have we a word of promise, nay a certain word of Prophesie, that the enemies of God shall be destroyed? And shall not we that are called by Gods name help forward their ruine? Must Babylon downe, and shall any of us seek to keep her up? Must Basing (a limb of Babylon) be demolished? And will you not now, as well, contribute your axes, and other instruments to raze it down.

The proactive approach that was completely absent from Royalist writings was again emphasized here. The will of God, His command even, was clear, and it was up to His people to strive to make it happen. There was not a trace of Swadlin’s passivity in Beech’s sermon when he demanded action from the soldiers:

Your hatred to the massacres of those horrible Monsters of bloud and rebellion, will animate you: All things call upon you to help forwards the ruine of Gods enemies, and to supresse those inhumanities, murders, burnings, spoylings[...] God cals, man cals, mercie cals, judgement cals, the Church cals, the Commonwealth cals, the wife cals, the child cals; this and future ages and generations, all call upon you, presently to set about the work.\textsuperscript{1033}

These texts directed at the soldiers of both armies demonstrated not only the differences between religious military instruction but also the quality of dehumanisation between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians. Whereas the King’s ministers were conciliatory and preached for mercy and forgiveness even to their soldiers, the godly clergy had no qualms about judging the enemy and advising their armies or the members of Parliament on how to proceed with God’s war and spill the blood of the guilty. The Royalist theological interpretation did not condone violence or preaching for war, and the King’s ministers always reminded their audience of the Christian quality of being mercifull. The enemies, although horrible rebels, were still redeemable, and even though Royalists censured them more or less harshly, they did not consider them to be beyond redemption if they would just lay down their arms and ask the King for forgiveness. There was no room for dehumanisation in Royalist preaching. The Parliamentarians, by contrast, were led to interpret the Civil War as an eschatological conflict between the light and the darkness since claiming to be the Saints fighting the Lord’s battle was crucial for legitimising their struggle. Hence, the enemy had to be on the side of the anti-Christ, and it followed that there were no hindrances to the religious dehumanisation of the Royalists.

\textsuperscript{1032} Ibid. 25.
\textsuperscript{1033} Ibid. 27–29.
14. THE EFFECTS OF DEHUMANISATION: SHREWSBURY, BOLTON, HOPTON CASTLE, NASEBY AND BASING HOUSE

I have examined the rhetoric of delegitimization and pointed out its religious themes – particularly that Catholicism was an important accusation in creating otherness. In this chapter, I present specific cases that offer some concrete insight into dehumanising language and its potential influence on the soldiers’ behaviour. Even though there is no method of calculating exactly the effects of delegitimization, it is possible to present how the enemy was portrayed in certain cases and how that presentation might have been quite far from who the enemies actually were. It is also crucial to pay attention to the use of dehumanising rhetoric when justifying atrocities. This alone shows that there were indeed differently valued groups in the Civil War, and one’s human dignity depended on the group that one belonged to or was portrayed as belonging to. Killing someone in a battle can result from many things, the least of which is not the fact that the victim was probably trying to kill you. However, if the casualties are afterwards presented as a certain group of people or as belonging to a generally despised group, this is done for the purpose of diminishing their dignity and strengthening the narrative according to which their slaying was more justifiable. Since fighting the enemy is a soldier’s duty, he must be prepared for it, for example, by delegitimising the enemy beforehand. The following cases that I present are, however, more complicated than a simple battle between equals. They include the negotiated surrenders of a garrison, the aftermath of a large field battle and the storming of a stronghold. The way these events were illustrated in the reports provides a view on the uses of delegitimization in the context of actual events in the Civil War.

In February 1645 the Royalist garrison of Shrewsbury surrendered to a Parliamentarian army besieging the town. During the Civil War, towns, cities and castles changed hands, some of them multiple times, but what made Shrewsbury special was what happened after the gates were opened to the Parliamentarian troops. Quarter was given to the Royalists, but 13 Irish soldiers were not included in the agreement and were thus hanged. This angered the Royalists, particularly Prince Rupert, who answered in kind and hung the same number of Parliamentarian prisoners in Oswestry. The ensuing debate and its effects on the conduct towards prisoners and on the policy of reprisals has been discussed in detail in earlier scholarship.1034 However, there has been less interest in the identity of those 13 Irish who were left behind to their fate and in the significance of dehumanising propaganda in the context of that atrocity. The guilt of the Irish, in the eyes of the English, was a burden that set

---

them apart from the other denizens of the British Isles. This otherness was exploited by Parliamentarian propaganda in which the Royalists and the Irish were juxtaposed by their real or imaginary actions as well as by the Catholic religion, irrespective of the actual professions of the persons in question. The treatment of the Earl of Newcastle’s ‘Popish’ army in the London press was, in a way, the pinnacle of associating Royalism with Irish Catholicism, but it did not end with the battle of Marston Moor. The very same mechanisms of dehumanisation were used to portray new enemies, and their effects became visible in the atrocities performed by the Puritan soldiers.

Parliament had declared on 24 October 1644 that no quarter should be given to any hostile Irishman or to any Papist born in Ireland. In Shrewsbury, the Parliamentarian army carried out this ordinance. In a published letter written on 22 February 1645, the conditions for the surrender of the town were stipulated: ‘the Castle was delivered upon these conditions, That the English should march to Ludlow, but the Irish to be delivered up, which we shall hang with Authority.’ Colonel Thomas Mitton wrote an account of the event: ‘They surrendred the Castle upon condition to march to Ludlow, leaving their Armes behinde them, and the Irish that were in the Castle to be hanged, which is performed.’ A somewhat different account was also published in which no Irish rebels were mentioned: ‘the Castle was surrendred upon Condition, that the Officers and Souldiers that were in the sayd Castle should March away with their Armes[...] and all the Officers and Souldiers in the Town behind them.’ In this narrative, the Irish made no appearance, although it was added that ‘there were many Papists and some notable Agents that fled out of the Town, and ranne away as soone as they heard that our forces had made entrance’. Later, in May, a report by Lieutenant Colonel Reinking was published, which says more about its author than the events that had happened. The Irish were left out of this account as well, but there were also other omissions and an enlargement of the role of the Lieutenant Colonel himself that led the aforementioned Colonel Mitton to reply to it. In his reply, it appeared that it was Mitton himself who had marked the Irish apart from the other prisoners: ‘I my selfe went to the gate of the Castle, and with my own hands[...] wrote the names and quality of all the souldiers therein, and gave the list of them to Colonell Lloyd. So when they were all gone out, and sent with a guard to the stone-bridge (excepting the Irish, upon whom I put a difference

1035 A True and Full Relation Of the manner of the Taking of the Towne and Castle of Shrewsbury. With the Conditions On which the Castle, and Fort at Frankvill, were surrendered. London, 1645, 6.
1038 A More Exact and Particular Relation of the taking of Shrewsbury, then hath hitherto been published. With the manner and performance thereof by Liutenant Collonel William Reinking… London, 1645, passim.
in the list that I gave Colonell Lloyd)."\textsuperscript{1039} In a list of victories ordered to be published by Parliament as a sign of God’s mercy, the Irish were again mentioned; ‘the Castle was delivered upon quarter, for all but the Irish to march to Ludlow.’\textsuperscript{1040}

