

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**ENGLISH NEWSBOOKS AND THE IRISH REBELLION OF 1641,
1641-1649**

**By
David A. O'Hara
Department of History, McGill University, Montreal
February 2001**

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

© David A. O'Hara 2001



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-70117-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

The outbreak and continued progress of the Irish rebellion of 1641 played a significant role in the birth and development of domestic newsbooks in England between 1641-49. This thesis examines the manner in which these periodicals reported the insurrection to their readers. As relations between king and parliament deteriorated during the winter of 1641-42, the attention awarded to this uprising by these publications helped to ensure that Ireland became a popular concern. Weekly chronicles of Irish affairs continued unabated after the onset of civil war in England. Amid fears that Ireland could be utilized by Charles I in his struggle with Westminster, pro-parliamentary, and subsequently pro-royalist editors employed the rebellion as part of a propaganda war that accompanied armed conflict in all three Stuart kingdoms. Accordingly, this study suggests that a principle stratagem of the newsbooks was not necessarily to communicate news of Irish matters, but more often than not, their motivation lay in manipulating accounts relating to the rebellion in order to wage political combat in England.

ABSTRAIT

Le déclenchement et la continuation de la rébellion irlandaise de 1641 ont joué un rôle important relatif à l'éclosion et au développement des livres d'actualités (newsbooks) en Angleterre entre 1641 et 1649. Cette thèse examine la manière dont ces périodiques rendent compte de l'insurrection à leurs lecteurs. Pendant que les relations entre le roi et le parlement détérioraient au cours de l'hiver de 1641 et 1642, l'intérêt prêté à cette insurrection par ces publications a aidé à faire de l'Irlande un cas populaire. Les chroniques hebdomadaires des affaires irlandaises ont continué sans cesse après le début de la guerre civile en Angleterre. Craignant que Charles I puisse se servir de l'Irlande dans ses luttes contre Westminster, des éditeurs pro-parlementaires, et par la suite des éditeurs royalistes ont employé la rébellion comme une partie importante d'une guerre de propagande accompagnant le conflit armé dans les trois royaumes Stuart. En conséquence, cette étude suggère qu'un stratagème principal des livres d'actualités n'était pas nécessairement de communiquer les nouvelles des affaires irlandaises, mais le plus souvent on était motivé par le besoin de manipuler les renseignements à propos de la rébellion afin de lancer une bataille politique en Angleterre.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe and their excellent short-title catalogue of British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700 thankfully made this study of Civil War newsbooks manageable. Financial and personal constraints have determined that, whenever possible, I have consulted microfilm copies of the newsbooks contained in George Thomason's Collection of Tracts. For their assistance in this task I am grateful to staff members at the libraries of the University of Colorado, Boulder, and the University of Ulster, Coleraine. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to the J.W. McConnell Foundation, and the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society in Montreal for funding that afforded me the opportunity to consult many original newsbooks in the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the library of Worcester College, Oxford; and the British Library. I am thankful to the staff at these respective libraries for their assistance, particularly Dr. Joanna Parker at Worcester College.

Most deserving of recognition is Professor Michael Perceval-Maxwell, who supervised this thesis. Under his tutelage, I have learned an immense amount about the complexities associated with the multiple kingdoms of Charles I. Moreover, although faced with supervising much of this work while I resided in Denver and Coleraine respectively, he did so with unqualified enthusiasm and support. I am also indebted to Robert Cookson and John Stubbs, the 'authentic voices of American History', for their support and friendship during my time in Montreal. Similar thanks must go to Mary McDaid, Gerry Zavorsky, Andrew Szanajda, and Christina Boyle. Appreciation is due Colleen Parish for making the submission of this project as painless as possible.

A different sort of gratitude is owed to my parents, Tommy and Bridie O'Hara, for the countless hours of child-minding that gave me the time to write this thesis. Thanks too must go to my children, Caleb and Catherine, who were often a welcome interruption from the rigors of this project. Finally, and most important, this dissertation could never have been completed without the support and sacrifices of my wife, Michele. Her ceaseless encouragement, combined with her threats to divorce me unless I finished it, often provided sufficient incentive for me to return to the world of Marchamont Nedham and company whenever I found my resolve beginning to wane.

FORMAT OF REFERENCES

In order to facilitate the consultation of newsbooks cited in this work, the following format, when relevant, will be used for all references to periodicals published between 1641 and 1649: *Title*; issue number; end date; *STC* number provided by Nelson and Seccombe's, *British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700. A Short-Title Catalogue of Serials Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America* (New York, 1987); Thomason Tracts shelfmark; and page number. Place of publication for pamphlets and newsbooks is London, unless otherwise stated. Dates remain in the old style, although the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
FORMAT OF REFERENCES	v
INTRODUCTION: PERIODICAL NEWS IN ENGLAND BEFORE 1641	1
1. ANGLO-IRISH RELATIONS BEFORE THE REBELLION	22
2. NEWSBOOKS AND THE OUTBREAK OF THE REBELLION: NOVEMBER 1641-AUGUST 1642	45
3. TOWARD A CESSATION: SEPTEMBER 1642-SEPTEMBER 1643	91
4. NEWSBOOKS AND THE CESSATION OF 1643: SEPTEMBER 1643- AUGUST 1645	140
5. "FROM IRELAND IS EVERYDAY EXPECTED SOME REMARKABLE THING": SEPTEMBER 1645-AUGUST 1647	194
6. THE REBELLION AND THE RECRUDESCENCE OF ROYALIST NEWSBOOKS: SEPTEMBER 1647-DECEMBER 1648	231
7. CROMWELL'S IRISH EXPEDITION: JANUARY-AUGUST 1649	263
CONCLUSION	307
APPENDIX	315
BIBLIOGRAPHY	317

INTRODUCTION

PERIODICAL NEWS IN ENGLAND BEFORE 1641

On Monday, 29 November 1641, *The Heads of Severall Proceedings in this Present Parliament* was published in London. Eight pages in length, it conveyed a scant chronicle of occurrences that had transpired in parliament the previous week to a nation hitherto starved of such intelligence. A second issue of this title appeared on 6 December, and with this the first periodical to communicate domestic news in England had been born.¹ By January 1642 sixteen separate serials were in operation, and the introduction that month of issue numeration and consecutive pagination from one week to the next helped consolidate the concept of periodical news.

No doubt that the emerging political crisis in England between Charles I and parliament created an unprecedented demand for news, but the Irish rebellion, launched on 22 October 1641, was the catalyst in the birth of *Heads of Severall Proceedings* and similar periodicals at this time. Over the next several months, the attention awarded by these publications to this uprising helped ensure that Ireland remained a principal source of public concern. Indeed, as England moved progressively toward civil war the serials became increasingly belligerent toward the court, and in this context, they often implied that the rebellion was part of a much larger conspiracy designed to effect the destruction of English Protestantism. Weekly chronicles of the Irish conflict continued unabated after the outbreak of civil war in England, and throughout the 1640s both parliamentary and

¹ *The Heads of Severall Proceedings in this Present Parliament* [unnumbered], 29 Nov. 1641, 181.101\E. 201(1); [unnumbered], 6 Dec. 1641, 181.102\E. 201(2).

royalist newsbooks utilized events in Ireland in the propaganda war that accompanied insurrection in all three of Charles I's kingdoms.

A ROYAL PREROGATIVE

Although this thesis is concerned with English newsbooks as they pertain to Ireland after the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641, before looking at this literature some explanation of the early history of printed news in England, and specifically serial news, may be necessary. Fascinating as this history may be, it is not my intent here to provide a detailed narrative of these developments. Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish between periodicals that surfaced in England before 1641, and those that emerged in the aftermath of the insurrection in Ireland during the fall of that year.

The quest for news afflicted every level of society in early-modern England as people of all ranks gathered and disseminated information via verbal communication and personal contact throughout the realm.² While London operated as the epicenter of news, the sojourns of traders, travelers and such like to and from the capital helped ensure that even those of humble origins living in the provinces could be well informed on important matters of state.³ In fact, inquiring after news of affairs within the kingdom and beyond was generally the most common means for individuals to initiate conversation.⁴

² Adam Fox, "Rumor, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England," *The Historical Journal*, 40, 3 (1997), pp. 600-601; Richard Cust, "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England," *Past & Present* 112 (1986), p. 65; John Rous, *Diary of John Rous*, ed., Mary Anne Everett Green, Camden Society 66 (London, 1856), p. 44; F.J. Levy, "How Information Spread among the Gentry, 1550-1640," *Journal of British Studies* 21 (1982), p. 24.

³ For the circulation of news among the lower levels of society in late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century England and the effect it had on popular political opinion see Fox, "Rumor, News and Popular Political Opinion," pp. 597-620; Cust, "News and Politics," pp. 60-90; Pauline Croft, "The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century," *Transactions of the Historical Society*, 6th series, 1 (1991), pp. 43-69; Thomas Cogswell, "The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s," *Journal of British Studies* 29 (1990), pp. 187-215.

⁴ Fox, "Rumor, News and Popular Political Opinion," pp. 600-601; Cust, "News and Politics," p. 65.

The development of written and printed sources of news, which became a hallmark of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, began to brace conventional means of oral dissemination.⁵ It was not uncommon for the more literate segments of English society to satisfy their appetites for information through private correspondence, and the more affluent among them, to arrange for professional news writers or 'intelligencers' to provide them with a personal news service.⁶ In addition, after the introduction of the printing press to England in the late fifteenth century, printed news began to emerge slowly in the form of pamphlets, broadsides, ballads and similar works. By the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods the wars of religion on the continent generated public demand in England for news of these conflicts, and accordingly, a growing number of publications were printed to satisfy this interest.⁷ Between 1591-94, for example, 129 news items were entered in the Stationer's Register, and a further 142 titles were entered between 1594 and 1610.⁸ News of the religious conflicts in both France and the Low Countries were especially appealing, more so if English volunteers were known to be involved.⁹

Intelligence from abroad was also selected according to the nature of English prejudices. For instance, more information was printed about the Turks than any other race bar the French and the Dutch. English and Continentals alike regarded this race as

⁵ Fox, "Rumor, News and Popular Political Opinion," p. 620.

⁶ Matthias Shaaber, *Some Foreunners of the Newspaper in England, 1476-1622* (Philadelphia, 1929), pp. 2-3; Levy, "How Information Spread among the Gentry," p. 24.

⁷ Shaaber, *Foreunners of the Newspaper*, pp. 120-134, 169.

⁸ G. B. Harrison, "Books and Readers, 1591-4," *The Library*, 4th series, 8 (1927), pp. 285-287.

⁹ Ibid; H.J. Webb, "Military Newsbooks during the Age of Elizabeth," *English Studies* 33 (1952), p. 241. For a complete list of both extant and non extant news pamphlets from this period see D. C. Collins, *A Handlist of News Pamphlets 1590-1610* (London, 1943), pp. 2-121.

not only barbaric and savage, but they also perceived the Turks as a serious threat to the security of Christendom. It followed that Christian victories over them were well received in England.¹⁰ A similar reception was most likely generated by printed accounts concerning the rebellions that took place in Ireland during Elizabeth's reign.¹¹ The majority of these works chronicled the military engagements that had taken place between English and Irish forces in that kingdom and it was not uncommon for them to highlight the barbarism of the natives.¹² It would be misleading, though, to assume that there was a plethora of pamphlets or news ballads that addressed Irish affairs during the Elizabethan or even the early Jacobean era. For instance, between 1579 and 1622 only thirty-two news items of this nature were registered with the Stationers' Company of London.¹³ Indeed, in correspondence to Venice in July 1599, one Francis Cordale lamented that "he could send no news of the Irish wars, all advertisements thence being prohibited."¹⁴

Reporting on foreign occurrences was considered much safer than relaying intelligence that touched upon domestic concerns, particularly in view of the fact that domestic news was deemed to be a prerogative of the crown. Before 1641 the state

¹⁰ Shaaber, *Forerunners of the Newspaper*, pp. 180-182.

¹¹ For example, see Thomas Churchyard, *The moste true reporte of James Fitz Morrice death* [1579]; idem, *A Scourge for Rebels* (1584); *The true reports of the prosperous successe which God gave vnto our English Souldiours...in Ireland*, [1581]; Raph Byrchensha, *A Discovrse occasioned vpon the late defeat, given to the Arch-rebels, Tyrone and Odonnell* (1602).

¹² For example, see Churchyard, *James Fitz Morrice death*; idem, *The Fortvnate Farewel to the most forward and noble Earle of Essex* (1599). A noted writer of the period, Churchyard, the author of these works, was also a veteran of military service in Ireland. *Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 66 vols. (London, 1885-1901), vol. iv, p. 343. The issue of English prejudice toward the Irish during this period will be addressed more fully in chapter two.

¹³ For a list of these titles see Shaaber, *Forerunners of the Newspaper*, pp. 130-131.

¹⁴ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1598-1601* (London, 1869), p. 251.

attempted by means of this prerogative to control the dissemination of all manner of information intended for public consumption. Accordingly, for almost a century preceding the outbreak of the English Civil War the crown and the Stationers' Company jointly regulated not only the news but also all other aspects of the printing trade.¹⁵ This cooperative control was clearly manifested in the Star Chamber Decree of 23 June 1586. In response to Puritan publications that had been critical of Elizabethan church liturgy, the queen authorized the Star Chamber to enact a comprehensive regulatory code to govern English printing. This decree, which continued in effect until 1637, limited both the number of printers in England (twenty-three), and the number of presses (fifty-five). No additional presses were to be set up without the permission of the appropriate ecclesiastical authorities (i.e., the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London), and no individual was permitted to print anything unless the same authorities licensed it.¹⁶

The administration and enforcement of the regulations were entrusted jointly to the Stationers' Company and ecclesiastical officials. The wardens of the Stationers' had unlimited powers of search and seizure conferred upon them, and could destroy and

¹⁵ The Stationers' Company had been formed in 1403 and was essentially a guild of booksellers, printers and others in the publishing trade. The company had been granted a royal charter in 1557 that gave it wide powers for the control of the printing industry in England. Printing was limited to the members of the London Company. All others who intended to publish had first to obtain the necessary authorization. For a complete history of the Company see Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History 1403-1949* (Stanford, CA., 1960).

¹⁶ Frederick Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England 1476-1776. The Rise and Decline of Government Controls* (Urbana, IL., 1952), pp. 61-62; *The Times [London] Tercentenary Handlist of English & Welsh Newspapers, Magazines & Reviews*, ed. J.B. Williams (London, 1920), pp. 3-4. It should also be noted that from the middle of the sixteenth century, printing was concentrated in London. Indeed, the only legitimate printing presses outside the capital were those at the two universities, Oxford and Cambridge.

confiscate all presses and unlicensed books if uncovered, while printers, booksellers and such like could be imprisoned for violating this code.¹⁷ Thus, during the late Elizabethan and early Stuart era there was a *quid pro quo* between the state and the Stationers'. The government furnished the authority that granted both copyright and powers of search and seizure to the Company, and in return the Stationers' served as investigative and enforcement agents of the state in the censorship of printed matter.¹⁸

Despite these measures by the crown, the majority of the populace in early modern England remained illiterate, at least to the extent that they could not sign their own names. Using this evidence as a benchmark, David Cressy has argued that approximately two-thirds of the adult male population, and possibly as many as four-fifths of the female population, could be considered illiterate during this period.¹⁹ Nonetheless, Cressy also suggests that literacy levels for urban male inhabitants,

¹⁷ Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 135-140.

¹⁸ Michael Mendle, "Grub Street and Parliament at the Beginning of the English Revolution," in Jeremy D. Popkin, ed., *Media and Revolution* (Lexington, KY., 1995), p. 31. This issue of censorship has been the focus of recent debate. Sheila Lambert has attacked a common assumption held by many scholars that the government exercised strict control of the press throughout the reigns of both James I and Charles I. For example, see Christopher Hill, "Censorship and English Literature" in idem, ed., *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Writing and Revolution in 17th Century England*, (Amherst, MA., 1985), vol. 1, pp. 32-71. Lambert argues that, in 1586, and again in 1637, (both economically depressed periods) the Stationers' Company lobbied diligently for stricter controls over printing. Printers labored hard to secure a reduction in the number of printing presses, and Stationers resorted to monopoly and protectionism in an attempt to cope with the threat of ever increasing competition. Lambert further maintains that while limitations on freedom of expression undoubtedly existed at this time, economic and practical factors inherent in the small size of the market for printed material in England were just as significant as formal censorship in limiting participation. For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see Sheila Lambert, "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1637," in *Aspects of Printing from 1600*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford, 1987), pp. 1-29; idem, "State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers' Company before 1640," in *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1910*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester, 1992), pp. 1-32; Michael Frearson, "London Corantos in the 1620s," in *Studies in Newspaper and Periodical History, 1993 Annual*, ed. Michael Harris (Westport, CT., 1993), pp. 3-17.

¹⁹ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 59.

particularly Londoners, were considerably higher - as much as 78% in some areas.²⁰ The ability to sign one's name also appears to have been closely tied to one's social and economic status at this time. Members of the clergy, aristocracy or gentry had greater educational opportunities than yeomen or tradesmen, who in turn often fared better than husbandmen, servants or laborers.²¹ Reading, however, was generally taught before writing. Consequently, children who had the opportunity of attending school would have learned to read before the age of seven, an age when those from the lower levels of the social hierarchy were often forced by the economic needs of their families to join the labor market. Thus it's possible that a greater percentage of the rural and urban poor could read to some degree before they ever had the opportunity to learn to write or even to master their own signature.²²

THE ADVENT OF THE CORANTO

Irrespective of literacy levels, the advent of the Thirty Years War in Germany in 1618 led to a thirst for news of this conflict throughout much of Europe and the English were no exception. England had a particular interest in the war. James I's son-in-law, Frederick, the Calvinist Elector of the Palatinate, had become a principal antagonist after having accepted the throne of Bohemia in August 1619. The Habsburgs of Austria, who received full backing from their Catholic cousins in Spain, subsequently contested Frederick's

²⁰ Further evidence by Cressy suggests that in addition to London, literacy levels were much higher among those who lived in the south-east and midlands of England than for those who lived in the north and far south-west of the kingdom. Cressy, *Reading and Writing*, pp. 72-74.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 119, 146-163.

²² Margaret Spufford, "First Steps in Literacy: The Reading and Writing Experiences of the Humblest Seventeenth-Century Spiritual Autobiographers," *Social History* 4 (1979), pp. 408-409. See also Keith Thomas, "The Meaning of Literacy in Early Modern England," in *The Written Word: Literacy in transition*, ed. Gerd Baumann (Oxford, 1986), pp. 97-131, and Wyn Ford, "The Problem of Literacy in Early Modern England," *History* 78 (1993), pp. 22-37.

decision, and many in England perceived this conflict as yet another struggle in the perpetual war between the forces of Protestantism and those of Rome. Furthermore, public opinion considered it the duty of the crown to assist Frederick's cause in Germany, particularly after a Spanish army had moved into Bohemia in the summer of 1620, defeated the Elector and forced him and his wife to flee.²³ James's lack of support for his son-in-law at this juncture was perceived by many in England to be part of a conciliatory foreign policy toward Spain, which included an alliance based on a marriage of Prince Charles to the Catholic Spanish Infanta. For many Protestants, if this union took place, toleration of Roman Catholics and even a return to Rome could follow. Thus Puritan propagandists' urged military support for the Protestant cause in Germany together with a declaration of war against Spain.²⁴

Events on the continent at this time led to the introduction of arguably the single most important news source that preceded the newsbook in England - the coranto. The coranto originated in Holland and consisted of a single sheet of news in small folio, printed in two columns that covered both sides of the paper.²⁵ Like much of printed news before its arrival, and indeed its progeny, the civil war newsbook, the coranto was popularized by conflict. Yet the first corantos to transmit news of the German campaigns to England were not technically English. Rather, Petrus Keerius published the earliest known extant coranto in Amsterdam on 2 December 1620, titled *The new tydings out of*

²³ For a complete history of this conflict see C.V. Wedgwood, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1938); S.H. Steinberg, *The Thirty Years' War and the Conflict for European Hegemony, 1600-1660* (New York, 1966), and Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1984).

²⁴ Louis B. Wright, "Propaganda Against James I's 'Appeasement' of Spain," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 6 (1942-43), pp. 149-163.

²⁵ Folke Dahl, "Amsterdam-Cradle of English Newspapers," *The Library*, 5th series, 4 (1950), p. 167.

*Italie are not yet com.*²⁶ Keerius followed this with a second coranto, *Corrant out of Italy, Germany, &c* on 23 December, and over the ensuing months several rival series of corantos by at least three other Dutch publishers were imported into England.²⁷ Like Keerius's editions, they carried translated intelligence from all over the continent, particularly of the war in Germany, but more importantly the arrival of these publications introduced the concept of periodicity to printed news for English readers. However, as Joseph Frank noted, the first newspapers in England were "English only in language and point of sale, not in source or content."²⁸

The restrictions placed upon English publishing by the crown prohibited the native presses from being able to compete with their Dutch counterparts. But the popularity of these imports, while drawing official condemnation from the king, stirred English printers into action.²⁹ Sometime between February and August 1621, a bookseller named Thomas Archer published the first unlicensed English coranto. Although none of Archer's early editions have survived, contemporary correspondence suggests that they resembled their Dutch counterparts and came out at approximately weekly intervals.³⁰ However, Archer's corantos were short lived. He was arrested in August of that year and

²⁶ Keerius had at one time lived and worked as an engraver in England and still remained in contact with English printers and publishers after he had returned to Holland in 1593. Dahl, "Amsterdam-Cradle of Newspapers," pp. 166-170; idem, *A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks, 1620-1642* (London, 1952), p. 31; *Handlist of English & Welsh Newspapers*, p. 8.

²⁷ A list of these early Dutch imports can be found in Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 31-48.

²⁸ Joseph Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, MA., 1961), p. 6.

²⁹ In December 1620 and again in July 1621 James had issued two proclamations "against excesse of Lavish and Licentious Speech of matters of State." James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes, eds, *Stuart Royal Proclamations: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625* (Oxford, 1973), vol. i, pp. 495-496, 519-21. Moreover, in January 1621 the king persuaded the States General of Holland to place a ban upon the export of corantos to Britain. *Handlist of English & Welsh Newspapers*, pp. 8-9.

³⁰ Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 49-50.

charged with publishing news of the war in the Palatinate without having obtained a license.³¹

Surprisingly, shortly after Archer's imprisonment the first extant English coranto titled *Corante, or newes from Italy, Germany, Hungarie, Spaine and France* was published with authority on 24 September 1621 for N.B.³² Although the identity of N.B. is uncertain, the consensus is that it was either Nathaniel Butter or Nicholas Bourne, two renowned publishers of the period.³³ Translated from a Dutch imprint, this title, which was modified to *Corant or weekly newes, from Italy, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, France, and the Low-Countries* the following week, continued to operate until 22 October 1621.³⁴ Although these issues were unnumbered and appeared at irregular intervals, it is clear from the wording within the title that this was an attempt to establish England's first domestic news serial. Subsequent periodicals geared toward relating occurrences from abroad appeared shortly thereafter, and until 1624, when a shift in James's foreign policy may have made foreign news less lucrative, publication syndicates

³¹ Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 151; Laurence Hanson, "English Newsbooks, 1620-1641" *The Library*, 4th series, 18 (1938), pp. 363-364.

³² It is difficult to determine exactly why a license was granted by the state at this time for this publication. In light of the current demand for intelligence from the continent, the crown may have come to the realization that joint regulation by the state and the Stationers' Company of domestic news publications would be much easier to control than foreign imports. The Stationers' may also have been confident that news printed under their auspices could open a valuable market in competition with the Dutch. The Company received a fee from all works submitted to it for the necessary license. From 1582 this fee had been fixed at 6 pence for a book and 4 pence for a pamphlet. In an attempt to escape these payments, individuals often failed to seek licenses for their publication. For a fuller discussion on this issue see, W. W. Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650* (Oxford, 1956), particularly pp. 38-62.

³³ Dahl, "Amsterdam-Cradle of English Newspapers," pp. 170-171; Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, p. 51. From 1602 to December 1622, Butter published approximately 200 books, 82 of which could be considered news-related. For a brief history of both Butter and Bourne's activities in the printing trade up to this time, see Leona Rostenberg, "Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne, First 'Masters of the Staple'" *The Library*, 3rd series, 12 (1957), pp. 23-33; Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 40-41.

³⁴ Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 51-54.

engaged in keeping their readers informed of events on the continent in numbered and dated editions.³⁵

Although the government allowed the publication of periodical news concerning foreign occurrences, the ban on relating domestic affairs remained intact. This may also help explain the dearth of printed material that related news from Ireland at this time. After the submission of O'Neill in 1603, few tracts addressed affairs in that kingdom. This paucity of material may be partly explained by the fact that aside from Sir Cahir O'Doherty's rebellion in 1608, Ireland had remained free from any major uprising. Thus unlike continental news, which was popularized by the Thirty Years War, Irish affairs furnished little interest for the English news market. Furthermore, between 1620 and 1639 the Stationers' Company secured the patent of king's printer in Ireland. Similar to England, this granted the Stationers' a monopoly over all printed matter, including operating licenses.³⁶ Presumably, this coalition between the crown and the Stationers' imposed the same restrictions on the publication of Irish news as those prescribed for the printing of English news.

THE FIRST NEWSBOOKS

The new English coranto was not simply an imitative copy of its continental counterpart. Rather, Nathaniel Butter and rival publishers modified the traditional Dutch format from a single folio size sheet to a quarto pamphlet that usually consisted of between eight and twenty-four pages. This format was to become the standard for English periodical news

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 55-113; Hanson, "English Newsbooks, 1620-1641," pp. 365-369; Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Oxford, 1996), p. 8.

³⁶ Mary Pollard, "Control of the Press in Ireland through the King's Printer's Patent 1600-1800," *Irish Booklore* 4 (1980), pp. 81-82.

until the establishment of England's first acknowledged newspaper, the *Gazette* in 1665. Hence readers began to view these new creations as books of news.³⁷ It would be misleading, however, to suggest that these early English corantos simply evolved into the newsbooks of the 1640s. Joad Raymond, for example, reminds us that the publishers of the civil war newsbook introduced consecutive pagination and signatures, which were not associated with the coranto. Moreover, unlike corantos, or pamphlets for that matter, the serials of the 1640s employed regularity in length, exact periodicity, and a brief, unchanging title.³⁸

But the introduction of these newsbooks, or corantos as contemporaries generally continued to call them, represented the first attempt at periodical printing of news in England.³⁹ Still, the principal source of intelligence for English publishers continued to remain news printed in the foreign corantos. Despite occasional correspondence from abroad, and the changes brought about in terms of location and format, domestic publications still relied heavily upon Dutch translations for the main political and military developments in Europe. Dahl has estimated that between 1622-1632 approximately 60 to 70 per cent of the news material in the English periodical press originated from the Netherlands.⁴⁰ For the most part, however, the continental material was related in a monotonous manner and presented to readers in a series of short disconnected paragraphs. Passages generally conveyed military engagements that had

³⁷ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 7.

³⁸ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 9.

³⁹ Sheila Lambert, "Coranto Printing in England: The First Newsbooks" *Journal of Newspaper and Periodical History* 8 (1992), pp. 3-19; Michael Frearson, "The Distribution and Readership of London Corantos in the 1620s," in *Serials and their Readers, 1620-1914*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris, (Winchester, 1993), pp. 1-25; Frearson, "London Corantos in the 1620s," pp. 3-17.

⁴⁰ Dahl, "Amsterdam-Cradle of English Newspapers," p. 173.

taken place on the continent together with the activities of the principal political and military figures involved in these conflicts. The role played by ordinary citizens was rarely mentioned except *en masse* as the populace of a community that was under siege or who had been subjected to oppression.⁴¹

The tedious nature of the foreign reports may have contributed toward the most notable difference between English serials and their European counterparts - namely the relationship that the London publishers developed with their editor. By 1622 the London publishers appeared to favor Thomas Gainsford, a former military officer who had served in Ireland and possessed significant experience in foreign travel, to edit the generally haphazard continental accounts and provide a more continuous narrative.⁴² Furthermore, Gainsford not only attempted to make foreign news more intelligible for his patrons, but he also introduced the editorial notice. When receiving unfavorable news, readers would often be exhorted to trust in God, and when appropriate, the editor attempted to distinguish between rumor and certainty while correcting errors in previously published editions.⁴³ In one number, for example, Gainsford claimed that "There hath beene a late report, which hath generally gone about here in London, how that Count Mansfield should lately haue beene destroyed by treacherie...but of this we confesse that we haue seene nothing from beyond the sea."⁴⁴ Such notices were almost unheard of in continental newsprint, and although Gainsford's tenure was short-lived, (he died in 1624)

⁴¹ Shabber, "The History of the First English Newspaper," *Studies in Philology* 29 (1932), pp. 569, 574.

⁴² Hanson, "English Newsbooks, 1620-1641," p. 381.

⁴³ Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, p. 20; Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 9-11.

⁴⁴ Cited in Shaaber, "First English Newspaper," pp. 577-578.

the editorial notice, which he pioneered, would become employed by the editors of the civil war newsbooks.⁴⁵

Despite the fact that the printing of domestic news remained banned, the early English periodicals enjoyed some measure of success, principally when they related news from the continent that had a bearing on affairs at home. Throughout much of 1623, for example, the principal story was the lengthy visit of Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham to Spain in an attempt by the crown to court the Spanish Infanta. Consequently, the English public was eager to get its hands on any reading material that related to the affair.⁴⁶ Forty-six corantos survive from that year, and in addition to thirty-eight miscellaneous publications on current events, they make up approximately one quarter of all works that were registered with the Stationers' Company for 1623.⁴⁷ By the end of 1623 the number of serials published in London exceeded both the number of educational books and sermons, the latter being a traditional staple for many printers.⁴⁸ Indeed, at a price of between two and three pence per copy, and the production cost of approximately a half-penny, periodical news could prove to be a profitable enterprise.⁴⁹

Nonetheless, foreign affairs continued to be a sensitive issue for James throughout 1623 and 1624, particularly in the context of the Spanish Match and the crown's conciliatory policy toward Spain. The attention awarded by news publications to this business forced the king in September 1623 to issue yet another proclamation

⁴⁵ For details of Gainsford's role in the world of publishing at this time see, Mark Eccles, "Thomas Gainsford, Captain Pamphlet," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 14 (1982), pp. 259-270.

⁴⁶ Judith Simmons, "Publications of 1623," *The Library*, 5th series, 21 (1966), p. 207.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 207, 216.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴⁹ Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 12-13; Frearson, "Distribution and Readership of London Corantos," p. 5.

“against the disorderly Printing, uttering, and dispersing of Bookes, Pamphlets, &c.” To all intents and purposes this edict was a reiteration of the 1586 decree and it was followed by a similar proclamation in August 1624.⁵⁰ However, the crown’s dependence on the Stationers’ Company to regulate the publication of news and other productions may have failed to bring about the desired results. Many London corantos were printed without having had been licensed or entered in the Stationer’s register.⁵¹ In fact, perhaps as many as one-third of all works printed during this period were not registered with the Company.⁵²

By the end of 1624 Butter and Bourne appear to have become the only effective producers of serial news in London. This partnership dominated the weekly news market until October 1632 publishing six additional series of numbered corantos, each series containing approximately fifty editions.⁵³ Even though the highly literate London populace was the primary target for these copies, contemporary diaries and personal correspondence suggest that they also reached provincial readers.⁵⁴ Notwithstanding that it was 1635 before the nation’s first public postal service was created, London serials

⁵⁰ *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, i, pp. 583-585, 599-600.

⁵¹ Frearson, “London Corantos in the 1620s,” p. 8.

⁵² Greg, *Aspects and Problems of London Publishing*, p. 68.

⁵³ Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 133-222. There were two rival series of newsbooks published during this decade to challenge the monopoly of Butter and Bourne. From September 1624 until August 1628, Thomas Archer produced a series that totaled only 12 numbers. The bookseller Ralph Mabb also published a series in 1627. However, no extant copies have been found of Mabb’s newsbooks. Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 266-279. It is difficult to determine exactly the sum total of copies that may have been printed. Michael Frearson has suggested that the number of issues may have ranged from as little as 250 too as many as 1,500 per week. Thus in a given year the total number of newsbooks printed in a full series of 50 could have fallen anywhere between 12,500 and 75,000. Frank suggests a more realistic figure of 500 copies each week, and when business slowed this number may have slipped to 250. Frearson, “Distribution and Readership of London Corantos,” p. 5; Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 13.

⁵⁴ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 6.

could be effectively distributed to the counties through retail booksellers in provincial towns who had contacts in the capital. In addition, common carriers frequently transported goods to and from London along with private letters in which newsbooks could be enclosed. Such was the speed of these carriers that news reached much of the country within days of it having been printed in London.⁵⁵

The only real competition that these publications faced within the provinces was the manuscript newsletters written by a group of semi-professional news writers. Two of the most notable figures in this business were John Pory and Joseph Mead. Pory had been MP for Bridgewater in Somerset between 1605-11 but by 1631 he was being paid as much as twenty pounds a year by Sir John Scudamore in Herefordshire - one of his many clients - to provide a personal news service that covered both international and domestic affairs. Pory spent much of his time gathering these reports in and around St. Paul's, where throngs of Londoners often gathered to discuss the affairs of the day. Indeed, he appears to have made the print shop of Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne his base of operations.⁵⁶ Thus it is possible that even the authors of newsletters may have received much of their intelligence, in terms of foreign reports at least, from the publishers of corantos.

Joseph Mead, a Cambridge divine, provided a comparable news service for Sir Martin Struteville of Dalham in Suffolk, keeping him abreast of recent events by sending him as many as four letters a week.⁵⁷ Although Mead lived between sixty and seventy

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 7-9.

⁵⁶ William S. Powell, *John Pory 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, NC., 1977), pp. 55-58.

⁵⁷ Cust, "News and Politics," p. 63.

miles from the capital, he subscribed to the London corantos. Most weeks he received a copy wrapped in a newsletter sent via carrier from one of his correspondents in the capital, and after digesting the contents of both sources Mead forwarded his own letters of news to Stratteville.⁵⁸ This did not mean that Mead or his contemporaries viewed these books of news without suspicion.⁵⁹ Their popularity during the 1620s was the subject of Ben Jonson's satire *The Staple of News* in 1626. Therein, Jonson satirized a news office that depicted newsmongers as little more than con-men. To his readers he declared that the news was not:

...any reasonable man's, but news made like the time's news (a weekly cheat to draw money) and could not be fitter reprehended than in raising this ridiculous Office of the Staple, wherein the age may see her own folly or hunger and thirst after publish'd pamphlets of news, set out every Saturday but made all at home, and no syllable of truth in them, than which there cannot be a greater disease in nature, or a fouler scorn put upon the times.⁶⁰

Notably, the character of the chief clerk within the news office at the center of Jonson's play was named Nathaniel, an allusion perhaps to Nathaniel Butter.

But by 1630, Butter and his partner Nicholas Bourne were facing difficulties. The Protestant war effort in Germany was weakening, and English readers may have lost interest in reports of Protestant defeats, or indeed of false victories that could have made

⁵⁸ Levy, "How Information Spread among the Gentry," pp. 21-22; Frearson, "Distribution and Readership of London Corantos," p. 9. For further evidence of provincial residents being kept abreast of news from London see also *Diary of John Rous*, pp. 7, 31; Cust, "News and Politics," pp. 65-66; George Roberts, ed., *The Diary of Walter Yonge*, Camden Society 41 (London, 1848), pp. xxiv-xxv; Arthur Searle, ed., *Barrington Family Letters 1628-1632*, Camden Society, 4th series, 28 (London, 1983), particularly pp. 24, 201, 206, 215-216, 222-223; J.S. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974), pp. 21-23, 39-40.

⁵⁹ Frearson, "Distribution and Readership of London Corantos," p. 18.

⁶⁰ Ben Jonson, *The Staple of News*, ed. Devra Rowland Kiefer (London, 1976), p. 75.

the public suspicious of their news.⁶¹ The pair's sixth series, which began in February or March of 1628 and lasted until August 1629, comprised only forty-one numbers.⁶² Matters continued to deteriorate as the seventh series, which began in late 1629 or early 1630 and ended in April 1631, constituted only twenty-five numbers.⁶³ The decline in the number of weekly editions, and the probable decrease in the number of copies printed, may help explain why there are no extant editions of this series until 16 July 1630. Throughout the second half of 1631 and for much of 1632 this trend was briefly redressed with a turn of events in the Thirty Years War. The Protestant cause had been significantly strengthened by the invasion into Northern Germany by Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. The Swedish king's intervention and the series of Protestant victories that followed led to a noticeable increase in the number of serials being printed, and from 29 November 1631 until 12 October 1632 Butter and Bourne's eighth series produced fifty editions, thereby averaging at least one issue per week.⁶⁴

Ironically, the shift in fortunes for Protestant forces in Europe may have contributed to the government prohibition of 17 October 1632 against this partnership's continued operation.⁶⁵ It has been suggested that there were two specific reasons for this ban. Officially, the ban was instigated at the insistence of the Spanish ambassador in England, who had on several occasions protested to

⁶¹ C. John Sommerville, *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (Oxford, 1996), p. 27; Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, p. 162.

⁶² Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp. 162-165.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 166-172.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 187-220

⁶⁵ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1631-33*, (London 1862), p. 426.

Charles against the anti-Spanish nature of the English serials.⁶⁶ The final straw, however, appears to have been Butter and Bourne's decision to publish a slanderous report taken from a Dutch coranto, which suggested that the Marquis D' Olivares, Spain's chief minister of state, had been dismissed for embezzlement. Unofficially, the king probably welcomed the opportunity to have these works banned. In recent months the corantos had been full of praise for Adolphus, and such enthusiasm for a foreign ruler - albeit a Protestant one - may have been too much for Charles to bear.⁶⁷ Weekly news publications remained banned for the next six years.⁶⁸

Domestic production of serial news resumed again in December 1638 when Butter and Bourne, after they had promised to pay ten pounds per annum toward the repair of St. Paul's, were granted a royal license that permitted them to print foreign news for the term of twenty-one years.⁶⁹ Within hours of this agreement they launched the first number of their new series, *An Abstract of Some Speciall Forreigne Occurrences, brought down to the weekly Newes, of the 20 of December*. This series was completely different from past efforts in terms of appearance and manner of publication. Rather than printing the traditional weekly periodical quarto that comprised some 8-24 pages, the new series consisted of

⁶⁶ Dahl, "Amsterdam-Cradle of English Newspapers," p. 174.

⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 174-175.

⁶⁸ For much of this time the only form of periodical news available in England were a number of smuggled corantos from Amsterdam. Butter and Bourne continued to operate in the publishing trade, but their activities with regard to news were confined to the publication of semi-annual compilations of over one hundred pages that do not belong to the early history of the newsbook. Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 15.

⁶⁹ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1638-39* (London, 1871), p. 182.

issues that numbered only 4 pages each that were to be printed three times each week.⁷⁰

The reality of the situation was that, in terms of titles and periodicity, Butter and Bourne's efforts remained irregular. The renaissance of serial news in England had come in the aftermath of what was unquestionably the most comprehensive government legislation for the regulation of printing since 1586. On 11 July 1637 the Star Chamber decreed new provisions that were primarily geared toward ending the abuses and evasions that had crept into the operation of the licensing system. Henceforth all books and pamphlets were to be licensed under the joint supervision of the ecclesiastical authorities and the Stationers' Company, with occasional interference by the state. Furthermore, it was ordered that each work was not only to bear the name of the author, printer and licensor, but that all printers were required to deposit 300 pounds as a guaranty not to print anything that had not been licensed by authority.⁷¹

Having received a patent for the publication of foreign news, Butter and Bourne were now (in theory) protected against both foreign and domestic competition. But the new decree had set up specific licensors for each type of publication, including newsprint, and it was determined that there would be stronger penalties for any violations.⁷² Butter's frustration at times with these tighter controls led to his penning the

⁷⁰ Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, pp.223-236. These modifications in production may have been an attempt by the pair to cut costs in response to a decline in demand while at the same time affording them the opportunity to increase their weekly sales figures. Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 17.

⁷¹ A copy of this decree can be found in *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*, 5 vols. ed. Edward Arber (London, 1875-94), vol. iv, pp. 529-36. See also Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 142-143.

⁷² Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 142, 159.

following editorial notice on 11 January 1641, in what was by now his twelfth series.

Explaining to his readers why it had been five weeks since the publication of his last title, he declared:

Courteous Reader: Wee had thought to have given over printing our Forraigne avisoos, for that the Licenser (out of partiall affection) would not often times let passe apparent truth, and in other things (oftentimes) so crosses and alter which made us almost weary of Printing....⁷³

Very possibly, though, there were more pressing reasons why Butter was weary of providing continental news. By 1641, foreign reports no longer enjoyed the appeal of earlier years. Although the Thirty Years War in Germany continued, events that were unfolding closer to home now created an unprecedented demand for news in England of domestic troubles. English readers had become accustomed to not only printed news but more importantly, periodical news. For the better part of two decades, domestic publication of foreign affairs, though often irregular, had kept the kingdom informed of the principal political and military occurrences that had transpired on the continent. The public's appetite may have been whetted by news of these accounts, especially if they addressed the cause of Protestantism on the international stage. It was the threat to Protestantism in England, however, that initiated a seismic shift away from interest in continental affairs to demand for home news. Widespread concern over this threat, particularly in its response to the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland, helped give birth to a new generation of English newsbooks.

⁷³ Cited in Dahl, *Bibliography of English Corantos*, p. 251. Similar frustrations may have been a factor in Bourne having retired from the partnership several months earlier.

CHAPTER ONE

ANGLO-IRISH RELATIONS BEFORE THE REBELLION

Before this news coverage can be properly evaluated, it is important to render an account of events that led to the outbreak of the Irish rebellion. It is not my intention here to furnish a comprehensive history of Anglo-Irish relations prior to October 1641.

Nevertheless, a brief overview is necessary in order to appreciate the complex nature of Irish politics at this time, and to provide a greater understanding of Ireland's position as one component in the multiple kingdoms ruled by the Stuart monarchy.

THE TUDOR CONQUEST OF IRELAND

After Ireland first became subjected to English rule in the twelfth century, a disparate collection of Anglo-Norman and Gaelic Irish lordships subsisted throughout the island. Too engrossed with either domestic or continental affairs to pay serious attention to Irish affairs, English kings generally left it to their Norman nobles to administer a nation amidst native insurrections and intransigence. Dublin became the center of English government, although by 1500 the crown's authority was largely ineffective outside what became commonly known as the Pale.¹

By the 1530s, however, and after Henry VIII's assertion of independence from the papacy, pressure increased for more direct English interference in the government of Ireland. Yet the crown had neither the inclination nor the resources to invest in a

¹ The Pale was the area in Ireland where English law and royal administration was generally respected. The extent of the Pale varied. By the early sixteenth century, it consisted of the coastal area between Dublin and Drogheda, extending inland for some twenty to forty miles. Outside the Pale, several towns, notably, Waterford, Cork, Limerick and Galway remained havens of English fealty.

comprehensive military conquest of the island. An English-born deputy, Sir Anthony St Leger, was sent to Dublin in 1540 to secure the support of the Gaelic lordships for Anglicized rule. St Leger introduced a policy known as 'surrender and regrant,' an approach designed to induce the Gaelic chiefs to surrender their lands to the English crown, recognize the king as their true sovereign, and assist in the expansion of royal authority throughout the island. In return, they would have their estates formally restored by the crown, and their titles upheld against local challenges. To acknowledge a series of agreements reached with many native lords, the Dublin parliament in 1541 declared Henry, King of Ireland. Henceforth, Ireland would be recognized as a kingdom in its own right, with English monarchs considered sovereigns of both realms.²

Throughout the second half of the sixteenth century, the crown's policy toward its new realm was one that promoted the safety of England, rather than the subjugation of Ireland.³ By the reign of Elizabeth I, religious issues had become inextricably tied to Anglo-Irish relations. The Protestant Reformation had resulted in England and her queen emerging as pivotal players in the international struggle against the forces of the Counter Reformation. Concerned by the threat posed by her Catholic subjects in Ireland, programs were adopted by the monarchy in an attempt to secure England's 'back door.' To this end, 'New English' Protestants were sent over and all but monopolized important political offices within the Irish government. This policy was clearly aimed at excluding from office the mainly Catholic 'Old English', who had been the backbone of the crown's administrative and military establishment since the middle ages. As descendants

² Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603* (London, 1985), pp. 137-142.

³ J.C. Beckett, *The Making of Modern Ireland, 1603-1923* (London, 1966), p. 13.

of the Anglo-Norman settlers, the Old English were committed to English rule in Ireland. However, not only did the majority of them continue to adhere to Catholicism, but also, some members were commonly charged by the New English as having 'degenerated' by adopting native Irish customs.⁴ These claims undermined the self-proclaimed loyalty of the Old English to the crown, and convinced the government that a change in Ireland's political administration was necessary in order to promote greater control over the island.

To accomplish this goal, between 1565-76 a series of programs were implemented under the supervision of New English lord deputies. These included the settlement of native lands by Protestant immigrants and the establishment of provincial presidencies in the provinces of Munster and Connaught. It was hoped that such programs would reduce the local power and influence of both the Old English and Gaelic lords.⁵ Efforts were also made to convert the indigenous Catholic population of Ireland to Protestantism. But the new religion, spread by an English-speaking clergy using an English liturgy, held little appeal. Many natives identified the new religion with conquest and plantation, and the program of Anglicization.⁶ As a result, by the end of the Tudor period, a polarity between the Catholic and Protestant interests in Ireland had emerged, and the faith professed by both Old-English and Irish alike would in due course provide common ground for their resistance to English rule.⁷

⁴ Aidan Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42* (London, 1966), pp. 15-19.

⁵ For a detailed account of the work of these men, notably the Earl of Sussex and Sir Henry Sidney, see Nicholas Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (Sussex, 1976), particularly pp. 45-116.

⁶ Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p. 212; Alan Ford, *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*, 2nd ed., (Dublin, 1997), p. 29.

⁷ Alan Ford, "The Protestant Reformation in Ireland," in *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641*, ed. Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (Dublin, 1986), pp. 50-74.

Attempts by the English crown to extend its political authority sparked a series of insurrections in Ireland during the closing years of Elizabethan rule. The most serious of these uprisings occurred in Ulster where the native chieftains had been resolute in defense of Gaelic independence. Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone, the principal lord in the north, was convinced that the process of Anglicization being gradually implemented in the rest of Ireland threatened his political influence in Ulster.⁸ By 1595, O'Neill had emerged as the champion of Gaelic resistance and the leading player in the province's rebellion against English rule. The uprising spread beyond Ulster and threatened for a time to destroy English authority throughout the kingdom. The conflict climaxed in December 1601, when a coalition of Spanish and Irish forces suffered a devastating defeat at the Battle of Kinsale. O'Neill finally submitted to a negotiated settlement on 30 March 1603, by which he was permitted to keep his lands and authority in Ulster but on the clear understanding that his power was limited to that of a subject of the monarch.

THE PLANTATION OF ULSTER

The end of the Elizabethan wars in Ireland was accompanied by the death of the queen. Her successor, James Stuart, king of Scotland, became the first monarch to rule all three kingdoms within the British Isles. The new reign also witnessed the most comprehensive policy of plantation to affect Ireland.⁹ James became an ardent proponent of plantation,

⁸ Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Suffolk, 1993), p. 219.

⁹ Earlier plantation schemes dated back to the reign of Mary I in the mid-1550s. In an attempt to extend English influence in Ireland, the counties of Leix and Offaly had been confiscated and were renamed as Queen's County and King's County. Although limited in its success, this enterprise helped pave the way for further plantation projects. The most notable of these occurred during the reign of Elizabeth when private enterprises in the 1570s under Sir Thomas Smith and the Earl of Essex respectively, attempted to establish greater control over Ulster. These attempts, however, proved short-lived and ineffective. See for example, Philip S. Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Dublin, 1984), pp. 43-52. The most successful attempt at plantation in Elizabethan Ireland occurred shortly after the

and his enthusiasm was shared by a Dublin administration dominated by New English Protestants determined to reduce any remnant of independence that still existed in Ulster.¹⁰ By 1607, this had become evident to O'Neill, who was faced with the threat of a provincial presidency being established within the province similar to those that had been set up in Munster and Connaught. Rather than surrender his independence, on 4 September O'Neill, along with the earl of Tyrconnell and approximately one hundred followers sailed for the continent.¹¹ It was the 'flight of the earls' rather than their submission in 1603 that marked the end of the old order.¹² The manner of their departure guaranteed that their estates would be forfeit to the crown. Six counties within the province - Armagh, Cavan, Coleraine (later renamed Londonderry), Donegal, Fermanagh and Tyrone, now provided the authorities the opportunity to settle much of Ulster with English and Scottish Protestants.¹³ Moreover, a sudden but short-lived insurrection in the north-west of the province during the spring of 1608 confirmed to the administration that plantation was necessary in order to establish complete control over the Northern Irish.

failed Desmond uprising in the southern province of Munster. From 1586-1598 efforts were made to attract Protestant immigrants to some six hundred thousand acres of escheated land. By 1598, some 4,000 settlers had migrated from England to avail themselves of new opportunities. Nevertheless, this relatively small population could not withstand the onslaught of Tyrone's rebellion and the plantation for a short time thereafter faced the threat of extinction. For a comprehensive history of the Munster Plantation, see Michael MacCarthy-Morrogh, *The Munster Plantation: English Migration to Southern Ireland, 1583-1641* (Oxford, 1986).

¹⁰ M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London, 1973), pp. 74-75.

¹¹ Nicholas Canny, "The Flight of the Earls 1607," *Irish Historical Studies* 17 (1971), pp. 380-399. Conversely, John McCavitt has argued recently that O'Neill's flight to the continent was precipitated by the fact that the earl had had re-entered conspiratorial designs for a new Catholic revolt in Ireland. John McCavitt, "The political background to the Ulster Plantation, 1607-1620," in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta (Belfast, 1993), p. 10.

¹² Beckett, *Modern Ireland*, p. 44.

¹³ From the time of James' accession, the eastern counties of Down and Antrim had already begun to undergo the process of plantation by predominantly Scottish settlers under private enterprises instituted by Hugh Montgomery and James Hamilton. For details of this early migration see Perceval-Maxwell, *Scottish Migration to Ulster*, pp. 46-67, and Raymond Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster, 1600-1641* (Cork, 1985).

By means of the plantation of Ulster the crown granted the greater part of escheated lands to undertakers, servitors and native grantees. Approximately one hundred English and Scottish undertakers received lots of between one to three thousand acres of land. In return, they agreed to establish residence by 1610, and by 1613 to have satisfied a series of building and settlement conditions.¹⁴ These provisions included prohibiting Irish tenants from working or living on the new plantations. The servitors, generally comprised of state officials who had seen military service in Ireland, received similar, though, smaller estates. Although encouraged to plant with English or Scottish tenants, this group was given some latitude in retaining Irish tenants in return for a higher rent.¹⁵ Much of the land that remained was granted in lesser lots to native landowners in the province who paid double rent for their holdings and who were provided with little security in the way of tenure.¹⁶ Plantation was not left entirely to individual undertakers or servitors. The city of London was also encouraged to participate and joined the process in 1610. Organized as a joint-stock enterprise, this project was supported by a number of city companies that undertook to plant the county of Londonderry with similar provisos to those that applied to individual undertakers.¹⁷

Undertakers found it difficult to conform to the terms to which they had agreed. This was evident in their failure to banish the Irish from the plantations. Even though many natives were driven from their lands, others were permitted to stay either as

¹⁴ Aidan Clarke and R. Dudley Edwards, "Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question, 1603-23," in *New History of Ireland*, (hereafter *NHI*) ed. T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (Oxford, 1976), vol. iii, pp. 197-203; Robinson, *Plantation of Ulster*, pp. 77-80.

¹⁵ Robinson, *Plantation of Ulster*, pp. 72-75.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-77, 199-201; Clarke, "Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question," p. 200.

¹⁷ For a comprehensive history of the Londonderry plantation see T.W. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation 1609-41: The City of London and the Plantation in Ulster* (Belfast, 1939).

laborers or as tenants. Irish tenants often proved more attractive to the new landowners since they could be charged higher rents, while the problems associated with attracting settlers from across the water were averted.¹⁸ As a result, although approximately 14,500 English and Scottish adult males had settled in Ulster by 1622, these numbers were not sufficient to effectively colonize the province.¹⁹ Thus, the proposed Protestant plantation was from the beginning impregnated with native Catholics, and these disparate populations were forced to coexist amidst cultural, linguistic and religious differences.

The Ulster Irish were not the only group to suffer from the crown's plantation program. From 1611, James began to challenge rights to land ownership elsewhere in Ireland. In counties such as Wexford, Longford and Leitrim, landholders were often forced to cede parts of their estates to the crown that were then made available for English or Scottish planters. Furthermore, plantations such as Munster enjoyed a new lease on life. This plantation, which had all but collapsed in 1598 following O'Neill's rebellion, prospered to such an extent that, by 1622 an estimated 14,000 New English settlers had migrated to the province. By 1641, their numbers had increased to 22,000.²⁰ Clearly, James' reign witnessed plantation taking root in a number of important regions, notably in Ulster and Munster. As importantly, the qualified success of these programs provided the crown with further opportunities to expand English rule throughout Ireland.

To complete a more comprehensive campaign of Anglicization, the king recognized that greater political and religious control needed to take place. To this end, the Catholic majority that prevailed within the Irish House of Commons was overturned.

¹⁸ Clarke, "Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question," pp. 203-204.

¹⁹ Robinson, *Plantation of Ulster*, p. 104.

²⁰ MacCarthy-Morrogh, *The Munster Plantation*, p. 260.

Forty new boroughs were created in areas settled by New English or Scottish Protestants, which resulted in eighty-two additional seats for the house, almost half of them being apportioned to Ulster.²¹ The parliamentary elections of 1613 thus saw a majority of Protestants returned to the Commons (132-100), at the expense of the Old English and those few Irish who became MPs. Evidence of the new political order was that, of the sixty-four seats in Ulster, Catholics secured only one of these seats.²² It was clearly colonial Ireland that was now represented in the lower house, giving the government the means to destroy the political influence of the Old English.²³

Alarmed that New English dominance of the Irish commons would lead to anti-Catholic legislation, the Old English withdrew from the house and complained to the king that the parliamentary elections had discriminated against them. A compromise was eventually reached that reduced the Protestant majority, although this did not necessarily guarantee that Catholics would escape prejudicial legislation. Nonetheless, the crown, concerned that such measures could spark rebellion, leaned toward restraint in the enforcement of recusancy laws. Also, by the early 1620s, James's foreign policy was intent upon securing a proposed Spanish match for Prince Charles. This, and the recognition that persecution was likely to lead to civil unrest, discouraged the state from responding to demands by the New English for the suppression of Irish Catholicism. Even when the match foundered, the king, despite occasional proclamations against Catholics, continued to promote a policy of *de facto* toleration towards them.²⁴

²¹ Clarke "Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question," p. 213.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 214.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Ford, "The Protestant Reformation in Ireland," p. 59.

CHARLES I AND THE GRACES

The accession of Charles I in March 1625 presented the Old English with the opportunity to prove that they could be loyal subjects to the crown while continuing to adhere to their faith. Shortly after ascending the throne, the new king became embroiled in wars with both France and Spain - conflicts that he had few resources to fight. Ireland compounded his problems. The crown could not afford the possibility of native insurrection, nor could it allow the island to be used as a platform for a Spanish-led invasion of England.²⁵ With these considerations, the king abandoned the idea of a repressive policy against Catholicism in Ireland.

In 1626, Charles tentatively agreed to a series of concessions with the Old English in return for their pledge to underwrite the military defense of the island. Collectively known as the 'matters of grace and bounty,' these concessions ranged from suspending recusancy fines, to shelving the requirement that individuals who wished to inherit property, hold political office or practice law, had to take the oath of supremacy. This oath would be replaced by an oath of allegiance to the crown that would not force Catholics to reject Papal supremacy.²⁶ Conversely, the New English perceived that such proposals could threaten their political and religious dominance. Though few Catholics had been forced to pay recusancy fines, they remained a symbol of the state's refusal to recognize Catholicism, while the oath of supremacy had been an important requisite in allowing the New English to monopolize political power.²⁷

²⁵ Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 28-29.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37; *idem*, "Selling royal favours, 1624-32," in *NHI*, iii, pp. 234 -235.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

In actuality, the fore-mentioned concessions did not guarantee that they were granted. In January 1628, a delegation of Old English and New English representatives arrived in England to negotiate these issues with crown officials. By May, both parties had agreed to fifty-one 'Instructions and Graces' in return for the promise of three annual subsidies of 40,000 pounds to the crown.²⁸ The Graces ranged from minor regulations on matters of bureaucratic reform to fundamental policy changes. To placate the New English, recusancy laws remained intact and admission for Catholics to public office denied. Nevertheless, Catholics could inherit their estates by taking an oath of allegiance rather than the oath of supremacy.²⁹ Most importantly, in order to satisfy Old English claims for confirmation of their estates, the king agreed that the Irish parliament could apply the English Concealment Act of 1624, which stated that sixty years' possession of an estate validated a good title.³⁰ If applied to Irish society, this measure would not only grant security to most Catholic landowners in Ireland but it could also result in curtailing future Protestant settlements.

Even though the Old English had secured these concessions from the king, it was up to the Irish parliament to ratify them. Unfortunately for this group, under the terms of Poynings' Law - an act passed in 1494 before Ireland had been elevated to the status of a kingdom - this proved to be a major obstacle. Constituted to prevent the Irish executive from challenging the power of the English crown, Poynings' Law stated that all proposed legislation submitted to the Irish parliament by the executive be first submitted to the

²⁸ Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 44 -47.

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 47-48, 238-254; idem, "Royal favours," pp. 237-238.

³⁰ Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 52-53; Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford, 1991), p. 380.

king and his council in England for prior approval.³¹ Lord Falkland, the Irish lord deputy, called elections for a new parliament in October 1628 to confirm the Graces, but failed to follow procedure properly. Faced with the fact that legislative ratification of the Graces would consequently be declared null and void, Falkland postponed the meeting of the Irish parliament indefinitely.³² Despite the fact that a number of the Graces were in time honored by the government, the Dublin government used this technicality to suspend statutory confirmation of the most important concessions, notably granting security of land tenure to the Old English. Failure to do so remained a source of grievance to this faction for years to come.³³

WENTWORTH IN IRELAND

By 1629, peace arrangements with both France and Spain not only allowed Charles to dispense with his parliament at Westminster, but they also afforded him greater opportunity to extend crown power in England and Scotland. Similarly, in 1632 the king appointed Thomas Wentworth as lord deputy of Ireland, who through a program of 'thorough' government executed a form of rule whereby the fiscal, political and religious interests of the crown were enforced, while the interests of all factions in Irish society were undermined.³⁴ Wentworth made his intent clear from the onset of his arrival in Ireland in July 1633, when he attempted to establish a deputy's party within the Irish parliament. He believed that by doing so he could create a balance between the Old English and the New English factions within the Commons, thereby preventing either

³¹ M. Perceval-Maxwell, "Ireland and the Monarchy in the Early Stuart Multiple Kingdom," *Historical Journal* 34 (1991), p. 280.

³² Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 54-57; Perceval-Maxwell, "Ireland and the Monarchy," p. 284; Clarke, "Royal favours," pp. 239-240.

³³ Clarke, "Royal favours," p. 240; idem, *Old English*, pp. 57-59.

³⁴ Hugh Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland, 1633-41: A Study in Absolutism* (Manchester, 1959), pp. 6-7.

party from forming an alliance against him.³⁵ By the summer of 1634, he had succeeded. Although there were 112 Catholic representatives in the Lower House, more than one third of the 142 Protestant members were connected to Wentworth's government. Thus, as long as the Commons divided along religious lines, neither group could secure a majority without the support of the administration.³⁶ It was his goal, he noted, to "bow and govern the Native by the Planter and the Planter by the Native."³⁷ In attempting to fulfill this objective, however, the lord deputy alienated all principal elements in Irish politics.

If Wentworth hoped to operate unconstrained by party interests, it was important that he not only balance the budget, but that he also raise enough income to guarantee financial independence for the executive.³⁸ Accordingly, he increased the efficiency of the financial machinery already at his disposal. He succeeded to such an extent that during his tenure revenues grew one hundred per cent.³⁹ Moreover, by 1638 crown income had not only exceeded expenditure, but much of the government's debt had been paid off. As importantly, this financial success encouraged him to implement political and religious policies that would have far-reaching consequences.⁴⁰

The lord deputy's refusal to allow the Graces to receive statutory confirmation by parliament was particularly troubling for the Old English. This became evident in 1635, when he proposed to continue the crown's policy of plantation and re-settlement in the

³⁵ Ibid., p. 43.

³⁶ Clarke, *Old English*, p. 80.

³⁷ *Strafford's Letters*, vol. i, p. 199 cited by Kearney in *Strafford*, pp. 43-44.

³⁸ Aidan Clarke, "The Government of Wentworth, 1632-1640," in *NHI*, iii. p. 246; idem, *Old English*, pp. 77-78.

³⁹ Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 169-170.

⁴⁰ For a fuller examination of Wentworth's economic policies, see Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 130-170.

western province of Connaught. Royal claims to the province were submitted and received confirmation by Grand Juries in the counties of Roscommon, Mayo and Sligo.⁴¹ Nevertheless, the jury in County Galway - an area that was home to the earls of Clanricard, one of the most prominent Old English families - rejected the crown's title to much of this land. It was only after intimidation from the executive that the Galway jury reversed its decision in 1636, thus opening the province for resettlement.⁴² Yet it was the manner in which the Old English in Galway had been treated that created the greatest concerns. Proposals for the plantation had made no distinction between this group and the native Irish, and convinced the Old English that their loyalty and the safeguard of their interests had ceased to be important concerns for the Dublin administration.⁴³

If it was the issue of land titles that alienated the Old English from Wentworth, then it was his religious policies that created the most bitterness among the New English.⁴⁴ William Laud was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, and Laud was determined to impose greater conformity upon the church in all three kingdoms using the power of the state to attain this end. In England this meant using the Court of Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission to discipline the puritan faction within the established church who opposed Laud's concurrent policy of imposing conformity to a ritual which looked suspiciously 'popish'. In Scotland, the same policy led to the introduction of the Scottish prayerbook and the covenanting reaction, and similarly, in Ireland Wentworth was encouraged to impose Laudian order on the church. By 1635, a

⁴¹ Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 92-93.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 94-102; *idem*, "Government of Wentworth," pp. 253-256.

⁴³ Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 102-103; Clarke, *Old English*, p. 110.

⁴⁴ Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 104.

Court of High Commission had been established in Dublin along the lines of its English counterpart, and five years later the Calvinistic episcopate convinced the New English that, not only was the implementation of Laudian reforms the foundation for a return to Popery, but more importantly, their political supremacy in Ireland would be jeopardized.⁴⁵ To add insult to injury, Catholics continued to receive *de facto* toleration from an administration that was convinced it was politically expedient to do so.⁴⁶

The New English also became estranged by Wentworth's decision to utilize Laudian policy to address the financial needs of the church in Ireland. In seeking to recover former church property secularized since the Reformation, the holdings of a number of New English settlers came under threat. Since many of their estates had been recent acquisitions, these landowners often relied upon the security of the common law system to guarantee them tenure. Nonetheless, the executive subjected them to a systematic violation of this system in an attempt to undermine their titles.⁴⁷ Evidently, no landowner in Ireland, regardless of his religious persuasion, could feel completely secure under Wentworth's administration.

By 1638, the lord deputy had alienated all the chief political groups in Irish society. Wentworth may have enjoyed unconditional support from the crown in carrying out these programs, but most likely, they were policies that had been conceived in England without concern for existing interests in Ireland.⁴⁸ However, by this juncture,

⁴⁵ Terence Ranger, "Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation," in *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660*, ed. Trevor Aston (New York, 1965), p. 278.

⁴⁶ Clarke, "Government of Wentworth," pp. 256-257; Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 119.

⁴⁷ Ranger, "Strafford in Ireland," pp. 279-290.

⁴⁸ Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 220.

Charles's attempts to impose religious conformity on his subjects in Scotland presented a crisis for the monarchy that ultimately undermined Wentworth's authority in Ireland.

THE SCOTTISH CRISIS

If ever there was clear evidence of the problems involved in ruling multiple kingdoms, then the Scottish crisis that developed in the summer of 1637 provides it. For, as it transpired, events in this kingdom played an important destabilization role in both England and Ireland - testimony of the fact that events in one kingdom could influence affairs in the other two.⁴⁹

In July 1637, Charles attempted to impose on the Scots the new prayerbook, based on the English model. Determined that 'mass' would never be tolerated, the Scots revolted.⁵⁰ By February 1638, such was the opposition to this Laudian reform that a National Covenant had been drawn up which bound the signatories to uphold and defend the reformed religion of the church in Scotland against the re-establishment of the 'Popish religion.'⁵¹ Matters had so escalated by June 1639 that Charles attempted to assert his royal authority by mounting an ill-conceived and inadequately financed

⁴⁹ Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), p. 27. It is not my intent here to give a detailed account of the Scottish conflict, nor of the crisis that it precipitated in both England and Ireland. These issues have been fully addressed in a number of recent histories. For example, see David Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution, 1637-1644: The Triumph of the Covenanters* (Newton Abbot, 1973); M. Perceval-Maxwell, "Ireland and the Monarchy in the Early Stuart Multiple Kingdom," pp. 279-295; idem, "Ulster 1641 in the Context of Political Developments in the Three Kingdoms," in *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, ed. Brian MacCurta (Belfast, 1993), pp. 93-106; idem, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*, (Montreal, 1994); Conrad Russell, "The British problem and the English civil war," *History* 72 (1987), pp. 395-415; idem, "The British Background to the Irish Rebellion," *Historical Research* 61 (1988), pp. 166-182; idem, *Causes of the English Civil War*; idem, *Fall of the British Monarchies*; Anne Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (London, 1991), pp. 9-61; Derek Hirst *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658* (London, 1986), pp. 188-220; Martyn Bennett, *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638-1651* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 1-81

⁵⁰ Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, 10 vols. (London, 1901), vol. viii, pp. 314-315.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 329-333.

military campaign against the Covenanters. The failure of this expedition had significant repercussions for the monarchy, particularly in relation to its Irish kingdom.

From the onset, Ireland had been drawn into the Scottish crisis. This was particularly so for Ulster, a province that had witnessed substantial settlement by Scots in recent years. Viewed by Wentworth as a potential fifth column, the lord deputy feared that this faction could provide armed support for their co-religionists in Scotland. Accordingly, troops from the lord deputy's new army in Ireland - the rank and file of which being predominantly Catholic - were stationed in the north-east of the province during the winter of 1638-39.⁵² In May 1639, Wentworth imposed the 'Black Oath' upon all Scots in Ulster aged sixteen and older that required them to renounce the Covenant and swear allegiance to the king. It was hoped that such measures would force the most hardened of them to return to their homeland.⁵³ More importantly, the forcing of a truce by Scottish forces in the summer of 1639 compelled the king in September to recall his lord deputy from Dublin to organize the next effort to impose his will. Over the next several months Wentworth played a pivotal role in the king's council, his significance being made evident when he was made earl of Strafford and promoted to lord lieutenant of Ireland in January 1640.⁵⁴ As Strafford became the central figure in Charles's government, however, Irish affairs became inextricably connected with events in England and Scotland.⁵⁵

⁵² Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 187.

⁵³ Clarke, "Government of Wentworth," p. 268.

⁵⁴ Gardiner, *History of England*, ix, p. 83.

⁵⁵ Perceval-Maxwell, "Ulster 1641," p. 96.

Upon his return to England, Strafford convinced the king that a sizable force was needed to restore order against the Scots. To obtain sufficient funds for this purpose, he encouraged him to summon both his Irish and English parliaments in the spring of 1640. In March, the lord lieutenant returned to Ireland and presided over a Commons that voted four subsidies of 45,000 pounds each to pay for a new Irish army that would consist of 1,000 horse and 8,000 foot.⁵⁶ The English parliament, meanwhile, which met at Westminster on April 13, did not prove as cooperative. By convening this body, Charles in effect had ended the crown's 'eleven years tyranny,' a period of personal rule by the monarchy without the summoning of a parliament. When assembled, many of its members refused to grant the king assistance against the Scots until he addressed a series of financial, religious and political grievances. Reaction by Charles was swift. The king dissolved the 'Short Parliament' on 5 May, and he engaged the Scottish army on 28 August, without the men and money that he badly needed. To compound his problems, Charles's Irish troops had not yet departed Ireland.⁵⁷ With these limitations, the crown's forces retreated before the advancing Covenanter army at Newburn, and the Scots occupied the two northern counties of England, upon which they levied 850 pounds a day.⁵⁸ Financially destitute, the king was forced to summon another parliament on 3 November 1640.

THE FALL OF STRAFFORD

The events that transpired in England from the spring of 1640 had significant repercussions for Ireland. Having returned again to London in April, Strafford's Dublin

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 97; Clarke, *Old English*, p. 126.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 131-132.

⁵⁸ Gardiner, *History of England*, ix, p. 203.

regime began to disintegrate in his absence. By June, his government (under the supervision of Sir Christopher Wandesford) was struggling to contain an informal alliance that had now developed in the Irish parliament between the Old English and the New English.⁵⁹ This union found common ground in their opposition to the arbitrary manner by which the earl had governed. Indeed, as Conrad Russell has noted, "Strafford appears to have achieved the distinction of being perhaps the only Englishman to have obliterated the religious divide in Irish politics."⁶⁰ Faced with growing discontent, Wandesford prorogued the Dublin Parliament from 17 June until 1 October. Shortly after it was recalled, however, a Petition of Remonstrance was drafted that expressed the grievances of both factions. Complaints ranged from the failure of the administration to grant security of land tenure, to the establishment of the Court of High Commission, which reflected the fact that the Remonstrance was neither exclusively Old English nor New English.⁶¹ Even more importantly, their counterparts who now sat at Westminster welcomed such criticisms.

When the Long Parliament assembled in November, Irish affairs had become a matter of great significance. Under the influence of John Pym, one of the most militant critics of the crown within the English House of Commons, Strafford was increasingly linked to a fear of Catholicism, particularly in light of the composition of the new army he had created in Ireland.⁶² It was especially troublesome that although this army had not been prepared in time to serve the king against the Scots, it could still be used in

⁵⁹ Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 189-196.

⁶⁰ Russell, *British Monarchies*, pp. 382-383.

⁶¹ Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 201-202.

⁶² Perceval-Maxwell, "Ulster 1641," pp. 101-102.

Scotland, or worse yet, England.⁶³ As a result, many MPs regarded Strafford's executive as a threat to the security of England and wanted him held accountable. Such sentiment gave momentum to a campaign to impeach the earl for treason.⁶⁴ Although this crusade originated in England, it was strengthened by the close cooperation of Strafford's Irish opponents, irrespective of their religious persuasion.⁶⁵ A parliamentary committee of thirteen delegates that represented both Old English and New English interests was sent to London in December 1640 to assist in the destruction of the lord lieutenant's monopoly over Irish government. Their influence soon became evident in the fact that sixteen of the twenty-eight indictments against the earl related to his Irish administration.⁶⁶ After a trial that lasted several weeks and the replacement of the impeachment process by an Act of attainder, Strafford was declared guilty of treason, and executed on 12 May 1641. Meanwhile, executive power in Ireland had been delegated to two New English lord justices, Sir William Parsons and Sir John Borlase, both of whom were committed to the puritan ascendancy in that kingdom.

Strafford's trial had raised a number of important constitutional issues. These included the nature of executive authority in Ireland and the relationship between the crown's English and Irish kingdoms. The earl's administration had proved powerful enough to have had subverted the political process in Ireland, a problem that clearly needed to be addressed.⁶⁷ Recent events in England, moreover, convinced the Old English of the need to assert Irish legislative independence, and as the House of

⁶³ Aidan Clarke, "The breakdown of authority, 1640-41," in *NHI*, iii, pp. 278-279.

⁶⁴ Perceval-Maxwell, "Ulster 1641," p. 98.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 100; Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 133-134.

⁶⁶ Clarke, "Breakdown of authority," p. 282.

⁶⁷ Clarke, *Old English*, p. 139.

Commons at Westminster increasingly usurped the prerogative of the crown, this faction feared that the authority of the Irish legislature would also be undermined. Although the Old English were the driving force, in February 1641 a 'constitutionalist' coalition within the Irish parliament drafted a statement of twenty-two grievances or 'queries,' which not only questioned the legality of recent governmental practices, but also attempted to define the limits of executive authority in Ireland.⁶⁸ In this context, it was maintained that Ireland had been annexed to the crown of England, not to the parliament of England. As such, although the English council's role was recognized in the administration of Ireland, it was acknowledgment that the English legislature had no such role in Irish government.⁶⁹ But the primary concern at Westminster was not to effect legislative control over Ireland, but rather to limit the power of the monarchy in England. To this end, restraining the executive in Ireland was generally deemed to be more important to the English Commons than the constitutional relationship between the two parliaments.⁷⁰ Thus as Aidan Clarke has suggested, it was not the relationship of the Dublin and London legislatures that was at issue, but the relationship of the executive to the law.⁷¹

THE OUTBREAK OF REBELLION

Strafford's trial had helped promote closer cooperation between the principal parties in Irish politics. But his execution created division and dissent. By the summer of 1641, conflicting attitudes to the important issues of land and religion saw this spirit of collaboration between the Old English and some of the New English dissipate. For

⁶⁸ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 123-124; idem, "Ireland and the Monarchy," pp. 291-293; Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 141-142.

⁶⁹ Clarke, *Old English*, p. 148; Perceval-Maxwell, "Ireland and the Monarchy," p. 291.

⁷⁰ Perceval-Maxwell, "Ireland and the Monarchy," p. 291; idem, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 165, 168.

⁷¹ Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 148-149.

several months the representatives of the Irish Commons in London had lobbied the king for measures that would guarantee them valid titles to their estates. It appeared that their efforts had finally borne fruit by August, when most of these legislators returned to Ireland with the necessary bills, confident that statutory confirmation by the Irish legislature would occur before the current session of the Dublin parliament had ended. However, Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus, and fellow members of the faction of the New English who (after Strafford's impeachment) controlled the crown's council in Ireland, hindered these designs. Aware that successful ratification could end the plantation process, from which they had prospered, as part of their stratagem to delay the passage of the bills through the Dublin legislature, the Irish parliament was prorogued in August.⁷² This ensured that, until 9 November at least, when the next session of this body was scheduled to meet, no settlement over security of land tenure could be obtained.⁷³

By August 1641, the Old English had also become concerned over the condition of their religious liberties. Under Strafford, they had enjoyed tacit toleration. Yet the growing tide of anti-Catholic sentiment that accompanied proceedings against the earl at Westminster convinced Pym and his associates of the need to suppress popish interests in all three of Charles's kingdoms, particularly Ireland. This was evident in the articles of impeachment drawn up against Strafford, whereby the grievances of the New English were included at the expense of Old English concerns.⁷⁴ The appointment of Parsons and

⁷² Russell, "British Background to the Irish Rebellion," pp. 174-175; Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 158-159; idem, "Ulster 1641," p. 104.

⁷³ Meanwhile, the Parsons and Loftus camp on the Irish council lobbied their counterparts on the English council to convince the king into proroguing the Irish parliament to the end of February 1642. Although Charles agreed to this in October, the order arrived in Ireland after the rebellion had broken out. Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 160-161.

⁷⁴ Kearney, *Strafford*, p. 202.

Borlase no doubt compounded these fears. There was some optimism by August when the earl of Leicester, who had been commissioned as Ireland's new lord lieutenant in May, gained the respect of the Old English after his appointment had created initial alarm among them. Any hope, however, that Leicester could have resolved the principal grievances of this faction dissipated when Charles decided to return him to his diplomatic post in France.⁷⁵ Tensions increased further during negotiations between the English and Scottish commissioners throughout the summer, when the Scots desired that religious uniformity fashioned on the church in Scotland be established in all three kingdoms, a view not unwelcome in some corners of the English Commons.⁷⁶

Throughout 1640-41 the welfare and grievances of the native Irish had been postponed. Politically isolated, this faction had become increasingly alarmed over the growth of anti-Catholic sentiment in England. This insecurity was heightened when a number of Ulster Protestants presented Westminster with two petitions in the spring and summer of 1641 that supported the Root and Branch Bill. If passed, this bill would not only abolish episcopacy throughout the Stuart kingdoms, but more importantly, it convinced Irish Catholics that after the puritans had imposed a Calvinistic order on the established church in Ireland, they would proceed to extirpate their religion.⁷⁷ Many natives now concluded that the use of force was the only recourse available to defend their faith against the swell of anti-Popery now prevalent in England.⁷⁸ Clearly, the precedent established by the Scots, who had revolted in defense of their creed, convinced

⁷⁵ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 106-108.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 163; *idem*, "Ulster 1641," p. 103.

⁷⁷ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 113-114.

⁷⁸ Perceval-Maxwell, "Ulster 1641," pp. 104-106.

a number of Ulster lords that they too could rise up to protect their religious freedom.⁷⁹

This resolve was compounded by a series of poor harvests in Ireland during the late 1630s, which had helped create an economic crisis. Native landholders in Ulster, who had been forced to borrow heavily or sell some of their land to remain solvent, were particularly hard hit.⁸⁰ In fact, their plight was further exacerbated by the advent of the political crisis in Scotland, which severely undermined the traditionally strong trade links that had existed between the province and Scottish markets.⁸¹

Although native conspiracies dated to February 1641, it was not until October that a cabal headed by Sir Phelim O'Neill, Lord Maguire and Rory O'More launched their rebellion. The participants had two principal objectives. First, Maguire and O'More were to seize Dublin Castle on 23 October, thereby disabling the administration. Second, O'Neill, taking advantage of the religious and economic discontentment that existed throughout Ulster, would lead a much larger rebellion in the north.⁸² The Dublin coup, however, failed before it got under way. Plans to take the castle were leaked to the lord justices on the evening of 22 October by a relation of Hugh MacMahon, one of the leading conspirators. As a result, Maguire, MacMahon, and approximately thirty others were arrested, which destroyed any hopes of the rebels taking Dublin.⁸³ Without knowledge of this, the rising in Ulster proceeded.

⁷⁹ Raymond Gillespie, "The End of an Era: Ulster and the outbreak of the 1641 rising" in *Natives and Newcomers*, p. 200.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 195; Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 45.

⁸¹ Gillespie, "Ulster and the outbreak of the 1641 rising," pp. 205-207; Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 41-43.

⁸² Patrick J. Corish, "The rising of 1641 and the catholic confederacy, 1641-5," in *NHI*, iii, pp. 290-291.

⁸³ Gillespie, "Ulster and the outbreak of the 1641 rising," p. 204.

CHAPTER TWO

NEWSBOOKS AND THE OUTBREAK OF THE REBELLION

NOVEMBER 1641-AUGUST 1642

Although the plan to seize Dublin Castle was foiled by Owen O'Connolly on 22 October, the insurrection in Ulster continued under the leadership of Sir Philim O'Neill. Taken by surprise, within days much of the province had succumbed to the insurgents. From Ulster, the revolt spread southward. Dundalk was captured on 31 October, Ardee a few days later, and by mid-November Irish forces were threatening Drogheda.¹ The defeat of government forces at Julianstown on 29 November, however, helped turn the rebellion into a nationwide affair. This debacle highlighted the weakness of a Dublin government ill equipped to defend the interests of Catholics and Protestants alike.² It further compounded the frustrations of the Old English in their failure to obtain protection for their estates during the November session of the Irish parliament. After being reassured by Irish commanders that they remained loyal to the king, the Old English lords of the Pale joined the rebellion in mid-December.³ By March, although motives may have varied from place to place, the rebellion enjoyed support from the majority of Old English communities in the remaining southern counties.⁴

¹ Corish, "Rising of 1641 and the Catholic confederacy," pp. 292-293.

² Thomas Carte, *An History of the Life of James Duke of Ormond*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1851), vol. ii, pp. 97-100; Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 176-178.

³ For a detailed account of this defection by the Old English see Clarke, *Old English*, pp. 171-192, and Micheál Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland 1642-1649* (Dublin, 1999), p. 25.

⁴ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 246-260.

THE GRAND REMONSTRANCE AND THE OUTBREAK OF REBELLION

On 1 November, dispatches from the lord justices in Ireland informed both houses of parliament in London of the rebellion. The news arrived at a time when John Pym and fellow militants in the English Commons were attempting to curtail the power of the crown by preparing the Grand Remonstrance. The Remonstrance, which was a sweeping indictment of Charles's rule up to this point, was based upon Pym's belief that "malignant Papists, bishops and evil counselors" were at the root of the differences that divided king and parliament.⁵ The divisions at Westminster over the Remonstrance were compounded by news from Ireland. For, although Parliament quickly voted that an army of 8,000 men was to be raised, and that 50,000 pounds was to be borrowed for the suppression of the revolt, the question remained who should control these resources.⁶ Doubtless, many MPs were reluctant to trust Charles with an army that could be used over time against them.

By 11 November it was clear that the Commons wanted to hear about Ireland, and not about the Remonstrance.⁷ On that day the House received letters from Ireland, which insisted, unless substantial relief was sent, that kingdom would shortly be lost. While this news was being discussed, it was suggested that the Scottish army of 1,000 men, which had been proposed on 4 November as a response to the revolt, be increased to 10,000 men.⁸ The House of Lords opposed this for fear that it could result in the Scots gaining too much hegemony in Ireland. Indeed, the Lords would only consent to a Scottish force being

⁵ Gardiner, *History of England*, x, p. 60.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 55, 69.

shipped to Ireland on condition that an equal number of English troops were sent.⁹ Thus it was not until 21 December that the two houses at Westminster voted that both England and Scotland should each supply an army of 10,000 men to crush the revolt.¹⁰ The climate of distrust created over raising expedient relief for Ireland was further compounded by financial restraints. As a result, less than 1,700 pounds and only 1,400 men reached Ireland by the end of the year.¹¹ This meager support guaranteed that the rebellion would not be short lived. Captain Edmund Verney acknowledged this in Ireland on 11 January 1642, when he wrote to his brother Ralph, a member of the House of Commons. He remarked, "Had you sent 10,000 men 6 or 8 weeks since, I dare say the rebells had beene repelled by this, and now, for ought I know, it may last you many a yeare."¹²

News of the Irish rebellion further heightened the debate over the Remonstrance. Pym implied that this insurrection was part of a popish conspiracy that could be traced back to the court, and unless the king's 'evil counselors' were removed, the House would be forced to take full responsibility for the crushing it.¹³ After heated debate, the Remonstrance passed on 22 November in favor of Pym, 159-148.¹⁴ Such was the acrimony surrounding the vote, however, that one MP maintained that "we had all sat in the valley of the shadow of death; for we... had caught at each other's locks, and sheathed

⁹ For details of these issues see Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 265-269, and Hugh Hazlett, "The recruitment and organization of the Scottish army in Ulster, 1642-9," in *Essays in British and Irish history in honour of James Eadie Todd*, ed. H.A. Cronne, T.W. Moody and D.B. Quinn (London, 1949), particularly pp. 107-117.

¹⁰ Gardiner, *History of England*, x, p. 69.

¹¹ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 279.

¹² Francis Parthenope Verney, and Margaret M. Verney, eds, *Memoirs of the Verney Family during the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (London, 1907), vol. 1, p. 280.

¹³ Gardiner, *History of England*, x, pp. 55, 63.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

our swords in each other's bowells."¹⁵ But the slim majority by which it was approved convinced Pym and like-minded opponents of the crown of the necessity of securing popular support for their aims. For this reason, it was important to present recent parliamentary proceedings in a manner that would promote both the institution and specific individuals to the nation.¹⁶ Thus the tensions created by the debate over the Grand Remonstrance, and a demand for news of Ireland guaranteed that the nation was ripe for periodicals that focused on domestic affairs. As Joad Raymond concluded, "The Irish Rebellion and the Grand Remonstrance are the two events which precipitated the newsbook. The former created a situation in which news was a more valuable commodity... the latter created the parliamentary initiative to intervene in and address a public sphere of political concern."¹⁷

HEADS OF SEVERALL PROCEEDINGS

On 29 November 1641, *Heads of Severall Proceedings in this Present Parliament* was introduced to the London news market. Printed in small quarto, it consisted of a title page, a blank verso and six pages of text, which conveyed a scant chronicle of occurrences that had transpired in parliament between 22-27 November.¹⁸ John Thomas was responsible for its publication.¹⁹ A relative newcomer to the news business, Thomas had already gained a reputation for repeated violations against printing ordinances. This was often in relation to printing parliamentary speeches, some of which had been

¹⁵ Cited in Gardiner, *History of England*, x, p. 77.

¹⁶ Joad Raymond, "The Crisis of Eloquence: Reading and Writing English Newsbooks, 1641-1649," (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1994), pp. 76-77.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 61; idem, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 112-120.

¹⁸ *Heads of Severall Proceedings*, 29 Nov. 1641, 181.101\E. 201(1).

¹⁹ Although Thomas was the publisher there is no clear evidence as to who may have edited it. Frank has suggested that Samuel Pecke, a professional news-writer was most likely responsible, but this claim cannot be substantiated. Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 25; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 23.

fabricated.²⁰ Although technically illegal for individual members to disclose the proceedings of parliament to outsiders, MPs had leaked parliamentary speeches from the opening of the Long Parliament, many having been printed with or without the consent of their authors.²¹ In fact, the publication of such speeches, in addition to printed accounts of parliamentary proceedings, formed part of a periodical manuscript service for those readers who were able to pay for it, which according to Raymond, helped pave the way for the first newsbooks to appear.²²

By November, Thomas appears to have established a rapprochement with Pym, one of a number of MPs who chose to leak information when it suited his purposes.²³ Pym would have been a valuable source of information for any newsman of the era, particularly in obtaining news from Ireland. Not only was he a powerful figure in the House of Commons, but he was also a member of the committee on Irish affairs that had been formed by parliament on 3 November 1641 to orchestrate the suppression of the rebellion.²⁴ In its official capacity the committee received correspondence from the Dublin government, and Pym's access to such material may help explain why Thomas was responsible for publishing more pamphlets on the rebellion in November than any of his

²⁰ A.D.T Cromartie, "The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches November 1640-July 1642," *Historical Journal* 33 (1990), p. 38.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 23-44; Sheila Lambert, "The Beginning of Printing for the House of Commons, 1640-42," *Library* 3 (1981), pp. 43-61.

²² The fact that many of these manuscripts contained the generic title 'Diurnall Occurrences' has led Raymond to conclude that it was these works, rather than the corantos that were the antecedents of the newsbooks of 1641. For a full treatment of this issue see Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 100-108.

²³ Cromartie, "Printing of Parliamentary Speeches," p. 25; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 109-110; Lambert, "Printing for the House of Commons," p. 53.

²⁴ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 276-277.

competitors.²⁵ It could also help explain why he decided to launch *Heads of severall proceedings* by the end of that month.