Personal issues might have played a role here. It should be noted that Colonel Mitton also later upheld the anti-Irish policy. For example, in February 1646, a collection of several letters ‘concerning Irish Forces to be brought into England’ was published and read in the House of Commons. Those letters were intercepted and sent to Parliament by Colonel Thomas Mitton.\textsuperscript{1041} In addition, in April 1646, he was besieging Ruthin Castle as the Major General of North Wales and was responsible for the articles in which the terms of surrender of the castle were agreed on. The fourth article stipulated that Parliament’s army would allow ‘the rest of the Souldiers and others (the Irish onely excepted), who are barred by the Ordinance of Parliament, to passe to their respective Habitations’.\textsuperscript{1042} In Carnarven, where the Royalist garrison surrendered to Mitton’s forces, the articles decreed that ‘the Irish according to the sense of the Ordinance of Parliament made in that behalf shall be prisoners’. In Mitton’s account of the later actions of his soldiers, he mentioned that ‘there were killed their Commander Captain Cottingham a Papist’ in a surprise attack of the Royalists.\textsuperscript{1043} A further indication of Mitton’s attitude towards the Irish is found in a report that describes the storming of the port town of Conwy by his army in August 1646. This account mentioned that Conwy was an important town and hazardous ‘for its situation convenient for transportation into Ireland’. Therefore, when the town was taken, ‘many perish who were commanded to be tied back to back, Rich to be cast over board and sent by water to their own Cuntry’. In the title page, it was specified that ‘all the Irish were bound back to back and thrown into the Sea’.\textsuperscript{1044} It seems to be the case that Mitton was not too well disposed towards the Irish and was very punctual in following the Parliament’s ordinance.\textsuperscript{1045} This was not uncommon. Even Royalists, it is said, were ready to desert the King’s

\textsuperscript{1039} Colonel Mitton’s Reply to Lieutenant-Colonell Reinkings Relation of The taking of Shrewesburne; Which was printed without License, though said (in the Title thereof) to be published by Authority. 1645, 4.
\textsuperscript{1040} God appearing for the Parliament, In sundry late Victories Bestowed upon their Forces, Which Command and call for great Praise and Thanksgiving both from Parliament and People. London, 1645, 5.
\textsuperscript{1041} Several Letters Of great consequence Intercepted by Colonell Milton, Neer Ruthyn in Wales, Concerning Irish Forces to be brought into England, and other matters of great consequence. London, 1646.
\textsuperscript{1042} A Letter to The Honorable William Lenthall Esq; Speaker to the Honorab le House of Commons. Concerning the Surrender of Ruthin-Castle To Colonel Thomas Mitton, Major General of North-Wales. London, 1646, 7.
\textsuperscript{1043} The taking of Carnarven The Castle, Works, Ammunition Bag and Baggage, By Major-Generall Mitton. London, 1646, 3–4.
\textsuperscript{1044} Conoway Taken by Storme, By Major Generall Mitton, With the assistance of the Arch-Bishop of York. With the Copies of several letters and papers sent up about the same... London, 1646, A1r, A2v–A3r.
\textsuperscript{1045} This was not the case with all the commanders. For example, when the King’s last field army surrendered on 14 March 1646, New Model Army general Fairfax was very generous with his terms considering the captured Royalists. In the first article it, was stated that only those who were formerly excepted from pardon by name were excluded, otherwise the benefits of the agreement concerned all. It was explicitly agreed that being a foreigner or having formerly
cause when they heard that Charles was planning to bring Irish rebels to fight for him in England. This was claimed by John Rushworth, who accompanied Thomas Fairfax as his secretary in the New Model Army. According to Rushworth, the surrendered Royalist soldiers and officers of Sir Ralph Hopton’s army were eager to be sent to Ireland to fight the rebels there. This was purportedly due to a letter, that revealed the intention to bring Irish soldiers to England.1046 Thus, there was probably a lot of resentment towards the Irish even among the King’s men.

This incident in Shrewsbury was in no way exceptional. Captured Irish soldiers had been hung or otherwise killed in earlier cases too.1047 What made Shrewsbury special was the Royalist reaction to the atrocity. Prince Rupert was so enraged that he commanded 13 Parliamentarian prisoners, who had been promised quarter, to be killed in revenge.1048 This horrified the Parliamentarian grandees, and the Earl of Essex sent the Prince a letter to question his actions. The letter and Rupert’s ensuing answer were printed and published by the Royalists in April, both in Oxford and in Bristol. Essex used a major part of his letter to remind the Prince of the wicked actions of the Irish rebels and argued that they were worth less than English Protestants. This was familiar dehumanisation of the Irish. According to the Earl, ‘the Rebels of Ireland[…] did really intend by that odious Rebellion, to wrest that Kingdom, for ever, from the Crown of England, to the utter deshereson of the King, and His Posterity, and to extirpate the English Nation, and Protestant Religion’. The alleged horrors and served Parliament were not reasons enough to withdraw the protection of the articles from such people. Arguably, this leniency was rather due to military considerations than mercy, and Fairfax himself wrote as much in his letter accompanying the articles: ‘The Articles of agreement will speak the mercy, and needs no comment; yet I hope I may make this observation upon them, that thereby not only so great a body of Cavalry is broken, but so many both officers and soldiers disobliged from taking armes against you, and this at such a season when a forraine aid so ready[…] speak at large, the timely freeing of us for other services that remaine, with discouragement put upon the enemies garrisons in these parts, which we hope will cause them the more speedily to come in, wee trust will be good consequences of this work.’ Sir Thomas Fairfax’s Letter from Cornwall, Relating the whole businesse in the West. With The Articles at large, concluded upon by his Excellencies Commissioners and Sir Ralph Hoptons. London, 1646, 2–3. It is to be noted that, after Naseby, Fairfax wrote to William Lenthal that he was informed of some Irish among the prisoners but that he had no time to make inquiry into it. Nonetheless, he hoped that ‘they may be proceeded against above, according to Ordinance of Parliament’. Three Letters, From the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Fairfax, Lieut. Gen. Cromwell and the Committee residing in the Army. Wherein All the Particulars of the Great Victory… London, 1645, 2.

1046 A more Full and Exact Relation (Being the Third Letter To the Honorable William Lenthal Esquire, Speaker of the Honorable House of Commons) Of the several Treaties… London, 1646, 4–6.
1047 For instance, major general Richard Browne reported in January 1645 that five prisoners, who ‘were Irish by their owne confession’, were hanged according to the ordinance of Parliament. The unfortunate soldiers were Prince Rupert’s, but he did not protest. A Letter Sent from Major-generall Brown, to His Excellency The Earle of Essex. Containing, A true Relation of a great Victory obtained against the Kings forces neere Abingdon… London, 1645, 5. See also A Full Relation of The Defeate given, and Victory obtained upon Saturday last, by our Forces at Abbington… London, 1645, 3. An ‘Irish rebel’ was also hanged in Weymouth along with some ‘English malignants’ in March. A Briefe Relation of the Surprise of the Forts of Weymouth, The Siege of Melcombe… London, 1645, 8.
1048 Rupert, according to Parliamentarian accounts, ordered other reprisals also, for instance, in Herefordshire, ‘where he hanged in cold blood eleven English, to revenge of some rascal Irish hanged by Colonel Mitton’. The Moderate Messenger: Impartially, Communicating Martall Affairs to the Kingdome Of England. From Tuesday, Feb. 10. to Tuesday, Feb. 17. 1646, 19.
massacres were repeated in the letter: ‘they shall not suffer any English, or Protestant to live in that
Kingdom, That they prosecuted this horrid designe by murthering, hanging, drowning, burning alive,
and sterving, within few Moneths in one Province, one hundred fifty four thousand of harmlesse
Brittish Protestants, Men, Women, and Children.’ Because of these crimes and of the pursuit of
similar atrocities in England, the Irish were not to be treated equally to the English:

Now that such bloody barbarous Miscreants, so odious both to God and Men, so obnoxious to Law and
Justice [...] coming out of Ireland (where they neither did give nor receive Quarter) to burn and lay waste
this Kingdom, as they have done that, should after all this be admitted to receive Quarter here, and
consequently be made equall in Exchange with the English Nation, and Protestants: The Lords and
Commons of the Parliament of England, cannot with Religion, Honour, or Justice, in any sort consent unto
it. 1049

In practice and in law, this had of course been evident for some time already, and what the godly
soldiers did in Shrewsbury was in accordance with the ordinance of Parliament.

But who were those thirteen men who lost their lives in the aftermath in Shrewsbury? The
Parliamentarians certainly portrayed them as Irish rebels and wicked malignants who did not deserve
mercy. The Royalists saw them otherwise. It is to be noted that Prince Rupert himself ordered the
reprisals and, maybe even more remarkable, justified his actions in print despite having aversion to
public exchanges, as we have seen previously. His answer to Essex was telling, particularly when he
informed the Earl of his knowledge of the identities of those thirteen victims:

Those Souldiers of mine, which were barbarously murthered, in cold blood, after Quarter given to them, at
Shrewsbury, were those who during the time they were in Ireland served His Majesty stoutly, constantly,
and faithfully against the Rebels of that Kingdom, and after the Cessation there, were by His Majesties
Command transported to serve him in this, where they honestly performed the duty of Souldiers.

Therefore, Rupert was forced to ‘let the Authours of that Massacre know, that their own men must
pay the price of such Acts of Inhumanity, and be used as they use their Brethren’. Thus, the Royalist
version of the event was that the persons killed were not at all Irish rebels but actually fought against
the rebels in Ireland before being transported to fight in England in the service of the King. Rupert
answered that the way in which the rebellion in Ireland had started and the atrocities committed there
were not applicable to this argument, and he reminded Essex that the Earl himself did have many
soldiers in his army who had served the King in Ireland. The Prince professed that quarter had been

1049 A Letter from The Earl of Essex to His Highnesse Prince Rupert, concerning the putting to death of Souldiers come out
of Ireland taken Prisoners, With His Highnesse Answer thereunto. Bristol, 1645, 2–3.
given to those soldiers, and since the Royalists had observed this, the Parliamentarians should have done so too.1050

Rupert did not explicitly say the thirteen soldiers were not Irish. He only claimed that they had fought faithfully against the Irish rebels. There is only circumstantial evidence of their nationality, drawn from the formulations in the letter. The soldiers ‘were those who during the time they were in Ireland served His Majesty’, which implicates that they had been sent there and were not Irish in origin. Equally, the word ‘brethren’ used in conjunction with both the thirteen soldiers and those who killed them, leads one to suppose that they were of the same nationality, for probably not even a Royalist would publicly state that the English and the natural Irish were brothers.1051 Probably the strongest argument for the Royalist claims was that the Prince himself did take part in the affair and ordered reprisals. The Irish had been denied quarter before the incident in Shrewsbury. The Parliamentarian armies had hung and killed Irish prisoners of war multiple times even before the publication of the ordinance permitting them to do so lawfully. If these actions had not raised any objections, why would this – unless the killed persons were not in fact Irish but English. Sir George Wharton’s pamphlet, Englands Iliads, also mentioned this event. The pamphlet was naturally highly partial, but Shrewsbury was still one of only two cases in which killed prisoners were used as a weapon of propaganda describing the cruelty of the Parliamentarians. ‘In this Towne the Rebels did most barbarously execute 13. of His Majesties souldiers, which his Highnesse Prince Rupert did soone after justly requisite, (lege talionis) by hanging up a like number of theirs, which he had taken without Quarter given’, Wharton wrote.1052

This was not an isolated exchange. The King himself engaged in public discussion about the possibility of peace with Parliament in early 1646. In one published letter, Charles mentioned his Irish subjects. He maintained that ‘those whom they call Irish (who have so expressed their Loyalty to their Soveraigne,) were indeed (for the most part) such English Protestants, as had been formerly sent into Ireland by the two Houses’.1053 Thus, there seemed to have been some ambiguity over the identities of the Royalist soldiers in general, not only in the case of Shrewsbury. Different nationalities

1050 Ibid. 6–7.
1051 Although it should be added that Rupert wanted to portray himself as one who treated his prisoners equally. In his own words: ‘I have taken Prisoners of those who have taken Arms against His Majesty of all Nations, English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Walloons, of all Religions & Oppinions that are avowed by Christians, and have always allowed them Quarter, and equall Exchange, (how unequall soever the quarrel & contention is, & what judgement soever the Law hath determined upon such Persons).’ Ibid. 8.
became delegitimizing labels that were used very liberally because certain atrocities had to be defended. It is also very likely that these atrocities were portrayed in worse terms by claiming that they were directed at the English instead of the Irish. In both instances, the alleged identity of the victims was an important propaganda weapon, which shows the concrete consequences of dehumanisation.

The second event in Wharton’s *Englands Iliads* in which the identity of a prisoner played a role was the massacre of Bolton. Incidentally, Prince Rupert was involved in this case as well. On 28 May 1644, the Prince was besieging Bolton, which was called the Geneva of Lancashire because of the religious inclination of the townspeople. Their hard-line Puritanism was, according to Wharton, behind the defenders’ unfortunate decision to kill one of their prisoners, which so enraged Rupert that he ordered the storming of the town, and many defenders and civilians lost their lives. ‘They out of a zealous confidence hanged one of the Princes Capt: which they had not long before taken prisoner, whereupon the Prince stormed the town, & in the 2. attempt took it, wherein were kild at least 800 rebels’, the account related.1054 Another Royalist report of the storming of Bolton is found in the *Diary of Prince Rupert*, which was apparently compiled many years later by someone close to the Prince. The following statement was written in the margin of the account of the storming of Bolton: ‘During the time of the Attaque they took a prisoner (an Irishman) and hung him up as an Irish papist. And after defended the Town to the Last with great obstancacy’.1055 A Parliamentarian report of the same event omitted the hanging but vividly narrated the massacre of soldiers and civilians by ‘cruel, blaspheming and cursing Cavaliers’, who competed with each other on how many Roundheads they had killed, and dismembered the corpses afterwards.1056 This is of course delegitimization, but, if at all accurate, it gives an indication of how the Parliamentarians were treated by the Royalists in ways that would undoubtedly have bothered the moderate ministers of the King. Although dehumanisation was far less common in Royalist publications, it probably existed on the grass roots level just like in the armies of their enemies. We have caught glimpses of this in Parliamentarian reports, and this account from Bolton is no exception. The religious tones were noticeable. The Royalists allegedly mocked the enemy by asking ‘where is your Roundheads God now?’ while they were killing the defenders. They also reportedly claimed to be sending ‘Roundheaded Rogues’ to the Devil.1057 From

1057 Ibid. 3–4.
these and similar accounts, it is possible to deduce how the Royalist soldiers delegitimised their Parliamentarian opponents and how this delegitimizaition was strongly connected to Puritanism and the zealous religiosity of the Parliamentarians. All this is quite absent from official – and unofficial, for that matter – Royalist publications, however. The most we have is the Parliamentarian accounts of the events, and they clearly had propaganda reasons to present Royalist actions in the way they did. After all, they were fighting against the anti-Christ and his devilish soldiers, who had to be portrayed accordingly.

As for the identity of that one captured and killed captain, it seems that the unfortunate soldier was hung as an Irish Papist, and he is mentioned as an Irish soldier in earlier scholarship. It seems then possible that he was a born Irishman or an Anglo-Irish, an Englishman who had fought in Ireland against the local rebels or an Englishman who was, for one reason or another, labelled as Irish and killed. We cannot know for sure. What we can know, however, is that the case exemplifies another instance in which a person was killed for reasons related to his (claimed) ethnicity and another case in which Prince Rupert was so enraged that he was rather heavy handed with reprisal. It is all speculative, but nonetheless tentative, to imagine that the prisoners killed in Shrewsbury and in Bolton were slain not because of who they were but because of who they were said to be. Both the Prince’s letter to the Earl of Essex and his strong reactions to the atrocities suggest this, and, if such is the case, the slayings serve as an example of the power of dehumanisation – of which there can hardly be a more explicit demonstration than the killing of soldiers who fought against the ultimate evil of the Civil War, the Irish rebels, on the account that they were claimed to be the enemy that they had fought against. Another, less speculative conclusion that we can draw is that the Irish (or those that were labelled as such) were outside of the protection of the laws of war.

The Bolton massacre was not the only instance in which the actions of the Royalists were described as devilish, inhuman and unchristian. The surrender of Hopton castle and the ensuing mass killing of its defenders by the Royalists show how religion was entangled with quite secular actions as well.