Not surprisingly, news from Ireland and the Commons debate over the Remonstrance received prominence in the first weeks' edition of this newsbook. From the basis of letters that the Commons had received from Ireland, it was the Irish rebellion, however, that captured the headlines. But although the title page alluded to the distress and misery of the Protestants in that kingdom, beyond reporting that the insurgents were pressing hard toward Dublin, no additional details on these developments, or the plight of the settlers were related therein other than what had been headlined.²⁶ Rather, the principal concern of *Heads of Severall Proceedings* was not for the welfare of the Protestants in Ireland, but rather the threat that the uprising posed for the Protestants in England. Reports that the Irish were expecting arms and provisions from their co-religionists in England, France and Spain suggested that the rebellion was part of a much larger conspiracy.²⁷ These fears were compounded by news from Ireland that intimated the rebellion would spark a similar revolt by Catholics in England designed to effect the destruction of Protestantism in that kingdom.²⁸

After presenting this news, the editor turned his attention toward recent developments at Westminster. He addressed the debate on the Remonstrance in the

²⁵ For example, *The Last Newes from Ireland Being A Relation of the Hostile and bloody proceedings of Rebellious Papists* (1641), E. 175(2); *A Gun-Powder-Plot in Ireland for the blowing up of the chieftest Church in Dublin* (1641), E. 175(6); *A Late and True Relation from Ireland of the Warlike and bloody Proceedings of the Rebellious Papists in that Kingdome*, (1641), E. 176(16); *More Newes from Ireland: Or, The bloody practices and proceedings of the Papists in that Kingdome at this present*, (1641), E. 177(16).

²⁶ *Heads of Severall Proceedings*, 29 Nov. 1642, 181.101\E. 201(1), [title page].

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

following manner:

After this, in the house of Commons they read the declaration of the state of the Kingdom; and how farre the grievances had been reduced by this Parliament. there was a great debate about divers clauses in it, and it was first put to the question that those clauses wherein the Bishops are tearmed malignant persons to the well-farre, and peace of this Kingdome in the particulars named should be altered, and the house being divided it was carried by the Majors part that it should so stand.

Afterwards the house was twice divided upon the question for the passing of the said Remonstrance without any alteration, and for the publishing thereof, and the greater part carried it, in both there being great oppositions, and debate about it.²⁹

Considering the acrimonious nature surrounding the debate over the Remonstrance the account provided by *Heads of Severall Proceedings* was considerably more subdued. This restraint was a trait that would become a hallmark of serial news over the next several months.³⁰ As importantly, parliament uttered no complaint against Thomas's publication.³¹

On 6 December, Thomas published a second issue of *Heads of Severall Proceedings*. Irish affairs again commanded attention as the title page certified, "Wherein is contayned the votes and Orders in both Houses for sending of ayde and forces into Ireland both for Sea and Land."³² Readers were informed that parliament had received letters from Ireland of the necessity for relief to that kingdom by stressing that the insurgents had not only grown to a great army, but that they "commit many outragious and Hostile Acts."³³ Similar to the previous week's edition, no details were provided on these allegations or on any other aspect of the rebellion for that matter. Nonetheless, the intimation that a massacre against the Protestants was taking place ensured that the

²⁹ Ibid., [pp. 2-3, irregular pagination].

³⁰ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 113-114.

³¹ Ibid., p. 125.

³² *Heads of Severall Proceedings*, 6 Dec. 1641, 181.102\E. 201(2), [title page].

³³ Ibid., p. 1.

emphasis of that week's news was the divers plans by parliament for sending military aid to that kingdom. Of equal importance was the fact that this second issue of *Heads of Severall Proceedings* marked the arrival in England of a serial that was dedicated to covering domestic rather than international news.

EARLY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

The brief monopoly enjoyed by Thomas ended on 13 December. On that date, John Wright and Thomas Bates published *The Diurnall: Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament*.³⁴ Two more newsbooks, *The Diurnall Occvrrances: Or, The Heads of Proceedings in Parliament* for Bates and Francis Coules [Coles], and *Diurnall Occvrrances, Touching the Dayly Proceedings in Parliament* for John Hammond entered the market by the end of 1641.³⁵ In January 1642, sixteen separate titles were published, and although this figure dropped to eleven and eight respectively for the months of February and March, approximately 100 individual newsbooks had been printed in London between 29 November and 28 March.³⁶ Eight pages became standard for each of these serials. The title page often included a synopsis of news that could be found in greater detail within each edition. This in turn was generally arranged in chronological order in accordance with the days of each week. The arrival of *A Trve Diurnall of the Last Weeks Passages in Parliament* on 17 January 1642, moreover, introduced issue

³⁴ *The Diurnal: Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament*, 13 Dec. 1641, 109.1.

³⁵ *The Diurnall Occvrrances: Or, The Heads of Proceedings in Parliament*, 20 Dec. 1641, 103.1; *Diurnall Occvrrances, Touching the Dayly Proceedings in Parliament*, 25 Dec. 1641, 106.1.

³⁶ Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, *British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700. A Short- Title Catalogue of Serials Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America* (New York, 1987), p. 622.

numeration and consecutive pagination from one week to the next, thus helping to consolidate the concept of periodical news.³⁷

For much of this time most newsbooks required an editor, printer and publisher. In general, it was the publisher who occupied the pivotal role in their dissemination.³⁸ They commonly contracted both the editor and the printer, and since most publishers also operated as booksellers, it was at their businesses that the papers were sold. The editors, unlike the publishers, often remained anonymous. Their role was to summarize the principal proceedings that had taken place in parliament, and as such they did not write or contribute their own material.³⁹ Most likely, editors or publishers collated their news from MPs or their confidants in or around Westminster. Thus during these formative months, the newsbooks confined themselves to relating rather tedious accounts of parliamentary proceedings similar to the language that was used by MPs within the chamber of the House.⁴⁰ The most distinguished of these editors was Samuel Pecke, a professional news writer who had his own stall at Westminster Hall.⁴¹ Pecke's first newsbook was published for William Cook on 31 January and was titled *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*.⁴² From 1642-49, this and subsequent serials by Pecke that carried this title became the standard for competitors in providing the fullest details available of parliamentary news.

³⁷ *A True Diurnall of the Last Weeks Passages in Parliament*, no. 1, 17 Jan. 1642, 623.01A.

³⁸ Frank, *English Newspapers*, p. 23; A.N.B. Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War: Their Political Attitudes and Sources of Information," (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1971), p. 18.

³⁹ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 22.

⁴⁰ Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 22-23.

⁴¹ Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 104-105; Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 25.

⁴² *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, 31 Jan. 1642, 507.01\E. 201(12).

For most readers, these early periodicals must have been confusing. With the demise of effective authority over printing, many works appeared with false imprints or even no imprint at all.⁴³ Some titles, moreover, lasted only two or three weeks as publishers habitually formed and dissolved partnerships. On 20 December, for example, Thomas collaborated with Thomas Bates to change *Heads of Severall Proceedings to The Divrnall Occvrrences, Or, The Heads of Severall Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*.⁴⁴ By 3 January, Thomas and Nathaniel Butter were publishing this serial,⁴⁵ but on 21 February, Thomas, the sole publisher once again, renamed it *The Continuation of the Divrnall Occurrences. Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*.⁴⁶ This confusion was compounded by the fact that many newsbooks were similarly named. In January alone, ten London serials contained some variation of 'Diurnall Occurrances' from parliament in their title.⁴⁷ Clearly, nothing attracted public attention more than events at Westminster.⁴⁸ Indeed, over the next several months the demand for this news helped ensure that pioneers such as Thomas, Wright, Bates, Coles, and Cooke continued to publish periodicals for a nation steadily progressing toward civil war.⁴⁹

⁴³ Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 6.

⁴⁴ *Divrnall Occvrrences, Or, The Heads of Severall Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*, 20 Dec. 1641, 181.103\E. 201(3).

⁴⁵ *Divrnall Occvrrences*, 3 Jan. 1642, 181.105\E. 201(5).

⁴⁶ *Continuation of the Divrnall Occurrences. Or, the Heads of all the Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*, no. 7, 21 Feb. 1642, 181.207.

⁴⁷ See Nelson and Seccombe, *S T C*, p. 622.

⁴⁸ Perez Zagorin, *The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution* (London, 1969), p. 204.

⁴⁹ For a guide to the complexity of these titles, partnerships and rivalries from November 1641 through May 1642, see Frank, *English Newspaper*, Appendix B, pp. 278-280.

A POPISH CONSPIRACY

From the outbreak of the rebellion, although the Irish had claimed that they had taken up arms in order to obtain religious liberty, parliament was not convinced that their intentions were purely parochial. The newsbooks reflected this sentiment and often placed the revolt in the context of a much larger threat. On 29 November, *Heads of Severall Proceedings* reported that parliament had received letters from Ireland, which alleged that an officer presently serving in that kingdom had lately spent time at the household of Sir Henry Beddingfield in Norfolk. While there, the officer claimed that Beddingfield, a prominent Catholic, made no secret that he had canceled a proposed hunting trip to Ireland, for before Christmas "there would come the greatest troubles upon England and Ireland that have hapned these 100 Yeares."⁵⁰ Whether founded or not, the intimation was that the Irish rebellion would give rise to a Catholic insurrection in England and that a 'fifth column' had already been prepared to usher it in.

The fact that the Catholics had rebelled in Ireland was serious enough, but the possibility that similar troubles were on England's horizon was news that would have generated even greater agitation. From the Marian persecutions of the 1550s, a fear and hatred of Catholicism had endured in England. These sentiments were popularized by the Elizabethan polemicist, John Foxe, who in 1563 recorded a history of Protestant martyrs in *Acts and Monuments of the Christian Reformation*, and were reinforced periodically from that date to 1641.⁵¹ By 1641, Foxean reasoning had become entrenched in the

⁵⁰ *Heads of Severall Proceedings*, 29 Nov. 1641, 181.101\E. 201(1), p. 2

⁵¹ Robin Clifton, "The Popular Fear Of Catholics During The English Revolution," *Past and Present* 52 (1971), p. 35; Carol Z. Wiener, "The Beleagured Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," *Past And Present* 51 (1971), p. 28.

English psyche and this may help explain why the literature on the Irish rebellion was so popular.⁵² In this context, one can comprehend the sentiments of the London artisan Neamiah Wallington, who claimed “all these plots in Ireland are but one plot against England,” to afford English and Irish Catholics the opportunity “to bring their damnable superstition and idolatry amongst us.”⁵³ For individuals like Wallington, the uprising was yet another chapter, albeit a critical one, in the perpetual war for England’s survival against the might of Rome.

Throughout the winter of 1641-42, the king’s opponents in parliament promoted the fear of a clandestine coalition between Catholics in both kingdoms. As early as November, the papal agent in London communicated to Rome the effectiveness of this anti-Catholic campaign by claiming “the uprising in Ireland has greatly increased the malice of the Puritans... it has also universally disposed people to believe anything evil about the Catholics.”⁵⁴ Indeed, the confidence enjoyed by parliament in some quarters was such that, in correspondence to Sir John Pennington on 10 December, one Thomas Smith remarked “The House of Commons is sensible of all dangers... of Popish conspiracies here and in Ireland.”⁵⁵

Fears of a Catholic conspiracy heightened after 4 January, when the king failed in his attempt to apprehend the five members – Hampden, Haselrig, Holles, Strode and Pym – in the Commons’ chamber on charges of treason. This debacle resulted in the monarchy

⁵² Ethan Howard Shagan, “Constructing Discord: Ideology, Propaganda, and English Responses to the Irish Rebellion of 1641,” *Journal of British Studies* 36 (1997), pp. 7-17.

⁵³ Paul S. Seaver, *Wallington’s World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (London, 1985), p. 166.

⁵⁴ Dispatch from London, 19/29 November 1641 (Bibl. Apost. Vat. Latini MSS 5253, fo.110) cited in Jane Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Kingdoms: The Career of Randall MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 102.

⁵⁵ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1641-43* (London, 1887), p. 194.

leaving Whitehall for Hampton Court on 10 January, and shortly thereafter for York. Charles's departure from London intensified the struggle between king and parliament over the militia. It was probably no coincidence that on the same day the king exited the city, several serials reported that the Commons had received correspondence that had been intercepted from a 'great papist' in Ireland to a friend in London. Therein the author admonished the recipient to flee the capital for his own safety since "great designs were in agitation and likely to take effect against England, but especially against the city of London."⁵⁶ That same week the contents of this letter were also printed for John Thomas in a pamphlet titled *A Great Conspiracy of the Papists Against the worthy Members of both Houses Parliament*, though in more detail:

Many designs have bin defeated, yet that of Ireland holds well...our rich Enemies, Pym, Hampden, Strode and Hasilrige, are blemisht, challenged for no less than Treason: before I write next, we doubt not but to have them in the Tower or ther heads from ther sholders...for our Party is strong in the City...we are afraid of nothing....The Kings heart is Protestant, but our friends can perswade Him, and make Him believe anything; he hates the Puritan party, and is made Irreconcilable to that side....⁵⁷

The source of this letter, however, to which both newsbooks and pamphlet referred must be considered suspect, and its contents most likely a fabrication intended to inflame anti-Catholic paranoia.⁵⁸ As importantly, omitted from the newsbooks were details from the letter that suggested the king could be easily manipulated by the Papists. This suggests that, unlike some pamphlets, the weeklies may have acted with greater restraint in

⁵⁶ *Diurnall Occvrrances in Parliament*, 10 Jan. 1642, 99.01, p. 7; See also *Diurnall Occurrences in Parliament*, 10 Jan. 1642, 97.2\E. 201(6), p. 6, and *Passages in Parliament*, 10 Jan. 1642, 494.1, [p. 8].

⁵⁷ *A Great Conspiracy of the Papists Against the worthy Members of both Houses of Parliament and also against London* (1642), E. 131(14), [p. 2].

⁵⁸ It is difficult to comprehend how news of the attempted 'coup' against the five MPs on 4 January could have been included in correspondence from Ireland, which had been read in the Commons and published by the London serials, all by 10 January!

drawing too close an affinity between the king and popish conspiracies at this stage of affairs.

Newsbooks, though, continued to fuel anti-Catholic sentiment by relating allegations of collusion between English and Irish Catholics. According to *Perfect Diurnall* on 28 February 1642, the Papists in Lancashire were plotting to burn the principal towns in that county, a signal for all Catholics in England to rise.⁵⁹ A rival publication later revealed that the conspirators had been in correspondence with the Irish who were to land on the Lancashire coast upon the execution of these fires.⁶⁰ Considering that these accounts had been reported via Westminster, they no doubt carried considerable weight. Equally disturbing was the fear that the Irish were receiving support and backing from their Catholic counterparts on the continent. On numerous occasions the periodical press reported plans by foreign powers, most notably France and Spain, to furnish the Irish with arms and provisions. In February, for example, at least two newsbooks communicated that parliament had requested the Spanish Ambassador to inform his king that any attempt to foster the insurrection in Ireland would breach the articles of peace between the two nations.⁶¹ In March, moreover, reports from Dover intimated that a great army in France was ready to invade both England and Ireland!⁶²

Despite the fact that there was little if any substance to such reports, many in England became convinced that an Irish invasion was imminent. In Yorkshire, for

⁵⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, 28 Feb. 1642, 507.05\ E. 201(20), p. 2.

⁶⁰ *A Continuation of the True Diurnall of all the Passages in Parliament*, no. 10, 21 Mar. 1642, 68.10B\ E. 201(28), p. 73.

⁶¹ *A Continuation of the True Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, no. 6, 21 Feb. 1642, 623.06C, pp. 43-44; *Perfect Diurnall*, 28 Feb. 1642, 507.05\ E. 201(20), pp. 2-3.

⁶² *Perfect Diurnall*, 28 Mar. 1642, 507.11B\ E. 201(33), p. 8.

instance, Joseph Lister, a Bradford puritan, recounted one Sabbath during the winter when a fellow member of his congregation came to the chapel door and lamented that “we are all as good as dead men, for the Irish Rebels are coming.” Upon which:

the congregation was all in confusion, some ran out, others wept...and the Irish massacre being but lately acted, and all circumstances put together, the peoples hearts filled them with fear... Oh what a sad and sorrowful going home had we that evening, for we must needs go to Bradford and knew not but Incarnate Devils and Death would be their before us and meet us there.⁶³

The fact that the ‘Irish rebels’ were Protestant refugees from Ireland who had fled to England failed to diminish this fear. The multitudes of men, women and children who had arrived in England and Wales during the winter only heightened the dread that an Irish invasion was impending and that English Protestants would face a similar fate to that already experienced by their co-religionists in Ireland.⁶⁴ Clearly, the popular maxim of the era “he that will England win, must first with Ireland begin” took on greater meaning in the aftermath of the October uprising.

‘BLOODY SAVAGES’

Although the early serials recognized the religious implications of the Irish rebellion, more often than not, the Irish themselves were condemned for their disorder, rather than in disparaging religious tones. Ethan Shagan has suggested that an alternative non-Foxean construction can found in the pamphlets, which although still anti-popish, promoted the idea that the disloyalty and lawlessness of the Irish fostered social anarchy.⁶⁵ My examination of the newsbooks would support this contention. From the outset, the

⁶³ Joseph Lister, *The Autobiography of Joseph Lister of Bradford in Yorkshire 1627-1709*, ed. T. Wright, (London, 1842), pp. 6-8.

⁶⁴ Lindley, “Impact of the 1641 rebellion,” pp. 147-151.

⁶⁵ Shagan, “Constructing Discord,” pp. 17-23.

weeklies consistently referred to the Irish primarily as 'rebels, ' or 'bloody rebels' even when relating accounts of alleged cruelty by the insurgents. The fate supposedly suffered by the Barrymore family in Munster, for example, was not at the hands of Catholics or Papists - rather, they had been "most inhumanely murdered by the Rebels."⁶⁶ But Shagan overlooks an equally important non-Foxean construction that may help account for the popularity of printed news from Ireland. This was a propensity of the literature associated with the outbreak of the rebellion to depict the Irish as a nation of savages who enjoyed committing acts of barbarity, a belief that had become deeply embedded in English mentality by 1641.

Only two days after news of the uprising reached parliament, both Houses declared the rebellion to be "the treachery and wicked instigation of Romanish Priests and Jesuits, for the bloody massacre and destruction of all Protestants living there."⁶⁷ The idea that a massacre was intended first originated with Owen O'Connolly, who claimed that the Irish proposed to "destroy all the English inhabitants" throughout the kingdom.⁶⁸ Although it was implied that a massacre was only intended at this juncture, it was not long before these intentions were believed to have had been carried out. On 11 November, the MP, Sir Simonds D'Ewes, lamented "Never soe much hurt done in a fortnight in anie place as had done by the Rebels in Ireland, for many English and Protestants had been slaine and that with soe much crueltie as was scarce ever heard offe amongst Christians...."⁶⁹ Invariably,

⁶⁶ *Perfect Diurnall*, 31 Jan. 1642, 507.01\E. 201(12), p. 2.

⁶⁷ John Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State*, 8 vols. (London, 1680-1701), vol. i, p. 406.

⁶⁸ John T. Gilbert, ed., *A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652*, 3 vols. (Dublin, 1879-80), vol. i, pp. 353-354, 357-359. See also Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 210.

⁶⁹ W.H. Coates, ed., *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the first Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London* (New Haven, 1942), p. 118.

these sentiments were echoed in sundry news publications. Before broaching this issue, however, it may be useful to examine why accounts of atrocities associated with the October uprising were readily believed, and thus may have provided parliament with valuable propaganda in its efforts to secure popular support for suppressing the revolt.

Chronicles of Irish barbarity enjoyed a long history in England. Dating back to the twelfth century, Giraldus Cambrensis, historian of the Anglo-Norman invasion, had been highly critical of the Irish in justifying intervention in Ireland. In *Topography of Ireland* (1188), one of two works based on his travels in Ireland, Cambrensis concluded that the natives “are so barbarous that they cannot be said to have culture... They live on beasts only, and live like beasts...”⁷⁰ Cambrensis’s portrayal of Ireland as an ‘island of barbarians’ continued to influence English mentality in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when copies of his works were made more accessible through the benefit of the printing press.⁷¹ In the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean era, moreover, a number of English and Old English writers reinforced to varying degrees the stereotype of the Irish as the paragon of savagery to justify the conquest and colonization of that kingdom.⁷² To this

⁷⁰ Giraldus Cambrensis, *The Topography of Ireland*, trans. John J. O’Meara (London, 1951), pp. 84-86 and *passim*.

⁷¹ John Dillingham, “Images of Ireland 1170-1600: The Origins Of English Imperialism,” *History Today* 37 (1987), pp. 16-22. For the influence of Cambrensis on later generations of English writers on Ireland see also Andrew Hadfield, “Giraldus Cambrensis and English Writing about Ireland,” in *Strangers To That Land: British Perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine*, ed. Andrew Hadfield and John McVeagh (Gerard’s Cross, 1994), pp. 25-29; John Gillingham, “The English Invasion of Ireland,” in *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield and John Maley (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 24-42.

⁷² See for example, Edmund Campion, *Two Bokes of the Histories of Ireland* (1571), ed. A.F. Vossen, (Assen, 1963); John Derricke, *The Image of Irelande with a Discoverie of Woodkarne* (1581); Richard Stanishurst, *The Historie of Ireland*, in Ralph Holinshed, *Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London, 1807-8), vol. vi; Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, (1596), ed., Andrew Hadfield and Wiley Maley (1997); Barnaby Rich, *A New History of Ireland* (1610) in James P. Myers, *Elizabethan England: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland* (Hamden, Conn., 1983); Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary of his Travels* (Glasgow, 1907).

end, Edmund Spenser penned one of the most controversial works from the period.

Completed sometime between 1596 and 1598, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*

attempted to justify the implementation of the most draconian measures for subjugating

Ireland. Therein, Spenser declared that the Irish:

doe use all the beastly behaviour that may bee; they oppresse all men, they spoile as well the subject as the enemy; they steale, they are cruell and bloodie, full of revenge, and delighting in deadly execution, licentious, swearers, and blasphemers, common ravishers of woemen and murtherers of children.⁷³

Significantly, although this work was entered into the Stationers' register in 1598, it was not published until 1633.⁷⁴ Thus its publication may have provided fresh images of Irish barbarity eight years before the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641. Equally important, it may have influenced the atrocity literature of the 1640s.⁷⁵

Insurrections in Ireland during the Elizabethan and early Jacobean era allowed a number of news publications to further reinforce English perceptions of the Irish as the paradigm of barbarity.⁷⁶ Specific details of the inhumanity exhibited by the natives were rare. Nonetheless, at the conclusion of Tyrone's rebellion in 1602, one tract related that the Irish had drowned 200 English in Mallow ford, while many women and children had been stripped and murdered.⁷⁷ Two pamphlets printed for Nathaniel Butter in 1608

⁷³ Spenser, *View of the Present State of Ireland*, p. 74.

⁷⁴ It has been commonly assumed that the publication of *A View* was delayed until 1633 because of the embarrassment it may have caused the authorities due to the radical proposals promoted by the author. However, recent research suggests that the delay in publication may have been caused by a dispute between members of the Stationers' Company over who held the rights to publish Spenser's works. See Andrew Hadfield, "Was Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* Censored? A Review Of The Evidence," *Notes and Queries* 239 (1994), pp. 459-463.

⁷⁵ Willy Maley, "How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's *View*," in *Representing Ireland*, pp. 191-208.

⁷⁶ See for example, Churchyard, *James Fitz Morrice death*; idem, *Fortunate Farewel, Englands Joy* [1601].

⁷⁷ Byrchensha, *Discovrse occasioned vpon the late defeat, given to Tyrone and Odonnell*.

reported the uprising of Sir Cahir O'Doherty in Ulster, and lamented that the Irish had committed barbarous cruelties on the inhabitants of Loughfoyle.⁷⁸ A similar publication, which broadcast the same revolt, may have reflected the sentiments of many in England at this time:

Yea to such a habit of Savage tirany hath Rebellion brought that nation, that nothing hath beene or still is pleasing to a great part of them, but that which Kingdomes abhor... and that is Civill Warre, Murders and Massacres... How many hundreds of thousands of our English nation have beene drowned in their owne blood... how many widowes have be wailed the losse of their husbands, buthchered by these rebellious people?⁷⁹

The failure of O'Doherty's rebellion furnished the State the opportunity to advance the Ulster plantation. But with this came the need to attract greater numbers of English and Scottish settlers. Such considerations may have contributed toward the authorities promoting a more positive view toward Ireland and the Irish in the three decades that preceded the rebellion of 1641.⁸⁰ Indeed, what little news printed about events in that kingdom was relatively tedious and mundane.⁸¹ Nonetheless, over several hundred years the Irish had become the archetype of savagery and this image was not easily expunged from English mentality overnight. Thus the initial reports from Ireland in November 1641, which claimed that many thousands of Protestants were being

⁷⁸ *Newes from Ireland* (1608); *Newes from Lough-foyle in Ireland* (1608).

⁷⁹ *The Over-throw of an Irish rebell, in a late battaile* (1608).

⁸⁰ See for example, Sir John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued and Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign, 1612*, in *Ireland Under Elizabeth and James the First*, ed. Henry Morely (London, 1890), pp. 275, 335-336, 342 and passim; *Advertisements For Ireland, being a description of Ireland in the reign of James I*, ed., George O'Brien (Dublin, 1923), p. 58 and passim. The author of this last work was most likely Richard Hadsor. A member of an Old English family, Hadsor occupied the position of crown counsel for Irish affairs at Whitehall, and was sent to Ireland as a member of the commission of inquiry in 1622. Victor Treadwell, "New light on Richard Hadsor, I: Richard Hadsor and the authorship of 'Advertisements for Ireland', 1622/3," *Irish Historical Studies* 30 (1997), pp. 305-336.

⁸¹ For example, see *The Wonderfull Battell of Starelings* (1622), and *A Relation of the Most lamentable Burning of the citie of Corke* (1622).

massacred, would have conformed to well-entrenched convictions that the Irish were truly barbarians who delighted in committing acts of cruelty.

THE PAMPHLETS AND THE MASSACRES OF 1641

Evidently, the prejudice that surfaced in news publications following the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641 toward the Irish had antecedents that reached back to works that addressed earlier revolts in Ireland. In examining how the October uprising may have helped sow the seeds for civil war in England, scholars have placed considerable emphasis on those publications that promoted atrocities perpetrated by the Irish against the settlers in the early stages of the insurrection. Regardless of their veracity, it has generally been argued that printed accounts of these allegations proved pivotal in the growing struggle between king and parliament, particularly over control of those forces deemed necessary for quelling the rebellion.⁸² But in suggesting that the literature associated with the massacres was part of a parliamentary propaganda campaign, historians have failed to make the distinction between pamphlet and serial news. In fact, recent studies have focused upon the pamphlets of the period and have ignored the corresponding periodicals. By doing so, they have neglected an important source of news that did not necessarily correlate the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641 with a general massacre.

While it is not the purpose of this thesis to examine the pamphlet literature associated with the rebellion, it may be useful on this occasion to examine the manner in

⁸² For example, see James Morgan Read, "Atrocity Propaganda And The Irish Rebellion," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 2 (1938), pp. 229-244; Walter D. Love, "Civil War in Ireland: Appearances in Three Centuries of Historical Writing," *Emory University Quarterly* 22 (1966), pp. 57-72; Keith Lindley, "The impact of the 1641 rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641-5," *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972), pp. 143-176; Iain Donovan, "Bloody news from Ireland: The pamphlet literature of the Irish massacres of the 1640s," (M. Litt. thesis, University of Dublin, 1995); Shagan, "Constructing Discord, pp. 4-34.

which the pamphlets and the newsbooks differed in their coverage of the initial stage of the revolt. In response to public demand for news of events in both England and Ireland, numerous pamphlets were printed in the aftermath of the October uprising. An examination of the comprehensive collection of tracts amassed by the London bookseller, George Thomason, reveals that in November 1641 approximately twenty-two percent of the pamphlets amassed by Thomason addressed Irish affairs, and by December this figure had increased to twenty-eight percent.⁸³ Moreover, in a recent study of the pamphlet literature from this period, it has been suggested that approximately half of the tracts printed between 1641-42 in the Bradshaw, Lough Fea and Thorpe collections respectively relate specifically to the rebellion.⁸⁴

The majority of these publications appeared to stress either an intended or an actual massacre of Protestants in Ireland. The first pamphlet to do so was *Last newes from Ireland*. Similar to the first newsbook, this pamphlet was published by John Thomas. It was typical of most tracts of this nature in that it purported to be based upon a letter written by a gentleman from Ireland whose identity was neither disclosed nor well

⁸³ Lindley, "Impact of the 1641 rebellion," p. 144; G.K. Fortesque, ed., *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War 1640-1661*, 2 vols. (London, 1908), vol. i, pp. 39-53. It should be noted that many of the pamphlets contained in the Thomason collection have been catalogued in accordance with the events contained therein and were often printed several days or even months after the news was first made known. For example, *Last Newes from Ireland*, E. 175(2) was the copy of a letter written in Dublin on 27 October. Yet the title page claims that this news was read in Parliament on 5 November, suggesting that the pamphlet could not have been printed any earlier than 6 November. A more extreme example is *A Remonstrance of the beginnings and proceedings in the County of Cavan*, E. 110(9). Although dated 23 October 1641, it contained news from Ireland to 15 June 1642! For a detailed analysis of the problems associated with dating the Thomason tracts see, Stephen J. Greenberg, "Dating Civil War Pamphlets, 1641-1644," *Albion* 20 (1988), pp. 387-401; Michael Mendle, "The Thomason Collection: A Reply to Stephen J. Greenberg," *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 85-93; Stephen J. Greenberg, "The Thomason Collection: Rebuttal to Michael Mendle," *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 95-98.

⁸⁴ Donovan, "Bloody news from Ireland," p. 72.

known.⁸⁵ In this case, although the correspondence was dated at Dublin on 27 October 1641, no details of the author's identity are given. The letter, which had been read in parliament on 5 November, was deemed sufficiently important to be leaked to Thomas for publication. Therein it was claimed that the Irish had massacred countless Protestant men, women and children throughout Ulster as well as in the town of Dundalk. Yet the identity of only one victim was disclosed, an attorney of the Kings Bench named Iremonger. Instead, it was the threat of a massacre and the need for relief that appeared to be the focal point of the tract:

...these Papists or Rebels call it a Religious Warre, Ruine and Desolation they threaten to the poore Protestants, for they are ten to one, throughout this kingdome, so that unlesse the King and Parliament helpe and relieve us, we shall utterly be destroyed and rooted out of the Land....⁸⁶

Furthermore, when similar pamphlets implied that an intended slaughter had actually occurred, little in the way of substantive detail was provided.⁸⁷ For instance, Thomas also published *Late and True Relation from Ireland*, which according to the title page, claimed to contain details of the "barbarous and cruell Actions" of the Irish. But readers would have found no particulars of these outrages. Rather, it was reported that the rebels *intended* to inflict cruel punishments upon English Protestants by "cutting of the heads of all those that remaine...and putting both man and women, and child to the Sword."⁸⁸

Several pamphlets did furnish graphic details of atrocities. In *Bloudy Newes from*

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 84. Donovan maintains that publishers who were not renowned for a special interest in Irish affairs sold these pamphlets. But until the outbreak of the rebellion, no publisher had much reason to print news on Ireland. Moreover, the fact that Thomas printed several of these tracts suggests that some publishers did have an interest in that kingdom.

⁸⁶ *Last Newes from Ireland*, [p. 3].

⁸⁷ Love, "Civil War in Ireland," p. 60.

⁸⁸ *Late and True Relation from Ireland*, [p. 6].

Ireland, the author reported an account of one James Salmon who had recently escaped to London from that kingdom. According to the title page, Salmon claimed that the Irish in Armagh had been responsible for:

putting men to the sword, deflowering Women, and dragging them up and downe the Streets, and cruelly murdering them, and thrusting their Speeres through their little Infants before their eyes, and carrying them up and downe on Pike-points, in great reproach, and hanging Mens quarters on their Gates in the Street....⁸⁹

As with most pamphlets, however, very little detail was provided above and beyond what was already given on the front page. Likewise, no indication was given to show whether Salmon was an eyewitness to these events or if he was simply passing on hearsay that had spread as quickly as the rebellion itself.

More often than not, pamphlets that reported news from Ireland related accounts of atrocities that tended to focus upon specific acts of barbarity rather than whole scale massacres. In Kilkenny it was alleged that seven “blood-thirsty Savages, not deserving of the title of humanity,” beat the brains out of one Mr. Atkins, after which:

they layd hold on his wife being big with childe, & ravisht her, then ript open her wombe, and like so many Neroes undantedly viewed natures bed of Conception, afterward took her and her Infant and sacrificz’d in fire their wounded bodies to appease their immaculate soules... this and innumerable more horrid murtheres are committed by those Rebellious Papists which count it a meritorious worke to imbrew their hands in the blood of the poore Protestants....⁹⁰

Yet another tract related the manner by which the Irish had hanged one Englishman and then “cut his flesh in pieces, carrying pieces thereof up and downe in their hands, saying, this is the flesh of one of the Riylers against our holy Father the Pope.”⁹¹ Whether founded

⁸⁹ *Blowdy Newes from Ireland, Or The barbarous Crueltie by the Papists used in that Kingdome* (1641), E. 179(9), [title page].

⁹⁰ *A Bloody Battell: Or The Rebels Overthrow, and Protestants Victorie* (1641), E. 180(7), [pp. 4-5].

⁹¹ *A Treacherous Plot of a Confederacie in Ireland* (1641), E. 179(15), [p. 5].

or not, considering that the Irish had long become the paradigm for savagery and barbarity in England, such accounts would have been readily believed in most quarters. No doubt they influenced a petition from the inhabitants of Sarum in Wiltshire, who in February 1642 petitioned parliament to “aid them that lie languishing whose throats are exposed to the Sword of the savage and barbarous foe.”⁹²

It’s possible that a number of these pamphlets may have been the result of the king’s opponents in parliament, attempting to secure popular support for their struggle against the crown over relief for Ireland. The fact that Thomas printed several of these tracts could suggest that Pym had a hand in their publication. In addition, some pamphlets may have been influenced by the efforts of Protestant planters in Ireland to ensure swift political measures to crush the insurgents.⁹³ To this end, parliament resolved to finance the suppression of the uprising by promoting the Act for Adventurers, which had been proposed in the Commons on 11 February and passed into law on 19 March. By this, at the conclusion of the war, 2,500,000 acres of land were to be distributed among those adventurers who had subscribed toward the quelling of the rebellion. To raise the one million pounds needed from this scheme, potential subscribers were bombarded by literature that promoted the need to assist those who had suffered at the hands of the Irish.⁹⁴

Others still may have been motivated by individual greed. In January, for example, Martin Eldred, of Jesus College in Cambridge and Thomas Herbert at Trinity College,

⁹² *A Continuation of the True Diurnall of Passages in Parliament*, no. 7, 28 Feb. 1642, 623.07A/E. 201(19), p. 52.

⁹³ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 274.

⁹⁴ Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land*, pp. 40-46.

were arrested for their role in fabricating a number of petitions and news pamphlets that they had sold to John Greensmith for 2s. 6d. each.⁹⁵ Greensmith confessed that he had printed sundry pamphlets of these men and all three were imprisoned on 25 January for their actions.⁹⁶ Significantly, Greensmith had published several tracts on the Irish rebellion. Thus, considering his sources, these publications should be treated with caution.⁹⁷ Eldridge meanwhile, admitted that for a similar sum he had produced *Good Newes from Ireland* and *Bloody Newes from Ireland*, which were printed for H. Blunden and Martin Rookes respectively.⁹⁸ Considering that *Bloody Newes from Ireland* contained James Salmon's shocking allegations of the brutal massacre that had taken place in Armagh, it brings into question the motivation and the authenticity of similar tracts during this period.

Monetary gain by these pamphleteers was clearly a cause for complaint from the author of an anonymous letter in January, which was printed as, *No Pamphlet, Bvt A Detestation Against all such Pamphlets As are Printed, Concerning the Irish rebellion*. Therein, the composer maintained that the "many Fabulous Pamphlets" concerning the Irish rebels:

hath caused me to send this to the Presse, that all may perceive the vanity of the Authors, who for a small gaine, will endeavour with opprobrious lines to abuse God and Man...making credulous people to beleieve such things as are contrived from their Hellish braines... It is confessed, That the Irish doe dayly rise up in Armes and their Companies increase; likewise they pillage Protestants Houses, and take away all manner of Cattell; but for murdering or ravishing (as is reported) it is more than we ever heard of in Ireland:

⁹⁵ Cromertie, "Printing of Parliamentary Speeches," p. 39; Mendle, "Press and Parliament," p. 328.

⁹⁶ *Diurnall Occvrrances in Parliament*, no. 3, 31 Jan. 1642, 99.03, p. 3.

⁹⁷ For example, *Joyfull Newes from Ireland* (1641), E. 177(9); *Bloody Newes from Norwich: ...Likewise here is added the last bloody Newes from Ireland* (1641), E. 179(10); *The Happiest Newes from Ireland* (1641), E. 181(20); *A Bloody Battell*, E. 180(7).

⁹⁸ Cromartie, "Printing of Parliamentary Speeches," p. 39; *Good Newes from Ireland* (1641), E. 133(14); *Bloody Newes from Ireland*, E. 179(9).

only one Gentleman lost his life after this manner.⁹⁹

The author may have had good reason to complain about the number of publications that had promoted the Irish massacres following the outbreak of the rebellion. A recent study has concluded that thirty-two tracts of this nature were published in the last weeks of 1641 alone.¹⁰⁰ Taking into account that Thomason collected forty-two pamphlets in November and December, which addressed Irish affairs,¹⁰¹ it would be fair to suggest then, that the majority of tracts printed during the formative stages of the uprising, characterized events in Ireland as a 'blood-bath'.

THE NEWSBOOKS AND THE MASSACRES OF 1641

Although Joseph Frank claimed in his pioneering study of English newspapers that the newsbooks maintained regular coverage of the 'atrocities' in Ireland, he couldn't have been further from the truth.¹⁰² Rather, in contrast to the pamphlet literature, accounts of outrages or wide-scale massacres in the periodical press were extremely rare. Bearing in mind that individuals such as Thomas and Nathaniel Butter were noted for publishing both pamphlet and serial news, one would expect to uncover details of atrocities in each genre during the winter of 1641-42. On occasion, serials printed for Thomas suggested that "many outrageous and Hostile Acts" or that "many inhumane bloodie and tirannical actions" had been committed upon the Protestant population in Ireland.¹⁰³ However, particulars that related the victim's names or the manner of their death were rarely given.

⁹⁹ *No Pamphlet, But A Detestation Against all such Pamphlets As are Printed, Concerning the Irish rebellion, Plainely demonstrating the falshood of them* (1642), E. 134(3), [p. 1].

¹⁰⁰ Donovan, "Bloody news from Ireland," p. 71.

¹⁰¹ Lindley, "Impact of the 1641 rebellion," p. 144.

¹⁰² Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 24.

¹⁰³ *Heads of Severall Proceedings*, 6 Dec. 1641, 181.102, p. 1; *Diurnall Occvrrances*, 20 Dec. 1641, 181.103E. 201(3), pp.3-4.

Indeed, of ninety-three newsbooks printed between 29 November 1641 and 28 March 1642 that I consulted, only three related the identities of those murdered by the Irish. Of these three serials, two reported the same occurrence. This was despite the fact that as early as 26 December the *Diurnall, Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament* reported that the Irish had put 30,000 Protestants to death!¹⁰⁴ This was the only instance in which any newsbook during the winter provided an estimate of settlers that had been ‘massacred’ by the natives.¹⁰⁵

The first newsbooks to relate specific accounts of Irish atrocities were published on 20 December 1641. *Diurnal Occvrrances: Or, The Heads of Proceedings in Parliament*, and *Diurnall, Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament* both contained details of a letter written by one Thomas Partington that had been read in the House of Commons on 14 December.¹⁰⁶ The editor of *Diurnal Occvrrances* considered this news significant enough that Partington’s correspondence was the principal story for that particular edition. On the title page it was proclaimed, “Wherein is declared the

¹⁰⁴ Sir William Brereton at Chester had asserted this figure on the basis of information he had from Ireland. *Diurnall, Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament*, 26 Dec. 1641, 109.3, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ This estimate contrasts wildly to the exaggerated figures of 200,000 or even 300,000 later cited by Sir John Temple in *The Irish Rebellion: or, an History of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion Raised within the Kingdom of Ireland* (1646), E. 508. Although it is much closer to the figure of 27,000 promoted by Mary Hickson in her study of the massacres, Hickson maintains that these murders occurred in the first three or four years of the rebellion, not during the first two months as *Heads of all the proceedings* reported. See Mary Hickson, ed., *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century or the Irish Massacres of 1641-2*, 2 vols. (London, 1884), vol. i, p. 163.

¹⁰⁶ *Diurnal Occvrrances: Or The Heads of Proceedings in Parliament*, 20 Dec. 1641, 103.1; *Diurnall: Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings in Parliament*, 13 Dec. 1641, 109.2. Most likely, Partington was a Dublin merchant who was well trusted at Westminster. On occasion, he was employed as a messenger for the London Parliament in communicating news of Irish affairs to its counterpart in Scotland. In addition, he must have been viewed by Parliament as a reliable source of news in Ireland. On 30 July 1646, for example, the committee of Irish affairs requested that “ships riding before Dublin shall send, as quickly as possible...all messages which they may receive from Thomas Partington, residing by their order in that city.” See *Calendar State Papers Ireland 1633-1647* (London, 1901), pp. 423, 432, 439, 446, 455, 473, 477, 483.

bloody Massacres, and dismembering of Ministers, and others in Ireland.”¹⁰⁷ The identity of the ministers and the gruesome nature of their deaths were subsequently detailed therein, and included allegations that that these men had suffered various forms of mutilation.¹⁰⁸

News that promoted the horrific death faced by members of the clergy would no doubt have shocked those who read these newsbooks. They clearly parallel similar acts of barbarity that had been conveyed in the corresponding pamphlets of the day.

Nevertheless, that same week, and shortly before his entry into serial news, Nathaniel Butter published *Worse and Worse Newes from Ireland*. This tract contained a more detailed copy of Partington’s letter, which not only included news of the minister’s murders, but also alleged that even more startling atrocities had been committed against women and children in Munster. It claimed that the Irish had exercised:

all manner of cruelties, and striving who can be most barbarously exquisite in tormenting the poore Protestants, wheresoever they come, Cutting off their privie members, eares, fingers, and hands, plucking out their eyes, boyling the heads of little Children before their Mothers faces, and then ripping up their Mothers Bowels, stripping women naked, and standing by them naked, whilst they are in Travel, killing the Children as soone as they are borne, and ripping up their Mothers bellies, as soone as they are delivered....¹⁰⁹

Partington’s correspondence contained arguably the most harrowing allegations of Irish atrocities that were printed during the first months of the rebellion. Nonetheless, these horrors were clearly absent from both *Diurnal Occvrrances* and *Diurnal, Or, The Heads of all the Proceedings*, which had been published at approximately the same time.

The only other periodical to report the identity of those killed by the insurgents

¹⁰⁷ *Diurnal Occvrrances*, 20 Dec. 1641, 103.1.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2; *Diurnall: Or The Heads*, 109.2, p. 2.

¹⁰⁹ *Worse and Worse Newes from Ireland* (1641), E. 180(15), pp. 1-2.

was Pecke's *Perfect Diurnall* on 31 January 1642. It maintained that letters read in the Commons had claimed that the Countess of Barramore [Barrymore] and her family had been "most inhumanely murdered by the Rebels."¹¹⁰ No further details were produced, although it appears that this particular incident had been fabricated. Several weeks after it was alleged that she had been murdered, Lady Barrymore corresponded with friends in England. In her letter she claimed, "I live every hour at the mercy of our increasing enemies and dare not as yet stir because the safety of so many depends upon my stay here, and we have daily the objects of the Papist's cruelty, which doth some what terrify mee."¹¹¹ Thus although clearly alarmed by her predicament, Lady Barrymore remained alive and well.

The 'murder' of Lady Barrymore was the last such account contained in the newsbooks, at least until after the outbreak of civil war in England. This was despite the fact that a number of 'massacre pamphlets' continued to be printed, some even by the authority of parliament. This was the case on 21 March, when parliament ordered the publication of *A Remonstrance of Divers Remarkable Passages Concerning the Church and Kingdom of Ireland*.¹¹² This tract was based on a report presented to the Commons by one Dr. Henry Jones. The Protestant dean of Kilmore, Jones, and seven fellow clergymen had received commissions in December 1641 and January 1642 from the Dublin government to collect evidence of murders and massacres by the Irish, in addition to any

¹¹⁰ *Perfect Diurnall*, 31 Jan. 1642, 507.01\E. 201(12), p. 2.

¹¹¹ *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, i, p. 236.

¹¹² Henry Jones, *A Remonstrance of Divers Remarkable Passages Concerning the Church and Kingdom of Ireland* (1642), E. 141(30).

information on material losses suffered by the settlers.¹¹³ Early results of the commission's work formed the basis of the *Remonstrance*. Therein could be found eighty-five sworn depositions taken from Protestants, one-third of which testified to some of the most gruesome atrocities either intended or carried out against their brethren.¹¹⁴ Deponents often related the gruesome spectacle of mothers being brutally murdered along with their infant or unborn children. On 8 February, for example, Philip Taylor maintained that the Irish had ripped open the belly of a pregnant woman in Newry and as a result one of her unborn twins became fodder for a sow.¹¹⁵ While it is not my purpose here to examine the nature or validity of such testimonies, it is remarkable that, considering parliament had authorized this report to be published, not one of the eight newsbooks printed on 28 March referred to the report or to the depositions themselves.¹¹⁶ This was despite the fact that pamphleteers pillaged many of these accounts in their efforts to promote the belief that a general massacre of Protestants had taken place.¹¹⁷

It is difficult to determine why the newsbooks, for the most part, did not promote allegations of atrocities commonly found in the pamphlet literature of this period. News of such incidents may not only have increased circulation, but would have provided greater impetus for expediting aid to the Protestants in that kingdom. This is even more puzzling

¹¹³ Aidan Clarke, "The 1641 Depositions," in Peter Fox, ed. *Treasures of the Library Trinity College Dublin* (Dublin, 1986), p. 112.

¹¹⁴ Donovan, "Bloody News From Ireland," p. 63.

¹¹⁵ Jones, *Remonstrance*, p. 63.

¹¹⁶ The depositions can be found in 33 folio volumes in the library at Trinity College Dublin. For a comprehensive analysis of this source, see Clarke, "The 1641 Depositions," pp. 111-122; M. Perceval-Maxwell, "The Ulster Rising of 1641, and the depositions," *Irish Historical Studies* 21 (1978-79), pp. 144-167; Nicholas Canny, "The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social and Cultural History," *History Ireland* (1993), pp. 52-55; Love, "Civil War in Ireland," pp. 57-72; Robert Dunlop, "The depositions relating to the Irish massacres of 1641," *English Historical Review* 1 (1886), pp. 740-744; Mary Hickson, "The depositions relating to the Irish massacres of 1641," *English Historical Review* 2 (1887), pp. 133-137; idem, *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century*, passim; Gardiner, *History of England*, x, pp. 64-69.

¹¹⁷ Canny, "The 1641 Depositions," p. 54.

considering that the early periodicals were based on parliamentary sources, the very body that would have benefited the most from their publication. What is clear is that the manner in which the weekly press addressed this aspect of the rebellion undermines the perception that all news identified the early stages of the uprising with a catalogue of outrages. In this context at least, it appears that, unlike the pamphlets, the newsbooks remained ostensibly subdued publications.

A ROYAL CONSPIRACY

The restraint shown by the serials in relating the horrors associated with the outbreak of the rebellion was also evident in relation to the king. Although divisions deepened between Charles and parliament amid the monarchy's absence from London, the newsbooks never implicated the king directly with aiding or abetting the insurrection until the summer of 1642. The opportunity for doing so had been created in early November, when one of the principle architects of the uprising, Sir Philip O'Neill, proclaimed that Charles had commissioned the rebels on 1 October to resist attempts by the English parliament to usurp royal authority in Ireland.¹¹⁸ The commission was a forgery and was considered so by at least one newsbook.¹¹⁹ However, its existence and the fact that Charles did not proclaim the Irish as 'rebels' until 1 January 1642 could have been reason enough for the serials to question the king's motives in relation to the rebellion.¹²⁰ Rather, on several occasions the periodicals revealed the sovereign's concern for his Protestant subjects in Ireland. On 21 February, for example, *Perfect Diurnall* related that parliament

¹¹⁸ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 218-219. A copy of the commission can be found in Robert Dunlop, "The Forged Commission of 1641," *English Historical Review* 2 (1887), pp. 527-33.

¹¹⁹ *Diurnall Occurrences*, 2 Jan. 1642, 97.1, p. 6.

¹²⁰ The king's proclamation against the Irish can be found in Carte, *Ormond*, v, pp. 281-282.

was pleased to note the king was “sensible of the miseries of the Protestants, that he is not unwilling to venture his owne person in that warre, if the Parliament shall think it convenient.”¹²¹

Little empathy, however, was awarded to those who enjoyed connections to the court. On 2 January, *Diurnall Occurrences* reported that the committee of Irish affairs had received intelligence that claimed divers gentlemen had arrived in Dublin from the royal household intending to support the Protestants, but upon their arrival had allied with the rebels.¹²² Another publication on 31 January lamented that, although the rebels had suffered several defeats, Ireland still languished by the:

daily Revoltings of divers eminent persons and places to the Rebels; and those, some of those Commanders and Officers which came from England chiefly occasioned by their great discouragement in the slow expediting of that ayd allotted by the Parliament to joyne them; to enable them with strength and courage to set on so great a worke to relieve those Protestants which have suffered under a bloody persecution....¹²³

Similarly, *Continuation of the True Diurnall* noted that parliament had questioned the loyalty of three officers nominated by the crown for service in Ireland. All three had accompanied the king earlier that month when he had sought the arrest of the five MPs.¹²⁴

Convinced that Pym had promoted these accounts, Charles complained to the speaker of the House about a recent speech made by the MP in February, which claimed that a number of officers now in league with the Irish had passed through the ports by displaying

¹²¹ *Perfect Diurnall*, 21 Feb. 1642, 507.04, pp. 3–4. For similar concerns see also *A Continuation of the True Diurnall Occurrences and Passages in both Houses of Parliament*, no. 10, 21 Mar. 1642, 67.10, pp. 10–11.

¹²² *Diurnall Occurrences in Parliament*, 2 Jan. 1642, 97.1, p. 6.

¹²³ *Diurnall Occurrences: Or, The Last Weekes Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*, no. 4, 31 Jan. 1642, 181.204, [pp. 1–2].

¹²⁴ *A Continuation of the True Diurnall of Passages in Parliament*, no 3, 31 Jan. 1642, 623.03, p. 19.

royal warrants.¹²⁵ The Commons responded that credible intelligence from Ireland suggested that this was indeed the case, but rather than targeting the king, blame was dispensed to his counselors, who according to *Perfect Diurnall*, were “enimies to the peace of this Kingdom, and justly... suspected to be favorers of the rebellion.”¹²⁶

Attacks of this nature were generally the most popular means by which the newsbooks could cast doubt on Charles’s ability to reduce the revolt in Ireland. This became increasingly apparent after 15 February when parliament passed the Militia Ordinance. Approved without the consent of the king, this bill undermined the royal prerogative in that it transferred power over the militias to Westminster. Charles, however, continued to refute the legitimacy of parliament’s actions on this matter, and claimed:

The business of Ireland... will never be done in the way that you are in. Four hundred will never do that work. It must be put into the hands of one. If I were trusted with it, I would pawn my head to end that work; and, though I beggar myself, I can find the money for that.¹²⁷

Perhaps it was no coincidence that in the days leading up to Militia Ordinance, several newsbooks reported that considerable damage had been caused to the Protestants in Ireland by the earl of Antrim’s decision to join the insurgents.¹²⁸ A Catholic of Scottish descent, Antrim was one of the principal nobles in Ulster, and enjoyed close connections to the Stuart court.¹²⁹ But the earl as yet had refrained from joining the uprising, and in

¹²⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, 14 Feb. 1642, 507.03, p. 3.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 10, 21 Mar. 1642, 507.10B/E. 201(27), p. 6.

¹²⁷ Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, iv, p. 532 cited in Gardiner, *History of England*, x, pp. 172-173.

¹²⁸ See for example, *Divrnull Occvrrances: Or, The Heads of the Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*, no. 5, 7 Feb. 1642, 181.205, [p. 5]; *True Diurnal Occvrrances: Or, The Heads of the Proceednigs [sic] in both Houses of Parliament*, 7 Feb. 1642, 621.2/E. 201(13), p. 4.

¹²⁹ Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 26.

correspondence to the earl of Rutland on 25 February, he reacted angrily to these accusations. Antrim lamented "It is a great sorrow to me, my name and Honour should be so much defamed and scandalized by false and scandalous reports, nay, permitted to be published in Print that I have revolted from my King, and turned Rebell."¹³⁰ This correspondence, however, was intercepted in late February and forwarded to parliament. More importantly, it was published shortly thereafter as part of a short-lived periodical titled *A Continuation of the Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, for Francis Coles and Thomas Banks.¹³¹ This was the first attempt by London publishers to create a serial that went beyond the confines of simply reporting news from Westminster. But despite relating Antrim's professed loyalty to the crown, this newsbook reported that the earl remained committed to the free exercise of the Catholic faith, which he stressed:

I am devoted to, and am engaged to maintain in duty to God, and respect of my future hapinesse and salvation: Her Majesty, my gracious Queene I will to my power indeavour to obey, and her rightfull Raigne in his Majesties Dominions, under his government, endeavour to uphold and maintaine to the utmost of my life and fortune....¹³²

Although Sir William Parsons, one of the lord justices in Ireland, claimed in April that notwithstanding rumors to the contrary Antrim remained loyal to the king, the decision to publish the earl's correspondence was no doubt important propaganda for parliamentary opponents wishing to discredit him and the court.¹³³ English Protestants commonly accepted that, while Catholics maintained a religious allegiance toward Rome, they could not and should not be trusted as loyal subjects of the crown. Furthermore,

¹³⁰ *A Continuation of the Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, [n.d., letters 25 and 27 Feb. 1642], 63.2\E. 137(28), p. 1.

¹³¹ The first edition of this serial is not extant.

¹³² *Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, 63.2\E. 137(28), p. 2.

¹³³ Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 102-103.

Antrim's correspondence implied that the queen commanded considerable support from her fellow papists in Ireland. Accordingly, it was perceived that unless royal powers were checked by parliament, the destruction of English Protestantism would follow.

JOYFULL NEWS FROM IRELAND

Not all news associated with the outbreak of the Irish rebellion promoted doom and despair. Many English Protestants were convinced that as members of God's 'Elect' they might be severely tested at times, but if they remained loyal to the faith they would, with divine providence, prosper whatever the odds. In this context, "Joyfull news from Ireland" was commonly asserted by the newsbooks during the formative stages of the insurrection as they communicated how God had 'miraculously' preserved the Protestants in that kingdom.¹³⁴ Indeed, the success of English forces was often attributed to heavenly intervention, rather than the bravery of the troops. One letter from Dublin, dated 27 February 1642, related the manner in which relief reached the besieged town of Drogheda:

God by his infinite mercy hath freed us (I may say miraculously) from that hazard: for when our men there were driven to that extremity to eat Horseflesh, Sir Henry Titchbourne sallied out of the Town with only fourty Muskietiers, and fourty Horse, and beat off foure hundred of the Enemies, killed above threescore of them; recovered fourescore Cowes and Oxen, and two hundred Sheep...I must relate unto you Gods abundant goodnesse unto us, in that the night before the reliefe and succours which we sent by Sea from Dublin to them, should have entered into the Harbour of Drogheda, (which was strongly fenced over with a Chain and severall Boates) there happened a storme which broke their chainer, and gave our men so free a passage, as with little difficulty they came safely to the Towne.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ For example, *Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, 27 Feb. 1642, 63.2\E. 137(28), p. 4; *Continuation of the True diurnall*, no. 7, 28 Feb. 1642, 623.07A\E. 201(19), p. 5.

¹³⁵ *Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, 27 Feb. 1642, 63.2\E. 137(28), pp. 4-5. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 7, 14 Mar. 1642, 507.07, p. 1; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 9, 14 Mar. 1642, 507.09B, p. 2.

Although detailed military accounts such as this were uncommon in the periodical press during the first five months of the rebellion, what news that did appear placed great emphasis on the numbers of Irish that had been killed and the disproportionate successes enjoyed by English forces. On 27 December, for example, Pym reported to the Commons that Sir Henry Sellenger's forces in Munster had killed 200 rebels and hanged an additional 150.¹³⁶ In January, several serials reported the arrival in Ireland on 30 December of Sir Simon Harcourt's regiment from England. In an early engagement with the Irish, it was claimed that Harcourt's men had killed 400 rebels, while their own losses were confined to single digits.¹³⁷ Yet another encounter by English forces near Drogheda in March had left more than 350 Irish dead with barely the loss of one man.¹³⁸ Such reports belie the myth that all news from Ireland at this stage of the rebellion reflected the feeling of desperation. In fact, the arrival of Sir Richard Grenville's 400 horse and Colonel George Monck's regiment of 1500 foot from England on 20 and 21 February respectively, appeared to instill greater confidence among the Protestants.¹³⁹ These events not only contributed toward the siege of Drogheda being raised on 5 March, but amid the retreat of O'Neill's northern army, Ardee and Dundalk were also recaptured by English forces by the end of that month.¹⁴⁰

Conversely, news that related victories obtained by the rebels was rare. One notable exception was information contained in Antrim's letter to Rutland, wherein the

¹³⁶ *D[i]jv[n]all Occvrrances*, 27 Dec. 1641, 181.104A\E. 201(4), [p. 5].

¹³⁷ *True Diurnall or the Passages in Parliament*, 24 Jan. 1642, 101.2, pp. 1-2; *Diurnall Occvrrances*, 24 Jan. 1642, 99.02\E. 201(11), pp. 2-3.

¹³⁸ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 11, 28 Mar. 1642, 507.11B\E. 201(33), p. 3.

¹³⁹ *Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, [letter dated 27 Feb.] 1642, 63.2\E. 137(28), p. 5.

¹⁴⁰ Corish, "Rising of 1641 and the Catholic confederacy," p. 293.

earl claimed that English and Scottish forces had lost up to 4,000 men in a recent defeat in Leinster.¹⁴¹ The fact that there were no Scottish forces this far south, however, undermines the validity of these claims. Nonetheless, since the early serials remained dependent on parliamentary sources for their intelligence, the absence of similar accounts of rebel successes in the newsbooks could suggest that such news suffered from censorship. On 7 March 1642, for instance, the Venetian Ambassador claimed:

Several letters have arrived out of Ireland this week, but as they have all been stopped by parliament it is not possible to find out precisely what news they bring of events there. Their energy in this matter leads many to conclude that affairs are going unfavourably for them there.¹⁴²

But in general, what little military news contained in the newsbooks before the spring of 1642 related successes against the insurgents. These victories were no doubt well received by readers in England and reflected the belief that no matter the odds, God would not permit the destruction of Protestant forces in their struggle against those who were considered the foot soldiers of Rome.

TOWARD CIVIL WAR

On 28 March, it appeared that the history of serial news would be short lived. Concerned that “divers pamphlets and scandalous writing” had been printed of late, the Commons resolved to punish those individuals who printed or sold “any Act or Passage of this House under the name of a *Diurnal*, or otherwise” without an appropriate license.¹⁴³ Since no newsbook had received a license to print domestic news, all eight serials then in operation

¹⁴¹ *Diurnall Passages in Ireland*, no. 2, [letter dated 25 Feb.] 1642, 63.2\E. 137(28), p. 3.

¹⁴² *Calendar State Papers Venetian 1642-43* (London, 1924), pp. 3-4.

¹⁴³ Cited in Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 205.

ceased production.¹⁴⁴ In the weeks leading up to this, it was clear that parliament was determined to exercise greater control over the press. Complaints against the press had been voiced from several quarters, some of which related to Irish news. The Spanish Ambassador, for example, protested to the House of Lords about the printing of a message that he had received from parliament on 11 February, which had urged the cessation of supplies from Spain to Ireland.¹⁴⁵ As no order had been given by either House to publish this message, the printers were to be examined by what authority they had published it.¹⁴⁶ Meanwhile, Irish peers in the capital responded to books of Irish news that were “false and palpably feigned overnight in English alehouses” by petitioning the House of Lords that no news be printed except by order of the House. In addition, they appealed that a monopoly of printing Irish news be awarded to William Blayden, a stationer in London, whose father was an alderman in Dublin.¹⁴⁷ And on 28 March, one newsbook noted that Lord Dungarven and other Irish gentry resident in London had complained of divers letters which “runneth up and down the streets, entitled a new Letter, or new news out of Ireland.”¹⁴⁸

As a result of the ban, only one newsbook appeared in April, and that was at the beginning of the month.¹⁴⁹ In May, however, as parliament became increasingly preoccupied over the likelihood of civil war, the periodicals crept back. By the end of that

¹⁴⁴ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 22; Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 205.

¹⁴⁵ *A Message from a Committee of both Houses to the Spanish Ambassador*, (1642), Thomason Tracts, 669. f. 3. (45).

¹⁴⁶ *Continuation of the True Diurnall of Passages in Parliament*, no. 6, 21 Feb. 1642, 623.06B, pp. 36-37; no. 6, 21 Feb. 1642, 623.06C, p. 46.

¹⁴⁷ Cited in William Clyde, *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press* (London, 1934), pp. 62-63.

¹⁴⁸ *Continuation of the True Diurnall of all the Passages in Parliament*, no. 11, 28 Mar. 1642, 68.11A\ E. 201(34), p. 72.

¹⁴⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 12, 4 Apr. 1642, 507.12\ E. 202(1).

month, three separate weeklies had been printed. In June that figure rose to four, while by July and August six and ten publications were in operation.¹⁵⁰ Chaos in terms of titles, publication details, imprints and pirated editions persisted. Indeed, by August four separate serials appeared that utilized the title *Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament* - no doubt a reflection of the popularity of Pecke's newsbook, which had been re-launched on 20 June.¹⁵¹

By late spring and early summer the newsbooks began to provide substantive detail on a number of military encounters in Ireland. This may partly be explained by the fact that greater numbers of English and Scottish officers had now arrived on the island and were keen to keep friends and family informed of their activities. This is clearly evident in *Occvrrences from Ireland*. Printed in London on 3 May for Henry Twyford, it consisted of eight pages, including the title page, and its numeration indicated that it was part of a series, albeit a brief one.¹⁵² Dated 2-22 April, this periodical differed from other serials in that it went beyond the traditional boundaries of weekly news. Further, it dealt exclusively with news from Ireland. *Occvrrences from Ireland* was based on two letters sent by Robert Cole to friends in England. An officer in Monck's regiment that had arrived in Ireland in February, Cole detailed several engagements between English and Irish forces, which not only highlighted disparate victories by Protestant troops, but also the bloody nature of the war itself. According to the author, little quarter was given to the Irish regardless of rank

¹⁵⁰ Nelson and Seccombe, *S TC*, pp. 622-623. Although *Occvrrences from Ireland* covered news from Ireland between 2-22 April, it was not printed until 3 May. Thus I have included this newsbook in the May figures.

¹⁵¹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 1, 20 Jun. 1642, 509.1v. 202(8). See also N&S 510, 511 and 512.

¹⁵² *Occvrrences from Ireland*, no. 3, 3 May 1642, 464.3. The first two numbered editions in this series are not extant, N&S 464.1-2.

or gender as those considered to have aided the rebellion in any form were either hanged or put to the sword.¹⁵³ For instance, after English forces under the command of Henry Titchbourn had taken Dundalk, where it was alleged most of the inhabitants had been put to death, Cole stated "The warre is now become so bloody, that there is no quarter given on any side."¹⁵⁴

By the summer, the conflict had escalated in terms of the number of men fighting on both sides. On 18 July, *Perfect Diurnall* reported that the committee of Irish affairs had been informed that the rebel army now numbered near 40,000, while the Protestant army presently consisted of 44,000 men in pay.¹⁵⁵ Despite this apparent parity in numbers, the newsbooks continued to report disparate victories. It was common for Irish fatalities to range between 500-1000 while English losses remained minimal.¹⁵⁶ Yet although God's grace continued to be acknowledged in these successes, reports increasingly highlighted the bravery and acumen of English or Scottish forces. On 4 July, for example, the success in securing one stronghold from the Irish was due to the "valourous Courage of our Souldiers being so great, they would not leave the attempt, though it was great odds against them."¹⁵⁷ Furthermore, in the first week of August it was reported that on at least two occasions English ships had flown foreign colors on the pretense that they had arms and provisions to sell to the insurgents. Convinced by their willingness to trade, Irish commanders boarded to negotiate, whereupon they were apprehended and some hanged

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, [pp. 3-6].

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, [p. 7].

¹⁵⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 5, 18 Jul. 1642, 509.5A\E. 202(17), pp. 7-8.

¹⁵⁶ For example, see *Perfect Diurnall*, 25 Jul. 1642, 509.6C\E. 202(23), p. 3; *Some Speciall Passages from London, Westminster, Yorke, Hull*, no. 11, 9 Aug. 1642, 606.11A\E. 109(35), p. 1; *Perfect Durnall*, no. 10, 22 Aug. 1642, 511.10\E. 239(9), p. 8.

¹⁵⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 3, 4 Jul. 1642, 509.3A\E. 202(13), p. 3.

“for a greater terrour to their Colleagues.”¹⁵⁸ Accounts of military activity in the weekly press should be treated with caution, however, for it is clear that some were fabricated. On 19 August, for instance, *A Trve Relation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* related great successes achieved by Scottish soldiers in Munster in recent weeks, despite the fact that no Scottish forces operated in that province.¹⁵⁹

News of corresponding political developments in Ireland was conspicuously deficient in the newsbooks. In May and June of 1642, lay and clerical leaders representing Catholic interests had met at Kilkenny to discuss the formation of a central authority that would assume command of the rebellion. As a result of these meetings an Irish Catholic confederacy was established, whereby the native Irish and the Old English bound themselves through an oath of association that asserted their rights as subjects of Charles I. In addition, it was agreed that a provisional executive be established to direct affairs until a representative assembly of the confederate Catholics could be convened.¹⁶⁰ Significant as these developments were, it was not until after the outbreak of civil war in England that any periodical alluded to the rebel’s “Parliament at Kilkenny.”¹⁶¹ Rather, in relation to events affecting both kingdoms, the focus of the newsbooks throughout the summer was on the progressive struggle between king and parliament over military relief for Ireland.

¹⁵⁸ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 9, 1 Aug. 1642, 511.09\E. 202(29), p. 4; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 8, 7 Aug. 1642, 510.8\E. 202(30), p. 4.

¹⁵⁹ *A Trve Relation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*, 19 Aug. 1642, 638.01\E. 112(36), p. 4.

¹⁶⁰ Corish, “Rising of 1641 and the Catholic confederacy,” pp. 297-299; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 40-42.

¹⁶¹ *Special Passages and Certain Informations from Several Places*, no. 3, 30 Aug. 1642, 605.03\E. 114(36), p. 20.

In this vein, by August, as both parties were on the threshold of civil war, the cautious neutrality generally exhibited by the weekly press during its formative months was beginning to give way to a more perceptible parliamentary bias. An increasing number of periodicals now implied that the king was the principal encumbrance for preventing aid and munitions reaching Ireland. Several papers broadcast claims that troops in Ireland had deserted their posts in favor of returning to serve the king in England. On 19 July, for example, *Some Speciall Passages* reported that the Commons had received information that a number of commanders in Ireland, which included the Quarter-Master General, had departed that kingdom and joined Charles in his attempt to take Hull.¹⁶² The following week another serial related that the House had been notified that a Captain Lloyd had produced a warrant under the king's own hand, which permitted him to leave Ireland for royal service in England.¹⁶³ And on 8 August, *Perfect Diurnall* reported that certain commanders in Ireland, for want of pay, had claimed that they would gladly return to England so that "they should have royall entertainment from his Majesty."¹⁶⁴

According to many newsbooks, the fate of the Protestants in Ireland was not only being undermined by these desertions to the crown, but also by the struggle between king and parliament over military supplies for that kingdom. In June, parliament wanted the ordinance in the Tower of London to be shipped for the relief of Munster. But those responsible for this ordinance informed the Commons that the king had commanded them not to deliver it to Westminster.¹⁶⁵ In consequence, parliament prohibited the royal

¹⁶² *Some Speciall Passages from Westminster, Hull, Yorke*, no. 8, 19 Jul. 1642, 606.08\ E. 202(19), [p. 50]. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, 25 Jul. 1642, 509.6C\ E. 202(23), p. 3.

¹⁶³ *Some Speciall Passages*, no. 9, 26 Jul. 1642, 606.09\ E. 202(25), pp. 58-59.

¹⁶⁴ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 8, 8 Aug. 1642, 509.8A, p. 1.

¹⁶⁵ *Some Speciall Passages*, no. 5, 28 Jun. 1642, 606.05\ E. 202(9), [p. 25].

magazine at Hull, which they had already ordered to be secured in the Tower, from being made accessible to the crown for fear that the king would refuse to let any part of it be removed for Ireland.¹⁶⁶ Fearing the loss of Munster to the insurgents, parliament urged the king to reconsider. However, Charles refused, claiming that “they [parliament] take one part of his Armes from him by force, and then Petition him to deliver up the other.”¹⁶⁷ This refusal by the king no doubt deepened the division between both parties. After debate, both Houses ordered all arms in the Tower to be seized.¹⁶⁸ In an attempt to justify these actions by parliament, Samuel Pecke followed this account in *Perfect Diurnal* with news from Ireland that claimed Limerick had been lost to the Irish due to the slow relief from England.¹⁶⁹ On 8 August, moreover, as civil war beckoned, Pecke reported that Sir William Brereton at Chester had informed the Commons that the king had sent a warrant in an attempt to divert the magazine intended by parliament for Ireland to York.¹⁷⁰ Although the House took expedient measures by sending Augustine Skinner MP to the city to insure that these supplies sailed for Dublin, it was clear by this stage that Charles was desperate for whatever supplies he could muster, regardless of the consequences that his actions may have had for Ireland.¹⁷¹

Irrespective of the fact that parliament also employed both men and supplies originally intended for Ireland for its own uses, not all reports implied that the crown was responsible for the delay of relief for Ireland. One serial acknowledged that strong easterly

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 4, 11 Jul. 1642, 509.4A\E. 202(15), p. 8.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., no. 9, 15 Aug. 1642, 509.9A\E.202(37), p. 2.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

winds had often prevented supplies from reaching that kingdom.¹⁷² Moreover, according to *Occurrences from Ireland*, it was the lord justices who were the root of these problems. Frustrated over the lack of pay, in addition to the quality of ammunition and provisions, Robert Cole claimed:

The Lord Justices are very unkind, they will not give us neither seven days nor 14 nor 28 days pay but small imprests hardly enough to keep life and soul together. And for the private Souldiers, my Lord Parsons Ammunition [and] Beefe hath almost killed halfe of them. In the Rebels Proclomation they spoke of great sums they would give to any that should bring in the Lord of Ormonds head, Sir Charles Coot, the Treasurer, and divers others of the Councell: But when they spoke of the two Lord Justices, Lord Parsons and Burlace, they would not give two pence for theirs.¹⁷³

The inability to supply timely and effective relief to Protestant forces and settlers alike was an issue that surfaced regularly in the newsbooks that summer. In contrast to earlier serials that had focused on relating petitions from divers English counties, greater attention was now being given to solicitations that had come from disparate Irish interests. Petitions received from the inhabitants of Bandonbridge in the south of the island, to the populace of Coleraine in the north urged parliament to relieve their distress in one form or another.¹⁷⁴ Indeed, such was the demand for relief that on 7 July alone, the committee of Irish affairs read 100 Irish petitions.¹⁷⁵ In general, many requests were similar to one that claimed the settlers “had bin stripped of all they had by the Rebels, and craved therein some relief to sustain them.”¹⁷⁶ Requests that originated from particular sections of society were also reported. On 13 July, for example, Pym delivered several petitions from

¹⁷² *Some Speciall Passages*, no. 2, 24 Jul. 1642, 606.02, p. 13.

¹⁷³ *Occurrences from Ireland*, no. 3, 3 May 1642, 464.3, [p. 6].

¹⁷⁴ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 5, 18 Jul. 1642, 509.5A\E. 202(17), p. 7; *Perfect Diurnall*, 11 Jul. 1642, 509.4C\E. 202(14), [p. 5].

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 12, 4 Apr. 1642, 507.12\E. 202(1), pp. 1, 4.

the committee to the Commons on behalf of Judges, JPs and Protestant ministers who all complained that their estates had been “spoyled.”¹⁷⁷ Another petition from divers lords in Ireland urged the laws in England to be effectively executed against papists and recusants “since this most tedious and bloody Rebellion began, they have had some succours from England.”¹⁷⁸ Remarkably, one weekly claimed that a petition had been sent from the insurgents themselves who desired to lay down their arms upon terms of peace!¹⁷⁹ Amid this deluge of solicitations, however, not one appeared to allude to any form of massacre or barbarity perpetrated by the Irish. Rather, the emphasis was on obtaining military, financial or material aid to relieve those who had suffered tangible losses as well as to suppress the rebellion itself.

Parliament often responded to these requests by ordering collections throughout England. These contributions became another divisive issue for crown and parliament. Several newsbooks on 23 August referred to a letter written several days earlier by the king to the Commons “conjuring them before God not to borrow any of the monies given for the relief of Ireland to subdue that bloody Rebellion, and to imploy it against him.”¹⁸⁰ Parliament was in no mood to embrace Charles’s claims. On 23 August, as the king raised his standard at Nottingham, *Speciall Passages* relayed the frustrations felt by both Houses:

If this Kingdome be not preserved (which the Malignant counsell about his Majesty would involve in blood as it is in Ireland) there can be no help for Ireland: that it is too much to be

¹⁷⁷ *Perfect Diurnall or the Proceedings in Parliament*, 19 Jul. 1642, 517.1\E. 202(18), pp. 3–4.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 25 Jul. 1642, 517.2\E. 202(24), p. 2.

¹⁷⁹ *Remarkable Passages in Parliament*, 6 Jun. 1642, 581.3\E. 202(4), p. 7.

¹⁸⁰ *Some Speciall Passages from divers parts of this Kingdome*, no. 2, 23 Aug. 1642, 605.02A\E. 13(18), p. 13; *Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*, 23 Aug. 1642, 638.02, [p. 4].

feared, the friends which the Rebels have in this Kingdome due too much forment this division between the King and Parliament....¹⁸¹

The Irish rebellion no doubt played an important role in bringing both king and parliament to this impasse. It had also been instrumental in the birth of periodical news that centered on domestic occurrences. For the first time, the English populace enjoyed weekly updates on important national concerns, and these included the crisis in Ireland. In fact, approximately 92% of the newbooks printed between the outbreak of the rebellion and the onset of civil war contained news that related to Irish affairs. No serial appeared to take an open stand for either king or parliament at this stage, and as their coverage of the Irish 'massacres' suggests, the early weeklies were not so much instruments of propaganda in contrast to the many pamphlets printed during the same period. Nonetheless, the fact remains that much of their news was gleaned from Westminster, and as a result the newsbooks appeared latently biased toward the hands that fed them. The advent of civil war in England triggered a significant increase in the number of periodical publications, and as will become evident the vast majority of these titles became overtly belligerent toward the king. This hostility became particularly intense amid fears of a royalist alliance with the Irish confederates. Invariably, these concerns would provide the London newsbooks with an armory of 'paper bullets' in the propaganda war that accompanied armed conflict in both kingdoms.

¹⁸¹ *Some Speciall Passages*, no. 2, 23 Aug. 1642, 605.02A\E. 113(18), p. 13.

CHAPTER THREE

TOWARD A CESSATION

SEPTEMBER 1642-SEPTEMBER 1643

The onset of civil war between king and parliament generated an even greater lust for news throughout England. Accordingly, over the next four months there was an increase in the number of newsbooks published. In September 1642 seven new serials entered the market, while an additional eight weeklies surfaced between 1 October and 31 December.¹ Many of these publications were short-lived, however, and shared similar or identical titles - a practice often employed by publishers in order to gain from the standing reputation of a more established rival.² With this in mind, the more prominent publishing concerns attempted to create a title page that their readers could readily identify. Francis Coles, for example, featured a woodcut of the House of Commons in session on the title page of *Perfect Diurnall* in an attempt to distinguish this Pecke-edited work from counterfeits or rival publications.³ Doubtless this also reflected the paper's political sympathies.⁴

Along with Francis Leach, Coles and Pecke were also responsible for *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*.⁵ As with *Perfect Diurnall*, this title was imitated by the rival partnership of Walter Cooke and Robert Wood.⁶ Yet another series of *Perfect Diurnall* was published

¹ Nelson and Seccombe, *STC*, p. 623.

² Joad Raymond, ed., *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-1660* (Moreton-in-Marsh, 1993), p. 18.

³ *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, N&S 513.

⁴ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 29.

⁵ *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*, N&S 638.

⁶ *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*, N&S 54; *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, N&S 511.

under the name of Will Cooke, whereas William Cooke was responsible for *Paerfect* [sic] *Diurnall of the Proceedigns* [sic] *in Parliament*.⁷ Although the majority of these titles continued to reflect a fixation with parliamentary affairs, serials such as *Weekly Intelligence from Severall Parts of this Kingdome* and *Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places* testify that some newsmen were going beyond the confines of Westminster in collating their news.⁸

Speciall Passages first appeared on 16 August 1642 and contained news of events throughout England and Ireland. The fact that it was commonly known as 'Blunden's Passages' suggests that its publisher, Humphrey Blunden, also fulfilled the role of editor.⁹ Blunden generally arranged his news according to geographic location, which in the first several weeks included Dublin, Kinsale, Galway and Limerick. Indeed, during the fall of 1642 *Speciall Passages* contained more news on Irish affairs than any other periodical.¹⁰ On occasion even competing titles cited it as their source when relating reports from Ireland.¹¹ This may also help explain Blunden's frustration in December over counterfeits and imitators when he complained "That under the usurped names of H. Blunden, and the

⁷ *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, N&S 512; *A Paerfect* [sic] *Diurnall of the Proceedigns* [sic] *in Parliament*, N&S 515.

⁸ *Weekly Intelligence from Severall Parts of this Kingdome*, N&S 686; *Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places*, N&S 605.

⁹ Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 To 1667* (Oxford, 1968), p. 27.

¹⁰ For example, see *Speciall Passages*, no. 5, 13 Sep. 1642, 605.05\E. 116(41), pp. 34-35; no. 7, 27 Sep. 1642, 605.07A\E. 118(45), pp. 49-50; no. 8, 4 Oct. 1642, 605.08\E. 119(24), pp. 58-59; no. 13, 8 Nov. 1642, 605.13\E. 126(26), pp. 113-114; no. 20, 27 Dec. 1642, 605.20A\E. 83(25), pp. 169-170. Irish news was nothing new to Blunden. Following the outbreak of the rebellion he had published several pamphlets that related to Ireland. For example, *Good Newes from Ireland* (1642), E. 133(14); *The Last Intelligence from Ireland* (1642), E. 132 (36); *More Happy and Joyfull Newes from Ireland* (1642), E. 142(15); *True Intelligence from Ireland* (1642), E. 142(23).

¹¹ *A Perfect Relation, or Symmarie of all the Declarations, Messages, and Answers, Passages and Proceedings Between the King's Majesty, and both Houses of Parliament*, no. 1, 29 Sep. 1642, 527.1\E. 240(15), pp. 2-3.

like, many inventions, lying and scandalous pamphlets have lately past the presse."¹²

Nonetheless, as events in both kingdoms unfolded during the fall of 1642, Blunden and his associates were afforded greater editorial license in the assortment and presentation of news material. This resulted in the cautious neutrality generally exhibited by editors during the early history of the newsbooks being transposed by an overt parliamentary bias.

THE OUTBREAK OF CIVIL WAR

The outbreak of civil war ensured that, for the foreseeable future, the primary focus of the serials would be the presentation of news that addressed the military struggle in England, rather than the rebellion in Ireland. But although the king's standard had been raised on 22 August, it was not until 23 October that the first major engagement took place at Edgehill in Warwickshire. At least one newsbook noted the significance of this date. *Speciall Passages* reminded its readers that this day marked the first anniversary of the outbreak of the Irish rebellion, when "much innocent Protestant blood" had been shed. It added, "these Jesuits and Rebels now at Court have prevailed to be the same day for this unhappy battle to be fought by the King against his Subjects; a day it seems they dedicate to bloody ends and uses."¹³ The battle itself was largely indecisive, though it did furnish the king with the opportunity to march swiftly on London.¹⁴ The decision by Charles to set up a base in Oxford, however, meant that it was almost three weeks before royalist forces approached the capital. Meanwhile, the earl of Essex had managed to enter the city

¹² *Speciall Passages*, no. 18, 13 Dec. 1642, 605.18\E. 130(10), p. 154.

¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 12, 1 Nov. 1642, 605.12\E. 126(1), p. 102. Catholics also celebrated the 23 October as Ignatious Day in honor of Ignatious Loyola the founder of the Society of Jesus.

¹⁴ For a comprehensive account of the battle at Edgehill see Peter Young, *Edgehill 1642: The Campaign and the Battle* (Kineton, 1967), pp. 107-126.

with the remnants of an army that had fought at Edgehill. Reinforced by the London militia, this coalition outnumbered the king at Turnham Green and forced him to withdraw to Oxford on 13 November. Oxford thus became the royalist headquarters for the rest of the war.

Failure by the king to seize the capital at this early stage of affairs helped determine that the English Civil War would become a prolonged struggle.¹⁵ In this context, the crown and parliament both acknowledged that political and military developments in Ireland could influence the conflict in England. Most significant of these considerations concerned the loyalty of the Protestant army there, particularly those troops under James Butler, earl of Ormond, the king's lieutenant general in that kingdom. If afforded the opportunity to transport this army to England, Charles was optimistic that the royalist war effort would be bolstered. Conversely, parliament's interests were best served if the troubles in Ireland continued, thereby preventing the possibility of these troops, or worse still, the Irish, from coming over to assist the king.

The outbreak of armed conflict in England generated mixed emotions in Ireland. According to one Dublin Protestant, he and his co-religionists in that city suffered "the more here for your distractions in England...all the Papists amongst us, weare favours in their hats, and buy up all the blew and white ribbon in Dublin for favours."¹⁶ As in England, Irish hostilities at this juncture appeared destined to become equally protracted. Throughout the summer of 1642 a military coalition that included Ormond's royalist army, the Scottish covenanters, and regional commanders such as Murrough O'Brien,

¹⁵ S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, 4 vols. (London, 1897-1898), vol. i, pp. 52-60.

¹⁶ *Speciall Passages*, no. 11, 25 Oct. 1642, 605.11\E. 124(14), p. 96.

earl of Inchiquin in Munster had enjoyed a tactical and numerical advantage.¹⁷ Although the rebels occupied most of the country, Ormond continued to control Dublin, much of the Pale, County Louth and parts of Down and Cork, in addition to a number of small enclaves scattered throughout Ulster and Connaught. Meanwhile, the Scots under major general Robert Monro commanded much of east Ulster.¹⁸ As many as 37,000 Protestant soldiers, moreover, were believed to be in arms throughout Ireland as opposed to the estimated troop strength of 23,000 Gaelic and Old English Catholics.¹⁹

The advent of civil war in England, however, forced parliament to divert much of its resources into its struggle against the king. Indeed, when Charles complained to this body of its intent to employ funds for the relief of Ireland against the crown, both Houses maintained "If this Kingdome be not preserved...there can be no help for Ireland."²⁰ Parliament's pre-occupation with being able to sustain its war effort at home no doubt led to a shortage of pay and provisions for the Protestant forces in Ireland. This did not prevent several newsbooks from empathizing with the plight of these soldiers and of promoting concerns that the dearth of supplies would promote contention among them. *Speciall Passages*, for example, related news from Kinsale of conditions faced by government forces:

Our Souldiers...are much infected with diseases, and dejected for want of meanes, and our cause in that respect groweth more and more desperate...men that lived halfe a score of yeares in this Country had they beene armed and placed with good Commanders had beene worth three times as many as shall newly come out of England, would have maintained themselves...without murmuring and such dangerous grudgings as we heare daily.²¹

¹⁷ Jane H. Ohlmeyer, "The wars of religion, 1603-1660," in *A military history of Ireland*, ed. Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery (Cambridge, 1996), p. 164.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 164-165.

¹⁹ Scott Wheeler, "Four Armies In Ireland," in *Ireland from Independence to Occupation 1641-1660*, ed. Jane H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 50-51.

²⁰ *Speciall Passages*, no. 2, 23 Aug. 1642, 605.02A\E. 113(18), p. 13.

²¹ *Ibid.*, no. 13, 8 Nov. 1642, 605.13\E. 126(26), p. 113.

Thus despite trials that appear to have included inexperienced troops and second-rate officers, according to this source, many veterans remained steadfast, for “although great and strange words are uttered about the generall differences in England... the Souldiers hatred to the Irish is uncontrollable, and will never bee appeased.”²² The short-lived *Weekly Intelligencer* echoed similar sentiments. On 11 October the editor relayed correspondence from Dublin dated 8 September, which not only claimed that the war would be along affair, but also questioned the ability of some English officers to suppress this rebellion. The author lamented:

This Kingdome is for present lost, I wish it be regained in seven years; I wish our Lieutenant be right, for heere are Officers of his making as perfect haters of the Parliament, as they are lovers of popery: its true that poor numbers that have lost their estates here are right and valiant, and had the recovery beene committed to them, it had beene done by this, but Souldiers love long Warrs because they know not how other wayes to live.²³

Further political capital was made of government forces in Ireland by *Perfect Diurnall*, which implied that the crown was responsible for luring troops to England in order to serve the king. On 17 October, Pecke promoted intelligence received by the Commons from Ireland that asserted the Irish and “Romanish priests delude the Armies by persuading them that they have the Kings authority for what they do.”²⁴ The following month *Perfect Diurnall* went so far as to falsely relate that ‘Irish Rebels’ had arrived in Cheshire and Lancashire in order to serve the king.²⁵ The fact that Pecke continued to rely on parliamentary sources for much of his information suggests that Westminster was

²² Ibid., p. 114.

²³ *Weekly Intelligence from Severall Parts of this Kingdome*, 11 Oct. 1643, 686.1VE. 121(34), p. 5. The second and last number in this series was printed the following week.

²⁴ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 18, 17 Oct. 1642, 513.18A\VE. 240(40), [p. 5].

²⁵ Ibid., no. 24, 28 Nov. 1642, 513.24B\VE. 242(27), [p. 7].

quite willing to allow the promotion of such allegations, regardless of their veracity, if they induced those in England who remained undecided to declare for parliament.