---

1058 Scholars such as Michael Braddick and Mark Stoyle drew their relation of the events from Ernest Broxap, *The Great Civil War in Lancashire (1642–51).* Manchester, 1773. In addition, the Irishness of the victim is mentioned by Carlton, *Going to the Wars,* 257. See also John Barratt, *Cavaliers. The Royalist Army at War 1642–1646.* Sutton Publishing, 2004 (first published 2000), 236.

The author of a news piece claimed that even pagans and infidels abhorred human bloodshed, and when it was done against faith and promise, it was a sin of the most horrible quality. The Welsh Royalists had allegedly granted quarter to the defenders of Hopton castle, but when the Parliamentarians surrendered and came out of the castle, they were attacked with swords and buried alive in a pit. ‘Tis true, that these men had resolutely repulsed their enemies, and slaine about 60. of them in their assaulting of that Castle, which the Lawes of this Land allow, as is well knowne to all that are versed in them, but that the Law of Armes should be violated in cold blood, is an act unbefitting Humanity, much lesse Christian Protestants’, the author lamented. Breaking the codes of conduct was not only morally wrong, it was also inhuman and unchristian. The Parliamentarians blamed a Royalist commander, Sir Miles Woodhouse, of the massacre of Hopton castle. Woodhouse was criticised for killing ‘about thirty of our men in cold bloud’ despite his promise of quarter. In another account, Woodhouse is mentioned as ‘one that came out of Ireland’. Thus, another atrocity was connected to Ireland, but this one was connected to Wales as well since the besiegers were mentioned as being Welsh.

According to the Royalists, dehumanisation played a part in the massacre. Edward Symmons mentioned that the Parliamentarian soldiers who had been slain at Hopton Castle had shouted at the Royalist, ‘O you Rogues, you doggs, will you fight against the Lord, against your redeemer’, which, he concluded, suggested that they had been taught that their cause was also that of God and that their enemy was opposing the Lord. This blasphemy, alongside other taunts, had angered the Royalists so much that they killed the Parliamentarians when the castle was taken. Symmons was sad because the cruelty of the act contradicted ‘His Majesties meeke and gratious Spirit’, although he confessed that the enemies deserved it. They were also to blame for their own fate from a wider perspective. According to Symmons, the original causes of all the barbarous and inhuman events that had overtaken England were the blasphemous and bloody principles which the godly preachers advocated in their sermons. Their principles influenced Royalists too: ‘the examples of others, though deadly Enemies, will prevaile more in matters of evill, then the precepts of any (though of neerest friends) in matters of good.’ Hence, at least from the perspective of a Royalist divine, religious
dehumanisation mattered, and as a true and merciful minister of the Church of England, he was very disappointed by it. 

The battle of Naseby, fought on 14 June 1645, decided the first Civil War. As a result, the Royalist cause was lost, although the war still continued until 1646. One of the most infamous episodes of the war occurred during the battle and its aftermath when the victorious Parliamentarians attacked the Royalist baggage train and the women who had been left there. Some of the civilians were killed, and others were mutilated. The ethnic identity of the women is again an interesting factor, either in facilitating the atrocity or in excusing it. According to the reports, there were both Irish and other women accompanying the Royalist baggage train. A letter from a gentleman in the Parliamentarian army narrated the battle and its cruel aftermath: ‘the Irish women Prince Rupert brought on the field (wives of the bloody Rebels in Ireland (his Majesties dearly beloved subjects) our souldiers would grant no quarter too, about 100 slain of them, and most of the rest of the whores that attended that wicked Army are marked in the face or nose, with a slash or cut.’

John Vicars, in his Parliamentary Chronicle, agreed that the victims were Irish:

Prince Rupert also, or rather Prince Robber, had brought into the field many Irish women, Inhumane Whores, with Skeans or long Irish knives about them, to cut the throats of our wounded men, and of such prisoners as they pleaded, (the wives of the bloody Rebels in Ireland, his Majesties dearly beloved Subjects) to whom our Souldiers would grant no quarter, about a 100 of them were slain on the ground, and most of the rest of the whores, and Camp-sluts, that attended that wicked Army, were marked in their faces or noses with slashes and cuts, and some cut off; just rewards for such wicked strumpets.

Another letter related the incident thus: ‘the Wagons that carried the middle sort of Ammunition Whoores, who were full of money and rich apparell, there being at least 150 of that tribe, the gentiler sort in Coaches.’ Then there were ‘common rabble of common vermin on foot[...] many of these were Irish women, of cruel countenance, some of them were cut by our Souldiers.’ Some sources did not distinguish these women based on their origin but mentioned similar actions against them. ‘We heare the number of whores that were killed, were about thee or four hundred’, one report stated, adding that ‘We heare not of any Irish among them [the prisoners].’

---

1064 An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, For Thursday next to be a day of Thanksgiving within the Lines of Communication. And throughout the whole Kingdome the 27, of this instant June... London, 1645, 4.
1065 Vicars, Magnalia Dei Anglicana, 163–164.
1066 A more exact and perfect Relation Of the great Victory (By Gods providence) obtained by the Parliaments Forces under command of Sir Tho. Fairfax In Naisby Field, on Saturday 14. June 1645. London, 1645, 4–5.
were in their Army, and many taken, which are every one wounded’, narrated another, repeating the assessment that some were killed and those that were left alive were mutilated.\textsuperscript{1068} \textit{The Parliaments Post} published a list of prisoners, that mentions ‘Many Ladies’. It also listed those killed, with an almost apologetic tone: ‘in the pursuite three hundred or 400. Women killed.’\textsuperscript{1069} \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer} noted that women from different social classes had been present: ‘Abundance of women (some conceived to be Ladies and Gentlewomen of quality) taken, and above a hundred slain.’\textsuperscript{1070} Curiously, both newspapers failed to mention the alleged Irishness of the victims. Royalist accounts of the event were few: although one could have thought this kind of atrocity would have been useful for propaganda purposes, neither Prince Rupert nor anyone else rose up to condemn the cruel attack on the defenceless civilians. It may very well have been that, after the battle, the Royalists spirit for fighting and for writing was lost. One account, called \textit{Brief Memorials}, mentioned that ‘In the Pursuit of the Rebels, cruelly killed above 100 Women and Souldiers Wives, and some of them of Quality’.\textsuperscript{1071} The Earl of Clarendon probably drew his information from \textit{Brief Memorials}, for he related that, in Naseby, ‘The Enemy left no manner of Cruelty unexercised that day; and in the pursuit kill’d above one hundred Women, whereof some were the Wives of Officers of Quality’.\textsuperscript{1072} This short report mentioned neither the Irish nor the mutilations, but Clarendon clearly recognized the political significance of his histories, and the role of the Irish in the King’s service may have been something he wanted to downplay.

Basing House, a Royalist stronghold, was stormed in October 1645. Numerous defenders lost their lives in the ensuing massacre, which might have been facilitated by religious dehumanisation. The owner of the house and the commander of its garrison was John Paulet, the Marquess of Winchester, who was Roman Catholic. Thus, it is easy to see how Basing House was labelled as the nest of Papists in Parliamentarian propaganda. Previously, I examined William Beech’s sermon \textit{More Sulphure for Basing}, which was given to the troops surrounding the garrison and which was very dehumanising in nature. It was intended precisely for the soldiers who later participated in the storming. In Beech’s sermon, Basing House was called a limb of Babylon, and its defenders were said to be friends with the Irish rebels. Other sources also questioned the quality of the Royalist garrison: \textit{The Parliament’s
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\textsuperscript{1068} \textit{A More Particular and Exact Relation of The Victory obtained by the Parliaments Forces under the Command of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Wherein Divers things very considerable are mentioned...} London, 1645, 2.
\textsuperscript{1069} \textit{The Parliaments Post: Faithfully Communicating To the Kingdome the Proceedings of the Armies on both sides. From Tuesday; the 10. To Tuesday, the 17. Of June. 1645}. London, 1645, 8.
\textsuperscript{1070} \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer: Sent Abroad To prevent mis-information. From Tuesday the 10. of June, to Tuesday the 17. of June, 1645}. London, 1645, 837.
\end{flushleft}
Post wrote of the besieged that ‘It is believed that they would have surrendered it before this, but that being all Papists, and conscious of the bloudy practises of the Church of Rome, they cannot expect to have such easie quarter, and good conditions, as some other Garrisons on their submission have received, and this doth render them the more obstinate’. The writer added that fleeing would not ‘long preserve them from the justice and the vengeance of the Sword of the Parliament’. \(^{1073}\) Another newspaper, *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, also mentioned the narrow possibility of quarter because of the quality of the defenders:

> It is believed the Roysters therein are well furnished with provisions, but the Lieutenant-Generals intentions being to storme, it is hoped they will imitate their neighbours at Winchester-Castle, and accept of faire termes in due time before it be too late, for that otherwise (many of that Garrison being Papists) they are like to receive little favour from the besiegers. \(^{1074}\)

The account of *The Moderate Intelligencer* confirmed that the Catholicism of the garrison influenced the decisions of the Parliamentarians besieging it:

> The Lieutenant-General sent them a sharp Summons, telling them, They had been evill neighbours, used the Country people hardly: They were a nest of Romanists and so of all others could worst make good their Arms against the Parliament; and therefore they must look for no mercy, if they stood out to the utmost period; but all the severity that in a just way of arms might be made good. \(^{1075}\)

Popery, in addition to inspiring the attackers, seemed to be a factor that made the defenders more stubborn. *The City-Scout* speculated that ‘they within are as resolute to stand it out to the last man’ and guessed that Basing House would last longer than Winchester Castle because ‘these being mostly papists’. \(^{1076}\) The stubborn defence was allegedly due to the Catholic priests who strengthened the resolve of the soldiers, as *The Kingdomes Weekly Post* wrote:

> We are certainly informed, that there are many Priests in Bazing-House, who knowing how ill it would goe with them if that place were taken, doe perswade the Defendants to persevere in their obstinacie, telling

\(^{1073}\) *The Parliaments Post: Faithfully Communicating To the Kingdome the Proceedings of the Armies on both sides. From Tuesday; the 30. to Tuesday, the 7. of October 1645*. London, 1645, 4.

\(^{1074}\) *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer: Sent Abroad To prevent mis-information. From Tuesday the 7. of October, to Tuesday, Octob. 14. 1645*. London, 1645, 969.


\(^{1076}\) *The City-Scout, Communicating The affaires of the Armie, to the City and Kingdome. From Tuesday Octob. 7. to Tuesday the 14. of the same*. London, 1645, 7.
them, that it is meritorious, and that if they dye in the defence of that place, that they shal be numbred in
the Catalogue of Martyrs.\textsuperscript{1077}

That Lieutenant-General in command of the besiegers was Oliver Cromwell, of whom there is a
curious glimpse in the accounts of the siege, describing how religion influenced the high command
of the New Model Army. Minister Hugh Peters gave his report of the completion of the siege to the
Speaker of Parliament, telling that Cromwell,

having spent much time with godly prayer, the night before the storm, and seldom fights without some
Texts of Scripture to support him: And this time he rested upon[...] the 115. Psalm, and the 8. verse. They
that make them are like unto them, so is every one that trusteth in them. Which with some Verses going
before was now accomplished.\textsuperscript{1078}

This was further explained in \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer}:

The word which the religious Major Gen. chose, when he came to sit down before that popish Garrison was
out of the 115. Psalme, concerning the worshippers of Images: Their gods are the works of mens’ hands,
wood and stones, eyes they have and see not, eares and heare not, and hands and handle not; And that word
of God was made good in the enemy, who upon the Storme had not strength to handle their weapons to
defend themselves, but were delivered to the mercy of our soldiers.\textsuperscript{1079}

It seemed that the commander of the Parliamentarian army, and not only ministers and newspapers,
was of the opinion that the garrison was full of idolatrous Papists and it that was godly work to get
rid of them. To some extent, it was certainly true that the garrison was Catholic since the marquess
himself belonged to the Church of Rome and probably had soldiers and civilians of the same faith
there. However, Parliamentarian accounts did not distinguish between the religion of the enemies –
they were all labelled as Papists who deserved what was coming. Cromwell wasted no time in taking
the stronghold that had plagued the Parliamentarians since the beginning of the war. His heavy guns
made a breach in the defences, and on 14 October the house was stormed. \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly
Post} described the battle as follows:

The dispute was long and sharpe, the enemy for ought I can learn desired no quarter, and I beleive that they
had but little offered them: you must remember what they were, they were most of them Papists; therefore

\textsuperscript{1077} \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly Post; Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies to the Kingdome. October 15\textsuperscript{th}.}
London, 1645, 2.
\textsuperscript{1078} Hugh Peters, \textit{The full and last relation, of all things concerning Basing-House: With Divers other Passages; represented to Mr. Speaker, and divers Members in the House.}
London, 1645, 5.
\textsuperscript{1079} \textit{The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer: Sent abroad To prevent mis-information. From Tuesday the 14. of October, to Tuesday, Octob. 21. 1645.}
London, 1645, 976.
our Musquets and our sword; did show but little compassion, and this House being at length subdued, did now satisfie for her treason and rebellion by the blood of the offenders.

Later, the same newspaper had a more specific report of the behaviour of the Parliamentarian soldiers: ‘yet they [the Royalists] fought it out to the last[…] being all resolved to dye[…] This made our men farre more resolute, who not minding their desperat fury, cryed out, Downe with the Papists, Downe with the Papists: by this meanes there were few of them left, who were not put to the sword.’\textsuperscript{1080} The Scottish Dove continued with the same method of delegitimization but with crueller words: ‘That which next offers it selfe to our relation, is the taking of the late habitation of devillish men, the sinke of English abomination, called Basing-House: in which House was more then a good many Priests, and agents of the Devill and Pope.’\textsuperscript{1081} Some publications, such as The Kingdomes Weekly Post and The Scottish Dove, strengthened the narrative that the defenders had it coming and deserved what they got simply because they were Catholics. Minister Peters also wrote his account from this perspective.\textsuperscript{1082} He mentioned that there were Popish books inside the house and, among the Royalist casualties, ‘Major Cuffle a man of great account amongst them, and a notorious Papist, and Robinson the player, who a little before the storme, was knowne to be mocking, and scorning the Parliament, and our Army’.\textsuperscript{1083} To be sure, there were accounts that did not mention religious motivations behind the killing. The Moderate Intelligencer stressed that during the storming religious fervour was not the only thing on the soldiers’ minds, but there were more mundane concerns as well:

Some Souldiers were eager of plunder, otherway there had hardly any in the place scapt with life. The Souldier or other that were in the House, seeing our men come; to save their lives, would bring them to Chambers where there was good plenty of Riches: others minded not booty, but fell upon them, and killed many.

\textsuperscript{1080} The Kingdomes Weekly Post. October 15\textsuperscript{th}, 8.
\textsuperscript{1081} The Scottish Dove. From Fryday the 10. of Octob. Till Fryday the 17. of Octob. 1645, 820.
\textsuperscript{1082} Peters was not always a perfect example of a bloodthirsty Puritan preacher – rather, he apparently was very flexible with his views depending on the situation. For instance, in March 1646, when he was with the New Model Army that was mopping up the last Royalist forces in the West, he wrote an account in which he defended the lenient terms given to surrendering Royalists. Peters stated that the army delighted not in drinking blood, Parliaments aims were reductive rather than destructive, and they looked at it in the spirit of the New Testament and mercy. There were, however, political considerations behind the leniency. The Parliamentarians did not want to upset defeated Royalists by harsh treatment, and Peters confessed as much. See Master Peters Messuage From Sir Thomas Fairfax, Delivered in both Houses of the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled: With the whole state of the West… London, 1646, 5–8. (Irregular pagination.)
\textsuperscript{1083} Peters, The full and last relation, 2.
The report also mentioned four Catholic priests who had been taken prisoners and who were ‘reserved for the gallows’.\textsuperscript{1084} According to John Vicars, only one woman was killed because she ‘fell a railing upon our soldiers at their entrance, calling them Roundheads, and Rebels to the King; whereupon one of our soldiers cut her on the head’. Vicars also mentioned six priests and ‘Robinson the Players sonne’ being slain.\textsuperscript{1085} Cromwell himself was even blunter in his report to Parliament: ‘they Summoned a Parley, which our men would not hear.’ Of the casualties, he stated: ‘We have had little losse; many of the Enemy our men put to the Sword, and some Officers of quality.’\textsuperscript{1086} The commander of the garrison, the Catholic marquess himself, survived, partly because he had previously taken two Parliamentarian officers as prisoners who protected him. \textit{The Moderate Intelligencer} even speculated that ‘its thought all had bin put to the Sword but for these mens sakes of ours’.\textsuperscript{1087} Even if we can admit other reasons for the massacre of the garrison aside from religious dehumanisation, it certainly was important in justifying the event later in the newspapers.