Military developments in Ireland continued to attract the attention of the newsbooks, particularly reports that promoted alleged oft-disparate victories against the Irish. Nonetheless, for any individual who read more than one weekly these accounts would have been confusing. Inchiquin's success at Liscarrol in County Cork on 3 September, for example, was widely reported by several serials, but this did not prevent the editors from presenting conflicting versions in terms of troop strength, fatalities and even the location of this engagement. According to at least one periodical, a Protestant force that was only one-tenth in strength defeated an Irish army that numbered as many as 17,000! In contrast, a rival weekly maintained that not only were both sides of equal parity, but that the battle occurred in a separate province altogether.²⁶ Equally remarkable was the fact that the intelligence surrounding events at Liscarrol originated in letters brought to parliament from Ireland by one Captain Ashley. Either the letters themselves contained diverging accounts of what had transpired in that kingdom, or some editors

²⁶ On 29 September *A Continuation of True and Speciall Passages, from Severall Places of this Kingdome* reported that 17,000 rebels were scattered by an Anglo-Scottish force of 1,700 killing 700 Irish, despite the fact that Scottish forces remained confined to Ulster at this time. *Continuation of True and Speciall Passages*, 29 Sep. 1642, 74.1\E. 119(6), pp. 6-7. That same week *Speciall Passages* maintained that a Protestant force of 1,600 had defeated an Irish army of 16,000, killing 700 of the rebels with the loss of only twelve men. *Speciall Passages*, no. 7, 27 Sep. 1642, 605.07A\E. 118(45), p. 56. The following week Blunden provided further details of this battle and paid particular attention to the personal courage and leadership of Inchiquin. However, the strength of the Irish was now put at 5,000 foot and 10 troop of horse, while Inchiquin's forces remained at 1,700 foot with an additional 8 troop of horse. *Speciall Passages*, no. 8, 4 Oct. 1642, 605.08\E. 119(24) pp. 58-59. In contrast, Pecke maintained that 1,600 men under Inchiquin had set upon a similar number of rebels in their quarters in Connaught, killing 700 Irish while losing only six men, *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 16, 3 Oct. 1642, 513.16A\E. 240(19), [p. 4]. A rival edition of *Perfect Diurnall* claimed that an Anglo-Scottish force of 3,000 men had encountered a rebel force of some 5,000 near Galway, which resulted in 2,000 Irish fatalities and fewer than ten government soldiers killed. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 17 [sic] 3 Oct. 1642, 511.16C\E. 202(45), [p. 5]. *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament*, moreover, noted that approximately 1,000 troops had sallied out of Galway and defeated an Irish force of 16,000, killing 700 with the loss of only six men. *Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 10, 29 Sep. 1642, 638.10\E. 240(16), [p. 7].

may have considered that it made greater copy to relate the success of Protestant troops, despite 'overwhelming' odds. The reality of Liscarrol was that Catholic numbers were closer to 7,000, while Protestant strength was approximately half that figure.²⁷ Thus the generally contrary and inflationary figures provided by the newsbooks to their readers suggests that these publications could not be relied upon to present military affairs in Ireland in an impartial or reliable manner.

ORMOND'S FEALTY

Lack of money and provisions prevented Protestant troops from following up on successes such as Liscarrol.²⁸ The dearth of supplies from England generally restricted them to garrisoning important ports and castles, although occasional campaigns into rebel territory were mounted in order to secure or destroy crops, livestock and shelter.²⁹ The fact that government forces were often compelled to maintain a defensive strategy presented the opportunity for several newsbooks to question the fidelity of James Butler, the earl of Ormond. One of the few Old English Protestants in Ireland, Ormond had by 1641 become the principal royalist figure in that kingdom. Accordingly, after the outbreak of the rebellion the king appointed him as lieutenant general of the crown's forces. Conversely, most of the earl's family and friends were Catholic, a number of whom became leading figures in the political and military leadership of the rebellion. These included Ormond's great uncle, Richard Butler, the viscount Mountgarrett, who assumed the presidency of the supreme council of the confederacy at Kilkenny,

²⁷ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 307-311; Richard Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, 3 vols. (London, 1963), vol. ii, pp. 22-23. It should be noted that Protestant forces in Ireland were not exclusively Protestant. Some Catholics also fought for the crown.

²⁸ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 311.

²⁹ Wheeler, "Four Armies In Ireland," p. 45.

Ormond's brother-in-law, Donough MacCarthy, the viscount Muskerry, and Richard Bellings, the earl's son-in-law who also acted as secretary of the council.³⁰

Even before the establishment of the confederate council, however, these connections played a role in efforts to undermine Ormond's credibility in England. The earl was aware of this. In an attempt to squash rumors that claimed he had provided intelligence to the rebels, on 3 March 1642 Ormond wrote to Sir Philip Percival and complained of:

reports of pamphlets spread of mee and lie like Knives as they are...my Religion saith fullnesse nor the hazard of my life preserves mee not from the reproach and scandall dayly cast upon mee by those that conclude me guilty because most of my papist kindred and friends are soe....³¹

The earl clearly still enjoyed support at Westminster. When one particular pamphlet slandered his reputation in February, the House of Commons ordered that measures be taken for "Repairing the Honour of the Lord of Ormond much wounded by this pamphlett and for the corporall punishment of the printer."³²

During the spring of 1642 Ormond performed his role as commander of the crown's forces in Ireland admirably, and victories obtained over the insurgents at Drogheda in March and Kilrush in April did much to enhance his reputation. In light of this, as relations between the king and parliament in England deteriorated, each camp recognized the importance of securing the earl's allegiance. This resulted in his being

³⁰ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 65.

³¹ Ormond to Sir Philip Percival, 3 Mar. 1642, Bodleian Library, Carte MSS 118, f. 113. For further correspondence on this issue see Leicester to Ormond, 13 Mar. 1642, Bodl., Carte MSS 2, f. 461; Wishart to Ormond, 22 Mar. 1642, Bodl., Carte MSS 2, f. 492; Tempest to Ormond, Mar. 1642, Bodl., Carte MSS 2, f. 492; Tempest to Ormond, Mar. 1642, Bodl., Carte MSS 4, f. 555.

³² Order of House of Commons to Committee of Printing, 8 Mar. 1642, Bodl., Carte MSS 2, f. 415. The pamphlet in question appears to be *The Petition of Sir Philomy Oneale* (1642), E. 137(14), which declared a readiness by the Irish to submit to the king upon honorable condition. The fact that this petition had been 'endorsed' not only by O'Neill, but also by "Osmond" [sic] and the earl of Antrim among others, suggests that it was nothing more than propaganda.

feted by both parties. In July the Commons awarded Ormond a jewel in “remembrance of their affection and also a pledge of their intention of taking all occasion to acknowledge his...zealous endeavours to serve this State and the true Religion.”³³

Likewise, on 30 August, one week after the royal standard had been raised, the king elevated Ormond to a marquis and also conferred on him the knighthood of the garter.³⁴ These accolades from the crown, though, compounded a growing distrust toward the earl by lord justice Parsons and other New English officials of the Irish government whose fealty lay not with the king, but rather with Westminster.

This mistrust may help explain why within days after the onset of civil war a number of newsbooks began to depict Ormond in a less flattering light. Up to this juncture, the serials had consistently acknowledged the lieutenant general’s service in Ireland.³⁵ But with the advent of hostilities in England there was pressing support at Westminster and in the Dublin administration for Leicester, the pro-parliamentary lord lieutenant of Ireland, to receive his commission from the king to sail for Ireland. If this came to pass, government forces in Ireland would come under Leicester’s command, rather than Ormond’s.³⁶ In this vein, on 19 September *Perfect Diurnall* noted that since he had received his honors from the king, Ormond “slackens his vigilancy over the Protestant forces whereby there is great distrust of his fidelity to the Parliament.”³⁷ *Speciall Passages* further reported that since these accolades, Ormond:

³³ Lenthall to Ormond, [Jul. 1642], Bodl., Carte MSS 3, f. 409.

³⁴ *Speciall Passages*, no. 4, 6 Sep. 1642, 605.04E. 115(21), p. 32.

³⁵ For example, see *Continuation of the True Diurnall of Passages in Parliament*, no. 7, 28 Feb. 1642, 623.07A\E. 201(19), p. 51; no. 7, 28 Feb. 1642, 623.07B, p. 52; *Perfect Diurnall*, 14 Mar. 1642, 507.09A\E. 201(23), [p. 2]; 14 Mar. 1642, 507.09B, [p. 2]; *True Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, no. 10, 21 Mar. 1642, 626.10\E. 201(29), [p. 2].

³⁶ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 288-296, 349-351.

³⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 513.14\E. 240(5), [p. 2].

hath not gotten much honour in the Field...his souldiers are much disheartened, hearing that many of the Commanders are daily sent for to His Majesty, and such relief as was coming to them, detained from them in England by the Cavaliers.³⁸

That same week a rival newsbook claimed that although the marquis had 8,000 men under his command in the Irish capital, he “stirs not, but suffers the Rebels to come even to the walls of Dublin, pillaging and spoyling without any resistance.”³⁹ One serial falsely contended that Ormond had rebelled and was presently imprisoned by the Protestants at Limerick Castle in the north of Ireland!⁴⁰ In this regard, the editor’s history was as poor as his geography as, Limerick Castle had capitulated to the insurgents on 21 June.⁴¹ In fact, Ormond’s passivity at this time was due to the marquis’s ill health, rather than any deep-seeded conspiracy with the rebels.⁴² Nonetheless, it was clear that following the outbreak of civil war a number of London newsbooks were echoing concerns felt at Dublin and Westminster over the lieutenant general’s role as commander of the crown’s forces in Ireland. By doing so they were implying that little confidence could be placed in the king to reduce the rebellion.

‘THE GREAT ONEALE’

Ormond was not the only Irish figure at this time to attract the attention of the periodical press. The principal news to come out of Ireland in the last months of 1642 addressed the arrival of Owen Roe O’Neill. O’Neill, the nephew of the earl of Tyrone, had for almost

³⁸ *Speciall Passages*, no. 7, 27 Sep. 1642, 605.07A\E. 119(2), p. 51. This particular edition of *Speciall Passages* was published for Robert Wood and was different from Blunden’s edition, which was printed the same day. *Ibid.*, no. 7, 27 Sep. 1642, 605.07A\E. 118(45).

³⁹ *Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 9, 24 Sep. 1642, 638.09\E. 240(9), [pp. 4 -5]. The strength of Ormond’s forces in the entire province of Leinster at this time has been estimated to be between 4-6,000, Wheeler, “Four Armies in Ireland,” p. 51.

⁴⁰ *An Exact and True Divrnall of the Proceedings in Parliament*, 29 Aug. 1642, 143.3\E. 202(39), p. 3.

⁴¹ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 304.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 351-352.

four decades enjoyed a successful military career on the continent while in the service of Spain. After the outbreak of the rebellion in Ulster, papal diplomatic pressure persuaded the Spanish governor of the Low Countries to allow him to 'desert' his command in order to support the uprising.⁴³ Accordingly, in early July 1642 O'Neill returned to his native Ulster with fellow veterans and a cargo of badly needed arms and ammunition.⁴⁴ His arrival created fresh hope for the insurrection in the north, which was beginning to lose its momentum against Monro's Scottish forces, and by the end of August, he was appointed commander of the Ulster army at a general assembly of the Ulster Irish at Clones.⁴⁵ O'Neill not only faced the challenge of Monro, however, but that of organizing a disciplined force from a rabble that he claimed possessed "no obedience among soldiers, if one [can] call men soldiers who behave nothing better than animals."⁴⁶

The first serials to convey news of O'Neill's arrival were printed on 19 September. Such was the weight of his reputation that four separate issues of Robert Wood's *Perfect Diurnall* were published on that date, all of which highlighted this event.⁴⁷ More significantly, the return of Owen Roe provided the newsbooks the opportunity for propaganda to further undermine the credibility of the crown. *Speciall Passages* provided the most detailed account. Blunden claimed that, according to the Mayor of Pembroke in South Wales, several individuals, including the commander of the

⁴³ Jerrold I. Casway, "Owen Roe O'Neill's Return to Ireland in 1642: The Diplomatic Background," *Studia Hibernica* 9 (1969), pp. 48-64.

⁴⁴ Casway, "Owen Roe O'Neill's Return," pp. 60-61; idem, *Owen Roe O'Neill and the Struggle for Catholic Ireland* (Philadelphia, 1984), pp. 62-63.

⁴⁵ Casway, "Owen Roe O'Neill's Return," p. 62; idem, *Owen Roe*, p. 63.

⁴⁶ Cited by Raymond Gillespie, "Owen Roe O'Neill," in *Nine Ulster Lives*, ed. Gerard O'Brien and Peter Roebuck (Belfast, 1992), p. 155.

⁴⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14A/E. 240(7); no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14B; no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14C/E. 240(6); no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14D/E. 240(3). Wood's *Perfect Diurnall* continued until 19 June 1643, and although imitations and counterfeits of it were common, this was the only occasion in which more than three separate issues appeared in one week.

ship that had transported O'Neill to Ireland, had recently been detained in the port. These men not only swore that O'Neill had landed with 300 soldiers, but that he possessed a commission from the king to oppose all English and Scottish forces that resisted him.⁴⁸ *Perfect Diurnall* was even more frenetic and reported that the commission encouraged O'Neill to "kill and destroy all the English and Scots in Ireland and afterwards to come over to England, to doe the like to the Rebels here."⁴⁹ Another edition of this serial even proclaimed that since his arrival O'Neill "doth put all men, women and children to the sword."⁵⁰ Although some editors may have hoped that the commission was obtained without the king's knowledge, others appeared to promote Owen Roe's return as part of an international popish conspiracy that Charles was privy to.⁵¹ Blunden, for example, presented news from Dublin that maintained O'Neill would never have landed if two English naval captains had not set sail for England "either out of favour to the Rebels, or in obedience to the command of some that was loath to hinder the landing of Oneale."⁵² Clearly, allegations that implied the king had conspired to bring O'Neill to Ireland overshadowed the significance of the landing itself and the effect this could have on the conflict in that kingdom.

⁴⁸ *Speciall Passages*, no. 6, 20 Sep. 1642, 605.06A\ E. 118(10), pp. 42-43.

⁴⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14A\ E. 240(5), [p. 6].

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14D\ E. 240(3), [p. 7].

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14A\ E. 240(7), [p. 3]; no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 511.14B, [pp. 5-6]; no. 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 513.14\ E. 240(5), [p. 7].

⁵² *Speciall Passages*, no. 7, 27 Sep. 1642, 605.07A\ E. 118(45), p. 50. Although the majority of English naval officers supported parliament during the civil wars, Henry Stradling and Thomas Kettleby, the Admiral of the Irish Guard, remained loyal to the king. Both men responded to orders issued by Charles on 23 June that requested all captains to bring their ships to Newcastle or Scarborough. M.L. Baumber, "The Navy and Civil War in Ireland 1641-1643" *Mariner's Mirror* 57 (1971), p. 389. Their departure from the Irish coast had left both men open to charges of desertion and piracy by several newsbooks. For example, see *Speciall Passages*, no. 2, 23 Aug. 1643, 605.02A\ E. 113(18), p. 13; *Remarkable Passages, or a Perfect Diurnall of the Weekly Proceedings in both Houses of Parliament*, no. 1, 12 Sep. 1643, 583.1\ E. 202(44), p. 2; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 13, 12 Sep. 1643, 511.13\ E. 239(19), [p. 2].

Colonel Thomas Preston followed O'Neill to Ireland in September. Preston was of Old English stock, and although he had similarly distinguished himself on the continent in the service of Spain, his appearance, unlike Owen Roe's, was not heralded by the newsbooks. Shortly after he landed, however, the supreme council appointed Preston as commander of the confederate forces in Leinster.⁵³ But although Preston and O'Neill brought with them considerable leadership and military experience to the Irish cause, they also harbored a mutual dislike toward one another that would manifest itself as the rebellion progressed. This rivalry did have propaganda value in England. On 25 October, for instance, *Speciall Passages* related claims that O'Neill had been awarded "the chiefe command" among the Irish, which apparently forced Preston into wishing that he had never returned to that kingdom. This competition between the confederation's two principal commanders, it was concluded, would "bring an advantage to the Protestant Party."⁵⁴

THE FIRST CONFEDERATE ASSEMBLY

The need for greater cooperation between the insurgents was instrumental in the first meeting of the general assembly of the confederate Catholics. The assembly gathered between 24 October and 21 November 1642 at Kilkenny, a town that *Perfect Diurnall* later noted the Irish "doe more Idolize than any other."⁵⁵ Old English and native Irish representatives from all four provinces congregated as a unicameral body, with bishops, lords and commons sharing the same chamber.⁵⁶ Mindful of the principle of royal

⁵³ In addition to Ulster and Leinster being handed to O'Neill and Preston, Garrett Barry and John Bourke were appointed military commanders for Munster and Connaught respectively.

⁵⁴ *Speciall Passages*, no. 11, 25 Oct. 1642, 605.11VE. 124(14), p. 97.

⁵⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 41, 27 Mar. 1643, 513.41A, [p. 7].

⁵⁶ Ó Sióchru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 44.

authority in Ireland, the assembly members drew up an oath of association by which they swore loyalty to the king and the defense of their lives, liberties and religion against the governments in Dublin and Westminster.⁵⁷ They were thus denying that the English parliament had any right to legislate for Ireland, a concern reinforced by that body having legislated earlier in the year the confiscation of two and a half million acres of Irish land.⁵⁸ Furthermore, although the general assembly may have been a parliament in all but name, the confederates were careful never to assume the title, remaining steadfast in their declared loyalty to the crown.⁵⁹ Such nuances, though, made little difference to the editor of *Speciall Passages*, who, in breaking news of the first meeting of the assembly related:

Our Rebellious Rebels have had a generall meeting, which they call a Parliament, by what authority assembled, I know not at Kilkenny; some say the Parliament in the Lord Lieutenants time was never dissolved, and that they assemble by the same authority, others say they have received a new power, but certaine it is they have a generall meeting, and have decreed to persevere in the utter extirpation of our Nation and Religion.⁶⁰

Before dispersing, each assembly elected a supreme council of twenty-four members who were selected in equal numbers from lists submitted by representatives from each of the four provinces.⁶¹ This council assumed responsibility for the executive and judicial functions of government in addition to overseeing the daily administration of the confederate war effort, although in theory it surrendered its authority whenever an

⁵⁷ J.C. Beckett, "The Confederation of Kilkenny Reviewed," *Historical Studies* II, ed. Michael Roberts (London, 1959), pp. 32-33; Corish, "Rising of 1641," pp. 298-300.

⁵⁸ Beckett, "Confederation of Kilkenny," pp. 33-34; Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land*, pp. 40-42.

⁵⁹ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 44-45.

⁶⁰ *Speciall Passages*, no. 20, 27 Dec. 1642, 605.20A/E. 83(25), p. 169.

⁶¹ Beckett, "Confederation of Kilkenny," p. 31.

assembly was in session.⁶² Thus, as the war progressed, it was the supreme council that assumed the dominant role in both political and military affairs.⁶³

'IRISH CAVALIERS'

As developments in both kingdoms unfolded during the fall of 1642, the parliamentary newsbooks proceeded to identify the rebellion in Ireland with the royalist war effort in England. This was particularly evident in *Speciall Passages* wherein those who enjoyed the king's ear were promptly dubbed "Irish Cavaliers."⁶⁴ Similarly, Blunden printed allegations from a "Godly Minister" in Shrewsbury, which not only claimed that the cavaliers plundered, pillaged and wore crucifixes about their necks, but that they also drank "a health to the good successe of Sir Phelim O'Neale in Ireland."⁶⁵ On 25 October, *Speciall Passages* further questioned the king's intent concerning both kingdoms when it presented news from Westminster that claimed the king:

hath let loose the Raines of the Papists (whose mercy is cruelty)... for the extirpation of the contrary Religion by fire and faggot... likewise that his Majestie hath such members of Irish Rebels and Papists about him as is not to be beleaved... that his Ma [jesty] had reproved the Lords Justices in Ireland for being so severe against the Rebels, advising them to respect them with mercy though these bloody villaines were mercilessly inhumane and savage like to the poore Protestants....⁶⁶

Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages echoed these sentiments and the effect such news was having upon Protestant forces in Ireland. On 24 September, it maintained that the Irish received:

great encouragement from England by the King's party, declaring themselves to bee the Kings onely subjects, and that they have his commission for what they doe, some of the chief of them having lately had access to his Majesty, and in great favour, whereby there is such devisions and Jealousies raised among our owne forces, that those which stand

⁶² Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 49.

⁶³ Micheal Ó Siochru, "The Confederation of Kilkenny," *History Ireland* 2, no. 2 (1994), p. 52.

⁶⁴ *Speciall Passages*, no. 6, 20 Sep. 1642, 605.06A\E. 118(10), p. 47.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 9, 11 Oct. 1642, 605.09A\E. 121(31), p. 69.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 11, 25 Oct. 1642, 605.11\E. 124(14), p. 94.

well affected to the Parliament are discouraged to proceed further in the service, fearing to be betrayed by others of their owne party.⁶⁷

Few serials were more anti-royal and indeed anti-Irish by this time than *England's Memorable Accidents*. First published on 12 September 1642 for Stephen Bowtell, this newsbook did not waver in presenting news that portrayed both parties in the worst possible light.⁶⁸ On 3 October, the editor reported parliament's petition to the king that deplored those in his midst who had "excited and fomented an horrid Rebellion in Ireland and...endeavoured to begin a massacre here...and that they intended to bring over the Irish Rebels...to assist them."⁶⁹ Later that month he related that "a person of credit" had sworn that many Irish had voluntarily confessed they would have never have rebelled without the commission from England that had given them the authority to rise in arms.⁷⁰ Equally damning to the king were allegations that claimed Jesuits and priests on the continent had collected considerable sums of money to relieve the Irish and to further the king's struggle against the parliament in England.⁷¹ Nor did the insurgents escape attention. News "credibly reported" from Dublin in September expressed fear among the Protestant minority in that city that they were about to be massacred by the "viperous Inhabitants amongst them."⁷² Shortly thereafter the editor presented 'intelligence' that claimed vessels flying Irish colors had not only seized English and Scottish ships, but that

⁶⁷ *Certaine Specieall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 9, 24 Sep. 1642, 638.09\E. 240(9), [p.4]. This series was another Pecke-edited production. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 15, 26 Sep. 1642, 513.15\E. 240(14), [pp. 4-5].

⁶⁸ The first week's edition was titled *Quotidian Occurrences in and about London*. The remaining eighteen issues, however, were titled *England's Memorable Accidents*, N&S 579.

⁶⁹ *England's Memorable Accidents*, [unnumbered] 3 Oct. 1642, E. 240(22)\579.04, p. 28. This series remained unnumbered.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 17 Oct. 1642, 579.06\E. 240(42), p. 42.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 31 Oct. 1642, 579.08\E. 240(49), p. 58.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 26 Sep. 1642, 579.03\E. 240(12), p. 21.

“they throwe all the men overboard, or else hang them, and they commit the like cruelty upon the very Doggs in those ships.”⁷³ Although unfounded, the selection and presentation of such reports by *England's Memorable Accidents* was a useful means of propaganda designed not only to reinforce the image of the ‘wild Irish,’ but more importantly, to associate the king and his adherents with these ‘savages.’

THE BIRTH OF ‘MERCURIUS AULICUS’

Amid the increasing belligerence of the London weeklies, it was only a matter of time before the court initiated a sustained campaign to fight with the pen as well as the sword.⁷⁴ The advent of *Mercurius Aulicus* in Oxford on 7 January 1643 opened a new chapter in the history of the English newsbook.⁷⁵ Although the king was aware of the power of the press and had printing presses carried with him into the north Midlands and Welsh borders, *Aulicus* marked the first and indeed the most successful attempt by the crown in promoting a weekly news serial.⁷⁶ Peter Heylin, a Laudian divine, appears to have been responsible for editing the first issues of *Aulicus*, although by September 1643, John Berkenhead, who had enjoyed a close relationship with Laud during the 1630s, had become the principal editor.⁷⁷ The editorial office was located in Oriel College where the Executive Committee of the Privy Council met.⁷⁸ Here, *Aulicus* was supplied with

⁷³ Ibid., 17 Oct. 1642, 579.06\E. 240(42), p. 45.

⁷⁴ P.W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford, 1969), p. 29.

⁷⁵ *Mercurius Aulicus, Communicating the Intelligence and Affaires of the Court to the Rest of the Kingdome*, no. 1, 7 Jan. 1643, 275.101A. Efforts were made by the authorities to keep copies of *Aulicus* from reaching London. However, the royalists not only succeeded in smuggling the court mercury into the city, but from the second week of production until the first week of February 1645, secret presses in the capital successfully produced reprints of this work.

⁷⁶ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 28-29. For details of the court's efforts in utilizing the power of the press in the formative stages of the civil war see Joyce Lee Malcolm, *Caesar's Due. Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646* (London, 1983), pp. 124-140.

⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 18-27, 30-34.

⁷⁸ Frederick John Varley, *Mercurius Aulicus* (Oxford, 1948), p. ix.

intelligence from the court, which was channeled through Edward Nicholas's office on the instructions of George Digby, both of whom were secretaries of state to the king.⁷⁹

The fact that *Aulicus* reflected the king's views and those of the ruling clique, and also that by late 1643 it cost three pence, suggests that it was aimed primarily at the upper classes.⁸⁰ However, considering that as many as 3,000 copies of *Aulicus* could have been published at times, and that each civil war periodical passed through many hands, England's first 'official newsbook' most likely enjoyed a wide audience.⁸¹

From the outset, *Aulicus* was designed to counter the propaganda promoted by the periodical press in London. And, the fact that it was printed on Sunday implied a conscious ridiculing of Puritan sabbatarianism.⁸² The first week's edition opened with the following proclamation:

The World hath long enough been abused with falsehoods: And there's a weekly cheat put out to nourish the abuse amongst the people, and make them pay for their seducement. And that the world may see that the Court is neither so barren of intelligence as it is conceived, nor the affaires thereof in so unprosperous a condition as these pamphlets make them, it is thought fit to let them truly understand the state of things, that so they may no longer pretend ignorance, or bee deceived with untruths.⁸³

In this context, Heylin and Berkenhead not only presented news, but they followed it with their own personal observations and concluded each edition with a repudiation of reports that had been recently printed in the parliamentary press.⁸⁴ This wealth of editorial

⁷⁹ Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 42.

⁸⁰ This was greatly more expensive than the parliamentary weeklies, which usually sold for a penny a copy. Keeping in mind that one penny could purchase a quarter pound of beef or mutton, this difference in price was considerable. Joyce Lee Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 141-143; Thomas, *Berkenhead*, p. 52.

⁸¹ 250 copies appeared to have been the common unit for setting printing rates during this era, and it is likely that newsbooks were generally printed in quantities of between 250 and 1,000. The average print-run was probably 500 copies, while more popular titles such as *Aulicus* and *Perfect Diurnall* may have approached as many as 3,000 copies. For a more detailed examination of print-runs for newsbooks at this time see Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 233-237. See also Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 13, 57, 146, and Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 8, 10, 12.

⁸² Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 33.

⁸³ *Aulicus*, no. 1, 7 Jan. 1643, 275.101A, p. 1.

⁸⁴ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 34.

comment resulted in *Aulicus* consisting of twelve pages rather than the standard eight found in its rivals.

Given the fact that the pro-parliamentary serials continued to associate the court with the rebellion in Ireland, it is notable that Irish affairs received little attention by *Aulicus* in the first several months of its history. On occasion, parliament was charged with utilizing funds collected for Ireland to maintain the war against the crown in England. These measures, the editor maintained, were “new Arts invented every day for extorting money.”⁸⁵ Nonetheless, aside from allegations of alleged financial abuse, the relative silence by *Aulicus* on Irish issues was deafening. No doubt Oxford wished to depreciate any attention that may have increased awareness of events in that kingdom, particularly at a time when Charles had initiated moves toward establishing a cessation with the confederates. Indeed, it was not until the summer of 1643 that *Aulicus* relayed news that touched on Ireland, and this was generally in response to allegations made by the capital’s newsbooks that linked the king with the insurgents.

January 1643 also witnessed the introduction of two additional London serials, bringing the total number of pro-parliamentary weeklies for that month to nine.⁸⁶ *Certain Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome* and *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* were the fruits of a publishing partnership that involved Robert White, who would become the most successful newsbook proprietor of the first civil war.⁸⁷ First

⁸⁵ *Aulicus*, no. 9, 4 Mar. 1643, 275.109, p. 113. See also no. 10, 11 Mar. 1643, 275.110A, p. 125, and no. 19, 13 May 1643, 275.119, pp. 247-248.

⁸⁶ This included rival editions of *Perfect Diurnal* and *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* for Coles and Wood respectively, Blunden’s *Speciall Passages, England’s Memorable Accidents*, which ceased operation after 16 January, and *The Daily Intelligencer of Court, City, and Countrey*, which lasted only one week.

⁸⁷ A.N.B. Cotton, “John Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group,” *English Historical Studies* 93 (1978), pp. 821-822; Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” p. 61.

published on 23 January, *Certain Informations* was edited by William Ingler, a scandal-monger who relied heavily on rumor and gossip that generally resulted in inaccurate reports.⁸⁸ More important was *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, which first appeared on 3 January and continued to operate, albeit with minor interruptions, until 9 October 1649. No concrete evidence can be found as to the identity of the editor. Frank suggests that one Richard Collings fulfilled this role, whereas both Cotton and Raymond favor Captain Thomas Audley. The fact that *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* paid considerable attention to military affairs, however, suggests that it was Audley who edited it.⁸⁹ In fact, the editor himself noted in April that he would shortly have to “repaire to my Colours” having in recent times “made more use of my Pen then my sword.”⁹⁰ Whomever his identity, there can be little doubt that *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* was outspoken in its praise for parliament and equally disdainful in promoting its abhorrence for both Catholicism and royalist forces, who were frequently referred to as the “Popish Army,” “Popish Rebels,” “Popish Cavaliers,” or those “blood-sucking popish Cavaliers.”⁹¹

⁸⁸ Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” p. 69. For example, on 6 March 1643 the editor claimed that up to 1500 Irish rebels had arrived in North Wales, while later that same month he asserted that Ormond had captured Kilkenny from the Irish! *Certain Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome*, no. 7, 6 Mar. 1643, 36.07E. 92(3), p. 50; no. 10, 27 Mar. 1643, 36.10E. 94(11), p. 78.

⁸⁹ Frank argues that since the paper appears to have been edited by the same individual throughout its history, the title page of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 229, 12 Oct. 1647, which bore the phrase “Collected by R.C.,” suggests that the author was one Richard Collings, a London bookseller. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 36, 308 n. 13. Cotton on the other hand maintains that Audley was responsible, and points to claims made by Robert White when the House of Lords in June 1644 summoned White to answer defamatory remarks made against the earl of Stamford in a recent edition of the newsbook. Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” pp. 61-62; Clyde, “Parliament and the Press” p. 407. Raymond also favors Audley, but suggests that editorial responsibility may have changed hands at some point during the paper’s history. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 27 n.31.

⁹⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 16, 18 Apr. 1643, 214.018E. 97(9), p. 128.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, no. 2, 10 Jan. 1643, 214.002E. 84(29), p. 10; no. 5, 31 Jan. 1643, 214.005E. 86(40), pp. 39-40; no. 6, 7 Feb. 1643, 214.006E. 88(20), p. 45.

'ENGLAND TURNED IRELAND'

As the civil war progressed during the winter of 1642-43 the pro-parliamentary newsbooks became less restrained in relating atrocities that were alleged to have been committed by both the cavaliers and the Irish in their respective kingdoms. The most horrific allegations resembled those accounts that had been promoted by divers pamphlets in the months following the outbreak of the rebellion. *Speciall Passages* reported news from Munster on 31 January 1643 that claimed the Irish had "most inhumanely murdered" four children in the village of Coole, whereby the infants were found with "their eyes pluckt out, their noses cut off, and one of them having about 30 Wounds."⁹² However, the credibility of this account must remain suspect, particularly when one considers that this news was dated on Thursday 26 January, and thus unlikely to have reached Blunden in London by the following Tuesday when that week's edition of *Speciall Passages* was printed.

Alleged royalist atrocities in England were also promoted. Although a code of conduct operated throughout the civil war, failure by both royalist and parliamentary forces to observe it consistently provided fodder for propagandists on both sides.⁹³ Forces under the command of Prince Rupert, the king's nephew, were generally at the sharp end of these charges, and were often analogous with Irish barbarity. On 20 November, for example, *Perfect Diurnall* highlighted the cruelty exhibited by Rupert's men at Brentford earlier that month. According to the editor, such was "their barbarous

⁹² *Speciall Passages*, no. 25, 31 Jan. 1643, 605.25E. 86(39), p. 207. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 34, 6 Feb. 1643, 513.34A/E. 246(2), [p. 5]; no. 34, 6 Feb. 1643, 511.34B, [p. 5].

⁹³ For a comprehensive examination on the rules of war at this time see, Barbara Donagan, "Codes and Conduct In The English Civil War," *Past & Present* 118 (1988), pp. 65-95; idem, "Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason in the English Civil War," *American Historical Review* 99 (1994), pp. 1137-1166; Ian Roy, "England Turned Germany? The Aftermath Of The Civil War In Its European Context," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 28 (1978), pp. 127-144.

carnage... Ireland and Germany could scarce parallell the like ...and an Irish Whore being Comrade to one of the Cavalliers finding one of our souldiers halfe dead upon the ground used him most cruelly, and afterwards cut his throat.⁹⁴ The following month Pecke informed his readers that as royalist troops plundered Marlborough in Wiltshire, they used women “with the like cruelty as the Rebels doe in Ireland.”⁹⁵ In the process of capturing the Gloucestershire town of Cirencester on 2 February 1643, moreover, *Perfect Diurnall* further alleged that Rupert’s forces spared neither:

Men, women and children that they met withall in the streets, and most cruelly murdered a godly Divine and his whole family, and two other Ministers as is most notoriously knowne, those they let escape with life, they used with worse cruelty than death; stripped them starke naked and dragged them about the street...holding their naked swords and pistols to their brests, and at last drove them like doggs into a Church, where they kept them in that naked and miserable condition all day and night without allowing them either bread or water...the like cruelty in all respects if it were fully related, could not be paralel’d by the Irish Rebels.⁹⁶

Regardless of the credibility of such accounts, the serials showed little hesitation in likening royalist ‘atrocities’ with crimes associated with the rebels in Ireland, which no doubt helped project the image of “England turned Ireland.”⁹⁷ Likewise, the London newsbooks shared the belief long evident in their coverage of the Irish revolt that the conflict in England was one in which God would intervene to assist those forces that remained steadfast whatever the odds against the forces of Rome. Recent defiance to

⁹⁴ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 23, 20 Nov. 1642, 513.23B\ E. 242(17), [p. 6]. Also no. 23, 20 Nov. 1642, 513.23A\ E. 242(20), [p. 5]. Since Irish women often went bare headed, a fashion used by prostitutes in England, they were often referred to as whores. Charles Carlton, *Going To The Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638-1651* (London, 1992), p. 37.

⁹⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 27, 19 Dec. 1642, 513.27B\ E. 244(15), [p. 4]. See also *Speciall Passages*, no. 20, 27 Dec. 1642, 605.20A\ E. 83(25), p. 163, and *England’s Memorable Accidents*, 19 Dec. 1642, 579.15\ E. 244(16), p. 118.

⁹⁶ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 35, 13 Feb. 1643, 513.35A\ E. 246(13), [p. 4]. Also *Ibid.*, no. 35, 13 Feb. 1643, 511.35B, [p. 5].

⁹⁷ *Marleborowes Miseries, or, England turned Ireland*, as noted by Roy, “England Turned Germany,” p. 128.

royalist forces by the inhabitants of Bradford in Yorkshire, for instance, led *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* to proclaim, “God striketh these popish Cavaliers with the like feare that the Rebels in Ireland have had in all their Battles, never having successe against the Protestants, though they were six times more in number.”⁹⁸

Pro-parliamentary weeklies did not monopolize allegations of cruelty. On 20 May 1643, *Mercurius Rusticus*, a second royalist serial, was published at Oxford.⁹⁹ Edited by one Bruno Ryves, this newsbook, according to Joseph Frank, “did with a bludgeon what Birkenhead [sic] was doing with a rapier.”¹⁰⁰ *Rusticus* was a specialized paper in that it focused primarily on promoting allegations of atrocities perpetrated by parliamentary armies throughout England. Indeed, the sub-title read “The Countries Complaint of the Murthers, Robberies, Plunderings, and other Outrages, Committed by the Rebels, on His Majesties faithful Subjects.”¹⁰¹ Although news of the rebellion in Ireland was never related, *Rusticus* measured parliamentary atrocities far greater than those associated with the Irish. In the first week’s edition, the editor lamented the many outrages of the civil war and claimed that Westminster’s troops had committed “Acts that have out done the Outrages of the wild Irish, the barbarisness of Goths and Vandals, or any other spoylers.”¹⁰² In this vein, *Rusticus* later claimed that parliamentary soldiers had raped two young women, one of whom, it was alleged, was only fourteen and blind. These barbarities, the editor maintained:

... we have not read in the black Catalogue of the outrages of the Rebellious Irish... for in the Examinations upon Oath of those that reporte the miserable sufferings of the poor Protestants in Ireland, and the barbarousnesse of the Irish published by order of

⁹⁸ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 2, 10 Jan. 1643, 214.002\E. 84(29), p. 10.

⁹⁹ *Mercurius Rusticus, or the Covntries Complaint*, no. 1, 20 May 1643, 384.01\E. 103(3).

¹⁰⁰ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 41.

¹⁰¹ *Rusticus*, no. 1, 20 May 1643, 384.01\E. 103(3).

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, [p. 1].

Parliament, we doe not finde that God gave them up to so reprobate a sense, as to commit or attempt any Rapes....¹⁰³

By the summer of 1643 it was clearly evident that periodicals representing both royalist and parliamentary interests were intent in measuring allegations of atrocities committed by either side against cruelties associated with the rebels in Ireland. Newsbooks, it seems, were now utilizing the Irish, who had long become the paragon of barbarity in England, as a yardstick in promoting the appearance of moral virtuosity.

THE WAR TO THE BATTLE OF ROSS

Although *Aulicus*, and subsequently *Rusticus*, failed to provide news of the rebellion in Ireland, the London weeklies continued to furnish their readers with reports from that kingdom during the first months of 1643. *Speciall Passages* and *Perfect Diurnall* remained the principal newsbooks to convey Irish news during this time, much of which continued to exaggerate successes obtained by Protestant troops. Although the war continued to be characterized by isolated sieges and scattered engagements, this did not inhibit these publications from relating questionable successes secured by the Protestants. This was certainly the case in January when they reported a victory obtained by Colonel George Monck against Preston the previous month. According to both newsbooks, 1,500 soldiers had marched from Dublin and successfully relieved the garrison of Ballinakill in County Kildare. Upon their return to Dublin, Monck's men encountered a rebel force of 8,000 at Timahoe, which they routed, killing at least 700 of the insurgents.¹⁰⁴ In truth,

¹⁰³ Ibid., no. 7, 1 Jul. 1643, 384.07, pp. 54-55. In truth, there was some validity to these assertions by *Rusticus*. A recent study on the outbreak of violence in Armagh, for example, suggests that although the English settlers were sometimes treated in the most appalling and humiliating manner, there was very little evidence of rape. See Hilary Simms, "Violence in County Armagh, 1641," in *Ulster 1641*, p. 136. Rape, moreover, was equally as rare in the English civil wars. See Carlton, *Going to the Wars*, pp. 259-260.

¹⁰⁴ *Speciall Passages*, no. 21, 3 Jan. 1643, 605.21B\ E. 84(1), p. 275; no. 22, 11 Jan. 1643, 605.22A\ E. 84(6), pp. 182-183; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 28 [sic], 2 Jan. 1643, 513.29A\ E. 244(33), [p. 8].

Timahoe had resulted in defeat for the Irish. Preston's troop strength, however, was closer to 1,300 rather than 8,000 and his losses were believed to be 60, not 700.¹⁰⁵

Timahoe helped determine that the Irish in Leinster remained relatively quiet until the spring.¹⁰⁶ Likewise, since Liscarrol, Inchiquin's army in Munster had stayed comparatively subdued having received few supplies from Dublin, as indeed had government troops in Connaught under the supervision of the Ulick de Burgh, the earl of Clanricarde. The dearth of military engagements in Ireland during the winter did not go unnoticed by *Speciall Passages*. On 14 March Blunden presented news from Ireland that claimed the army had exhausted the treasury in that kingdom having "done nothing but lye still and spend money."¹⁰⁷ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* did not share these sentiments. No doubt feeling compassion for his 'comrades in arms,' the editor maintained that "the English souldiers there are much without pay, & every way necessitated, yet knowing they have a good cause... apply their best and continued endeavours."¹⁰⁸

Meanwhile, the Scottish army of approximately 10,000, which had landed in Ulster in 1642, was in a strategic standoff in the north, again through a lack of supplies.¹⁰⁹ Although much of O'Neill's army had been driven south of the line from Ballyshannon in the west, to Newry in the east, the topography of this terrain made it

¹⁰⁵ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 387; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 29. A crowd of spectators on a distant hill was mistakenly perceived to be reinforcements, which may have influenced the distortion of Preston's numbers.

¹⁰⁶ Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 29.

¹⁰⁷ *Speciall Passages*, no. 31, 14 Mar. 1643, 605.31\E. 93(7), p. 253.

¹⁰⁸ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 9, 28 Feb. 1643, 214.009\E. 91(8), p. 70.

¹⁰⁹ Hazlett, "Scottish Army in Ulster, 1642-9," p. 125; David Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates: Scottish-Irish Relations in the Mid-Seventeenth Century* (Belfast, 1981), pp. 128-129; Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 50.

difficult for the Scots to initiate further campaigns.¹¹⁰ Requests from Dublin that ordered Scottish forces to reinforce the Protestant armies outside Ulster went unheeded. Not only was Owen Roe a real threat in the north, but victory for royalists forces in England could lead to the overthrow of the covenanters in Scotland. In this light, Scottish forces in Ireland, the only Scottish army in operation, were of vital importance to an Edinburgh government that intended that it should remain in, or near the province, allowing it to intervene in England or Scotland if necessary.¹¹¹ This, however, did not preclude rival editions of *Perfect Diurnall* on 30 January 1643 from presenting news of a victory obtained by a Scottish settler army commanded by Colonel Sir William Stewart near Londonderry. This force functioned independently from Monro and operated chiefly in Tyrone and Donegal. Although greatly outnumbered, it was alleged that Stewart's army slew about 1,000 of 4,000 rebels while losing only five men!¹¹² There appears to be no truth to these allegations.

The embellishment or even fabrication of military successes by Protestant forces in Ireland was nowhere more evident than in news presented by several serials in the spring that falsely proclaimed Kilkenny had fallen. On 27 March *Perfect Diurnall* asserted that Protestant troops had killed or imprisoned the nobles and gentry assembled in the town who were delivered "into the hands of those they had determined the ruine of, that both their wicked lawes and makers might have their Just condemnation together."¹¹³ *Certaine Informations* and *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* even related that

¹¹⁰ Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 127-128.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 121, 128-129.

¹¹² *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 33, 30 Jan. 1643, 513.33A, [pp. 7-8]; no. 33, 30 Jan. 1643, 513.33B\E. 245(26), [pp. 7-8]; no. 33, 30 Jan. 1643, 511.33A\E. 245(25), [p. 6]; no. 33, 30 Jan. 1643, 511.33B, [p. 6].

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 41, 27 Mar. 1643, 513.41A, [p. 7]; no. 41, 27 Mar. 1643, 513.41B\E. 247(10), [p. 7]. See also *Speciall Passages*, no. 33, 28 Mar. 1643, 605.33\E. 94(15), p. 267.

Ormond had marched out of Dublin with a force of 3,000 strong and slaughtered the entire town!¹¹⁴ On 2 March the marquis had indeed set out from the Irish capital with an army of 3,000 men, but it was the capture of New Ross and Wexford, rather than Kilkenny that was the aim of this expedition.¹¹⁵

Having failed to take New Ross, on 18 March Ormond was challenged on his return to Dublin by Preston at Old Ross. The ensuing battle resulted in victory for the Protestants - a victory that provided Ormond with no great military advantage other than getting an army desperate for provisions back to Dublin relatively unscathed.¹¹⁶ Yet the excitement generated by news of Old Ross was such that *Speciall Passages* claimed 15,000 rebels had been killed - a considerable achievement notwithstanding that Preston's troop strength for the entire province of Leinster rested between 5-7,000!¹¹⁷ Blunden concluded, moreover, that the Protestants "would not do halfe of this all the last yeare when they had plenty of victualls and pay. It is good to let them be hungry...."¹¹⁸

COMMISSIONS FOR PEACE

Success at Old Ross by Ormond did not deter the king from attempting to secure a truce with Kilkenny. On 17 March, one day before the battle itself, delegates representing the crown and the confederates met for the first time at Trim to discuss terms for negotiating a cessation of arms. Failure to secure London was evidence that the prospects of a

¹¹⁴ *Certaine Informations*, no. 10, 27 Mar. 1643, 36.10\E. 94 (11), p. 78; *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 38, 30 Mar. 1643, 638.38\E. 94(18), [p. 5].

¹¹⁵ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 422, 428.

¹¹⁶ Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 32-33.

¹¹⁷ *Speciall Passages*, no. 35, 11 Apr. 1643, E. 96(2)\605.35, p. 285; Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," pp. 50-51. *Perfect Diurnall* offered its readers a more realistic set of figures by reporting that Preston had lost approximately 200 men and that forty officers had been captured. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 44, 17 Apr. 1643, 513.44B, [pp. 3-4]. See also no. 45, 24 Apr. 1643, 513.45A\E. 247(31), [p. 4]; no. 45, 24 Apr. 1645, 513.45B, [p. 4]. The number of Irish fatalities here was even less than the estimated 500 Irish fatalities recorded by Irish sources. Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 433.

¹¹⁸ *Speciall Passages*, no. 35, 11 Apr. 1643, E. 96(2)\605.35, p. 289.

decisive royalist victory in England were bleak unless Charles was able to secure greater numbers of troops. This could be best achieved by not only freeing English regiments in Ireland, but also by bringing over both Gaelic Irish and Old English Catholics. In all probability, however, news of such measures would undermine support for the king among those who remained uncommitted in England, not to mention those already in the crown's service.¹¹⁹

Formal negotiations between Oxford and Kilkenny had begun two months earlier on 11 January when a commission had been issued to Ormond, the earl of Clanricard and five others, which authorized them to meet the insurgents and to hear their grievances.¹²⁰ This commission circumvented an Irish council that continued to remain under the supervision of Parsons, and which from October 1642 had two parliamentary commissioners, Robert Reynolds and Robert Goodwyn attend its meetings.¹²¹ On 3 February 1643, though, the king ordered the expulsion of both MPs from the council. This heightened fears at Westminster that Irish affairs were now being "steered by the Court Comparse" in order to secure a peace with the rebels.¹²²

Six weeks later, the Irish presented a remonstrance of their grievances to the royalist delegation.¹²³ These focused on the disparities suffered by Catholics in that

¹¹⁹ Joyce Lee Malcolm, "All the king's men: the impact of the crown's Irish soldiers on the English civil war," *Irish Historical Studies* 83 (1979), pp. 244-245.

¹²⁰ Although the first confederate assembly had sent a petition to the king at the end of November, the king's commission of 11 January appears to have been in reply an earlier petition from the provisional supreme council that had been sent on 31 July 1642. Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 61 n. 23.

¹²¹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no 14, 19 Sep. 1642, 513.14VE. 240(5), [p. 2]; no 18, 17 Oct. 1642, 511.18AVE. 240(41), [p.3]. Goodwyn replaced Sir Henry Mildmay who was one of the two original commissioners ordered by the Commons on 12 September to go to Ireland.

¹²² *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 38, 6 Mar. 1643, 513.38A, [pp. 5-6]; no. 38, 6 Mar. 1643, 513.38BVE. 246(37), [pp. 5-6]; no. 39, 13 Mar. 1643, 513.39C\VE. 246(43), [pp. 4-5]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 10, 7 Mar. 1643, 214.010E. 92(10), p. 75

¹²³ Ormond chose not to attend the meeting at Trim as a result of plans by the council to give command of the expedition for New Ross and Wexford to Lord Lisle. Lisle was not only the son of the absentee lord

kingdom and included their exclusion from public office, the denial of the Graces, protection for their lands and titles, and no doubt with the adventurers act in mind, an insistence that the English parliament could not legislate for Ireland. Blame, moreover, for the perpetration of these abuses was placed not with the king, but rather with Parsons and his corrupt administration in Dublin. With this in mind the Irish insisted that their complaints be redressed in a newly elected Irish parliament, with no impediment on Catholics either voting or sitting in that body, and that Poynings' law be suspended while it was in session. Significantly, the Irish outlined the benefits to the crown if these grievances could be amended; the most important of which was the prospect of 10,000 Catholic troops being made available for the royalist cause in England.¹²⁴

News that the king was willing to treat with the confederates presented the London newsbooks with considerable propaganda over the effect a cessation would have for both kingdoms. *Certain Informations* asserted on 20 February that if the Protestant forces in Ireland disbanded this would result in "the cutting of their throats." In addition, the editor noted that these measures were "a plot to quiet the Rebels, and end the Warre there, that so with free liberty they may come over and helpe the Cavaliers to subdue this Kingdome, and extinguish the Protestant Religion."¹²⁵ Even before the first meeting at Trim, a fresh wave of unfounded reports surfaced that maintained the Irish were preparing to cross into England. On 14 February, for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* reported that royalist forces were attempting to secure the harbor at Milford

lieutenant, the earl of Leicester, but like his father, was also considered to be pro-parliament. Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 421-422.

¹²⁴ Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 62-63; Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 439-441.

¹²⁵ *Certain Informations*, no. 5, 20 Feb. 1643, 36.05\E. 90(3), p. 38.

Haven in preparation for the Irish.¹²⁶ Three weeks later, *Certain Informations* claimed that between 500-1,500 rebels had already landed in North Wales and were in the process of marching to Chester!¹²⁷

The serials were provided with further ammunition when the king appeared to satisfy one of the grievances of the confederates by his dismissal of Parsons as lord justice on 31 March.¹²⁸ This did not sit well with the *Perfect Diurnall*, which related that in order for the king to expediently secure the business of Ireland:

...he puts out the persons most affected to the Parliament...the Lord Cheife Justice Parsons, who is the best verst in the Irish affaires of any in the kingdome. At last we shall se it cleare, that Irelands Rebellion was raised to bring the better about some designes against the Parl. In England, but the worke being done there, and Ireland lost, new forces shall be fetcht thence to help it forwards here.¹²⁹

Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer echoed these sentiments and contended:

All Protestants do know the Rebels hated him (next to Sir Charles Coote) more than any man else living, and because the Rebells knew no man living could more prejudice them in gaining peace, and getting of Dublin, and so by consequence come into England, than Sir William Parsons, they have prevailed to put him out...the Protestant Party will finde his removeall is their ruine....¹³⁰

It was not only the Irish who were involved in negotiations with the crown over a possible cessation at this time. Throughout England, and even among some MPs at Westminster there were still cries for peace. In response to this, parliament agreed on a series of peace proposals in December that were to be submitted to the king. But although discussions between commissioners representing both parties began on 1 February at Oxford, intransigence from the king forced parliament to break off these talks on 14

¹²⁶ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 7, 14 Feb. 1643, 214.007\E. 89(16), pp. 55-56.

¹²⁷ *Certain Informations*, no. 7, 6 Mar. 1643, 36.07\E. 92(3), p. 50.

¹²⁸ In all likelihood the king dismissed Parsons for continuing to secretly correspond with the English parliament. Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 462.

¹²⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 52, 12 Jun. 1643, 513.52B\E. 249(16), [p. 2].

¹³⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 22, 6 Jun. 1643, 214.022A\E. 105(8), pp. 170-171.

April.¹³¹ Charles's unwillingness to compromise was shored by the fact that military successes by his armies during the spring in the south-west, the north, and the west midlands, had helped determine that he was not inclined towards peace.¹³²

With the collapse of peace talks in England, a further commission from the king on 23 April ordered Ormond to seek a one-year military cessation with the confederates. This was not unexpected in Ireland. Indeed, the marquis later corresponded to Charles claiming that "By the time your Letters touching a Cessation came to my hand, this place was full of that business, and it became the common discourse of all men."¹³³ Viscount Taaffe, a "Grand Irish Papist" in the king's army, carried the commission to Dublin. In view of the failure of peace negotiations at Oxford, when news of this came to light, it became the basis of the most hostile attacks to be perpetrated thus far by the pro-parliamentary newsbooks against the crown.¹³⁴

'IRISH REBELS LANDED'

No periodical attempted to capitalize on the recent truce negotiations more than *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*. The interest sparked by this commission may have been responsible for the publication on 6 June of two separate editions of this title, while the following week three issues were available.¹³⁵ These were, in fact, the only occasions in

¹³¹ Gardiner, *Civil War*, i, pp. 78-82, 89-93, 100, 108.

¹³² Ibid., pp. 85-86, 97-98, 105-108.

¹³³ Ormond to the King, 11 Jul. 1643, Bodl., Carte MSS 63, f. 212.

¹³⁴ Along with his compatriot, lord Dillon, Taaffe had been the center of controversy in recent weeks. In May, several newsbooks reported that, while at court, both men had corresponded with Muskerry in Kilkenny professing the king's pleasure at Muskerry's service in Ireland. According to *Speciall Passages*, Dillon and Taaffe had certified "that the affaires of England stood so at this time that His Majestie could not publicly declare what was in his breast, but in truth and in deed... was resolved to reward the Lords who are the chiefe Rebels in Ireland." *Speciall Passages*, no. 41, 23 May 1643, 605.41\E. 103(7), p. 336. See also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 20, 23 May 1643, 214.020\E. 103(8), pp. 154-155, and *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 46, 25 May 1643, 638.46\E. 104(5), [p. 6].

¹³⁵ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 22, 6 Jun. 1643, 214.022A\E. 105(8); no. 22, 6 Jun. 1643, 214.022B\E. 105(9); no. 23, 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023A\E. 105(33); [unnumbered], 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023B; no. 23, 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023C\E. 105(24).

the long history of this newsbook that imitators and forgeries were ever attempted. No doubt news of Taaffe's mission renewed fears of an Irish invasion. On 6 June, one edition of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* contended that on his journey to Ireland, Taaffe had publicly produced the commission on several occasions, promising English Catholics that the king would shortly have the assistance of many thousands.¹³⁶ The following week another edition included *A Fine Designe Discovered. And Irish Rebels Landed* in its title.¹³⁷ This issue related in considerable detail allegations that more than 100 of these "Savage Rebels" had landed near Chester, a key royalist stronghold on the English border of North Wales. The editor noted that such was the anger among the inhabitants of the town upon hearing this news that they rose up in arms against those troops who were ordered to escort the Irish into the town. One Orlando Bridgeman publicly addressed their concerns and professed that the Irish were not rebels "but His Majesties Catholique Subjects, such as the Recusants of the North and other parts of the Kingdome... that have a Commission from his Majesty... and therefore need not to fear them...."¹³⁸ Nonetheless, the editor maintained that, in light of the 'massacres' committed against their brethren in Ireland, many in Chester had already left the town to seek protection from Sir William Brereton, the commander of parliamentary forces in Cheshire:

...acknowledging they have been too long deluded by the King and his Counsels, that he could not bee content (against the knowne laws) to arme the Papists of this Kingdome, but to bring in the barbarous Rebels (though with a pretence they are Irish never in rebellion) a people to be abhorred of all Nations for their bloody and inhumane actions towards the innocent Protestants... The Counsels that steere,

¹³⁶ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 22, 6 Jun. 1643, 214.022A\B. 105(8), p. 170.

¹³⁷ *A Fine Designe Discovered. And Irish Rebels Landed. The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, [unnumbered], 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023B. Besides from the title, however, this was another edition of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 23, 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023A\B. 105(33).

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 184; [unnumbered], 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023B, p. 184. Bridgeman was a London-based lawyer and the son of the Bishop of Chester. He had arrived in Chester in June 1642 and was instrumental in organizing the royalist party in that town. R. N. Dore, *The Civil Wars in Cheshire* (Chester, 1966), p. 25; J.S. Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974), p. 67.

and continue the War against Parliament, do it as in relation to these bloud thirsty Irish Rebels, whom they at Oxford publicly speak well of, while they damne the Parliament for Traitors and Rebels, judgement is not far off, it is even at the doore: God will not leave till the bloud of those innocent souls that suffered in Ireland be revenged on the friends and countenancers of their enemies here.¹³⁹

In truth, on 31 March the king had requested approximately 1,000 troops from Ireland under the command of Captain Robert Byron to embark for England. These soldiers, however, were English Protestants who had been part of Ormond's Leinster army, and the only force of any description to leave Ireland before a cessation was concluded with the confederates in September.¹⁴⁰ Yet even Ormond became aware of the apparent propaganda campaign that *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* was waging over this issue. On 11 July, the marquis complained to the king that "the printed Weekly Intelligencer from London took upon him to trick some of this nation from court hither... to the disadvantage of your Majestys Commands." Ormond concluded:

How this affair of so great importance became so soon this vulgar I know not, but it put me out of the Course I was commanded, and had begun to hold therein; for perceiving how the strong for want of true information did begin to stagger at the false reports that were spread abroad thereof, how many of your good subjects did murmur at it....¹⁴¹

Notwithstanding these sentiments, unfounded reports of the Irish having landed continued to surface over the next several weeks. The less than credible *Certaine Informations* appeared keen to promote such claims. In this context, Ingler lamented that the Irish will shortly "swarme like Bees in England, to the infinite danger of Religion,

¹³⁹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, [unnumbered], 13 Jun. 1643, 214.023B, p. 184. For a similar account see also *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 49, 14 Jun. 1643, 638.49\E. 106(6), [p. 6]. *Perfect Diurnall*, meanwhile, claimed that if the 'Irish' were permitted to come ashore, the garrison at Chester would desert the king and lend their support to Brereton. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 52, 12 Jun. 1643, 513.52B\ E. 249(16), [p. 2]; no. 53, 19 Jun. 1643, 513.53B\ E. 249(17), [p. 3].

¹⁴⁰ Malcolm, "All the king's men," pp. 246, 251.

¹⁴¹ Ormond to the King, 11 Jul. 1643, Bodl., Carte MSS 63, ff. 212-214.

Parliament, Liberty, and all that we at this present enjoy.”¹⁴² Furthermore, according to his colleagues, the favor presently exhibited by the court toward the rebels was of the sort that not only was it “a treble offence in any man to affront an Irish man,” but that the people of England have now become “slaves and villaines to French, Irish, Papists and others....”¹⁴³

THE ORDINANCE OF JUNE 1643

June not only witnessed an ‘Irish invasion’ of England but also marked parliament’s first serious effort to control the press since the advent of the civil war. Amid the plethora of unauthorized publications, which included newsbooks, the Stationers’ Company presented parliament in April 1643 with a remonstrance that sought a complete reorganization of the control of printing.¹⁴⁴ On 14 June, parliament responded to this remonstrance with the Ordinance for the Regulation of Printing that established joint control over the press by parliament and the Stationers’ Company. Robert Elkin has suggested that the prospect of a cessation and the desire by Westminster to keep unfavorable news from reaching its supporters was instrumental in this decision.¹⁴⁵ But if the reaction of the inhabitants at Chester to news that an ‘Irish’ force had already landed is to be believed, then this explanation appears to be unlikely.

The principal aims of the ordinance were in fact designed to satisfy both the Stationers’ and Westminster. Under its terms, all works were required to be licensed by

¹⁴² *Certain Informations*, no. 33, 4 Sep. 1643, 36.33, p. 255. See also no. 21, 12 Jun. 1643, 36.21\E. 105(27), pp. 165, 167; no. 23, 26 Jun. 1643, 36.23\E. 56(2), p. 184.

¹⁴³ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 24, 4 Jul. 1643, 214.024B\E. 59(11), [p. 5]; *The Parliament Scout: Communicating his Intelligence to the Kingdome*, no. 2, 6 Jul. 1643, 485.02\E. 59(12), p. 12.

¹⁴⁴ Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 172.

¹⁴⁵ Robert E. Elkin, “The Interactions between the Irish Rebellion and the English Civil Wars,” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1961), p. 135.

persons appointed by parliament and to be registered at Stationers' Hall.¹⁴⁶ Greater powers were also granted to the Stationers' to punish offenders. These included seizing materials and equipment used in printing unlicensed works, and for violators to be brought before parliament for examination and punishment.¹⁴⁷ Thus the property rights of both the company and its membership were to be protected from piracy and counterfeiting. In return, the government would receive support in suppressing dangerous and seditious publications.¹⁴⁸

The immediate effect of the ordinance was to bring some semblance of order to the newsbooks. Although both *Aulicus* and *Rusticus* could afford to ignore it, the London printers did not have that luxury since the type of each publication could generally afford a clue to the identity of the printer. Thus while the printer of an occasional pamphlet might escape detection, those responsible for weekly publications were not able to enjoy similar scope for evasion.¹⁴⁹ As a result, the number of London printers who entered their serials into the Stationers' register increased, while the more flagrant counterfeits and titles were eliminated.

The new licensing act also helped launch *The Parliament Scout* on 27 June.

Edited by John Dillingham, this newsbook was introduced to the nation as follows:

Having perused an Ordinance of Parliament, I perceive a generall prohibiting of Printing any thing but what is Licensed, which had it been agreed unto sooner, would have prevented many inconveniences that have befallne the Parliament by divers things mistaken that have been made publique, and by some things published by disaffected persons to the Parliament, as it were in favour to their proceedings, yet of purpose to being [sic] scandall upon them.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Henry Walley, the clerk of the Stationers' Company, was given responsibility over licensing of the newsbooks.

¹⁴⁷ Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 173, 176.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

¹⁴⁹ William Clyde, "Parliament and the Press, 1643-7," *Library*, 4th series, 13 (1932-33), p. 406.

¹⁵⁰ *Parliament Scout*, no. 1, 27 Jun. 1643, 485.01\N. 56(7), p. 1.

A former tailor, Dillingham had supplemented his income since 1639 by writing newsletters for Edward Montagu, the earl of Manchester.¹⁵¹ By 1643, Manchester had become one of parliament's leading commanders and this association may help explain why Dillingham devoted considerable space to military affairs in the first several months of *Parliament Scout*.¹⁵² Similarly, the editor enjoyed contact with Oliver St John, Pym, and other members of the 'Middle Group' within the House of Commons.¹⁵³ These military and political connections thus helped *Parliament Scout* to be better informed than many of its competitors during its formative months.

The June ordinance also benefited the Pecke-Coles partnership as they initiated a new series of *A Perfect Diurnall* on 3 July. No longer troubled by imitators and counterfeits, this periodical continued to remain a competent record of parliamentary news until October 1649.¹⁵⁴ The publishers of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *Certaine Informations*, *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, and the fledgling *Mercurius Civicus*, responded almost immediately to the ordinance by registering their titles. This last production, which was published by John Wright and Thomas Bates, first appeared on 11 May.¹⁵⁵ Beginning on 25 May, *Civicus* became England's first illustrated

¹⁵¹ Valerie Pearl, "Oliver St. John and the 'middle group' in the Long Parliament: August 1643-May 1644," *English Historical Studies* 81 (1966), p. 506 n. 3; A.N.B. Cotton, "John Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group," *English Historical Studies* 93 (1978), pp. 818-820; idem, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 83, 88-89.

¹⁵² Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 45-46.

¹⁵³ The 'middle Group' was a coalition of MPs whose tenets often proved the most realistic compromise between the irreconcilable extremes of both the war and peace factions within the Long Parliament. See J. H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), particularly pp. 31-47; Pearl, "Oliver St. John and the 'middle group,'" pp. 490-519; Cotton, "Dillingham," p. 821; idem, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 88-89.

¹⁵⁴ Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 43-44.

¹⁵⁵ *Mercurius Civicus*, *London's Intelligencer*, no. 1, 11 May 1643, 298.001/E. 101(15). Like *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* there is little evidence or indeed agreement as to the identity of the editor. Frank maintains that the intermittent use of rhymed headlines and of a hand to indicate important news items suggest that Richard Collings acted as editor of both *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* and *Civicus*. Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 41. Raymond has dismissed this as "nonsensical," although he and Plomer have

newspaper as the title page was generally graced with one or two woodcuts that featured the head of a prominent individual. The first of these depicted Henrietta Maria, who in that particular week's edition received considerable attention as a result of the recent debate within the House of Commons over the impeachment of the queen for high treason.¹⁵⁶ Although crude, this and similar woodcuts helped distinguish it from its competitors, and until its demise on 10 December 1646 it never suffered from imitations or forgeries.¹⁵⁷

Civicus also incorporated the phrase "Londons Intelligencer" in its subtitle, indicating that its primary concern was the affairs of the English capital. But from the beginning, the editor focused less on news about the city than on news gleaned from within it.¹⁵⁸ The first issue, for example, contained news from Ireland that had been sent by Sir John Temple, a member of the Dublin council, to Robert Goodwin at Westminster, who in February had been dismissed from council meetings by the king. According to the editor, Temple's correspondence highlighted the problems faced by the Irish administration in alleviating the miseries of English soldiers garrisoned in Dublin:

... whose wants threaten the City... with sudden ruine and desolation, they having used all meanes and strained themselves to the utmost, yet all not sufficing to stop the crying wants of the Army, and keepe the souldiers from plundering that City... that unlesse they have very sudden supplies, they will be destroyed.¹⁵⁹

failed to identify the individual who assumed editorial responsibility. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 28, n. 35; Henry R. Plomer, "An Analysis of the Civil War Newspaper 'Mercurius Civicus'," *Library*, 2nd series, 6 (1905), pp. 200-201.

¹⁵⁶ *Civicus*, no. 3, 25 May 1643, 298.003\E. 104(3), pp. 17, 22-24.

¹⁵⁷ Plomer, "Mercurius Civicus," p. 185.

¹⁵⁸ Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 63.

¹⁵⁹ *Civicus*, no. 1, 11 May 1643, 298.001\E. 101(15), [p. 4].

Reflecting a familiarity with military history, the editor lamented that even “the very Heathen Romans, when Italy was overrun with a powerfull invading army, and Hannibal marched even to the gates of Rome, even then they sent supplies to Seicilie.”¹⁶⁰ In that week’s edition, *Civicus* also made clear to its readers that it was intent on refuting “the presumptuous untruths which are vented under the name of Mercurius Aulicus,” a sign that the London newsbooks were beginning to take direct notice of their Oxford counterpart.¹⁶¹

‘WEEKLY CHEATS’

By the summer of 1643, *Aulicus* had become increasingly belligerent toward the pro-parliamentary serials. On 29 July the editor noted that “so many weekly cheats do they publish constantly to gull the people of their mony... who differ as much from each other as they all do from truth.”¹⁶² These ‘weekly cheats’ included *Civicus* and *Parliament Scout*. Shortly after both titles were launched, *Aulicus* wasted little time in attempting to undermine their credibility. *Parliament Scout* was ridiculed within four days after its debut over claims that the Irish rebels derived their commission from the “Free States of Ireland.”¹⁶³ According to *Aulicus*, however, within three lines of this allegation, *Parliament Scout* maintains that “Colonell Taffe is an Irish Rebelle, and is employed under the great Seale at Oxford... you may see Master Scout is a sagacious intelligent creature.”¹⁶⁴ Meanwhile, *Civicus* was charged on 20 May for having conveyed several “tales” in its inaugural issue. These included assertions that since the beginning of

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, [p. 5].

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, [p. 3].

¹⁶² *Aulicus*, no. 30, 29 Jul. 1643, 275.130A, p. 406.

¹⁶³ *Parliament Scout*, no. 1, 27 Jun. 1643, 485.01\E. 56(7), p. 3.

¹⁶⁴ *Aulicus*, no. 26, 1 Jul. 1643, 275.126, pp. 344-345.

the rebellion in Ireland, parliament had provided 500,000 pounds in money and provisions for that kingdom.¹⁶⁵ Yet, *Aulicus* responded, "...it doth appeare by their owne accompt... that the Houses have received well neare 120000 L on several Statutes for the relief of Ireland, which they have inverted to their owne use, and the maintaining of a rebellion in this Kingdome."¹⁶⁶ Conversely, on occasion *Civicus* was not averse to assailing the 'court weekly' for what it failed to mention in relation to the Irish. On 8 June, in an effort to make capital out of speculation concerning a cessation with the rebels, the editor noted *Aulicus*'s neglect in reporting that a troop of "insolent" Irish rebels and their "whores" were presently at Charlbury near Oxford.¹⁶⁷

By this time it was also evident that *Aulicus* was becoming less restrained in utilizing Ireland in the propaganda war now raging between king and parliament. On 17 June, for example, the editor contended that parliamentary ships operating between Chester and Dublin were stealing relief intended for:

His Majesties poor Subjects there, who are now almost lost for want of supply, which is kept from them on purpose to maintaine this wicked Rebellion here in England... these desperate Rebels [parliament] resolving to compass their ends though thereby they ruine both England and Ireland.¹⁶⁸

But it was the publication on 25 July of a declaration by the Commons that addressed the rise and progress of the rebellion in Ireland that *Aulicus* found particularly odious. Published by order of parliament, this sixty-three-page tract was a comprehensive

¹⁶⁵ *Civicus*, no. 1, 11 May 1643, 298.001\E. 101(15), [p. 4].

¹⁶⁶ *Aulicus*, no. 20, 20 May 1643, 275.120, pp. 263-264. Hugh Hazlett has suggested that between the Adventurers' scheme and funds raised by general assessment, parliament had collected approximately one million pounds by this time. However, little of this was used to help maintain the war in Ireland. Hugh Hazlett, "The Financing of the British Armies in Ireland, 1641-9," *Irish Historical Studies* 1 (1938), pp. 31-32.

¹⁶⁷ *Civicus*, no. 5, 8 Jun. 1643, 298.005\E. 105(17), p. 34.

¹⁶⁸ *Aulicus*, no. 24, 17 Jun. 1643, 275.124A, pp. 311-312. See also no. 31, 5 Aug. 1643, 275.131A, p. 412.

indictment against the court that chronicled the king and queen's alleged involvement in the birth and development of a rebellion, which it maintained, had resulted in 154,000 Protestants being massacred between 23 October 1641 and 1 March 1642.¹⁶⁹ *Civicus* and *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* gave considerable attention to this declaration within days of it being published. Each newsbook devoted six of eight pages that week to summarizing the principal accusations set forth by parliament, although neither, it should be added, cited the incredible figure of Protestant fatalities alluded to in the declaration.¹⁷⁰ Nonetheless, both weeklies included charges that the 'rebels', who had landed near Chester in June, had been identified by English refugees settled in that town as those who had "cut their husbands throats" and "ripped up their Childrens bowels."¹⁷¹ Yet, concluded *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, these "Villaines are entertained in his Majesties pay."¹⁷²

At the heart of these allegations was an examination of one John Dod, a minister who had fled his home in County Cavan. Reportedly, Dod had arrived in London on 13 June after spending several weeks in Oxford, during which time he recognized a number of rebels at Oxford he knew to have committed:

... the most barbarous actions of that rebellion, as the dashing of small infants in pieces, the ripping up of women with childe, and the like; among whom was one Thomas Brady, who at Turbet [Belturbet] in the County of Cavan... within seven miles where this said examinat lived, as 36 old men, women and children, not able to flie were passing over a

¹⁶⁹ *A Declaration of the Commons assembled in Parliament; Concerning the Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland* (1643), E. 61(23), p. 21. This figure of 154,000 had apparently originated with an examination of Dr. Robert Maxwell, a rector in county Armagh, who on 22 August 1642 claimed to have heard it while he was a prisoner of the rebels. For a copy of Maxwell's deposition see Hickson, *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century*, i, pp. 326-340.

¹⁷⁰ *Civicus*, no. 9, 28 Jul. 1643, 298.009\E. 62(4), pp. 66-71; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 28, 1 Aug. 1643, 214.028\E. 63(1), pp. 218-223.

¹⁷¹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 28, 1 Aug. 1643, 214.028\E. 63(1), p. 220. See also *Civicus*, no. 9, 28 Jul. 1643, 298.009\E. 62(4), p. 68.

¹⁷² *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 28, 1 Aug. 1643, 214.028\E. 63(1), p. 220.

bridge, caused them all to be throwne into the water, where they all drowned.¹⁷³

Moreover, Dod added that as many as 3,000 Irish rebels could now be found in a city where “there are daily and publique meetings at Masse, in almost every street there... that for one Sermon preached, there are foure Masses said.”¹⁷⁴

Oxford wasted little time in responding to these allegations. On 29 July, *Aulicus* asserted:

They would perswade fooles (if any be so senseless as to beleeeve them) that the Queenes Majesty had an hand in the contrivance of it. But the contrivers of this Declaration might as well have slandered Her Majestie for being the Author of their Rebellion in England. Which Declaration is such a collection of bottomlesse untruths as never yet were fastned on the sacred person of a Prince. For a taste Ile give you one only, viz. The Deposition of John Dod, who like a lying wretch doth not stick to say (for none of these examinations were taken upon oath, which is worth the noting)... Things so notoriously false, that greater and more scandalous lies were never vented.¹⁷⁵

Aulicus may have been correct in assuming that Dod was a “lying wretch.” If *Perfect Diurnall* on 6 February 1643 is to be believed, an “Orthodox Divine Mr. Dod” of Northamptonshire had recently been plundered of all that he had by Rupert’s troops in that county. If this were the same individual, it would certainly undermine Dod’s Irish credentials.¹⁷⁶ The refutation by *Aulicus* on attacks upon the queen, furthermore, reflected the court’s determination to defend the reputation of Henrietta Maria at a time when she was being assailed by newsbooks and divers other publications for her alleged role in the conflicts raging in both England and Ireland.

¹⁷³ *Civicus*, no. 9, 28 Jul. 1643, 298.009\E. 62(4), pp. 69-70. See also *Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland*, E. 61(23), pp. 20-21, 62-63.

¹⁷⁴ *Civicus*, no. 9, 28 Jul. 1643, 298.009\E. 62(4), p. 70. Also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 28, 1 Aug. 1643, 214.028\E. 63(1), p. 222. This particular allegation had been promoted as early as 3 July. See *Certaine Informations*, no. 24, 3 Jul. 1643, 36.24\E. 59(1), p. 187.

¹⁷⁵ *Aulicus*, no. 30, 29 Jul. 1643, 275.130A, p. 406.

¹⁷⁶ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 34, 6 Feb. 1643, 511.34A\E. 246(2), [p. 5].

'THE QUEEN'S BELOVED SOLDIERS'

Amid fears that her Catholicism influenced the king, no individual received greater slander by the pro-parliamentary newsbooks throughout the summer of 1643 than the queen. The House of Commons had resolved to impeach her in May midst charges, according to *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, that it was she who had been the:

Instrumentall cause of all the wofull distempers in Ireland; And who it is that hath fomented this unnaturall warre against the Parliament and Kingdome, and to bring that designe to passe; went beyond [the] Sea; provided Arms and Ammunition, Pawned the Jewells of the Crowne for the same...and is now actually in the head of a Popish army against Parliament, and protects the Earle of Antrim, an Irish Rebel...¹⁷⁷

News during the summer that the Scots had re-captured Antrim added further legitimacy to parliament's action.¹⁷⁸ Taken on his return to Ulster from England in May, it was disclosed that the earl had in his possession a commission from the queen to raise a Catholic army in Ireland for service in England.¹⁷⁹ This commission, reported *Certaine Informations*, granted Antrim powers not only to pardon the insurgents but also to send over 20,000 men to aid the Cavaliers, and an additional 20,000 troops to Scotland to hinder the Scots from aiding their brethren in England.¹⁸⁰ This may have been an exaggeration, but in truth Antrim had received the backing of the queen to persuade the Irish to negotiate a truce with the royalists in Ireland, after which both armies would unite to drive the Scots from Ulster. These forces would then cross into Scotland and assist in a royalist rebellion against the covenanters in order to restore royal authority in that

¹⁷⁷ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 21, 30 May 1643, 214.021\E. 104(18), pp. 161-162.

¹⁷⁸ The Scots had imprisoned Antrim at Carickfergus Castle for 6 months in 1642. He escaped in October, however, after which he had made his way to York. Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 112-117.

¹⁷⁹ *Civicus*, no. 6, 16 Jun. 1643, 298.006\E. 106(13), p. 45; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 24, 20 Jun. 1643, 214.024\A\E. 55(8), p. 188.

¹⁸⁰ *Certaine Informations*, no. 22, 19 Jun. 1643, 36.22\E. 55(4), p. 173

kingdom. There was further optimism that in due time this Irish army would assist the king in England.¹⁸¹

Several newsbooks in June conveyed news of Antrim's mission and the queen's involvement in it. No more so than *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, which over the next several weeks promoted a campaign of propaganda based on the assumption that the earl had been instructed to treat with the "Queen's beloved Soldiers" to bring about the extirpation of the Protestant religion in all three kingdoms.¹⁸² In this vein, the editor reminded his readers of the barbarity exhibited by a race that had "cut the throats of an hundred and fifty thousand Protestants."¹⁸³ Given the opportunity, he added that the rebels would "cut the throats of men and women in London, and dash the Children's braines against the stones, as they did in Ireland."¹⁸⁴ Similarly, the editor of *Wednesday's Mercury* claimed that since the beginning of the rebellion two hundred thousand Protestants had been massacred, the Irish having:

used all the Protestants, with most barbarous, and hellish cruelties, killing and murdering, and slaying all that came into their powers, and leaving their bodies to be devoured of Wolves, hogs, crowes and kins....¹⁸⁵

Wednesday's Mercury further roused images of Irish savagery by proclaiming that Protestant troops in Ireland had often entered native accommodation, wherein they witnessed the inhabitants:

feeding upon the dead carkasse, and cutting of slices from...thighes, legs, or armes, broyling them on the fire, to preserve their owne lives...those that fed hogs, with the

¹⁸¹ Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, p. 119.

¹⁸² *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 24, 4 Jul. 1643, 214.024B\E. 59(11), [p. 3]; no. 25, 11 Jul. 1643, 214.025\E. 59(22), pp. 193-194; no. 27, 25 Jul. 1643, 214.027\E. 61(22), p. 212.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, no. 25, 11 Jul. 1643, 214.025\E. 59(22), pp. 193-194.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁵ *Wednesday's Mercury, or, the Speciall Passages and Certain Informations from Severall Places*, no. 4, 2 Aug. 1643, 669.4\E. 63(4), p. 27. This was the last number in a relatively brief series that was first printed on 19 July 1643.

flesh of Christian Protestants are now forced, to devoure and eate up one another, the Lord is holy in all his wayes, and just in all his workes, repaying the wicked according to their deserts.¹⁸⁶

Even the generally mundane *Perfect Diurnall* related that for want of food the rebel armies had not only devoured their own dead, but in some parts of the country the Irish had eaten their own children!¹⁸⁷

The promotion of Irish atrocities by the newsbooks at this juncture reflected a growing fear in England that a cessation between the king and the confederates in Ireland was nigh, and if concluded it could prove catastrophic for Westminster's war effort. Even in the aftermath of the outbreak of the rebellion, when the serials related that an Irish invasion was imminent, accounts that highlighted Irish barbarity were rare. Yet in the first year of the civil war, the restraint evident in these pioneering weeklies had clearly dissipated. By the summer of 1643, images that promoted Irish barbarity most likely reflected the fear that Ireland would tip the balance in England in favor of the king. Perhaps then, by advertising such 'occurrences', the pro-parliamentary editors were seeking to encourage non-partisans, or even those who may have been pondering their commitment to the king's cause, to reconsider their position.

A CESSATION CONCLUDED

Negotiations to secure a cessation in Ireland formally got under way on 24 June 1643. Between 20 May and 19 June a second general assembly of the confederates had met at Kilkenny. This afforded the Irish the opportunity to provide a negotiating team to treat with representatives of a Dublin administration increasingly falling under the control of

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

¹⁸⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 5, 31 Jul. 1643, 504.005\E. 249(30), p. 36; no. 6, 7 Aug. 1643, 504.006\E. 249(31), p. 46.

Ormond.¹⁸⁸ In fact, amid these talks the marquis's powers were further consolidated in July when the king ordered the arrest of Parsons, Temple and two additional pro-parliamentary members of the Irish council.¹⁸⁹ This action had been taken in response to this faction's continued support for the English parliament and their persistent attempts to undermine both the king and the pro-cessation camp headed by Ormond.¹⁹⁰ Not unexpectedly, the pro-agreement group received hostility from the parliamentary press. On 3 July, for instance, *Perfect Diurnall* reported that "a faction at Dublin hath lately much wrought upon some to incense the Protestant forces against this Parliament."¹⁹¹ Pecke further related that this cabal within the Irish council had issued a proclamation "declaring the Parliament to be the only cause why Ireland suffers the wants and miseries it doth at this present."¹⁹² Considering that Pecke continued to rely on sources within Westminster for most of his information, these allegations most likely originated from official sources in Dublin. On the other hand, not all the weekly publications were convinced that a truce with the Irish was inevitable. *Certain Informations* remained optimistic that Ormond would remain opposed to such an agreement. Indeed, before news reached the editor that a cessation had been concluded he reported that although the marquis was "supposed to be somewhat inclined to the Pacification, he hath since testified the contrary, and will vigorously prosecute the wars against the Rebels."¹⁹³

Divisions by this time had also emerged within the confederate camp. In return for minimum concessions, Old English nobles such as Muskerry were keen to agree to

¹⁸⁸ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 64-67.

¹⁸⁹ Adam Loftus and Robert Meredith were the other two members. Carte, *Ormond*, ii, p. 503. See also *Civics*, no. 14, 31 Aug. 1643, 298.014, pp. 109-110.

¹⁹⁰ Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 503-504.

¹⁹¹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 1, 3 Jul. 1643, 504.001E. 249(23), p. 8.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*

¹⁹³ *Certain Informations*, no. 35, 18 Sep. 1643, 36.35E. 67(22), p. 269.

terms with the king as quickly as possible. However, the arrival at Kilkenny in July of Pier Francesco Scarampi, the papal envoy, helped foster opposition to a cessation among both the native Irish and members of the clergy. In light of recent successes by Irish forces, Scarampi maintained that a truce should be postponed until the confederates were in a much stronger bargaining position. Furthermore, he argued that there was no guarantee that a royalist victory in England would result in religious toleration for Irish Catholics.¹⁹⁴ From a military perspective, the Irish had certainly enjoyed recent successes.¹⁹⁵ Although O'Neill had suffered defeat on 13 June by settler forces under Stewart at Clones, victory at Trim the following month helped restore Owen Roe's reputation as the most capable commander within the confederate army. But several London newsbooks promoted distorted and wholly inaccurate accounts of what had actually transpired in Ulster. On 1 June, for example, *Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* falsely communicated that in one engagement the Scots had killed 1,200 of the rebels, including O'Neill himself.¹⁹⁶ And, over the ensuing weeks, additional periodicals reported that further encounters had resulted in O'Neill's forces suffering losses in excess of 2,000 men.¹⁹⁷

Reports of divers successes obtained against O'Neill were accompanied by acclaim for the Scottish forces in Ulster, who, according to *Certain Informations*, had

¹⁹⁴ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 67.

¹⁹⁵ These successes included the capitulation of the fort at Galway to the confederates in June, a month that also witnessed a major defeat for Protestant forces in Munster under the command of Sir Charles Vavasour. See Carte, *Ormond*, ii, pp. 477-485. At least two newsbooks reported the extent of Vavasour's defeat, which itself was an unusual occurrence. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 54, 19 Jun. 1643, 511.54\ E. 249(18), [p. 7]; *Certain Informations*, no. 23, 26 Jun. 1643, 36.23\ E. 56(2), p. 178.

¹⁹⁶ *Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 47, 1 Jun. 1643, 638.47A, [p. 7]; no. 47, 1 Jun. 1643, 638.47B\ E. 104(26), [p. 7].

¹⁹⁷ *Wednesday's Mercury*, no. 3, 28 Jul. 1643, 669.3\ E. 62(8), p. 19; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 5, 31 Jul. 1643, 504.005\ E. 249(30), p. 36; no. 6, 7 Aug. 1643, 504.006\ E. 249(1), p. 46; *Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 51, 27 Jul. 1643, 638.51\ E. 631 (25), [p. 8]. The only notable defeat for O'Neill at Clones resulted in no more than 150 fatalities for Irish forces. See Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 45.

“almost cleared it from all that Viperous Vermine”¹⁹⁸ No newsbook, though, showered as much praise on these forces as *Parliament Scout*. Dillingham consistently acknowledged the efforts of the Scots, who “play their parts like men and drive the Rebels before them, which puts us in hope that they will with the ashes of the massacred English may in time drive out that cruell enemy....”¹⁹⁹ In what was perhaps a veiled attack upon Ormond, Dillingham further maintained “had those instructed dealt as faithfully in the other Provinces,” Ireland would now be “rid of a barbarous enemy as any in the world.”²⁰⁰ It was surely no coincidence that praise for Scots forces in Ulster at this time accompanied the parliamentary commission to Edinburgh. Spearheaded by Sir Henry Vane, the commissioners sought to secure the assistance of a Scottish army in England.²⁰¹ Royalist military successes, revelations concerning Antrim’s mission, and continued negotiations between Oxford and Kilkenny, had all played their part in helping Pym and his associates in the ‘middle party’ to persuade anti-Scots parliamentarians to suppress their reservations about a Scottish alliance.²⁰² Thus, accolades by *Parliament Scout* for the Scots are perhaps not surprising given the editor’s fore-mentioned connections to Pym and this faction.

On 15 September 1643, Ormond and the confederates agreed to a one-year cessation of arms. The agreement was merely a truce, and it was by no means an all-embracing peace settlement. The Scots in Ulster were not bound by it, and some

¹⁹⁸ *Certain Informations*, no. 28, 31 Jul. 1643, 36.28\E. 62(16), p. 220.

¹⁹⁹ *Parliament Scout*, no. 7, 10 Aug. 1643, 485.07\E. 64(13), p. 56.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 5, 27 Jul. 1643, 485.05\E. 61(26), p. 37.

²⁰¹ Lawrence Kaplan, “Steps to War: the Scots and Parliament, 1642-1643,” *Journal of British Studies* 9 (1970), pp. 60-62; *idem*, *Politics and Religion during the English Revolution. The Scots and the Long Parliament 1643-1645* (New York, 1976), pp. xvi-xvii.

²⁰² Hexter, *King Pym*, pp. 134-135; Pearl, “Oliver St. John and the ‘middle group,’ ” pp. 495-499; Elkin, “Interactions between the Irish Rebellion and the English Civil Wars,” pp. 137, 144-145.

Protestant commanders, notably Inchiquin, were not particularly enthusiastic in their support. The native Irish and the Catholic clergy, moreover, were not satisfied with an arrangement that did not confirm free and open exercise of their religion.²⁰³ Nonetheless, the moderates at Kilkenny were convinced that an armistice provided a foundation upon which negotiations toward obtaining substantive concessions could begin.²⁰⁴ As for Charles, the cessation not only secured the introduction of English forces from Ireland, but it also afforded him the opportunity to bolster the royalist war effort in England with Irish Catholics. But the military necessity of the royalists in securing this agreement proved a political liability. For, when news of the truce with the confederates reached Westminster, the pro-parliamentary periodicals were furnished with a fresh supply of 'paper bullets' that afforded these publications ample armory to assail the king and his adherents.