Afterwards an anonymous pamphlet mocked the Royalists for the fall of Basing House. It repeated the theme that the garrison had been a stronghold of Papists:

Poore Cavileer, thy condition is lamentable; though thou have Antichrist, the Pope, the devil & all to thy friends, thou must submit. What is become of that invincible Garrison, that nest of uncleane Birds, that hath continued for divers yeeres hatched, brought forth, and fostered sundry impious deeds: that very seed plot and Nurserie of all mischiefe?\textsuperscript{1088}

One of the purposes of the pamphlet was to make an example of Basing House to the other garrisons of the King yet to be surrendered. The use of the phrase ‘Popish garrisons’, in plural, was a familiar extension of the dehumanising rhetoric in application to yet another enemy when the previous one had been defeated. \textit{Mercurius Veridicus} derided the Royalists too: ‘what said some, is Bazing gone, all our dearest friends (the Papists) taken, or sent to Purgatory so quickly? Could not their Beads, their Crucifixes, their Holy-water, defend them one houre; what became of the Priests and

\textsuperscript{1084} \textit{The Moderate Intelligence}. \textit{From Thursday October 9. to Thursday Octob. 16. 1645}. Highly irregular pagination. The account is found under the 15th of October, Kk4v.
\textsuperscript{1085} Vicars, \textit{Magnalia Dei Anglica}na, 291.
\textsuperscript{1086} Lieut: Generall Cromwells Letter To the Honorable, William Lenthall Esq; Speaker of the House of Commons; of the Storming and Taking Basing-House. London, 1645, 4–5.
\textsuperscript{1087} \textit{The Moderate Intelligence}. \textit{From Thursday October 9. to Thursday Octob. 16. 1645}. Highly irregular pagination. The account is found under the 15th of October, Kk4v.
\textsuperscript{1088} \textit{A Looking-Glasse for The Popish Garrisons: Held forth in the Life and Death of Basing-House. Wherein is described her former vanity, present condition, and a friendly admonition to the other Malignant Dens}. London, 1645, 2.
Jesuites?’. It seemed that the notion of the Popish garrison was widely believed, and the victory over it was relished in the press. Certainly, the storming of Basing House was not celebrated purely on religious grounds. The stronghold had been a thorn in Parliament’s side since the beginning of the war, and it had already withstood two sieges before the last and successful one. Hence, in October 1645, a long and bloody struggle that had cost many Parliamentarian soldiers their lives came to its conclusion. No wonder, then, that the victory was revelled in the London press also for reasons other than religious, although it is hard not to note the familiar terminology used in conjunction with the Royalist enemy.

These examples portrayed the power of dehumanisation. In every case, there was a group that had to pay the ultimate price, their lives. Moreover, those who were killed were often labelled as Irish or Papists by the Parliamentarian propaganda. These examples clearly show how Irishness was constructed as the ultimate form of otherness in the context of the Civil War. The denizens of Ireland were perceived as the direst threat to the English and Protestantism, and they were therefore set outside the customary and legal protection of codes of war. Irishness stigmatized not only the Irish rebels but the English Catholics and the Royalists in general, even those who had fought against the very same rebels. Thus, it is not too hard to see the likelihood that a native English person could be killed as an Irishman or woman – justifying the butchering of individuals by their alleged origin. Furthermore, we can discern that Catholicism was also a reason for delegitimization, as the case of Basing House suggested. According to the narratives of this event, the alleged Papists were only ‘friends of the Irish’, not Irish themselves, and their dehumanisation was all about their religion, not their ethnicity. These events showed, that certain traits, such as Popery or Irishness, were used very liberally by the Parliamentarians in conjunction with military actions in which many lives were lost.

1089 Mercurius Veridicus: Or, True Informations, of Speciall and Remarkable Passages, from both Houses of Parliament: And several Counties of the Kingdome. From Saturday the 11. of Octob. To Saturday the 18. of October. London, 1645, 179.

1090 It is to be noted that, in uncodified and unwritten laws of war that are based on shared customary rules, the type of storming that happened both in Bolton and in Basing House was generally accepted, for if the garrison did not take the quarter offered to it, the attacker had no obligation to offer it again. Thus, the defenders were literally at the mercy of the besiegers if they had declined the terms offered and a breach was forced. Often, a garrison that did not surrender in time was massacred, and this was seen as the responsibility of the defenders who had chosen not to capitulate. Dehumanisation, however, was not conditional to what was lawful or unlawful in the codes of war, and the killing of civilians was frowned upon even during a storming. The soldiers at Basing House had no idea if the garrison would to surrender or not when they listened to Beech’s dehumanising sermon, but they were certainly mentally prepared to make the defenders pay the highest price.
By these case examples, I have tried to illustrate how dehumanising rhetoric was not purely the thundering of ministers in sermons and religious pamphlets. It was likewise used in the context of actual atrocities, either as a facilitator of those atrocities or as an excuse for them. There were certain groups, such as the Irish, who were outside of the protection of laws and codes. This was by no means purely ethnic, as the case of Basing House exemplified, where Catholicism was the chief means of delegitimization. Moreover, I have stressed the importance of the shifting of these despised identities to different enemy groups. The Englishmen that were killed in Shrewsbury might have been Irish, or the atrocity might have been justified afterwards by the claimed Irishness of the victims. The same was true of the unfortunate Royalist women in the aftermath of Naseby. Even if the dehumanisation of the enemy did not facilitate the massacring the enemy in any particular case – and even if there was no need to attain a Puritan level of religious delegitimization in order to kill one’s enemies, as the example of Bolton showed – this rhetoric was used in a very tangible way to justify the atrocities to the general public. Hence, dehumanisation was in no way meaningless in the English Civil War. Rather, it was an important tool in the ministers’ toolbox for preparing the soldiers for the bloody requirements of war.
CONCLUSIONS

I have examined the history of the British conflicts of the 1640s from the Irish Rebellion to the end of the First Civil War in England. Throughout 1641 to 1646, several competing narratives emerged in the public press, that described the war and its participants and rationalized it for contemporaries who were anxious about the calamities that had befallen them. These narratives were founded on religious viewpoints, and they competed for the loyalty as well as the beliefs of the English people.

On the one hand, the Royalist clergy supported the old order and the English Protestant church that had been established during the reigns of Elizabeth Tudor and James Stuart. For these ministers, the war was a horrible calamity, instigated by the rebellious Puritan firebrands. The royal clergymen saw it as a punishment for the nation’s sins and advised passive submission before God’s wrath. Those who died for the King and his prerogative would receive the laurels of a martyr in the afterlife, but the ministers offered no comparable religious instigation to drive them forward in this life. According to the Royalist clergy, Christ had not been a man of violence and neither should his followers be. Thus, there was no concerted attempt to religiously instruct the Royalist soldiers in their profession and in an efficient pursuit of the war – the ministers rather put their efforts into admonishing them of their moral infractions such as swearing. This reluctance to preach in favour of the war extended to the language used of the enemy: it was rarely dehumanising, and despite the terrible sin of rebellion against the lawful sovereign, the Royalist clergymen always reminded their audiences that the King was merciful and would deal leniently with those surrendered. Certainly, the Royalist ministers were not pacifists: they acknowledged the King’s privilege of military leadership and his need to defend his just prerogatives. This martial work was necessary, but it was not to be done by men of faith but by those with more mundane occupations.