²⁰³ Corish, "Rising of 1641," p. 308.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

NEWSBOOKS AND THE CESSATION OF 1643

SEPTEMBER 1643-AUGUST 1645

On 25 September, ten days after the cessation had been concluded in Ireland, members of both Houses at Westminster joined with commissioners representing the Scottish covenanters to sign the Solemn League and Covenant. Securing this agreement had not been without difficulty. In return for military intervention in England, the Scots had demanded that the English parliament not only commit to the destruction of episcopacy, but that the church in that kingdom be reformed along Scottish-Presbyterian lines.¹ Not all MPs were ardent Presbyterians, however, and even after the proponents of episcopacy had deserted Westminster there remained an influential minority of Independents who were opposed to any rigid ecclesiastical structure. Nonetheless, fears of an impending cessation between the Irish and the king helped Pym and the 'middle party' to cultivate support for a treaty which determined that in return for Scottish assistance, parliament agreed to reform the Church of England "according to the word of God."²

Although Edinburgh's aspirations had been diluted in favor of an ambiguous religious settlement, concerns over developments in Ireland also helped foster support in Scotland for this treaty. The threat of Irish intervention in England, it was feared, could help bring about a royalist victory in England, and with that, the ruin of the Kirk north of the border.³ Indeed, after news of the cessation had reverberated among the covenanters,

¹ A copy of the Covenant can be found in Edward Hyde, 1ST Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, 6 vols., ed. W. D. Macray (Oxford, 1888), vol. iii, pp. 206-208.

² Kaplan, *Politics and Religion*, pp. xxi-xxii; idem, "The Scots and Parliament," pp. 62-64; Gardiner, *Civil War*, i, pp. 226-236. News of the cessation did not reach Westminster until the end of September. And, although parliament issued a declaration against it on 30 September, it did so without having actually received confirmation of any details of the truce. Carte, *Ormond*, iv, p. 3.

³ Charles L. Hamilton, "Scotland, Ireland and the English Civil War," *Albion* 7 (1975), p. 125.

Perfect Diurnall noted that the Scots were “greatly incensed against the cessation...terming it the most damnable designe ever yet set on foot for the extirpation of Protestants and...the setting up of Popery in all three Kingdomes....”⁴ *Certaine Informations*, moreover, noted the significance of the cessation on the Anglo-Scottish alliance, and expressed concern that if the Ulster Scots did not agree to the truce, Edinburgh would most likely divert its resources to Ulster rather than England. Thus the editor maintained that the basis of the cessation was not only to bring the Irish to England, but as importantly, it was designed to prevent the Scots from supporting the parliamentary war effort.⁵

Not surprisingly, Oxford reacted angrily to news of the Covenant. Within days, *Aulicus* argued that this treaty had been established in order to murder the king and to destroy the church in England. Berkenhead concluded, “Let men and angels witnesse to posterity what was done this week...for I confesse I tremble to think such a solemne, studied, malicious perjury should ever be committed in this wretched Island.”⁶ The reaction by the royalist press to the Covenant, however, paled in comparison to the manner in which the London weeklies responded to news of the cessation. When word of this agreement reached England it not only afforded marvelous propaganda for the pro-Westminster editors, but it also resulted in their hostility to both the crown and the Irish scaling new heights.

⁴ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 15, 30 Oct. 1643, 504.015E. 252(4), p. 113.

⁵ *Certaine Informations*, no. 40, 23 Oct. 1653, 36.40E. 71(32), p. 312.

⁶ *Aulicus*, no. 39, 30 Sep. 1643, 275.139A, p. 543.

THE ADVENT OF 'MERCURIUS BRITANICUS'

Nowhere was opposition to the cessation more evident than in the pages of *Mercurius Britanicus*. Already responsible for the publication of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* and *Mercurius Civicus*, Robert White first printed *Britanicus* on 29 August 1643.⁷ This latest addition to White's stable was not licensed through the usual channels. Rather, it was entered into the Stationers' Register by order of lord general, (first Essex, then Fairfax) and thus appeared to have had official backing from the army.⁸ This military connection was further strengthened by the fact that Captain Thomas Audley acted as the paper's principal editor. From issue 52, however, Audley's assistant, Marchamont Nedham appears to have assumed sole responsibility.⁹ In this capacity, Nedham became one of the most gifted and widely read polemicists of his day, and helped to raise the standard of news-writing by employing a unique brand of biting satire throughout *Britanicus* and subsequent news publications.¹⁰

The primary responsibility of Audley and Nedham was to combat *Aulicus*, and within a short period, six of its eight pages were devoted to refuting and smearing its Oxford rival.¹¹ Nonetheless, in its first week of publication Irish affairs occupied center stage in *Britanicus*. These included allegations that a number of 'rebels' had recently landed in Wales intended for Oxford, and that, as a result of Ormond's recent refusal to act against the insurgents in Ireland, many Protestants had been murdered in that

⁷ *Mercurius Britanicus: Communicating the Affaires of Great Britaine*, no. 1, 29 Aug. 1643, 286.001.

⁸ Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 30-31, 74-75.

⁹ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 31, 150; Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 49; idem, *Cromwell's Press Agent: A Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620-1778* (Lanham, Md., 1980), p. 15.

¹⁰ Blair Worden, "'Wit in a Roundhead': the dilemma of Marchamont Nedham," in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*, ed. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky (Manchester, N.Y., 1995), pp. 301-337; Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 297.

¹¹ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 49.

kingdom.¹² Within days, *Aulicus* responded to these charges and informed its readers, "All other newes (I mean Lyes) you must expect from a fine new thing, borne this weeke, called Mercurius Britannicus."¹³ With this the first shot had been fired, and for the next two years each paper engaged in discharging an arsenal of paper bullets at one another that did little to lessen the gulf between king and parliament.

The scathing attacks directed against the court helped make *Britannicus* one of the most popular London newsbooks. When news of the cessation reached the capital, for example, Audley and Nedham responded by claiming that the truce had been greeted at Oxford by a "great ringing of Bells."¹⁴ They alleged, moreover, that as a result of this agreement, the king had been applauded at Rome where countless masses were now uttered for him.¹⁵ Equally disturbing were claims that the cessation was nothing but a ploy by the Irish to destroy the remaining Protestants in that kingdom, and as a result of his actions, Charles had sacrificed these subjects "to a Masse and a Massacre at once."¹⁶ In this vein, *Britannicus* rekindled images associated with the outbreak of the rebellion by asserting that the king had now secured the support of those who had massacred 100,000 Protestants by:

...cutting the throats of some, putting out the eyes of others, ripping up the bellies of women, dashing their infants braines against the stones, hanging up some, drowning others by sixty in a company...tying Ministers and their wives back to back, cruelly putting them to death, and all this cruelty exercised on them, because they were Protestants, and yet these unpareld Popish Rebels are by a Protestant King called Subjects.¹⁷

¹² *Britannicus*, no. 1, 29 Aug. 1645, 286.001, pp. 1-2.

¹³ *Aulicus*, no. 35, 2 Sep. 1643, 275.135A, pp. 485-486.

¹⁴ *Britannicus*, no. 8, 17 Oct. 1643, 286.008VE. 71(10), p. 64.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 10, 2 Nov. 1643, 286.010VE. 74(11), p. 73.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 9, 26 Oct. 1643, 286.009VE. 72(2), p. 71.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 72. The allegation that 100,000 Protestants had been massacred since the beginning of the rebellion was repeated in less graphic terms by several newsbooks that week. For example, see *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 14, 23 Oct. 1643, 504.014VE. 252(3), p. 108; *Weekly Account*, no. 8, 26 Oct. 1643, 671.108VE. 72(7), [p. 3]; *Civicus*, no. 22, 26 Oct. 1643, 298.022VE. 72(10), p. 165[sic]; *Welch Mercury*, no. 1, 28 Oct. 1643, 708.1VE. 73(10), p. 5; *Certaine Informations*, no. 41, 30 Oct. 1643, 36.41VE. 74(6), p. 316.

Caustic reminders of the horrors associated with the rebellion in conjunction with the alleged reaction by the court were no doubt intended to deepen the outrage generated by the cessation. The willingness to employ such attacks no doubt helped *Britanicus* to become the most popular pro-parliamentary serial during its tenure.

PAPER POT-GUNNERS

Invariably, news of the cessation incited a fresh wave of reports that promoted allegations of either an expected or actual massacre of the Protestants in Ireland.¹⁸ *Perfect Diurnall* reported that the Protestants in that kingdom had let it known that as soon as government forces were shipped to England, they would “go to the slaughter in a more miserable manner then at the beginning of the Rebellion.”¹⁹ On 30 November *Weekly Account* lamented that the level of violence and rape now being perpetrated in that kingdom was such that it was as if the Irish had “contracted with the Devill for the tradition and Monopoly of sinne.”²⁰ As for the threat that the truce posed for England, *The Welch Mercury* insisted that, while making peace with the Irish was worse than concluding one with the devil, it hoped “the Devill will let a great fart, and raise such a storme, that awle her Irish Rebels shall be cast away, and drown’d....”²¹

Similar to news of the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641, the primary concern of

¹⁸ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 33, 28 Nov. 1643, 214.033\E. 77(10), p. 254; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 18, 20 Nov. 1643, 504.018\E. 252(8), p. 142; *Weekly Account*, no. 12, 22 Nov. 1643, 671.112\E. 77(17), p. 4; *Mercurius Cambro-Britannicus*, no. 5, 27 Nov. 1643, 708.5\E. 77(7), p. 3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 19, 27 Nov. 1643, 504.019\E. 252(9), p. 148.

²⁰ *Weekly Account*, no. 13, 30 Nov. 1643, 671.113\E. 77(16), [p. 3]. Edited by Daniel Border, a former scrivener, this serial got its start on 6 Sep. 1643. One of the most enduring London weeklies, *Weekly Account* survived until January 1648 (albeit with a change in title to *The Perfect Weekly Account* in May 1647). Like Pecke, Border relied heavily on parliamentary sources, but according to Frank, in terms of its quality it was “the poor man’s *Perfect Diurnall*.” Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 92. See also Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 33-34.

²¹ *The Welch Mercury*, no. 1, 28 Oct. 1643, 708.1\E. 73(10), p. 5; no. 2, 3 Nov. 1643, 708.2\E. 74(18), p. 6. Later changing its name to *Mercurius Cambro-Britannicus*, this was one of nine issues of a series that satirized its news by employing a Welsh accent.

the newsbooks as a result of the cessation was not the plight of the Protestants in Ireland, but rather, the fate awaiting their co-religionists in England. The fledgling *Kingdomes Weekly Post* asserted that, having received a commission from the king as a result of the cessation, the principal objective of the Irish was to massacre, irrespective of age or gender, parliament's supporters in England.²² *Civicus*, meanwhile, appealed to the patriotism of those who as yet remained uncommitted to either camp by asserting that the Irish would exercise as little mercy to women and children in England as they had to the settlers who had been ravished and massacred in Ireland. In fact, the editor concluded, "No man that hath a true Heroicke English spirit, but will endeavour with heart and hand to expulse and destroy this venomous brood out of this Kingdome."²³

However, by the fall of 1643 *Aulicus* was becoming increasingly combative toward the pro-parliamentary press. In early October, it proclaimed that these "paper Pot-gunners" were "weekly fools in print, for they talk, and speak, and write such horrible coarse stuffe yet dyed in Parliament colour, so that the Devill will make himselfe a suit of it...."²⁴ *Perfect Diurnall* was singled out for particular criticism by Oxford, perhaps because Pecke's "Weekly Calendar of pure Coxcombs" continued to enjoy a close association with both Houses of Parliament, and hence retained a reputation for presenting relatively reliable and informative parliamentary news.²⁵ But it is clear that over the next several weeks, the manner in which Pecke and his colleagues in the Westminster camp had related news of the cessation stirred the ire of the court and resulted in Berkenhead firing volleys of his own. Although *Aulicus* had generally

²² *Kingdomes Weekly Post*, no. 4, 28 Nov. 1643, 217.4VE. 77(9), pp. 27-28.

²³ *Civicus*, no. 23, 2 Nov. 1643, 298.023VE. 74(14), p. 179.

²⁴ *Aulicus*, no. 40, 7 Oct. 1643, 275.140A, p. 551.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

avoided Irish affairs for much of its early history, the cessation marked the first serious attempt by the royalists to utilize developments in Ireland for political gain. For example, in refuting allegations of the dangers this truce posed for England, Berkenhead responded by proclaiming that there was “worse Rebels at home then the Irish.”²⁶ Claims that maintained the king had granted this cessation in order to bring the insurgents to England were further rebutted. Rather, according to *Aulicus*, these ‘rebels’ were English Protestants who had ventured their lives against the Irish. Their return was thus further evidence that the king now fought in defense of the Church of England against “Rebellious Brownists and Anabaptists; who are so maliciously bent against the Protestant Religion.”²⁷

INNOCENT AS DOVES

The increasing belligerence that Berkenhead demonstrated following the cessation did not go unchallenged. *The Scottish Dove*, which first appeared on 15 October 1643, launched a series of exceptionally biting attacks against *Aulicus*.²⁸ On 10 November, George Smith, the editor, left readers in no doubt about his contempt for a paper that he claimed conveyed “fraud, blasphemy, and lyes, into all parts,” to better “pay Gregory his due.”²⁹ These attacks could also become quite personal. The following week, for instance, Smith accused Berkenhead of having a “Malignant, insolent evill lying spirit,” which had been fostered at Oxford among “Armenian popelings” who acted as patrons to the Irish Rebels.³⁰ On the other hand, the title page of each issue of *Scottish Dove* depicted

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 565.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 48, 2 Dec. 1643, 275.148\E. 78(16), p. 686. For similar claims see also, no. 41, 14 Oct. 1643, 275.141A, pp. 580-581, and no. 43, 28 Oct. 1643, 275.143A, p. 614.

²⁸ *The Scottish Dove. Sent Out, and Returning*, no. 1, 20 Oct. 1643, 594.001\E. 71(24). This production was most likely a continuation of the ephemeral, *The Scotch Mercury*, N&S 591\E. 69(23), which appeared ten days earlier on 5 October. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 34.

²⁹ *Scottish Dove*, no. 4, 10 Nov. 1643, 594.04\E. 75(21), pp. 28-29.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 5, 17 Nov. 1643, 594.05\E. 76(7), p. 34.

a large wood-cut of a dove carrying an olive branch that incorporated the words “holy innocency is blessed,” below which a caption read, “Be Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves.”³¹ This image helped distinguish *Scotish Dove* from rival pro-parliamentary weeklies, and as importantly, the promotion of the *Dove* as a purveyor of truth and innocence, contrasted sharply to the fiction and degradation claimed by Smith to be inherent in *Aulicus*.

Scotish Dove also reflected the editor’s Presbyterian sympathies, and it is no coincidence that it was launched on the coat tails of the new alliance between London and Edinburgh.³² But although Smith maintained that his primary concern was with the Scots, particularly the activities of their army in northern England, he often deviated from these areas of specialization. Irish affairs regularly attracted his attention, and this news, which was often conveyed to the reader in a litany of biblical jargon, generally mirrored the editor’s vehement anti-Catholicism.³³ In response to the respective agreements reached with both the Scots and the Irish, for example, Smith contrasted the fortunes that could be generated by the Covenant with those that would come about as a result of the cessation:

Now the way to prevent all these treacherous designes, is, resolvedly, every one to enter into [a] Covenant with God, for Reformation of sinne, (for which God hath brought this evill upon us) and covenant unanimously one with another to stand together in defence of Gods truth... against the common enemy: This kind of holy covenanting hath been ever very succesfull, to all the people of God, as... in the time of Hezekiah, and of Josiah, and in the time of Ezra... Therefore let all that hate the Idole of Rome, whether Annabaptists, Antinomians, or other Separatists of any kind, joyne together... in the

³¹ *Ibid.*, no. 4, 10 Nov. 1643, 594.04\E. 75(21), pp. 29-30. The dove was generally considered an emblem or token of truth and innocence. Derived from the biblical account of Christ’s baptism by John the Baptist, the appearance of a dove testified to the truth of that particular deed.

³² See for example, *Scotish Dove*, no. 17, 9 Feb. 1644, 594.021\E. 33(12), p. 135; no. 27, 19 Apr. 1644, 594.027\E. 43(16), p. 210.

³³ For example, see *Scotish Dove*, no. 21, 8 Mar. 1644, 594.021\E. 36(6), p. 165; no. 36, 21 Jun. 1644, 594.036\E. 52(3), pp. 284-285; no. 38, 5 Jul. 1644, 594.038\E. 53(22), pp. 300-303; no. 43, 9 Aug. 1644, 594.043\E. 3(3), p. 339.

pulling down of Antichrist, it is a worke worthy [of] our lives, if we should reduce our King, and reduce him out of the hands of Idolaters and trayters....³⁴

Smith's endorsement of the Covenant and his contempt for the cessation was particularly evident in his response to *Mercurius Hibernicus, Or, A Discourse of the late Insurrection in Ireland*. Published at Bristol in late June 1644, James Howell, a staunch royalist, was responsible for this pamphlet in which he castigated the birth of these weekly "mongrell race of Mercuries."³⁵ This denunciation of the pro-parliamentary newsbooks was most likely in response to the persistent attacks on the crown for its alleged role in the outbreak of the rebellion and its dealings with the insurgents thereafter. Howell claimed:

There is not any thing since these wars began, whereof there hath been more advantage made, to traduce and blemish His Majesties actions, to alienate and imbitter the affections of his people, to incite them to armes, and enharden them in the quarrell, than of the Irish Affaires.³⁶

But the principal purpose of *Hibernicus* was to reflect blame for events in Ireland, which included the necessity of a cessation, away from the king. To this end, primary responsibility for the insurrection was awarded to the Scots. According to Howell, the success obtained by the covenanters in securing religious freedom "wrought wonderfully upon the imagination of the Irish," whose grievances were far greater than the Scots, "and filled them... with thoughts of emulation."³⁷ Westminster was also indicted for its role in

³⁴ Ibid., no. 4, 10 Nov. 1643, 594.04\E. 75(21), p. 29.

³⁵ [James Howell], *Mercurius Hibernicus: Or, A Discourse of the late Insurrection in Ireland* [1644], E. 52(17). Howell had acquired first hand knowledge of events in Ireland prior to the rebellion. During the mid-1630s he had corresponded with Strafford, and in 1639 was employed by the earl as a clerk in the Irish council. *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. x, pp. 109-114. For an appraisal of Howell's life and work, see also Daniel Woolf, "Conscience, constancy, and ambition in the career and writings of James Howell," in *Public duty and private conscience in seventeenth-century England: essays presented to G. E. Aylemer*, ed., John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (Oxford, 1993), pp. 243-278.

³⁶ *Hibernicus*, p. 1.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 6-7.

having created a climate for rebellion. The Irish, it was asserted, were the victims of the “most sangumary [sanguinary] designe of extirpating, at least of enslaving a whole ancient Nation... planted there by the hand of Providence from the beginning.”³⁸

Moreover, in lieu of parliament’s mismanagement of both men and money levied to suppress the rebellion, *Hibernicus* maintained that the king was forced to agree to the cessation in order to secure the lives of his “loyall Subjects” in that kingdom. Despite this, the author insisted that the Irish truce was a more honorable pacification than that which had been agreed to with the Scots after they had taken to arms.³⁹

Considering that the covenanters were the focus of these attacks, *Scotish Dove* appears to have assumed responsibility in combating *Hibernicus*’ claims. On 5 July, Smith devoted approximately forty percent of that week’s edition to refuting this “blind Harper, or a disguised Jesuite assended from the Abysses of Hell, to justifie the late rebellion in Ireland by Sophismes.”⁴⁰ The *Dove* contended that not only was *Hibernicus*’ harp out of tune for suggesting that the Irish were emulating the Scots, but that its argument was akin to insisting that “because one man saves his head from breaking, therefore I may cut another mans throat.”⁴¹ Smith further maintained that the pacification with the Scots was an honorable act, and reminded his readers that this nation had not only legitimate grievances, but that they were the king’s “native people.” In this light, the editor concluded that the Irish possessed neither claims; thus this cessation was “displeasing to God, and impious,” for this people are not only “Idolaters,” but they are also “bloody Butchers of Gods people....”⁴²

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 18-19.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 18-22.

⁴⁰ *Scotish Dove*, no. 38, 5 Jul. 1644, 594.038VE. 53(22), p. 300.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 301.

⁴² Ibid., p. 303.

'A SPANISH STRATAGEM'

Within six weeks of the cessation the first troops had departed Ireland for service in England. In late October two English regiments from Munster arrived at Minehead and Bristol respectively. A further 2,000-2,500 soldiers from Leinster landed at Mostyn in Flintshire in November, while in December a force of approximately 1,700 men disembarked in Cheshire. These regiments comprised the first wave of several royalist convoys that sailed from Ireland between October 1643 and June 1644.⁴³ Predictably, when reports first surfaced that fresh troops had landed, the pro-parliamentary newsbooks proclaimed to their readers that the 'Irish rebels' had arrived.⁴⁴ *Perfect Diurnall* shortly retracted its initial charge and noted that the new arrivals at Bristol were English Protestants. Nonetheless, it qualified this by asserting that the king was following a "Spanish stratagem... to bring over the Irish last, lest their plot be too soon discovered and abhorred by all men."⁴⁵

In general, most Westminster periodicals continued to maintain that these troops were Irish papists, and accordingly, they promoted reports that depicted the king's reinforcements in the worst possible light. The fallible *Certain Informations*, for example, insisted that the recent arrivals in Cheshire had "hewed a godly Minister in that County in pieces" and were about to launch "a new Irish Massacre in England."⁴⁶ Several serials claimed that the Irish had not only committed divers outrages at Bristol, but that

⁴³ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 35, 38-39; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 53; Gardiner, *Civil War*, i, pp. 245, 251; Malcolm, "All the king's men," pp. 251-252.

⁴⁴ *Certain Informations*, no. 42, 6 Nov. 1643, 36.42\E. 75(3), p. 325; *Scottish Dove*, no. 3, 594.003\E. 74(16), p. 22; *True Informer*, no. 7, 4 Nov. 1643, 629.07\E. 74(21), p. 51; *Civics*, no. 23, 2 Nov. 1643, 298.023\E. 74(14), p. 178; *Informator Rusticus: or, the Countrey Intelligencer*, no. 1, 3 Nov. 1643, 198.1\E. 74(15), p. 6; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 16, 6 Nov. 1643, 504.016\E. 252(6), pp. 121-122; *Parliament Scout*, no. 23, 1 Dec. 1643, 485.23\E. 77(23), p. 202.

⁴⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 17, 13 Nov. 1643, 504.017\E. 252(7), p. 132.

⁴⁶ *Certain Informations*, no. 52, Jan. 15, 1644, 36.52, p. 409.

one of them had been identified by a mother who had fled from Ireland shortly after the outbreak of the rebellion as having murdered five of her children. It was further alleged that when challenged, the accused affirmed that “he had Commission for what he did then, and that if he had the like Commission he would doe as much here.”⁴⁷

The arrival of English regiments from Ireland may have done little to promote unity within royalist ranks. Shortly upon debarkation at Bristol, the veterans from Munster linked up with troops under the command of lord Hopton, commander of the king’s forces in the West Country. If *Weekly Account* is to be believed, Cornish soldiers in Hopton’s service berated these men as “Irish Kernes and Popish Dogges.” Tensions, it was alleged, escalated to the point that a number of Cornishmen were killed in skirmishes with the ‘Irish,’ and approximately 500 of them returned to their native Cornwall shortly thereafter.⁴⁸ These allegations would have been particularly pointed considering that the Cornish were generally considered to be the most loyal and indeed the most savage English soldiers in the royalist army.⁴⁹

It wasn’t only Cornish forces who were alleged to have deserted the crown. By mid-November news of similar defections encouraged the editor of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* to conclude, “I finde this Cessation of Armes with these barbarous Irish Rebels, hath lost the King more, than unadvised action that ever he did.”⁵⁰ Henry Rich,

⁴⁷ *Civicus*, no. 27, 30 Nov. 1643, 298.027E. 77(15), p. 314. See also *Mercurius Cambro-Britannus*, no. 6, 5 Dec. 1643, 708.6E. 77(28), pp. 1-2, and *Certain Informations*, no. 48, 18 Dec. 1643, 36.48, p. 375.

⁴⁸ *Weekly Account*, no. 28, 28 Dec. 1643, 671.128E. 79(17), [pp. 1-2].

⁴⁹ M.J. Stoyke, “‘Pagans or Paragons?’: Images of the Cornish during the English Civil War,” *English Historical Review* 111 (1996), pp. 299-323.

⁵⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 31, 14 Nov. 1643, 214.031E. 75(31), pp. 237. In the last weeks of 1643, sundry newsbooks claimed that the cessation had contributed toward mutinies and defections throughout royalist ranks. For example, see *Kingdomes Weekly Post*, no. 1, 9 Nov. 1643, 217.1E. 75(17), p. 5; *True Informer*, no. 8, 11 Nov. 1643, 629.08E. 75(23), p. 59; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 17, 13 Nov. 1643, 504.017E. 252(7), pp. 132-133; no. 18, 20 Nov. 1643, 504.018E. 252(8), p. 139; *Compleate Intelligencer*, no. 3, 14 Nov. 1643, 52.3E. 75(32), p. 43.

earl of Holland, was the most frequently cited defector. It was widely reported that Holland had fled Oxford because his conscience could no longer permit him “to associate with those at court...intent to join with the Irish in the extirpation of Protestants in Ireland and the introduction of popery into England.”⁵¹ The earl, however, was noted for migrating between royalist and parliamentary camps during the 1640s, and his return to London was most likely the result of his failure to ingratiate himself with the king rather than any rectitude over the cessation.⁵² *Scotish Dove* further claimed that as a result of crown bringing over the ‘Irish,’ a number of leading royalists in both Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire had submitted to parliament.⁵³ But the evidence suggests that these individuals remained loyal to the king, and thus such reports were either based on misleading information, or were premeditated untruths intended to sway greater numbers to the parliamentary cause.⁵⁴

Although the London newsbooks were primarily preoccupied over the consequences that the cessation posed for affairs in England, news of military affairs in Ireland continued to attract attention. The Scots in Ulster remained opposed to the truce, and because of this, the third general assembly of the confederates met at Waterford on 7 November and decided to liberate the north from the covenanters.⁵⁵ Yet even before the confederates had agreed to focus their efforts on Ulster, several serials reported that

⁵¹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 18, 20 Nov. 1643, 504.018\E. 252(8), p. 139; See also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 31, 14 Nov. 1643, 214.031\E. 75(31), p. 939[sic]; *Kingdomes Weekly Post*, no. 1, 9 Nov. 1643, 217.1\E. 75(17), p. 5.

⁵² Lindley, “Impact of the 1641 Rebellion,” p. 171; *Dictionary of National Biography*, xvi, pp. 998–999.

⁵³ Smith identified the more prominent of these individuals as Sir Edward Hussey, Sir Ralph Tharrald [Thorold], Sir William Tharrald [Thorold], Sir Robert Markham, Sir Philip Tarren, Sir William Pilham, Sir Richard Winfield, Stephen Anderson, Esquire and Mr. Suten, Esquire. *Scotish Dove*, no. 4, 10 Nov. 1643, 594.004\E. 75(21), pp. 30–31.

⁵⁴ Lindley, “Impact of the 1641 Rebellion,” pp. 172–173.

⁵⁵ Of the nine meetings that took place between 1642 and 1649 this was the only occasion in which the general assembly met outside Kilkenny. Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 206 (Table I).

Monro's forces had slain up to 8,000 rebels!⁵⁶ Conversely, on 30 December *Aulicus* maintained that a recent encounter between Irish and Scottish forces in Ulster had resulted in the Scots being overthrown, while native troops had advanced more than thirty miles into the province. Berkenhead, moreover, exhibited little sympathy to the Ulster Scots, and asserted that their "bloud might have beene spared by the Cessation" for not a man who abided by this truce had been "lost by any mutuall quarrell one against the other."⁵⁷ These sentiments expressed by *Aulicus* clearly reflected the hostility at Oxford toward the recent alliance between the covenanters and Westminster. This was the first time in fifty-two weeks that Berkenhead had related news of events alleged to have taken place in Ireland, and thus one could be forgiven in assuming that the cessation had helped free Oxford from the shackles hitherto associated with relating affairs in that kingdom. Yet unlike its London counterparts, news from Ireland remained scant in *Aulicus*. No doubt parliament's impediments to communication diminished the flow of information from Ireland to the royalists,⁵⁸ but the prevailing anti-Irish sentiment in England may have led the crown to de-emphasize its reliance on help from Ireland.

In accordance with the alliance between Edinburgh and Westminster, the first wave of 20,000 Scottish soldiers crossed the Tweed on 19 January 1644. Over the next several weeks this army secured most of Northumberland and Durham, and by the spring it had linked up with parliamentary forces to besiege York. These developments ensured

⁵⁶ *Certaine Informations*, no. 42, 6 Nov. 1642, 36.42\E. 75(3), p. 328; *Compleate Intelligencer*, no. 2, 7 Nov. 1643, 52.2\E. 75(6), p. 28; *Parliament Scout*, no. 19, 3 Nov. 1643, 485.19\E. 74(19), p. 166. The following week, however, *Parliament Scout* and *Scottish Dove* contended that Irish fatalities were closer to 800 and 200 respectively. Dillingham adjusted his figure on the grounds that original claims "seemed so impossible." *Parliament Scout*, no. 20, 10 Nov. 1643, 485.20\E. 75(22), p. 175; *Scottish Dove*, no. 4, 10 Nov. 1643, 594.004\E. 75(21), p. 30.

⁵⁷ *Aulicus*, no. 52, 30 Dec. 1643, 275.152\E. 81(19), p. 748.

⁵⁸ John Lowe, "Charles I and the confederation of Kilkenny, 1643-9," *Irish Historical Studies* 14 (1964), pp. 11-12.

that the demand for news remained high. In January, for example, an avid reader could purchase one of almost a dozen stable periodicals on any given day of the week except Sunday.⁵⁹

While established titles such as *Britanicus* and *Perfect Diurnall* continued to prosper throughout 1644, they continually faced new competition.⁶⁰ The first arrival of the year was perhaps the most significant. *Occurrences of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages in Parliament* debuted on 5 January, and until its demise in October 1649 was one of the most popular pro-parliamentary weeklies. Renamed *Perfect Occurrences* in April 1644, it was edited by Henry Walker, a former ironmonger turned pamphleteer-bookseller and Independent minister. Although a newcomer to serial news, Walker's reputation preceded him after he had been convicted for casting a copy of one of his publications, *To your tents, O Israel!* into the king's carriage in 1642.⁶¹ Not surprisingly, considering the author's credentials, *Perfect Occurrences* soon became noted for its fervent anti-Catholicism, and by the end of 1644, the attention it gave to the

⁵⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, *Certain Informations* and *Aulicus*, for example, appeared on Monday, although the latter claimed to run from Sunday to Sunday. Tuesday saw the publication of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligence*, while the newly revived *Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages* and *Weekly Account* appeared on Wednesday. *Britanicus* and *Civicus* were available on Thursday. *Scottish Dove* joined *Parliament Scout* on Friday and *True Informer* could be purchased on Saturday. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 56-57; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 32.

⁶⁰ Three non-ephemeral newsbooks were launched by the end of January. These were *Occurrences of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, (Jan. 1644-Oct. 1649) N&S 465; *Mercurius & c.* (later *Mercurius Veridicus*, Jan.-Apr. 1644) N&S 320; and *The Spie*, (Jan.-Jun. 1644) N&S 609. February witnessed the first of six issues of *The Military Scribe*, (Feb.-Mar. 1644) N&S 402. *An Exact Diurnall*, (later *A Diary*, May 1644-Mar. 1646) N&S 144, was introduced in May and attempted to rival *Perfect Diurnall* in balancing coverage of parliamentary and military affairs at the end of each week rather than at the beginning. June brought the advent of the England's first foreign language serial, *Le Mercure Anglois*, (Jun. 1644-Dec. 1648) N&S 258. Edited by Dillingham, this four-page weekly was designed to satisfy an overseas interest in English affairs, and its success is evident by the fact that it continued to operate until December 1648. *The Court Mercurie* made its mark in July, (Jul.-Oct. 1644) N&S 81, and despite the editor's assertions, it did not enjoy any particular pipeline to intelligence from Oxford. *The London Post* (later *The Weekly Postmaster*, Aug.-May 1645) was established the following month, while the last enduring newsbook of 1644 was *Perfect Passages*, which sprouted forth in October (Oct. 1644-Mar. 1646).

⁶¹ Plomer, *Booksellers and Printers*, p. 187; Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 214; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 37.

emerging Independent-Presbyterian divisions at Westminster. Like Pecke, parliamentary news was Walker's primary concern, and detailed reports of meetings from within the Commons suggest that he had a well-placed informant.⁶² The fact that *Perfect Occurrences* was published on a Friday, moreover, allowed readers to catch up on mid-week parliamentary news, which would not have been available to patrons of *Perfect Diurnall* until the following Monday.⁶³

INCHIQUIN'S 'INVASION'

Throughout the first weeks of 1644 Walker and his colleagues continued to berate the king for bringing over troops from Ireland. However, some of these editors began to apply the terms 'English-Irish' or 'Irish-English' in order to distinguish English soldiers or possibly Old English forces from the 'natural Irish'.⁶⁴ But according to Border, although these convoys may have consisted of English veterans, they could not be trusted having "breathed so long in the Irish ayre."⁶⁵ In this context, *Parliament Scout* asserted that the victory obtained by Sir Thomas Fairfax over Sir John Byron's 'English-Irish' forces at Nantwich in Cheshire on 25 January 1644 was just reward for these "Acteons dogs" who had turned upon their "Masters."⁶⁶ This derision did not escape the attention of Berkenhead, who retorted that if these troops were to be compared to dogs it was because they were used as such while in Ireland.⁶⁷

⁶² Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 235.

⁶³ Ibid., pp. 214-216; Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 81.

⁶⁴ For example, *Occurrences*, no. 2, Jan. 12, 1644, 465.1002\E. 81(26), [p. 6]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 27, 29 Jan. 1643, 504.027\E. 252(18), p. 213; *Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 2, 10 Jan. 1644, 59.02\E. 81(15), p. 4; *Mercurius Cambro-Britannus*, no. 8, Jan. 24, 1643, 708.8, [p. 6].

⁶⁵ *Weekly Account*, no. 18, 3 Jan. 1643, 671.118\E. 80(6), [p. 2].

⁶⁶ *Parliament Scout*, no. 32, 2 Feb. 1644, 485.32\E. 31(7), p. 275. In Greek mythology, Actaeon, a hunter, witnessed Artemis (Diana) bathing. In anger she changed him into a stag, and his own dogs tore him to pieces.

⁶⁷ *Aulicus*, no. 5, 3 Feb. 1644, 275.025A, p. 818.

Defeat at Nantwich led some leading royalists to question the fidelity of the veterans from Ireland. Two of these regiments had fled during the fighting, and approximately half of the 1,600 prisoners taken by parliament took the Covenant and committed themselves to Fairfax.⁶⁸ *True Informer* contended that this was further evidence that since the arrival of these troops, desertions to parliament outnumbered those transported from Ireland as a result of the cessation.⁶⁹ Byron conveyed his frustrations to Ormond on this issue and implored that future reinforcements were rather:

Irish than English, for the English we have already are very mutinous, and...are so poisoned by the ill-affected people here, that they grow very cold in this service; and since the rebels here call in the Scots, I know no reason why the King should make any scruple of calling in the Irish, or the Turks if they would serve him.⁷⁰

Although the pro-parliamentary newsbooks would not have known about Byron's request, several editors recorded divers convoys of 'natural Irish' had landed in February and March at Bristol and Cheshire respectively. Most important of these reports were those that related the arrival of Inchiquin from Munster. Although considered to be the principal civil and military figure in that province, Inchiquin lacked the prestige of the presidential office which had remained vacant since the death of his father-in-law Sir William St. Leger in 1642.⁷¹ In his desire to secure this appointment from the king, Inchiquin traveled to England in January 1644 accompanied by approximately 800 men. Upon arrival, the earl made his way to Oxford, while his troops were tasked to assist Hopton in the south-west. Allegations that these recent arrivals were 'Irish rebels' and not

⁶⁸ Gardiner, *Civil War*, i, p. 295.

⁶⁹ *True Informer*, no. 20, 3 Feb. 1644, 629.20VE. 31(10), pp. 147-148.

⁷⁰ Byron to Ormond, 30 Jan. 1644, cited in Gardiner, *Civil War*, i, pp. 295-296. For further correspondence on this matter see also, Digby to Ormond, 8 Feb. 1644, Carte, *Ormond*, vi, p. 33, and Ormond to Digby, 8 Mar. 1644, Carte, *Ormond*, vi, p. 53.

⁷¹ John A. Murphy, "The Politics of the Munster Protestants, 1641-49," *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society* 76 (1971), p. 9.

'English-Irish,' invariably sparked claims that while Inchiquin was with the king his soldiers exercised outrages similar to those that they had perpetrated in Ireland.⁷²

Unfortunately for Inchiquin, Charles had already promised the Munster presidency to lord Portland, a man who had absolutely no experience of Irish affairs. Thus the earl returned to Ireland in the spring, not only disillusioned with the crown, but also uncertain about his support for the cessation and the royalist cause in that kingdom.⁷³ This apparent snub did not escape the attention of *Britanicus*, which on 12 March maintained that a "Cardinals Letter had secured Portland's appointment from Rome." It further maintained that although:

Inchiquin, who hath no more of the Protestant then the first syllable of his name, and that is an Inch... Portland with his Pill of Popery carryed it, and now poore Inchiquin, who was in a quandary...dotes with himselfe, whether he should goe to the Bogs againe, or come to Westminster....⁷⁴

This selection of Portland, moreover, encouraged several editors to predict that upon his return to Ireland, Inchiquin would abandon the king's cause and violate the cessation.⁷⁵ Border, nonetheless, questioned whether the earl's return to that kingdom was the result of having failed to land the presidency or his shame brought about by the outrages committed by his soldiers in England.⁷⁶ When news that Inchiquin had actually defected to parliament reached London in August, however, the serials were unanimous in condoning the earl for his decision to embrace the parliamentary cause.

⁷² *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 27, 29 Jan. 1643, 504.027\E. 252(18), p. 213; *Weekly Account*, no. 22, 1 Feb. 1643, 671.122\E. 31(1), [p. 2]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 31, 26 Feb. 1644, 504.031\E. 252(22), p. 248.

⁷³ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 117-118.

⁷⁴ *Britanicus*, no. 26, 12 Mar. 1644, 286.026\E. 37(2), p. 203.

⁷⁵ *Occurrences*, no. 11, 9 Mar. 1644, 465.1011, [p. 4]. See also *Mercurius Veridicus*, no. 7, 12 Mar. 1644, 320.07, [p. 6].

⁷⁶ *Weekly Account*, no. 37, 13 Mar. 1644, 671.137\E. 37(6), [p. 6].

'IRISH AMBASSADORS'

Inchiquin was not the only important visitor to journey from Ireland to Oxford during this period. In November 1643, the confederate assembly had appointed a seven-man delegation headed by Muskerry to present a series of peace proposals to the king.⁷⁷

Although the commissioners did not depart Ireland until March and arrived at Oxford on the 23rd of that month, it appears that the London weeklies were aware that these agents were expected long before Muskerry and his associates ever set foot on English soil. In February, several newsbooks claimed that these men had already landed in England and were accompanied by 1,500 rebels! Even more specious were allegations that this force included Inchiquin, Sir Phelim O'Neill, and even the "Great Oneale" himself!⁷⁸

These 1,500 'rebels' were most likely the last of the crown's English troops to be shipped from Ireland as a result of the cessation.⁷⁹ Yet this did not inhibit *True Informer* from maintaining that upon arrival, this force had commandeered Bristol and had established open mass throughout the city. The editor further reported that these recent additions to the king's army had "imbrued their hands in the blood" of "divers English Protestants" who had fled from Ireland to Bristol to seek protection. These refugees, furthermore, could not demand justice against these "bloody murderers" for fear that they

⁷⁷ The remaining commissioners were Alexander McDonnell, Nicolas Plunket, Sir Robert Talbot, Dermot O'Brien, Richard Martin, and Geoffrey Brown. Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 2, 65; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 95-97; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 70-71.

⁷⁸ *Certain Informations*, no. 56, 15 Feb. 1644, 36.56\E. 3(10), p. 441; *Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, no. 6, 8 Feb. 1644, 59.06\E. 32(1), p. 6; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 43, 14 Feb. 1644, 214.043\E. 33(6), p. 236; *Britanicus*, no. 23, 19 Feb. 1644, 286.023A\E. 33(21), p. 182 and 286.023B, p. 182; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 29, 12 Feb. 1644, 504.029\E. 252(20), p. 232; *Scottish Dove*, no. 17, 9 Feb. 1644, 594.017\E. 32(12), p. 136; *True Informer*, no. 21, 10 Feb. 1644, 629.21, p. 157; no. 22, 17 Feb. 1644, 629.22\E. 33(14), pp. 159-160; *Civicus*, no. 40, 29 Feb. 1644, 298.040\E. 34(20), p. 417; *Occurrences*, no. 7, 9 Feb. 1644, 465.1007\E. 32(9), [p. 6]; *Veridicus*, no. 6, 5 Mar. 1644, 320.06\E. 35(20), [p. 3].

⁷⁹ Malcolm, "All the king's men," p. 252.

would face a similar fate as their relatives left in Ireland.⁸⁰ This information, though deemed “incredulous,” was used to accuse the king’s ‘evil councilors’ of intending to place Bristol in the hands of the Irish.⁸¹ For good measure, the following week *True Informer* cautioned its readers that it was unlikely that those responsible for the massacres in Ireland would “change their savage human natures” simply by crossing the sea.⁸²

After the confederate delegation reached England, at least one newsbook asserted that they had been accorded the same respect at court generally reserved for foreign ambassadors.⁸³ Muskerry and his fellow ‘ambassadors’ presented their initial proposals to the king on 28 March. Annexed to the Remonstrance of Grievances that had been proposed in March 1643, these demands became the basis of negotiations between Oxford and Kilkenny over the next two years. The principal propositions demanded complete religious freedom for Catholics in Ireland, a free and independent Irish parliament, and laws and institutions in Ireland that did not discriminate against the native Irish.⁸⁴ If Charles agreed to these proposals, the confederates were prepared to commit 10,000 men toward the royalist war effort in England. Given this enticement,

⁸⁰ *True Informer*, no. 21, 10 Feb. 1644, 629.21, p. 157. Although little evidence is available to indicate the identity of the editor, both Frank and Cotton suggest that Henry Walley, the chief licenser of the weekly press from June 1643–March 1644, was most likely responsible. Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 54; Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” p. 153.

⁸¹ *True Informer*, no. 21, 10 Feb. 1644, 629.21, p. 157.

⁸² *Ibid.*, no. 22, 17 Feb. 1644, 629.22\E. 33(14), pp. 159–160.

⁸³ *Britaines Remembrancer*, no. 3, 2 Apr. 1644, 28.3\E. 40(11), p. 23.

⁸⁴ These demands are printed in full in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 128–133. They also included the suspension of Poynings law; all acts and ordinances of the Irish Parliament since 7 August 1641 to be annulled; an act of oblivion to cover offenses committed since the outbreak of the rebellion; the repeal of the adventurer’s act; the reversal of Wentworth’s plantations; the abolishment of the court of wards; and that all land-holdings be confirmed by a sixty year act of limitation. They were later summarized by *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 56, 28 May, 1644, 214.056\E. 49(26), p. 452, and *Scottish Dove*, no. 33, 31 May 1644, 214.033\E. 50(3), pp. 260–261. See also Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 98–100; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 70–71.

Britanicus predicted that these demands would be granted, since the king “will not dare to deny them that Kingdome, for destroying of this.”⁸⁵

Military intervention by the Scots on behalf of parliament no doubt made the prospect of securing a sizable confederate force appealing to the king. But the court was also aware of the pitfalls associated with any Irish alliance. This dilemma was evident to lord Digby, who in correspondence to Ormond, maintained that:

...every body that is faithfull to the kinge's interests apprehendes the necessitye of a peace, both for the preservation of the protestants in Ireland, and the support of our affayres heere; but every body also is seekinge, as the ape did, to pull the chestnutt out of the fire with the puppye's foote, and to cast of the councill of graunting the Irish anything at all to his neighbour.⁸⁶

Members of the Dublin administration, moreover, who had been summoned to Oxford by the king, opposed confederate demands and cautioned that by granting concessions to the Irish, a parliament would be created in that kingdom which would be irrevocably controlled by papists.⁸⁷ To complicate matters further, a delegation of Irish Protestants also traveled to Oxford, and on 18 April presented the king with propositions that insisted on extending the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland.⁸⁸ These articles reflected the antagonism of Irish Protestants to any peace settlement with the Catholics, and compounded the difficulties faced by the crown over the effect such an agreement might have on royalists in both England and Ireland. In light of these considerations, Charles refused to commit to any major concessions at this juncture, and the confederate

⁸⁵ *Britanicus*, no. 30, 8 Apr. 1644, 286.030\E. 40(33), pp. 237-238.

⁸⁶ Digby to Ormond, 9 May 1644, in Carte, *Ormond*, vi, p. 119.

⁸⁷ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 71.

⁸⁸ These propositions can be found printed in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 148. They included demands that all penal laws be fully executed; all future office holders be required to take the oath of supremacy; the present Parliament in Dublin continue; Poyning's law to remain sacrosanct; the plantation policy to be extended; full reparations be made to the Protestants by the confederates, and that all 'war criminals' be prosecuted. The Protestant proposals were also summarized in both *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 56, 28 May 1644, 214.056\E. 49(26), pp. 452-453, and *Scottish Dove*, no. 33, 31 May 1644, 594.033\E. 50(3), p. 262. See also Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 100-101; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 72.

delegation returned to Ireland having failed to secure its principal political and religious demands.⁸⁹

Given the sensitive nature of these negotiations, it is not surprising that *Aulicus* failed to relate any news regarding the confederate agents at Oxford. Their visit, however, attracted adverse attention in the London weeklies. Notwithstanding the fact that Muskerry and his colleagues had returned to Kilkenny empty-handed, *Perfect Occurrences* insisted that the king had pardoned these “monsters of mankind” for having “murdered a hundred thousand souls.”⁹⁰ Likewise, *Britanicus* concluded that by “cutting a 120,000 Protestant throats,” the Irish had attained all their propositions.⁹¹ *Perfect Diurnall* added weight to these claims by reporting that a member of the Protestant delegation had recently arrived in London and informed the Commons that not only were their propositions ignored by the king, but those of the “blood-sucking Rebels were cherished, and in effect passed by his Majestie.”⁹² Durant Hotham, editor of *The Spie*, echoed these sentiments and launched a particularly caustic indictment against the crown:

Now let those, who have had the left eye of their understandings open, judge impartially, whether they are not enforced to conceive him [Charles] both a favorer of that Rebellion, and a Papist in his heart, that would give consent to things so necessary destructive to the Religion and Politie of that distressed Kingdome....⁹³

The visit of the Catholic commissioners to Oxford clearly kindled a wave of outrage in the parliamentary serials that would have made even the most ardent royalist cringe. Nonetheless, the king’s necessity in securing confederate reinforcements for service in England ensured that peace talks with Kilkenny continued. But rather than treat with the

⁸⁹ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 175-178; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 72; Lowe, “Confederation of Kilkenny,” pp. 2-4.

⁹⁰ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 23, 31 May 1644, 465.1023\E. 252(36), [p. 3].

⁹¹ *Britanicus*, no. 38, 3 Jun. 1644, 286.038\E. 50(7), pp. 301-302.

⁹² *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 44, 3 Jun. 1644, 504.044\E. 252(38), p. 352. See also no. 45, 10 Jun. 1644, 504.045\E. 252(41), p. 358 for what appears to be a variation of this account.

⁹³ *The Spie, Communicating Intelligence from Oxford*, no. 19, 6 Jun. 1644, 609.19\E. 50(19), p. 151.

Irish directly, Charles resolved that future negotiations would proceed in Ireland under the supervision of Ormond.⁹⁴

"A FISHING IN THE SEA"

Reports surrounding the arrival of the confederate agents in England appeared to spark divers allegations in the newsbooks that insisted considerable numbers of native Irish had also landed.⁹⁵ It's possible that this time there was some truth to these assertions. Joyce Malcolm has argued that, as a result of the cessation, approximately 22,000 troops were transported to England from Ireland between October 1643 and June 1644. Since an estimated 12,000 English soldiers were sent to suppress the rebellion, and at least 4,000 of these remained in Ireland until 1647, then Malcolm maintains that no more than 8,000 veterans could have made the return voyage. Thus, she concludes, 14,000 men are left unaccounted for, unless of course they were Irish.⁹⁶ These figures, though, do not take into account the fact that some of those who fought for Ormond and against the Irish were Protestants who had been born in Ireland of settler parents or even grandparents. This is not to say that no Irish came, but it is difficult to assert that they *were* Irish.

Certainly, the cavalier press was convinced that a sizable number of Irish had arrived to bolster the king's cause in England. On 2 March, *Aulicus* confirmed to its readers that 2,000 "resolute Irish" had recently landed at Whitehaven in Cumberland, and added that "next to their Allegiance to His Sacred Majestie," they had come to "quit some

⁹⁴ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 208-210; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 73.

⁹⁵ These included claims that up to 4,000 and 6,000 Irish had disembarked at Somerset and Wales respectively. See for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 42, 7 Feb. 1643, 214.042\E. 31(21), p. 328; *Veridicus*, no. 3, 13 Feb. 1644, 320.03\E. 33 (3), [p. 4]; *Scottish Dove*, no. 20, 1 Mar. 1644, 594.020\E. 35(1), p. 157; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 36, 8 Apr. 1644, 504.036\E. 257(27), p. 287.

⁹⁶ Malcolm, "All the king's men," pp. 251-253.

old score with the Scots.”⁹⁷ This assertion did not go unchallenged by *Britanicus*, which claimed that the Irish alluded to had not only landed “in red coats, died in the blood of many thousand Protestants” but that Whitehaven “will soon be made a black haven by landing such prodigious murderers.”⁹⁸

The likelihood that Ormond may have succeeded in recruiting Irish natives for service in England became inextricably linked to increasing allegations by the newsbooks that highlighted violations of the code of war. Nowhere was this more evident than in news that related the storming of Hopton Castle, a parliamentary fort in Shropshire, on 13 March, and the subsequent execution of the garrison. The garrison at Hopton had repeatedly refused to surrender under quarter when it had been offered, thus when the defenders eventually agreed to abandon their arms, they were forced to submit under mercy rather than quarter. As such, in respect to the rules of war, the king’s forces were within their rights to put the inhabitants to the sword.⁹⁹

But several London periodicals portrayed the occurrences at Hopton in a somewhat different light. It was widely reported that, not only had the garrison yielded upon fair quarter, but that after doing so, the Irish exercised barbaric cruelty upon the occupants.¹⁰⁰ There may have been some truth to these claims. Protestant forces in Ireland sometimes acted in this manner, and could therefore have taken the habit with them to England. *Britanicus* not only provided the most detailed account of this affair, but it was also the only weekly to infer that these atrocities had been committed by crown soldiers who had served in Ireland rather than the ‘natural’ Irish. The editor recorded that

⁹⁷ *Aulicus*, no. 9, 2 Mar. 1644, 275.209A, p. 859.

⁹⁸ *Britanicus*, no. 27, 18 Mar. 1644, 286.027A\E. 37(27), p. 213.

⁹⁹ Carlton, *Going to the Wars*, pp. 258-259; Donagan, “Atrocity, War Crime and Treason,” p. 1152.

¹⁰⁰ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 13, 22 Mar. 1644, 465.1013\E. 38(17), pp. [4-5]; *True Informer*, no. 26, 23 Mar. 1644, 629.26\E. 38(20), pp. 185-186; *Veridicus*, no. 10, 4 Apr. 1644, 320.10\E. 40(17), [p. 3].

after the castle had surrendered, one of the maidens therein perished through “obscene usage,” while twenty-four of the inhabitants were:

tied back to back, and then some of them had their hands cut off... all of them throwne into a muddy pit, where as often as any of them indeavoured to raise themselves out of the mud, striving to prolong their miserable lives, they were straight by these bloody Villaines beat down into the mud again with great stones which they hurled at them, and in this sad manner lamentably perished.¹⁰¹

A similar account in *The Spie* held the ‘natural’ Irish responsible for this savagery.

Indeed, the editor concluded that such cruelty was unknown even among “Heathens nor the worst of Barbarians, unlesse they were branches of the same stock, savage, brutish, Irish Kernes, whose wickednesse and irreligion, renders them altogether void of the common principles of humanity.”¹⁰² Irrespective of whether ‘English-Irish’ or Irish natives executed this garrison, however, the manner in which the occupants were reportedly put to death revived images of the ‘massacres’ associated with the outbreak of the rebellion in Ireland. *Britanicus* may have attempted to generate further outrage when it followed these killings with news that the confederate commissioners had been welcomed at Oxford by the court.¹⁰³ In this way, readers were reminded that in his quest to seek assistance from the Irish, the king was prepared to embrace those considered responsible for the horrific atrocities perpetrated on the Protestant population in Ireland.

In September 1644, equally shocking allegations surfaced that claimed the Irish had exercised atrocities in Pembrokeshire. According to *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, a number of inhabitants in those parts had been murdered irrespective of age or gender, while others were “halfe hanged, and afterwards stigmatized, and their flesh burnt off

¹⁰¹ *Britanicus*, no. 30, 8 Apr. 1644, 286.030\E. 40(33), p. 237.

¹⁰² *Spie*, no. 11, 11 Apr. 1644, 609.11\E. 42(9), p. 83.

¹⁰³ *Britanicus*, no. 30, 8 Apr. 1644, 286.030\E. 40(33), pp. 237-238.

their bodies to the barebones, and yet suffered in great torture to live.”¹⁰⁴ These reports appear to have been used to justify the parliamentary ordinance of 24 October that no quarter was to be granted to Irish soldiers in England.¹⁰⁵ Although this was a clear violation of the established code of war that protected combatants, it was merely a ratification of the treatment already being handed out to Irish captives by the summer of 1644.¹⁰⁶

The London press generally celebrated occurrences that highlighted the execution of Irish prisoners, and this was evident in their relation of the ‘Swanley Affair.’ Captain Richard Swanley was a parliamentary naval commander who intercepted a transport off the south Wales coast in May 1644 carrying troops from Dublin to Bristol. According to *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, Swanley tied sixty of the Irish back to back and threw them overboard “to drink their belly full of salt water.”¹⁰⁷ *Parliament Scout and Perfect Diurnall* employed similar jocularity in relating this incident. While Dillingham claimed that Swanley had sent the Irish “a fishing in the Sea,” Pecke was delighted that the captain had made “Water Ratts” of the rebels.¹⁰⁸ This incident sparked a war of words between London and Oxford. *Aulicus* insisted that this “barbarous Mariner” had tendered the Covenant to all on board upon pain of death, and added that while some took it, those

¹⁰⁴ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 77, 23 Oct. 1644, 214.077\E. 13(19), pp. 618-619; no. 78, 29 Oct. 1644, 214.078, p. 623.

¹⁰⁵ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 65, 28 Oct. 1644, 504.065\E. 256(29), p. 416. Also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 78, 29 Oct. 1644, 214.078, pp. 624-625; *Weekly Account*, no. 61, 31 Oct. 1644, 671.161, pp. 481-482; *Scotish Dove*, no. 54, 1 Nov. 1644, 594.054\E. 15(6), p. 421.

¹⁰⁶ For example, *Britanicus*, no. 42, 8 Jul. 1644, 286.042\E. 54(6), p. 330; *Court Mercurie*, no. 3, 20 Jul. 1644, 81.03\E. 2(25), p. 7; *Scotish Dove*, no. 40, 19 Jul. 1644, 594.040\E. 2(19), pp. 317-318; *Civicus*, no. 60, 17 Jul. 1640, 298.060\E. 2(16), p. 580; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 51, 22 Jul. 1644, 504.051\E. 254(4), pp. 403, 405; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 65, 30 Jul. 1644, 214.065\E. 3(22), p. 520.

¹⁰⁷ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 53, 7 May 1644, 214.053\E. 46(4), p. 428.

¹⁰⁸ *Parliament Scout*, no. 46, 9 May 1644, 485.46\E. 46(8), p. 383; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 41, 13 May 1644, 504.041\E. 252(32), p. 324. For additional accounts of this incident see, *Britanicus*, no. 34, 6 May 1644, 286.034\E. 45(11), p. 270; *Scotish Dove*, no. 30, 10 May 1644, 594.030\E. 47(5), p. 237; *Weekly Account*, no. 36, 9 May 1644, 671.139\G.E. 46(12), [p. 3].

who refused were bound and cast into the sea.¹⁰⁹ Berkenhead, moreover, condemned his parliamentary counterparts for condoning the captain's conduct in murdering individuals who were "unwilling to be purjur'd, be for Lawes and Liberties."¹¹⁰ In response, *Britanicus* castigated *Aulicus* for slandering the 'meritable' actions of Swanley, and asserted that those who had refused the Covenant were Irish rebels; thus it was just to "wash them to death from the blood of the Protestants that was upon them."¹¹¹ Yet when news of these deaths reached Ormond, the marquis lamented that those drowned had not only received "soe little Christianity," but that Swanley's victims had "faithfully served the king against their owne countrymen all the tyme of these troubles."¹¹² If these remarks are to be credited, then those individuals drowned by the captain's were indeed Irish, although the question remains whether these were Old English or Gaelic Irish who had remained opposed to the insurrection.

Matters appeared to climax in February 1645 when parliamentary forces hanged thirteen of Rupert's Irish soldiers at Shrewesbury, who, according to the prince, had surrendered upon guarantee that they would receive quarter. This action angered Rupert sufficiently that he not only retaliated by hanging an equal number of parliamentary captives, but he also warned the earl of Essex that reprisals would continue if similar

¹⁰⁹ *Aulicus*, no. 18, 4 May 1644, 275.218A\E. 49(3), pp. 965-966.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 19, 11 May 1644, 275.219A, pp. 973-974; no. 20, 18 May 1644, 275.220A, pp. 983-984. These comments appeared to have little effect at Westminster. Shortly thereafter, parliament awarded Swanley a gold chain worth 200 pounds for his efforts. *A Diary*, no. 3, 6 Jun. 1644, 144.103\E. 252(39), pp. 22-23.

¹¹¹ *Britanicus*, no. 36, 20 May 1644, 286.036\E. 49(4), p. 282. It appears that Swanley's actions established a precedent. Over the next several months a number of newsbooks praised similar 'heroics' committed against the Irish and their priests who had been intercepted at sea by parliamentary ships. For example, see *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 25, 14 Jun. 1644, 465.1025\E. 252(43), [p. 6]; *Scottish Dove*, no. 35, 14 Jun. 1644, 594.035\E. 51(2), p. 279; *Britanicus*, no. 69, 10 Feb. 1645, 286.069\E. 269(6), p. 547; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 11, 14 Mar. 1645, 465.3011\E. 258(35), [p. 8].

¹¹² Ormond to Sir John Mennes, 29 May 1644, in Carte, *Ormond*, vi, pp. 136-137.

executions were repeated.¹¹³ This sparked outrage among a number of editors who considered the prince's actions unjustified. Walker, for example, noted that "because we hang up the Irish Rebels, therefore the English Nation must perish, must be extinguished; and this is his [Rupert's] course to bring the people of England to utter extirpation."¹¹⁴ Border echoed these sentiments and proclaimed:

You see then how these infamous Rebels are prized, when Protestants of our own Nation are murdered, in lieu or gratulation of such blood-thirsty Cannibals, whose barbarous cruelty render them odious to the whole world.¹¹⁵

Rupert's threats, however, appear to have done little to deter the killing of up to 100 Irish women (most likely the wives or followers of Irish or 'English-Irish' veterans) after their capture at the battle at Naseby in June 1645.¹¹⁶ This execution underscored the contempt that now prevailed in parliamentary circles toward the Irish, irrespective of gender and contrasted sharply too earlier instances when such women had been exchanged for parliamentary prisoners.¹¹⁷

CASTLEHAVEN'S ULSTER EXPEDITION

Although a formal cessation between royalist and confederate forces had been

¹¹³ For details of this incident see *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 94, 8 Apr. 1645, 214.094\E. 276(22), pp. 751-752; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 6, 10 Apr. 1645, 419.006\E. 277(14), p. 44; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 17, 25 Apr. 1645, 465.3017\E. 260(22), [pp. 5-7]; *Mercurius Veredicus*, no. 2, 26 Apr. 1645, 394.102\E. 279(1), pp. 12-13; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 91, 28 Apr. 1645, 504.091\E. 260(24), p. 723. The London serials had often promoted Rupert's devotion toward the Irish by terming him the "Patron" of Irish rebels, and even "King of Ireland." For example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 59, 18 Jun. 1644, 214.059\E. 51(10), p. 478; *Parliament Scout*, no. 50, 6 Jun. 1644, 485.50\E. 50(16), p. 401; *Britanicus*, no. 53, 14 Oct. 1644, 286.053\E. 12(19), p. 421; no. 55, 28 Oct. 1644, 286.055\E. 14(13), p. 435.

¹¹⁴ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 17, 25 Apr. 1645, 465.3017\E. 260(22), [p. 7].

¹¹⁵ *Weekly Account*, no. 13, 2 Apr. 1645, 671.213\E. 276(6), [p. 5].

¹¹⁶ *Civics*, no. 108, 18 Jun. 1645, 298.108\E. 288(35), p. 963; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 25, 465.3025\E. 262(10), [pp. 5-6]; *Perfect Passages*, no. 34, 18 Jun. 1645, 523.34\E. 262(9), p. 272; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 99, 23 Jun. 1645, 504.099\E. 262(11), p. 784.

¹¹⁷ Approximately 120 Irish women had been captured at Nantwich in January 1644 with knives in their possession allegedly to cut the throats of parliamentary prisoners and their wounded. Nonetheless, Fairfax exchanged these women for parliamentary prisoners. *True Informer*, no. 20, 3 Feb. 1644, 629.20\E. 31(10), p. 147; *Veridicus*, no. 4, 320.04\E. 33(23), [p. 2]; *Certain Informations*, no. 56, 15 Feb. 1644, 36.56\E. 33(10), pp. 436-438; *Aulicus*, no. 5, 3 Feb. 1644, 275.205A, p. 818.

established, failure by Scottish forces in Ulster to support this agreement guaranteed military operations in Ireland would continue. Following the truce, the third confederate assembly approved plans to launch a major offensive to drive the Scots out of the north. Notwithstanding claims by both O'Neill and Preston, the supreme council appointed the earl of Castlehaven as supreme commander of this expedition.¹¹⁸ By August 1644, the earl's army of approximately 10,000 men faced off near Charlemount in Armagh against a Protestant force of equal number under the command of Monro.¹¹⁹ However, the strong personal rivalry between Castlehaven and O'Neill helped determine that confederate operations were uncoordinated and ineffective. Compounded by a scarcity of provisions and poor weather, this resulted in the Irish withdrawing to winter quarters in Leinster before any major engagement took place.¹²⁰

The London newsbooks conveyed an altogether different picture of this retreat. In late August several serials confidently proclaimed that Monro had routed Castlehaven's army of 22,000, and as many as 8,000 Irish had been captured or slain!¹²¹ The editor of the fledgling *London Post* even went as far as to conclude that this was "one of the greatest Victories that within these many yeeres have been gained in Christendome."¹²² *Aulicus* wasted little time in dismissing these allegations amid claims that they were tales

¹¹⁸ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, p. 3.

¹¹⁹ The English parliament appointed Monro in April 1644 as commander of British forces in Ulster. The following month, he secured Belfast from British forces under Colonel Chichester, one of several English colonels in Ulster who had refused Westminster's repeated requests to take the Covenant. Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 85-87; Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 160-162.

¹²⁰ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," pp. 51-52; Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 10-13; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 128-129.

¹²¹ *Civics*, no. 66, 29 Aug. 1644, 298.066\E. 7(23), pp. 626-627; *Parliament Scout*, no. 62, 29 Aug. 1644, 485.62\E. 7(24), p. 498; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 3, 30 Aug. 1644, 465.2003\E. 254(25), [p. 3]; *Scottish Dove*, no. 46, 30 Aug. 1644, 594.046\E. 7(29), pp. 367-368; *True Informer*, no. 46, 7 Sep. 1644, 629.46\E. 8(15), pp. 342-343.

¹²² *London Post*, no. 5, 10 Sep. 1644, 233.105\E. 8(25), p. 6. Later known as *The Weekly Post-Master*, this title got underway in August and lasted until the following May. Raymond has since discredited claims by Frank that John Rushworth, Walley's successor as licenser of newsbooks in April 1644, and his assistant, Gilbert Mabbot, were responsible for its contents. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 38, n. 78.

promoted by parliament in order fool the nation into contributing money for the Scots in Ulster.¹²³ Berkenhead offered his own interpretation on events, and insisted that several officers had confessed, after returning to their respective garrisons at Carrickfergus and Belfast after the battle, that Monro's forces had been routed by the Irish, which resulted in at least 4,000 Scottish fatalities!¹²⁴ Despite attempts by both the cavalier and parliamentary press to capitalize on this expedition for propaganda purposes, there can be no doubt that the retreat of Castlehaven and O'Neill consolidated Monro's position in Ulster and marked the end of major military operations in that province until 1646.¹²⁵

ANTRIM'S SCOTTISH EXPEDITION

The confederation's desire to rid Ulster from the Scots also played a role in its decision to support the earl of Antrim's expedition to Scotland in June 1644. After his escape from Carrickfergus Castle in October 1643, Antrim had spent much of the ensuing winter at Waterford, Oxford, and Kilkenny lobbying both the king and the confederates to back military incursions into both England and Scotland from Ireland.¹²⁶ Although the Irish rejected the earl's plan for sending 10,000 men to bolster the crown's cause in England, they agreed to support a more modest proposal to ship between 2-3,000 men to the Western Isles. Upon arrival this expedition, which was to be supplied by Ormond, would assist the new royalist army in the Highlands under the command of the marquis of Montrose, the king's lieutenant general in Scotland. If successful, it was hoped that this campaign would not only force Edinburgh to order the withdrawal of their army from

¹²³ *Aulicus*, no. 36, 7 Sep. 1644, 275.236A\E. 10(20), pp. 1145-1146.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 38, 21 Sep. 1644, 275.238\E. 13(9), pp. 1173-1174.

¹²⁵ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 52.

¹²⁶ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 52-56; John Lowe, "The Earl of Antrim and Irish aid to Montrose in 1644," *Irish Sword* 4 (1960), pp. 192-195; Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 166-169; Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 128-133.

Ulster, but that it would also force the Scots to reduce their assistance for parliamentary forces in England.¹²⁷

After numerous obstacles concerning cost, supplies, and shipping had been overcome, an expedition of approximately 1,600 men sailed for Scotland on 27 June 1644 under the command of Alasdair MacColla, a kinsman of Antrim.¹²⁸ When news of this invasion reached London in early August,¹²⁹ the pro-parliamentary newsbooks reported that this army was personally commanded by the earl, and was almost double in size to the force that had actually departed Ireland.¹³⁰ But while *Weekly Account* confidently observed that the Irish would generate as much success in Scotland as they had in England, *Parliament Scout* urged that “we had need to take a sudden course with these Rebels, who from an inconsiderable company of Vermine, are grown able to disturb both Kingdomes.”¹³¹ The Edinburgh government appeared to share this sentiment and responded by ordering an army of 6,000 men under the command of the earl of Argyle to drive the Irish back to the sea. This decision received support from *Britanicus*, which proudly noted “how both Kingdomes keep pace in the War and moves [sic] together

¹²⁷ Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 129-133.

¹²⁸ Approximately three-quarters of this force were native Irish, while the rest were composed mainly of the Scots-Irish MacDonnells of Antrim. Caoimhin Ó Danachair, “Montrose’s Irish Regiments,” *Irish Sword* 4 (1959), pp. 61-67; Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 172-173.

¹²⁹ The arrival of this expedition would have come as no great surprise to regular patrons of the newsbooks. From February, a number of serials had promoted news of Antrim’s efforts to cultivate royal support for invasion of both kingdoms. See for example, *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 30, 19 Feb. 1644, 504.030\E. 252(21), p. 237; no. 39, 29 Apr. 1644, 504.039\E. 252(30), p. 311; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 50, 16 Apr. 1644, 214.050\E. 42(28), p. 405; no. 52, 30 Apr. 1644, 214.052\E. 44(11), p. 421; *Weekly Account*, no. 33, 17 Apr. 1644, 671.139D\E. 43(7), [p. 8]; no. 35, 1 May 1644, 671.139F\E. 44(17), [p. 8]; *The Spie*, no. 12, 19 Apr. 1644, 609.12\E. 43(13), p. 96; *Scottish Dove*, no. 29, 3 May 1644, 594.029\E. 45(5), p. 228.

¹³⁰ See *Weekly Account*, no. 49, 7 Aug. 1644, 671.149\E. 4(23), p. 240; *A Diary*, no. 11, 8 Aug. 1644, 144.111\E. 254(13), p. 87; *Civicus*, no. 63, 8 Aug. 1644, 298.063\E. 4(28), p. 593; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 33, 9 Aug. 1644, 465.1033\E. 254(14), [p. 3]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 54, 12 Aug. 1644, 504.054\E. 254(15), p. 428; *Scottish Dove*, no. 43, 9 Aug. 1644, 594.043\E. 3(3), p. 344.

¹³¹ *Weekly Account*, no. 49, 7 Aug. 1644, 671.149\E. 4(23), p. 240; *Parliament Scout*, no. 64, 13 Sep. 1644, 485.64\E. 8(34), p. 512.

against the Common enemy, as if there were but one genius to them both.”¹³² On the other hand, Oxford was angry over what it perceived was the employment of a double standard by the London press over Irish intervention into Scotland. *Aulicus* castigated its counterparts for their “Sordid Partiality” in this matter for thinking:

...it lawfull for the Scots to invade England, to promote a Rebellion against their Native Sovereigne, (who gave them all that their Insatiableness could desire) and yet raile on the Irish for coming into Scotland to suppress those who have proposed to themselves a full Conquest of both England & Ireland.¹³³

This criticism did not inhibit the pro-Westminster periodicals promoting partisan and generally inaccurate accounts of developments north of the border. Over the next several months these works often claimed that the Irish in Scotland had been scattered, slain, or forced to return to Ireland.¹³⁴ In April 1645, for example, both *Civicus* and *Perfect Diurnall* printed correspondence sent to the Scottish commissioners at Westminster that alleged 500 Irish rebels had been killed as a result of a great defeat suffered by Montrose at Dundee.¹³⁵ Although *Aulicus* asserted that this news was nothing more than “ridiculous fiction” based on a “shameless weake forgery,” Berkenhead himself did not escape criticism over the quality of his news from north of the border.¹³⁶ On 18 April, *Scotish Dove* informed its readers:

Surely, Aulicus receives his intelligence from Scotland by a Raven, and shee’s fitter to give him intelligence of the Weather then of the Armies: yet Aulicus undertakes to give intelligence to his malignant Disciples of the Affaires of Scotland...but Aulicus, if you be

¹³² *Britanicus*, no. 48, 26 Aug. 1644, 286.048\E. 7(11), p. 376.

¹³³ *Aulicus*, no. 40, 5 Oct. 1644, 275.240\E. 14(12), p. 1186.

¹³⁴ For example, *Scotish Dove*, no. 50, 4 Oct. 1644, 594.050\E. 11(1), p. 388; no. 61, 20 Dec. 1644, 594.061\E. 21(6), p. 480; *A Diary*, no. 28, 21 Nov. 1644, 144.128\E. 18(4), p. 197; no. 30, 5 Dec. 1644, 144.130\E. 21(1), p. 212; *London Post*, no. 14, 3 Dec. 1644, 233.114\E. 20(3), p. 8; no. 20, 21 Jan. 1645, 233.120\E. 25(13), p. 6; no. 21, 28 Jan. 1645, 233.121, pp. 2-3; *True Informer*, no. 58, 21 Dec. 1644, 629.58\E. 21(37), pp. 437-438; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 22, 30 May, 1645, 465.3022\E. 260(42), [pp. 5-6]; *True Informer*, no. 6, 31 May, 1645, 498.06\E. 286.06, p. 42; *Parliaments Post*, no. 4, 3 Jun. 1645, 487.04\E. 286(21), p. 5.

¹³⁵ *Civicus*, no. 99, 17 Apr. 1645, 298.099\E. 278(13), pp. 888-889; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 90, 21 Apr. 1645, 504.090\E. 260(18), pp. 714-715.

¹³⁶ *Aulicus*, [unnumbered] 27 Apr. 1645, 275.313\E. 284(20), p. 1561.

not more weather-wise then intelligible in Scottish newes, you wil no longer be called the Court-Mercurie, but the Malignants foole....¹³⁷

Yet it appears that *Aulicus* mirrored a more accurate assessment of affairs in Scotland. Montrose and his Irish troops, in truth, had been cornered after a swift raid on Dundee, but he escaped back to the hills with very few casualties.¹³⁸ In desperate need to bolster their reputation in England, the covenanters publicized this retreat as a momentous victory and fooled Westminster into ordering a public thanksgiving.¹³⁹ Indeed, until August 1645 Antrim's recruits played a significant role in creating chaos throughout the Scottish Highlands. These men became the nucleus of an army that conducted an effective campaign of large-scale guerilla warfare, which resulted in a year of spectacular victories.¹⁴⁰ Until their defeat at Philiphaugh in September 1645, this force killed or wounded between 12-14,000 covenanters, while suffering less than 1,000 casualties in return.¹⁴¹ As importantly, the need to bolster Argyle's struggle against Montrose necessitated the withdrawal of several Scottish regiments from northern England. This may have done little to delay the king's ultimate failure in the first civil war but it diminished the part played by the covenanters in that defeat.¹⁴² Unfortunately, for the confederates, although the victories secured by Montrose helped ensure that

¹³⁷ *Scottish Dove*, no. 78, 18 Apr. 1645, 594.078\E. 278(18), p. 611.

¹³⁸ John Buchan, *Montrose* (London, 1928), pp. 201-205.

¹³⁹ David Stevenson, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644-1651* (London, 1977), pp. 28-29; Charles McNeill, ed., *The Tanner Letters* (Dublin, 1943), pp. 185-187.

¹⁴⁰ This included six major engagements: Tippermuir (1 Sep. 1644), Aberdeen (13 Sep. 1644), Inverlochy (2 Feb. 1645), Auldearn (9 May 1645), Alford (2 Jul. 1645) and Kilsyth (15 Aug. 1645). Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 174-175. O Danachair, "Montrose's Irish Regiments," pp. 62-63; Lowe, "Irish aid to Montrose," pp. 197-198; Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 146-147.

¹⁴¹ O Danachair, "Montrose's Irish Regiments," pp. 61-62.

¹⁴² Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 178-79.

Monro's army in Ulster was forced to remain on the defensive, very few of these soldiers, as Kilkenny had hoped, were ordered back to Scotland.¹⁴³

INCHIUIN'S 'CONVERSION'

News of Antrim's Scottish expedition paled in comparison to the attention, and indeed the elation, projected by the London serials over Inchiquin's decision to abandon the king and declare for parliament. The earl's defection on 17 July 1644 was no doubt influenced by his failure to secure the presidency of Munster. But in light of the major royalist defeat at Marston Moor in Yorkshire earlier that month, Inchiquin's decision may also have reflected a growing impatience among Munster Protestants toward the king's cessation with the confederates. Many of these individuals were now convinced that the only way to secure their interests was by switching their allegiance to the English parliament, and in so doing, prosecuting a war that would bring about the defeat of Catholic forces in Ireland.¹⁴⁴

Although the newsbooks were taken by surprise at Inchiquin's decision to defect, several editors offered their own interpretation of events. *Britanicus*, for instance, maintained that the earl's "conversion" resulted from his visit to Oxford where he had witnessed the duplicity of the king first hand, while *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* falsely asserted that the appointment of Muskerry as Portland's deputy in Munster had brought about Inchiquin's change of heart.¹⁴⁵ Overjoyed by the earl's decision to abandon the king, the editor of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* further proclaimed:

¹⁴³ It has been estimated that as few as 1,400 of Monro's men plus Argyle's regiment stationed in Ulster returned to their homeland during this time. Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 178-179; Ohlmeyer, *Marquis of Antrim*, pp. 146-147.

¹⁴⁴ Murphy, "Politics of the Munster Protestants," p. 10.

¹⁴⁵ *Britanicus*, no. 46, 5 Aug. 1644, 286.046\E. 4(13), p. 363; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 66, 6 Aug. 1644, 214.066\E. 4(20), p. 531.

...when man despaires, then God appears; when his Majestie continues in shewing actions of favor to those bloody Rebels; God doth crosse the designe, and shewes he is angry with them, and will have the innocent blood, shed by them...revenged on them.¹⁴⁶

But nowhere was Inchiquin's defection more celebrated than in the pages of *Scottish Dove*. On 9 August, Smith utilized his customary biblical rhetoric to announce that this news was "so joyfull...it puts new life into a languishing and almost dead Kingdome, like as the Message by the Angel to Abraham and Sarah, in promising them a Son it being a mercy beyond expectation...."¹⁴⁷ Two weeks later, Smith remained elated by this news and expressed gratitude that the earl:

...seduced by the Jesuiticall Faction, to take up arms against the Protestant Religion, and personally to come over into England, to stain the earth with Protestant blood; should in the nick of time, be changed from a destroyer, to be a preserver, and a Champion of God, to raise the hearts and dying spirits, of destroyed people.¹⁴⁸

Inchiquin's decision to abandon the cessation had almost immediate effect. With the support of lord Broghill and other leading Protestants in Munster, the earl secured parliamentary control of Cork, Youghal, and Kinsale by ordering the expulsion of all Irish Catholics from these communities.¹⁴⁹ News that Kinsale had been secured roused the editor of *The London Post* to predict that the war in Ireland would now turn in parliament's favor since the recapture of that town in Elizabeth's reign had paved the way for the recovery of the entire kingdom.¹⁵⁰ By August, Inchiquin convinced his brother, lieutenant colonel Henry O'Brien, to surrender the royalist garrison at Wareham in

¹⁴⁶ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 66, 6 Aug. 1644, 214.066\E. 4(20), p. 529.

¹⁴⁷ *Scottish Dove*, no. 43, 9 Aug. 1644, 594.043\E. 3(3), p. 339.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 45, 23 Aug. 1644, 509.045\E. 7(7), pp. 355-356.

¹⁴⁹ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 14, 222-230, 235-244; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 124-125; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 70-74; *London Post*, no. 2, 20 Aug. 1644, 233.102\E. 6(28), pp. 6-7; *A Diary*, no. 11, 8 Aug. 1644, 144.111\E. 254(13), pp. 85-86; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 53, 5 Aug. 1644, 504.053\E. 254(12), p. 424.

¹⁵⁰ *London Post*, no. 1, 6 Aug. 1644, 233.101\E. 4(16), p. 6. The editor was referring to the battle of Kinsale in December 1601, which resulted in a resounding defeat for the Irish by lord Mountjoy, a defeat that broke the back of Tyrone's rebellion.

Dorset, and return with his men to Munster in order to support his co-religionists in that province.¹⁵¹ Thus one year after the cessation had been signed Protestant forces in two of Ireland's four provinces were now committed to the parliamentary cause and stood opposed to the truce.

Amid these developments, negotiations were renewed in Dublin in September between Ormond, (who in January had been appointed as the king's lieutenant general in Ireland) and commissioners appointed by the fourth confederate assembly that had met between 20 July - 31 August 1644. The royalist defeat at Marston Moor on 2 July, which helped bring the north of England under parliamentary control, was further evidence that without significant support from the Irish the crown could not win the civil war. In light of this, the king sought peace in Ireland with fresh vigor. The cessation between Oxford and Kilkenny was extended to 1 December, and renewed on subsequent occasions thereafter as both Ormond and the confederate agents debated proposals similar to those that had been submitted at Oxford earlier in the year.¹⁵² But although progress was made on a number of less contentious issues, negotiations continued to lag. Not prepared to accede to the confederate's principal political and religious demands, the lord lieutenant decided in October to seek further instructions from the king.¹⁵³ However, Ormond did not receive these instructions until the following spring, and as a result of this delay, talks were suspended for much of the winter.

¹⁵¹ *Civicus*, no. 64, 15 Aug. 1644, 298.064\E. 6(15), pp. 608-609; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 67, 14 Aug. 1644, 214.067\E. 6(12), p. 542; no. 68, 20 Aug. 1644, 214.068\E. 6(29), p. 545; no. 72, 17 Sep. 1644, 214.072\E. 9(3), pp. 579-580; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 55, 19 Aug. 1644, 504.055\E. 254(20), p. 437.

¹⁵² Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 131; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 75-76.

¹⁵³ These propositions continued to include such demands as freedom of worship and the suspension of Poynings' law. These renewed proposals and Ormond's response to them can be found in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iii, pp. 277-297, 313-319. See also Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 132-139; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 77-83.

Charles's attempts to reach a permanent settlement with the Irish were hampered by the fact that the marquis had to reconcile his responsibilities as the crown's principal representative in Ireland with not only his own personal interests, but those of his fellow Protestants in that kingdom.¹⁵⁴ *Perfect Occurrences* portrayed Ormond's dilemma to its readers in a somewhat different light, and acknowledged the lord lieutenant to be the consummate politician in that he was resolved to see how events in England unfolded before making a lasting peace with the rebels. Walker noted that this was:

... the course of worldly wise men that will ballance their motions with the times, and waite to conforme themselves to every temporal power, he is right or wrong. But it is wicked wicked and hellish pollicy to stand so unsettled in compliance with Irish Popish Rebels, Jesuites, Priests, and Fryers.¹⁵⁵

Yet reaction to news of Ormond's latest truce with the insurgents contrasted sharply with the hysteria associated with the first cessation twelve months earlier.¹⁵⁶ It's possible that Marston Moor, Inchiquin's defection, and the continued defiance by the Scots in Ulster to any form of peace settlement, helped promote a spirit of optimism among the parliamentary newsbooks. Indeed, *True Informer* was confident that the recent ordinance passed at Westminster, which forbade quarter to the Irish, would prevent these rebels from committing to the king's cause in England.¹⁵⁷ And, despite reports over the winter that claimed further convoys of Irish were expected to arrive in that kingdom, these accounts were generally devoid of the ferment associated with earlier relations.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 114-117; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 76-77, 79.

¹⁵⁵ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 16, 29 Nov. 1644, 465.2016\E. 256(42), [p. 2].

¹⁵⁶ For example, see *A Diary*, no. 28, 21 Nov. 1644, 144.128\E. 18(4), p. 195; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 82, 26 Nov. 1644, 214.082\E. 19(1), p. 658; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 68, 18 Nov. 1644, 504.068\E. 256(36), p. 541.

¹⁵⁷ *True Informer*, no. 54, 16 Nov. 1644, 629.54\E. 17(9), pp. 404-405. Also *Civicus*, no. 80, 5 Dec. 1644, 298.080\E. 21(2), p. 740.

¹⁵⁸ For example, see *London Post*, no. 21, 28 Jan. 1645, 233.121, p. 8; *Weekly Account*, no. 5, 5 Feb. 1645, 671.205\E. 268(4), [p. 5]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 82, 24 Feb. 1645, 504.082\E. 258(27), p. 652; *Scottish Dove*, no. 71, 28 Feb. 1645, 594.071\E. 270(33), p. 555.

THE SIEGE OF DUNCANNON

Despite the renewed cessation, Inchiquin's defection ensured military operations in Ireland continued. Nonetheless, the surprise generated by the earl's volte-face was compounded by persistent divisions within confederate ranks, and meant that Irish forces failed to act decisively in Munster until Preston put siege to the fort at Duncannon in January 1645.¹⁵⁹ Duncannon occupied the gateway to the ports of Waterford and New Ross on the border between Munster and Leinster. Although the aging royalist, lord Esmond, held the fort for the king, the majority of the garrison followed the lead of Esmond's deputy, Captain Larkin, whose sympathies lay with Westminster. Accordingly, in September Larkin received a commission from Inchiquin to take over command and declare the fort for parliament.¹⁶⁰ These actions were justified by *Perfect Passages* on the grounds that correspondence from Ireland insisted that a number of royalist sympathizers within the garrison had been caught secretly plotting to betray Duncannon to Castlehaven, who, it was alleged, lay within two miles.¹⁶¹ Considering its strategic importance, the defection of the fort to parliament made it imperative that the confederates reduce the garrison. It was Preston, however, and not Castlehaven who set down before Duncannon, and on 19 March, almost two months after it had been besieged, Esmond capitulated, (Larkin had been killed during the siege) and the garrison was permitted to march out with honors.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 53.

¹⁶⁰ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iv, pp. xxxv-xxxix, xlvii; *Civicius*, no. 73, 17 Oct. 298.073\E. 13(6), p. 685; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 64, 21 Oct. 1644, 504.064\E. 256(25), p. 508; *Scottish Dove*, no. 52, 18 Oct. 1645, 594.052\E. 13(11), p. 407; *True Informer*, no. 51, 26 Oct. 1645, 629.51\E. 14(6), p. 383; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 78, 29 Oct. 1644, 214.078, p. 625.

¹⁶¹ *Perfect Passages*, no. 6, 27 Nov. 1644, 523.06\E. 19(3), p. 45.

¹⁶² For details of the siege see Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iv, pp. xl-xlvii.

The London newsbooks were also aware of Duncannon's significance, and news of the fort attracted considerable speculation during the spring of 1645. In March several serials mistakenly claimed that a naval expedition led by Captain Swanley had raised the siege and killed many of the rebels in the process.¹⁶³ Further reports in April, which were alleged to have been based on letters from Cork, insisted that the garrison had repelled an assault by the Irish, and added that Castlehaven and 500 of his forces had been killed. In fact, this correspondence contended that since beheading and hanging was thought too good for the earl, he was thrown headlong into the sea.¹⁶⁴ That such 'intelligence' purported to be based largely on letters received from Ireland by sources that remained anonymous, accents the problems associated with relating news of military developments in that kingdom. But even when a source was provided, this did not guarantee that the news was authentic. On 24 May 1645, members of the House of Commons suspected that correspondence received from Inchiquin proclaiming a great victory over the rebels at Youghall was fabricated. These suspicions were based on handwriting contained within the letter that appeared to differ from earlier requests from the earl for supplies to sustain his troops.¹⁶⁵ The messenger, one Christopher Coleman, was subsequently examined, and confessed that he had manufactured this news in order to obtain a gratuity from parliament.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ *Civicus*, no. 95, 20 Mar. 1645, 298.095\E. 274(8), pp. 859-860; *Perfect Passages*, no. 21, 19 Mar. 1645, 523.21\E. 258(38), p. 168; *Scottish Dove*, no. 74, 21 Mar. 1645, 594.074\E. 274(17), p. 583; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 12, 21 Mar. 1645, 465.3012\E. 260(1), [p. 2]. Swanley had managed to convey some supplies to the fort under cover of darkness, but his ships did not attempt to come within range of confederate batteries.

¹⁶⁴ *London Post*, no. 29, 1 Apr. 1645, 233.129\E. 260(7), p. 5; *A Diary*, no. 46, 3 Apr. 1645, 144.146\E. 276(7), [p. 6]; *Scottish Dove*, no. 76, 4 Apr. 1645, 594.076\E. 276(15), p. 599.

¹⁶⁵ For example, see *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 72, 17 Sep. 1644, 214.072\E. 9(3), pp. 578-581; *A Diary*, no. 33, 2 Jan. 1645, 144.133\E. 23(12), pp. [2-4].

¹⁶⁶ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 95, 26 May 1645, 504.095\E. 260(41), p. 758; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 100, 20 May 1645, 214.100\E. 284(23), p. 804; *True Informer*, no. 5, 24 May, 1645, 498.05\E. 285(11).

The fact that this forgery also contained claims that blood had recently rained from the heavens in Dublin suggests that it was more than Inchiquin's inscription that made the Commons wary of this correspondence. Not willing to establish a precedent of granting pardon to "offenders of so high a nature," Coleman was committed to custody, and parliament ordered that similar transgressors were to be apprehended.¹⁶⁷ This measure appeared to restrain at least one serial in relating unconfirmed successes. In June, *Civicus* was skeptical of news proclaiming a parliamentary victory in Pembrokehire that was conveyed to Westminster by a messenger claiming to be in major general Langhorn's service. The editor concluded that until this news had been confirmed, "we dare not confide in it, there having been of late so much falsehoods found in some Messengers, as that fellow that counterfeited a Letter from the Lord Inchiquin in Ireland."¹⁶⁸

MACMAHON AND MAGUIRE

Civicus may have felt more at ease when it could confirm news of events that took place within London. This was certainly the case during the winter of 1644-45 with the trial and execution of Connor, lord Maguire, and Hugh MacMahon, two of the principal rebels apprehended by the Dublin government on the eve of the outbreak of the Irish rebellion. Sent to England shortly after their arrest, Maguire and MacMahon appeared to have become inconspicuous residents of the Tower while awaiting trial for treason. Their escape in August 1644, and their recapture the following month, however, attracted

pp. 33-34; *Parliaments Post*, no. 3, 27 May 1645, 487.03\E. 285(18), pp. 2-3; *Perfect Passages*, no. 31, 27 May 1645, 523.31\E. 286(2), pp. 242-243.

¹⁶⁷ *Parliaments Post*, no. 3, 27 May 1645, 487.03\E. 285(18), pp. 2-3; *Perfect Passages*, no. 31, 27 May 1645, 523.31\E. 286(2), pp. 242-243.

¹⁶⁸ *Civicus*, no. 107, 12 Jun. 1645, 298.107\E. 288(8), p. 957.

considerable attention in the newsbooks and made it unlikely that either man could enjoy the relative anonymity associated with their earlier incarceration.¹⁶⁹

After both fugitives had been apprehended, the authorities worked to secure indictments. *Scotish Dove* had already reached a verdict, and insisted that although each rebel would have a fair trial, they would also have “clean linnen to be hanged in,” which was “more favour than ever they have shewed to any English Protestants in Ireland.”¹⁷⁰ MacMahon and Maguire were indicted for treason in November 1644 and February 1645 respectively, on grounds that they had been key figures in planning the outbreak of the rebellion. Notwithstanding that both men had been arrested before any outrages could have taken place, several newsbooks also maintained that each had promoted the torture and massacre of many thousands of Protestant settlers in the initial stages of the uprising.¹⁷¹ MacMahon was convicted and executed on 22 November - his death receiving little sympathy from the *London Post*. According to the editor:

This man had condemned many thousand Protestants in Ireland to the Gibbet, and Fire, and Sword, and now (Behold, in a full measure he feels the vengences of them all... He had caused the bowells of many women great with child, to be ripped up, and now he feelles the hand of the Executioner entring through his own bowells into the heart of his Treson.¹⁷²

It was probably no coincidence that shortly before Maguire's arraignment on 10

¹⁶⁹ Both men appear to have been apprehended after being spotted hiding out in a Catholic home on Drury Lane. For divers reports on their escape and recapture see *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 60, 23 Sep. 1644, 504.060\E. 256(8), pp. 477-478; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 72, 17 Sep. 1644, 214.072\E. 9(3), p. 578; no. 73, 24 Sep. 1644, 214.073\E. 10(7), p. 583; *A Diary*, no. 19, 19 Sep. 1644, 114.119\E. 256(7), p. 134; *London Post*, no. 5 [sic] 24 Sep. 1644, 233.105\E. 10(5), p. 3; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 6, 20 Sep. 1644, 465.2006\E. 256(6), [p. 8]; *True Informer*, no. 47, 28 Sep. 1644, 629.47\E. 10(17), pp. 347-348; *Weekly Account*, no. 56, 24 Sep. 1644, 671.156\E. 10(6), pp. 443-444.

¹⁷⁰ *Scotish Dove*, no. 56, 15 Nov. 1644, 594.056\E. 17(8), p. 438. See also *Perfect Passages*, no. 4, 13 Nov. 1644, 523.04\E. 17(1), p. 30.

¹⁷¹ See for example, *Weekly Account*, no. 64, 20 Nov. 1644, 671.164\E. 18(2), [p. 6]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 81, 19 Nov. 1644, 214.081\E. 17(13), p. 654; *Civicius*, no. 90, 13 Feb. 1645, 298.090\E. 269(15), pp. 817-818; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 81, 17 Feb. 1645, 504.081\E. 258(25), p. 641.

¹⁷² *London Post*, no. 13, 26 Nov. 1644, 233.113\E. 18(18), pp. 1-2.

February 1645, *Scotish Dove* proclaimed that recent apparitions had been witnessed at the bridge where many of the Protestants had been drowned shortly after the rebellion began. These spirits, alleged Smith, had risen out of the water amid cries of “Revenge, Revenge.”¹⁷³ Revenge it was, and although Maguire’s trial had been delayed by a number of challenges, which included his demand that as an Irish lord it was his right to be tried by his peers in Ireland, the jury quickly reached a verdict.¹⁷⁴ On 20 February, amid claims that at his execution he had refused to express sorrow over his role in the atrocities, Maguire was duly hanged, drawn and quartered.¹⁷⁵ With this, the saga surrounding both conspirators came to an end; but not before the pro-parliamentary serials had reminded the nation of the bloody massacres associated with the outbreak of the rebellion. The renaissance of such images would most likely have been welcomed at this time by those who stood opposed to the corresponding peace negotiations taking place at Uxbridge between king and parliament.

PRESBYTERIANS & INDEPENDENTS

While the pro-Westminster newsbooks had hitherto flourished in response to opposition between king and parliament, by the winter of 1644–45 discord closer to home also justified attention.¹⁷⁶ Frustration over the failure by parliamentary forces to follow up on their success at Marston Moor was compounded by the humiliating defeat suffered by

¹⁷³ *Scotish Dove*, no. 66, 24 Jan. 1645, 594.066\E. 26(2), p. 516. This claim appears to be based on a deposition taken from one Elizabeth Price on 26 June 1643, and relates to a series of alleged apparitions of Protestant settlers who had been drowned near Portadown in November 1641. Hickson, *Seventeenth Century Ireland*, i, pp. 176–183. The fact that Smith was aware of the contents of Price’s deposition suggests that her testimony was known before John Temple used it in his *History of the Irish Rebellion*, published in 1646.

¹⁷⁴ *Civicus* provided the most detailed account of the trial. *Civicus*, no. 91, 13 Feb. 1645, 298.091\E. 269(15), pp. 815–819. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 68, 18 Nov. 1644, 504.068\E. 256(36), pp. 539–540.

¹⁷⁵ *True Informer*, no. 67, 22 Feb. 1645, 629.67\E. 270(13), pp. 506–507; *The Monthly Account of February*, [unnumbered] Feb. 1645, 205.2\E. 258(30), p. 15.

¹⁷⁶ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 45.

Essex at Lostwithiel in August 1644, and the fiasco surrounding the earl of Manchester's indecisiveness at Newbury in October that same year. These debacles convinced individuals such as the Independent MP, Oliver Cromwell, that if the war against the king was to be successfully prosecuted then a remodeling of the parliamentary army needed to take place. From November 1644, this belief was central to Cromwell's attempts at Westminster to introduce the Self-Denying Ordinance.¹⁷⁷ Although this measure was designed to prevent members of either House from holding military commands, Cromwell was prepared to terminate his own commission if a more effective army could be created to defeat the king. Nonetheless, over the ensuing months the ordinance sparked heated debate in both Houses, and although it received support from the predominantly Independent 'war party', it encountered opposition among the largely Presbyterian 'peace party'.¹⁷⁸

Arguably parliament's most successful commander in 1644, Cromwell had served as Manchester's lieutenant general in the Eastern Association army and had won acclaim for his performance at Marston Moor. However, by the fall of 1644 he questioned the commitment of the earl and other aristocratic commanders to the war effort amid suspicions that they preferred to negotiate with the king rather than force his surrender.¹⁷⁹ Mistrust on political issues was reinforced by religious differences. While Manchester endorsed a restructure of the Church in England along Presbyterian lines, Cromwell supported those who opposed any form of official hierarchy.¹⁸⁰ By November, this feud

¹⁷⁷ A.N.B. Cotton, "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance," *History* 62 (1977), pp. 211-231.

¹⁷⁸ J.H. Hexter has stressed that these were not completely exclusive groupings. For example, a substantial number of MPs who were listed as elders of the Presbyterian Church, were also 'political Independents' and favored a more vigorous prosecution of the war against the king. See J.H. Hexter, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents," in *Reappraisals in History* (London, 1961), pp. 163-184.

¹⁷⁹ Cotton, "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance," pp. 211-212.

¹⁸⁰ Gardiner, *Civil War*, ii, pp. 20-21, 58-59, 66-67.

had been transferred to parliament. Under examination in the Commons for the Eastern Association's recent failings, Cromwell revealed that Manchester had defended inaction at Donnington Castle by insisting that, "if we should beat the King never so often yet he would be King still and his posterity, but if he should beat us once we must be hanged and our posterity undone."¹⁸¹ In the face of such accusations, Manchester countered by alleging that Cromwell had consistently displayed anti-Scottish and anti-Presbyterian feelings, and these had inhibited him from fully committing his troops to a war, which if prosecuted successfully, could secure a Presbyterian church settlement.¹⁸²

Although the pro-parliamentary serials had been prudent about reporting discord within the halls of Westminster, these divisions were beginning to surface in the weekly press. Although principal titles such as *Perfect Diurnall*, *Civics*, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* and *Scottish Dove* generally reflected Presbyterian tendencies, it was Henry Walker who first communicated the political divisions between Independents and Presbyterians in both *Perfect Occurrences* and *Perfect Passages*.¹⁸³ These differences extended to Ireland. In December 1644, Walker suggested that only Independents should be sent to fight in that kingdom since they were the "most Religious, or tender-conscienced people in England," and hence, "the least corrupted of any."¹⁸⁴

Irrespective of whether an editor held Independent or Presbyterian sympathies, for the time being at least, the periodical press in London remained united in its hostility toward the Irish and the cessation. Moreover, in light of growing attention awarded by

¹⁸¹ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1644-45* (London, 1890), p. 151.

¹⁸² Peter Gaunt, *Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 54-59.

¹⁸³ For example see *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 16, 29 Nov. 1644, 465. 2016\E. 256(42), pp. 2-3. Also Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," p. 225; idem, "Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group," pp. 827-828.

¹⁸⁴ *Perfect Passages*, no. 8, 11 Dec. 1644, 523.08\E. 21(13), p. 60.

Aulicus to disagreements at Westminster, and within the parliamentary army, these editors generally promoted unity on the domestic front, and appeared to suspend their differences until the war had been won.¹⁸⁵ Nedham, for example, maintained, "let us first dispute it out with the papist, and then we shall have more time to argue it out amongst ourselves."¹⁸⁶ Likewise, Dillingham insisted that the dispute between Cromwell and Manchester was not a "quarrel between Independencie and Presbyterie, which some would have," and questioned whether "our differences" should be allowed to "ruine one the other, then the enemy."¹⁸⁷

Although a Presbyterian, by the fall of 1644, Dillingham had become a great admirer and acquaintance of Cromwell. Notwithstanding the fact that he had formerly served as a news correspondent to Manchester and his family, the editor of *Parliament Scout* shared the conviction that a remodeling of the army was necessary in order to achieve complete victory against the king.¹⁸⁸ This support for the lieutenant general clearly angered Manchester. When the Independent MP, Oliver St. John, proposed to take Dillingham with him to Uxbridge, fears that his reports in *Parliament Scout* could undermine the peace negotiations resulted in Manchester and his colleagues in the Lords engineering his arrest on the grounds that he had slandered the earl of Essex.¹⁸⁹ This was

¹⁸⁵ For example, see *Aulicus*, no. 27, 6 Jul. 1644, 275.227A; E. 2(30), p. 1063; no. 34, 24 Aug. 1644, 275.234\E. 9(5), pp. 1127-1128; [unnumbered], 2 Feb. 1645, 275.304A\E. 270(14), pp. 1361-1362.

¹⁸⁶ *Britanicus*, no. 41, 31 Jun. [sic] 1644, 286.041\E. 53(6), p. 323.

¹⁸⁷ *Parliament Scout*, no. 76, 5 Dec. 1644, 485.76\E. 21(3), pp. 606-607; no. 77, 12 Dec. 1644, 485.77\E. 21(15), p. 614.

¹⁸⁸ Cotton, "Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group," pp. 823-824; idem, "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance," pp. 218-219.

¹⁸⁹ Along with the publisher, Robert White, Dillingham was accused of having defamed the honor of the Lord General. *Parliament Scout* had reported on 30 January 1645 that a Dutch sea captain, driven in by poor weather to Liverpool, had maintained that he had come from "his Excellency with Armes for the Irish Rebels." Although it was clear that this referred to the Prince of Orange, Manchester and his colleagues charged that Dillingham had accused Essex of supplying the Irish rebels with arms. *Parliament Scout*, no. 84, 30 Jan. 1645, 485.84\E. 26(12), pp. 674-675. Dillingham received support from Nedham on this issue. On 3 February, *Britanicus* concluded "What a deale of folley is here wrapt up in a mysterie!... The Text is

clearly a calculated move to silence Dillingham while the peace talks were in progress, and only after negotiations had concluded was he released.¹⁹⁰

Failure to secure a settlement with the king at Uxbridge helped paved the way for both Houses to approve the New Model Ordinance on 17 February and the Self-Denying Ordinance on 3 April. Accordingly, commanders such as Essex and Manchester were forced to resign their commissions, and a new parliamentary army of approximately 22,000 men under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax was created. And, in light of late revisions to the Self-Denying Ordinance, which permitted a member of either House to be re-appointed after resigning their commission, parliament responded to Fairfax's request in June to assign Cromwell as lieutenant general, and commander of the cavalry in the new army.¹⁹¹

THE 'TREATY' AT UXBRIDGE

Commissioners representing both king and parliament had first met at Uxbridge on 29 January 1645. The parliamentary delegates had been instructed that the issues concerning religion, the militia, and Ireland would have to be addressed before any peace settlement could be achieved. Westminster proposed that the king: surrender control over the militia; agree to the termination of episcopacy and the establishment of a Presbyterian church order throughout England; and annul the Irish cessation in order to afford parliament the opportunity to prosecute the war against the confederates.¹⁹² The demand for a new Presbyterian settlement, it should be added, did not guarantee that both Houses would

plaine enough to mee... for there [are] other Excellencies in the world, and besides you see here what Countryman the Master of the ship was...." *Britanicus*, no. 68, 3 Feb. 1645, 286.068\E. 27(8), p. 539.

¹⁹⁰ Cotton, "Dillingham," pp. 821, 824-825; idem, "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance," pp. 228-229.

¹⁹¹ Ian Gentiles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 24-27; Cotton, "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance," p. 229.

¹⁹² Gardiner, *Civil War*, ii, pp. 123-124.

implement such changes, but it did help to secure continued military support from the Scots.¹⁹³ Besides which, although Cromwell and his fellow Independent MPs remained committed to prosecuting the war, they were confident that Charles would never accede to this ultimatum. Their optimism was well founded. Considering the nature of these demands, negotiations between both royalist and parliamentary commissioners came to a halt on 22 February, with each camp increasingly determined to pursue alternative solutions in order to secure victory.

There can be no argument that the general sentiment expressed by the pro-parliamentary periodicals over failure to secure a settlement at Uxbridge was the result of the king's resolve to honor the Irish cessation. *Scotish Dove*, for example, falsely asserted that although agreement had been reached over the militia and religion, the royal commissioners had refused to agree on propositions that addressed Ireland.¹⁹⁴ *The Monthly Account* left its readers in no doubt the reason for this recent impasse by suggesting that:

...because the King will continue peace with the Irish Rebels, therefore he will stand out by Warre against the Parliament, and will agree no peace with the Parliament, because he will not joyne with them in the Warre against the Irish... it is plaine, that the King stands for the Irish Catholicks, against his Protestant Subjects.¹⁹⁵

The editor of *A Diary* appeared even more perplexed over the deadlock, and added, "Who would have thought that the proceedings of the Treaty should find an obstacle in this point."¹⁹⁶ Likewise, *Civicus* lamented that the opportunity for peace had been lost as a result of the king's unwillingness to loose the support of "such an innocent, and

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹⁹⁴ *Scotish Dove*, no. 69, 14 Feb. 1645, 594.069E. 269(19), p. 540.

¹⁹⁵ *The Monthly Account of February*, Feb. 1645, 205.2E. 258(30), p. 12. This newsbook was the second in a series of three monthly serials that appeared from January to March 1645. Nelson and Seccombe, *STC*, p. 135.

¹⁹⁶ *A Diary*, no. 39, 13 Feb. 1645, 144.139E. 269(14), p. 8.

harmlesse generation of Vipers and murtherers of so many thousand of His protestant Subjects....”¹⁹⁷

Aulicus acknowledged that the cessation had created a stalemate at Uxbridge. But Berkenhead defended the king’s actions on the grounds that “all good men know, that for the preservation of his good Subjects, the King may conclude, not only a cessation, but even a Peace, (although upon somewhat hard termes to himselfe) with Rebels....”¹⁹⁸

Nedham considered this a “trifling excuse” that was nothing but false and shameful doctrine,¹⁹⁹ while Smith assailed *Aulicus* for having:

...mockt us with a thing like a Treatie at Uxbridge, to spin out time by such Sophistries, till you could effect that [a peace] in Ireland...so you might have blinded the peoples eyes, and tyed the Parliaments hands, till those bloodie Rebels had come hither to helpe you cut the throats of as many Protestants in England, as they have already done in Ireland, and therefore refused to Treat with us of Ireland, because it neither stood with your honour, nor agreed with your designe to Treat upon those affaires: such is your immorall hatred to Protestants and to the Protestant Religion.²⁰⁰

The consensus among Smith and his colleagues in the parliamentary fold appears to place the failure to reach agreement at Uxbridge squarely on the shoulders of the crown, particularly on the king’s decision to abide by the cessation. Without renewal, though, the cessation would have ended in a matter of months. This issue then, may have been promoted as a pretext for not reaching an accommodation with the king in order to place the crown in a disadvantageous position after other reasons had led the negotiations to fail.

¹⁹⁷ *Civicus*, no. 92, 27 Feb. 1645, 298.092\E. 270(29), p. 834.

¹⁹⁸ *Aulicus*, [unnumbered], 9 Feb. 1645, 275.305\E. 271(4), p. 1376. Before Uxbridge *Aulicus* maintained that the king was eager for peace and, perhaps as some sort of concession to moderates, publication was twice suspended before negotiations. However, it may have been indicative of Charles’s own attitude toward the talks that the court weekly not only continued to publish while they were in progress, but broadcast unwavering positions on major issues such as the cessation. See Malcolm, *Caesar’s Due*, p. 142.

¹⁹⁹ *Britannicus*, no. 72, 3 Mar. 1645, 286.072\E. 271(5), p. 581. See also no. 74, 17 Mar. 1645, 286.074\E. 273(14), pp. 592-593; no. 79, 21 Apr. 1645, 286.079\E. 278(21), p. 728.

²⁰⁰ *Scottish Dove*, no. 78, 18 Apr. 1645, 594.078\E. 278(18), p. 612.

THE KING'S CABINET OPENED

The capture of the royal writing cabinet during the summer of 1645 appeared to validate allegations in the weekly press that had highlighted the king's duplicity at Uxbridge. The cabinet had fallen into parliamentary hands after the resounding success obtained by the New Model Army at Naseby on 14 June. This victory helped determine that the royalist war effort was now on borrowed time. But the seizure of Charles's correspondence also appeared to suggest that before, during, and after Uxbridge, the king was prepared to grant considerable concessions to the Irish in order to secure a sizable confederate army for duty in England.

The contents of the royal cabinet afforded the pro-parliamentary weeklies with considerable political capital, and little time was wasted in conveying news of its contents to the nation. In late June several serials claimed that this correspondence indicated that the king was willing to repeal Poynings' Law and other statutes that discriminated against the Papists in Ireland if he could secure up to 40,000 men from Kilkenny.²⁰¹ Given the recent revelations surrounding Poynings' Law, the editor of *Mercurius Veridicus* even took it upon himself to identify Poynings to his readers, and explain the significance that the former lord deputy's legislation had for both kingdoms.²⁰²

²⁰¹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 105, 24 Jun. 1645, 214.105\E. 289(3), p. 845; *Civicus*, no. 109, 25 Jun. 1645, 298.109\E. 289(10), p. 969; *True Informer*, no. 10, 28 Jun. 1645, 498.10\E. 290(10), pp. 73-74; *Mercurius Veridicus*, no. 11, 28 Jun. 1645, 394.111\E. 290(8), p. 82; *Perfect Diurnall*, 30 Jun. 1645, 504.100\E. 262(14), p. 792. In fact, the king's letter of 27 Feb. 1645 says that he was willing to 'suspend' rather than repeal Poynings' Law. Moreover, the actual number of troops he hoped to secure was 10,000 men, not 40,000.

²⁰² *Veridicus*, no. 12, 5 Jul. 1645, 394.112\E. 292(8), p. 90. First printed on 19 April 1645, this was a renaissance of the similarly named weekly that had ceased publication in April 1644. The resurrection of a recently deceased title was a popular means by which to enter a market that continued to sustain between eleven and sixteen newsbooks each week during the first half of 1645. For example, April also saw the advent of *A Perfect Declaration of the Proceedings in Parliament*, which from the second issue, changed its name to *The True Informer*, N&S 498 (*True Informer*, N&S 629, had ceased operations in February 1645).

On 4 August, *Britanicus* became the first and only newsbook that summer to provide the nation with substantive details of these letters.²⁰³ Furthermore, it was indicative of Nedham's increasing hostility toward the crown that although the bulk of the king's correspondence was directed to the queen, the letters he chose to promote were those that Charles had written to Ormond. From the time that the king had departed Oxford in June 1644, Nedham's principal antagonist, *Aulicus*, had appeared less frequently. Between May and August 1645, for instance, only five issues of Berkinhead's paper had been published, and it eventually gave up the ghost on 7 September 1645.²⁰⁴ Thus, during much of this period, but particularly after the breakdown of the peace negotiations at Uxbridge, Nedham became less fixed in assailing *Aulicus*, and more bent on promoting venomous attacks on Charles himself.²⁰⁵

The letters to Ormond - dated 15 December 1644, 7 January 1645, and 16 and 27 February 1645 respectively - provided damning evidence of the king's willingness to secure an agreement with Kilkenny irrespective of any peace negotiations with parliament.²⁰⁶ Indeed, when their contents surfaced, *Britanicus* went as far as to dispatch blame for the outbreak of the rebellion on the king rather than with the insurgents. The Irish, Nedham, maintained, were living in "peace and plenty" prior to their revolt, and were thus unwilling to risk an insurrection until they were persuaded to do so by the promise of reward from Charles.²⁰⁷ The king's correspondence to Ormond would have

²⁰³ Parliament had earlier authorized the publication of a tract titled, *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, which contained the royal letters. Although dated by Fortesque in accordance with the battle at Naseby on 14 June, the date scrawled by Thomason on the title page was 14 July. *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645), E. 292 (27).

²⁰⁴ Nelson and Seccombe, *S TC*, p. 207.

²⁰⁵ For example, *Britanicus*, no. 72, 3 Mar. 1645, 286.072\E. 271(5), pp. 575-576; no. 74, 17 Mar. 1645, 286.074\E. 273(14), p. 591; no. 79, 21 Apr. 1645, 286.079\E. 278(21), p. 728.

²⁰⁶ Copies of each of these letters can be found in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iv, pp. 104-105; pp. 118-119; pp. 143; pp. 153-154.

²⁰⁷ *Britanicus*, no. 92, 4 Aug. 1645, 286.092\E. 294(29), p. 827.

done little to dissuade readers from this assertion. On 7 January, it was revealed that Charles had communicated to the marquis to diligently secure a settlement with the confederates, “the timely conclusion of which will take off that inconvenience which otherwise I may be subject to by the refusal of that Article upon any other reason.” The king further commanded Ormond to convince the Irish:

the danger there may be of their totall and perpetual exclusion from those favours I intend them, in case the Rebels here clap up a Peace with me upon reasonable termes, and only exclude them; which possibly were not counsellable for me to refuse, if the Irish Peace should be the only difference betwixt us, before it were perfected there. These I hope are sufficient grounds for you to perswade the Irish diligently to dispatch a Peace upon reasonable terms assuring them, that you having once fully engaged to them my word...all the Earth shall not make me break it.²⁰⁸

Britanicus therefore insisted that even before Uxbridge the king was not only resolved against any agreement in relation to Ireland, but that he had intended to capitalize on the impending talks to secure expedient assistance from the rebels.²⁰⁹

Further correspondence to Ormond amid the negotiations suggested that Charles was more determined to reach a settlement with the confederates in Ireland than one with the English parliament. On 16 February, the king made it clear to the lord lieutenant that if he could not secure a peace upon the powers already granted him, he was, if he could “have it no cheaper,” to commit to join with the Irish against both the Scots and Inchiquin.²¹⁰ After the Uxbridge talks had collapsed, the crown’s desperation deepened further. On 27 February, Ormond was commanded to conclude a peace with the Irish “whatever the cost.” The king added:

... if the suspension of Poynings Act...and the present taking away of the Penal Lawes against Papists, by a Law will do it; I shall not think it a hard Bargaine so that freely and

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 829. While there was a discrepancy over the date of this letter - Nedham reported that it had been sent from Oxford on 7 Jan. as opposed to 9 Jan. - the copy produced by *Britanicus* appears to be authentic. For a comparison see Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iv, pp. 118-119.

²⁰⁹ *Britanicus*, no. 92, 4 Aug. 1645, 286.092\E. 294(29), pp. 829-830.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 830.

vigorously they ingage themselves in my assistance, against the Rebels of England and Scotland....²¹¹

In light of such instructions, *Britanicus* concluded that there was now little more the king could do to procure an agreement with the rebels other than “to joyn with them in person, and cut the throats of the Protestants with his own hand.”²¹²

Nedham’s criticisms of the king that week angered the House of Lords and sparked attempts by the House to apprehend those responsible. But this was not in response to the aforementioned attacks on Charles for his complicity with the Irish.

Rather, the Lords were outraged that *Britanicus* had issued the following ‘wanted’ notice:

If any man can bring any tale or tiding of a wilfull King, which hath gone astray these foure yeares from his Parliament, with a guilty Conscience, bloody Hands, a Heart full of broken Vowes and Protestations: If these marks be not sufficient, there is another in the mouth: for bid him speak, and you will soon know him: Then give notice to Britanicus, and you shall be well paid for your paines.²¹³

This derision, particularly in relation to the king’s speech impediment, went too far. The Lords ordered the arrest of Robert White, the printer, who blamed Audley for the offending passage. For the past year, Audley had been acting as Rushworth’s deputy, and had been given the responsibility of licensing *Britanicus*. He in turn reproved Nedham, who he claimed, had disregarded his recommendation that this passage be revised.

²¹¹ Ibid., p. 828.

²¹² Ibid., p. 830. According to Michael Perceval-Maxwell, Sir Robert Southwell, while consulting with Ormond and using his papers in the 1680s, wrote an account of the marquis’s role in the 1640s. This account suggests that although not advocates of a permanent peace with the Irish before the Uxbridge negotiations, the king and Ormond hoped that the troops departing Ireland as a result of the cessation would help convince parliament to make peace at Uxbridge. In fact, it appears that both men envisaged an alliance with Westminster against the confederation after an agreement at Uxbridge had been reached, and only when these negotiations failed, did a peace in Ireland become attractive to the crown. This became almost essential after the disaster at Naseby in June 1645. I am grateful to Professor Perceval-Maxwell for making this information known to me, and for providing me with an unpublished copy of his forthcoming article “Sir Robert Southwell and the Duke of Ormond’s Reflections on the 1640s.”

²¹³ *Britanicus*, no. 92, 4 Aug. 1645, 286.092\E. 294(29), p. 825.

Despite these claims, Audley was sentenced to a short stay in prison, while Nedham was let off with an official reprimand and ordered to apologize publicly for his remarks.²¹⁴ Within days, Nedham conformed to this request by composing *Mercurius Britanicus, His Apologie To all Well-affected People*, wherein he confessed “I have overshot my self, though I hope, not beyond Recovery.”²¹⁵ But this was in response to the author’s irreverent carping of the king’s stutter, rather than to assaults on Charles for his collusion with the Irish. Indeed, Nedham’s *Apologie* insisted that the king’s letters to Ormond had “transported me beyond my self, and clouded my judgement with so much passion, that I did not discern when my pen slipped....”²¹⁶ No doubt that since the cessation of 1643, *Britanicus* and like-minded periodicals in London had become increasingly critical of the king for his willingness to negotiate with the insurgents. But the fact that Nedham was not reproached for his assertion that the king was personally prepared to help slash the throats of Irish Protestants suggests that by the summer of 1645, these attacks, no matter how biting, were condoned at Westminster.

The king’s letters to Ormond not only sparked outrage among the pro-parliamentary newsbooks, but for different reasons, they also angered the confederation at Kilkenny.²¹⁷ Although negotiations between Ormond and the confederate commissioners had resumed in April, Charles’s correspondence clearly indicated that the marquis had been approved to concede concessions far greater than those that he was prepared to acknowledge. However, shortly after the king’s defeat at Naseby, Edward Somerset, earl of Glamorgan, arrived in Dublin from England, and unbeknown to

²¹⁴ Clyde, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 88–89.

²¹⁵ *Mercurius Britanicus, His Apologie to all Well-affected People*, [11 Aug.] 1645, E. 296(10), p. 2.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2–3.

²¹⁷ According to Clanricard, the published letters arrived in Ireland from France. Clanricarde to Ormond, 21 Aug. 1645, Bodl. Carte MSS 15, ff. 478–479 as noted in Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 93, n. 33.

Ormond, he carried with him a secret commission from the king to act independently from the lord lieutenant in securing a peace with Kilkenny.²¹⁸

In light of Ormond's tough negotiating stance, the prospects of achieving a peace appeared to diminish after the king's letters to the marquis suggested that he had deceived the confederates during recent negotiations.²¹⁹ Glamorgan, a staunch Catholic, would perhaps prove more effective at convincing his co-religionists in Ireland of the king's eagerness to reach an agreement. Convinced that the earl's mission was to assist in the negotiations with the confederates, Ormond permitted him to attend Kilkenny in early August. But on 25 August, Glamorgan concluded a covert treaty with the confederates, which determined that in return for an army of 10,000 men, the insurgents would receive their principal religious demands. This arrangement, moreover, was to remain secret until these troops had landed in England, and agreement had been reached between Ormond and the confederate negotiators on other issues.²²⁰ Keeping Glamorgan's true mission to Ireland hidden before such measures had been resolved proved impossible, however, and when news of the earl's activities at Kilkenny surfaced, the newsbooks were afforded a scandal that was arguably more damaging to the king than the cessation.

²¹⁸ From January 1645 Glamorgan had received several commissions from the king to treat for peace, but the difficulties now faced in traveling to Ireland may help explain his delay. For details of events leading up to the earl's departure in June see John Lowe, "The Glamorgan Mission to Ireland 1645-6," *Studia Hibernica* 4 (1964), pp. 155-161.

²¹⁹ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 92-93.

²²⁰ Lowe, "Glamorgan Mission," pp. 161-166; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 93-94. These concessions can be found in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, pp. 67-75.

CHAPTER FIVE

“FROM IRELAND IS EVERYDAY EXPECTED SOME REMARKABLE THING”¹

SEPTEMBER 1645-AUGUST 1647

Defeat at Naseby helped determine that it was only a matter of time before the royalists war effort in England succumbed to the now superior parliamentary forces spearheaded by the New Model Army. New Model troops followed up this success with victory in July 1645 over Goring's western army at Langport in Somerset, which opened up the south-west of the country. In September, Rupert was forced to surrender Bristol to Fairfax, and to compound the crown's misery that month, Montrose and his Irish brigade, after appearing to have taken control of affairs north of the border, were routed at Philiphaugh by covenanting forces freshly returned from England. Amid a comprehensive mopping up operation by New Model forces throughout England and Wales, the king returned to Oxford in October aware that Ireland remained his last hope for military relief.²

The success of the New Model Army generated several fresh additions to a flourishing weekly news market during the latter half of 1645. These included *The Proceedings of the Army Under the Command of Sir Thomas Fairfax*, by Edward Bowles, chaplain to the Lord General, and *Mr. Peters Report from the Army to the Parliament*, which was the work of Hugh Peters, a noted Independent minister.³ Readers

¹ *Scotish Dove*, no. 155, 15 Oct. 1646, 594.155VE. 357(11), p. 69.

² John Kenyon, *The Civil Wars of England* (London, 1988), pp. 147-155.

³ *The Proceedings of the Army Under the Command of Sir Thomas Fairfax* appeared in July and August, N&S 565; *Mr. Peters Report from the Army to the Parliament* surfaced intermittently under different titles between July and November, N&S 411. Peters was employed by Fairfax to relate “semi-official” supplements to the general's own reports to parliament of the army's successes. He had also served as a military chaplain in Ireland during the summer of 1642, and it was here that Peters appears to have began

with a keen interest in military affairs could also enjoy John Dillingham's staunch pro-army *The Moderate Intelligencer*, launched shortly after the author's release from custody in March, and *The Parliament's Post*, which first appeared in May 1645.⁴ Amid these new arrivals, established papers such as *Perfect Diurnall*, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *Civicus*, *Britanicus*, *Perfect Occurrences*, *Perfect Passages*, *Scottish Dove* and *Weekly Account* continued to prosper. Indeed, publishers wishing to profit from hitherto familiar titles restored *True Informer* and *Mercurius Veredicus* in April 1645, while Samuel Pecke and Francis Leach similarly revived *A Continuation of Certaine Speciall an [sic] Remarkable Passages* in September.⁵ Thus until the spring of 1646, when Westminster initiated a crackdown on newsbooks, between thirteen and eighteen separate serials could be purchased each week.

The increase in the number of pro-army newsbooks, however, created the impression in Presbyterian quarters that the London press was beginning to favor the New Model at a time when the army was perceived to be operating in the interests of the sectaries.⁶ Thomas Edwards, for example, a noted Presbyterian minister, viewed weekly news pamphlets as instruments of Independent propaganda intent on retarding the

his career as a 'war correspondent.' For example, see *A True Relation of the Passages of Gods Providence in a Voyage for Ireland* (London, 1642), E. 242(15). For details of Peters' activities in Ireland at this time see, Raymond Stearns, *The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peters, 1598-1660* (Urbana, ILL., 1954), pp. 187-201. Additional pro-army titles at this time were *The Kingdomes Weekly Post: Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies*, published between October and December, N&S 216, and *The Citties Weekly Post Faithfully Communicating the Affaires of the Armies*, N&S 45, which surfaced in December.

⁴ *The Moderate Intelligencer: Impartially Communicating Martiall Affaires to the Kingdome of England*, N&S 419; *The Parliaments Post: Faithfully Communicating to the Kingdome the Proceedings of the Armies*, N&S 487.

⁵ *True Informer*, N&S 498; *Mercurius Veredicus*, N&S 394; *A Continuation of Certaine Speciall an [sic] Remarkable Passages informed to the Parliament*, N&S 61. The original *True Informer* had ceased to operate in February 1645, while both *Veredicus* and *A Continuation* had disappeared in April and May of 1644 respectively.

⁶ Such fears were no doubt strengthened by Henry Walker who referred to the New Model as "the Independent Army," *Perfect Passages*, 25 Nov. 1645, E. 366(22), p. 450; *Perfect Occurrences*, 7 Nov. 1645, E. 266(14), [p. 2].

establishment of a Presbyterian government, and assailed Dillingham for being “the great Historian and Chronicler of the sectaries.”⁷ But although Dillingham continued to elevate Cromwell and fellow New Model commanders throughout the final stages of the civil war, *Moderate Intelligencer* generally reflected the author’s religious moderation and desire for peace. With parliamentary victory all but assured by the spring of 1646, Dillingham promoted flexibility and tolerance between all sides in order to create a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations.⁸ Perhaps it was for this purpose that he, unlike some of his contemporaries, played down the king’s complicity in the Glamorgan affair when news of the earl’s covert activities came to light.

GLAMORGAN’S TREATY UNCOVERED

Despite the fact that the war in England was all but over, the London newsbooks recognized that the conflict in Ireland continued, and as such, Protestant interests in both kingdoms remained under threat. This belief received further support when rumors of the Glamorgan treaty first surfaced. Shortly after the earl and the confederates had agreed terms in August, the supreme council ordered copies of the accord to be printed and distributed to a number of leading ecclesiastics.⁹ Most noted of these individuals was Malachy O’Queely, archbishop of Tuam, and the recovery of O’Queely’s copy after he had been killed in a skirmish near Sligo on 17 October laid bare the Glamorgan treaty for both the Dublin and Westminster governments.¹⁰

Before news of this discovery reached England in January, however, the English

⁷ Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena: or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time* (1646), E. 323 (2), pp. 11, 115; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 41, 191-192.

⁸ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 58, 16 Apr. 1646, 419.058/E. 333(15), pp. 387-388.

⁹ Lowe, “Glamorgan Mission,” p. 166.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 179; Cate, *Ormond*, iii, p. 204; Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, iv, p. 353.

press was convinced that an Irish peace had been concluded. This was not surprising considering the number of individuals at Kilkenny who had become privy to the earl's treaty.¹¹ By early September several serials contended that an agreement had been reached in Ireland which guaranteed 10,000 rebels for the king in England, and at least one title claimed that Glamorgan had been a party to this arrangement.¹² Invariably, rumors of a settlement were followed by reports claiming that a fresh wave of rebels had landed in England and Wales.¹³ One newsbook even suggested that 800 Irish had landed in Lancashire but that this force had been totally routed and killed!¹⁴

Claims of an "absolute peace" persisted over the next several weeks, and on 3 October *Perfect Occurrences* provided its readers with an alleged copy of the principal articles agreed to between the king and the confederates. Some of these were curiously accurate in that the Catholics in Ireland, Walker related, were not only to be provided with the free exercise of their religion, but that all laws, which discriminated against them, were to be repealed.¹⁵ But the fact that *Perfect Occurrences* incorporated political provisos as part of the accord suggests that, until the discovery of O'Queely's copy of the treaty, details of any agreement were based more on speculation and rumor rather than on anything more substantial.¹⁶ Ormond, meanwhile, although he most likely knew of the

¹¹ Lowe, "Glamorgan's Mission," p. 166.

¹² *Parliaments Post*, no. 17, 9 Sep. 1645, 487.16\E. 298(29), pp. 5-6, 8. See also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 116, 9 Sep. 1645, 214.116\E. 300(11), pp. 932-933; *Weekly Account*, no. 36, 10 Sep. 1645, 671.236\E. 300(16), [p. 5]; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 28, 11 Sep. 1645, 419.028\E. 300(20), p. 218; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 111, 15 Sep. 1645, 504.111\E. 264(14), p. 881.

¹³ *A Continuation*, no. 6, 31 Oct. 1645, 61.06\E. 307(26), p. 8; no. 14, 26 Dec. 1645, 61.14\E. 313(23), p. 7; *Britanicus*, no. 100, 6 Oct. 1645, 286.100\E. 304(2), p. 890.

¹⁴ *A Continuation*, no. 6, 31 Oct. 1645, 61.06\E. 307(26), p. 8.

¹⁵ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 41, 3 Oct. 1645, 465.3041\E. 264(21), [p. 8]. See also *A Continuation*, no. 2, 3 Oct. 1645, 61.02\E. 303(35), p. 8.

¹⁶ These included the provision that the rebels would have a free and independent parliament granted to them to settle "all things." *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 41, 3 Oct. 1645, 465.3041\E. 264(21), [p. 8]; *A Continuation*, no. 2, 3 Oct. 1645, 61.02\E. 303(35), p. 8.

thrust of the terms of Glamorgan's treaty before O'Queely's copy reached Dublin, continued to negotiate a political settlement with the confederate commissioners.¹⁷

However, the arrival in Ireland on 12 October of the papal nuncio, Giovanni Battista Rinuccini, archbishop of Fermo, added a new complexity to these talks.

Rinuccini had been dispatched to Ireland by Pope Innocent X to help ensure that any treaty between Charles and the Irish guaranteed the free exercise of the Catholic religion in that kingdom.¹⁸ His entry into Irish politics appeared to come as no great surprise to the London press. Notwithstanding the fact that the nuncio did not arrive in Ireland until mid-October, in September several periodicals claimed that this newly anointed "King of the Rebels" had already landed.¹⁹ Reports that documented Rinuccini's arrival, moreover, likened it more to a military invasion than any diplomatic or ecclesiastical mission.²⁰ In fact, details of the archbishop's cache for the confederate war effort prompted Walker to proclaim that "these are not times to divide and make parties, and raise divisions... Let not Israel take part with the Idolaters in persecuting their brother Benjamin."²¹ Amazingly, though, considering the prominence of Rinuccini in confederate politics over the next year, it wasn't until October 1646 that any editor endeavored to identify the nuncio by name!²²

¹⁷ Colonel Barry seems to have kept Ormond informed about what was going on at Kilkenny. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 95.

¹⁸ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 214-216; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 97; Andrew Boyd, "Rinuccini and Civil War In Ireland, 1644-49," *History Today* 41 (Feb. 1991), p. 44.

¹⁹ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 28, 11 Sep. 1645, 419.028\E. 300(20), p. 218; Also *A Continuation*, no. 1, 26 Sep. 1645, 61.01\E. 303(12), p. 8; *Veridicus*, no. 23, 27 Sep. 1645, 394.123\E. 303(16), p. 162.

²⁰ Boyd, "Rinuccini," p. 45. In truth, the nuncio was responsible for bringing to Ireland a considerable sum of specie, arms, and ammunition for the confederate war effort. See for example, *Perfect Passages*, no. 50, 8 Oct. 1645, 523.50\E. 304(10), p. 394; *Britanicus*, no. 104, 10 Nov. 1645, 286.104\E. 308(31), p. 928; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 119, 10 Nov. 1645, 504.119\E. 266(15), pp. 943, 950; *Perfect Passages*, no. 60, 17 Dec. 1645, 523.60\E. 266(36), p. 488.

²¹ *Perfect Passages*, no. 60, 17 Dec. 1645, 523.60\E. 266(36), p. 488.

²² *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 43, 23 Oct. 1646, 465.4043\E. 358(17), [p. 1]. See also *Civics*, no. 182, 19 Nov. 1646, 298.182\E. 362(17), pp. 2454-2455.

By November 1645 Rinuccini successfully reached Kilkenny, but his arrival only accentuated divisions within the confederate camp. Since the summer of 1645, members of the largely Old English peace faction, which dominated the supreme council, were keen to reach a speedy settlement with the king before the war in England was lost. The royalist defeat at Naseby no doubt ensured that Old English nobles such as Mountgarret and Muskerry were prepared to conclude an agreement with the crown that did not guarantee any of the outstanding ecclesiastical issues. Conversely, under the direction of Rinuccini, the clerical faction, which was largely comprised of the clergy and native Irish within the assembly favored a prosecution of the war until their demands could be guaranteed.²³ In light of these developments, Glamorgan returned to Kilkenny desperate to secure the nuncio's endorsement for the August accord and to secure reinforcements for the relief of Chester (the last English port in royalist hands). To this end, on 20 December the earl pledged further guarantees that successive lord lieutenants after Ormond would be Catholic, and that Catholic bishops would be admitted into the Irish parliament.²⁴

The entire process was thrown into chaos, however, when O'Queely's copy of the August agreement was uncovered at Sligo. Ormond received details of this in late December from the parliamentary commissioners in Belfast who insisted "We thought it was of concernment, to let the good party at Dublin see how they are being bought and sold."²⁵ Public exposure of the treaty forced Ormond to act against Glamorgan, and

²³ Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 97-98.

²⁴ Ibid; Lowe, "Glamorgan's Mission," pp. 172-174.

²⁵ *A Diary*, no. 4, 18 Feb. 1646, 144.204\E. 322(36), p. 7. This claim appears in a letter dated 6 January 1646 from Robert King to William Pierpont. One of the Ulster commissioners, King also complained that much of their recent correspondence to England had not reached its destination. This could help explain why it took so long for news of the Glamorgan treaty to reach Westminster.

accordingly, the lord lieutenant had the earl arrested upon his return to Dublin from Kilkenny at the end of the month.²⁶ Despite the fact that O'Queely's death had been documented since early December, no mention was made of the treaty.²⁷ Indeed, the House of Commons did not receive a copy of the treaty from its commissioners in Belfast until 16 January 1646. Within days all the principal newsbooks feasted on these revelations.²⁸ *The Cities Weekly Post* found it difficult to reconcile recent overtures by the king to parliament for a peace settlement with the fact that in return for their support in England, he had offered "those barbarous Monsters free and full tolleration for the exercise of their bloody Religion."²⁹ Likewise, *Scotish Dove* concluded that it was evident Charles had granted:

those bloody idolatrous people... a full and free liberation of their bloudy Religion, and (for ought I see) of their barbarous cruelty too... let the world judge how these things and the pretence of a Treaty can stand together, with safety to the Parliament and Kingdome.³⁰

But in general the initial reaction of the London serials to the Glamorgan affair was relatively restrained, at least in comparison to reports that first conveyed news of the cessation of 1643, or of the recovery of the king's correspondence to Ormond at Naseby. Amid the collapse of the royalist war effort in England, and attempts by Charles to court

²⁶ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 202-204; iv, pp. 333-338; Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, pp. 3-5, 211.

²⁷ The archbishop's death was widely reported amid claims that rather than a victim of a relatively minor skirmish, he was one of up to 1,000 rebels killed in an engagement with the forces of Sir Charles Coote and Sir Robert Stewart near Sligo. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 129, 9 Dec. 1645, 214.129\E. 311(16), p. 1036; *Weekly Account*, no. 50, 10 Dec. 1645, 671.250\E. 311(20), [p. 6]; *A Diary*, no. 82, 11 Dec. 1645, 114.182\E. 311(23), p. 7; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 40, 11 Dec. 1645, 419.040\E. 311(21), p. 220; *True Informer*, no. 34, 13 Dec. 1645, 498.34\E. 311(28), p. 272; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 124, 15 Dec. 1645, 504.124\E. 266(28), p. 997; *Britannicus*, no. 109, 15 Dec. 1645, 286.109\E. 311(29), p. 968.

²⁸ See for example, *Cities Weekly Post*, no. 5, 20 Jan. 1646, 45.05\E. 316(28), pp. 4-5; *Civicus*, no. 139, 22 Jan. 1646, 298.139\E. 317(9), pp. 2009-2011; *A Continuation*, no. 18, 23 Jan. 1646, 61.18\E. 317(12), p. 2; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 130, 26 Jan. 1646, 504.130\E. 506(3), p. 1040; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 135, 20 Jan. 1646, 214.135\E. 317(1), p. 1081; no. 136, 27 Jan. 1646, 214.136\E. 319(4), pp. 1088-1090.

²⁹ *Cities Weekly Post*, no. 5, 20 Jan. 1646, 45.05\E. 316(28), pp. 4-5.

³⁰ *Scotish Dove*, no. 118, 21 Jan. 1646, 594.118\E. 317(4), p. 935.

both the Scots and the Independent leadership at Westminster over a possible settlement, these latest revelations were not exploited to the same extent as earlier bombshells from Ireland. *Scotish Dove*, for example, after it first reported the affair to its readers, concluded “I might say more but I will be modest and very manerly.”³¹ Such sentiments suggest that newsbook editors recognized the fact that news from that kingdom was worthwhile promoting when it benefited parliamentary interests, but with the king all but defeated, the need to accent the crown’s complicity in yet another Irish stratagem was diminished.

The disclosure of Glamorgan’s activities, nevertheless, generated some form of damage control by *Mercurius Academicvs*. Launched from Oxford in December 1645, this new royalist weekly, which lasted until March 1646, was most likely edited by Richard Little, an Anglican minister in partnership with one Thomas Swadlin.³² On 2 February, it defended the king against charges made by *Scotish Dove* by insisting that Charles was a “Nursing Father of His Protestant Subjects in His three Kingdoms,” and thus would never grant toleration to any contrary religion.³³ The following week, in a prologue to a lengthy rejoinder of Charles’s role in Glamorgan’s activities, *Academicvs* proclaimed:

The World beleeves His Majesty had no hand in beginning the Warre in Ireland; That the World may know His Majesty hath no hand in continuing Warre there, and offers both His hands to discontinue the Warre here....³⁴

In addition, although the editor admitted that the earl’s mission had been to recruit Irish troops for the king in England, he asserted that the royal commission was for that purpose

³¹ Ibid.

³² *Mercurius Academicvs*, [unnumbered], 15 Dec. 1645, 260.01.

³³ Ibid., no. 7, 2 Feb. 1646, 260.07\E. 318(4), p. 67.

³⁴ Ibid., no. 8, 9 Feb. 1646, 260.08\E. 320(2), p. 69.

and that purpose only.³⁵

The defense afforded to the king by *Academicvs* over the Glamorgan affair appeared to breathe new life into Nedham. Missing the rivalry of *Aulicus* since September 1645, *Britanicus* had become almost indistinguishable from the other principal pro-parliamentary serials of the day. But on 23 February, Nedham presented a lengthy riposte to *Academicvs*, and reminded his readers that in light of Charles's correspondence at Naseby, which had instructed Ormond to press for a peace whatever the cost, Glamorgan would never have made such offers without similar instructions from the king.³⁶ Yet in the aftermath of the Glamorgan revelations, it was George Digby, the king's principal Secretary of State, rather than Charles or even the earl himself who bore the brunt of Nedham's venom.

THE KING'S 'MACHIAVELLI'

Digby's unpopularity no doubt stemmed from his involvement in the failed attempt to seize the five MPs at Westminster in January 1642. From the fall of 1643, moreover, he had operated as one of the king's principal secretaries of state and in October 1645 succeeded Rupert as lieutenant general of the king's forces north of the Trent. Within days of receiving this command Digby suffered defeat at Sherburn in Yorkshire, and his flight to Dublin via the Isle of Man in December attracted widespread ridicule and scorn from the London weeklies.³⁷ After it had been confirmed that he had landed in Ireland,

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

³⁶ *Britanicus*, no. 119, 23 Feb. 1646, 286.119\E. 324(11), pp. 1041-1044.

³⁷ See for example, *Scottish Dove*, no. 106, 31 Oct. 1645, 594.106\E. 307(27), pp. 839-840; no. 114, 24 Dec. 1645, 594.114\E. 313(18), pp. 901-902; *Britanicus*, no. 103, 3 Nov. 1645, 286.103\E. 308(5), p. 916; no. 110, 22 Dec. 1645, 286.110\E. 313(10), p. 976; *A Diary*, no. 77, 6 Nov. 1645, 144.177\E. 308(17), p. 6; *True Informer*, no. 29, 8 Nov. 1645, 498.29\E. 308(25), pp. 226-227; no. 35, 20 Dec. 1645, 498.35\E. 313(9), p. 178; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 131, 23 Dec. 1645, 214.131\E. 311(14), p. 1051; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 125, 22 Dec. 1645, 504.125\E. 266(31); *Civicus*, no. 135, 24 Dec. 1645, 298.135\E. 313(16), p. 179.

for instance, Henry Walker sardonically remarked that the purpose of the lord's visit was to convene with "the Popes Nuncio for a benediction."³⁸ Confirmation of Digby's arrival in Dublin compounded the anger triggered by the capture of his coach at Sherburn, which contained divers state papers. Some of these revealed the desperation of the king to secure confederate troops for England,³⁹ and in view of recent developments in Ireland this implied that Digby must have had some knowledge of the earl's covert commission.⁴⁰

After news reached London in February that Glamorgan had been released,⁴¹ *Britanicus* became increasingly preoccupied by this business and of Digby's involvement in it. Indeed, despite the fact that the king's secretary had played a pivotal role in the earl's apprehension,⁴² these actions did little to convince Nedham of his innocence in the affair. Rather, *Britanicus* claimed that Digby was not only responsible for orchestrating the entire concern, but that he had transferred the guilt to Glamorgan in order to save his own neck.⁴³ This, he added, "plainly points out that Trick of State which Machiavel

³⁸ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 4, 23 Jan. 1646, 465.4004\E. 317(13), [p. 7].

³⁹ According to several serials, the captured letters revealed that Ormond had not only been instructed to grant the Irish freedom of worship in divers Catholic towns, but that he had also been conferred powers by the king to contravene acts of Parliament. See for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 123, 28 Oct. 1645, 214.123\E. 307(16), p. 988; *Civicus*, no. 127, 30 Oct. 1645, 298.127\E. 307(23), p. 1114; *True Informer*, 1 Nov. 1645, 498.28\E. 308(3), pp. 217-218.

⁴⁰ Parliament ordered Digby's letters to be published shortly after their capture, *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 117, 27 Oct. 1645, 504.117\E. 266(8), p. 931. But it wasn't until 16 Jan. 1646 that the Commons ordered the Sherburn papers to be published alongside copies of the Glamorgan treaty taken from O'Queely. Gardiner, *Civil War*, iii, p. 42.

⁴¹ Under examination Glamorgan protested his innocence, and on 21 January, while Ormond awaited instructions from the king on how to proceed on this matter, the earl was released on bail. Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 205-209, and Ormond to King, 19 Jan. 1646, in *Ibid.*, vi, pp. 344-347; Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, pp. 211-222, 247, 251-254. Although the king subsequently denied that he had granted Glamorgan power to make such a treaty, and publicly ordered that the charges against the earl be prosecuted, he privately commanded Ormond to suspend the execution of any sentence until further notice. King to Ormond, 31 Jan. 1646, in Carte, *Ormond*, vi, pp. 347-349.

⁴² Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, p. 211; Lowe, "Glamorgan's Mission," p. 181; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 5, 30 Jan. 1646, 465.4005\E. 319 (20), [p. 7].

⁴³ *Britanicus*, no. 119, 23 Feb. 1646, 286.119\E. 324(11), p. 1043.

commends in things not justifiable...when the Scene of Affairs begins to turn, to present him a Traitor in a Tragedy before the People."⁴⁴ Similar accusations reverberated in March after New Model forces seized a ship from Ireland in the Cornish harbor of Padstow. Uncovered was correspondence from Digby and Glamorgan to the court that touched on plans to transport 10,000 soldiers from Ireland. These letters were subsequently read aloud to the local royalists of the county by Hugh Peter, who claimed that the king would have sold even his most loyal adherents (ie., the Cornish) to murdering Irish Papists had not the parliamentary army intervened.⁴⁵

On 23 March, after details of these letters surfaced in London, Nedham announced that he would forgo trifling with *Academicvs* that week in order to focus his efforts on the Glamorgan business, on which, he insisted, "I mean to be as downright, as I was upon the Letters taken at Naseby."⁴⁶ Consequently, *Britanicus* devoted the entire edition, and indeed much of the following week's issue to these developments by including copies of the king's commission to the earl, letters concerning the affair from Digby to Sir Edward Nicholas, and the articles agreed to by Glamorgan and the confederates on 25 August.⁴⁷ From this evidence Nedham concluded that not only were Digby and Ormond privy to the earl's covert activities, but both men had been guilty of

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 1042. For similar sentiments see, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 137, 3 Feb. 1646, 214.137\E. 320(7), p. 4.

⁴⁵ According to the newsbooks, all but two of the ship's occupants were put to the sword, and the captain, one Patrick Allen, confessed that he had been commissioned by Edward Hyde, the lord chancellor, to execute a courier service that would convoy intelligence from Dublin to the king. *Britanicus*, no. 121, 16 Mar. 1646, 286.121\E. 328(8), pp. 1063-1064; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 53, 12 Mar. 1646, 419.053\E. 327(25), pp. 336-338; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 141, 17 Mar. 1646, 214.141\E. 328(10), p. 42; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 11, 13 Mar. 1646, 465.4011\E. 506(17), [p.6]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 137, 16 Mar. 1646, 504.137\E. 506(18), pp. 1097-1098.

⁴⁶ *Britanicus*, no. 122, 23 Mar. 1643, 286.122\E. 329(4), p. 1065.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 1065-1072; no. 123, 30 Mar. 1646, 286.123\E. 330(4), pp. 1074-1078. Nedham was the only editor to publish the articles of 25 August in their entirety.

orchestrating a counterfeit impeachment against Glamorgan in order to salvage Charles's reputation. Thus the earl's arrest, *Britanicus* asserted, was nothing more than a charade since each had agreed to release him "when the Pageantry was over."⁴⁸

A NEW LORD LIEUTENANT

One is left with the question why *Britanicus* utilized the Glamorgan affair to conduct a campaign designed to vilify Ormond and Digby, the king's principal agents in Ireland. It is possible that Nedham's hostility toward both men was calculated to promote the interests of the political Independents at Westminster. Amid new peace propositions considered by the English parliament in the winter of 1645-46, *Britanicus* supported the Independents' position that any peace negotiations with the king should be conducted as militantly as the latter stages of the war had been.⁴⁹ During this time this group was keen to banish Scottish influence from both English *and* Irish affairs. After considerable debate and disagreement in the Commons, MPs agreed to appoint an English governor for Ireland in December 1645.⁵⁰ It was further resolved to repeal the parliamentary ordinances of March and April 1644, which had recognized Monro as acting commander-in-chief of all British forces in Ireland, and which had created joint committees to

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 122, 23 Mar. 1646, 286.122\E. 329(4), pp. 1066, 1068, 1069-1070. Over the next several weeks Nedham continued to promote the Padstow letters in his efforts to berate both Digby and Ormond. See for example *Britanicus*, no. 128, 4 May 1646, 286.128\E. 335(14), pp. 1096-1101; no. 129, 11 May, 1646, 286.129\E. 337(9), pp. 1104-1108. It should also be noted that within days of his release, Glamorgan was back in Kilkenny, which according to several newsbooks, (including *Britanicus*) was sufficient evidence to conclude that these actions had been induced by threats from Kilkenny to suspend negotiations with the royalists. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 53, 12 Mar. 1646, 419.053\E. 327(25), p. 337; *Britanicus*, no. 121, 16 Mar. 1646, 286.121\E. 328(8), p. 1064; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 141, 17 Mar. 1646, 214.141\E. 328(10), p. 42.

⁴⁹ Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, p. 28.

⁵⁰ Presbyterian MPs not only favored councilor rule in both church and state under the supervision of both Houses of Parliament, but they also feared that the nomination of a new parliamentary lord lieutenant could preclude the possibility of Ormond's defection to Westminster. Robert Armstrong, "Protestant Ireland and the English Parliament, 1641-1647," (Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 1995), pp. 210-211.

manage the war. This would help parliament to exercise sovereign control over the war in that kingdom despite a strong Scottish and royalist presence.⁵¹

Philip Sidney, viscount Lisle, was nominated as chief governor of Ireland on 21 January 1646, and three months later he was granted a commission by parliament to operate as lord lieutenant for one year. Son of the former lord lieutenant, the earl of Leicester, Lisle enjoyed close ties with political Independents such as Oliver St. John and Sir Henry Vane (the younger), not to mention leading officers within the New Model Army.⁵² As the agent of this faction, Lisle's appointment was designed to challenge the lieutenancy of Ormond, whose authority had never been acknowledged by parliament, and whose political ties with the Presbyterian camp at Westminster aroused Independent distrust.⁵³ By having Lisle appointed lord lieutenant, moreover, the Independents were confident that they could exclude the Scots from exercising influence in Irish affairs.⁵⁴

While news of Lisle's appointment was conspicuously absent in the pro-Presbyterian serials, *Britanicus*, which helped pave the way for this appointment by its persistent attacks on Digby and Ormond, responded favorably to parliament's choice of candidate. Nedham, nonetheless, remained guarded until a similar nominee was procured to lead a new English army for the re-conquest of Ireland.⁵⁵ However, given the fact that this force would most likely be formed from the ranks of the New Model, the choice of Lisle as lord lieutenant ensured that, irrespective of who received command of the army,

⁵¹ David Scott, "The 'Northern Gentlemen', the parliamentary Independents, and Anglo-Scottish relations in the Long Parliament," *Historical Journal* 42 (1999), pp. 368-369, 373-375; Patrick Little, "The English Parliament and the Irish Constitution, 1641-1649," unpublished paper delivered at the Cregan Conference, Dublin, March 1999. I am grateful to Patrick Little for making a copy of this paper available to me.

⁵² John Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost: The British Context of Viscount Lisle's Lieutenancy of Ireland," in Ohlemeyer, *Independence to Occupation*, p. 135.

⁵³ Little, "English Parliament and the Irish Constitution," p. 15.

⁵⁴ Scott, "'Northern Gentlemen,'" pp. 368-369; Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," p. 138.

⁵⁵ *Britanicus*, no. 126, 20 Apr. 1646, 286.126/E. 333(20), p. 1086.

would do so under his leadership.⁵⁶ It wasn't by chance, moreover, that shortly after Lisle's appointment, Sir John Temple, a long-standing friend of the viscount and his family published *The Irish Rebellion*.⁵⁷ Therein Temple highlighted the cruelties allegedly committed by the Irish in the initial stages of the uprising, which the author largely drew from depositions taken by commissioners appointed by the lords justices, particularly Parsons, in the aftermath of the rebellion.⁵⁸ The renaissance of images depicting barbarities against Protestant settlers no doubt benefited the Lisle campaigners in their efforts to justify a new conquest of Ireland that would preclude Catholics in Ireland from ever owning land again.⁵⁹ They arguably made some impression upon Nedham. On 4 May, one week after Temple's publication, *Britanicus* exhorted its readers to "Remember the wounds, the stabs and the hangings, drownings, backings and hewings, and starvings in Ireland, these will take up one seven years, perhaps Eternity...."⁶⁰ Nevertheless, considering the attention *Irish Rebellion* must have generated in the first weeks after publication, it is surprising that neither *Britanicus* nor *Perfect Occurrences*, the two principal Independent weeklies of the day, mentioned Temple's work or employed the massacres therein to justify a fresh conquest of that kingdom.

PARLIAMENT'S PURGE

Obtrusive anti-royalism may have been fashionable for much of the civil war, but in light of the king's defeat and the challenge of reaching a settlement with the crown, this was a time that required prudence. This became even more so after Charles fled north and

⁵⁶ Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," pp. 136-137.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 138-140. A privy councilor and former master of the rolls in the Irish administration, Temple had been suspended from his offices and imprisoned by order of the king for his opposition to the cessation with the confederates in 1643.

⁵⁸ Temple, *Irish Rebellion*, particularly pp. 90-133.

⁵⁹ Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," pp. 138-139; Love, "Civil War in Ireland," p. 65.

⁶⁰ *Britanicus*, no. 128, 4 May 1646, 286.128VE. 335(14), p. 1095.

surrendered to the Scottish army at Newark in May. Outraged by these actions, *Britanicus* berated the king in such a manner that both Nedham and Audley were brought before the House of Lords.⁶¹ *Britanicus* had consistently exhibited anti-Presbyterian and fervent Scotophobia over the past several months, and this assault on the king afforded the Presbyterian faction at Westminster the opportunity to suppress one of the Independents' principal mouthpieces.⁶² On this occasion, Audley, rather than Nedham spent time in the Fleet on grounds that the offending issue had not been officially licensed.⁶³ Although his spell in custody was less than two weeks, Nedham, having been released on bail of 200 pounds, agreed to cease writing without official authorization. This was not a severe punishment, and it most likely reflected some measure of gratitude for Nedham's past services in promoting the parliamentary cause. It was the fall of 1647 before Nedham's journalistic career was resurrected, and unfortunately for Westminster his talents at that time would be employed in support of the king.⁶⁴

Britanicus had joined a growing list of fatalities in the periodical press. Between April 1646 and September 1647 readers benefited from fewer titles than at any other time since 1643.⁶⁵ In March 1646, a parliamentary purge of the London newsbooks resulted in a significant reduction in the number of established titles. *Veredicus*, *True Informer*, *A Diary*, *Perfect Passages*, *Cities Weekly Post*, and *A Continuation* were all forced into 'early retirement' that month.⁶⁶ The following eight newsbooks survived: *Perfect Diurnall*, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *Moderate Intelligencer*, *Scottish Dove*,

⁶¹ Ibid., no. 130, 18 May, 1646, 286.130\E. 337(24), p. 1111.

⁶² Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 47.

⁶³ Clyde, "Parliament And The Press," p. 419; Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, pp. 28-29.

⁶⁴ Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, p. 29.

⁶⁵ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 117.

⁶⁶ Several less established titles were also consigned to silence. These included Oxford's *Academicvs*, although this was most likely the result of the city being placed under siege.

Civicus, *Perfect Occurrences*, *Weekly Account*, and for the time being at least, *Britanicus*.⁶⁷ It is possible that the Presbyterian party at Westminster orchestrated this purge in response to concern voiced by the Scottish commissioners in London over adverse publicity given to a negotiated settlement with parliament.⁶⁸ Parliament's intervention, however, was more likely an attempt to curtail a market that was responsible for putting out an average of seventeen separate titles each month.⁶⁹ Political discrimination, moreover, was not a factor in determining which titles were to be censored. *Perfect Passages*, for example, was a noted Independent publication, while *True Informer* had been pro-Presbyterian and sympathized with the Scots. In addition, of the eight established papers permitted to continue, *Britanicus*, *Perfect Occurrences*, and *Moderate Intelligencer* were noted for their Independent stance. Thus the March ordinance may have been primarily designed to curtail the number of newsbooks, rather than any concerted attempt at Westminster to exercise a 'Presbyterian tyranny' over the press.⁷⁰

BENBURB

For those editors who survived the parliamentary purge, the spring of 1646 produced a labyrinth of peace negotiations, which must have sent the heads of even the most informed readers spinning. This was particularly the case in relation to Ireland. In April news reached London that the queen's agent in Rome, Sir Kenelm Digby, had arrived at an agreement with the Vatican that promised more favorable terms to the confederates

⁶⁷ *Scottish Dove*, no. 127, 28 Mar. 1646, 594.127\E. 330(3), p. 606.

⁶⁸ Clyde, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 95-100; idem, "Parliament and the Press," pp. 420-424.

⁶⁹ Nelson and Seccombe, *STC*, pp. 628-629.

⁷⁰ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 47.

than the Glamorgan articles.⁷¹ News of these proceedings, Nedham noted, made him “wonder what is in this word Digby, that almost all of the name become Traitours and Incendiaries.”⁷² Rinuccini received this intelligence prior to the sixth confederate assembly, which met between 5 February and 4 March 1646, and urged its members to postpone any agreement with Glamorgan until it could be confirmed if the king was prepared to agree to the Roman articles. The supreme council, aware that the current cessation with the king expired on 1 April was anxious not to jeopardize a peace settlement with the royalists, and agreed to extend the truce until 1 May while they waited for confirmation of Sir Kenelm’s accord. This never materialized, and on 28 March, after news reached Kilkenny that Charles had publicly repudiated Glamorgan’s authority, the confederates, despite opposition from Rinuccini, concluded a peace with Ormond.⁷³

The comprehensive measures outlined in what became known as ‘The First Ormond Peace’ failed to guarantee the security of the Catholic religion in Ireland and thus ensured that the nuncio and his supporters would endeavor to undermine it.⁷⁴

⁷¹ A Roman Catholic, Sir Kenelm had been sent to Rome the previous year by Henrietta Maria in order to persuade the Papacy to contribute arms and money for Glamorgan’s confederate expedition to England. In November 1645 both parties agreed that in return for 100,000 crowns paid to the queen by Rome Irish Catholics would be granted complete religious and civil liberty. Furthermore, all principal offices and fortresses in Ireland were to be placed in Catholic hands, and a coalition of royalist and confederate forces were tasked to unite in driving out both the Scottish and English parliamentary forces from the island. Thereafter the confederates were to send an army of 12,000 men to assist the royalists in England where the penal laws against the Catholics of that kingdom were similarly to be repealed. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 100; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 108–109.

⁷² *Britanicus*, no. 127, 27 Apr. 1646, 286.127E. 334(9), pp. 1090, 1092. Sir Kenelm in fact was a cousin of George Digby.

⁷³ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 230; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 100–101, 105; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 109–111.

⁷⁴ The articles of 28 March are extensive and can be found in their entirety in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, pp. 286–310. In sum, the treaty determined that in return for an army of 10,000 men, the king agreed to substitute an oath of allegiance for an oath of supremacy, admit Catholics to all civil and military offices, and remove limitations on Catholic education. Further concessions included a commitment to reverse Strafford’s confiscation’s, and to grant a general pardon for everything perpetrated since the outbreak of the rebellion. The peace, moreover, was not to be made public before 1 May, after which time the lord

Rinuccini's efforts in this regard were bolstered in June by news that Owen Roe O'Neill had secured for the confederates their single greatest military success of the war at Benburb in County Tyrone. O'Neill's Ulster army had been relatively inconspicuous over the past year with the focus of confederate operations largely confined to western Munster and Connaught. Reports of these campaigns were well documented in the London newsbooks, particularly since they highlighted the failure of Kilkenny's forces. Indeed, discord between the two confederate generals, Preston and Castlehaven, had undermined attempts to successfully deliver Youghal and similar Protestant strongholds in Munster throughout the fall of 1645,⁷⁵ while a coalition of English parliamentary and Scottish forces, inflicted a heavy defeat on Irish forces at Sligo in October.⁷⁶ O'Neill's victory at Benburb on 5 June appeared to have offset these failures. Rinuccini had brought with him fresh resources for the Catholic war effort, and by the spring of 1646 he had provided the Ulster general with sufficient arms and funding to afford him the opportunity to launch an extensive campaign against the Scots. In late May, Owen Roe was informed that Monro was planning a rendezvous near Benburb with Sir Robert

lieutenant could choose to have it published at any time. A summation of the articles can also be found in Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 111-113.

⁷⁵ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 53; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 90-94. For diverse reports on Castlehaven's Munster campaign see, *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 38, 12 Sep. 1645, 465.3038\E. 264(13), [pp. 2-3]; *Parliaments Post*, no. 17, 9 Sep. 1645, 487.17\E. 300(9), p. 6; *Scottish Dove*, no. 98, 6 Sep. 1645, 594.098\E. 300(3), pp. 774-775; *Weekly Account*, no. 37, 17 Sep. 1645, 671.237\E. 301(17), [pp. 3-4]; *Perfect Passages*, no. 62, 30 Dec. 1645, 523.62\E. 266(3), pp. 490-492. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 124, 4 Nov. 1645, 214.124\E. 308(11), p. 996; *Kingdomes Weekly Post*, [no. 4], 4 Nov. 1645, 216.04\E. 308(9), pp. 31-32; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 36, 6 Nov. 1645, 419.036\E. 308(16), p. 185; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 118, 3 Nov. 1645, 504.118\E. 266(12), p. 942; *Scottish Dove*, no. 107, 7 Nov. 1645, 594.107\E. 308(21), p. 846; *Weekly Account*, no. 48, 26 Nov. 1645, 671.248\E. 310(5), [p. 5].

⁷⁶ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 41, 18 Dec. 1645, 419.041\E. 313(3), p. 227; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 3, 16 Jan. 1646, 465.4003\E. 506(1), [p. 3]; *Cities Weekly Post*, no. 4, 13 Jan. 1646, 45.04\E. 315(14), p. 8; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 134, 13 Jan. 1646, 214.134\E. 315(15), p. 1015; *Civicius*, no. 138, 15 Jan. 1646, 298.138\E. 316(9), p. 2004; *Scottish Dove*, no. 117, 14 Jan. 1646, 594.117\E. 316(2), pp. 929-930; *Weekly Account*, no. 3, 15 Jan. 1646, 671.303\E. 316(8), [pp. 4-5]; no. 4, 21 Jan. 1646, 671.305\E. 317(3), [pp. 4-5].

Stewart's Laggan army and a force led by Colonel George Monro, his son-in-law, who was marching south from Coleraine. It was hoped that these forces would carry the war into the heart of the confederation, perhaps even as far as Kilkenny itself. To prevent this, O'Neill's army of approximately 5,000 men moved north to Benburb where a defensive position was selected near a crossing-point of the Blackwater River. News of this resulted in Monro marching his troops fifteen miles toward the Irish. But after several hours of skirmishes, the Scots, exhausted from their long march, were shattered by a surprise confederate charge at dusk. Monro's forces were routed, and in the process between 2,000-3,000 of his men were killed.⁷⁷ Fortunately for the Scots, rather than following up this victory, O'Neill retired to Kilkenny in August to support Rinuccini's coup against the supreme council.⁷⁸

It didn't take long for news of this defeat to reach London. On 16 June, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* informed its audience that Monro had suffered a total rout, and over the next several days reports of the battle were related in some detail by all the principal newsbooks.⁷⁹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* apportioned blame for Benburb on the divisions between Presbyterian and Independent at home, a breach, it claimed, which had been cultivated by the Papists. These differences, the editor cautioned, would result in dire consequences for all three kingdoms, and in this context he reminded its readers that "Hee that will England win, with Ireland must first begin;

⁷⁷ For details of the battle at Benburb, see G.A. Hayes McCoy, *Irish Battles. A military history of Ireland* (Belfast, 1989), pp. 191-197. Contemporary accounts can be found in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, v, pp. 25-29, and idem, *Contemporary History*, i, pp. 113-116; 676-683.

⁷⁸ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 55.

⁷⁹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 152, 16 Jun. 1646, 214.152\E. 340(25), p. 136; *Civics*, no. 159, 18 Jun. 1646, 298.159\E. 340(34), p. 2279; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 67, 18 Jun. 1646, 419.067\E. 340(32), pp. 497-498; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 25, 19 Jun. 1646, 465.4025\E. 511(12), [pp. 2-3]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 151, 22 Jun. 1646, 504.152\E. 511(15), pp. 1208-1209; *Scottish Dove*, no. 136[sic], 25 Jun. 1646, 594.139\E. 341(19), p. 692.

they [Catholics] have already fowly done too faire for that Kingdome, take timely heed oh England-Scotland.”⁸⁰ Two week’s later the editor related a copy of Monro’s report of the battle. Although the major general acknowledged this defeat, he noted that only 500-600 of his men had been lost, and ascribed this failure to divine judgment intended to combat the conceit among his troops.⁸¹ According to *Moderate Intelligencer*, however, Monro had informed the parliamentary commissioners upon his return to Belfast that the English horse was primarily responsible for the failure at Benburb. As a result, on 23 July, although admitting that news of the battle was “ancient,” Dillingham chose to relate an extensive account of the previous month’s engagement - one that contrasted the bravery of the English horse with the fervent manner of the retreat made by their Scottish counterparts.⁸² These aspersions did little to heal either Presbyterian-Independent or Anglo-Scottish divisions, but in light of the fact that the king had recently absconded to the Scottish army in northern England, such sentiments were hardly surprising.

THE ORMOND PEACE PROCLAIMED

In the aftermath of Benburb, the newsbooks were faced with the unenviable task of acknowledging further confederate achievements. These included Preston’s seizure of Roscommon (although logistical difficulties and a shortage of supplies forced him to abandon plans to take Sligo), and the capture of Bunratty Castle by Muskerry after a prolonged siege.⁸³ Despite these successes, the Ormond peace was proclaimed

⁸⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 152, 16 Jun. 1646, 214.152\E. 340(25), p. 136.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, no. 154, 30 Jun. 1646, 214.154\E. 342(6), pp. 147-149. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* was the only serial to convey details of Monro’s account. A copy of the major general’s letter can also be found in Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, i, pp. 677-679.

⁸² *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 72, 23 Jul. 1646, 419.072\E. 345(16), pp. 548-554 [sic].

⁸³ See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 73, 30 Jul. 1646, 419.073\E. 346(7), p. 573; no. 74, 6 Aug. 1646, 419.074\E. 349(12), p. 583; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 31, 31 Jul. 1646, 465.4031\E. 511(28), [pp. 6-7]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 159, 4 Aug. 1646, 214.159\E. 349(4), p. 191; *Scottish Dove*, no.

in Dublin on 30 July. Four days later the supreme council at Kilkenny followed suit. Nonetheless, these victories had hardened Rinuccini's resistance to any peace settlement that did not afford complete freedom for the Catholic religion in Ireland. This appeared even less attainable given the fact that the king now languished in Scottish hands. Confident of O'Neill's support, the nuncio convened an ecclesiastical synod in Waterford on 6 August, which over the next three weeks, not only rejected the peace, but also declared that confederate Catholics were no longer bound to follow the commands of the supreme council. Furthermore, all those who supported the accord would do so under penalty of excommunication. Following this, Rinuccini returned to Kilkenny in September, and with the support of both O'Neill and Preston, imprisoned those members of the supreme council who had promoted the agreement. A new council was established, which included both the Ulster and Leinster generals, and Rinuccini replaced Mountgarret as president of a new confederate government.⁸⁴

The Ormond peace was reported in all the principal parliamentary papers within three weeks of it being declared in Dublin,⁸⁵ and by the end of August a copy of the published articles could be found in at least two serials.⁸⁶ However, similar to the Glamorgan revelations, the initial reports of the peace were generally void of the hysteria that attended news of the cessation in 1643. The war in England had been won, and

145, 5 Aug. 1646, 594.145\E. 349(7), pp. 719-720; *Civicus*, no. 166, 6 Aug. 1646, 298.166\E. 349(14), p. 2333.

⁸⁴ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 107-117; Patrick J. Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates, 1645-9," in *NHI*, iii, pp. 320-321.

⁸⁵ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 75, 13 Aug. 1646, 419.075\E. 350(6), p. 596; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 159, 17 Aug. 1646, 504.159\E. 513(2), pp. 1273-1274; *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 161, 18 Aug. 1646, 214.161\E. 350(14), p. 205; *Scottish Dove*, no. 147, 19 Aug. 1646, 594.147\E. 350(16), p. 8; *Weekly Account*, no. 34, 19 Aug. 1646, 671.334\E. 350(19), [p. 6]; *Civicus*, no. 168, 20 Aug. 1646, 298.168\E. 350(20), p. 2348; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 34, 21 Aug. 1646, 465.4034\E. 513(5), [pp. 2-3].

⁸⁶ *Weekly Account*, no. 35, 25 Aug. 1646, 671.335\E. 351(8), [pp. 6-7]; *Civicus*, no. 169, 27 Aug. 1646, 298.169\E. 351(15), pp. 2358-2359.

although Irish affairs continued to attract considerable attention in the newsbooks, they were no longer promoted with the same fervor that accompanied earlier reports of royalist-confederate unanimity. It was recognized that fresh troops and supplies would have to be sent to Ireland to quell the rebellion, but the defeat of the king appeared to have alleviated the Irish threat. From the outbreak of the rebellion, the safety and security of England had consistently been a primary concern for the newsbooks. And in this context, any hint of a rapprochement between the crown and Kilkenny had provided excellent fodder for the pro-parliamentary press to cast further discredit upon the king and the royalist war effort in England. But once Charles had been defeated in that kingdom, the ferment that generally accompanied news of significant developments in Ireland appears to have dissipated.

Despite this, the fall-out from the Ormond peace received extensive coverage in the periodical press, particularly in terms of the effect it had in Ireland. Confederate politics had generally received scant attention in the newsbooks, but in the aftermath of these latest developments editors reveled in highlighting the divisions, imprisonment's, and persistent threats of excommunication that reverberated within the confederate camp.⁸⁷ Not all of these reports could be taken at face value. *Perfect Occurrences*, for example, contended that during a debate on the peace, violence had broken out at

⁸⁷ See *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 166, 22 Sep. 1646, 214.166\E. 353(2), pp. 242-243; no. 167, 29 Sep. 1646, 214.167\E. 355(18), pp. 249-250, 254-255; no. 173, 10 Nov. 1646, 214.173\E. 361(8), pp. 292-293; no. 175, 24 Nov. 1646, 214.175\E. 362(30), p. 307; *Civicus*, no. 172, 17 Sep. 1646, 298.172\E. 354(12), p. 2386; no. 175, 1 Oct. 1646, 298.175\E. 355(24), pp. 2396-2399; no. 182, 19 Nov. 1646, 298.182\E. 362(17), pp. 2454-2455; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 80, 17 Sep. 1646, 419.080\E. 354(13), p. 650; no. 90, 26 Nov. 1646, 419.090\E. 363(7), p. 772; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 38, 18 Sep. 1646, 465.4038\E. 354(14), [p. 4]; no. 40, 2 Oct. 1646, 465.4040\E. 513(13), [pp. 3, 8]; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 2, 15 Jan. 1647, 465.5002\E. 371(5), [pp. 11, 16]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 164, 21 Sep. 1646, 504.164\E. 513(11), p. 1312; no. 166, 5 Oct. 1646, 504.166\E. 513(15), pp. 1328, 1333; no. 170, 2 Nov. 1646, 504.170\E. 513(22), p. 1365; no. 174, 30 Nov. 1646, 504.174\E. 513(26), p. 1395; *Scotish Dove*, no. 152, 23 Sep. 1646, 594.152\E. 355(5), p. 47; no. 153, 1 Oct. 1646, 594.153\E. 355(27), p. 56; *Weekly Account*, no. 40, 30 Sep. 1646, 671.340\E. 355(21), [pp. 6-8].

Kilkenny between members of the supreme council, which resulted in the death of at least two members of that body.⁸⁸ The divisions generated by the peace also resulted in a failed attempt by some confederate renegades to fall upon Ormond as he made his way to Kilkenny in early September to accept control from the supreme council and to disperse the confederation.⁸⁹ News of this encouraged *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* to echo a common desire among the London serials that this would encourage the marquis to abandon his trust of “these inhumane Papists,” and induce him to open negotiations with the English parliament for the surrender of Dublin.⁹⁰ It also provided fresh optimism for the reduction of that kingdom and led *Perfect Occurrences* to proclaim:

Some say it is impossible to recover Ireland, but I take such men to be in the same capassity that the Ghost was in, that frighted away the Centinels from the treasure Guard at the disbanding of the late Westerne Brigade... which was nothing but a man mistaken walking in his shirt about the streetes to looke for his bed.⁹¹

Over the next several months, Ormond’s willingness to treat with Westminster became the subject of considerable speculation in the weekly press, and his prominence was such that a woodcut of the marquis occupied the front page of *Civicus* on several

⁸⁸ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 39, 25 Sep. 1646, 465.4039\E. 355(12), [p. 8]. Although members of the supreme council who had supported the peace were imprisoned in mid September, there is no evidence that any of them lost their lives in the process.

⁸⁹ For divers reports of this incident see *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 167, 29 Sep. 1646, 214.167\E. 355(18), p. 254; no. 168, 6 Oct. 1646, 214.168\E. 356(4), p. 260; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 81, 24 Sep. 1646, 419.081\E. 355(8), p. 662; no. 84, 15 Oct. 1646, 419.084\E. 357(13), p. 689; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 39, 25 Sep. 1646, 465.4039\E. 355(12), [p. 6]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 165, 28 Sep. 1646, 504.165\E. 513(12), p. 1324; no. 166, 5 Oct. 1646, 504.166\E. 513(15), p. 1328; *Scottish Dove*, no. 153, 1 Oct. 1646, 594.153\E. 355(27), p. 55; *Civicus*, no. 175, 1 Oct. 1646, 298.175\E. 355(24), p. 2402. See also Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 258-264.

⁹⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 167, 29 Sep. 1646, 214.167\E. 355(18), p. 254. See also *Ibid.*, no. 168, 6 Oct. 1646, 214.168\E. 356(4), p. 264; *Weekly Account*, no. 41, 7 Oct. 1646, 671.341\E. 356(7), [p. 6]; *Civicus*, no. 176, 8 Oct. 1646, 298.176\E. 356(9), pp. 2407-2408; no. 177, 15 Oct. 1646, 298.177\E. 357(12), pp. 2413-2414; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 83, 8 Oct. 1646, 419.083\E. 356(8), pp. 677-678; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 167, 12 Oct. 1646, 504.167\E. 513(17), p. 1337.

⁹¹ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 45, 6 Nov. 1646, 465.4045\E. 360(13), [p. 6].

occasions during the period.⁹² Ormond's decision to open channels of communication with parliament was no doubt made easier by Rinuccini's decision to launch an autumn campaign against Dublin. Confederate forces were camped within a few miles of the Irish capital by early November, and the combined armies of Preston and O'Neill, estimated to be between 8-10,000 strong, were more than double the number of royalists in arms within the city.⁹³ But the late start to the campaign undermined any attempt to successfully take Dublin before the onset of winter. This situation was compounded by the mistrust exhibited between both generals, who by early December, had retired with their respective armies to winter quarters.⁹⁴ Preston's retirement, moreover, was in response to threats of excommunication by Rinuccini, who feared with good reason an independent agreement between Ormond and the general.⁹⁵

Rumors of furtive communication between Preston and the lord lieutenant had not escaped the attention of the periodicals in London, and throughout December it was claimed that Ormond had agreed to everything from a cessation to a confederacy with the rebels.⁹⁶ The marquis's perfidiousness, it was even claimed, had resulted in the confederate occupation of both Dublin and the Irish Parliament!⁹⁷ On the other hand, the

⁹² *Civicius*, no. 175, 1 Oct. 1646, 298.175\E. 355(24), p. 2395; no. 176, 8 Oct. 1646, 298.176\E. 356(9), p. 2403; no. 183, 10 Dec. 1646, 298.183\E. 365(17), p. 2459.

⁹³ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 55. Invariably, the newsbooks inflated the troop strength of the confederates, which were reported to be as high as 21,000 men! See for example, *Scottish Dove*, no. 159, 11 Nov. 1646, 594.159\E. 361(9), p. 98[sic]; *Civicius*, no. 182, 19 Nov. 1646, 298.182\E. 362(17), p. 2452.

⁹⁴ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 118-123; Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 55.

⁹⁵ Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," pp. 321-322; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 120-121.

⁹⁶ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 50, 12 Dec. 1646, 465.4050\E. 365(23), [p. 4]; no. 51, 18 Dec. 1646, 465.4051\E. 366(13), [p. 8]; *Diutinus Britanicus*, (not *Britanicus*), no. 3, 16 Dec. 1646, 111.03\E. 366(6), p. 21; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 176, 14 Dec. 1646, 504.176\E. 513(28), p. 1411; *Weekly Account*, no. 52, 23 Dec. 1646, 671.352\E. 367(5), [p. 7]; no. 53, 30 Dec. 1646, 671.353\E. 369(2), [p. 5]; *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 178, 15 Dec. 1646, 214.178\E. 366(1), p. 354; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 95, 31 Dec. 1646, 419.095\E. 369(8), p. 822.