On the other hand, the Parliamentarian preachers’ hard-line approach to Protestantism allowed them to present vastly different views on the subject of religious war, since for them, it was precisely that. Not only were they defending the true Protestant religion against the Papists and popishly affected malignants, they were also instigating a war against the anti-Christ to help the Lord bring about His kingdom come. In this battle of the end times, religion was a crucial armament for Christian soldiers. Hence, the godly preachers needed to instruct and prepare the Parliamentarian armies for war. There was a tangible pursuit to create an army of saints, which would actively and zealously engage itself in mundane as well as spiritual tasks: winning the war for Parliament and for God. This double aim made the clergy uncompromising, for even when a diplomatic solution was sought by Parliament, the hard-line ministers accepted no terms that they labelled as false and unsound conditions for peace.
There was to be war until God was sated, and His appeasement would be attained only by spilling the blood of the guilty. Therefore, the Puritan ministers spared no effort in dehumanising the Royalists in religious terms. What had once been said about the Irish rebels was later used to describe English soldiers fighting for the King to tarnish them with the stain of Popery. The anti-Catholic sentiments of the English were successfully used against the Royalists both as a weapon of propaganda and a dehumanising tool for war.

Throughout my thesis, I have sought to present a novel interpretation of the significance of religion in the English Civil War by examining the different approaches the King and Parliament had towards religious warfare and how comprehensive the narratives and guidelines derived from these approaches were. Earlier scholars, above all Michael Walzer, have recognized the powerful influence of Puritan theology in changing the political and religious discontent into an armed revolution and how this revolution was framed with biblical rhetoric. Following this line of interpretation, I have examined not only the justificatory and apocalyptic narratives of the war but also the concrete efforts that the ministers devoted to reforming and advising the soldiers in both spiritual and military ways. It was certainly not only the New Model Army that benefited from the spiritual instruction and edification of zealous soldiers and officers. Both Presbyterians and Independents came together in creating a narrative of God’s battle against the anti-Christ, which they tirelessly propagated to the Parliamentarian armies from the beginning of the conflict. Thus, in the pursuit of a religious, uncompromising war and in the preparation of its participants, there was no distinction between the New Model Army and the other Parliamentarian armies. The separation lay rather between the King’s armies and all the Parliamentarian armies: the crucial difference already defined the First Civil War before Fairfax’s army came into existence.

Despite the various interpretations of the Bible, it would be an oversimplification to claim that it all came down to theological differences. Although I have used such convenient labels as ‘Puritan’ and ‘Royalist’ to generalize various individuals with even more various convictions and arguments – and there certainly are positions that are generalizable as I have sought to demonstrate – the distinctions might very well be attributed to other things than pure faith: for example, political considerations, personal reasons and the use of rhetorical skills. Rather than deciphering the ministers’ motives, I have concentrated on the language and narratives with which they pursued their aims and created a layer of the public sphere containing competing religious ideas and viewpoints on the conflict at hand.

These religious concepts shaped how the war was seen and pursued, and they overlapped with the political debate on the future of England, its Parliament, and its King.

Therefore, I have aimed to move past the point of arguing whether the English Civil War was a war of religion or not. Scholars have thoroughly discussed this matter, and although I have suggested that, in certain instances, the implications of religious propaganda may have played a part, I cannot claim to possess a definitive answer to the question. Instead, I have sought to present how the war and preparation for it was very often described in distinctive religious terminology depending on which minister one listened to. Religion had various roles in the war, not limited to choosing an allegiance or motivating the soldiers.

The questions of who the enemy was and what was to be done with them were answered by the clergy, and these answers were given in the language of opposing religious views. While both sides were deeply anti-Catholic and abhorred the atrocities of the Irish Rebellion, the propaganda value of these sentiments was seized by Parliament to be used in the Civil War against their English opponents. For the Puritans, religious war was not only allowed but recommended, especially against Papists and other enemies perceived as antichristian. Thus, the Irish and the English Royalists were juxtaposed and very often described in the same dehumanising terms. In the sermons of the militant ministers, the war was presented as being not only between the King and Parliament but also between Christ and the Devil. In this conflict, there were to be no compromises. The malignants and servants of the anti-Christ were to be scattered and destroyed mercilessly. They were guilty of idolatry and bloodshed, the sins that had drawn God’s wrath over England. The Parliamentarian radical preachers emphasised the religious duty of judgement and the punishment of the guilty and exhorted politicians and soldiers to act accordingly. It was a grievous sin not to punish wrongdoers. This religious dehumanizing rhetoric can be linked to the atrocities that took place during the Civil War, and while these delegitimising words were certainly not the sole cause of the massacres, even some contemporaries criticised the harsh language that the ministers used to describe their enemies and blamed it for the escalation of hostilities.

The Royalists, for their part, always tempered their declarations of punishment with mercy. The language of the King’s ministers, with few exceptions, was that of forgiveness and rapprochement. Even the obvious potential of equating the rebellion in Ireland to that in England was rarely used. The Royalist clergy reproached the Parliamentarian soldiers for their actions against their lawful sovereign, but they were also ready to reclaim them from their misguided ways back to loyalty to the King. In many instances, they recognised the role of Puritan ministers in instigating and encouraging the enemy soldiers, and they criticised this activity as un-Christian. Contemporaries therefore
acknowledged the distinct ways in which the Parliamentarian and Royalist clergy approached the conflict and acted in support of their cause. Unfortunately for the latter party, preaching for moderation and against warmongering did not serve the requirements of the war as well as more concrete and hands-on advice to the armies would have. Similarly, the moral reformation of the soldiers’ offensive language, which the King and his ministers saw as important, was not successful by their own admission and as attested by their enemies’ testimonies that mentioned swearing Cavaliers.

In the years following the Restoration, these religious factors were still remembered, often with horror. The dedication to the 1684 edition of Ram’s *Souldiers Catechisme* by one John Turner described the calamities of the Civil War as follows:

>Blessed Times indeed! when Men were taught Rebellion as a Principle of Religion, and were Arm’d with those very places of Scripture which forbid Resistance, which it is one great business of this Catechism to do, to Fight against Gods Anoynted, and their lawful King.\(^{1092}\)

Turner had written a long preface for the readers in order to prepare them for the words and ideas that he found unsuitable for the civilised, loyal subjects of the 1680s. While condemning the rebellion so plainly that it was obvious to the reader that rising against one’s sovereign was not a recommended activity by any means, Turner also stressed the significance of *The Souldiers Catechisme* and the role it had played in the Civil War and its aftermath: ‘it was without Question, none [sic] of the meanest Instruments in bringing His Royal Father [Charles I] to the Block.’\(^{1093}\) Even if Turner did not know the author of the catechism, having found the early anonymously published edition from 1644, he put a lot of responsibility on it for the calamities of the 1640s.

I have argued, that while Ram’s catechism was certainly one of the most important religious-martial publications of the age, it was by no means the only one. Many prominent Parliamentarian ministers from both Independent and Presbyterian backgrounds were also chaplains in the armies and were given the opportunity to declare their radical views in the public press. Revolutionary political ideas concerning the relationship between the sovereign and Parliament, not to mention ideas that seemed to turn the social order completely upside down as, for example, presented by John Lilburne and other Levellers, were reflected in the uncompromising sermons and pamphlets of the Puritan army chaplains. Instead of social questions, the clergymen highlighted the concept of religious war on both a physical and spiritual level: God’s struggle against the anti-Christ in which they had to play their

---

\(^ {1092}\) Robert Ram, *The Souldiers Catechism, Composed for the Parliaments Army... And now republisht to satisfie tender Consciences in the Grounds upon which the late thorough Reformation Proceeded*. London, 1684, Av.