⁹⁷ *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 180, 29 Dec. 1646, 214.180\E. 368(7), p. 372. See also *London Post*, no. 1, 31 Dec. 1646, 232.1\E. 369(7), p. 7; *Mercurius Diutinus*, no. 9, 27 Jan. 1647, 111.09\E. 372(9), p. 67.

following month, reports suggested that Ormond and Preston had not only united their forces and marched against O'Neill and the nuncio, but that they had driven the latter to Waterford.⁹⁸ These allegations may have been promoted by the newsbooks as a result of the breakdown of negotiations between Ormond and the parliamentary commissioners. Having arrived in Dublin in mid-November, the commissioners were faced with the marquis's resolve not to surrender the city to the English parliament without command from the king.⁹⁹ In response to Ormond's intransigence on this issue, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* maintained that heretofore the marquis would no longer have his title acknowledged in future publications, but rather he would simply be referred to as "plain Ormond."¹⁰⁰

Along with *Moderate Intelligencer* and *Perfect Occurrences*, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* was providing its readers with the greatest amount of Irish news at this time. But this did not prevent it from remaining skeptical at times of the information coming out of that kingdom. In January 1647 the editor informed his readers, "Our Intelligence from Ireland hath bin of late full of clouds, so full, that beyond those Cloudes, we can discover nothing...."¹⁰¹ Likewise, in relation to Ormond's activities he

⁹⁸ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 181, 5 Jan. 1647, 214.181\E. 370(11), p. 376; no. 183, 19 Jan. 1647, 214.183\E. 371(12), p. 391; no. 184, 26 Jan. 1647, 214.184\E. 372(7), p. 404; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 179, 4 Jan. 1646, 504.179\E. 513(31), p. 1433; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 53, 1 Jan. 1647, 465.4053\E. 370(2), [p. 4]; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 98, 21 Jan. 1647, 419.098\E. 371(16), p. 855; *London Post*, no. 3, 29 Jan. 1647, 232.3\E. 372(20), p. 22.

⁹⁹ *Diutinus Britanicus*, no. 1, 2 Dec. 1646, 111.01\E. 364(7), p. 8; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 175, 7 Dec. 1646, 504.175\E. 513(27), pp. 1400-1401; no. 177, 21 Dec. 1646, 504.177\E. 513(29), p. 1419; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 49, 4 Dec. 1646, 465.4049\E. 365(1), [pp. 6-7]; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 279-281.

¹⁰⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 177, 8 Dec. 1646, 214.177\E. 365(12), p. 342. The editor, however, failed to live up this promise. See for example, no. 180, 29 Dec. 1646, 214.180\E. 368(7), p. 372; no. 181, 5 Jan. 1647, 214.181\E. 370(11), pp. 373, 376; no. 183, 19 Jan. 1647, 214.183\E. 371(12), p. 391.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, no. 183, 19 Jan. 1647, 214.183\E. 371(12), p. 391. See also *The London Post*, no. 2, 21 Jan. 1647, 232.2\E. 371(17), pp. 12-13.

claimed that Ireland presently represented the double face of Janus, whereby “Wee have herein a great suspence, and know not what to conclude.”¹⁰²

It was clear, though, that a growing concern for the Protestant population of Dublin sparked a desire for greater unanimity at home among the serials in their desire to see fresh troops and supplies being shipped to Ireland. *Weekly Account* stressed that domestic distractions had allowed Ireland to be:

overwhelmed with all the mischiefs and terrours that can derive themselves from Famine, Fire, and Sword; nay from the cruelties of a race of barbarous and inhumane Rebels; yet have we by reason of domestick differences bin unable to give them necessary relief, and by a sufficient force, in force of those rebellious Irish to relinquish their oppressions inflicted on the Protestants.¹⁰³

The need to secure effective relief for the Protestants in Ireland at this time also prompted *Perfect Occurrences* to exhort “It is said in the booke of Joshua. Ye shall passe before your Brethren Armed all the might men of valour, and helpe them, untill the Lord have given your brethren rest.”¹⁰⁴

Eagerness to obtain assistance for their co-religionists in Ireland might help explain why claims of dismemberment and rape committed against Protestants settlers became increasingly conspicuous at this juncture.¹⁰⁵ In November 1646, several papers related allegations made by one John Byssse who had recently arrived in Chester.¹⁰⁶ Byssse

¹⁰² *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 181, 5 Jan. 1647, 214.181\E. 370(11), p. 373. This was a problem that persisted, and on occasions the serials placed little confidence in some of the news that circulated out of Ireland. For example see, *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 10, 12 Mar. 1647, 465.5010\E. 379(6), p. 80; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 108, 8 Apr. 1647, 419.108\E. 383(22), pp. 1007-1008; *Weekly Account*, no. 12, 24 Mar. 1647, 671.4012\E. 381(12), [p. 8]; no. 15, 14 Apr. 1647, 671.415\E. 384(1), [pp. 1-2].

¹⁰³ *Weekly Account*, no. 46, 4 Nov. 1646, 671.346\E. 360(6), [p. 2].

¹⁰⁴ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 50, 12 Dec. 1646, 465.4050\E. 365(23), [p. 3]. See also no. 51, 18 Dec. 1646, 465.4051\E. 366(13), [p. 6].

¹⁰⁵ See for example, *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 46, 13 Nov. 1646, 465.4046\E. 362(7), [pp. 5-6]; no. 47, 20 Nov. 1646, 465.4047\E. 362(23), [p. 8]; *Scotish Dove*, no. 160, 18 Nov. 1646, 594.160\E. 362(14), p. 110; no. 161, 26 Nov. 1646, 594.161\E. 363(5), p. 116.

¹⁰⁶ Byssse has been identified by Michael Perceval-Maxwell as one of the Protestant leaders in the Irish House of Commons in 1640. Perceval-Maxwell, *Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 74.

maintained that after a Protestant garrison near Dublin had surrendered upon quarter to the rebels, the inhabitants were not only inhumanely murdered, but the bodies of two officers and a minister were barbarously defiled.¹⁰⁷ *Mercurius Candidus* appeared to take considerable license over this occurrence by informing its readers that amid this “hellish act of mockery,” and without opening his mouth, the dead preacher delivered his own funeral oration to these “deafe Adders,” urging them to amend their ways and repent.¹⁰⁸ The likelihood that one John Harris, a former actor, was responsible for *Candidus* suggests that the author may have had difficulty in leaving the histrionics of his former profession behind him.

Candidus survived for only a single issue before it became one of a growing number of titles forced into retirement by years’ end. At the beginning of 1647 only five established newsbooks continued to prosper. These were *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *Moderate Intelligencer*, *Perfect Diurnall*, *Weekly Account*, and *Perfect Occurrences*. At first glance *Perfect Occurrences* appeared to have acquired a new editor by the name of Luke Harruney. But this was an anagram for Henry Walker, and since the paper continued to remain largely unchanged, it came as little surprise in October 1647 when Walker once again acknowledged his authorship.¹⁰⁹ Both *Scotish Dove* and *Mercurius Civicus* had ceased publication in the closing days of 1646. Smith’s *Dove* appeared for the final time on 25 December, amid complaints by the editor that considering the dearth of domestic news “to publish one and the same thing by several

¹⁰⁷ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 88, 12 Nov. 1646, 419.088\E. 362(5), p. 746; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 46, 13 Nov. 1646, 465.4046\E. 362(7), [p. 7]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 174, 17 Nov. 1646, 214.174\E. 362(11), pp. 301-302; *Mercurius Candidus*, *Communicating the Weekly Newes to the Kingdome of England*, no. 1, 20 Nov. 1646, 292.1\E. 362(21), pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁸ *Candidus*, no. 1, 20 Nov. 1646, 292.1\E. 362(21), pp. 3-4.

¹⁰⁹ Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 128-129; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 53, 1 Jan. 1647, 465.4053\E. 370(2), [p. 1].

pens is but a Cheat to the people when old things are couched under new Titles, or lying glosses.”¹¹⁰ It was surely no coincidence that the demise of the *Dove* coincided with the retreat of the Scottish army from English soil. *Civicus*, meanwhile, gave up the ghost on December 10. In the last weeks, the editor had increasingly plagiarized news from the pages of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*,¹¹¹ and its ‘suicide’, like other newsbooks of the era, was most likely induced as a result of economic difficulties.¹¹² Indeed, although five new titles appeared in late 1646, these productions were generally short-lived with only *Diutinus Britanicus* enjoying any semblance of longevity.¹¹³

New additions to the market during the first eight months of 1647 were few, and those serials that attempted to do so generally lasted less than six issues.¹¹⁴ Two exceptions were Pecke’s revival of *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages Informed to the Parliament*, which ran for thirteen issues between June and September, and *A Perfect Summary of Chiefe Passages in Parliament*, which appeared in eleven numbers between July and October- most likely edited by Henry Walker.¹¹⁵ At the same time, Dillingham attempted to remain competitive by relying increasingly on

¹¹⁰ *Scottish Dove*, [unnumbered], 25 Dec. 1646, 594.162\E. 368(1), pp. 4-5.

¹¹¹ Compare for example, *Civicus*, no. 182, 19 Nov. 1646, 298.182\E. 362(17), and no. 183, 10 Dec. 1646, 298.183\E. 365(17) with *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 174, 17 Nov. 1646, 214.174\E. 362(11), and no. 177, 8 Dec. 1646, 214.177\E. 365(12).

¹¹² Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 124-125; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 50-51.

¹¹³ The first of eleven numbers of this serial appeared on 2 December 1646. Possibly edited by Thomas Audley, a change of title to *Mercurius Diutinus* occurred on 16 December, N&S 111. In addition to *Diutinus* and *Candidus*, the remaining titles were: *Perfect Passages of State*, which appeared only once on 4 August, N&S 525; *Papers from the Scots Quarters* promoted the burden of the Scottish army on the English in Northern England, and surfaced on six occasions during October and November, N&S 480A; Finally, *The London Post, Communicating the High Counsellis of both Parliaments* appeared on 31 December 1646 and lasted for seven weeks, N&S 232.

¹¹⁴ These included *England’s Remembrancer of Lon[d]ons Integrity*, N&S 126; *Papers of the Resolution*, N&S 481; *Mercurius Britanicus*, N&S 289 (not considered a serious imitation of Nedham’s original); *The Armies Post*, N&S 20; *A Diarie, or an Exact Journall, of the Proceedings of the Treaty*, N&S 94.

¹¹⁵ *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages Informed to the Parliament*, N&S 62; *A Perfect Summary of Chiefe Passages in Parliament*, N&S 528.

foreign news to fill *Moderate Intelligencer*. Although keen to relate intelligence from Ireland, he lamented to his readers during the winter that he received more constant news from Rome, Venice, Turkey and even Jerusalem than he did from Dublin.¹¹⁶ Despite these complaints, over the next several months developments in Ireland helped ensure that *Moderate Intelligencer* would remain committed in providing a steady stream of Irish news for its readership.

DUBLIN'S SURRENDER

Confederate unanimity had been significantly eroded by the Ormond peace. But in the aftermath of Rinuccini's 'coup d'état,' and the imprisonment of the peace faction within the supreme council, a group of moderates led by Nicholas Plunkett and Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, came to the fore of Irish politics. Members of the supreme council under the nuncio's presidency, Plunkett and French believed that Catholic unity could only be achieved through compromise and conciliation between both the clerical and peace blocs. In this context, prior to the advent of the seventh general assembly, which met at Kilkenny on 10 January 1647, the moderates exercised their influence to secure the release of former council members who had supported the peace.¹¹⁷ Debate on the Ormond treaty occupied all three factions in the new assembly during the initial weeks of its engagement, and although the majority of members rejected the peace on 2 February, further schisms were checked when the assembly absolved the former council for agreeing to this accord.¹¹⁸ This was despite contrary reports at the time in the London

¹¹⁶ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 91, 3 Dec. 1646, 419.091\E. 364(11), p. 773. Since February of 1646, in what was most likely a ploy to boost sales, Dillingham had expanded his paper from eight to twelve pages. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 106-107.

¹¹⁷ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 6, 12 Feb. 1647, 465.5006\E. 375(17), p. 46; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 123-127. While French had been appointed to the new supreme council in September 1646, Plunkett had been a member of this body since its formation in 1642.

¹¹⁸ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, vi, pp. 177-178.

press, which claimed that the Old English had usurped control from the clergy at Kilkenny, and now intended to drive Rinuccini from Ireland.¹¹⁹

Notwithstanding opposition from the peace camp, on 17 March the assembly revised the confederate oath of association by adapting several articles proposed by the clergy designed to bolster the rights of Irish Catholics,¹²⁰ measures *Perfect Occurrences* interpreted to mean that Kilkenny had granted a license to slaughter all Protestants.¹²¹ The following day the clergy had to accept two additional amendments passed by assembly members, the most important of which determined that the assembly, rather than the clergy, assumed the role of final arbiter over the feasibility of these proposals in any future agreement with the king.¹²² Before this body dispersed on 4 April, it elected a new supreme council of 24 members. And, although Plunkett and his fellow moderates on the new council never constituted a majority, they manipulated the balance of power between the clerical and peace factions in their efforts to promote consensus politics and a more balanced peace treaty with Ormond.¹²³

Although both the moderate and peace factions at Kilkenny were committed to opening a new round of negotiations with Ormond, unanimity was proving a challenge within English politics at this time, and this reduced the marquis's room for maneuver.

¹¹⁹ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 103, 25 Feb. 1647, 419.103A\E. 378(1), p. 926. See also *London Post*, no. 7, 26 Feb. 1647, 232.7\E. 378(9), p. 55.

¹²⁰ These amendments included: demands for the free and public exercise of the Catholic religion; the restoration of all jurisdictions and privileges enjoyed by the clergy in the reign of Henry VIII; the nullification of all laws passed against Catholics since that time; and that the clergy were to benefit from the restitution of all churches and benefices in confederate controlled areas. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 135.

¹²¹ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 12, 26 Mar. 1647, 465.5012\E. 382(2), p. 96.

¹²² The other amendment maintained that the issue concerning churches and benefices should not hinder the possibility of reaching an accommodation with Ormond. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 135.

¹²³ Although the clerical faction held the largest number of seats on the new council, it had to compete against four members of the peace faction, and eight moderates, which included both Plunkett and French. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 140-142.

On 30 January, after the king had repeatedly rejected measures toward securing a political and religious settlement by both the Scots and Westminster, Charles was handed over to the English parliament.¹²⁴ Shortly thereafter, in response to Ormond's intimations toward an agreement with this body, commissioners left for Dublin to negotiate the city's surrender to parliamentary forces.¹²⁵ In light of the withdrawal of Scottish troops from English soil, however, the possibility of sending fresh regiments to Ireland afforded the Presbyterian majority within the Commons the opportunity to rid itself of the New Model Army. Headed by the Denzil Holles, this party was convinced that the New Model had become a bastion of religious radicalism, and as such its demobilization would not only check sectarianism and save money, but it would also permit parliament to focus greater resources on suppressing the rebellion in Ireland.¹²⁶ In February 1647 the Commons resolved that aside from approximately 6,400 men to occupy divers English garrisons, the remnant of the New Model foot would either go to Ireland or be disbanded.¹²⁷ But parliament's failure to address grievances such as arrears in pay, and an indemnity from prosecution for their living of 'free quarter' during the civil war helped determine that the rank and file of the New Model found any proposals of this nature unacceptable. In addition, when it was later revealed that parliament intended to choose well known

¹²⁴ The Scots were also bankrupt, and the incentive of a financial settlement of 400,000 pounds from parliament no doubt helped them to take this decision.

¹²⁵ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 188, 23 Feb. 1647, 214.188\E. 377(21), p. 436; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 103, 25 Feb. 1647, 419.103A\E. 378(1), p. 928; *London Post*, no. 7, 26 Feb. 1647, 232.7\E. 378(9), p. 53; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 8, 26 Feb. 1647, 465.5008\E. 378(8), pp. 60-62; *Weekly Account*, no. 8, 22 Feb. 1647, 671.408\E. 377(17), [p. 5]; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 187, 1 Mar. 1647, 504.187\E. 515(1), p. 1495.

¹²⁶ Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 145-146.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

Presbyterian commanders to supervise the Irish expedition, the vast majority of officers and soldiers refused to participate in that service.¹²⁸

Not surprisingly, these occurrences prompted concern among the newsbooks throughout the spring. *Perfect Diurnall*, which generally promoted consensus politics at Westminster, abandoned its traditional bi-partisan position on this matter and directed criticism toward the political Presbyterians. Those who sought to slur the army in order to impede it from going to Ireland, Pecke noted “are better friends to the Irish Rebels then to the English Protestants.” Rather, he asserted “Is it not fit to Incourage men that are faithfull to serve in love, then let drops of love, and gratitude appeare to that Army, that under God has saved us in England.”¹²⁹ On the other hand, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* cast blame for the failure to expedite troops for Ireland on New Model officers who had discouraged their men from going to that kingdom.¹³⁰ These soldiers, the editor concluded, rather than resting on their laurels should adventure into Ireland to defend their religion “by which they shall give more honour to God, bring more renowne into this Kingdome, and by assisting their distressed Brethren, make their reward in heaven more great and weighty.”¹³¹ Even after fresh regiments had been shipped to Ireland in June, both *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* and *A Diary or an Exact Journall* highlighted the valor of the pro-parliamentary veterans in Munster. In an effort perhaps to stress the disparity between these soldiers and their New Model counterparts, *A Diary*

¹²⁸ Ibid., pp. 150-157.

¹²⁹ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 188, 8 Mar. 1647, 504.188\E. 515(2), p. 1510. In recent months Pecke had demonstrated support for the leadership and objectives of the New Model, and accordingly had been accused of siding with the Independents. For example see, *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 150, 15 Jun. 1646, 504.150\E. 511(11), p. 1200; no. 170, 2 Nov. 1646, 504.170\E. 523(22), p. 1362; no. 185, 15 Feb. 1647, 504.185\E. 513(38), p. 1486. Also Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 118-119.

¹³⁰ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 207, 4 May 1647, 214.207\E. 385(20), p. 513.

¹³¹ Ibid., no. 211, 1 Jun. 1647, 214.211\E. 390(13), pp. 541-542.

noted that Inchiquin's men were "as high in courage as low in Fortunes. True Protestants and all of one mind, who are proud of any danger that can speake them gallant Christians, and will have their soules sooner divided from their bodyes, then suffer themselves to be divided into Schismes and factions."¹³²

Predictably, claims of Irish atrocities once again accompanied the push by the weekly press for fresh troops to quell the rebellion. In April at least two newsbooks related allegations that the rebels had recently stripped and cast up to sixty men, women, and children into a deep cave in Kerry. The noise of their suffering was such, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* proclaimed, that the innocent blood of these souls "doth cry aloud to heaven for vengeance."¹³³ According to reports in *Moderate Intelligencer*, moreover, a parliamentary expedition that had recently passed through Down and Armagh could find no trace of the 40,000 English inhabitants in those counties. It was concluded from this evidence that these Protestants had had their throats cut!¹³⁴

In view of the difficulties to secure soldiers for Ireland, the first significant parliamentary force to arrive in that kingdom for almost three years did not do so until the summer of 1647. Commanded by Colonel Michael Jones, 2, 000 troops landed outside Dublin on 7 June accompanying the parliamentary commissioners tasked to complete negotiations with Ormond for the surrender of the city.¹³⁵ Notwithstanding attempts by

¹³² *A Diarie or an Exact Journall of the Proceedings of the Treaty Betwixt the Parliament and the Army*, no. 2, 29 Jul. 1647, 94.2\E. 400(22), p. 15. See also *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 218, 20 Jul. 1647, 214.218\E. 399(13), pp. 598-599.

¹³³ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 205, 13 Apr. 1647, 214.204\E. 384(15), p. 498. See also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 194, 19 Apr. 1647, 504.194\E. 515(8), p. 1555.

¹³⁴ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 102, 18 Feb. 1647, 419.102\E. 377(5), pp. 914-915. *Perfect Diurnall* also related news of this expedition, but made no mention of the 'killings'. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 186, 23 Feb. 1647, 504.186\E. 513(39), pp. 1488-1489.

¹³⁵ Of New English stock, Jones had abandoned the king's cause in Ireland after the cessation of 1643 and had thereafter supported the parliamentary war effort in England.

the moderates at Kilkenny during the spring to pursue a negotiated settlement with the marquis, Ormond remained intent on delivering Dublin to Westminster.¹³⁶ Recent developments in both England and Ireland had only served to compound the miserable conditions with which the inhabitants and royalist soldiers in Dublin were forced to endure the past several months.¹³⁷ On 19 June, upon the conclusion of his treaty with the commissioners, he finally agreed to surrender the city, and within six weeks the king's lord lieutenant set sail for England.

DUNGAN'S HILL

The injection of fresh regiments into Dublin, coupled by Kilkenny's decision to launch a new offensive in Leinster helped ensure that there was an increase in the frequency and volume of military news found in the serials during the summer of 1647. *Moderate Intelligencer* sustained its reputation as a purveyor of military news with Dillingham providing the most comprehensive military chronicles from Ireland throughout this time. These not only included reports of divers engagements between parliamentary and confederate forces,¹³⁸ but also the most detailed account of a mutiny conducted by some New Model recruits in Dublin at the beginning of July. Despite the fact that this mutiny had originated over pay and conditions, Dillingham appeared to take aim at the

¹³⁶ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 146-149. These attempts had been prompted by the arrival of the royalist agent George Leyburn (using the pseudonym Winter Grant). Leyburn had been sent to Ireland by the queen in April 1647 to broker a treaty between Ormond and Kilkenny that would hopefully afford assistance for the king in England.

¹³⁷ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 296-298.

¹³⁸ For example, see *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 118, 17 Jun. 1647, 419.118\E. 393(2), p. 1127-1128; no. 120, 1 Jul. 1647, 419.120\E. 395(5), pp. 1143, 1150-1151; no. 121, 8 Jul. 1647, 419.121\E. 397(12), pp. 1162-1164; no. 122, 15 Jul. 1647, 419.122\E. 398(13), pp. 1173-1176; no. 123, 22 Jul. 1647, 419.123\E. 399(28), pp. 1186-1187; no. 124, 29 Jul. 1647, 419.124\E. 400(19), pp. 1199-1200; no. 125, 12 Aug. 1647, 419.125\E. 401(34), pp. 1210-1211.

parliamentary Presbyterians by suggesting that such occurrences would not have taken place had these men been allowed to go to Ireland under their own commanders.¹³⁹

The mutiny successfully squashed, Jones was able to focus on a more serious threat to Dublin's security. Liberated from the rivalry with O'Neill, who had been ordered by the supreme council in June to advance upon Sligo, Preston had been given responsibility for the assault on Dublin. To this end, in July he successfully seized several fortified garrisons that girdled the city, and by the end of that month his army had laid siege to Trim, the last significant outpost. Before Trim could be taken, however, Jones marched out of Dublin and engaged Preston at Dungan's Hill on 8 August. Parliamentary and confederate forces numbered approximately 6,500 and 8,000 men respectively, but the ensuing battle culminated in Preston's foot being scattered into a nearby bog where the majority of them were put to the sword.¹⁴⁰

Within two weeks of the contest all the principal newsbooks in London carried news of Jones's victory. *Moderate Intelligencer* provided its readers with the most detailed account of the battle, and proudly claimed that 5,000 Irish fatalities was testimony of the "greatest slaughter to the Rebels that ever was gained in Ireland."¹⁴¹ Conversely, parliamentary fatalities from the engagement were low, and proclaimed to be

¹³⁹ Ibid., no. 122, 15 Jul. 1647, 419.122\E. 398(28), pp. 1173-1174. Although not related in as much detail, news of the mutiny was widely reported in several other weeklies. See for example, *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 28, 16 Jul. 1647, 465.5028\E. 518(5), p. 183; *A Diarie*, no. 1, 17 Jul. 1647, 94.1\E. 398(30), p. 5; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 207, 19 Jul. 1647, 504.207\E. 518(6), p. 1662; *A Continuation*, no. 3, 23 Jul. 1647, 62.03\E. 400(1), [p. 2].

¹⁴⁰ Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, vii, pp. 32-33; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 148-149.

¹⁴¹ Dillingham further reported that no more than 500 of Preston's foot escaped with their lives. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 126, 19 Aug. 1647, 419.126\E. 402(26), pp. 1222-1223. For additional accounts of the battle see, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 222, 17 Aug. 1647, 214.222\E. 402(13), p. 636; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 33, 20 Aug. 1647, 465.5033\E. 518(20), pp. 222-223; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 212, 23 Aug. 1647, 504.212\E. 518(21), pp. 1703-1704; *Perfect Summary*, no. 5, 23 Aug. 1647, 528.05\E. 518(22), pp. 34-35.

less than twenty men by at least one periodical.¹⁴² Although such figures may have been an exaggeration,¹⁴³ the weekly press was clearly delighted by news of Jones's triumph, and additional successes obtained by Inchiquin in Munster at this time only added to their joy.¹⁴⁴ But there was no doubting that Dungan's Hill proved to be the greatest military debacle of the decade for the Irish confederation. Preston's Leinster army had been considered Kilkenny's premier force, and in light of this devastating defeat any aspirations that the confederates may have had for the investment of Dublin soon evaporated.

Although there were fewer established titles during the first eight months of 1647 than at anytime since the outbreak of the rebellion, Ireland had remained fixed in the public eye. It was clear that despite the relative calm that followed the conclusion of the first civil war between king and parliament in England, news of Irish affairs continued to furnish fascinating material for English readers. Compensating for the absence of military activity at home, London's editors increasingly filled their pages with both military *and* political developments in Ireland. Events over the past two years in that kingdom had provided substantial reading, and despite the estrangement between parliament and the New Model Army, the injection of fresh troops from England added to the newsbooks fixation with the Irish rebellion.

This struggle between the army and Westminster scaled new heights in the

¹⁴² *Perfect Summary*, no. 5, 23 Aug. 1647, 528.05\E. 518(22), p. 34.

¹⁴³ These figures appear to have been gleaned from Jones's own account of the battle, but even Irish sources acknowledged losses of up to 3,000 men. Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 319; Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, vii, pp. 32-33.

¹⁴⁴ For example, see *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 221, 10 Aug. 1647, 214.221\E. 401(21), p. 628; no. 223, 24 Aug. 1647, 214.223\E. 404(13), pp. 637-639; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 127, 26 Aug. 1647, 419.127\E. 404(23), pp. 1233-1235; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 213, 30 Aug. 1647, 504.213\E. 518(24), pp. 1711-1712.

summer of 1647 when the king was seized in June by a faction of the New Model operating under instruction from Cromwell. In July a series of propositions known as 'The Heads of the Proposals' were drawn up by the army leadership and submitted to Charles as a basis of negotiation. The terms offered, which were generally regarded as generous, called for: biennial parliamentary elections, control of the army for ten years by a Council of State, and the retention of Episcopacy with the proviso of guaranteed toleration of dissenters.¹⁴⁵ The king's rejection of these proposals, however, helped convince senior New Model officers that in order to effect a political settlement on the kingdom, command of London, the bastion of the political Presbyterians, would have to take place.¹⁴⁶ In early August the army occupied the city, and shortly thereafter it assumed control of the capital's press. With this, a new chapter in the history of periodical news had begun.

¹⁴⁵ Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 181-184.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 184-185.

CHAPTER SIX

THE REBELLION AND THE RECRUDESCENCE OF ROYALIST NEWSBOOKS

SEPTEMBER 1647-DECEMBER 1648

Although Fairfax had augmented the army's position by occupying London, divisions within that body soon became apparent. 'Heads of the Proposals' had convinced many rank and file soldiers that the New Model leadership was prepared to reach a settlement with the king, which did not reflect revolutionary ideas taking root among this faction. By the fall of 1647 these soldiers had embraced ideas for reforming society and government championed by the Levellers, a London-based band of radical activists that promoted such reforms as an extension to the parliamentary franchise, complete religious toleration, and the abolition of the House of Lords.¹ This influence was particularly evident in October with the appearance of the 'Agreement of the People.' Endorsed by agents of the New Model regiments, this document not only asserted that sovereignty lay with the people but it also outlined a radical new constitution calling for executive and legislative power to be conferred upon an annually elected unicameral legislature.² Odious to both Westminster and the army grandees, such proposals forced Fairfax to summon representatives of the regiments, general officers, and a number of leading Levellers to Putney Church in late October. Chaired by Cromwell, the ensuing debates helped restore some measure of unity within the army, but the fact that the major general

¹ Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 197-199. For a comprehensive examination of the political and social programs advocated by the Levellers at this time see, H.N. Brailsford, *The Levellers and the English Revolution*, ed. Christopher Hill, (London, 1961); David Underdown, *Pride's Purge. Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971); G. E. Aylemer, *The Levellers in the English Revolution* (London, 1975).

² Brailsford, *The Levellers*, pp. 261-265; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 202-203.

was compelled to suppress a Leveller-inspired mutiny by two regiments shortly thereafter signified that fraction within the New Model remained.³

THE ADVENT OF 'THE TRINITY'

Fairfax expressed a similar desire to suppress the periodical press during the fall in order to thwart the proliferation of royalist publications. To this end, on 20 September he communicated to the earl of Manchester (speaker of the House of Lords) the following sentiments:

I have sent inclosed some Printed Pamphlets, that are not only very scandalous and abusive to this Army in particular, but indeed to the whole Kingdome in general. My Desire is, That these and all the like Nature may be suppressed for the future; and yet, That the Kingdom's Expectation may be satisfied in relation to Intelligence, till a firm Peace be settled, considering the Mischiefs that will follow by the poisonous Writings of evil Men, sent abroad daily to abuse and deceive the people, That (if the House shall see fit) some Two or Three Sheets may be permitted to come out Weekly, which may be licensed, and have some Stamp of Authority with them....⁴

The lord general further requested that Gilbert Mabbott, who had "approved himself faithful" in the service of both the Commons and the army, be appointed chief licenser.⁵ This appointment was secured as part of a new parliamentary ordinance passed by both Houses on 30 September designed to curtail the press.⁶

Although the new legislation provided Mabbott with far-reaching punitive powers against transgressors, it did not prevent the dawning of a new generation of unlicensed

³ Gentiles, *New Model*, pp. 202-225.

⁴ *Journal of the House of Lords*, ix, p. 441.

⁵ *Ibid*; *Perfect Summary of Chiefe Passages*, no. 11, 6 Oct. 1647, 528.11VE. 518(41), p. 85. Mabbott had formerly acted as John Rushworth's deputy, but in March 1647 the Commons dismissed both men from their respective positions for failing to suppress publications critical of parliament. For details of Mabbott and the licensing system see chapter eight of Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War."

⁶ The new ordinance passed by parliament incorporated measures that determined that, editors were liable to be fined forty shillings or receive forty days imprisonment for violating the new regulations; printers were to be penalized twenty shillings or face twenty days incarceration; stationers and booksellers were assessed ten shillings or ten days in jail; while the hawker or news peddler faced being whipped as a common rogue. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 213.

royalist newsbooks. Even before Westminster had the opportunity to enact this ordinance, the first numbers of two royalist mercuries appeared on the streets of London.

Disillusioned perhaps by the ascendancy of the Independents, John Hackluyt, a Presbyterian minister and former army chaplain, launched *Mercurius Melancholicus* in early September in an effort to promote the restoration of monarchical power.⁷ However, in light of the printing ordinance passed by parliament on the 30th of that month,

Melancholicus left its readers in no doubt the problems that it faced, since:

one point of knavery will now a dayes finde more chap-men to buy it, then twelve points of honesty. Divinity Pamphlets are but standing dishes in the Booke-sellers shops: whilst roguery in sippets is gobbled up like Bells banquets by whole meales, and not so much as a scrap to be seene the next morning.⁸

Mercurius Pragmaticvs also expressed contempt toward the late legislation.⁹

Making its debut on 21 September, this serial was largely the work of Marchamont

Nedham.¹⁰ After a sixteen-month enforced sabbatical from penning newsbooks,¹¹

Nedham returned to weekly news in support of the king. This decision had been prompted by the army's failure (amid internal divisions and the growing power of the New Model

⁷ *Mercurius Melancholicus: or, Newes from Westminster, and other Parts*, [unnumbered], [n.d., ms. 4 Sep. 1647], 344.01\E. 405(24). Martin Parker, a noted ballad-monger of the period, most likely assisted Hackluyt. This would account for the use of verse found throughout the life of the paper. Parker, moreover, not only penned several numbers when the authorities imprisoned Hackluyt late in 1647 and again in the spring and summer of 1648, but may also have produced a number of counterfeited editions of *Melancholicus*. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 137-138.

⁸ *Melancholicus*, no. 5, 2 Oct. 1647, 344.05\E. 410(2), p. 26.

⁹ *Mercurius Pragmaticvs. Communicating Intelligence from all Parts*, no. 3, 6 Oct. 1647, 369.103\E. 410(4), p. 17.

¹⁰ Royalist poets, Samuel Shepherd and John Cleveland, assisted in the production of *Pragmaticvs*. Thus similar to *Melancholicus*, poetry was a common feature during its history. For connections between poets and newsbooks during this period see Joad Raymond, "The Daily Muse; Or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read The News," *The Seventeenth Century* 11 (1995), pp. 1-30.

¹¹ Since his release from prison in May 1646 Nedham had turned to the practice of medicine. However, this did not prevent him on occasion from writing several political pamphlets that lent support to the Independents and the army. These included: *Independencie No Schism* (1646), E. 344(24), and *The Case of the Kingdom stated* (1647), E. 392(13). For details of Nedham's activities during this time see Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, pp. 39-45, and Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead," pp. 319-322.

leadership) to secure a post-war settlement with the king, which Nedham maintained, provided the best means to thwart the Presbyterian majority at Westminster.¹² Enjoying what was arguably the best intelligence of any royalist editor from within both bodies, Nedham became the scourge of parliament and the army grandees.¹³ Not surprisingly, within a short time he was targeted by the authorities,¹⁴ but despite Richard Lownes being committed to Newgate for publishing and vending *Pragmaticvs* in October, the author himself remained at large.¹⁵

On 5 November 1647 *Mercurius Elencticus* became the third significant addition to the king's camp.¹⁶ A veteran of the royalist horse during the first civil war, George Wharton, its editor, was also an astrologer by profession.¹⁷ Accordingly, *Elencticus* often spent time assailing parliamentary astrologers such as William Lilly and John Booker, and on occasion these attacks were directed against both men for predictions that they had made in relation to Ireland.¹⁸ *Elencticus* was unique in that the editor also appeared sympathetic to the plight of the native Irish in their current struggles. In only its third week of operations, the editor argued that if these people had been treated as Christians,

¹² Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead," pp. 321-322; Frank, *Cromwell's Press Agent*, pp. 45-46.

¹³ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 139; Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead," p. 322;

¹⁴ Clyde, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 127-128.

¹⁵ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 42, 22 Oct. 1647, 465.5042\E. 518(46), p. 291. Similarly, the printer of *Melancholicus* was fined 20s and had his press broken that month. *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1645-1647* (London, 1891), p. 602; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 56-58.

¹⁶ *Mercurius Elencticus. Communicating the Unparallel'd Proceedings at Westminster*, [no. 1], 5 Nov. 1647, 312.01\E. 412(30).

¹⁷ *Dictionary National Biography*, xc, pp. 1313-1315. Similar to both Hackluyt and Nedham, Wharton benefited from the assistance of fellow scribes, the most notable being Samuel Shepherd. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 141-142.

¹⁸ For example, see *Elencticus*, no. 19, 5 Apr. 1648, 312.19\E. 434(28), pp. 141-142; no. 22, 26 Apr. 1648, 312.22\E. 437(10), p. 168; no. 35, 26 Jul. 1648, 312.35\E. 454(12), pp. 269, 273; no. 46, 11 Oct. 1648, 312.46\A\E. 467(14), p. 382. In December 1646 Wharton had attempted to unmask Booker's inveterate hatred toward the Irish in a tract titled *Belhum Hybernicae; or, Irelands Warre Astrologically demonstrated* (1646), E. 365(21). See also John Booker, *A Bloody Irish Almanick* (1646), E. 328(14).

or with half the favor granted to the Scots after they had rebelled in 1639, they would have ceased their rebellion. Furthermore, Wharton maintained that despite popular assumptions, history portrayed the Irish not as cowards but rather as an enemy in the same vein as the ancient Gauls, Britons, Germans and Romans.¹⁹

These comments were remarkable considering that since 1641 the Irish had often been portrayed in the parliamentary newsbooks as recreant savages, while earlier royalist weeklies had generally distanced themselves completely from the rebels. But such was the current climate of anger and frustration toward Westminster and the army over worsening economic, social, and political conditions, that *Elencticus* felt confident enough to employ the Irish in a renewed propaganda war against the king's opponents. It should be noted that Wharton's colleagues did not necessarily share his sentiments. Hackluyt acclaimed recent successes by Inchiquin's forces in Munster during the fall, although these appear to have been promoted in order to accent the sloth of the army in England rather than to celebrate the demise of the Irish.²⁰ On 24 September, though, the editor of a counterfeit issue of *Melancholicus* prayed that God would "smite those bloody Rebels with weakenesse and temerity... while they behold the hand of God, writing with their blood, the fatall sentence that so disturbed Belshazar."²¹

¹⁹ *Elencticus*, no. 3, 19 Nov. 1647, 312.03\E. 416(13), p. 20.

²⁰ *Melancholicus*, [no. 1], 4 Sep. 1647, 344.01\E. 405(24), p. 5. Also no. 3, 18 Sep. 1647, 344.03A\E. 407(25), p. 16.

²¹ Belshazzar was the last king of Babylon in the sixth century A.D. According to Old Testament sources, writing that appeared on the palace wall from a disjoined hand prophesized of his downfall. *Melancholicus*, no. 4, 24 Sep. 1647, 344.04B\E. 408(12), p. 4 [sic]; no. 4, 24 Sep. 1647, 344.04C\E. 408(13), p. 16. Martin Parker may have been responsible for at least one of these editions, and these sentiments suggest that Parker possessed greater hostility toward the Irish than Hackluyt. For Parker's role in the history of *Melancholicus* see Frank, *English Newspapers*, pp. 137-138.

Ireland soon became an integral part of the propaganda war between this royalist troika and its opposition. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *Moderate Intelligencer*, *Perfect Occurrences*, *Perfect Diurnall* and *Perfect Weekly Account* all operated under official license and remained committed to relating news of the rebellion. In the fall of 1647, O'Neill had launched a campaign of desolation around Dublin that was designed to produce famine and hardship for parliamentary forces in the city and outlying regions. In an attempt to alleviate this problem Jones sallied from Dublin in November, but supply shortages prevented Owen Roe from engaging and the Ulster confederates were subsequently forced to withdraw to western Leinster.²² O'Neill's operations, however, had created a dearth of food and other necessities for the civilian and military populations in both camps.²³ According to reports in *Perfect Occurrences* on 28 November, not only had food prices in Dublin more than doubled in recent weeks, but one could "walke through the city, and see but here, and there a shop open."²⁴ In fact, *Moderate Intelligencer* asserted that it was not men, but instead money and provisions that were now needed in order to prosecute victory in Ireland.²⁵

²² The activities of Jones, O'Neill, and their respective forces were well documented in the parliamentary newsbooks throughout the fall. See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 130, 16 Sep. 1647, 419.130\E. 407(12), p. 1271; no. 134, 14 Oct. 1647, 419.134\E. 410(25), p. 1317; no. 135, 21 Oct. 1647, 419.135\E. 411(15), p. 1331; no. 136, 28 Oct. 1647, 419.136\E. 412(2), p. 1343; no. 140, 25 Nov. 1647, 419.140\E. 416(37), p. 1391; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 227, 21 Sep. 1647, 214.237\E. 407(35), p. 676; no. 232, 2 Nov. 1647, 214.232\E. 412(19), p. 716; *Moderne Intelligencer*, no. 7, 30 Sep. 1647, 431.7\E. 409(18), p. 55; *Perfect Summary*, no. 9, 20 Sep. 1647, 528.09\E. 518(34), p. 66; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 43, 29 Oct. 1647, 465.5043\E. 518(48), pp. 304-305; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 219, 11 Oct. 1647, 504.219\E. 518(43), p. 1762; no. 221, 25 Oct. 1647, 504.221\E. 518(47), p. 1777; no. 222, 1 Nov. 1647, 504.222\E. 520(1), pp. 1785-1786; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 42, 26 Oct. 1647, 671.442\E. 411(25), [p. 3]; no. 46, 17 Nov. 1647, 671.446\E. 416(2), [pp. 7-8]; no. 47, 23 Nov. 1647, 671.447A\E. 416(27), [p. 8].

²³ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 37, 17 Sep. 1647, 465.5037\E. 518(33), p. 251; no. 47, 26 Nov. 1647, 465.5047\E. 520(8), pp. 323-324; no. 50, 17 Dec. 1647, 465.5050\E. 520(16), pp. 340-341; *Mercurius Morbicus*, no. 1, 2, 3, [n.d., ms. 20 Sep. 1647], 350.1\E. 407(30), p. 6; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 227, 21 Sep. 1647, 214.237\E. 407(35), p. 676; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 38, 30 Sep. 1647, 671.438\E. 409(21), [p. 2].

²⁴ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 47, 26 Nov. 1647, 465.5047\E. 520(8), pp. 323-324.

²⁵ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 128, 2 Sep. 1637, 419.128\E. 405(13), p. 1245; no. 137, 4 Nov. 1647, 419.137\E. 412(25), p. 1356.

Royalist newsbooks generally failed to provide their readers with details of developments in Ireland. Yet Nedham, Hackluyt and Wharton were keen to utilize the rebellion to ridicule or discredit both parliament and the army grandees. Nedham was particularly critical of the latter. In response to the Commons' resolve to raise an additional 20,000 pounds each month for Ireland, he appeared to argue that, in order to preserve their standing at home, the grandees deemed it suitable to continue the war in Ireland indefinitely. On 19 October he noted that the:

Planters and Waterers of the Army, may be the better enabled to maintaine a Nursery of young suckling Souldiers for the service of Ireland, with all speede, for feare the Rebels should catch cold and die this Winter, and so themselves have no worke to doe the next Summer, nor the next after; for its conceived that Warre (if well managed) may last one 7 yeeres longer, that our brave men at Arms may have a tolerable pretence, and a competent time to establish themselves at home for ever.²⁶

Condemnation of parliament flowed from *Melancholicus* in November amid allegations from Hackluyt that it had diverted charitable contributions intended to feed and clothe the soldiers in Ireland. In this context, the editor questioned whether the Irish rebels or the English parliament were "the more bloody Tyrants" since these donations had been exhausted maintaining "a company of cogging, cheating and dissembling knaves."²⁷ Similar sentiments were echoed at the end of the month when *Melancholicus* directed criticism toward the committee at Derby House that was clearly designed to inflame public opinion. In reference to the recent "Jack-a-Dandy" ordinance drawn up by this committee for the relief of Ireland, Hackluyt related that the sufferings of the Protestants in that kingdom:

make no more impression upon the brazen-hearted Parliament, then an arrow shot against a Tower, or the crack of a Cannon discharged against the Center of the moon... for present reliefe...shall be sent over when two Mundayes meet in a week. Death, Hell,

²⁶ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 5, 19 Oct. 1647, 369.105\E. 411(8), p. 36.

²⁷ *Melancholicus*, no. 11, 13 Nov. 1647, 344.11\E. 414(11), pp. 65-66

Damnation. Divells, why doe ye not...ceaze at once upon these Murderers, and carry them quick unto your fiery Regions; there to sit in an Everlasting Parliament, and be a tormentor, for here they bare the hatred of God and man.²⁸

In a similar vein, recent exertions by parliament to persuade the Adventurers into purchasing more land in Ireland moved Wharton to contend that these “greedy Citizens” should be wary of adventuring additional funds for that kingdom “since they have been cheated of so much already.”²⁹ Indeed, *Elencticus* maintained that intelligence from that kingdom indicated that Jones’s foot soldiers had been mostly killed or taken captive, and that Westminster dare not publish such news for fear of discouraging fresh purchasers of Irish land.³⁰

KNOCKNANUSS

Despite reports of unrest within Inchiquin’s army over the lack of pay and provisions from the English parliament,³¹ the Munster Protestants proved formidable opponents for confederate forces. The lord president and his men had captured up to a dozen castles throughout the province, including Cashel, where it was alleged all the inhabitants had been put to the sword.³² News in early November that the confederate army in Munster was on the march under the command of Theobald Taaffe yielded further opportunity for glory.³³ Taaffe had taken the field with some 8,000 men near Mallow in County Cork,

²⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 17, 25 Nov. 1647, 344.17E. 421(10), p. 103.

²⁹ *Elencticus*, no. 2, 12 Nov. 1647, 312.02E. 414(4), p. 15; no. 3, 19 Nov. 1647, 312.03E. 416(13), p. 20. See also no. 6, 5 Jan. 1648, 312.06E. 421(34), p. 47.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 3, 19 Nov. 1647, 312.03E. 416(13), pp. 19-20.

³¹ See for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 226, 14 Sep. 1647, 214.226E. 407(4), pp. 661-662; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 129, 9 Sep. 1647, 419.129E. 406(9), p. 1259.

³² *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 132, 30 Sep. 1647, 419.132E. 409(16), p. 1291; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 36, 15 Sep. 1647, 671.436E. 407(7), [p. 7]; *Perfect Summary*, no. 11, 6 Oct. 1647, p. 84.

³³ Taaffe had been one of Ormond’s most loyal adherents, but when the marquis departed Ireland he declared his allegiance to Kilkenny. Shortly thereafter, Muskerry, who believed it necessary to attend the supreme council on a more regular basis in order to better counter Runnicini’s influence, handed him command of confederate forces in Munster. Ó Siochra, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 157.

when Inchiquin with a smaller force of approximately 5,000 soldiers goaded his counterpart into combat on 13 November at Knocknanuss Hill. The ensuing battle climaxed in a devastating defeat for the confederate army, and allowed Protestant forces in Munster to capture all the principal towns in the province bar Limerick, Waterford, and Clonmel.³⁴

Knocknanuss received extensive coverage in the newsbooks, and according to letters from Inchiquin to the English House of Commons, which surfaced in the weekly press in early December, between 4-5,000 of Taafe's soldiers were killed at the cost of less than 200 of his own men.³⁵ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* confidently asserted that this victory would have reduced the whole kingdom if winter had not intervened and forced Inchiquin from the field.³⁶ *Perfect Diurnall* subsequently related correspondence from an unidentified source in Cork, which claimed that, with the lives of many Protestants at stake, Inchiquin's soldiers, despite want of food and rags on their backs were "as valiant as any men in the whole world."³⁷ Not unexpectedly, the euphoria manifest in the parliamentary serials over Knocknanuss solicited a response from their royalist counterparts. *Elencticus* ridiculed such reports amid claims by the editor that Inchiquin's victory was more likely achieved against the cows of the province rather than the Irish.³⁸ Parliament's decision to reward Inchiquin and his men with 1,000 pounds and

³⁴ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," pp. 58-59.

³⁵ Invariably, *Moderate Intelligencer* provided the most comprehensive reports of the battle. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 141, 2 Dec. 1647, 419.141\E. 419(3), pp. 1396-1398; no. 142, 9 Dec. 1647, 419.141\E. 419(3), p. 1411; no. 144, 23 Dec. 1647, 419.144\E. 421(7), p. 1075. Similar reports can be found in *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 236, 30 Nov. 1647, 214.236\E. 418(5), p. 748; no. 237, 7 Dec. 1647, 214.238\E. 419(13), pp. 750-751; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 48, 3 Dec. 1647, 465.5048\E. 520(10), p. 333; no. 49, 10 Dec. 1647, 465.5049\E. 520(12), p. 333; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 227, 6 Dec. 1647, 504.227\E. 520(11), pp. 1826-1827; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 47, 1 Dec. 1647, 671.447B\E. 418(9), [pp. 5-7].

³⁶ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 237, 7 Dec. 1647, 214.238\E. 419(13), p. 756.

³⁷ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 1859, 3 Jan. 1648, 504.231\E. 520(21), pp. 1859-1860.

³⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 5, 3 Dec. 1647, 312.05, p. 40.

10,000 pounds respectively was also greeted with scorn. While *Elencticus* maintained that Knocknanuss was another fabrication by parliament designed to con the Adventurers into providing them with additional money,³⁹ *Pragmaticvs* was confident that the grantees would never allow these sums to reach the recipients. Instead, Nedham concluded:

the Devill a penny are they like to have, and so their heels may coole for all a Westminster Vote...because that Warre must be kept on foot still, the better to countenance the keeping up of Forces here, which could not be done handsomely if Inchiquin should thrive too much, and the Irish fall too low...And besides it is not thought policy that this New-Model of Parliament should gratifie the limbs of Presbytery, (such as Inchiquin) and part with their golden gods to men of a different Religion and Faction....⁴⁰

Royalist periodicals also voiced criticism over parliament's decision to print correspondence uncovered in Taaffe's writing cabinet taken at Knocknanuss, which included two letters penned by Digby in August 1647.⁴¹ *Perfect Diurnall* and *Perfect Weekly Account* published copies of these in early December, the substance of which suggested that, if agreement could be reached shortly between the court and Muskerry's party at Kilkenny, Taaffe should preserve his army for the king by assuming a defensive stance in Munster.⁴² *Elencticus* attempted to undermine the credibility of these claims by suggesting that pro-parliamentary pamphleteers had claimed that Digby was in France participating in a duel when these letters were supposedly written in Wexford and

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 12, 7 Dec. 1647, 369.112\E. 419(12), [p. 6]. Inchiquin's link to the political Presbyterians is addressed later in this chapter.

⁴¹ *Two Letters of the Lord Digby to the lord Taaffe* (1647), E. 419(8).

⁴² *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 227, 6 Dec. 1647, 504.227\E. 520(11), pp. 1827, 1831; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 48, 8 Dec. 1647, 671.448\E. 419(17), [pp. 3-4].

Kilkenny respectively.⁴³ But ironically, it was *Pragmaticvs* that appeared to take particular exception to Digby's alleged correspondence being unveiled. While editor of *Britanicus*, Nedham had eagerly marketed correspondence by both the king and the earl with regard to Ireland in the aftermath of both Naseby and Sherburn. Yet Nedham expediently dismissed these recent letters as forgeries promoted by the grandees in order to serve their own interests. In this vein, *Pragmaticvs* maintained that considering the present unpopularity of the army, England must be "bug-bear'd with the noise of a pretended Army to be ingaged for his Majesty out of Ireland."⁴⁴ Despite these assertions, the editor further claimed that even if Digby's correspondence was authentic, he saw nothing wrong with the king employing the Irish to help himself recover from his current predicament. Nedham concluded that this was as much the fault of those in England who had allowed the rebellion to thrive by deliberately withholding supplies to the Protestants in Ireland in order to become a "stalking horse" at home.⁴⁵

News of Knocknanuss reached the eighth confederate assembly shortly after it had opened proceedings in Kilkenny on 12 November. In the wake of Dungan's Hill, this latest disaster undermined the policy of prosecuting the war independent of a peace with the royalists, and subsequently helped restore credibility to attempts spearheaded by the peace faction toward securing such a settlement.⁴⁶ After an acrimonious debate, the assembly agreed (despite Rinuccini's objections) to send commissioners to Paris in order

⁴³ *Elencticus*, no. 6, 5 Jan. 1648, 312.06E. 421(34), p. 47. Correspondence from Digby to the earl of Clanricard in late August suggests that Digby was at Kilkenny, and was making preparations for his departure to France. John Lowe, ed., *Letter-Book of the Earl of Clanricard 1643-47* (Dublin, 1983), pp. 473, 475-476. Moreover, Digby's pleas to Taaffe appear to have been heeded as the confederate army in Munster remained inactive for the next two months while Inchiquin raided unchallenged throughout the province. Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 157.

⁴⁴ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 12, 7 Dec. 1647, 369.112E. 419(12), [p. 6].

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, [p. 7].

⁴⁶ Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 159; Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," p. 325.

to secure an agreement with the queen,⁴⁷ but with the proviso that any religious stipulations required the approval of the Vatican.⁴⁸ Together with the marquis of Antrim, Muskerry and Geoffrey Brown (two of the principal members of the peace faction) were chosen for this mission.⁴⁹ Meanwhile, French and Plunkett were both selected as envoys for Rome with instructions to induce the pope to use his influence in brokering a deal between Kilkenny and Paris. Should the negotiations with Henrietta Maria fail, they were to ask the pontiff to assume the role as papal protector of Ireland.⁵⁰ Before these missions got underway, moreover, a new supreme council was selected which reflected the revival of fortunes for the peace faction with the return of familiar figures such as Mountgarrett and Richard Bellings to that body.⁵¹

‘A FIERCER ENEMY THAN THE REBELS’

Details of these developments were conspicuously lacking in the weekly press. However, this did not prevent *Melancholicus* from proclaiming on 5 February that while the supreme council at Kilkenny was resolved to strengthen its forces by seeking support

⁴⁷ Despite Rinuccini's star beginning to fade, several parliamentary newsbooks initially reported that the clergy had prevailed against the laity at the assembly. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 145, 30 Dec. 1647, no. 145, 419.145E. 421(17), p. 1088; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 52, 31 Dec. 1647, 465.5052E. 520(20), p. 361; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 231, 3 Jan. 1648, 504.231E. 520(21), p. 1859. However, within week's it was acknowledged that Muskerry and his colleagues within the peace faction had gained the upper hand. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 149, 27 Jan. 1648, 419.149E. 423(28), p. 1136; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 235, 31 Jan. 1648, 504.235E. 520(31), p. 1893; *Anti-Pragmaticvs*, no. 19, 3 Feb. 1648, 270.19E. 425(13), p. 7.

⁴⁸ It was stressed to the envoys that in any accord with Henrietta Maria they were to secure the terms for the Catholic religion formerly granted by Glamorgan. Corish, "Ormond, Rinucinni, and the confederates," p. 325.

⁴⁹ The bishop of Clogher was originally selected to be part of the three-man delegation. A close associate of both Rinuccini and O'Neill, the bishop refused the appointment on grounds that he spoke neither English nor French, and that he was unpopular with the queen and her counselors. Amid bitter recriminations, this issue threatened the future of the assembly, and it wasn't until Plunkett (who was acting as the chairman of that body) orchestrated a compromise that the situation was diffused. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 162-163; Corish, "Ormond, Rinucinni, and the confederates," p. 325.

⁵⁰ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 161-162, 167-169. Another delegation was approved for Spain, but there is no evidence that this ever left Ireland.

⁵¹ The moderates, however, continued to control the balance of power on the new council. Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 164-165.

from the continent, the “Juglers at Westminster” and the “cowardly Saints of the Army” would require God’s forgiveness for failing to act accordingly.⁵² By 1648 Protestant troop strength in Ireland ranged between 18-25,000 men, while a similar number of confederates were believed to be arms.⁵³ But although both sides were of equal strength, soldiers in each camp generally faced an arduous existence. Inadequate and unhygienic shelter, a poor diet, and a wet climate often resulted in sickness and disease among soldiers. This was particularly true for parliamentary troops, who relied heavily on money and provisions from England.⁵⁴ In view of such problems, these forces were generally limited to conducting short foraging campaigns into confederate-held territory, which helped increase their own supplies, while at the same time denying resources to the enemy.⁵⁵ Indeed, reports from Ireland suggested that keeping his men in the field was the only means by which Jones could keep them warm and disciplined.⁵⁶

Although the pro-parliamentary newsbooks generally provided bald narratives of military activity in Ireland at this time, readers were left in no doubt as to the hardships faced by Westminster’s forces. Amid reports that the present Irish winter was “a fiercer enemy than the Rebels,” the editor of *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* reminded his

⁵² *Melancholicus*, no. 23, 5 Feb. 1648, 344.23\E. 426(4), pp. 135-136.

⁵³ Wheeler, “Four Armies In Ireland,” pp. 50-51; Ohlmeyer, “Wars of Religion,” pp. 170-171.

⁵⁴ Ohlmeyer, “Wars of Religion,” pp. 178-180.

⁵⁵ These incursions were well documented in the parliamentary weeklies, and included Jones’s expeditions into Wicklow, Westmeath and Kildare. Rather than responding directly to these strikes, however, O’Neill generally retaliated by withdrawing supplies from Protestant reach. For divers reports of these operations see, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 150, 3 Feb. 1648, 419.150\E. 425(11), pp. 1147-1148; no. 151, 10 Feb. 1648, 419.151\E. 426(20), pp. 1159-1160; no. 154, 2 Mar. 1648, 419.154\E. 430(11), p. 1195; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 236, 7 Feb. 1648, 504.236\E. 520(34), p. 1901; no. 237, 14 Feb. 1648, 504.237\E. 520(37), p. 1906; no. 240, 6 Mar. 1648, 504.240\E. 522(2), pp. 1932-1933; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 57, 4 Feb. 1648, 465.5057\E. 520(32), pp. 401-402; no. 61, 3 Mar. 1648, 465.5061\E. 522(1), p. 503; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 250, 7 Mar. 1648, 214.250\E. 431(10), p. 864; *Kingdomes Weekly Account*, no. 9, 8 Mar. 1648, 180.09\E. 431(13), pp. 70-71. Most likely edited by the former parliamentary censor Henry Walley, *Kingdomes Weekly Account* first appeared in January 1648 as *Heads of Chiefe Passages in Parliament*.

⁵⁶ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 250, 7 Mar. 1648, 214.250\E. 431(10), p. 864; *Kingdomes Weekly Account*, no. 9, 8 Mar. 1648, 180.09\E. 431(13), pp. 70-71.

readers of the adverse effect that both cold and hunger could have on these soldiers.⁵⁷

Perhaps drawing on personal experiences, the editor noted that "All Rebellions are dangerous in themselves, but the rebellion of the belly is the most desperate of all."⁵⁸ In fact, shortages in Dublin were such, he later revealed, that in the process of a recent expedition marching forth from the city a number of Jones's soldiers were forced to borrow shoes and clothes from civilians in the streets.⁵⁹ Likewise, *Perfect Diurnall* reported that parliamentary troops in the Irish capital tramp the streets "more like ghosts than men," while even the officers, who had received no pay for over four months, were forced to beg for bread from the common soldiers when they had some to spare.⁶⁰

Although there may have been much manipulation of events in Ireland, at the same time Inchiquin's campaign in Munster was communicated to English readers. Inchiquin's men had been active in Tipperary where they successfully relieved Cahir, occupied Carrick, and took Callan - this last success generating reports that above 300 Irish were put to the sword, including a number of women to whom the soldiers refused mercy.⁶¹ The lack of humanity by the Munster Protestants may have stemmed from their frustration that, despite their successes in recent months, parliament continued to provide them with little or no supplies. *Kingdomes Weekly Post* relayed claims from the province that insufficient clothing had forced troops to share their uniforms. Thus while some

⁵⁷ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 244, 25 Jan. 1648, 214.244\E. 423(23), p. 816.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 245, 1 Feb. 1648, 214.245\E. 424(10), p. 824.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 249, 29 Feb. 1648, 214.249\E. 429(11), pp. 850-851.

⁶⁰ *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 237, 14 Feb. 1648, 504.237\E. 520(37), p. 1911.

⁶¹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 252, 21 Mar. 1648, 214.252\E. 433(7), pp. 873-874; *Kingdomes Weekly Account*, no. 10, 15 Mar. 1648, 180.10\E. 432(13), pp. 68-69; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 156, 16 Mar. 1648, 419.156\E. 432(17), pp. 1219-1220; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 242, 20 Mar. 1648, 504.242\E. 522(7), p. 1645.

soldiers served in the field others were forced to remain in their beds.⁶² Convinced that the lack of food and clothes had contributed to the death of some of his men, Inchiquin informed parliament in February 1648 that if aid and money did not reach him shortly he would be forced to transport his troops to England.⁶³

While the parliamentary periodicals may have conveyed news of the desperate straits faced by Protestant forces in Ireland in an attempt to secure appropriate funding, their royalist counterparts continued to utilize the plight of these troops to undermine parliament and the grandees. Not for the first time was an Irish issue used to wage an English political battle, and accordingly, amid the advent of popular pro-royalist disturbances in England, attacks against both parties over this issue intensified.⁶⁴ Notwithstanding parliament's decision in February to levy 20,000 pounds each month for Ireland, *Elencticus* claimed that this was yet another "old Worme eaten pretence... to stuffe up their own Pockets... support their own Tyranny, and to ingrosse to themselves the Riches of the Kingdome."⁶⁵ *Mercurius Bellicvs* provided its readers with an equally caustic rebuke of parliament by contending that the Protestants in Ireland were now prepared to eat their own flesh, while our "Statemongerers" feast high as "ravenous devourers of the Poore."⁶⁶

⁶² *Kingdomes Weekly Post*, no. 9, 1 Mar. 1648, 215.9A/E. 430(6), p. 67. This serial, which has been attributed to Daniel Border, operated between 5 January and 9 March 1648.

⁶³ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 250, 7 Mar. 1648, 214.250A/E. 431(10), pp. 858-859. See also no. 249, 29 Feb. 1648, 214.249A/E. 429(11), p. 856.

⁶⁴ For example, see Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 45, 69.

⁶⁵ *Elencticus*, no. 13, 23 Feb. 1648, 312.13, pp. 97-98.

⁶⁶ *Mercurius Bellicvs. Or, an Alarum to all Rebels*, no. 4, 20 Feb. 1648, 279.04A/E. 428(4), pp. 6-7.

Perhaps following the example set by Nedham, his former antagonist, John Berkenhead had returned to serial news and launched *Bellicvs* in November 1647.⁶⁷ Berkenhead's presence ensured that satire remained an integral part of this serial's arsenal in disparaging the king's adversaries. For example, upon news in February 1648 that the Commons had ordered canon to be shipped for Leinster, the author responded that if the Protestants in that kingdom could "digest buttered bullets out of a Cannon in flakes, and frie them over a barrell of Gunpowder, they shall not starve."⁶⁸ Despite retaining his wit, Berkenhead enjoyed neither the resources nor the access to the intelligence that accompanied him as editor of *Aulicus*, and thus *Bellicvs* never achieved the notoriety to which the Oxford based serial had been accustomed.⁶⁹

Aulicus itself resurfaced in February, although Samuel Shepherd rather than Berkenhead appeared to be responsible for the renaissance of this title.⁷⁰ It too lost little time in addressing the lack of support for Protestant forces in Ireland, and accordingly assailed the Independent leadership for its culpability on this issue. On 24 February Shepherd vilified Fairfax or "King Tom" for disbanding the northern horse after several attempts to have these men shipped to Dublin had failed. Irrespective of the fact that the lord general was forced to take these measures in response to storms in the Irish Sea, *Aulicus* portrayed matters in a much different light. Fairfax's decision, the editor proclaimed, was made to enhance his authority in England, and the:

grandest piece of Treason, that ever was committed by a subject who knows that if our Irish forces should prevail, they would set their swords against his sides; and if the Rebels

⁶⁷ Although the first two numbers of *Bellicvs* appeared on 22 November and 29 November 1647 respectively, it wasn't until 14 February 1648 that the paper resurfaced. With Berkenhead at the helm, *Bellicvs* continued to operate on a weekly basis until July of that year.

⁶⁸ *Bellicvs*, no. 5, 29 Feb. 1648, 279.05\E. 429(15), p. 8. For similar remarks see also *Mercurius Aulicus: Again Communicating Intelligence from all Parts*, no. 4, 24 Feb. 1648, 273.04\E. 429(4), [p. 4].

⁶⁹ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 154-155; Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 143-144.

⁷⁰ *Aulicus*, no. 1, 3 Feb. 1648, 273.01\E. 425(8).

there gain the day, then hath hee a faire colour to keepe up his Standards heer; and spread his flaunting plumes over every corner of this Kingdome, and play Lord Paromount over all the Estates and persons of the People.⁷¹

Furthermore, *Elencticus* questioned how victory could ever be attained in Ireland when Fairfax and his retinue could devour 500 pounds at one dinner, while English soldiers in that kingdom died daily from cold and hunger having failed to receive as much as five pennies this past several months.⁷² This concern by the royalist newsbooks, however, was most likely inspired not so much by compassion for the Protestants in that kingdom than by a desire to see both substantial resources and a sizable parliamentary army shipped out of England.⁷³ Growing discontent in divers English counties toward parliament and the army suggested that a royalist coup d'état was imminent, and as spring dawned the first of a series of popular uprisings provided the opportunity for this to take place.

A SECOND CIVIL WAR

Westminster and the grandees were under no illusion as to the domestic crisis that they faced. Poor harvests, inflation and high unemployment all contributed to a climate of anger and frustration felt by much of the population in England in the aftermath of the first civil war. In addition, failure to supplant semi-military local administrations (formed during the first civil war to raise money and recruit soldiers) with traditional civilian governments, and the arbitrary manner with which the authorities suppressed traditional practices only served to foster agitation and abetted demands for a return to economic and political normality.⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, no. 4, 24 Feb. 1648, 273.04\E. 429(4), [pp. 4-5].

⁷² *Elencticus*, no. 12, 16 Feb. 1648, 312.12, p. 89.

⁷³ Thomas, *Berkenhead*, pp. 155-156.

⁷⁴ Robert Ashton, *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution, 1603-1649* (London, 1978), pp. 278-287, 320-321; Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 45, 69.

The impasse between the king and parliament provided additional momentum for these sentiments. Charles's escape from Hampton Court in November 1647, and his renewed captivity on the Isle of Wight shortly thereafter, suggested that the prospects of a settlement remained dim.⁷⁵ This appeared even more remote in December when the king concluded an agreement with the Scots that engendered a fresh military threat to the Westminster regime. Grieved at being excluded from negotiating a settlement with the king, the Scots had grown increasingly disturbed over the ascendancy of the Independents at Westminster and the growing radicalism within the army. In this context, the ensuing *Engagement* between Charles and the Scottish commissioners proposed that, in return for military assistance from Scotland, the king would establish Presbyterianism in England for a three-year period, during which time plans for a final religious settlement were to be finalized.⁷⁶

News of this alliance resulted in parliament passing the *Vote of No Addresses* on 17 January 1648, thereby terminating all negotiations with the king.⁷⁷ It also helped restore unity to the army, which proved indispensable given the mood of the kingdom over the weeks and months ahead. In February, what originated as a military mutiny over demobilization in South Wales, had within weeks given rise to a more popular revolt that saw the insurgents openly declare for the king. By April royalist forces in northern England mobilized and successfully seized both Berwick and Carlisle by the end of the month, while a series of uprisings erupted in East Anglia, Essex and Kent in April and May. Collectively referred to as the 'Second Civil War', these uprisings were generally

⁷⁵ Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 14-20.

⁷⁶ Kenyon, *Civil Wars of England*, pp. 176-177; Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 39-41.

⁷⁷ Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 50-53.

uncoordinated, and were often motivated not so much by patent royalist affection than by parochial grievances against parliament and the army. Nonetheless, they were sufficient to ensure that Fairfax, Cromwell, and their colleagues in the New Model were once again forced to arms.⁷⁸

A significant increase in the number of newsbooks accompanied events as they unfolded during the spring and summer of 1648. Between March and August a total of thirty-six new serials sprouted to life,⁷⁹ and the fact that the vast majority of these titles were pro-royalist no doubt reflected the current mood of the country. At times, however, many of the editors responsible for these new publications paid little attention to the news, particularly Ireland, but rather engaged in trading personal insults and name-calling with their rivals.⁸⁰ Moreover, similar to the uprisings themselves, most of these periodicals proved relatively short-lived and lasted fewer than five numbers.⁸¹

The most significant newcomer was neither royalist nor fleeting. Launched on 29 June, *The Moderate* was born out of a dispute between Dillingham and Gilbert

⁷⁸ Kenyon, *Civil Wars of England*, pp. 178–182.

⁷⁹ March witnessed the introduction of *Mercurius Insanus*, N&S 335, *Perfect Weekly Account*, N&S 533, *Packets of Letters*, N&S 480, and *VWestminster Projects*, N&S 710; April marked the advent of *Ierimiah Revived*, N&S 206, *Mercurius Academicus*, N&S 261, *Mercurius Britannicus*, N&S 284, *Mercurius Critticus*, N&S 303, *Mercurius Militaris Communicating Intelligence*, N&S 347, *Mercurius Militaris, or the People's Scout*, N&S 348, and *Mercurius Veridicus*, N&S 391; May saw the debut of *Journal of Parliament*, N&S 208, *Mercurius Britanicus*, N&S 282, *Mercurius Gallicus*, N&S 326, *Mercurius Honestus*, N&S 331, *Mercurius Poeticus*, N&S 360, *Mercurius Publicus*, N&S 377, *Mercurius Urbanicus*, N&S 389, and *Parliament – kite*, N&S 483; June gave rise to *Mercurius Censorius*, N&S 296, *Mercurius Domesticus*, N&S 310, *Mercurius Psitacus*, N&S 375, *The Moderate*, N&S 413, *Nevv Nevvs*, N&S 442, *Parliaments Scrich-owle*, N&S 489, *Parliaments Vulture*, N&S 490, and *Perfect Diary of Passages*, N&S 499; July witnessed the birth of *Mercvrjvs Melancholicvs*, N&S 345, *Mercurius Scoticus*, N&S 385 and *Royall Diurnall*, N&S 588; and August concluded with the arrival of *Colchester Spie*, N&S 48, *Hermes Strajcus*, N&S 185, *Mercurius Anglicvs*, N&S 263, *Mercurius Aquaticus*, N&S 271, and *Mercurius Fidelicus*, N&S 321.

⁸⁰ Amid slurs such as “Poyesen-head” and “Arse-worme,” Henry Walker, the principal Independent editor, bore the brunt of these insults. See for example, *Psitacus*, no. 1, 12 Jun. 1648, 375.1, p. 5 [sic]; *Melancholicvs*, no. 1, 28 Jun. 1648, 345.1\E. 455(1), p. 6; *Colchester Spie*, no. 2, 17 Aug. 1648, 48.2\E. 459(13), [p. 3]; *Royall Diurnall*, no. 3, 14 Aug. 1648, 588.3\E. 458(15), [p. 8].

⁸¹ Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 60 n.187; Frank, *English Newspaper*, appendix D, pp. 283–284.

Mabbott.⁸² In conjunction with Dillingham's printer, Robert White, Mabbott briefly appropriated the title, numbering and other characteristic features of *Moderate Intelligencer* in June to produce an alternative issue of the paper with his imprimatur stamped on its pages. However, complaints by Dillingham to the House of Lords forced White to rename and renumber his rendering of that title to *The Moderate*.⁸³ Most likely, Mabbott continued to assume responsibility for the editorials,⁸⁴ and by the fall of 1648 these clearly revealed that *The Moderate* had become a platform for championing the Leveller program.⁸⁵

INCHIQUIN'S TRUCE

Royalist aspirations were further boosted in the spring of 1648 with news that Inchiquin had abandoned Westminster in favor of the king. On 3 April the lord president agreed to a cease-fire with the confederates and on 20 May both parties agreed to a formal truce. Despite divers successes in recent months, Inchiquin had grown disillusioned with parliament over its failure to provide adequate supplies for his forces. But this decision had also been influenced by the ascendancy of the Independents in England.⁸⁶ No doubt

⁸² The dispute centered on derogatory remarks made in *Moderate Intelligencer* on 11 May concerning the mistreatment of John Lilburne (a leading Leveller) by the authorities. In response, Dillingham proclaimed *Dieu nous donne les Parlyaments briefe, Rois de vie longue* - which resulted in Mabbott refusing to license this particular copy. *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 164, 11 May 1648, 419.164\E. 441(30), pp. 1314-1314. Cotton, "John Dillingham," pp. 829-830; Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 152-153; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 65; Brailsford, *The Levellers*, p. 402.

⁸³ Cotton, "John Dillingham," pp. 829-830; Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 152-155; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 65; Brailsford, *The Levellers*, p. 402.

⁸⁴ While Raymond, Frank and Brailsford support Mabbott's authorship, this claim has been rejected by Cotton, and questioned by Jurgen Dieth. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 65-67; Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 153-155; Brailsford, *The Levellers*, pp. 406-408; Cotton, "London Newsbooks in the Civil War," pp. 258-266; Jurgen Dieth, "The Moderate. Politics and Allegiances of a Revolutionary Newspaper," *History of Political Thought* 4 (1983), p. 251.

⁸⁵ For details on the connection between *The Moderate* and the Leveller movement see Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 154-160; Roger Howell, Jr. and David E. Brewster, "Reconsidering the Levellers: The Evidence of *The Moderate*," *Past and Present* 46 (1970), pp. 68-86; Brailsford, *The Levellers*, pp. 401-416; Dieth, "The Moderate," pp. 247-294.

⁸⁶ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 161, 20 Apr. 1648, 419.161\E. 436(15), pp. 1269-1270.

the earl harbored memories of the manner in which he had been treated by Lisle when the parliamentary-appointed lord lieutenant arrived in the province to take up his post in February 1647. Accompanied by a retinue of hard-line Independents, Lisle's arrival in Munster had borne closer semblance to an army of conquest rather than one of relief amid attempts by the viscount to impose authoritarian rule.⁸⁷ Relations became further strained by a power struggle in the province between Inchiquin and lord Broghill. Mirroring the Presbyterian-Independent divisions in England, Broghill's commitment to the Lisle camp forced Inchiquin to employ his Presbyterian connections at Westminster to undermine the lord lieutenant's expedition by claiming that it was intended to bring Ireland under the control of the political Independents.⁸⁸ In view of the fact that Lisle's commission required renewal by parliament before 15 April 1647, these charges helped ensure that any plans to extend his lieutenancy failed.⁸⁹ However, articles of impeachment drawn up by the army against Holles, Stapleton and nine of their associates in August 1647 weakened Inchiquin's standing at Westminster. And the subsequent ascendancy of Lisle, Temple, and like-minded Independents at Derby House suggested that Irish affairs would be subjected to the guiding hand of that particular faction.⁹⁰

Similar to his conversion to parliament in 1644, news of Inchiquin's latest volte-face attracted widespread attention from the weekly press. But while pro-parliamentary titles had rejoiced at the earl's earlier migration, on this occasion the editors generally

⁸⁷ Armstrong, "Protestant Ireland," p. 270; Murphy, "Munster Protestants," p. 12; Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," pp. 145-146.

⁸⁸ Inchiquin's allies included Denzil Holles and Sir Philip Stapleton, who both sat on the Derby House Committee for Irish Affairs at Westminster.

⁸⁹ Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," pp. 145-147, 150-153; Murphy, "Munster Protestants," pp. 12-14.

⁹⁰ Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost," pp. 154-155; Murphy, "Munster Protestants," p. 14.

related the current revelation in a series of bland and relatively subdued reports.⁹¹ Not surprisingly, the lord president's decision to forsake Westminster was widely acclaimed by their royalist counterparts, who employed it to launch fresh attacks against parliament and the army over the forthcoming weeks. Nedham proclaimed that MPs had not only been "planet-strooke" by Inchiquin's defection, but they had ordered the doors of the Commons to be closed for fear that some members would convey "the Infection to Malignant eares."⁹² Likewise, Berkenhead alleged that this news had shaken the House to the point that members "sate for a good while looking upon one another like men dropt from the clouds."⁹³ The Commons' decision to annul the lord president's powers and vote him a traitor attracted further derision. Rather, *Melancholicus* asserted that they should reserve that title for themselves, for "never were such a Pack of Traytors and Rebels shuffl'd together since England was England."⁹⁴ In addition, the editor maintained that while the earl had done everything within his power to sustain his troops, our:

pittillesse, Godlesse Parliament... wallow in the Wealth of the whole kingdome, and shut up his Majestic from helping or relieving these distressed souls, bathing in their goar, whilst they sit at Westminster (by the help of a man mid-wife) to invent Bathes and Bathes-shoes to bathe their luxurious limbes.⁹⁵

Prominent Independents in both parliament and the army attracted the lion's share of scorn from the royalist triumvirate. Cromwell and Fairfax were both vilified for allegedly contriving to secure funds from parliament at the expense of the Munster

⁹¹ For example, see *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 18 Apr. 1648, 214.256\E. 436(2), p. 910; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 67, 14 Apr. 1648, 465.5067\E. 522(17), p. 482; no. 68, 21 Apr. 1648, 465.5068\E. 522(19), pp. 476-477; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 246, 17 Apr. 1648, 504.246\E. 522(18), p. 1984; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 6, 19 Apr. 1648, 533.06\E. 436(10), pp. 34-36; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 161, 20 Apr. 1648, 419.161\E. 436(15), p. 1270.

⁹² *Pragmaticvs*, no. 2, 11 Apr. 1648, 369.202\E. 435(12), p. 4.

⁹³ *Bellicvs*, no. 13, 25 Apr. 1648, 279.13\E. 437(5), p. 8.

⁹⁴ *Melancholicus*, no. 34, 24 Apr. 1648, 344.34\E. 436(23), p. 201.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 32, 10 Apr. 1648, 344.32\E. 435(5), p. 187.

Protestants.⁹⁶ Furthermore, *Pragmaticvs* insisted that Lisles's lieutenancy had been orchestrated by their political colleagues in order to "worm out Inchiquin...Jones, and all Presbyterians there in Authority," which when accomplished, would allow "Creatures of their own to domineer in that Kingdome, as well as this."⁹⁷ The Independent junta at Derby House, it was charged, had not only purposely neglected Inchiquin, but was now engaged with Broghill and similar "Independent creatures" among the New English in Ireland to feign a declaration certifying that all Protestants in that kingdom opposed the earl.⁹⁸ Attacks upon Independent involvement in Irish affairs were no more conspicuous than in Nedham's character assassination of Lisle. Ironically, as the author of *Britanicus* in the spring of 1646, Nedham had appeared as an advocate of this faction's efforts to secure the lord lieutenancy for Lisle. In the aftermath of his conversion to the royalist fold, however, he did not balk in deriding the viscount. On 20 June *Pragmaticvs* claimed that Lisle had pawned his soul to this junta in order to escape impeachment for misusing funds during his tenure in Ireland.⁹⁹ Lisles's alleged lack of valor while serving in that kingdom was further stressed, and duly became the butt of Nedham's wit:

This Gentleman is an excellent Generall for a running Army; for, then, you shall be sure to have him alwaies in the head of his men. Witness his famous services in Ireland, where it was a wonder to see how active his Lordship was wont upon a petty Rout, that he went beyond all the other Commanders, and got ground so manfully, that he scorn'd to rally at less forty miles distance...and then only to take Guard of the best Runners for his Convoy. Once his Lordship was in a grievous Fright, upon an unexpected appearance of one of his own Parties; and to shew that he held more confidence in the Spurr than the Sword, he ran off his head piece for hast, and rode bellowing a maine, through Towne and Country, For God's sake, a horse: An hundred pounds for a fresh horse to Dun-cannon.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ See for example, *Melancholicus*, no. 31, 3 Apr. 1648, 344.31\E. 434(14), p. 185; no. 32, 10 Apr. 1648, 344.32\E. 435(5), p. 188; *Pragmaticvs*, no. 1, 4 Apr. 1648, 369.201\E. 434(17), [p. 8].

⁹⁷ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 12, 20 Jun. 1648, 369.212\E. 448(17), [pp. 2-3].

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 4, 25 Apr. 1648, 369.204\E. 437(4), pp. 7-8; *Elencticus*, no. 22, 26 Apr. 1648, 312.22\E. 437(10), pp. 169-170. Broghill's co-conspirators were named as Sir Adam Loftus, Sir Arthur Loftus, Sir Robert King, and Sir Robert Meredith.

⁹⁹ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 12, 20 Jun. 1648, 369.212\E. 448(17), [pp. 2-3].

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

For Nedham and his colleagues it was clear that the ascendancy of the Independents represented a serious threat to the restoration of the king. Inchiquin's decision to forsake parliament afforded the royalist editors the opportunity to highlight this, and in this context their attacks were not only designed to influence popular opinion, but may also have been directed at those Presbyterians who remained committed in reaching a political and religious settlement with the crown.

News of Inchiquin's cease-fire also cultivated fresh optimism among royalist newsbooks for Stuart fortunes in all three kingdoms. Portraying Ireland as the king's "Prodigall Sonne," *Mercurius Insanus* rejoiced that it is "with penitence returned to it's loveing Father, from feeding like swine upon the nasty husks of rebellion, and to enjoy the plentiful fruit of the fat calfe, of Peace and tranquility...."¹⁰¹ Prior cessations with the Irish had generally been promoted in the parliamentary press as a precursor to an invasion of England. On this occasion, however, royalist periodicals were generally responsible for advancing claims of an Inchiquin-led expedition that was expected to aid the royalist revolts in both England and Wales.¹⁰² The prospect of this encouraged *Mercurius Publicus* to appeal for unity among the Irish, Scots and Welsh, who, the editor insisted, had all suffered as a result of the contrivances by these "Monstrous Generation of Independents, begot by the Divell upon the Peoples capricious Ignorance."¹⁰³ By May

¹⁰¹ *Mercurius Insanus*, [unnumbered], [n.d., ms 24 Apr. 1648], 335.4\E. 436(24), pp. 2-3 [sic].

¹⁰² For example, *Mercurius Veridicus*, no. 1, 21 Apr. 1648, 391.1\E. 436(18), [p. 6]; no. 2, 27 Apr. 1648, 391.2\E. 437(14), [p. 4]; *New News*, [unnumbered], [11 Jun. 1648], 442.1, [p. 7]; *Melancholicus*, no. 34, 24 Apr. 1648, 344.34\E. 436(23), p. 201; *Pragmaticus*, no. 2, 11 Apr. 1648, 369.202\E. 435(12), [p. 4]; no. 15, 11 Jul. 1648, 369.215\E. 451(42), [p. 8]; *Parliament-Kite*, no. 14, 24 Aug. 1648, 483.14\E. 460(31), p. 87; *Elencicus*, no. 42, 13 Aug. 1648, 312.42\E. 463(6), p. 342.

¹⁰³ *Mercurius Publicus*, no. 3, 29 May 1648, 377.3\E. 445(19), pp. 18-20.

even *Moderate Intelligencer* lamented that such was the dissatisfaction among the Welsh toward parliament at this time, that the Irish would be embraced in those parts.¹⁰⁴

In Ireland, meanwhile, not everyone was enthused over the Inchiquin truce. Convinced that it did not serve the interests of the Catholic Church, but was instead part of a ploy to bring Ormond back to the kingdom, Rinuccini and his supporters opposed the agreement.¹⁰⁵ Having failed to prevent the cessation, the nuncio forsook Kilkenny, sought refuge with O'Neill (who also condemned the cease-fire¹⁰⁶) and pronounced excommunication on all those who supported it.¹⁰⁷ Despite appeals to Rome from the supreme council against Rinuccini's actions, it was clear that an irrevocable division within the confederacy had emerged between the clergy and native Irish - who generally supported the nuncio - and the Old English who largely endorsed the truce.¹⁰⁸ Consequently, O'Neill's opposition to the accord ensured that throughout the summer of 1648 the supreme council was forced to utilize much of its energy combating their former Ulster commander in both Connaught and Leinster rather than converging valuable resources in defeating parliamentary forces.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 166, 25 May 1648, 419.166\E. 449(9), p. 1349.

¹⁰⁵ Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," p. 329.

¹⁰⁶ Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, i, pp. 741-743.

¹⁰⁷ Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, pp. 165-167; Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 174-177.

¹⁰⁸ It should be stressed that divisions also emerged within the clerical faction at this point. In light of recent military and financial shortcomings, several leading bishops opposed Rinuccini's actions amid the belief that some form of settlement was required with Inchiquin and the royalists in order to prosecute confederate aims. Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 177-185; Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," pp. 329-331.

¹⁰⁹ Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," pp. 59-60. See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 166, 25 May, 1648, 419.166\E. 444(9), p. 1359; no. 168, 8 Jun. 1648, 419.168\E. 446(28), p. 1384; no. 169, 15 Jun. 1648, 419.169\E. 447(24), p. 1394; *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 264, 13 Jun. 1648, 214.264\E. 447(10), p. 972; no. 265, 20 Jun. 1648, 214.265\E. 448(20), p. 984; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 75, 9 Jun. 1648, 465.5075\E. 522(37), p. 545; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 14, 21 Jun. 1648, 533.14\E. 449(12), [p. 6].

'GO ON AND PROSPER LOYALL ORMOND'

Significant as these developments were, the resumption of conflict in England resulted in a significant drop in the volume of Irish news in both the parliamentary and royalist newsbooks. Despite efforts by *Moderate Intelligencer* and *Perfect Occurrences* to continue their coverage of events in Ireland,¹¹⁰ most serials generally paid scant attention to the rebellion during the summer. This was particularly true for the royalist mercuries, several of which failed to provide their readers with any news or commentary relating to Irish affairs for weeks on end.¹¹¹ The conflict closer to home preoccupied these papers, but this provided little to be cheerful about. New Model forces had suppressed the divers royalist uprisings within weeks, and although a Scottish army comprising approximately 9,000 men under the Duke of Hamilton had crossed into England on 8 July, by mid August it had been routed by Cromwell at Preston. After a brief mopping up campaign in the north, the major general successfully invaded Scotland, and by early October terms were agreed between Cromwell and the earl of Argyll, (who had opposed Hamilton's expedition) that placed the Edinburgh government in the hands of the earl and fellow anti-engagers.¹¹²

With the second civil war all but over the Irish rebellion once again commanded greater attention from the periodical press. The collapse of royalist fortunes in both England and Scotland meant that Ireland remained the last hope for the Stuart monarchy. This too appeared to be waning when Colonel George Monck, who had received a

¹¹⁰ *Perfect Occurrences*, for example, appears to have been the only newsbook to carry details of the schism within confederate ranks. *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 78, 30 Jun. 1648, 465.5078\E. 522(45), p. 376.

¹¹¹ *Bellicvs*, for example, failed to relate any news concerning Ireland between May and July. Likewise, *Pragmaticvs* and *Melancholicvs* contained no Irish material in May and June respectively.

¹¹² Kenyon, *Civil Wars of England*, pp. 186-192.

commission in July 1647 to command all parliamentary forces in Ulster - except the regiments of Monro- successfully seized Carrickfergus, Belfast and Coleraine from the Scots in September 1648.¹¹³ *Moderate Intelligencer* welcomed news of Monck's achievements and concluded that as a result of these successes, conditions in Ulster now surpassed those in America as an incentive to new plantation. Dillingham added that the province now yielded "As much ground to plant a new, as all Wales, which may be... gone into without wasting the greatest part of a man's Estate, and apparent danger of life." Nonetheless, he cautioned that for this plantation to succeed, "righteous Laws, and righteous men" were needed in Ulster to help lay the appropriate foundation for this settlement.¹¹⁴

These successes, and parliament's decision to reward Monck with 500 pounds, invoked the ire of the royalist newsbooks. Nowhere was this more evident than in the pages of *Mercurio Volpone*.¹¹⁵ Indicative of the editor's staunchly anti-Independent stance, *Volpone* claimed that the colonel's treachery had been perpetrated by the Independents in order to expel the Scots from Ulster, thus securing the plantation for their own ends. These allegations were based on correspondence from the province, which claimed that Monck's actions were one of the "most barbarous and un-Souldierlike Acts" launched without first informing Monro that a state of hostilities existed between the two

¹¹³ Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 263-264.