\(^ {1093}\) Ibid. B2v.
part as tools of divine judgement. This radical idea of ordinary soldiers acting as saints was contrasted sharply with the traditional Christian concept of the clergyman as a preacher for peace and tranquillity, while the monarch was the one who held the sword and decided when and where to go to war. The Royalist position on the matter was naturally closer to this traditional approach, and the King’s clergymen underlined both Charles’s supreme power and his executive martial rights. The case against these ancient privileges of the monarch was made by the godly ministers with an indisputable religious argument: even if the King was the highest power in the realm, God was still above him. Thus, from the cause and lawfulness of war to the instruction of the soldiers and dehumanisation of the enemy, religion was one of the most important tools for creating a coherent framework within which the Parliamentarian armies operated.

This framework was constructed during the early stages of the war. I have suggested that the exceptionality of religious radicalism in the New Model Army should be re-examined. Hymn-singing, fervently praying saints were not the exclusive property of Fairfax’s army, quite the contrary. The whole Parliamentarian military effort was permeated with religious justifications and duties, presented and propagated by the Puritan preachers. And the Independents were not the only ones leaning towards radical interpretations of the Scriptures. In fact, Presbyterian clergymen, such as Ram, Thomas Case, Stephen Marshall, Christopher Love and William Beech, were well-versed enough in the actual business of warfare to give meaningful instruction to the soldiers, and they were radical enough to demand an uncompromising attitude towards the enemies of God and the merciless execution of justice to save England from the Lord’s wrath. Therefore, in the First English Civil War, the Presbyterian ministers were instrumental in framing the conflict in predominantly religious terms and in creating the godly spirit that was later acquired and retained by the New Model Army. The epitome of this militant zeal, Oliver Cromwell, while undeniably an exceptional character, was an obscure officer during the early Civil War, whose Puritan piety and strong will influenced only his regiment. By contrast, the sermons and pamphlets of the ministers reached a far larger audience right from the beginning of the conflict.

How this framework was carried over to the Second Civil War and the later New Model Army campaigns in Scotland and Ireland is another interesting question. Did the conflict continue because the guilty had not been sufficiently punished? What was the religious justification for attacking the Scots, who had been godly allies with Parliamentarians in facing the ‘devilish Cavaliers’ at Marston Moor and in other battles? Was the dehumanising rhetoric harsher towards the Irish when the rebellion finally got Parliament’s undivided attention? Addressing these later developments and the role of religion in them in comparison to the First Civil War would be useful for depicting lengthier
processes during the era. In addition, analyses of the preceding conflicts could be incorporated to complete the picture: the Presbyterian clergymen’s influence on the religious character of the Parliamentarian armies raises the question of whether a similar development took place across the northern border in the army of Scots in the Civil War and in the Bishops’ Wars. Especially since the latter crisis emerged from protests against Charles’s attempt to impose uniform church practices on England and Scotland, a strong religious element was present in the Scots’ military articles. Perhaps the Scottish Presbyterian ministers presented an example that their religious brothers in England seized for their own use. This is not to say that there was not enough inspiration: multiple books and treatises about Christian faith and war had been published in England in the first part of the 17th century. Hence, the most interesting question in the context of the Civil War was why the Parliamentarians embraced this militant theology in the public press while the Royalists, for the most part, did not. A thorough answer to this question is outside the scope of this study, but it should acknowledge the fact that quite a few Puritan preachers who published their sermons, catechisms or pamphlets, were or had been military chaplains. By contrast, with the exception of clergymen such as William Chillingworth, Thomas Barton and Edward Symmons, only few Royalist ministers who managed to publish their sermons and pamphlets had served in the King’s armies. Hence, the actual knowledge and expertise of warfare resided less among the royal clergymen than among the Puritans. Moreover, it seems that the King himself used his personal influence to shape the content of military articles. It would not be far-fetched to suggest that royal approval was behind many of the sermons preached and printed in Oxford, and, similarly, royal disapproval prevented the presentation of certain opinions in public.

Thus, I am in agreement with scholars such as Jason Peacey and David Como in their acknowledgement of the significance of the public press, the most crucial method of propagating different opinions and viewpoints during the era. While earlier scholarship has established the role of religion in the political debates of the 1640s and how even radical interpretations were allowed access

1094 See Articles of Militarie Discipline. Edinburgh, 1639 and Articles and Ordinances of Warre; For the present expedition of the Armie of the Kingdome of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1640. Both of these sources detailed the kirk discipline of the Scottish army as well as its camp discipline. The latter was published in England in August 1642, and its title page contained the famous verse of Luke 3:14 (although mistakenly attributed to the Gospel of John), often quoted in this present work. See Camp Discipline, Or, The Souldiers Duty. In certain Articles and Ordinances of Warre, commanded to be observed in the Armie of Scotland. London, 1642, title page A1r.

1095 To mention only a few, see Alexander Leighton, Speculum Belli sacri, Or the Lookingglasse of the Holy War, Wherein is discovered: The Evill of War. The Good of Warr. The Guide of War. 1624; Richard Bernard, The Bible-Battells. Or The Sacred Art Military. For the rightly wageing of warre according to Holy Writ. London, 1629; The Swedish Discipline, Religious, Civile, And Military. London, 1632.
to the public sphere, no comparative effort has been made in the context of warfare, targeting the soldiers as the primary audience. Addressing this has been my contribution to the present discussion.

The image of a psalm-singing, pious New Model Army soldier has been one of the most enduring legacies of the English Civil War. This study has re-examined this portrayal and set it in its context. Religious ideals certainly influenced warfare, but their scope was much wider than a simplistic presentation of godly warrior saints suggests. Competing opinions on and concepts of religion as an instrument of war existed and affected the instruction of armies as well as how the enemy was portrayed and perceived. Some of these opinions and concepts were better suited to the requirements of war than others. In the end, the military victory was achieved by Parliament, the side that placed more emphasis on the religious-martial advice of its soldiers. Stating that religion was the sole reason for the outcome of the conflict would be far-fetched. It is, however, appropriate to end with a quote that reminded the English of the importance of the religious instruction of an army already in 1632: ‘It is not without a mystery, I suppose, that the old Israelites had an Armory in their Temple: they would shew us, That these two cannot well be parted.’

---

1096 The Swedish Discipline, 1.
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Military Orders And Articles Established by His Majesty, For the better Ordering and Government of His Majesties Army. Also Two Proclamations, one against Plundring and Robbing. The other against Selling or Buying of Armes and Horse. Oxford, 1643.
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The Newest and Truest, And most unpartiall Relation of all the late Occurrence which hath happened at Sherbourne-Castle, and thereabouts. London, 1642.
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An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, Wherein The County of Lincolne is added in the association of the six Counties of Norfolke, Suffolke, Essex, Cambridge, Hartford, Huntington, for the mutuall defence each of other against the Popish Army in the North under the command of the Marquesse of Newcastle. London, 1643.


The Parliaments Post: Faithfully Communicating To the Kingdome the Proceedings of the Armies on both sides. From Tuesday; the 10. To Tuesday, the 17. Of June. 1645. London, 1645.

The Parliaments Post: Faithfully Communicating To the Kingdome the Proceedings of the Armies on both sides. From Tuesday; the 30. to Tuesday, the 7. of October 1645. London, 1645.


The Parliaments Resolution To raise Forces to suppresse all those that are promoters of the Warre begun at Hull against Sir John Hotham. London, 1642.
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Several Letters Of great consequence Intercepted by Colonel Milton, Neer Ruthyn in Wales, Concerning Irish Forces to be brought into England, and other matters of great consequence. London, 1646.

Several Letters To The Honourable William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker of the House of Commons; And to the Committee of both Kingdoms, concerning the State of Sir Tho. Fairfax Army. Shewing the obedience of the Souldiers, which were Mutiniers to the Commands of the Parliament, and their readinesse to serve the State, under the Command of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Together with Sergeant-Major Generall Skippons Speech, to all the Officers and Souldiers, and their concurrence thereunto. London, 1645.
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