¹¹⁴ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 185, 5 Oct. 1648, 419.185\E. 465(39), p. 1567; also no. 186, 12 Oct. 1648, 419.186\E. 467(16), p. 1677 [irregular pagination]. Additional reports of Monck's Ulster successes in the pro-parliamentary weeklies can be found in *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 279, 3 Oct. 1648, 214.279\E. 465(23), pp. 1102, 1104; *The Moderate*, no. 12, 3 Oct. 1648, 413.2012\E. 465(25), p. 92; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 270, 2 Oct. 1648, 504.270\E. 526(11), p. 2175; no. 271, 9 Oct. 1648, 504.271\E. 526(14), p. 2178; *Perfect Weekly Account*, no. 29, 4 Oct. 1648, 533.29\E. 465(29), [p. 2].

¹¹⁵ This newsbook debuted on 5 October 1648, but only lasted for two issues.

commanders.¹¹⁶ Clearly embittered, the anonymous correspondent concluded that since Ireland neither produced nor entertained venomous creatures, [snakes] “I trust the poysonus vermin of Independency, shall never settle nor thrive within its Borders; In comparison of whom a Scot is an angel of light....”¹¹⁷

Despite these setbacks in Ulster, the royalist mercuries were provided with renewed optimism when Ormond returned to Ireland (he landed at Cork) from France at the end of September. As part of a grand royalist strategy incorporating all three Stuart kingdoms,¹¹⁸ the marquis had been instructed by the queen in Paris to reach a settlement with the confederates and thus mobilize both the pro-royalist Catholic and Protestant factions in Ireland.¹¹⁹ In anticipation of his arrival the supreme council summoned the ninth confederate assembly to gather at Kilkenny on 4 September. Considering recent royalist fortunes in both England and Scotland, it was not beyond reason that an expedient agreement would be reached between the lord lieutenant and the duly appointed confederate commissioners. Yet, over the ensuing weeks failure by both parties to reach harmony over religious concessions ensured that a settlement remained beyond reach.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ *Mercurio Volpone*, no. 1, 5 Oct. 1648, 259.1\E. 465(37), pp. 2-3. See also *Elencticus*, no. 46, 11 Oct. 1648, 312.46A\E. 467(14), p. 382 and *Pragmaticus*, no. 27, 3 Oct. 1648, 369.227\E. 465(19), p. 11. Monck's surprise assault on Carrickfergus appears to have been in response to Monro's nephew, Sir George Monro, leading 3,000 troops from Ulster in July to assist Hamilton in England. Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 260-263.

¹¹⁷ *Volpone*, no. 1, 5 Oct. 1648, 259.1\E. 465(37), p. 3. See also no. 2, 12 Oct. 1648, 259.2\E. 467(22), pp. 9-10.

¹¹⁸ This was certainly the opinion of Jones, who maintained that both Inchiquin's truce and Ormond's arrival in Ireland had been designed to coincide with the uprisings in England and the invasion from Scotland. *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 229[sic], 30 Oct. 1648, 504.274\E. 526(21), p. 2208.

¹¹⁹ Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 185; Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 171. Ormond had spent the past several months at the exiled royal court in Paris where he had represented the queen in negotiations with the confederate commissioners.

¹²⁰ For a detailed examination of negotiations between Ormond and the confederates during this time see Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 185-197.

Within four weeks, Ormond's return to Irish soil had been confirmed at Westminster.¹²¹ Invariably, it generated considerable attention in the weekly press, and over the next several weeks there was a marked increase in the volume of news concerning Ireland in both the royalist and parliamentary newsbooks. Papers in both camps contended that the lord lieutenant had successfully united, or intended to do so, all Irish factions and that he was now prepared to head a strike against the parliamentary forces at Dublin.¹²² Clearly excited by these reports, *Elencticus* boldly cheered "Go on and prosper Loyall ORMOND."¹²³ *Pragmaticvs* was optimistic that as a result of these latest developments Jones would shortly be rooted out of Dublin and that the king would recover the first of his three kingdoms. Nedham concluded that Charles would soon recover both England and Scotland also, his majesty "being Master of the hearts of many hundred thousands...."¹²⁴

Concern over Ormond successfully reaching an agreement with the confederates resulted in parliamentary commissioners being dispatched to the king in order to solicit a public repudiation of the lord lieutenant's actions. Charles's evasive response to this

¹²¹ Rumors of Ormond's imminent return to Ireland, or even claims that he had actually landed had surfaced in the parliamentary press long before the marquis actually arrived. See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 163, 4 May, 1648, 419.163\E. 438(14), p. 1303; no. 176, 3 Aug. 1648, 419.176\E. 456(23), pp. 1478-1479; no. 177, 10 Aug. 1648, 419.177\E. 457(33), p. 1482; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 83, 4 Aug. 1648, 465.5083\E. 525(11), p. 608; *Perfect Diurnal*, no. 249, 8 May. 1648, 504.244\E. 522(26), p. 2004; no. 262, 7 Aug. 1648, 504.262\E. 525(13), p. 2106; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 271, 8 Aug. 1648, 214.271\E. 457(16), p. 1040.

¹²² *Elencticus*, no. 49, 31 Oct. 1648, 312.49\E. 469(15), p. 404; *Pragmaticvs*, no. 31, 31 Oct. 1648, 369.231\E. 469(10), p. 12; *Militaris*, no. 3, 31 Oct. 1648, 346.3\E. 469(10), p. 24; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 283, 31 Oct. 1648, 214.283\E. 469(11), pp. 1134, 1136; *The Moderate*, no. 16, 13 [31] Oct. 1648, 413.2016\E. 469(16), p. 135; *Perfect Diurnal*, no. 229 [sic], 30 Oct. 1648, 504.274\E. 526(21), p. 2208; no. 275, 6 Nov. 1648, 504.275\E. 526(25), p. 2212; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 1 Nov. 1648, 533.33\E. 469(19), p. 258; [unnumbered], 15 Nov. 1648, 533.35\E. 472(10), p. 278; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 189, 2 Nov. 1648, 419.189\E. 470(1), pp. 1716-1717.

¹²³ *Elencticus*, no. 49, 31 Oct. 1648, 312.49\E. 469(15), p. 404.

¹²⁴ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 31, 31 Oct. 1648, 369.231\E. 469(10), p. 12.

request on 1 November angered several anti-royalist newsbooks.¹²⁵ *Mercurius Militaris*, a pro-Leveller serial that appeared for five weeks during October and November was especially incensed.¹²⁶ By justifying Ormond's villany, the editor insisted that the king:

...now hath pawned his faith and oaths so often, and nulled them all again, that he can try experiments with them; he now owns Ormond, but when he sees the wisdom of the House upon it he can disown him again at pleasure.¹²⁷

Elencticus did not share these sentiments and maintained that it was unreasonable for Westminster to force Charles to declare against the marquis, who it insisted was bravely attempting to preserve Ireland for the king until such time parliament returned both England and Scotland to him.¹²⁸ In addition, Wharton claimed that if parliament concluded a peace with the king and restored his liberty, this would ensure calm in Ireland. To this end, *Elencticus* admonished Westminster not to "deny the poore Irish that which so willingly you allow your selves; A Liberty of conscience, nor must you sell their Lands, or rob them of their Ancient Priviledges, and customes."¹²⁹

If the level of animosity toward Charles from Independent and Leveller editors during the closing weeks of 1648 was a gauge of more widespread hostility in these factions, then it was evident that neither Ireland nor the king would receive such

¹²⁵ See for example *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 284, 7 Nov. 1648, 214.284\E. 470(10), p. 1143; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 97, 10 Nov. 1648, 465.5097\E. 526(26), p. 718; *Packets of Letters*, no. 36, 21 Nov. 1648, 480.36\E. 473(12), [p. 1]; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 192, 23 Nov. 1648, 419.192\E. 473(15), p. 1752; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 278, 27 Nov. 1648, 504.278\E. 526(32), p. 2237. According to his answer, which was printed in full by *Perfect Diurnall*, the king claimed that since the advent of treaty with both Houses he had not concluded business in relation to Ireland with any party except the parliamentary commissioners. In addition, Charles maintained that since he had agreed that parliament would have sole responsibility for the prosecution of the war in that kingdom upon the conclusion of the treaty, he considered it unreasonable for him to be pressed to make any public declaration on this issue.

¹²⁶ This title had first surfaced in April 1648 as a royalist weekly, N&S 347 and would be utilized again in 1649 by both Leveller and anti-Leveller journalists, N&S 348 and 349. John Harris was most likely responsible for this particular series. *Mercurius Militaris: Communicating from all parts of England, Scotland, & Ireland*, N&S 346.

¹²⁷ *Militaris*, no. 4, 8 Nov. 1648, 346.4\E. 470(14), p. 32.

¹²⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 50, 8 Nov. 1648, 312.50\E. 470(19), p. 492.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* For similar sentiments by the author see also no. 57, 26 Dec. 1648, 312.57\E. 477(31), pp. 542-543.

considerations. In December, for example, *A Declaration, Collected out of the Journalls of both Houses of Parliament*, which was most likely penned by Henry Walker, relayed the sentiments of an anonymous Independent divine who charged that the king was the principal cause of bloodshed in all three kingdoms.¹³⁰ *The Moderate* was particularly antagonistic and depicted Charles not as a sovereign who had been misled by evil counselors, but rather as a tyrant personally responsible for the blood of thousands. In November Mabbott was the only editor to present news of a petition presented to Fairfax from divers officers and soldiers in the north of England, wherein it was proclaimed that although the king's:

evil counsell were very instrumental yet his Majesty himself was, and is the Capitoll Author, Contriver, Abettor, and Mannager of all the blood-shed, massacres, and whatsoever ruins have befallen not only this Kingdom, but also that of Ireland.¹³¹

Accordingly, *The Moderate* not only opposed any treaty with the king, but also demanded that Charles be tried for rape and mass murder.¹³²

Despite valiant responses by *Mercurius Impartialis* against derision's made by Mabbott and his colleagues in the parliamentary press toward the king,¹³³ it was clear that the heyday of royalist newsbooks had come to an end. In the aftermath of the second civil war the various serials that had surfaced during the spring and summer of 1648 in support of the king had become extinct, and even the trinity appeared to have lost one hypostasis with the disappearance of *Melancholicus* in November. It was also evident by this stage that the Independents were no longer willing to tolerate Presbyterian MPs and their

¹³⁰ *A Declaration, Collected out of the Journalls of both Houses of Parliament*, no. 1, 6 Dec. 1648, 90.1\E. 475(17), pp. 1, 4.

¹³¹ *The Moderate*, no. 20, 28 Nov. 1648, 413.2020\E. 473(31), pp. 173-174.

¹³² For example, *The Moderate*, no. 19, 21 Nov. 1648, 413.2019\E. 473(1), pp. 153-154; no. 23, 19 Dec. 1648, 413.2023\E. 477(4), pp. 202-203.

¹³³ See *Mercurius Impartialis*, no. 1, 12 Dec. 1648, 333.1\E. 476(3), pp. 2-4. *Impartialis* turned out to be a single-issue publication.

aspirations of achieving a settlement with the monarchy. On 6 December Colonel Thomas Pride and his troops purged the Commons of these members, and the remaining members (mainly Independents) formed a subsequent 'Rump' Parliament.¹³⁴ In conjunction with the army, this body not only terminated negotiations with the king, but also initiated proceedings to place Charles on trial for his life.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Among the principal reasons later provided by the grandees for their decision to seclude divers members from the Commons was that, by relieving Lisle from his command in Ireland and placing power in the hands of Inchiquin, these individuals had betrayed Ireland into enemy hands. See for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 293, 9 Jan. 1649, 214.293\E. 537(22), p. 1212; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 199, 11 Jan. 1649, 419.199\E. 537(38), p. 1836; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 105, 5 Jan. 1649, 465.5105\E. 527(3), p. 787.

¹³⁵ Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 276-283.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CROMWELL'S IRISH EXPEDITION

JANUARY - AUGUST 1649

In the weeks following the purge, the newly contrived Commons - acting in league with the army grandees - orchestrated the trial and execution of the king. Despite opposition from the House of Lords, the Rump voted that ultimate constitutional authority resided with the people, and since members of this body were their elected representatives, this power had been delegated to them. Accordingly, it declared that future decrees and ordinances would be considered 'Acts of Parliament,' and by this a High Court of Justice was established before which the king was charged with high treason against the nation. Charles was found guilty of this indictment by the court on 26 January, and four days later he was executed outside the royal palace at Whitehall.¹ Shortly thereafter, the Commons abolished both the monarchy and the House of Lords and ordered that henceforth the kingdom would be governed by the Rump and an executive Council of State elected in rotation from amongst its own members. In May parliament formally recognized England as a free commonwealth.²

Pride's Purge also generated greater efforts by the authorities to suppress the

¹ Underdown, *Pride's Purge*, pp. 143-207; Gardiner, *Civil War*, iv, pp. 288-323. A detailed account of the king's trial was published in three parts between 22-29 January 1649 as *A Perfect Narrative of the whole Proceedings of the High Court of Justice in the Tryal of the King*, N&S 518.1-3. Prepared by authority, probably by Gilbert Mabbott, this newsbook appears to have been the principal source for divers parliamentary serials. For an examination of how these publications covered the trial and execution of the king see Raymond, *Making the News*, chapter 5, and C.V. Wedgwood, *The Trial of Charles I* (London, 1964), pp. 123-127.

² S.R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656*, 4 vols. (London, 1903), vol. i, pp. 1-6; idem, ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1626-1660* (Oxford, 1906), pp. 384-388.

royalist press. Wharton's *Elencticus* and a revived edition of *Melancholicus* by Hackluyt failed to outlive the king.³ And, although *Pragmaticus* continued to operate until early May, Hackluyt's apprehension by the authorities in January may have provided sufficient incentive for Nedham to abandon his participation in its production at the end of that month.⁴ In contrast to the demise of the royalist stable, six well-established parliamentary newsbooks - *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, *The Moderate*, *Moderate Intelligencer*, *Perfect Occurrences*, *Perfect Diurnall*, and *Perfect Weekly Account* - all continued to flourish. Licenses were also granted in the first weeks of the new regime to *The Armies Modest Intelligencer*, *A Perfect Summary of Exact Passages of Parliament*, and *The Kingdomes Faithfull and Impartiall Scout*.⁵

THE SECOND ORMOND PEACE

Quelling the rebellion in Ireland became a top priority for the newly created Council of State. News that Ormond had finally concluded a settlement with the confederates compounded this resolve. The recent purge at Westminster, and subsequent plans to put the king on trial for his life had no doubt played a pivotal role in breaking the deadlock between the lord lieutenant and Kilkenny and on 17 January 1649 both parties proclaimed a second peace. Composed of some thirty-five articles, this latest accord comprised several clauses that marked significant gains for the confederates on religious,

³ At least two editions of *Elencticus* surfaced sporadically in February, but these appear to have been short-lived efforts. *Mercurius Elencticus, Communicating Intelligence from all Parts*, N&S 311, and *Mercurius Elencticus, Communicating the Unparaell'd Proceedings of the Rebels at Westminster*, N&S 313.

⁴ Worden, "Wit in a Roundhead," p. 324; Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 193.

⁵ *Armies Modest Intelligencer*, N&S 18; *Perfect Summary*, N&S 530; *Kingdomes Faithfull and Impartiall Scout*, N&S 210. Although *Armies Modest Intelligencer* (later substituting "Weekly" for "Modest") only lasted five issues, *Perfect Summary* and *Impartiall Scout* operated until their licenses were withdrawn by parliament in the fall of 1649. Theodore Jennings, a veteran of the New Model Army as well as deputy censor to Gilbert Mabbott edited *Perfect Summary*, while Daniel Border, who continued to edit *Perfect Weekly Account*, appears to have been responsible for *Impartiall Scout*.

constitutional, plantation and military issues.⁶ The first and most important of these provisions determined that individual Catholics would be granted the free exercise of religion, security of land tenure, and an exemption from resusancy fines. The confederates were also promised constitutional consideration in relation to the official position of the Catholic Church and the controversial issue of church property in the next meeting of the Irish parliament. To be summoned within the next six months, the confederates were confident that this body would be dominated by the Catholic interest, and this strengthened the prospect of achieving permanent recognition of the Church in Ireland.⁷ These measures failed to satisfy Rinuccini, and the nuncio, now ostracized by Ormond and the Old English at Kilkenny, departed for the continent on 23 February 1649. Failure to secure O'Neill's support for the peace, moreover, ensured that domestic unity among the Irish remained incomplete. Despite this fracture in the Irish camp, the new agreement signified the dissolution of the confederacy, and in its place twelve members of the supreme council were appointed 'commissioners of trust' to assist Ormond in managing confederate controlled areas.⁸

It was more than three weeks after the peace had been proclaimed in Ireland that this news first surfaced in the newsbooks.⁹ *Perfect Weekly Account* conveyed the fear of

⁶ Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 198-201; Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," pp. 333-334.

⁷ Additional provisions stipulated that: both parties were to maintain a standing army of 15,000 foot and 2,500 horse until a full settlement had been reached in the next Irish parliament; all impediments hindering Catholics from sitting or voting in this parliament were to be removed; individuals affected by attainders and forfeitures since the succession of James in 1603 were granted the right to petition parliament for redress and compensation; and an act of oblivion was agreed for all actions committed before or since the outbreak of the rebellion. A copy of the articles can be found in Gilbert, *Irish Confederation*, vii, pp. 184-213. See also Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," p. 334, and Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 199-201.

⁸ Corish, "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates," p. 334; Ó Siochru, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 197.

⁹ Several editors had voiced their frustrations over the lack of Irish news in the first weeks of 1649. This was most likely the result of bad weather in the Irish Sea, and the fact that Irish privateers appeared to be particularly active at this time. *Armies Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 5, 22 Feb. 1649, 18.5E. 545(3), p. 39;

one Dublin Protestant who alleged that all parties in Ireland had united in a “conspiracy to destroy us.”¹⁰ These sentiments were later endorsed by the editor of *Kingdomes Faithfull and Impartiall Scout* who proclaimed that, while Ormond and Inchiquin were both professed Protestants, they had complied with the “bloud thirsty Irish Rebels, profest Roman Catholics to destroy all the godly party both of that nation and this.”¹¹ In contrast, this news provided some solace to *Pragmaticvs*. Nedham’s successor asserted that as a result of this union, and the fact that a royalist fleet commanded by Rupert had sailed from Holland in January to bolster royalist fortunes in Ireland, the days of the new regime at Westminster were numbered.¹² Initial reports concerning the accord, however, provided readers with few details, and often related contradictory claims as to whether O’Neill had given it his seal of approval.¹³ It wasn’t until early March that the serials

Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, no. 299, 20 Feb. 1649, 214.299\E. 544(11), p. 1264; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 204, 15 Feb. 1649, 419.204\E. 543(3), p. 1196; *Impartiall Scout*, no. 8, 23 Mar. 1649, 210.08\E. 527(40), p. 63. For details of the activities of Irish privateers during this time see Jane Ohlmeyer, “Irish Privateers during the Civil War, 1642-50,” *Mariner’s Mirror* 76 (1990), pp. 119-133, and “‘The Dunkirk of Ireland’: Wexford Privateers during the 1640s,” *Journal of the Wexford Historical Society* 12 (1988-89), pp. 23-24.

¹⁰ *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 14 Feb. 1649, 533.48\E. 543(2), p. 384.

¹¹ *Impartiall Scout*, no. 5, 2 Mar. 1649, 210.05\E. 527(27), p. 33.

¹² *Pragmaticus*, no. 43[sic], 27 Feb. 1649, 369.246B\E. 545(15), [p. 6]; *Ibid.*, no. 44[sic], 5 Mar. 1649, 369.246C\E. 546(4), [p. 7]. Rupert’s activities were the subject of much speculation in the weekly press in the first weeks of 1649. His Irish-bound fleet of approximately 8 vessels (although several parliamentary papers reported it to be exceedingly higher) landed at Kinsale in February. See *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 199, 11 Jan. 1649, 419.199\E. 537(38), p. 1834; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 287, 29 Jan. 1649, 504.287\E. 527(12), p. 2310; no. 292, 5 Mar. 1649, 504.292\E. 527(29), p. 2348; *The Moderate*, no. 29, 30 Jan. 1649, 413.2029\E. 540(20), p. 284; *Armies Modest Intelligencer*, no. 2, 1 Feb. 1649, 18.2\E. 541(2), p. 4; *Impartiall Scout*, [no. 1], 2 Feb. 1649, 210.01\E. 541(5), p. 8; no. 2, 9 Feb. 1649, 210.02\E. 542(2), p. 14; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 206, 1 Mar. 1649, 419.206\E. 545(26), p. 1918.

¹³ See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 203, 8 Feb. 1649, 419.203\E. 541(27), p. 1883; no. 204, 15 Feb. 1649, 419.204\E. 543(3), p. 1196; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 110, 9 Feb. 1649, 465.5110\E. 527(17), pp. 830-831; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 289, 12 Feb. 1649, 504.289\E. 527(19), pp. 2324-2325; *Perfect Summary*, 12 Feb. 1649, 530.03\E. 527(20), pp. 21-21; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 298, 13 Feb. 1649, 214.298\E. 542(14), p. 1256; no. 301, 6 Mar. 1649, 214.301\E. 546(7), p. 1280; *The Moderate*, no. 31, 13 Feb. 1649, 413.2031\E. 542(11), p. 299; *Impartiall Scout*, [no. 3], 16 Feb. 1649, 210.03\E. 543(7), p. 23.

elaborated on these accounts,¹⁴ and at least three of the principal papers later provided their patrons with a summary of the January articles.¹⁵ But in general, reports of the peace in the licensed newsbooks failed to produce the biting editorials often generated by rumors or news of past settlements between the marquis and the Irish. Much had changed. Ireland may have remained a dangerous base for pro-royalist operations to the new regime, and thus had to be conquered. But defeat for royalist forces in the second civil war and the execution of the king perhaps helped determine that, for both press and public alike, the rebellion no longer posed the same threat to England's security as it had in earlier years.

There was no doubt that it was Dublin not London that occupied Ormond's concerns. The marquis knew that the Irish capital had to be regained before the Council of State could reinforce Jones, and this became even more pressing when news reached him that the king had been beheaded. Ormond wasted little time in proclaiming his allegiance to Charles II, who had assumed his father's title on 4 February while a guest in Holland of his brother-in-law, the Prince of Orange. The lord lieutenant's proclamation was printed in full by several parliamentary newsbooks,¹⁶ and elicited a response from Henry Walker, who declared that, "time may come when Ormond may answer for this

¹⁴ See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 206, 1 Mar. 1649, 419.206\E. 419.206\E. 545(26), p. 1918; *Impartiall Scout*, no. 5, 2 Mar. 1649, 210.05\E. 527(27), pp. 33-34; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 113, 2 Mar. 1649, 465.5113\E. 527(28), pp. 864, 872; *Perfect Summary*, no. 6, 5 Mar. 1649, 530.06\E. 527(30), p. 50; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 1, 7 Mar. 1649, 194.01\E. 546(9), pp. 4-5; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 292, 5 Mar. 1649, 504.292\E. 527(29), p. 2348.

¹⁵ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 209, 22 Mar. 1649, 419.209\E. 548(13), pp. 2007-2008; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 305, 3 Apr. 1649, 214.305\E. 549(11), pp. 2306-2308; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 296, 2 Apr. 1649, 504.296\E. 529(6), pp. 2388-2389.

¹⁶ See for example, *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 117, 30 Mar. 1649, 465.5117\E. 529(3), p. 527; *Impartiall Scout*, no. 9, 30 Mar. 1649, 210.09\E. 529(4), pp. 70[sic] - 70. Summations can be found in *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 304, 27 Mar. 1649, 214.304\E. 548(19), p. 1303; *The Moderate*, no. 37, 27 Mar. 1649, 413.2037\E. 548(21), p. 381; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 295, 26 Mar. 1649, 504.295\E. 529(1), p. 2386; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 28 Mar. 1649, 533.54\E. 548(23), pp. 430-431.

scandalous Paper to the Parliament of England, as [the] Duke of Hamilton hath done and others."¹⁷

Charles's execution also encouraged the marquis to solicit a declaration of loyalty to the crown from Jones.¹⁸ On 9 March he urged the colonel to abandon the Independents:

now that they have barbarously and inhumanly...murthered Gods Annointed...not as heretofore some patricides have done, to make roome for some usurper, but in a way plainly mainifesting their intentions...to change the Monarchy of England into Anarchy, unlesse their aime be first to constitute an elective Kingdom, and Cromwell or some such John Leydon being elected...by the same force by which they have thus far compassed their ends to establish a perfect Turkish tyrranny.¹⁹

These sentiments failed to garner a favorable response from Jones, who, while neither condemning nor condoning the king's death, assailed Ormond for his recent alliance with the confederates. This pact, the colonel insisted, made little or no provision for the Protestant population or their religion in Ireland, neither he concluded, could be preserved by an "Army of Papists."²⁰ Initial attempts by the marquis to win over O'Neill proved equally fruitless. The general's wish that he be allowed an army of almost 7,000 men at the government's expense was not well received by the Old English

¹⁷ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 117, 30 Mar. 1649, 465.5117\E. 529(3), p. 527. Hamilton was one of three principal royalists executed in London on 9 March by the regime. It had been reported that, unbeknown to the king, the duke had counterfeited the great seal and used it to commission the beginning of the Irish insurrection. *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 297, 6 Feb. 1649, 214.297\E. 541(17), p. 1248.

¹⁸ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 425-426.

¹⁹ *Impartiall Scout*, no. 9, 30 Mar. 1649, 210.09\E. 529(4), pp. 70-71. It appears that Jones forwarded this correspondence to Westminster shortly after receiving it from Ormond. These letters also formed the basis of at least three pamphlets published around the same time. *The Marquesse of Ormonds Declaration... With his Summons to Colonel Jones for the Surrender of Dublin* (letter dated 9 March, 1649), E. 548(28); *Articles of Peace made with the Irish Rebels... Also a Letter sent by Ormond to Col. Jones... with his Answer* (1649), E. 555(21); *A True Copy of Two Letters from the Earle of Ormond to Col. Michael Jones. With Col. Jones his Answer* (1646), E. 529(28).

²⁰ *Impartiall Scout*, no. 9, 30 Mar. 1649, 210.09\E. 529(4), p. 71; *The Moderate*, no. 37, 27 Mar. 1649, 413.2037\E. 548(21), p. 382; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 295, 26 Mar. 1649, 504.295\E. 529(1), p. 2386; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 28 Mar. 1649, 533.54\E. 548(23), p. 431. For subsequent correspondence between the two commanders on this issue see also *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 301, 7 May 1649, 504.301\E. 529(34), pp. 2486-2489.

commissioners, and the ill-faith that governed relations between this faction and O'Neill helped ensure that the latter persisted in his refusal to endorse the peace.²¹

A formal alliance with the Scots in Ulster also appeared beyond reach at this juncture. The king's fate had generated widespread condemnation in both the province and in Scotland among the covenanters. On 15 February the Presbytery in Belfast - imitating the kirk party in Scotland - denounced the sectaries of the new regime at Westminster and ordered the renewal of the solemn league and covenant.²² Ormond's recent accord with the Catholics at Kilkenny led to the Presbytery's rejection of overtures from the marquis to enter into a pro-royalist coalition.²³ Instead, Monck's refusal to proclaim the covenant resulted in the Scots launching a military campaign of their own against the parliamentary forces in the north. Amid considerable support from royalist sympathizers throughout Ulster, however, what originated as a Presbyterian revolt soon turned into a royalist rising, albeit one that was independent of the lord lieutenant. By early April these forces had not only seized control of Belfast and Carrickfergus, but Sir Charles Coote found himself besieged by the Laggan army at Londonderry.²⁴

²¹ For details of these negotiations see Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 420-423; Casway, *Owen Roe O'Neill*, pp. 234-235, 240-243.

²² Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 267-268

²³ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 120, 20 Apr. 1649, 465.5120\E. 529(15), p. 947; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 299, 23 Apr. 1649, 504.299\E. 529(18), p. 2439; *Man in the Moon*, no. 2, 23 Apr. 1649, 248.02\E. 551(10), p. 14.

²⁴ Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 268-269. These developments were well documented in the weekly press. See for example, *Impartiall Scout*, no. 6, 9 Mar. 1649, 210.06\E. 527(32), p. 42; no. 10, 6 Apr. 1649, 210.10\E. 529(8), pp. 63-64; no. 12, 20 Apr. 1649, 210.12\E. 529(17), pp. 93, 95; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 210, 29 Mar. 1649, 419.210\E. 548(30), pp. 2006-2007; no. 213, 18 Apr. 1649, 419.213\E. 551(1), p. 2000; no. 214, 26 Apr. 1649, 419.214\E. 552(4), pp. 2003-2004; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 7 Mar. 1649, 533.51\E. 546(10), pp. 408-409; [unnumbered], 25 Apr. 1649, 533.58\E. 552(2), p. 458; *The Moderate*, no. 34, 6 Mar. 1649, 413.2034\E. 546(8), pp. 347-348; no. 40, 17 Apr. 1649, 413.2040\E. 550(28), p. 423; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 296, 2 Apr. 1649, 504.296\E. 529(6), pp. 2388-2389; no. 299, 23 Apr. 1649, 504.299\E. 529(18), p. 2440; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 118, 6 Apr. 1649, 465.5118\E. 529(7), pp. 932-933; no. 121, 20 Apr. 1649, 465.5121\E. 529(21), p. 997; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 7, 18 Apr. 1649, 194.07\E. 551(2), p. 56; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 308, 24 Apr. 1649, 214.308\E. 551(18), p. 1331.

Correspondence from Dublin generated conflicting accounts in the weekly press over whether Jones was facing a similar fate.²⁵ Despite the fact that Ormond did not move directly against the city until mid-June, *Pragmaticvs* informed its readers that Dublin had surrendered to the lord lieutenant in February!²⁶ Royalists may have been disappointed by Nedham's departure from this production earlier in the year, but *Pragmaticvs*, and indeed counterfeit editions of that title, continued to provide an array of optimistic reports concerning the crowns' fortunes in Ireland throughout the spring. Allegations, however, that Monck had declared for the king, that Dublin and Londonderry had been stormed by both Ormond and the Scots, and that O'Neill had united forces with the marquis were an indication of the wild inaccuracies being disseminated.²⁷ In fairness, on 17 April the editor asked his readers to pardon him for mistakenly claiming the previous week that Dublin had been taken. Nonetheless, he exonerated himself from any responsibility for this error by dispensing blame toward his "intelligencer":

A Parliament man, and one skilled in the art of lying, I shall credit him lesse here-after, altho I'll assure you he hath not tould me any untruthes formerly in such intelligence, therefore I desire you take not me for the author of that lye. For had I but suspected it to be a fable, I would not have incerted it in my last booke....²⁸

²⁵ For example, see *Impartiall Scout*, no. 5, 2 Mar. 1649, 210.05\E. 527(27), p. 39; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 28 Feb. 1649, 533.50\E. 545(20), p. 404; [unnumbered], 7 Mar. 1649, 533.51\E. 546(10), p. 408; [unnumbered], 14 Mar. 1649, 533.52\E. 546(22), p. 418; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 114, 9 Mar. 1649, 465.5114\E. 527(31), p. 891; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 293, 12 Mar. 1649, 504.293\E. 527(33), p. 2358; *Pragmaticvs*, no. 46, 20 Mar. 1649, 369.246\E. 548(3), [p. 7]; no. 47, 27 Mar. 1649, 369.247\E. 548(22), [p. 8]; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 210, 29 Mar. 1649, 419.210\E. 548(30), p. 2006.

²⁶ *Pragmaticvs*, no. 45, 20 Feb. 1649, 369.245\E. 5445(9), pp. 7-8.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 48, 3 Apr. 1649, 369.248\E. 549(13), [p. 8]; no. 49, 10 Apr. 1649, 369.249\E. 550(13), [p. 8]; no. 51, 24 Apr. 1649, 369.251A\E. 551(19), [p. 8]; no. 52, 30 Apr. 1649, 369. 252B\E. 552(12), [p. 4].

²⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 50, 17 Apr. 1649, 369.250\E. 550(32), [pp. 1-2]. A claim made the following week that Londonderry had fallen to the Scots suggests that the editor's sources of Irish news remained questionable. *Pragmaticvs*, no. 51, 24 Apr. 1649, 369.251A\E. 551(19), [p. 8].

Parliamentary serials such as *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* painted a more accurate representation of events in Ireland, and insisted that reports which advertised Dublin's fall had been fabricated in order to dissuade the soldiers at home from participating in the forthcoming expedition to that kingdom.²⁹ But preparations by the authorities for this enterprise appeared to encourage a fresh wave of royalist propaganda, manifest in the birth of several new periodicals in support of the crown.³⁰ Keen to follow *Pragmaticvs*, from the outset these titles promoted generally unreliable accounts concerning Dublin and Londonderry.³¹ *The Man in the Moon* fueled speculation on the plight of the former when it maintained:

The Reports thereof are various, according to the fancies of men; some report it taken by storm, others, that they mutiny'd in the City; some say againe, That it was surrendered upon honorable termes; sure something is in the wind, there could never be so much smoake, where there not some fire.³²

Doubtless, these remarks were geared toward raising doubts in England about an expedition to save Dublin. In a similar vein few additions to the royalist camp were as coarse as the fledgling *Mercurius Elencticus*, (*For King Charls II.*), which in May, maintained that the plight of both Dublin and Londonderry had Independent "Arses ready to make buttons."³³

The Ulster Presbytery's declaration against the new regime at Westminster

²⁹ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 309, 1 May 1649, 214.309\E. 552(21), p. 1344. See also, *The Moderate*, no. 42, 1 May 1649, 413.2042\E. 552(20), p. 483; *Modest Narrative of Intelligence*, no. 5, 5 May 1649, 433.05\E. 553(1), pp. 36, 40; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 301, 7 May 1649, 504.301\E. 529(34), p. 2472.

³⁰ See pp. 11-12 below for details of these new additions.

³¹ For example, *Mercurius Philo-Monarchicus*, no. 1, 17 Apr. 1649, 355.1\E. 550(27), p. 5; [unnumbered], 21 May 1649, 355.2\E. 555(34), [pp. 7-8]; *The Man in the Moon*, no. 3, 30 Apr. 1649, 248.03\E. 552(8), p. 22; *Mercurius Elencticus*, *Communicating the Unparralell'd Proceedings of the Rebellis at Westminster*, no. 2, 8 May 1649, 316.02\E. 554(10), p. 16; *Mercurius Elencticus*, (*For King Charls II.*), no. 1, 7 May 1649, 317.1\E. 554(5), [p. 3].

³² *Man in the Moon*, [no. 1], 16 Apr. 1649, 248.01\E. 550(26), p. 6.

³³ *Elencticus... Charls II.*, no. 2, 14 May 1649, 317.2\E. 555(10), [pp. 4-5].

reinforced the Council of State's resolve to launch a major military expedition across the Irish Sea. On 6 March it was agreed that 12,000 New Model veterans were to be shipped to Ireland, and the following week the council nominated Cromwell as commander-in-chief. At least one parliamentary editor was keen to see the lieutenant general accept the nomination, since even the name of Cromwell, he maintained, "strikes a terror to the Irish Rebels."³⁴ However, the lieutenant general himself hesitated in assuming this responsibility. Aware of the fortunes that had befallen previous commanders sent to Ireland, he sought guarantees that if he accepted this commission his army would not only be well equipped with arms, provisions and money, but that the project would continue to receive top priority at Westminster.³⁵ It was clear that Cromwell viewed Ireland as the greatest threat to the new regime. He confessed at the time that:

I had rather be overrun with a Cavalierish interest than a Scotch interest; I had rather be overrun by a Scotch interest, than an Irish interest; and I think of all this is most dangerous. If they shall be able to carry on their work, they will make this the most miserable people in the earth, for all the world knows their barbarism....³⁶

Thus on 30 March, after receiving sufficient guarantees from the Council of State on the fore-mentioned concerns, Cromwell accepted the command.³⁷

The implications of this decision were not lost on *Impartiall Intelligencer*. Amid efforts at promoting recruitment for the proposed campaign, the editor noted:

Wise men know how hopefull that Service is: Most of the best Gentlemen in Ireland, their prediccursors, went over inferiour Officers in Queen Elizabeths dayes, And the Souldiers are the willinge to go now, because they know that Gen. Crumwell goes in person.³⁸

³⁴ *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 4, 28 Mar. 1649, 194.04E. 548(24), pp. 28, 31.

³⁵ C.H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England* (London, 1901), p. 358; Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, pp. 23-26; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 350-351.

³⁶ Wilbur Cortez Abbott, ed., *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1988), vol. ii, p. 38.

³⁷ Abbott, *Cromwell*, pp. 46-47; Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, pp. 27-28.

³⁸ *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 9, 2 May 1649, 194.09E. 529(29), p. 71. See also *Continued Heads of Perfect Passages in Parliament*, no. 3, 4 May 1649, 75.3E. 529(30), p. 19.

In response to the abated control by the authorities over the press, *Impartiall Intelligencer*, which first appeared on 7 March 1649, was one of a number of licensed weeklies that emerged for the first time during the spring and early summer. *England's Moderate Messenger* and *A Modest Narrative of Intelligence* joined it in the parliamentary ranks in April, and all three publications prospered until September.³⁹ These newsbooks were the exception rather than the norm, though, as the majority of Westminster serials that surfaced at this time lasted fewer than six numbers.⁴⁰ This ephemeral life expectancy extended to two unlicensed non-Royalist papers. *Mercurius Militaris*, a pro-Leveller title, was revived by John Harris for three weeks in April and May, while John Hackluyt, the former editor of *Melancholicus*, was responsible for a similarly-titled effort that surfaced in late May (although by June this work was renamed *The Metropolitan Nuncio*).⁴¹ This marked Hackluyt's return to the news market, but it was clear that by assailing Leveller and royalist publications alike he had abandoned the royalist camp. It appears this was a price he was willing to pay for being released from prison by the authorities.⁴²

Several pro-royalist newsbooks also emerged at this time. Most of these works

³⁹ *England's Moderate Messenger*, N&S 124 (renamed *The Moderate Messenger* in July); *A Modest Narrative of Intelligence*, N&S 433. These serials were unspectacular efforts and generally conveyed a summary of news that was common to all the leading licensed serials of the day.

⁴⁰ *Continued Heads of Perfect in Parliament*, N&S 75 appeared for five issues in April and May. May also marked two numbers of *A Moderate Intelligence*, N&S 415, and single issue appearances by both *Mercurius Pacificus*, N&S 353 and *Mercurius Republicus*, N&S 382. *Mercurius Britannicus* ran for six weeks in May and June, N&S 285. June witnessed fleeting appearances from *The Moderate Mercury*, N&S 421, *First Decade of Vseful Observations*, N&S 152, and *A Book Without a Title*, N&S 26. Two numbers of *A Perfect Diurnall of Passages in Parliament* surfaced in July, N&S 502, while *A Tuesdaies Journal of Perfect Passages in Parliament* appeared over five weeks in July and August, N&S 641. August concluded with a single issue of *The Armies Painfull-Messenger*, N&S 19, and two numbers of *Great Brittaines Paine-Full Messenger*, N&S 173.

⁴¹ *Mercurius Militaris*, *Communicating Intelligence*, N&S 348; *Mercurius Militaris. Or, Times Only Truth-Teller*; *Metropolitan Nuncio. Or, Times Only Truth-Teller*, N&S 349.

⁴² Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 193; *Elencticus*, no. 9, 25 Jun. 1649, 316.09AE. 561(13), p. 66.

were also short-lived productions and included the resurrection of familiar titles such as *Elencticus* and *Melancholicus*.⁴³ A more enduring *Elencticus* debuted on 1 May and ran until November of that year, while the arrival of both *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, (*For King Charles II.*) and *The Man in the Moon* further strengthened the royalist stable.⁴⁴ *Pragmaticus... Charles II* appeared first on 24 April and signaled the return of Marchamont Nedham to serial news.⁴⁵ For the next two weeks Nedham competed against the original *Pragmaticus*, (his former paper) which had continued a relatively lonely vigil since the execution of the king, but this rivalry proved fleeting when the authentic version ceased to operate after 8 May.⁴⁶ *Man in the Moon* first hit the streets of London on 16 April, intent to unmask “a world of knavery vnder the sunne, both in Parliament, the Council of State, the Army, the City, and the Country, with intelligence from all parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland.”⁴⁷ The reality of the situation was that, its editor, John Crouch, did little to satisfy the second of these assurances.⁴⁸ “The smuttiest news-man”

⁴³ Fleeting appearances were made by *Mercurius Elencticus*, N&S 315, and *Mercurius Elencticus*, (*For King Charles II.*), N&S 317 in April and May respectively, while two issues of *Mercurius Melancholicus*, *For King Charles the Second* surfaced in May and June, N&S 343. In addition, two numbers of *Mercurius Philo-Monarchicus* appeared in April and May, N&S 355. Single issues of *The Divine Penitential Meditations*, N&S 111A, and *Mercurius Carolinus*, N&S 294 emerged in June and July respectively. Five numbers of *The Royall Divrball* could be purchased in July and August, N&S 588, and *Mercurius Aulicus*, (*For King Charles II*), N&S 277, ran for three weeks in August and September. On 6 September *Mercurius Hybernicus* became the last royalist newsbook to appear in 1649, N&S 329.

⁴⁴ *Mercurius Elencticus*, *Communicating the Unparralell'd Proceedings of the Rebellis at Westminster*, N&S 316; *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, (*For King Charles II.*), N&S 370; *Man in the Moon*, N&S 248.

⁴⁵ From 8 May there was no ‘e’ in the spelling of Charles, and there were often variations in the internal punctuation of the title.

⁴⁶ In May and June Nedham’s *Pragmaticus* spawned numerous counterfeits. Most likely, John Cleveland penned these works. See Nelson and Seccombe, *S TC*, pp. 246-247.

⁴⁷ *Man in the Moon*, [no. 1], 16 Apr. 1649, 248.01E. 550(26). The man in the moon was a familiar figure in folklore and nursery tales - the old man banished to the moon for gathering sticks on the Sabbath. According to the editor, like the moon, he could gaze in through doors and windows, spying on people’s nocturnal activities. Potter, *Secret rites and secret writing*, p. 18.

⁴⁸ David Underdown, “The Man in the Moon: Loyalty and Libel in Popular Politics, 1640, 1640-1660,” in *A Freeborn People. Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1996), p. 95. Crouch appears to be part of a large family of printers and booksellers who were noted for ballad-printing and opprobrious ‘low’ royalist propaganda. His printer, Edward Crouch, may have been his brother. Potter, *Secret rites and secret writing*, pp. 15-16.

of the era, according to Frank, Crouch dispensed political and sexual satire, rather than news, in his efforts to heap scorn upon the Council of State and the sectaries.⁴⁹

It was clear that *Man in the Moon* was intended at a more socially diverse readership. It sold for a penny, (half the price of other royalist publications) and well within the reach of the average craftsman. Moreover, its scurrilous anecdotes on those in authority were written in a common, colloquial manner geared toward a popular, male audience.⁵⁰ What was certain, Crouch's serial was not from the same mold as wartime cavalier productions such as *Aulicus*, which had generally targeted readers of a somewhat higher station.⁵¹ Instead, *Man in the Moon* appeared determined to exploit the increasing disquiet among the largely literate middling group of artisans, journeymen and apprentices within the capital toward the new administration at Westminster.⁵² Perhaps it was for this reason, that it quickly spawned attempts by the authorities to apprehend those responsible for its publication.⁵³

LEVELLER OPPOSITION TO CROMWELL'S EXPEDITION

In contrast to the licensed newsbooks, which had generally become little more than dull chronicles of passing occurrences, the pro-royalist serials were keen to employ news of current events, particularly Irish affairs, to deride the authorities. Cromwell's decision to accept command of the Irish expedition provided these publications with ample opportunity over the forthcoming months to undermine the new commander-in-chief and

⁴⁹ Frank, *English Newspaper*, p. 196.

⁵⁰ Underdown, "Man in the Moon," p. 98.

⁵¹ Malcolm, *Caesar's Due*, pp. 141-143.

⁵² Underdown, "Man in the Moon," pp. 98, 110.

⁵³ On 26 April - ten days after *Man in the Moon* made its first appearance - warrants were issued for the arrest of the author and publisher. *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1649-1650* (London, 1875), p. 530.

his colleagues amid their preparations for that campaign. On 17 April, for example, *Mercurius Philo-Monarchicus* responded to attempts at Westminster to garner support for this crusade by claiming that, although the government sought to transport Cromwell across the Irish Sea:

Nol has more mind to pick old quarrells at home with Tombes and Church-Windowes... then incounter fresh adversaries abroad; English Beef is better food then Irish Shamrocks, and a good featherbed with a plump Lawndresse... affords better quarter then a Bog.⁵⁴

Here, the editor seems to be appealing to the common ranks of English society to think twice before volunteering for service in Ireland. Nedham attempted to address a more affluent audience. Mocking Cromwell and his fellow sectaries for their efforts to raise money for Ireland's conquest, *Pragmaticus... Charles II* insisted that while the authorities feign that these funds are for "draining the Bogs in Ireland of Presbytery and Popery," they actually intended to "gueld their Bags here to... raise new forces to over-power those in the Army, and squeeze their friends in the City, which stand for Liberty."⁵⁵

This last assertion by Nedham clearly referred to the growing tide of Leveller opposition to the Irish expedition. By the spring, principal Levellers such as John Lilburne had become completely alienated from the Council of State, and in addition to demands that reforms advocated in the 'Agreement of the People' be implemented, they insisted that a freely elected parliament, unbridled from the coercion of the grandees, be established. Concerned also that Cromwell aspired to military dictatorship, the Levellers utilized outstanding grievances among army rank and file (particularly over arrears in pay), and launched a propaganda campaign that not only assailed the alliance between the Rump and the grandees, but one that incited these troops to mutiny. This resulted in

⁵⁴ *Philo-Monarchicus*, no. 1, 17 Apr. 1649, 355.1VE. 550(27), p. 6.

⁵⁵ *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 1, 24 Apr. 1649, 370.1VE. 551(15), [pp. 2-3].

Lilburne and three of his colleagues - William Walwyn, Thomas Prince and Richard Overton - being apprehended by the authorities on 28 March.⁵⁶

These arrests did not prevent a series of Leveller-inspired mutinies in the spring, the main inspiration for which was Cromwell's expedition. On 17 April four regiments of horse and four of foot were chosen by lot for this service. But although the soldiers selected were not compelled to go, they were informed that refusal to do so would result in their dismissal from the army. When 300 troops in Lieutenant-Colonel John Hewson's regiment refused to leave England until Leveller demands had been met, they were immediately cashiered. Given that these men failed to receive their arrears before being dismissed, a series of mutinies among regiments designated for Ireland ensued. These disturbances not only threatened the authority of Cromwell and the army high command, but equally important, they undermined the proposed conquest of Ireland.⁵⁷

The advent of *Militaris* (the pro-Leveller edition) on 24 April added impetus to this unrest. As the mutinies gained momentum, the editor took the opportunity to assail the expedition's commander-in-chief, who according to Harris, delayed embarking on his commission:

... for he knows no such venemous thing can live in Ireland, and if it could, he is fast in the boggs of his transgressions: and therefore, like the man that could not see wood for trees, he cannot goe to Ireland because he is there already.⁵⁸

These remarks were clearly designed to encourage opposition to the expedition from within Cromwell's ranks. Similarly, *Militaris* not only set upon the motivation of the

⁵⁶ For details of this campaign see Brailsford, *The Levellers*, pp. 471-480; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 315-321.

⁵⁷ Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, pp. 44-54; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 323-349; Chris Durston, " ' Let Ireland Be Quiet': Opposition in England to the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland," *History Workshop Journal* 21 (1986), pp. 106-112.

⁵⁸ *Militaris*, no. 3, [n.d., ms., 8 May] 1649, 348.3\E. 554(13), p. 32.

Independents for launching this campaign, but also argued that the campaign itself was morally wrong. In its inaugural week Harris commented that "the good soul of Philip the Second" had infected Cromwell and his colleagues in their zeal to invade that kingdom, and accordingly, he stressed the licentious intentions of that faction:

... let all the world judge, for a people that desire to live free, must almost equally with themselves, defend others from subjection, the reason is because the subjecting of others make the subdued strive for Dominion over you, since that is the only way you have left them to acquire their common liberty; more than which men (being not all Cromwells and Iretons) doe not usually desire.⁵⁹

Thus according to *Militaris*, the Irish were not only entitled to their liberty, but English rule in Ireland had forced the natives to rebel in order to achieve their freedom.⁶⁰ The editor further asserted that such oppression had become a hallmark of the Independent regime at home, and that Cromwell's enterprise was calculated to ensure that the present administration could keep both kingdoms enslaved. In this vein, Harris proclaimed:

... is it possible they should seek to tear the peoples Liberties, out of the hand of a strong enemy, and keep our Liberties most Tyrannically in their claws here; this Irish designe is as much for common good, as Chinamen come here to buy the ware of their own Countrey, why doe they not restore the Nation to a generall Freedom, and those that have acted it, out of the illegal imprisonment, which these grosse hypocrites have cast upon them... however they hold it most necessary to cry up that voyage the better to be provided to keep this Nation in Slavery, and to enrich and dignifie the whole party of Independents....⁶¹

Opposition by *Militaris* to the conquest of Ireland clearly reflected Leveller philosophy that placed the natural rights of the Irish on a par with the inhabitants of England.⁶² But the most comprehensive indictment against plans for the subjugation of

⁵⁹ Ibid., no. 1, 24 Apr. 1649, 348.1VE. 551(13), pp. 8-9.

⁶⁰ See also Norah Carlin, "Ireland and Natural Man in 1649," in *Europe and its Others*, II, ed. Francis Barker et al., (Colchester, 1985), p. 92.

⁶¹ *Militaris*, no. 1, 24 Apr. 1649, 348.1VE. 551(13), p. 9.

⁶² For a detailed examination of Leveller opposition to Cromwell's Irish expedition see, Carlin, "Ireland and Natural Man in 1649," pp. 91-111; idem, "The Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland in 1649," *Historical Journal* 30 (1987), pp. 260-288; idem, "Extreme or mainstream?: the English Independents and

that kingdom appeared at the end of April in a tract entitled *Certain Queries Propounded to the Consideration of those who are Intended for the Service of Ireland*. Although no copy of the original document is extant, (and there is no clue to its author) the seventeen rhetorical questions that comprised the *Queries* were reprinted and replied to by *Moderate Intelligencer* over a six-week period from 2 May until 14 June.⁶³ Aimed primarily at promoting dissension within the army, the author of the *Queries* applied Leveller ideas, such as natural rights and government by consent, to reject rule by conquest of the Irish, and accordingly, called upon New Model troops to refrain from participating in this endeavor. The inherent rights of the Irish were stressed in the first query, wherein the author questioned:

Whether the Land or Inheritance that any Nation hath for so many hundreds, or some thousands of years enjoyed, and possessed without any other laying claim to have a more special right to the same be not their right which God and nature hath given them.⁶⁴

These rights were repeated throughout the *Queries* and included, for example, the right of the Irish to choose their own government, laws, offices and administrators.⁶⁵ Like *Militaris*, the author also asserted that the Irish had the right to rise against their oppressors, for he insisted, "How can the conquered be accounted Rebels, if at any time

the Cromwellian reconquest of Ireland, 1649-1651," in *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict*, ed., Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 209-223; Durston, "'Let Ireland be Quiet,'" pp. 105-112; Christopher Hill, "Seventeenth-Century English Radicals and Ireland," in *A Nation of Change and Novelty. Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1990), pp. 133-151.

⁶³ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 215, 2 May 1649, 419.215\E. 552(26), pp. 2014-2016; no. 216, 10 May 1649, 419.216\E. 55(3), pp. 2025-2027; no. 217, 17 May 1649, 419.217\E. 555(25), pp. 2043-2044; no. 218, 24 May 1649, 419.218\E. 556(12), pp. 2054-2055; no. 219, 31 May 1649, 419.219\E. 557(5), pp. 2064-2065; no. 220, 7 Jun. 1649, 419.220\E. 559(3), pp. 2073-2074. The title and the text were confirmed almost two years later by a government-sponsored publication entitled, *An Answer to Certain Seditious and Jesuiticall Queres* by one Thomas Waring. Carlin, "Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland," p. 271; idem, "Ireland and Natural Man," [p. 92, irreg. pagination].

⁶⁴ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 215, 2 May 1649, 419.215\E. 552(26), p. 2014.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2015.

they seeke to free themselves, and recover their own.”⁶⁶ The *Queries* also implied that true patriots should seek not only their own freedom but also that of others, particularly against an administration which pretended to seek freedom in England while imposing tyranny on others.⁶⁷ The author even contended that the Irish were within their rights to solicit aid from whatever nation they chose in order “to preserve and deliver themselves from the cruelty of the English, rather than become slaves to their wils.”⁶⁸ Equally contentious were claims that the English would have behaved no differently if the Irish had robbed them of their lands and imposed a similar tyranny in England as had been exacted in Ireland.⁶⁹ In this context, the *Queries* invited Englishmen to repent for the persecution and usurpation of that nation by their kings and forefathers, and admonished the present generation that a prolonged war of conquest would make them “no lovers of peace but domination.”⁷⁰

The considerable copy devoted by *Moderate Intelligencer* to refuting each of the queries suggests that the authorities were worried about the effect these arguments would have on the army rank and file.⁷¹ At the same time, Dillingham may have unveiled the reasoning among leading Independents for the re-conquest of Ireland. His response to the first query, for instance, claimed that any natural rights the Irish may have possessed had been extinguished by the massacre of more than 100,000 English settlers that followed the outbreak of the insurrection in 1641.⁷² But *Moderate Intelligencer* generally played

⁶⁶ Ibid., no. 216, 10 May 1649, 419.216E. 555(3), p. 2026.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 2027.

⁶⁸ Ibid., no. 217, 17 May 1649, 419.217E. 555(25), p. 2043.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 2044.

⁷⁰ Ibid. For a more detailed examination of the *Queries* in the context of Leveller opposition to the re-conquest of Ireland see Carlin, “Ireland and Natural Man in 1649,” pp. 92-93, and idem, “The Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland,” pp. 271-273.

⁷¹ Durston, “Opposition in England,” p. 111.

⁷² *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 215, 2 May 1649, 419.215E. 552(26), pp. 2014-2015.

down the massacres, and indeed, the Catholicism of the Irish as justification for their subjugation. Dillingham's answers to the *Queries* suggest that the Independents had difficulty in justifying Cromwell's expedition on religious grounds. This faction, which had consistently championed religious toleration, appeared to resolve this dilemma by promoting the image of Irish barbarism.⁷³ This was evident from Dillingham's riposte to the second query, which addressed the right of the Irish to choose their own government and laws. He replied:

that where people do not acknowledge an eternall being, nor live according to the Laws of nature and reason...others may goe and possesse those Countries and give them some...that if by Laws intruded upon a rude people they be made able to know God and enrich themselves, they are not wronged but righted, and this is not a doing of evill that good may come, no more then to take a wild beast and make it tame and usefull to him that tooke it, though it be taken from 1000 acres of ground and confin'd to two or three....⁷⁴

In addition to the implication that the Irish were pagans, *Moderate Intelligencer* further argued that, irrespective of the cruelties committed against the English in Ireland, this people were more savage than the America Indian. Suggesting that the Irish were subhuman, the editor asserted that, "may not it be reasonable to tame such wilde beasts had they never been in any kinde so cruell and bloody to the English."⁷⁵ Two weeks after making this claim Dillingham refuted the proposal promoted in the fourteenth query, which maintained that conquest against the Irish would give the English an appetite for oppression. Instead, he responded that there was little "felicity in ruling over wilde people," and added:

⁷³ Carlin, "English Independents and the Conquest of Ireland," pp. 214-215, 219; idem, "Ireland and Natural man in 1649," pp. 92-96; idem, "Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland," pp. 284-285.

⁷⁴ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 215, 2 May 1649, 419.215E. 552(26), p. 2015. In addition, Dillingham later contended that the English rather than the Irish were the first planters in Ireland and thus the latter should be considered as intruders in there own right. Ibid., no. 216, 10 May 1649, 419.216E. 555(3), p. 2026.

⁷⁵ Ibid., no. 215, 2 May 1649, 419.215E. 552(26), p. 2015.

...what content is there to have Foxes, or Wolves, or Bears, in chains, unlesse in this, that the tame and usefull Beasts are preserved thereby from danger? and considering the pains and cost England hath been at that way, and the little fruit, it will be discretion, to destroy such game, that which by art and industry cannot be made usefull to itselfe, nor others, is fit for destruction.⁷⁶

Equally revealing here was the implication that in order to reduce Ireland, draconian measures would have to be employed by parliamentary forces to safeguard English interests in that kingdom. The demonization of the Irish, which built upon long-held English perception of the Irish as sub-human, provided the pro-Cromwell camp with a moral warrant for an expedition that might have been difficult to launch. The theme of Irish barbarity was no doubt generated by criticisms from both royalist and Leveller sources, and was further evidence of the extent to which the newsbooks operated as vehicles of propaganda serving the political needs of the moment. It contrasted sharply with the essentially egalitarian Leveller argument professed within the *Queries*, and appeared to be driven by a combination of English nationalism, (the necessity to protect the English state against a threatening foreign foe) with a theological conviction that the Irish were the personification of evil. The infamous massacres by Cromwell's men at Drogheda and Wexford had not yet come to pass, but it appears that *Moderate Intelligencer* may have been preparing its readers for what lay ahead.⁷⁷

Gilbert Mabbott, the pro-Leveller editor of *The Moderate* failed to comment on this debate and appeared unwilling to speak out against the Irish expedition.⁷⁸ The closest

⁷⁶ Ibid., no. 217, 17 May 1649, 419.217E. 555(25), p. 2044.

⁷⁷ Dillingham was not alone in this department. Angered by recent attacks by the royalist press on Cromwell, the editor of *Mercurius Britannicus* maintained that the forthcoming campaign would be a particularly bloody affair "to revenge the blood of the many thousands that hath been spilt by Commissions from the late King Charles." *Britannicus*, no. 1, 4 May 1649, 285.1\E. 552(27), p. 4.

⁷⁸ This stance by Mabbot may have reflected the fact that, while leading Levellers, such as Lilburne, Overton, Walwyn and Prince, had been vociferous in their opposition to the new regime, these men refrained from making any public statement on the question of Ireland. Indeed, Ireland may have represented a potentially divisive issue for the party. For further evidence that the Levellers were not a

Mabbott may have come to expressing sympathy for those slated to embark for Ireland was the occasional report that highlighted (even after the mutinies had been suppressed) continued opposition among some factions of the army to that campaign.⁷⁹ In light of the political tensions generated by the mutinies, and allegations that he had granted licenses to divers seditious publications, Mabbott succumbed to increasing pressure from the Council of State, and in May resigned as licenser of the newsbooks.⁸⁰ *The Moderate* itself continued to be licensed, and Mabbott continued his role as editor, but over the summer months his editorials appeared much more subdued, and a considerable share of his paper was devoted to presenting news of official parliamentary business.⁸¹

Mabbott's rivals in both the parliamentary and royalist camps, however, were keen to utilize recent dissension within the army in order to undermine their political opponents. In response to fresh reports out of Ireland in May, which highlighted the worsening condition of Jones's forces, several pro-government serials condemned the Levellers for hindering relief to that kingdom. In his new role as editor of the anti-Leveller edition of *Militaris*, Hackluyt proclaimed that, should Dublin be lost, "I shall without taint of malice boldly cast her blood and ruines, yea the losse of that whole Kingdom also on the brazen front of Lilburne, and his matchless Make-baits."⁸² This denunciation continued the following week in *Metropolitan Nuncio*. Therein, Hackluyt

monolithic political group with a single coherent program, see Carlin, "Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland," pp. 270-273, 280; Howell and Brewster, "Reconsidering the Levellers," pp. 68-86.

⁷⁹ On 3 July Mabbott reported that Colonel Stubbard's regiment avowed they would not journey to that kingdom unless over a "Golden Bridge," while fellow troops reportedly proclaimed that "the wood is not yet planted that shall carry them over into Ireland." *The Moderate*, no. 51, 3 Jul. 1649, 413.2051E. 562(22), p. 590. See also *Ibid.*, p. 603; no. 54, 24 Jul. 1649, 413.2054E. 565(23), p. 626.

⁸⁰ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1649-1650*, p. 127.

⁸¹ Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 180-181; Dieth, "The Moderate," p. 250. Mabbott's replacement as licenser of the newsbooks was Theodore Jennings.

⁸² *Militaris*, no. 1, 29 May 1649, 349.1E. 556(22), p. 7. See also *Britannicus*, no. 5, 29 May 1649, 285.5E. 556(27), p. 35; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 314, 5 Jun. 1649, 214.314E. 558(12), p. 1372.

prepared his readers for the impending bloodshed by mourning the fact that it would be a woeful spectacle to see English Protestants in Ireland “bathing their swords in each others bowels.” Such misery was compounded by the “bastard brats of Babylon,” who, according to the author, “stand gazing on, rejoycing at our ruine, and making laughter of our lamentations.”⁸³

Predictably, royalist newsbooks were keen to disparage Cromwell and the Council of State over the mutinies and exaggerated the number of troops involved.⁸⁴ Nedham endorsed Leveller claims that soldiers who accepted this assignment were destined for destruction, and that once these men had been removed from England, Cromwell and the grandees would have the opportunity to lay the foundations of tyranny at home. He concluded that, in view of recent successes by Ormond, it was no wonder Irish-bound troops referred to their forthcoming service as the “cut-throat expedition.”⁸⁵ Despite the fact that Cromwell was pre-occupied with suppressing domestic disturbances, on 7 May *Man in the Moon* questioned why this “notable hasty-pudding had “turned Snaile” in his commitment to sail for Ireland.”⁸⁶ Likewise, *Pragmaticus... Charles II* asserted that the lieutenant general “lay pimping here at London to the designe of crushing the Levellers with pretenses for Ireland.” This stratagem, according to Nedham, would serve no purpose, for this faction are “resolved not to go thither among Papists to be made Hawckes-meat for Antichrist.”⁸⁷

⁸³ *Metropolitan Nuncio*, no. 1[2], 6 Jul. [Jun.] 1649, 349.2, p. 5.

⁸⁴ While it has been estimated that at least 1,000 soldiers were believed to have been involved in the May mutinies, the royalist press propagated significantly higher numbers. See *Elencticus*, no. 5, 28 May 1649, 316.05\E. 556(19), p. 38; no. 18, 27 Aug. 1649, 316.18\E. 571(27), p. 137; *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 16, 7 Aug. 1649, 370.17\E. 568(7), [p. 2].

⁸⁵ *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 2, 1 May 1649, 370.02\E. 552(15), pp. 13-14.

⁸⁶ *Man in the Moon*, no. 4, 7 May 1649, 248.04\E. 554(4), p. 26

⁸⁷ *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 3, 8 May 1649, 370.03\E. 554(12), [p. 6].

Fairfax and Cromwell effectively reduced the last and most dangerous Leveller-inspired mutiny at Burford in Oxfordshire on 14 May. Thereafter, several licensed serials broadcast renewed enthusiasm for the expedition. On 6 June, for example, *Perfect Weekly Account* insisted that these troops were mindful that the fertility of the soil, the number of cattle, and the Irish climate combined to afford a suitable place to plant a new colony in that kingdom. These things considered, the editor contended, “put such a promptnesse into the mens spirits, that where one lays downe his arms, three are ready to take them up.”⁸⁸ However, Burford did not prevent the royalist press from continuing to plant seeds of doubt in the minds of those troops slated to disembark. On 26 June a counterfeit edition of Nedham’s *Pragmaticus* asserted that these men should question whether they wished to:

hazard their lives and limbes in the service of such ungrateful Masters, who (when they have done their work and undone themselves) disdaine to look upon them, but with contempt and hatred, not affording so much as a handfull of clean straw to keep them from the ground; nor when they are dead, a winding-sheet, (I am sure) not [a] Christian Buriall.⁸⁹

Similarly, *Elencticus* contended that, if Cromwell should pass into Ireland, these troops would be powerless in the face of Ormond and his army of 20,000 “Christians.”⁹⁰ The editor may have consciously used this term to overcome the problem of the joint Protestant-Catholic nature of the marquis’s army, but nonetheless, he remained convinced that Cromwell’s men would not have the opportunity to engage it. Rather, as soon as their

⁸⁸ *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 6 Jun. 1649, 533.64\E. 558(21), pp. 503-504. See also *Moderate Intelligence*, no. 1, 24 May 1649, 415.1\E. 556(13), p. 8; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 221, 14 Jun. 1649, 419.221\E. 560(6), pp. 2085-2086, 2088; no. 222, 21 Jun. 1649, 419.222\E. 561(2), p. 2097.

⁸⁹ *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 10, 26 Jun. 1649, 370.10B\E. 561(16), [pp. 5-6].

⁹⁰ *Elencticus*, no. 9, 25 Jun. 1649, 316.09\E. 561(13), p. 69.

arrears had been partially paid he predicted that they would abandon the expedition, and if they did not they were "worse then mad-men."⁹¹

"THE DEVIL BEE TURN'D A MONK"

While the propaganda continued unabated over the expedition, newsbooks in both camps appeared astonished by rumors in June that suggested Owen Roe O'Neill had agreed to a cessation with Colonel George Monck, the parliamentary commander in Ulster. Failure by O'Neill to reach an accommodation with Ormond in the aftermath of the January peace, and Monck's refusal to accept proposals made by the Ulster Scots to renew the covenant in the name of Charles II, had left both men isolated by the spring of 1649. Desperately short of supplies, and aware that Monck would find it impossible to face both him and the Scots at the same time, O'Neill moved against the colonel at Dundalk in March. Anticipating the alarm that this would cause to Monck, O'Neill initiated communication with his adversary over a temporary cessation of arms. The colonel recognized that such an agreement would not only safeguard his forces - and thus parliament's interests until Cromwell's expedition arrived from England - but that it would also compound the differences between O'Neill and Ormond. A three-month cessation was concluded on 8 May, during which each side agreed to assist one another if either of them came under attack from pro-royalist forces. In the interim, Monck awaited parliament's response to O'Neill's propositions for a more lasting settlement.⁹²

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Jerrold Casway, "George Monck and the Controversial Catholic Truce of 1649," *Studia Hibernica* 16 (1976), pp. 54-61; Maurice Ashley, *General Monck* (London, 1977), pp. 64-65. A copy of the articles between both men can be found in Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, ii, pp. 216-217. Monck amended these proposals in order to make them more palatable at Westminster. They included a pledge from O'Neill to uphold the interests of the English Parliament in Ireland on condition that liberty of conscience was granted to his followers. In addition, Monck agreed to ask for an act of oblivion for these men that dated back to 1641 and for Owen Roe to be granted a suitable command in the parliamentary army. See also *Calendar State Papers Ireland 1647-1660* (London, 1903), pp. 364-366.

Cromwell received confirmation of this arrangement from Monck toward the end of May.⁹³ Although he and his colleagues on the Council of State disapproved of it, and refused to ratify the pact with O'Neill, there appeared to be some sympathy for the colonel's actions. Nonetheless, public knowledge of this stratagem could undermine the pending invasion, and thus it was no surprise that the administration was keen to keep this news suppressed.⁹⁴ By mid-June, however, rumors of the cessation had surfaced in the weekly press, although without confirmation the principal licensed newsbooks appeared unwilling to expound upon them.⁹⁵ *Metropolitan Nuncio* considered this talk ridiculous and insisted that the antipathy between Monck and O'Neill was as great as between "Truth and falshood, light and darknesse, the one being a faithfull Protestant, the other a filthy Papist... and barbarous enemy." As such, Hackluyt added that, Monck could never shake hands with:

an unparalel'd monster whose Body and soul are of a scarlet dye with the bloud of poor English Protestants, and the only ringleader of those purple Charybes, and bloud-quassing canniballs ever since the first of that inhumane Rebellion, who in two moneths space did murder and massacre above one hundred and forty thousand souls....⁹⁶

Unconfirmed reports of an agreement perhaps motivated *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* to launch equally caustic allegations that promoted the lascivious nature of O'Neill.

Although stricken with age, the editor maintained that this man:

⁹³ Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, ii, pp. 221-222.

⁹⁴ Casway, "Controversial Catholic Truce," pp. 62-67; Ashley, *Monck*, pp. 66-67.

⁹⁵ See for example, *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 220, 7 Jun. 1649, 419.220\E. 559(3), p. 2074; no. 221, 14 Jun. 1649, 419.221\E. 560(6), pp. 2094-2095; no. 222, 21 Jun. 1649, 419.222\E. 561(2), p. 2108; *Modest Narrative*, no. 10, 9 Jun. 1649, 433.10\E. 559(5), p. 80; *Perfect Summary*, no. 21, 11 Jun. 1649, 530.21\E. 530(34), p. 166; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 15, 13 Jun. 1649, 194.15\E. 530(37), p. 116; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 316, 19 Jun. 1649, 214.316\E. 560(16), p. 1394; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 129, 22 Jun. 1649, 465.5129\E. 530(44), p. 1127.

⁹⁶ *Metropolitan Nuncio*, no. 3, 13 Jun. 1649, 349.3\E. 560(3), [p. 5].

By force or gifts...betrayes all the Maids he hath a mind unto, and afterwards marries them to his officers. It is no matter...that he hath got them with childe; A true politician, and in shew a great Papist, but working any way for his own advantage.⁹⁷

Disbelief concerning initial reports of a cessation was also evident in at least one royalist serial. *Elencticus* found these rumors incredible and declared that, “unlesse the devil bee turn’d a Monk” there was no truth to it.⁹⁸ This did not preclude the editor from employing the situation for propaganda purposes. On 25 June, although *Elencticus* claimed that this alleged union was a “Lye of the Saw-pit size,” it suggested that this news had been orchestrated by the Independents in order to foster courage among the expedition and “make them march on bravely to their Perdition.”⁹⁹ *Man in the Moon* did not share these sentiments. Animated by these rumors, Crouch launched a series of attacks against Cromwell over the next several weeks, which alleged that the lieutenant general had entered into a covert alliance with the Pope in order to secure for himself the crowns of both England and Ireland.¹⁰⁰ *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, moreover, highlighted the hypocrisy of the Independents for having condemned the late king for his pro-Catholic activities when they themselves had embraced a union with the grandee of the faction responsible for spilling the most blood in Ireland.¹⁰¹

Those who may have questioned initial reports of the cessation were assured to the contrary on 28 June when correspondence between both commanders was published

⁹⁷ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 315, 12 Jun. 1649, 214.315\E. 559(15), pp. 1391-1392.

⁹⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 8, 18 Jun. 1649, 316.08\E. 560(13), p. 64. Even after these rumors had been confirmed the editor continued to question this news. Ibid., no. 10, 2 Jul. 1649, 316.10\E. 562(18), pp. 75-76.

⁹⁹ Ibid., no. 9, 25 Jun. 1649, 316.09\E. 561(13), p. 66 [sic].

¹⁰⁰ *Man in the Moon*, no. 8, 5 Jun. 1649, 248.08\E. 558(19), pp. 72, 74; no. 9, 13 Jun. 1649, 248.09\E. 560(2), p. 79; no. 12, 4 Jul. 1649, 248.12\E. 562(27), pp. 99-100 [irreg. pagination].

¹⁰¹ *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 10, 26 Jun. 1649, 370.10A\E. 561(17), p. 78.

in London.¹⁰² Within days, O'Neill's draft proposals for peace and a copy of Monck's counter-propositions appeared in several parliamentary newsbooks - accompanied, it should be noted, by a deafening silence from the editors.¹⁰³ Clearly embarrassing to the administration, matters became even more complicated when Monck returned to England at the end of July after surrendering Dundalk to Inchiquin.¹⁰⁴ Aware of his predicament, the colonel met with Cromwell at Milford Haven shortly after his arrival, and it appears some form of damage control was agreed upon.¹⁰⁵ Cromwell accepted Monck's justification for the cessation, but in order to quell public disquiet, Monck assumed sole responsibility for his actions before both the Council of State and the House of Commons. Public censure followed, but in light of Cromwell's support it was agreed that the colonel had acted in the interest of parliament. Accordingly, charges against him were set aside.¹⁰⁶

The fact that these latest proceedings were widely publicized in the parliamentary press suggests that the authorities were eager to distance themselves from Monck's actions in Ireland.¹⁰⁷ Royalist newsbooks, however, were equally keen to ensure that a different perspective of the colonel's censure was promoted. Although quick to repudiate

¹⁰² It appears that one Colonel Mark Trevor had sent a copy of the correspondence, which had been printed in Cork, to the press in London. Trevor had deserted Monck at Dundalk in favor of Ormond as a result of the accord with O'Neill. Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, pp. 92-93; Casway, "Controversial Catholic Truce," p. 63.

¹⁰³ *Modest Narrative*, no. 13, 30 Jun. 1649, 433.13\E. 562(10), pp. 102-103; *England's Moderate Messenger*, no. 10, 2 Jul. 1649, 124.10\E. 531(11), p. 62; *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 318, 3 Jul. 1649, 214.318\E. 562(23), pp. 1410-1412.

¹⁰⁴ Casway, "Controversial Catholic Truce," pp. 67-68.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 69; Ashley, *Monck*, p. 66.

¹⁰⁶ Casway, "Controversial Catholic Truce," pp. 69-71; Ashley, *Monck*, pp. 67-68.

¹⁰⁷ See for example, *Tuesdaies Journall*, no. 4, 14 Jul. [Aug] 1649, 641.4\E. 532(17), p. 29; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 24, 22 Aug. 1649, 194.24\E. 571(14), p. 195; *Kingdoms Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 324, 14 Aug. 1649, 214.324\E. 569(8), pp. 1458-1459; *The Moderate*, no. 57, 14 Aug. 1649, 413.2057\E. 569(9), pp. 654-655, 661-662; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 137, 17 Aug. 1649, 4165.5137\E. 532(19), pp. 1229-1230; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 315, 13 Aug. 1649, 504.315\E. 532(15), p. 2701; no. 316, 20 Aug. 1649,

initial reports of the cessation in June, in August *Elencticus* informed its readers that O'Neill or Monck would never have entered into an arrangement without the backing of the administration at Westminster, and added that the general had received 50,000 pounds for doing so!¹⁰⁸ *Elencticus* and *Pragmaticus... Charls II* further highlighted the hypocrisy of parliament in understanding the necessity of this particular cessation, while it had executed the king for similar agreements with the Irish earlier in the decade.¹⁰⁹ Both papers concluded that the entire matter had significantly weakened Cromwell's expedition, particularly in fostering desertions within the ranks.¹¹⁰ But no serial was as critical of the Council of State for attempting to distance itself from this affair than *Man in the Moon*. Far from being an innocent party to Monck's pact, as it portrayed itself, Crouch maintained that it had revelled in the advantage it had rendered them. In an effort to underline the hypocrisy of these "purjur'd Villains," he added that:

they sent an Ambassador to the Turk with some Overtures; but the Turk (which hates perfidiousness) hath very honestly clapt him up in Prison; If Turks and Infidels hate their Agents for perfidiousness and treachery; pray what will Christians do?¹¹¹

The whole business, Crouch determined, was evidence that the "Saints will... Murder, swear, forswear, lie, steale, joyne with the Devill, the Turk, or a bloody Irish Rebell for an advantage."¹¹²

504.316\E. 532(1), pp. 2707-2709; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 15 Aug. 1649, 533.74\E. 569(15), pp. 570-571.

¹⁰⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 17, 20 Aug. 1649, 316.17\E. 571(1), pp. 132-133. See also *Ibid.*, no. 15, 6 Aug. 1649, 316.15\E. 568(3), pp. 116-117; *Aulicus. (For King Charls II)*, [unnumbered], 21 Aug. 1649, 277.1\E. 571(4), p. 7.

¹⁰⁹ *Elencticus*, no. 17, 20 Aug. 1649, 316.17\E. 571(1), pp. 133-134; *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 18, 21 Aug. 1649, 370.18\E. 571(8), [p. 6].

¹¹⁰ *Elencticus*, no. 16, 13 Aug. 1649, 316.16\E. 569(3), p. 128; no. 17, 20 Aug. 1649, 316.17\E. 571(1), pp. 131-132; *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 17, 14 Aug. 1649, 370.17\E. 569(17), [pp. 3, 8].

¹¹¹ *Man in the Moon*, no. 16, 8 Aug. 1649, 248.16\E. 568(13), p. 134.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, no. 17, 15 Aug. 1649, 248.17\E. 569(14), p. 144.

"WHAT IS YOUR NEWES FROM IRELAND?"

The volume of news from Ireland contained in the newsbooks during the spring and summer of 1649 was unprecedented. Interest in Irish affairs appeared to be the order of the day. In June, for example, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* proclaimed, "The generall Demand of the people is, What is your newes from Ireland? The sellers of the weekly sheets make answer, and cry aloud in the streets, Newes hot from Ireland."¹¹³

It appears that the London serials made every effort to satisfy this demand. In the months following Cromwell's decision to accept command of the Irish expedition, few newsbooks failed to field any news or commentary regarding that kingdom. Much of this material, though, remained biased and flawed, and the constant stream of inconsistent accounts would have perplexed readers who sought an accurate portrayal of occurrences in Ireland. At one point, such were the discrepancies in news from across the Irish Sea that Gilbert Mabbott decided to abstain from providing his readers with any accounts.¹¹⁴

Perhaps in an effort to bolster the mettle of Irish-bound troops, a popular theme of the pro-parliamentary weeklies was claims that related dissension and fraction within the Irish camp.¹¹⁵ Predictably, such allegations were strenuously denied by their royalist counterparts.¹¹⁶ Equally abhorrent to these editors were reports in June that a parliamentary fleet under the command of Admiral Robert Blake had successfully

¹¹³ *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 317, 26 Jun. 1649, 214.317\E. 561(18), p. 1401.

¹¹⁴ *The Moderate*, no. 51, 3 Jul. 1649, 413.2051\E. 562(22), p. 589.

¹¹⁵ For example, see *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 118, 6 Apr. 1649, 465.5118\E. 529(7), p. 932; no. 119, 13 Apr. 1649, 465.5119\E. 529(10), pp. 960, 963; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 298, 16 Apr. 1649, 504.298\E. 529(13), pp. 2422, 2425; *Perfect Summary*, no. 11, 16[9] Apr. 1649, 530.11\E. 529(12), p. 112; no. 13, 23 Apr. 1649, 530.13\E. 529(19), p. 132; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 11 Apr. 1649, 533.56\E. 55P(17), p. 442; [unnumbered], 30 May 1649, 533.63\E. 530(22), p. 497; *Continued Heads*, no. 3, 4 May 1649, 75.3\E. 529(30), p. 17; *Mercurius Pacificus*, no. 2, 31 May 1649, 353.2\E. 557(7), p. 15; *Moderate Intelligence*, no. 2, 31 May 1649, 415.2\E. 557(6), p. 12.

¹¹⁶ See *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 8, 12 Jun. 1649, 370.08A\E. 559(13), p. 64; *Melancholicus... Charles the Second*, no. 1, 31 May 1649, 343.1\E. 557(8), p. 6.

blockaded Rupert's ships at Kinsale, thus preventing them from jeopardizing supply lines to Ireland on the eve of the expedition.¹¹⁷ *Elencticus* appeared particularly angered by these reports and insisted that, by order of the regicides, licensed forgers such as Walker had fabricated this news.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, this protestation did not prevent the editor from asserting that it was the parliamentary fleet that had been destroyed by the prince.¹¹⁹ This assertion solicited a sharp response from *Metropolitan Nuncio*. Since this news had been blown into town by "the Stinking bladders of Elencticus," Hackluyt claimed, the editor should reserve "his breath to blow his poridg" for shortly "all the wind he hath will not be able to make one sigh for all his roguery."¹²⁰ Not to be outdone, *Elencticus* responded to these insults in kind and launched a tirade of personal abuse upon the former author of *Melancholicus*. These attacks focused upon Hackluyt's volte face, and concluded with allegations that he had been married on six separate occasions, but had divorced each of his wives because they refused to "play the Whores or Bawds to maintaine him."¹²¹

The escalation in military operations on the ground during the summer compounded the propaganda war. In May Ormond launched a fresh offensive in Leinster

¹¹⁷ For example, *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 14, 6 Jun. 1649, 194.14\E. 530(30), p. 112; no. 16, 20 Jun 1649, 1649, 194.16\E. 530(43), pp. 123-124; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 128, 15 Jun. 1649, 465.5128\E. 530(38), pp. 1065-1066, 1068-1069, 1079-1080; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 316, 19 Jun. 1649, 214.316\E. 560(16), pp. 1395-1396; *Perfect Diurnall*, 11 Jun. 1649, 504.306\E. 530(35), p. 2563; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 13 Jun. 1649, 533.65\E. 559(17), p. 513.

¹¹⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 7, 11 Jun. 1649, 316.07\E. 559(7), pp. 54-55. Also no. 6, 4 Jun. 1649, 316.06\E. 558(9), p. 42. For additional responses to reports concerning the blockade of Kinsale in the royalist serials see *Man in the Moon*, no. 9, 13 Jun. 1649, 248.09\E. 560(2), p. 79; *Pragmaticus...Charls II*, no. 7, 5 Jun. 1649, 370.07A\E. 558(18), [p. 8]; *Pragmaticus...Charls II*, no. 7, 5 Jun. 1649, 370.07B\E. 558(20), [p. 8].

¹¹⁹ In actuality, Blake had successfully blockaded Rupert's ships in Kinsale on 22 May. This blockade was maintained until October 1649 when bad weather drove the parliamentary fleet from their position, whereupon Rupert fled Ireland for Lisbon. Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, ii, p. 188; Wheeler, "Four Armies in Ireland," p. 63.

¹²⁰ *Metropolitan Nuncio*, no. 3, 13 Jun. 1649, 349.3\E. 560(3), [p. 8]. Hackluyt's criticisms over this issue were not just reserved for the royalist press. Henry Walker was rebuked for reports in *Perfect Occurrences*, which claimed the parliamentary fleet had destroyed Rupert's ships, seized Kinsale, and forced the prince to flee for safety. *Metropolitan Nuncio*, no. 1[2], 6 Jul. [Jun.] 1649, 349.2, [p. 2].

¹²¹ *Elencticus*, no. 9, 25 Jun. 1649, 316.09\E. 561(13), pp. 66-67.

that centered on capturing Dublin before Cromwell could land, and by mid-June he had successfully placed the city under siege.¹²² Amid claims of disparate royalist successes, this news encouraged *Man in the Moon* to predict that by August Ormond would be in England, whereupon it would be great sport to “see Fox Cromwell and his Cubbs un-earth’d, and forced out of their everlasting habitations at Westminster.”¹²³ However, Crouch’s confidence in Ormond was premature. Indecision before Dublin resulted in the marquis dispatching Inchiquin northward with approximately 3,000 men (from an estimated army of 10,000 horse and foot) to seize the parliamentary strongholds of Dundalk and Drogheda.¹²⁴ Drogheda fell on 11 July, and although the garrison was granted quarter, it seems that the majority of these troops decided to abandon the parliamentary cause and joined forces with Inchiquin.¹²⁵

News of Drogheda and of Inchiquin’s march toward Dundalk prompted Monck to summon relief from O’Neill. Owen Roe honored his commitment to assist the colonel, and on 23 July he dispatched around 800 men to Dundalk in order to retrieve desperately needed ammunition and provisions for his army. After leaving the town with these supplies, this party (supposedly intoxicated) was intercepted and routed by a band of

¹²² Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 446–454.

¹²³ *Man in the Moon*, no. 12, 4 Jul. 1649, 248.12\E. 562(27), pp. 101–102 [irreg. pagination].

¹²⁴ Casway, *Owen Roe O’Neill*, pp. 248; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 454.

¹²⁵ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 455; *Elencticus*, no. 14, 30 Jul. 1649, 316.14\E. 566(10), p. 106. Similar to divers other encounters between royalist and parliamentary forces at this time, the siege and capitulation of Drogheda attracted considerable copy in the weekly press. Without fail, newsbooks in both camps utilized this engagement for propaganda purposes, particularly in promoting hyper-inflated body counts. For a sample of this coverage see, *Impartiall Scout*, no. 25, 20 Jul. 1649, 210.25\E. 531(25), p. 202; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 319, 10 Jul. 1649, 214.319\E. 564(2), p. 1423; no. 320, 17 Jul. 1649, 214.320\E. 565(10), p. 1432; no. 322, 31 Jul. 1649, 214.322\E. 566(14), pp. 1442–1444; *Modest Narrative*, no. 16, 21 Jul. 1649, 433.16\E. 565(19), p. 122; no. 17, 28 Jul. 1649, 433.17\E. 566(7), pp. 132–134; *Moderate Messenger*, no. 13, 23 Jul. 1649, 124.13\E. 531(30), p. 88; *Elencticus*, no. 13, 24 Jul. 1649, 316.13\E. 565(22), pp. 102–103; no. 14, 30 Jul. 1649, 316.14\E. 566(10), pp. 105–106; *Man in the Moon*, no. 14, 25 Jul. 1649, 248.14\E. 565(26), p. 122.

Inchiquin's horse.¹²⁶ As a result, O'Neill was forced to abandon Monck, and within three days the parliamentary commander was forced to surrender the town amid a weakening resolve among his troops to withstand the ensuing siege.¹²⁷ This upturn in royalist fortunes was clearly reflected in *Mercurius Carolinus* when the editor proclaimed that 16 July should heretofore be designated 'St. Ormond's Day' as a manifest token of God's favor in this conflict.¹²⁸ Indeed, by the time that Inchiquin returned to Ormond at the end of July only Dublin and Londonderry (among the major parliamentary garrisons) held out against the lord lieutenant and pro-royalist Scottish forces in the north.¹²⁹ The fate of Londonderry had remained a source of constant speculation in recent weeks,¹³⁰ but in the aftermath of his forced retreat before Drogheda, O'Neill responded to an invitation from

¹²⁶ Casway, *Owen Roe O'Neill*, pp. 249-250.

¹²⁷ In this engagement, the former parliamentary commander, Colonel Trevor, led Inchiquin's horse. To compound Westminster's misery, it appears that a significant number of the Dundalk garrison followed the example set by their comrades at Drogheda and switched allegiance to the king. Similar to Drogheda, the capitulation of Dundalk generated considerable copy in the weekly press. Again not all newsbooks could be relied upon to present an accurate portrayal of events. *Elencticus*, for example, reported that Hugh Montgomery and George Monroe had taken Dundalk, whereupon almost 2,000 of the garrison had been put to the sword. *Elencticus*, no. 14, 30 Jul. 1649, 316.14\E. 566(10), p. 106. For further accounts that addressed this latest success by Inchiquin see *England's Moderate Messenger*, no. 14, 30 Jul. 1649, 124.14\E. 532(4), pp. 93, 96; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 1 Aug. 1649, 533.72\E. 566(17), p. 555; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 22, 1 Aug. 1649, 194.22\E. 566(20), pp. 177-178; no. 23, 1[8] Aug. 1649, 194.23A\E. 566(16), pp. 178-179; *Armies Painfull-Messenger*, no. 1, 2 Aug. 1649, 19.1\E. 566(25), p. 3; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 135, 3 Aug. 1649, 465.5135\E. 532(7), p. 1207; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 314, 6 Aug. 1649, 504.314\E. 532(10), pp. 2682-2683; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 323, 7 Jul. [Aug.] 1649, 214.323\E. 568(10), p. 1449; *Perfect Summary*, no. 21, 6 Aug. 1649, 530.25D\E. 532(9), pp. 121-122 [irreg. pagination]; *Elencticus*, no. 15, 6 Aug. 1649, 316.15\E. 568(3), pp. 116-117; *Pragmaticus...Charls II*, no. 16, 7 Aug. 1649, 370.16\E. 568(7), [p. 3].

¹²⁸ *Mercurius Carolinus*, no. 1, 26 Jul. 1649, 294.1\E. 566(6), [p. 8].

¹²⁹ Before returning to Dublin, Inchiquin had also seized Newry, Narrow-water, Greencastle, Carlingford, and Trim. Meanwhile, Clanricard had taken Sligo, while Belfast, Carrickfergus, and Coleraine were under the control of Montgomery and Monro, the latter having recently returned to Ireland with a commission from the exiled king (and subsequently upheld by Ormond) to command the Scottish army in Ulster. For details of this, and of subsequent activity by the principal Scottish royalists in Ulster during the summer, see Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, pp. 268-274.

¹³⁰ See for example, *Pragmaticus...Charls II*, no. 7, 5 Jun. 1649, 370.07B\E. 558(20), [p. 7]; *Man in the Moon*, no. 12, 4 Jul. 1649, 248.12\E. 562(27), p. 102; *Brittanicus*, no. 7, 5 Jun. 1649, 285.7\E. 558(13), p. 34; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 14, 6 Jun. 1649, 194.14\E. 530(30), p. 111; *Modest Narrative*, no. 13, 30 Jun. 1649, 433.13\E. 562(10), p. 104; no. 14, 7 Jul. 1649, 433.14\E. 563(7), p. 109; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 130, 29 Jun. 1649, 465.5130\E. 531(6), pp. 1086-1088; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 309, 2 Jul. 1649, 504.309\E. 531(11), p. 2621; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 227, 26 Jul. 1649, 419.227\E. 566(4), pp. 2176-2177.

Coote that promised the general substantial supplies to help relieve the siege. This news may have encouraged jeers from *Perfect Occurrences*, which claimed that, "Money makes the Old Wife trot," but by early August Owen Roe had successfully forced the Scots to abandon their siege of the city and withdraw to their strongholds east of the Bann.¹³¹

CROMWELL FOR IRELAND?

Reports of royalist successes aside, Cromwell remained determined to delay his departure for Ireland until adequate funds had been procured for the first crucial months of the campaign. To this end, by late June he had convinced parliament to enact legislation that charged 400,000 pounds on the future receipts of the excise, and from this security it was decreed that 150,000 pounds could be borrowed immediately from the city.¹³² These proposals were deemed futile by *Elencticus* and prompted the editor to scoff that this credit was good "as the Publique Faith, neither of which will bee now taken for the soiling a paire of Bootes."¹³³ In fact, considering the growing unpopularity of the new administration within London, the city merchants were confident that this sum would not be advanced, and even offered odds of twenty to one against Cromwell and his troops departing for Ireland anytime in the next twelve months.¹³⁴ Despite these misgivings, Cromwell completed the first leg of his journey by arriving at Bristol on 14 July. There,

¹³¹ *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 139, 31 Aug. 1649, 465.5139\E. 532(29), p. 1249; Casway, *Owen Roe O'Neill*, pp. 250-251; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 462-463.

¹³² Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, p. 86; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, p. 353.

¹³³ *Elencticus*, no. 11, 9 Jul. 1649, 316.11\E. 563(9), pp. 83-84.

¹³⁴ *The Moderate*, no. 53, 17 Jul. 1649, 413.2053\E. 565(11), p. 613. It appears that Ireland was a popular source for wagers in London at this time. See for example, *The Moderate*, no. 56, 7 Aug. 1649, 413.2056\E. 568(9), p. 651; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 229, 9 Aug. 1649, 419.229\E. 568(17), p. 2191.

while waiting for the necessary funds to arrive, he proceeded to complete his final preparations for the invasion.¹³⁵

The royalist newsbooks continued to capitalize on these delays and remained equally eager to vilify the commander-in-chief. Although the authorities successfully targeted Nedham for arrest on 18 June, *Pragmaticus... Charls II* appeared to spearhead these efforts.¹³⁶ On 31 July the editor maintained that rather than sail for Ireland, Cromwell intended to impeach those at Westminster whom he considered responsible for the delay of his expedition in order to consolidate his personal power and that of the Council of State at home. He continued, “what cares Oliver for a few nasty houses and Bogs in Ireland, so long as hee can Riot it at pleasure, in the Kings stately Pallaces in England, and have the Riches and Fat of the whole land at his dispose?”¹³⁷ Moreover, in light of recent successes by pro-royalist forces in Ireland, the editor confidently proclaimed that although Cromwell was no longer prepared to set foot in that kingdom:

hee cannot unlesse hee could worke the miracle of Moses, by dividing the Sea which hee is so farre from; that Pharoahs fate were the likelyer to befall him, and the devouring waves became a snare to his Host, as to the Egiptians.¹³⁸

Cromwell’s appointment as lord lieutenant of Ireland by parliament in June may have provided additional impetus for disparaging remarks by *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, while at the same time the editor upheld the virtues of Ormond and those of his followers. Ridiculing the confidence that the parliamentary periodicals had in Cromwell’s ability to

¹³⁵ Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, p. 97; Gentiles, *New Model Army*, pp. 353-354; *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 14, 24 Jul. 1649, 370.14\E. 565(21), [p. 4].

¹³⁶ *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1649-1650*, p. 537. Frank suggests that John Cleveland may have replaced Nedham as editor. Frank, *English Newspaper*, pp. 194-195.

¹³⁷ *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 15, 31 Jul. 1649, 370.15\E. 566(15), [pp. 1-2].

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 11, 3 Jul. 1649, 370.11\E. 562(21), [p. 6]. For additional examples of the editor’s disdain toward Cromwell over this issue see *Ibid.*, [p. 5]; no. 12, 10 Jul. 1649, 370.12A\E. 563(12), [pp. 2-3]; no. 13, 17 Jul. 1649, 370.13\E. 565(9), [p. 2].

defeat his royalist counterpart, the editor remarked that “should wee believe their owne Licensed Forgers, wee might suppose his Nose-ship can beate Ormond with as much ease as Hoggs eate Achornes or tame-Pigeons Pease.”¹³⁹ Indeed, the editor admonished Cromwell that unless he could “work the wonders of Gidian, and Conquer... Ormond with three hundred Janizzaries” he should return to his “vipers-nest, and sit till thou hast hatched thine owne Ruine at Westminster.”¹⁴⁰

But *Pragmaticus... Charls II* and his fellow scribes in the royalist fold reserved some of their greatest scorn for the parliamentary lord lieutenant in verse. Although not always the prerogative of these newsbooks, this medium became an effective weapon in the armory of royalist propaganda during the summer of 1649. No doubt convinced of its effectiveness *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, *Elencticus*, *Man in the Moon*, and even the fleeting *Mercurius Carolinus*, all employed four-quatrain, ballad-like poems on their title pages. Many of these poems discredited parliamentary plans for the subjugation of Ireland, and consistently ridiculed Cromwell into the bargain. On 24 July, for example, *Elencticus* conveyed the following ballad that mocked the delay of the expedition:

That Dublin is Reliev'd they boast,
Twit Ormond with Mishaps;
Yet come not neerer th' Irish-Coast,
Then Speed or Cambden's Maps

The Soldiers yet gets no Arrears
No Ships sent to Transport Him:
Nor any Hope to drowne his Feares,
Save Owen to exhort Him.¹⁴¹

Likewise, *Carolinus* was confident that any invasion of Ireland would result in a suitable

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 15, 31 Jul. 1649, 370.15VE. 566(15), [p. 2].

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 13, 17 Jul. 1649, 370.13VE. 565(9), [p. 2]. See also *Ibid.*, [p. 4].

¹⁴¹ *Elencticus*, no. 13, 24 Jul. 1649, 316.13VE. 565(22), p. 97.

demise for its commander-in-chief:

It is decreed Cromwell must die,
But just heaven will not have,
Trayters bones had where Royalty
pre-occupies the grave.

Therefore to Ireland he is sent,
By his impetuous fate:
That th' Irish may a death invent,
to him appropriate.¹⁴²

Of course, Cromwell continued to attract plaudits from the parliamentary press. Considering his history with Dillingham, and the lengthy riposte to the *Queries* in the spring by *Moderate Intelligencer*, it was no surprise that this paper consistently praised the lord lieutenant. In an effort clearly designed to instill greater confidence within the expedition, on 5 July Dillingham maintained that, according to divers statesmen and soldiers, their commander-in-chief was considered to be the most prudent and gallant soldier in Europe.¹⁴³ He further insisted that any recruit who decided to forsake the opportunity of serving under Cromwell would also have failed to serve with Julius Caesar, Augustus, Hannibal or Scipio - an indication perhaps of an expectation of popular support for imperial ventures. In this respect, *Moderate Intelligencer* addressed those troops who may have yet remained less than enthusiastic about their forthcoming endeavors:

...shame, therefore, you English Janizaries, leap out of your beds of down from your young wives and away for Ireland...if Ormond get Dublin, is there not a possibility of his

¹⁴² *Carolinus*, no. 1, 26 Jul. 1649, 294.1\E. 566(6), [p. 1]. For additional examples of royalist verse ridiculing Cromwell and the expedition see, *Man in the Moon*, no. 13, 11 Jul. 1649, 248.13\E. 564(3), p. 107; *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 15, 31 Jul. 1649, 370.15\E. 566(15), [p. 1]; *Elencticus*, no. 16, 13 Aug. 1649, 316.16\E. 569(3), p. 121.

¹⁴³ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 224, 5 Jul. 1649, 419.224\E. 563(3), p. 2121.

stepping into England? or if not, to make the War of Ireland hold 7 years that may be ended in 7 months if the opportunity be taken.¹⁴⁴

Perhaps recognizing the folly of such exuberance, particularly since Cromwell had no intention of embarking for Ireland until the necessary funds had been secured, the following week Dillingham reassured his readers that there was no longer a need for him to promote the urgent departure of this force. Ormond's unwillingness to approach Dublin until the summer harvest had almost been spent by the inhabitants, he claimed, and the marquis's belief that a direct assault upon the city would expedite the parliamentary army across the sea, were sufficient grounds to conclude that the city was under no immediate danger.¹⁴⁵

RATHMINES

There was certainly some substance to Dillingham's argument. Although Ormond had encamped at Finglas (three miles north of Dublin) on 19 June, he believed that his army was incapable of taking Dublin by storm. Accordingly, he proposed to blockade Jones and starve him out. For this purpose, on 25 July Ormond left 2,500 men under Lord Dillon on the north side of the river Liffey and moved his camp to Rathmines on the south side.¹⁴⁶ However, the following day, before the marquis could construct a battery to prevent the entry of ships to Dublin, the first installment of Cromwell's army numbering approximately 2,600 men arrived from Chester.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 2122. Dillingham may have felt compelled to use such language amid reports in *The Moderate* two days earlier that suggested some factions within the expedition were not committed to serving in Ireland. *The Moderate*, no. 51, 3 Jul. 1649, 413.2051\E. 562(22), p. 590.

¹⁴⁵ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 225, 12 Jul. 1649, 419.225\E. 564(6), p. 2143.

¹⁴⁶ G.A. Hayes McCoy, "Rathmines, 1649," in *Irish Battles: A Military History of Ireland* (Belfast, 1989), p. 206; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 463.

¹⁴⁷ Hayes McCoy, "Rathmines," p. 207; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 463-464.

The advent of these troops sparked unfounded rumors that within forty-eight hours of their arrival they had engaged and defeated Ormond!¹⁴⁸ Always keen to exploit uncertainty, the royalist press presented equally unfounded claims. *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, for example, alleged that these regiments had been forced to return to Anglesey after being badly beaten while attempting to enter Dublin harbor. On 2 August *Man in the Moon* even insisted that Cromwell's son had been killed during this operation!¹⁴⁹ Reports that the first part of the expedition had landed solicited the following response from *Elencticus*:

Foure Dreadfull Regiments (they say)
Are all in Dublin landed:
But 'tis the Cleane contrary way
[Fir'd, Split, or Sunke, or Sanded.]

That those within Rejoice and Feast,
But meane to Fast hereafter.
They neither want for Man nor Beast,
[The fitter they for Slaughter.]¹⁵⁰

Although *Elencticus* later admitted that these regiments had landed safely at Dublin, the editor was keen to stress that the majority of these men were raw recruits who had no military experience.¹⁵¹ But the reality of the situation was that the successful arrival of these troops from England bolstered Jones's position in Dublin. By the end of July the colonel not only commanded a force numerically as strong as Ormond's, but the new additions to his ranks were hardened New Model veterans who would shortly be afforded

¹⁴⁸ *Impartiall Scout*, no. 27, 3 Aug. 1649, 210.27E. 532(6), p. 216.

¹⁴⁹ *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 16, 7 Aug. 1649, 370.16E. 568(7), [p. 8]; *Man in the Moon*, no. 15, 2 Aug. 1649, 248.15E. 566(28), p. 130. The following week Crouch insisted that while Ormond had allowed these troops to enter Dublin, they had been captured as a result of Jones's capitulation to the marquis. *Man in the Moon*, no. 16, 8 Aug. 1649, 248.16E. 568(13), pp. 136, 138.

¹⁵⁰ *Elencticus*, no. 15, 6 Aug. 1649, 316.15E. 568(3), p. 113.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, no. 16, 13 Aug. 1649, 316.16E. 569(3), p. 126.

the opportunity to demonstrate these qualities to their opponents.

Jones's status at this juncture was further strengthened by rumors that Cromwell was preparing to land the bulk of his army in Munster.¹⁵² This forced Ormond to dispatch Inchiquin to that province with the better part of three regiments of horse to help coordinate a suitable defense.¹⁵³ It also placed more pressure on the royalists to press Dublin into surrender. To this effect, in an effort to prevent Jones from feeding the parliamentary horse, on 29 July Ormond ordered Sir Thomas Armstrong to sweep the meadows that stretched from Trinity College to Ringsend on the shores of Dublin Bay. Armstrong, though, was driven back and among the prisoners taken by parliamentary forces was one Captain Elliot, a young nephew of the colonel who had recently switched allegiance to the royalists. Much to the disdain of *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, Jones promptly hanged him as a deserter.¹⁵⁴

In a further attempt to gain control of the meadows, Ormond sent 1,500 foot under cover of darkness in the early hours of 2 August to fortify the derelict castle of Baggotrath. Standing less than one mile from the city, it was hoped that once an appropriate defense had been established there, a trench could be dug towards the Liffey, from which Ormond proposed to mount a battery to prevent future relief for Jones.¹⁵⁵ The fact that this expedition took several hours to reach their destination, however, meant that

¹⁵² Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 464; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 323, 7 Jul. [Aug.] 1649, 214.323\E. 568(10), p. 1456; *Moderate Messenger*, no. 16, 13 Aug. 1649, 124.16\E. 532(16), p. 106.

¹⁵³ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 464-465.

¹⁵⁴ *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 17, 14 Aug. 1649, 370.17\E. 569(7), [pp. 1-2]. For details of this operation see, *Moderate Messenger*, no. 15, 6 Aug. 1649, 124.15\E. 532(8), p. 106; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 7 Jul. [Aug.] 1649, 214.323\E. 568(10), p. 1456; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 229, 9 Aug. 1649, 419.229\E. 568(17), p. 2202; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 8 Aug. 1649, 533.73\E. 568(14), pp. 567-568; *Impartiall Scout*, no. 28, 10 Aug. 1649, 210.28\E. 532(14), p. 220; *Modest Narrative*, no. 19, 11 Aug. 1649, 433.19\E. 568(22), p. 147.

¹⁵⁵ Hayes McCoy, "Rathmines," p. 208; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 466-467.

this task could not be completed before daybreak.¹⁵⁶ As soon as Jones became aware of their presence, he launched a force of 4,000 foot and 1,200 horse against Baggotrath that overwhelmed and routed the occupants in the first charge. Buoyed by the unexpected ease of this success, the colonel continued his advance against Ormond's main camp at Rathmines, where Ormond was asleep after spending the night writing dispatches. After two hours of fighting a similar rout ensued. Jones was rewarded with a comprehensive victory over the marquis, and most importantly the siege of Dublin had been broken.¹⁵⁷

The Westminster weeklies gleaned initial news of these events primarily from correspondence dispatched from Dublin by Jones to the Council of State shortly after the battle had been concluded.¹⁵⁸ Considering that it had been widely reported in recent weeks that Ormond stood before Dublin with between 30–40,000 men, this intelligence no doubt caught both press and public in England by surprise.¹⁵⁹ But by mid August the licensed serials were proud to report that, as a result of this engagement, 4,000 of Ormond's men had been killed, while as many as 2,500 soldiers and a considerable

¹⁵⁶ Apparently one Edmund O'Reilly, (later Archbishop of Armagh) who had been engaged in conducting an intrigue between O'Neill and Jones, had instructed the guides to deliberately mislead the royalist party during the night. Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 467.

¹⁵⁷ Hayes McCoy, "Rathmines," pp. 208–212; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, pp. 468–470.

¹⁵⁸ All the parliamentary newsbooks carried news of Rathmines. Some of the more detailed accounts can be found in *Moderate Messenger*, no. 16, 13 Aug. 1649, 124.16\E. 532(16), p. 112; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 315, 13 Aug. 1649, 504.315\E. 532(15), pp. 2701–2702; *Perfect Summary*, no. 22, 13 Aug. 1649, 530.25\E, p. 133; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 324, 14 Aug. 1649, 214.324\E. 569(8), pp. 1459–1463; *The Moderate*, no. 57, 14 Aug. 1649, 413.2057\E. 568(9), pp. 659–661; *Tuesdaies Journall*, no. 4, 14 Jul. [Aug.] 1649, 641.4\E. 532(17), pp. 30–32; *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 15 Aug. 1649, 533.74\E. 569(15), pp. 573–574 [irreg. pagination]; *Great Britaines Paine-Full Messenger*, no. 1, 16 Aug. 1649, 173.1\E. 569(18), pp. 4–6; *Impartiall Intelligencer*, no. 23, 15 Aug. 1649, 194.23B\E. 569(13), pp. 187–188; *Impartiall Scout*, no. 29, 17 Aug. 1649, 210.29\E. 532(18), pp. 217–218; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 230, 16 Aug. 1649, 419.230\E. 569(19), pp. 2203–2204; *Perfect Occurrences*, no. 137, 17 Aug. 1649, 465.5137\E. 532(19), pp. 1224–1227; *Modest Narrative*, no. 20, 18 Aug. 1649, 433.20\E. 569(21), pp. 154–156.

¹⁵⁹ For example, see *Impartiall Scout*, no. 24, 13 Jul. 1649, 210.24\E. 531(18), p. 189; no. 26, 27 Jul. 1649, 210.26\E. 531(35), p. 215; no. 27, 3 Aug. 1649, 210.27\E. 532(6), p. 213; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 225, 12 Jul. 1649, 419.225\E. 564(6), p. 2154; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 314, 6 Aug. 1649, 504.314\E. 532(10), p. 2682.

supply of ordinance, arms and stores had been captured by parliamentary forces.¹⁶⁰ Even more remarkable were claims made by Jones that as few as twenty of his men had been lost in action! In light of such claims, *The Moderate* resorted to messianic terms in asserting that as a result of Ormond's evil intentions and with Jones as his instrument:

the Lord looked down from Heaven...and defeated them; Then he sent forth his wrath, and consumed them as stubble, or as chaffe before the winds. And thus hath he begun to avenge his Israel there, and visit for the blood of his people shed in that Kingdom....¹⁶¹

In keeping with its reputation as a bastion of military news, *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* appeared to award more copy to Rathmines than any of its competitors. The editor overstepped the mark, though, when he included a report that suggested Ormond himself had been slain!¹⁶² Given this particular allegation, it was ironic that the following week *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* attempted to convince those, who, as a result of the inconsistencies that surrounded initial reports of Rathmines in the newsbooks, remained skeptical of this latest success. On 21 August the editor reassured his audience that, although these papers had promoted "apparent contradictions, and such a thwarting of the truth by an indeavour to enlarge the story," they could rely on his intelligence, which came from "honest hands."¹⁶³

On the contrary, if *Great Britaines Paine-Full Messenger* is to be believed, the royalists in Northamptonshire refused to believe that Ormond had been defeated, and even threatened to lynch whomever was responsible for conveying this news to those

¹⁶⁰ According to Irish sources, approximately 600 royalists lost their lives and a further 1,800 officers and soldiers were taken captive. Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 470.

¹⁶¹ *The Moderate*, no. 58, 21 Aug. 1649, 413. 2058\E. 571(7), pp. 669-670.

¹⁶² *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 324, 14 Aug. 1649, 214.324\E. 569(8), pp. 1459-1461, 1452-1453[sic], 1464.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, no. 325, 21 Aug. 1649, 214.325\E. 571(6), p. 1465.

parts.¹⁶⁴ However, although royalist newsbooks generally acknowledged that Jones had scored some form of victory at Rathmines, and while failing to match their parliamentary counterparts in providing detailed accounts of the battle, they were quick to mock the casualty figures provided by their antagonists. *Pragmaticus... Charls II* jeered:

A Victory! A Victory!
 Lord save us! Ormond routed!
 His Forces tooke, and forc'd to fly,
 'Tis Treason to bee doubted.

Four thousand slaine; not one man losse,
 Or more; yet none of theirs:
 Believ't that can, for I confesse
 It sounds like Braines and Staires.¹⁶⁵

Man in the Moon found the disparity in the casualty figures particularly offensive and insisted that these reports were clearly designed to motivate the Irish-bound troops “who are as willing to go to Ireland, as a Bare is to goe to the stake.”¹⁶⁶ Similar accusations were promoted by *Elencticus* and *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, and while not denying that royalists forces had suffered losses, both papers maintained that former parliamentary troops who had deserted to Inchiquin earlier in the summer comprised the majority of those men either killed or captured by Jones.¹⁶⁷ Each newsbook further claimed that not only had the colonel failed to engage the main body of Ormond’s army, but also alleged

¹⁶⁴ *Great Brittaines Paine-Full Messenger*, no. 2, 24 Aug. 1649, 173.2\E. 571(22), p. 10.

¹⁶⁵ *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 17, 14 Aug. 1649, 370.17\E. 569(7), [p. 1]. Additional verse on the same theme can be found in *Elencticus*, no. 17, 20 Aug. 1649, 316.17\E. 571(1), p. 129.

¹⁶⁶ *Man in the Moon*, no. 17, 15 Aug. 1649, 248.17\E. 569(14), p. 144. For further ridicule by Crouch in relation to Rathmines see also *Ibid.*, no. 18, 23 Aug. 1649, 248.18\E. 571(18), p. 152.

¹⁶⁷ This appears to have been the case. Hayes McCoy, “Rathmines,” p. 211; Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 470. Gardiner also points out that, considering the number of troops who had recently deserted from the parliamentary ranks, Jones may have taken a similar approach to these men as he did with his own nephew only days earlier. Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i, p. 102.

that 1,200 of his own men had been killed. Accordingly, this was a pyrrhic victory and nowhere near absolute as portrayed.¹⁶⁸

Absolute it may not have been, but despite the debate in the weekly press over the magnitude of Jones's victory at Rathmines, the fact remained that parliament's forces had scored an important psychological blow to the royalist cause in Ireland.¹⁶⁹ Indeed, in the aftermath of this defeat Ormond communicated to Clanricarde that "No thing in the defeat [is] so terrible to me as the dejection it brings upon the best inclined, and the advantage it gives to others to work upon the fears of the people."¹⁷⁰ On the other hand, *Impartiall Intelligencer* was confident that news of Rathmines would vitalize the spirits of those slated for Ireland. These men, according to the editor, were not only astonished by Jones's success, but a greater commitment to serve in that kingdom, particularly among those soldiers who had hitherto expressed some doubt, was now foreseen. He remained equally assured of Cromwell's commitment to capitalize on this triumph, and added "that is a perfect victory indeed, which assureth every man to his estate, and delivereth him from oppression and fear of greater Enemies."¹⁷¹

As important were the strategic consequences of Rathmines. Had the marquis taken Dublin, the Cromwellian invasion of Ireland might have been postponed indefinitely.¹⁷² But as a result of the siege being raised, on 15 August - having received 100,000 pounds from Westminster to sustain his troops during the initial stages of their campaign - Cromwell landed near the Irish capital at the head of 4,000 horse and foot. A

¹⁶⁸ *Elencticus*, no. 17, 20 Aug. 1649, 316.17\E. 571(1), pp. 129-131; *Pragmaticus... Charles II*, no. 18, 21 Aug. 1649, 370.18\E. 571(8), [pp. 2-3].

¹⁶⁹ Carte, *Ormond*, iii, p. 471.

¹⁷⁰ Cited in Gentiles, *New Model Army*, p. 357.

¹⁷¹ *Impartiall Scout*, no. 29, 17 Aug. 1649, 210.29\E. 532(18), p. 220; Also *Perfect Weekly Account*, [unnumbered], 22 Aug. 1649, 533.75\E. 571(15), p. 574.

¹⁷² Gentiles, *New Model Army*, p. 357.

further 6,000 troops landed shortly thereafter, and in addition to the regiments that had arrived in late July, by mid-September approximately 12,000 New Model veterans were primed for the conquest of Ireland.¹⁷³ Perhaps it was no coincidence that shortly after this campaign got underway, the authorities in England sanctioned the termination of all newsbooks currently in operation.

¹⁷³ Ibid., pp. 356-357.

CONCLUSION

On 20 September 1649 an act “against unlicensed and scandalous books and pamphlets, and for the better regulating of Printing” was approved at Westminster. From the provisos set forth it was clear that the government was committed to expunging all existing newsbooks. The most stringent measures required all printers to post a bond of 300 pounds, while heavy fines were to be imposed on authors, printers, booksellers and buyers of books and pamphlets that had not been licensed. In addition, the Stationers’ were granted unprecedented search and seizure powers to prevent the appearance of unlicensed material from appearing. Most telling was that all previous licenses for newsbooks were to be withdrawn.¹

Although *Pragmaticus... Charls II* confidently proclaimed (amid the preparation of this legislation during the summer) that any new measures designed to quell the press would prove as hopeless as parliamentary efforts to relieve Dublin, the new ordinance had great success.² By mid-October the casualty rate among licensed parliamentary weeklies was 100 per cent, and by November only two royalist titles, *Man in the Moon* and *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, remained extant among those newsbooks that had not possessed licenses. However, the fact that the first of two authorized serials were introduced by the Council of State soon after the act took effect on 1 October, suggests

¹ See C.H. Firth and R. S. Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, 3 vols. (London, 1911), vol. ii, p. 245. See also Clyde, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 187-188, and Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 222-223.

² *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 15, 31 Jul. 1649, 370.15VE. 566(15), [p. 2].

that this body wanted some form of state-sponsored production in order to reconcile the nation to the dramatic political upheaval of recent months.³

Given that the outbreak of the Irish rebellion played a pivotal role in the birth of domestic periodical news in England, it is ironic that this fresh legislation by parliament was introduced shortly after the launch of the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland.

According to J.B. Williams, the Council of State had endeavored to suppress all newsbooks then in operation in response to news of Cromwell's infamous massacre at Drogheda on 11 September.⁴ But this argument is undermined by the fact that the government had been preparing these measures since May, and, that news of Drogheda appears to have reached London shortly *after* 20 September.⁵ Furthermore, given the prevailing prejudice toward the Irish at this time - reinforced no doubt by the recurrent allegations of atrocities perpetrated against English settlers in recent years - Cromwell's

³ *A Briefe Relation of Some Affaires and Transactions, Civill and Military, both Forraigne and Domestique* N&S 27 was edited by Walter Frost, (secretary to the Council of State) and debuted on 2 October. The following week, Henry Scobell (clerk to the Parliament) was awarded responsibility for *Severall Proceedings in Parliament* N&S 599. Responsibility for this second publication was later given to Henry Walker. These publications endured until October 1650 and September 1655 respectively, and are generally considered to be the prototypes for *Mercurius Politicus* N&S 361 and *The Publick Intelligencer* N&S 575. Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 75-76. Designed to serve the purpose of quelling rumor with information under the Commonwealth and Protectorate, both *Politicus* and *Publick Intelligencer*, according to S. R. Gardiner, "were eminently respectable, and are amongst our most valuable sources of information." Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, I, p. 174. Three other licensed papers appeared shortly after the act. In December Pecke returned to edit *A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages and Proceedings of, and in Relation to the Armies*, N&S 503, which survived until September 1655; *A Perfect and More Particular Relation of the Proceedings of the Army in Ireland* appeared for two issues in November, N&S 497; and *The Irish Monthly Mercury*, appeared in December 1649 and February 1650, N&S 204.

⁴ J.B. Williams, *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette* (London, 1908), pp. 123-124.

⁵ Clyde, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 192-193; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 75. The first wave of what appeared to be unconfirmed reports of Cromwell's successful storming of Drogheda can be found in *Modest Narrative*, no. 25, 22 Sep. 1649, 433.25; *Moderate Messenger*, no. 22, 24 Sep. 1649, 124.22\E. 533(9), p. 152 [irreg. pag.]; *Perfect Summary*, no. 26, 24 Sep. 1649, 530.26B\E. 533(10), p. 216; *Perfect Diurnall*, no. 321, 24 Sep. 1649, p. 2798; *The Moderate*, no. 63, 25 Sep. 1649, 413.2063\E. 574(22), [p. 734]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, no. 330, 25 Sep. 1649, 214.330\E. 574(23), p. 1512; *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 236, 27 Sep. 1649, 419.236\E. 574(27), p. 2286.

actions would most likely have been condoned rather than condemned.⁶ In fact, on 4 October *Moderate Intelligencer* made it clear that it defied the 1 October deadline in order to report “the first eminent action” of the lord lieutenant in Ireland.⁷ Early reports surrounding events at Drogheda had been unclear, and this confusion was compounded by counter-claims in the royalist press which insisted that it was Cromwell who had suffered a severe defeat at the hands of the Irish.⁸ Possibly these accounts, rather than the true nature of the contest may have prompted the Council of State to enforce their Act so rigidly.⁹

But the reality of the situation remains that this ordinance was enacted shortly after Cromwell arrived in Ireland. Following the king’s execution, it was clear that the conquest of that nation had become a top priority for the Council of State. It was also evident that by the spring of 1649 opponents of the new regime opposed such plans. For different reasons, both Leveller and pro-royalist publications attempted to undermine the proposed campaign, and it appears that until the battle at Rathmines there were still factions within the expedition reluctant to serve in that conflict. In view of these considerations, the authorities may have deemed it unwise to expedite the suppression of licensed newsbooks while these works attempted to combat incessant propaganda over Ireland from their opponents. The successful embarkation of Cromwell’s army in mid-

⁶ Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” p. 319; Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, pp. 74–75.

⁷ *Moderate Intelligencer*, no. 237, 4 Oct. 1649, p. 2298.

⁸ For example, see *Man in the Moon*, no. 22, 19 Sep. 1649, 248.22\E. 574(9), p. 186, and no. 23, 26 Sep. 1649, 248.23\E. 574(25), p. 193; *Pragmaticus... Charls II*, no. 23, 25 Sep. 1649, 370.23\E. 574(21), [pp. 4, 8]; *Mercurius Pragmaticus, for King Charls II*, no. 2, 24 Sep. 1649, 371\E. 574(20), p. 16; *Elencticus*, no. 22, 24 Sep. 1649, 316.22\E. 574(19), pp. 170–172.

⁹ Cotton, “London Newsbooks in the Civil War,” p. 320.

August perhaps eroded the need to contest this material, and thus helped to determine that the time was ripe for stricter execution over control of the press.

Although the curtain came down with vigor on the London weeklies, there can be little question that the advent and popularity of periodical news in England during the 1640s owed much to the outbreak and continued progress of the Irish rebellion. As an integral component in the multiple kingdoms of Charles I, Ireland was seen as a potential resource that could be utilized by the king in his power struggle with the English parliament. Accordingly, between November 1641 and September 1649 approximately 4,600 newsbooks were published for a nation keen to not only embrace news of the conflict between king and parliament at home, but also of the hostilities in Ireland.

As the figures provided in the appendix following this conclusion suggest, 100% of periodicals published in the nine months following the birth of *Heads of Severall Proceedings* contained material concerning the rebellion. Not unexpectedly, following the onset of civil war at home there was a drop in the number of weeklies that communicated news of Irish affairs to the nation. Nonetheless, these figures generally remained high. In fact, from my examination of approximately 4,200 issues, 75% of them contained news, rumor, or commentary that related to Ireland. Closer examination of these figures also suggests that, when news of pivotal occurrences surrounding the rebellion became known, there was an increase in the number of newsbooks that contained such material. For example, confirmation of the cessation in 1643 resulted in a significant increase during November and December of that year in the amount of periodicals communicating Irish news, (particularly since this event signaled the first

royalist convoys to depart for England). Inchiquin's defection to parliament in July 1644, the first Ormond Peace in the summer of 1646, and noted military successes by parliamentary troops on the island throughout the 1640s witnessed similar increases. Moreover, while these figures do not measure the volume of copy contained within the newsbooks, in general, the larger the number of serials that related news touching the rebellion, the greater the amount of material communicated.

Given the growing impasse between Charles and Westminster during the winter of 1641-42, the formative months of the insurrection resulted in much speculation and generally inaccurate reports that promoted imminent invasion by the Irish. However, these early publications commonly acted with restraint, especially in their treatment of the king and in any direct involvement he may have had in orchestrating this rebellion to satisfy his own agenda in England. Even the 'massacres' frequently found in the pamphlet literature following the outbreak of the uprising were rarely mentioned. It is striking, though, that on the eve of hostilities in England in 1642, the king's ties with - or supposed ties with - the Irish were emphasized by the newsbooks. This became a familiar tactic for the pro-parliamentary serials to employ in the propaganda war that accompanied the armed struggle at home, and one that did little to heal the divisions between both camps during the 1640s. For example, amid negotiations between Ormond and the confederates in 1643, fear of this link between the crown and the Irish was one ploy to not only persuade the Scots to join parliament, but also to induce anti-Scots parliamentarians to suppress their reservations about a Scottish alliance.

Stressing the ties between the king and the Irish was a recurrent theme, as was the frightfulness of the Irish, the two points being closely related. It was surely no coincidence that, parallel to the cessation negotiations, the London newsbooks promoted allegations of Irish barbarity. Such images, heretofore rare in the periodical press to this juncture, were most likely advertised to the nation in order to highlight the crown's willingness to unite with barbarians in order to secure victory over parliament. Predictably, Irish royalists, and even native English troops returning home to serve the crown as a result of the cessation were depicted in the worst possible light, often being charged with conducting a fresh wave of 'Irish massacres' in England. Similar allegations were also conspicuous amid the visit of the Irish Catholic delegation to Oxford in the spring of 1644, the breakdown of peace negotiations at Uxbridge, the disclosure of Glamorgan's activities, and in response to Ormond's return to Ireland after the second civil war. In this way, readers were reminded that in his quest to reach an agreement with the Irish for their assistance, the king was prepared to embrace those considered responsible for the horrific cruelties perpetrated upon many thousands of their co-religionists in Ireland.

Ireland clearly became the focus of a propaganda war for both camps in England. As this study has highlighted on numerous occasions, a principal objective of newsbook editors was not necessarily to convey news of Irish affairs to their readers, but more often than not, their motivation was to manipulate stories relating to the rebellion in order to denigrate their opponents at home. Amid recurrent negotiations between the crown and the confederates, the pro-parliamentary press seized every opportunity to assail the

royalist camp for its Irish intrigues. In this context, papers such as *Britanicus*, which appeared to endorse the interests of the war party at Westminster, were responsible for some of the most venomous attacks against the king and his ministers. Stressing these links between the king and the Irish may have been the best way of keeping that party together at a time when there were those at Westminster who were willing to reach a negotiated settlement with the crown.

Public distaste in England toward the Irish may have ensured that early royalist serials such as *Aulicus* generally failed to comment on the rebellion. This was hardly surprising considering the king's continual pursuit of a settlement with Kilkenny. There were no such inhibitions among the royalist troika that emerged during the fall of 1647. Although *Melancholicus*, *Pragmaticvs* and *Elencticus* generally failed to provide their readers with details of developments in Ireland, their respective editors were keen to utilize the uprising to ridicule both parliament and the army grandees. The ascent of the Independents at Westminster saw these attacks intensified. Indeed, the onset of popular pro-royalist disturbances in England during the spring of 1648 helped ensure that not for the first time Irish issues, most notably, Inichiquin's volte-face, and the plight of English troops in Ireland, were used to wage political battle in England.

The conclusion of military operations in the second civil war failed to dampen the propaganda. The collapse of royalist fortunes in both England and Scotland by the fall of 1648 meant that Ireland remained the last hope for the Stuart court. Despite Charles's execution in January 1649, and the subsequent founding of the commonwealth, pro-royalist editors used whatever ammunition they could glean from the Irish conflict in the

form of fact or rumor to influence popular behavior in England against the new regime. In fact, in response to Cromwell's appointment in the spring as commander-in-chief of the proposed expedition to quell the rebellion, considerable misinformation by a new generation of royalist weeklies became incessant. Buoyed by a series of Leveller-inspired mutinies within the ranks of the New Model, these periodicals made every effort to undermine this expedition and those responsible for its creation. Until Cromwell's departure in September it appeared that no business could compete with Ireland as a battery of paper bullets flew across the pages of the weekly press.

Considering the level of political opinion and popular awareness in England at this time, it is difficult to imagine that the information and propaganda generated by these publications over Ireland failed to have some influence upon English society. Regular exposure to such material may have solidified the loyalties of some partisans of one side or the other - it may have made others less committed. What is for certain, this paper war reflected the significance of the rebellion in the wider context of the multiple kingdoms of Charles I. The disintegration of crown control over all three of these realms heralded the beginning of a new chapter in Ireland's history, one that has haunted Anglo-Irish relations until modern times.

APPENDIX

The percentage of newsbooks, which were published in England between November 1641 and September 1649, that contained material relating to Ireland and the rebellion.

	1641		1642		1643	
	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News
January			30 (36)	100%	53 (61)	64%
February			21 (26)	100%	41 (47)	51%
March			26 (31)	100%	26 (31)	100%
April			1 (1)	100%	35 (40)	60%
May			4 (7)	100%	49 (52)	67%
June			10 (10)	100%	41 (44)	80%
July			17 (23)	100%	36 (37)	69%
August			31 (34)	77%	29 (32)	69%
September			39 (40)	97%	37 (40)	78%
October			44 (47)	93%	50 (50)	68%
November	1 (1)	100%	32 (35)	56%	63 (63)	89%
December	7 (9)	100%	36 (41)	42%	52 (53)	94%

	1644		1645		1646	
	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News
January	58 (59)	81%	57 (62)	74%	66 (71)	79%
February	68 (70)	78%	42 (45)	90%	59 (61)	78%
March	68 (68)	75%	49 (50)	75%	42 (46)	71%
April	64 (64)	84%	54 (55)	76%	32 (38)	75%
May	62 (62)	79%	63 (68)	52%	36 (40)	50%
June	54 (58)	55%	58 (62)	55%	29 (33)	90%
July	58 (61)	53%	67 (72)	76%	33 (38)	94%
August	61 (66)	82%	62 (66)	69%	30 (34)	100%
September	46 (50)	83%	62 (66)	68%	30 (34)	100%
October	60 (65)	83%	68 (73)	65%	35 (39)	91%
November	59 (63)	80%	60 (62)	78%	33 (37)	97%
December	47 (51)	55%	64 (69)	69%	31 (36)	97%

	1647		1648		1649	
	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News	Newsbooks Consulted/ (STC Total)	Percentage Relating Irish News
January	30 (34)	90%	42 (47)	71%	43 (44)	58%
February	31 (35)	78%	48 (52)	85%	42 (44)	76%
March	23 (27)	96%	50 (55)	60%	43 (43)	100%
April	21 (24)	100%	52 (55)	71%	58 (58)	100%
May	20 (21)	100%	67 (71)	46%	86 (87)	95%
June	22 (23)	86%	64 (70)	27%	74 (74)	96%
July	32 (33)	88%	66 (72)	29%	66 (69)	100%
August	32 (37)	88%	78 (85)	42%	70 (71)	100%
September	48 (53)	92%	47 (52)	49%	59 (59)	100%
October	34 (36)	82%	51 (55)	78%		
November	46 (50)	61%	42 (47)	74%		
December	31 (35)	74%	38 (42)	79%		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ENGLISH NEWSBOOKS: NOVEMBER 1641-SEPTEMBER 1649

The following bibliography is based on Nelson and Seccombe's *Short Title Catalogue of British Newspapers and Periodicals*. The format is: *STC* number; short title; and period of publication. An asterisk (*) indicates that some issues of a particular serial may be missing.

- 14.1-2 Anti-Aulicus. Discovering vveekly the policies, deceits, and erroneous maxims of the court (Feb. 1644).
- 15.1 An antidote against the malignant influence of Mercurius (surnamed) Aulicus (Sep. 1643).
- 18.1-5 The armies modest intelligencer. Communicating\The armies vveekly intelligencer. Communicating (Jan.-Feb. 1649).
- 19.1 The armies painfull-messenger. Affording true notice of all affairs (2 Aug. 1649).
- 20.1 The armies post. Faithfully relating all the proceedings (8 Jul. 1647).
- 26.1-2 A book without a title (Jun. 1649).
- 28.1-3 Britaines remembrancer. of the most remarkable passages in both kingdomes (Mar.-Apr. 1644).
- 29.1-2 Britanicvs vapvlans: or the vvhipping of poore British Mercury\Mercurivs vrbans, communicating the several lies, mistakes, and abuses of Brittanicus and others (Nov. 1643).
- 36.01-57 Certaine informations from severall parts of the kingdome (Jan. 1643-Feb. 1644).
- 37.1 Certaine speciall and remarkable passages of the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament (6 Oct. 1642).
- 41.1 Chiefe heads of each dayes proceedings in Parliament (15 May 1644).
- 45.01-11 The citties weekly post faithfully communicating the affaires of the armies (Dec. 1645-Mar. 1646).
- 48.1-3 The Colchester spie. Truly informing the kingdome of the estate of that gallant town, and the attempts of Fairfax against it (Aug. 1648).
- 52.1-5 The compleate intelligencer and resolver, communicating the affaires (Nov. 1643).
- 54.01-53 A continvation\continuation of certain speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (Oct. 1642-Jun. 1643).
- 55.1 A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (14 Oct. 1642).

- 56.01-15* A continvation of certain speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (Oct. 1642).
- 57.1-3 A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (Nov. 1642).
- 58.1 A continuation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (24 Nov. 1642).
- 59.01-20 A continvation of certain speciall and remarkable passages (Dec. 1643-May 1644).
- 60.1-4 A continvation of certain speciall and remarkable passages informed to the Parliament (Jul.-Aug. 1644).
- 61.01-24 A continvation of certaine speciall an [sic] remarkable passages informed to the Parliament (Sep. 1645-Mar. 1646).
- 62.01-13 A continuation of certain speciall and remarkable passages informed to the Parliament (Jun.-Sep. 1647).
- 62.A.1 A continvation of our weekly intelligence from His Majesties army (12 Sep. 1642).
- 63.1-2 * A continuation of the diurnall passages in Ireland (Feb. 1642).
- 64.A.1 A continvation of the most remarkable passages in both Houses of Parliament (3 Dec. 1642).
- 66.1-2 A continvation of the true diurnall occvrrrences in Parliament (Feb.-Mar. 1642).
- 67.01-11* A continuation of the true diurnall occurrences in Parliament (Feb.-Mar. 1642).
- 68.01-11B* A continuation of the true diurnall of all the passages in Parliament (Feb.-Mar. 1642).
- 69.1-2* A continuation of the true diurnall of passages in Parliament (Jan. 1642).
- 70.1 A continuation of the true diurnall of passages in Parliament (15 Aug. 1642).
- 71.01-10* A continuation of the true diurnall of proceedings in Parliament (Mar. 1642).
- 74.1 A continuation of true and speciall passages, from severall places of this kingdome (29 Sep. 1642).
- 75.1-5 Continued heads of perfect passages in Parliament and proceedings of the Councell of State, and the Army (Apr.-May 1649).
- 77.1 A coronto from beyond the sea (9 Jun. 1643).
- 78.1-2 The countrey foot-post: faithfully communicating/The countrey messenger, or the faithfull foot-post (Oct. 1644).
- 81.01-12 The covrt mercurie. Communicating the most remarkable passages of the Kings armie\The covrt mercurie. Relating for newes, the most remarkable passages of the Kings armie (Jun.-Oct. 1644).
- 86.1 The daily intelligencer of court, city and countrey (30 Jan. 1643).
- 90.1-6 A declaration, collected out of the journalls of both Houses of Parliament\Heads of a diarie, collected out of the journalls of both Houses (Nov. 1648-Jan. 1649).
- 94.1-2 A diarie, or an exact iournall, or the proceedings of the treaty (Jul. 1647).

- 97.1-3 Diurnall occurrences in Parliament (Dec. 1641-Jan. 1642).
- 98.1-2* Diurnall occurrences in Parliament (Jan. 1642).
- 99.01-11* The diurnall occvrrances in Parliament (Jan.-Mar. 1642).
- 100.1-4 Diurnall occurrences in Parliament (May-Jun. 1642).
- 101.1-2 The divrnal occvrrances, or, proceedings in Parliament/A true diurnall or the passages in Parliament (Jan. 1642).
- 102.1 The divrnal occvrrances, or proceedings in the Parliament the last weeke (17 Jan. 1642).
- 103.1 The diurnal occvrrances: or, the heads of proceedings in Parliament (20 Dec. 1641).
- 104.1-6* Diurnal occvrrances; or, the heads of the proceedings in both Houses of Parliament/A trve divrnall of the last weeks passage in both Houses of Parliament/Divrnal occurrences. Or, the heads of the proceedings (Jan.-Feb. 1642).
- 105.1-3* Diurnall occvrrances: or, the heads of the proceedings in both Houses of Parliament/A continuation of the true diurnall of passages in Parliament (Jan. 1642).
- 106.1-4 Diurnall occvrrances, touching the dayly proceedings in Parliament (Dec. 1641-Jan. 1642).
- 106A.1 Divrnall occvrrances, truly relating the most remarkable passages which have hapned in both Houses of Parliament (5 Dec. 1642).
- 107.1-2* The divrnal occvrrances, touching the dailie proceedings in Parliament (Jan. 1642).
- 109.1-3 The diurnall: or, the heads of all the proceedings in Parliament (Dec. 1641).
- 110.1-2 A diurnall out of the North: or, the daily occurrences of this weeke/A diurnall and particula [sic] of the last weekes daily occurrents (Jul. 1642).
- 111.01-11 Diutinus Britanicus, collector of the affaires of great. Britaine/Mercurius Diutinus, (not Britanicus) collector of the affaires (Nov. 1646-Feb. 1647).
- 111A.1 The divine penitential mediations... of his late sacred Majestie (18 Jun. 1649).
- 124.01-22 England's moderate messenger. Impartially communicating, the daily proceedings in Parliament and Councell of State/The moderate messenger. Impartially communicating, the daily proceedings in Parliament, and Councell of State (Apr.-Sep. 1649).
- 126.1-2 Englands remembrancer of Lodons [sic] integritie (Jan.-Feb. 1647).
- 142.1-2 An exact and true collection of the weekly passages/An exact and true collection of the most remarkable proceedings of the Parliament and armies (Jan.-Mar. 1646).
- 143.1-4 An exact and trve divrnall of the proceedings in Parliament (Aug.-Sep. 1642).
- 144.101-206* An exact diurnall faithfvly communicating the most remarkable proceedings in both Houses of Parliament/A diary, or an exact iovrnall faithfully communicating the most remarkable proceedings (May 1644-Mar. 1646).

- 145.1-8 The exchange intelligencer. Imparting chiefly such domestique and forraigne newes as have not been mentioned (May-Jul. 1645).
- 152.1 First decade of vseful observations raised out of modern experience (28 Jun. 1649).
- 153.1 Five matters of note. As, first, a continuation of the weekly occurrences in the High Court of Parliament (23 May 1642).
- 155.1 The flying post conveying weekly packets to all forraigne nations (10 May 1644).
- 167.1-4 Generall nevves, from all parts of Christendome (May 1646).
- 172.1 A grand diurnall of the passages in Parliament (28 Nov. 1642).
- 173.1-2B Great Britaines paine-full messenger, af-fording true notice of all affaires (Aug. 1649).
- 180-01-11 Heads of chiefe passages in Parliament, and an account of the state of the King and kingdome (Jan.-Mar. 1648).
- 181.101-208 The heads of severall proceedings in this present Parliament/Divrnnall occvrrnces, or, the heads of severall proceedings/The continuation of the divrnnall occvrrnces (Nov. 1641-Feb. 1642)).
- 182.1 Heads of severall proceedings in the present Parliament (29 Nov. 1641).
- 185.1 Hermes stratjcus; or, a scourge for Elencticus (17 Aug. 1648).
- 194.01-26 The impartiall intelligencer, containing, [communicating] a perfect account of the weekly passages in Parliament (Feb.-Jun. 1649).
- 198.1 Informator rusticus: or, the countrey intelligencer (3 Nov. 1643).
- 205.1-3 Ianuaries accovnt giving a full and true relation of all the remarkable passages/The monthley account of February/The generall account (Jan.-Mar. 1645).
- 206.1 Ieremiah revived: though in his prison...dewing down in four severall showres this springing moneth of April (Apr. 1648).
- 208.1 A jovrnall of Parliament. Or, a survey of the Parliaments proceedings, since they promised to settle the businesse of the kingdome (May 1648).
- 210.01-37 The kingdomes faithfull scout, communicating certain speciall and remarkable passages/The kingdomes faithfull and impartiall scout (Jan.-Oct. 1649).
- 213.1-3 The kingdomes scout. Perfectly communicating the proceedings in Parliament (Nov.-Dec. 1645).
- 213A.01-25* The kingdomes weekly intelligencer: or speciall passages and certain informations from severall places (Jan. 1643)
- 214.01-332 The kingdomes vweekly intelligencer: sent abroad to prevent misinformation (Jan. 1643-Oct. 1649).
- 215.1-9B The kingdomes vweekly post: communicating the certain, and most remarkable passages about the Kings Majesty (Dec. 1647-Mar. 1648).
- 216.01-10 The kingdomes weekly post; faithfully communicating the affaires of the armies (Oct.-Dec. 1645).
- 217.1-9 The kingdomes weekly post, with his packet of letters, publishing his message to the city and country (Nov. 1643-Jan. 1644).

- 219.1-2 Linx brittanicus, or contemplations upon the present condition of the kingdome/Link brittanicus the spotted beast or contemplations vpon the present condition of the degenerating kingdom (1648)
- 232.1-7 The London post, communicating the high counsellis of both Parliaments (Dec. 1646-Feb. 1647).
- 233.101-204 The London post: faithfully communicating his intelligence/The vweekely post-master: faithfully communicating his intelligence (Aug. 1644-May 1645).
- 248.01-57 The man in the moon, discovering a world of knavery vnder the sunne (Apr. 1649-Jun. 1650).
- 252.1 Martin nonsense, his collections which he saw with his brains, and heard with his eyes (27 Nov. 1648).
- 258.101-373* Le mercure anglois (Jun. 1644-Dec. 1648).
- 259.1-2 Mercurio volpone, or the fox: prying into every junto (Oct. 1648).
- 260.01-14 Mercurius academicvs (Dec. 1645-Mar. 1646).
- 261.1 Mercurius academicus: communicating the intelligence and affairs of Oxford to the rest of the passive party (Apr. 1648).
- 263.1 Mercvrius Anglicvs. Communicating intelligence from all parts of the kingdome of England (3 Aug. 1648).
- 265.1-2 Mercurius Anglicus. Or, a post from the North: communicating his intelligence to the kingdome (Feb. 1644).
- 267.1-3 Mercurius anti-Britanicus (Aug. 1645).
- 268.1 Mercvrius anti-melanchollicus. Or, news from Westminster, and all other parts (Sep. 1647).
- 269.1-2 Mercurius anti-mercurius. Impartially communicating truth, correcting falshood...and opposing...aspersions...upon ...Parliament (Sep. Oct. 1648).
- 270.01-19* Mercurius anti-pragmaticvs. Communicating some remarkable intelligence (Oct. 1647-Feb. 1648).
- 271.1 Mercurius aquaticus. Communicating intelligence from all parts of the kingdome, especially from the Navy (11 Aug. 1648).
- 272.1 Mercurius aulico-mastix. Or, the vwhipping mercury (12 Apr. 1644).
- 273.01-15 Mercurius aulicus: againe communicating intelligence from all parts (Feb.-May 1648).
- 274.1-4 Mercvrius avlicvs. Communicating intelligence from all parts of the kingdome (Aug. 1648).
- 275.00-319 Mercvrius avlicvs, communicating the intelligence and affaires of the court (Jan. 1643-Sep. 1645).
- 277.1-3 Mercurius aulicus. (For King Charls II.) (Aug.-Sep. 1649).
- 279.01-27 Mercurius bellicvs. Or, an alarum to all rebels (Nov. 1647-Jul. 1648).
- 282.01-13 Mercurius Britanicus alive again: shewing the distempers of these times/Mercurius Britanicus giving a perfect accompt of the designes of the royal party/Mercurius Britanicus. Stating the affaires of the kingdome as they now stand (May-Aug. 1648).

- 284.1 Mercurius Britannicus. Communicating his most remarkable intelligence unto the kingdome (7 Apr. 1648).
- 285.1-7 Mercurius Britannicus. Communicating intelligence from all parts (May-Jun. 1649).
- 286.01-130 Mercurius Britanicus: communicating the affaires of great Britaine (Aug. 1643-May 1646).
- 289.1-3 Mercurius Britanicus representing the affaires of great Britajne, to the city and kingdome (Jun.-Jul. 1647).
- 292.1 Mercurius candidus. Communicating the weekly newes to the kingdome of England (20 Nov. 1646).
- 293.1 Mercurius candidus. Communicating the weekly newes to the kingdome of England (28 Jan. 1647).
- 294.1 Mercurius Carolinus. Communicating intelligence from all parts (26 Jul. 1649).
- 295.1-2 Mercurius Catholicus. Communicating his intelligence from the most learned Protestant writers (Sep.-Dec. 1648).
- 296.1-3 Mercurius censorius. Or, news from the Isle of Wight, and other parts of the kingdome (Jun. 1648).
- 298.01-183 Mercurius civicus, Londons intelligencer: or truth really imparted (May 1643-Dec. 1646).
- 301.1 Mercurius clericus, or, newes from Syon (24 Sep. 1647).
- 302.1 Mercurius clericus. Or, news from the Assembly (25 Sep. 1647).
- 303.1-3* Mercurius criticus, communicating intelligence from all parts touching all affaires (Apr.-May 1648).
- 309.1-4* Mercurius dogmaticus communicating the proceedings at Westminster, at London, and the head-quarters (Jan.-Feb. 1648).
- 310.1 Mercurius domesticus, communicating intelligence concerning all affaires (5 Jun. 1648).
- 311.01-69* Mercurius elencticus, communicating intelligence from all parts (28 Feb. 1649).
- 312.01-59 Mercurius elencticus. Communicating the unparallell'd proceedings at Westminster (Nov. 1647-Jan. 1649).
- 313.1 Mercurius elencticus communicating the unparallell'd proceedings at Westminster (7 Feb. 1649).
- 314.01-56* Mercurius elencticus. Communicating the unparallell'd proceedings at Westminster (13 Feb. 1649).
- 315.1 Mercurius elencticus, communicating the unparallell'd proceedings of the rebells at Westminster (11 Apr. 1649).
- 316.01-27 Mercurius elencticus. Communicating the unparallell'd proceedings of the rebells at Westminster (May-Nov. 1649).
- 317.1-2 Mercurius elencticus, (for King Charls II.) (May 1649).
- 320.01-11 Mercurius &c./Mercurius veridicus. Communicating such intelligence as is brought to him (Jan.-Apr. 1644).
- 321.1-2 Mercurius fidelicus. Truly and faithfully imparting to the kingdome intelligence (Aug. 1648).

- 326.1-3* Mercurius Gallicus (May 1648).
- 329.1 Mercurius Hybernicus. Communicating intelligence chiefly from the kingdome of Ireland (6 Sep. 1649).
- 331.1-2 Mercurius honestus. Or, newes from Westminster (May 1648).
- 333.1 Mercurius impartialis: or an answer to that treasonable pamphlet, Mercurius militaris; together with the Moderate (12 Dec. 1648).
- 335.1-7* Mercurius insanus, insanissimus (Mar.-May 1648).
- 340.1-2 Mercurius medicus: or, a soveraigne salve for these sick times (Oct. 1647).
- 342.1-3 Mercurius melancholicus. Communicating the generall affaires of the kingdome (Dec. 1648-Jan. 1649).
- 343.1-2 Mercurius melancholicus, for king Charles the Second (May-Jun. 1649).
- 344.01-59B Mercurius melancholicus: or, newes from Westminster, and other parts (Sep. 1647-Nov. 1648).
- 345.1 Mercvrvs melancholicvs. Or newes from Westminster (28 Jul. 1648).
- 346.1-5 Mercurius militaris: communicating from all parts of England, Scotland 7 Ireland/Mercurius militaris or the armies scout, communicating from all parts (Oct.-Nov. 1648).
- 347.1 Mercurius militaris communicating intelligence from the saints militant dissembled at VWestminster (28 Apr. 1648).
- 348.1-3 Mercurius militaris, or the people's scout (Apr.-May 1649).
- 349.1-3 Mercurius militaris. Or times only truth-teller/The metropolitan nuncio. Or, times only truth-teller (May-Jun. 1649).
- 350.1-4 Mercurius morbicus. Or, nevves from Westminster, and other parts (Sep. 1647).
- 353.1-2 Mercurius pacificus: impartially communicating unto the common-wealth of England (May 1649).
- 355.1-2 Mercurius philo-monarchicus: communicating intelligence from all parts (Apr.-May 1649).
- 360.1 Mercurius poeticus. Discovering the treasons of a thing call'd Parliament (13 May 1648).
- 364.1 Mercurius populus [populi]. Or newes declaring plain truth to the people (Nov. 1647).
- 369.101-253 Mercurius pragmaticvs. Communicating intelligence from all parts (Sep. 1647-May 1649).
- 370.01-55 Mercurius pragmaticus, (for King Charles II.) (Apr. 1649-May 1650).
- 371.1-2 Mercurius pragmaticus, for King Charls II (Sep. 1649).
- 375.1-9 Mercurius psitacus. Or, the parotting mercurie (Jun.-Aug. 1648).
- 377.1-3 Mercurius publicus, communicating emergent occurrences (May 1648).
- 382.1-5* Mercurius republicus. Communicating martiall actions, with other publique affaires (29 May 1649).
- 384.01-21 Mercvrvs rusticus, or the covntries complaint of... the rebells (May 1643-Mar. 1644).
- 385.1 Mercurius Scoticus. Imparting the proceedings of the northern armies (19 Jul. 1648).

- 389.1 Mercurius urbanicus. Or, news from London and Westminster, and other parts (9 May 1648).
- 390.1-2 Mercurius vapulans, surveying and recording the choyssest actions and results (Nov. 1647).
- 391.1-3 Mercurivs veridicvs, communicating intelligence from all parts of Great Britaine (Apr.-May 1648).
- 394.101-210* Mercurius veridicus: or, true informations, of speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (Apr. 1645-May 1646).
- 401.1-2 The military actions of Europe, as also the counsels made publique relating thereto (Oct.-Nov. 1646).
- 402.1-6 The military scribe, declaring his vvarlike relations to the people (Feb. Apr. 1644).
- 411.01-16 Mr. Peters report from the army, to the Parliament/A copie of the Kings commission, granted to Sir Nicholas Crispe/The Kings ansvver to the propositions for peace/Heads of some notes of the citie scout from the armie/The city-scout, communicating the affaires of the armie (Jul.-Nov. 1645).
- 413.1001-2063* The moderate: impartially communicating martiall affaires to the kingdome of England (Jun. 1648-Sep. 1649).
- 415.1-2 A moderate intelligence, impartially communicating martiall affaires to the kingdom of England (May 1649).
- 419.001-237 The moderate intelligencer: impartially communicating martiall affaires to the kingdome of England (Feb. 1645-Oct. 1649).
- 420.1 The moderate intelligencer: impartially communicating martiall affaires to the kingdom of England (5 Jun. 1649).
- 421.1-2 The moderate mercury: faithfully communicating divers remarkable passages both forreign and domestic (Jun. 1649).
- 422.01-22* The moderate messenger: communicating the affaires of the Parliament, and city, to the kingdome of England (23 Feb. 1647).
- 424.1-4 The moderate messenger: impartially, communicating martiall affaires to the kingdome of England (Feb.-Mar. 1646).
- 431.1-7 The moderne intelligencer: faithfully communicating martiall affaires (Aug.-Sep. 1647).
- 433.01-25 A modest narrative of intelligence: fitted for the republique of England and Ireland (Apr.-Sep. 1649).
- 439.1 New Christian vses, upon the vveekly true passages, and proceedings (7 Oct. 1643).
- 442.1 Nevv nevvs, strange nevvs, true news (Jun. 1649).
- 453.1 The northerne nuntio (Aug. 1643).
- 464.1-3* Occvrrances from Ireland (Apr.-May 1642).

- 465.1001-5145 Occurrences of certain special and remarkable passages in Parliament/The perfect occurrences of Parliament, and the proceedings of the armie/Perfect occurrences of some passages in Parliament/Perfect occurrences of Parliament/Perfect occurrences of both Houses of Parliament/Perfect occurrences of every dayes journall in Parliament (Jan. 1644-Oct. 1649).**
- 470.1 Oxford djurnall: communicating the intelligence (7 Jan. 1643).**
- 479.1 A packet of letters from Sir Thomas Fairfax his quarter (30 Oct. 1645).**
- 480.01-37 Packets of letters from Scotland, Berwick, Newcastle, and York/Packets of letters from Scotland, and the north parts of England (Mar.-Nov. 1648).**
- 480A.1-6 Papers from the Scots quarters/A continuation of papers from the Scots quarters/A continuation of a iournall of passages of the Parliament of Scotland (Oct. -Nov. 1646).**
- 481.1-5 Papers of the resolution of the Parliament of Scotland/Papers of surrendring the Kings majesty to English commissioners/Papers of the Kings Majesties answer to the propositions/Papers concerning the debates of the Parliament of Scotland/Papers concerning the Scots commissioners, and their instructions (Jan.-Mar. 1647).**
- 483.01-15 The Parliament-kite. Or the tell-tale bird, communicating intelligence from all parts of the kingdome (May-Aug. 1648).**
- 484.1-4 The Parliament-porter: or the door-keeper of the House of Commons (Aug.-Sep. 1648).**
- 485.01-84 The Parliament scout: communicating his intelligence to the kingdome (Jun. 1643-Jan. 1645).**
- 487.01-21 The Parliaments post: faithfully communicating to the kingdome the proceedings of the armies (May-Oct. 1645).**
- 488.1 The Parliaments scouts discovery: or certain information from both armies (Jun. 1643).**
- 489.1-3 The Parliaments scrich-owle, her singing before death/The Parliaments scrich-ovvle, or intelligence from severall parts of the kingdom (Jun.-Jul. 1648).**
- 490.1 The Parliaments vulture. Newes from all parts of the kingdome (22 Jun. 1648).**
- 492.1-7 A particular relation of the severall removes, services, and successes of the right honorable, the Earl of Manchesters army/The continuation of true intelligence from the right honorable, the Earl of Manchester's army/A particular relation of the most remarkable occurrences from the vnited forces in the North/A continuation of true intelligence from the English and Scottish forces/A continuation of true intelligence from the armies of the North/A continuation of true intelligence from the army under the command of... Manchester (May-Aug. 1644).**
- 494.1 The passages in Parliament (10 Jan. 1642).**
- 498.01-45 A perfect declaration of the proceedings in Parliament; and true information from the armies/The true informer: containing a perfect collection of the proceedings in Parliament (Apr. 1645-Mar. 1646).**

- 499.1 A perfect diary of passages of the Kings army; and their severall fights, treaties, and actions (26 Jun. 1648).
- 502.1-2 A perfect diurnall of passages in Parliament (Jul. 1649).
- 504.001-324 A perfect diurnall of some passages in Parliament (Jul. 1643-Nov. 1649).
- 507.01-12 A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Jan. Mar. 1642).
- 508.1 A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (7 Mar. 1642).
- 509.1-9C A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Jun.-Aug. 1642).
- 510.1-9* A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Jul.-Aug. 1642).
- 511.01-54* A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Aug. 1642-Jun. 1643).
- 512.01-15* A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Aug.- Oct. 1642).
- 513.01-53B* A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Sep. 1642-Jun. 1643).
- 514.1 A perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (27 Feb. 1643).
- 515.1-5* A perfect [sic] diurnall of the proceedings [sic] in Parliament/A perfect diurnall of the proceedings [sic] in Parliament/A perfect diurnall of the proceedings in Parliament (Sep.-Oct. 1642).
- 517.1-2 A perfect diurnall or the proceedings in Parliament (Jul. 1642).
- 518.1-3 A perfect narrative of the whole proceedings of the High Court of Iustice in the tryal of the King/A continvation of the narrative... with the several speeches/A continvation of the narrative (Jan. 1649).
- 523.01-71 Perfect passages of each dayes proceedings in Parliament (Oct. 1644-Mar. 1646).
- 525.1 Perfect passages of state, and martiall affairs (4 Aug. 1646).
- 527.1-2 A perfect relation, or svmmarie of all the declarations/A perfect relation, or summary of 50 bookes (Sep.-Oct. 1642).
- 528.01-11 A perfect summary of chiefe passages in Parliament (Jul.-Oct. 1647).
- 529.1 A perfect svmmarie of chiefe passages in Parliament (12 Feb. 1648).
- 530.01-27 A perfect summary of exact passages of Parliament: and other choyce intelligence/A perfect summary of exact passages/A perfect summary impartially communicating a perfect diurnall of exact passages/A perfect summary of an exact diurnall of passages/A perfect summary of an exact dyarie (Jan.-Oct. 1649).
- 531.1 A perfect summary of the most remarkable passages between the Kings Majesty and the Commissioners (9 Oct. 1648).
- 532.1 A perfect tiurnall: or VVelch post. With her creat packet of letter (11 Feb. 1643).
- 533.01-82 The perfect weekly account containing certain special and remarkable passages/The perfect weekly account concerning certain special and remarkable passages (Mar. 1648-Oct. 1649).
- 540.1 The phoenix of Europe, or the forraigne intelligencer of our neighbour kingdomes (16 Jan. 1646).
- 565.1-7 The proceedings of the army under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax/An exact and perfect relation of the proceedings of the army under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax/A continvation of the proceedings of the army under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax (Jul.-Aug. 1645).

- 579.01-19 Quotidian occurrences in and about London, and in other places of this kingdome of England/England's memorable accidents (Sep. 1642-Jan. 1643).
- 581.1-3 Remarkable occurrences from the high court of Parliament/The heads of all the proceedings in both Houses of Parliament/Remarkable passages in Parliament (May-Jun. 1642).
- 582.1-8 Remarkable passages impartially relating the proceedings of the Protestant and Papistical armies/Remarkable passages published for the satisfaction of the whole kingdome/Remarkable passages, of the occurrences of Parliament, and proceedings of the armie/Remarkable passages. The occurrences of Parliament, and proceedings of the army (Nov.-Dec. 1643).
- 583.1 Remarkable passages, or, a perfect diurnall of the weekly proceedings (12 Sep. 1642).
- 588.1-5 The royall diurnall. Impartially imparting the affairs of England (Jul.-Aug. 1648).
- 591.1 The Scotch mercury, communicating the affairs of Scotland (5 Oct. 1643).
- 592A.1-8 The Scots army advanced into England/A true relation of the late proceedings of the Scottish army/A faithfull relation, of the late occurrences and proceedings of the Scottish army/The late proceedings of the Scottish army/Intelligence from the Scottish army/Extracts of letters dated at Edenburgh/Intelligence from the south borders of Scotland (Jan.-Apr. 1644).
- 594.01-162 The Scotish dove. Sent out, and returning/The Scotish dove sent out the last time (Oct. 1643-Dec. 1646).
- 595.1-3 The Scottish mercury. Relating the vweekley intelligence from Scotland and the court/The Scotch intelligencer, or the vweekely newes from Scotland and the court (Oct. 1643).
- 598.1 Severall new and good passages, or the weekly proceedings from divers places in this kingdome (27 Aug. 1642).
- 605.01-44 Some speciall and considerable passages from London/Speciall passages from divers parts of this kingdome/Some speciall passages, from divers parts of this kingdome/Some speciall passages from Westminster, Coventry, Portsmouth/Speciall passages and certain informations from severall places (Aug. 1642-Jun. 1643).
- 606.01-11B Some speciall passages from London, Westminster/Hull, Yorke (May-Aug. 1642).
- 607.1 Speciall passages and certain informations (13 Sep. 1642).
- 609.01-22 The spie, communicating intelligence from Oxford (Jan.-Jun. 1644).
- 612.1 The treaty traverst: or, newes from Newport in the Isle of VVight (26 Sep. 1648).
- 615.1 A true and perfect diurnall of all the chiefe passages in Lancashire (9 Jul. 1642).
- 616.01-11* A true and perfect diurnall of the passages in Parliament (6 Sep. 1642).
- 618.1-2 A true and perfect journall of the vvrrres in England/ A true and perfect journall of the civill vvarres in England (Apr. 1644).

- 620.1-3* A true diurnall occurrences, or proceedings in the Parliament this last weeke (31 Jan. 1642).
- 621.1-3 The true diurnall occvrrances: or, the heads of the proceednigs [sic] in the Parliament this last weeke/The true diurnal occvrrances: or, the heads of the proceedings in Parliament (Jan.-Feb. 1642).
- 622.1 The true diurnall occvrrances or, the heads of the proceedings of both Hovses (21 Feb. 1642).
- 623.01A-11B A true diurnall of the last weeks passages in Parliament/A continuation of the true diurnall of passages in Parliament (Jan.-Mar. 1642).
- 624.1-3* A true diurnall of the last weekes passages in Parliament (31 Jan. 1642).
- 625.1-2 A true diurnall of the passages in Parliament (Mar. 1642).
- 626.01-10* A true diurnall of the passages in Parliament (21 Mar. 1642).
- 627.1-3* A true diurnall or the passages in Parliament (31 Jan. 1642).
- 629.01-67 The true informer, continuing a collection of the most speciall and observable passages (Sep. 1643-Feb. 1645).
- 631.1 The true informer, or monthly mercury. Being the certain inteligence of Mercurius militaris or the armies scout (8 Nov. 1648).
- 638.01-56 A true relation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament/Certaine speciall and remarkable passages/A continvation of certaine speciall and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (Aug. 1642-Oct. 1643).
- 640.1-5 A true relation of the taking of Sherburne Castle/The second intelligence from Reading/The third intelligence from Reading/Mercurius bellicus. The fourth intelligence from Reading/Intelligence from the armie (Apr.-Jun. 1643).
- 641.1-5 A Tuesdaies journall of perfect passages in Parliament (Jul.-Aug. 1649).
- 669.1-4 Wednesday's mercury. Or, speciall passages and certain informations/The speciall passages continved/Wednesdays mercury, or the speciall passages (Jul.-Aug. 1643).
- 671.101-501 The weekly account/The perfect week[e]ly account (Sep. 1643-Jan. 1648).
- 673.1 A weekly accompt of certain special and remarkable passages from both Houses of Parliament (3 Aug. 1643).
- 676.1 A weekly accompt or perfect diurnall (10 Jul. 1643).
- 686.1-2 Weekly intelligence from severall parts of this kingdome (Oct. 1642).
- 696.1-3 The weekly nevves, from severall parts beyond the seas (May 1644).
- 708.1-9 The Welch mercury, communicating remarkable intelligences and true newes/Mercurius Cambro-Brittanus, the Brittish mercury, or the Vvelch diurnall (Oct. 1643-Jan. 1644).
- 709.1 The westerne informer. Containing the latest newes from... Sir Thomas Fairfax his armie (Mar. 1646).
- 710.1-5* VVestminster projects, or the mysterie of Darby Hovse, discovered/Tricks of state; or, more Westminster projects/Windsor projects, and Westminster practices: or, the mysterie of the Committee of Grandees at Darby-House opened /VVestminster projects: or, the mystery of iniquity of the committee of Darby-House discovered (Mar.-Jun. 1648).

MANUSCRIPT AND PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Carte MSS: 2; 3; 4; 63; 118.

Advertisements for Ireland, being a description of Ireland in the reign of James I. Edited by George O'Brien. Dublin, 1923.

A Bloody Battell: Or The Rebels Overthrow, and Protestants Victorie. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 180(7).

Bloody Newes from Ireland, Or The barbarous Crueltie by the Papists used in that Kingdome. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 179(9).

Bloody Newes from Norwich: ... Likewise here is added the last bloody Newes from Ireland. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 179(10).

Booker, John. *A Bloody Irish Almanick.* London, 1646. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 328(14).

Byrchensha, Raph. *A Discovrse occasioned vpon the late defeat, given to the Arch-rebels, Tyrone and Odonnell by the right Honourable the Lord Mountjoy, Lord Deputie of Ireland, the 24 of December, 1601.* London, 1602.

Cambrensis, Giraldus. *The Topography of Ireland.* Translated by John J. O'Meara. 1951.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1598-1601, 1638-39, 1641-43, 1644-45, 1645-47, 1649-50. London, 1869, 1871, 1887, 1890, 1891, 1875.

Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland, 1633-47, 1647-60. London, 1901, 1903.

Calendar State Papers, Venice, 1642-43. London, 1924.

Campion, Edmund. *Two Bokes of the Histories of Ireland.* 1571. Edited by A.F. Vossen. Assen, 1963.

Churchyard, Thomas. *The Fortvnate Farewel to the most forward and noble Earle of Essex.* London, 1599.

_____. *The moste true reporte of James Fitz Morrice death, and others the like offenders: with a briefe discourse of Rebellion.* London, [1579].

_____. *A Scourge for Rebels.* London, 1584.

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England.* Edited by W. D. Macray, 6 vols. Oxford, 1888.

Coates, W.H., ed. *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the first Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London.* New Haven, 1942.

- Davies, Sir John. *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued and Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign*. London, 1612. In *Ireland Under Elizabeth and James the First*. Edited by Henry Morely. London, 1890.
- A Declaration of the Commons assembled in Parliament; Concerning the Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland*. London, 1643. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 61(23).
- Derricke, John. *The Image of Irelande with a Discoverie of Woodkarne*. 1581.
- Edwards, Thomas. *Gangraena: or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these last four years*. London, 1646. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 323 (2).
- Englands Joy*. London, [1601].
- Firth, C.H., and R.S Rait. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*. 3 vols. London, 1911.
- Gardiner, Samuel R., ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1626-1660*. Oxford, 1906.
- Gilbert, J.T., ed. *A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652*. 3 vols. Dublin, 1879-80.
- _____, ed. *History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641-53*. 7 vols. Dublin, 1882-91.
- Good Newes from Ireland*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 133(14).
- A Great Conspiracy of the Papists Against the worthy Members of both Houses of Parliament and also against London*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 131(14).
- A Gun-Powder-Plot in Ireland for the blowing up of the chiefest Church in Dublin*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 175(6).
- The Happiest Newes from Ireland*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 181(20).
- Hickson, Mary, ed. *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century; or, the Irish Massacres of 1641-2, their Causes and Results*. 2 vols. London, 1884.
- [Howell, James]. *Mercurius Hibernicus: Or, A Discourse of the late Insurrection in Ireland*. [London, 1644]. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 52(17).
- Jones, Henry. *A Remonstrance of Divers Remarkable Passages Concerning the Church and Kingdom of Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 141(30).
- Jonson, Ben. *The Staple of News*. Edited by Devra Rowland Kiefer, London, 1976.
- Joyfull Newes from Ireland*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 177(9).
- The Kings Cabinet Opened*. London, 1645. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 292 (27).

- Larkin, James F., and Paul L. Hughes, eds. *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol 1: *Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*. Oxford, 1973.
- The Last Intelligence from Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 132(36).
- The Last Newes from Ireland Being A Relation of the Hostile and bloody proceedings of Rebellious Papists there*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 175(2).
- A Late and True Relation from Ireland of the Warlike and bloody Proceedings of the Rebellious Papists in that Kingdome*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 176(16).
- Lister, Joseph. *The Autobiography of Joseph Lister of Bradford in Yorkshire 1627-1709*. Edited by T. Wright, London, 1842.
- Lowe, John, ed. *Letter-Book of the Earl of Clanricard 1643-47*. Dublin, 1983.
- McNeill, Charles, ed. *The Tanner Letters*. Dublin, 1943.
- A Message from a Committee of both Houses to the Spanish Ambassador, to make stay of ships at Dunker intended for the supply of the rebels in Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts 669. f. 3. (45).
- More Happy and Joyfull Newes from Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 142(15).
- More Newes from Ireland: Or, The bloody practices and proceedings of the Papists in that Kingdome at this present*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 177(16).
- Moryson, Fynes. *An Itinerary of his Travels*. Glasgow, 1907.
- Nedham, Marchamont. *Mercurius Britannicus, His Apologie To all Well-affected People*. London, 1645. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 296(10).
- Newes from Ireland*. London, 1608.
- Newes from Lough-foyle in Ireland*. London, 1608.
- No Pamphlet, But A Detestation Against all such Pamphlets As are Printed, Concerning the Irish rebellion, Plainely demonstrating the falshood of them*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 134(3).
- The Over-throw of an Irish rebell, in a late battaile*. London, 1608.
- Peters, Hugh. *A True Relation of the Passages of Gods Providence in a Voyage for Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 242(15).
- The Petition of Sir Philomy Oneale*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 137(14).
- A Relation of the Most lamentable Burning of the citie of Corke*. London, 1622.
- A Remonstrance of the beginnings and proceedings in the County of Cavan*. London. 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 110(9).
- Rich, Barnaby. *A New History of Ireland, 1610*. In *Elizabethan England: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland*. Edited by James P. Myers, Hamden, Conn., 1983.
- Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland*. London, 1643. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 61(23).
- Roberts, George, ed. *The Diary of Walter Yonge*. Camden Society, 41 (1848).

- Rous, John. *Diary of John Rous*. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green. Camden Society, 66 (1856).
- Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters of Law, remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments*. 8 vols. London, 1680-1701.
- Searle, Arthur, ed. *Barrington Family Letters 1628-1632*. Camden Society 4th series, 28 (1983).
- Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. London, 1596. Edited by Andrew Hadfield and Wiley Maley. 1997.
- Stanihurst, Richard. *The Historie of Ireland*. In Ralph Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. London, 1807-8, vol. vi.
- Temple, Sir John. *The Irish Rebellion: or, an History of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion Raised within the Kingdome of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October 1641*. London, 1646. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 508.
- A Treacherous Plot of a Confederacie in Ireland*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 179(15).
- The true reporte of the prosperous successe which God gave unto our English souldiours against the forraine bands of our Romaine enemies, lately arrived, (but soone inough to theyr cost) in Ireland*. London, [1581].
- A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640*. 5 vols. Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1875-94.
- True Intelligence from Ireland*. London, 1642. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 142(23).
- Two Letters of the Lord Digby to the lord Taaffe*. London, 1647. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 419(8).
- Verney, Francis Parthenope, and Margaret M. Verney, eds. *Memoirs of the Verney Family during the Seventeenth Century*. 2 vols. London, 1907.
- The Wonderfull Battell of Starelings*. London, 1622.
- Wharton, George. *Bellum Hybernicae: or, Irelands Warre Astrologically demonstrated*. London, 1646. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 365(21).
- Worse and Worse Newes from Ireland being the copy of a letter read in the House of Parliament, the 14. Of this instant Moneth of December, wherein is contained such unheard cruelties, committed by the Papists against the Protestants*. London, 1641. British Library, Thomason Tracts E. 180(15).

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbott, Wilbur Cortez, ed. *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. 4 vols. Oxford, 1988.
- Adamson, John. "Strafford's Ghost: The British Context of Viscount Lisle's Lieutenantancy of Ireland." In *Ireland from Independence to Occupation 1641-1660*. Edited by Jane H. Ohlmeyer. Cambridge, 1995, pp.128-159.

- Ashley, Maurice. *General Monck*. London, 1977.
- Armstrong, Robert. "Protestant Ireland and the English Parliament, 1641-1647". Ph.D. thesis. Trinity College Dublin, 1995.
- Ashton, Robert. *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution 1603-1649*. London, 1978.
- Bagwell, Richard. *Ireland under the Stuarts*. 3 vols. London, 1963.
- Baumber, Michael L. "The Navy and Civil War in Ireland 1641-1643." *Mariner's Mirror* 57 (1971), pp. 385-397.
- _____. "The Navy and the Civil War in Ireland, 1643-1646." *Mariner's Mirror* 75 (1989), pp. 255-268.
- Beckett, J.C. *The cavalier duke: A life of James Butler, first Duke of Ormond, 1610-1688*. Belfast, 1990.
- _____. "The Confederation of Kilkenny Reviewed." In *Historical Studies II*. Edited by Michael Roberts. London, 1959, pp. 29-41.
- _____. *The Making of Modern Ireland, 1603-1923*. London, 1966.
- Bennett, Martyn. *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638-1651*. Oxford, 1997.
- Blagden, Cyprian. *The Stationers' Company: A History 1403-1959*. Stanford, CA., 1960.
- _____. "The Stationers' Company in the Civil War Period," *Library* 13 (1958), pp. 1-17.
- Bottigheimer, Karl. "Civil War in Ireland: The Reality in Munster." *Emory University Quarterly*, 22 (1966), pp. 46-56.
- _____. *English money and Irish land: The "Adventurers" in the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland*. Oxford, 1971.
- Boyd, Andrew. "Rinuccini and Civil War in Ireland, 1644-49." *History Today* 41 (Feb. 1991), pp. 42-48.
- Bradshaw, Brendan, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley, eds. *Representing Ireland: literature and the origins of conflict, 1634-1660*. Cambridge, 1993.
- Brailsford, H.N. *The Levellers and the English Revolution*. Edited by Christopher Hill. London, 1961.
- Buchan, John. *Montrose*. London, 1928.
- Canny, Nicholas. *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76*. Sussex, 1976.
- _____. "The Flight of the Earls 1607." *Irish Historical Studies* 17 (1971), pp. 380-399.
- _____. "The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social and Cultural History." *History Ireland* (Winter, 1993), pp. 52-55.
- Carlin, Norah. "Extreme or mainstream?: the English Independents and the Cromwellian reconquest of Ireland, 1649-1651." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict*. Edited by Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley. Cambridge, 1993, pp. 209-223.
- _____. "Ireland and Natural Man in 1649." In *Europe and its Others, II*. Edited by Francis Barker et al., Colchester, 1985.

- _____. "The Levellers and the Conquest of Ireland in 1649." *Historical Journal* 30 (1987), pp. 260-288.
- Carlton, Charles. *Going To The Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638-1651*. London, 1992.
- Carte, Thomas. *An History of the Life of James Duke of Ormond*. 6 vols. Oxford, 1851.
- Casway, Jerrold I. "George Monck and the Controversial Catholic Truce of 1649." *Studia Hibernica* 16 (1976), pp. 54-72.
- _____. *Owen Roe O'Neill and the Struggle for Catholic Ireland*. Philadelphia, 1984.
- _____. "Owen Roe O'Neill's Return to Ireland in 1642: The Diplomatic Background." *Studia Hibernica* 9 (1969), pp. 48-64.
- Clarke, Aidan. "The 1641 Depositions." In *Treasures of the Library Trinity College Dublin*. Edited by Peter Fox. Dublin, 1986, pp. 111-122.
- _____. "The Genesis of the Ulster Rising of 1641." In *Plantation to Partition*. Edited by Peter Roebuck, Belfast, 1981, pp. 27-45.
- _____. "Ireland and the General Crisis," *Past and Present* 48 (1970), pp. 79-99.
- _____. *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42*. London, 1966.
- _____. "Pacification, plantation, and the catholic question, 1603-23." In *A New History of Ireland*. Edited by T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne. Oxford, 1976, vol. 3, pp. 187-232.
- _____. "Selling royal favours, 1624-32." In *New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, pp. 233-242.
- _____. "The government of Wentworth, 1632-40." In *New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, pp. 243-269.
- _____. "The breakdown of authority, 1640-41." In *New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, pp. 270-288.
- Clifton, Robin. "The Popular Fear Of Catholics During The English Revolution." *Past and Present* 52 (1971), pp. 23-55.
- Clyde, William. "Parliament and the Press, 1643-7." *The Library* 13 (1932-33), pp. 399-424.
- _____. *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press*. London, 1934.
- Cogswell, Thomas. "The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s." *Journal of British Studies*, 29, no.3 (1990), pp. 187-215.
- Collins, D.C. *A Handlist of News Pamphlets, 1590-1610*. London, 1943.
- Corish, Patrick J. "Ormond, Rinuccini, and the confederates, 1645-9." In *New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, pp. 317-335.
- _____. "The rising of 1641 and the catholic confederacy, 1641-5." In *New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, pp. 289-316.
- Cotton, A.N.B. "Cromwell and the Self-Denying Ordinance." *History* 62 (1977), pp. 211-231.
- _____. "John Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group." *English Historical Studies* 93 (1978), pp. 817-834.

- _____. "London Newsbooks in the Civil War: Their Political Attitudes and Sources of Information." D.Phil. thesis. Oxford, 1971.
- Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge, 1980.
- Croft, Pauline. "The Restoration of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century." *Transactions of the Historical Society*, 6th series, 1 (1991), pp. 43-69.
- Cromartie, A.D.T. "The Printing of Parliamentary Speeches November 1640-July 1642." *Historical Journal* 33 (1990), pp. 23-44.
- Cust, Richard. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England." *Past and Present* 112 (1986), pp. 60-90.
- Dahl, Folke. "Amsterdam-Cradle of English Newspapers," *The Library*, 5th series, 4 (1949), pp.166-178.
- _____. *A Bibliography of English Corantos and Periodical Newsbooks, 1620-1642*. London, 1952.
- Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 66 vols. London, 1885-1901.
- Diethe, Jürgen. "The Moderate. Politics and Allegiances of a Revolutionary Newspaper." *History of Political Thought* 4 (1983), pp. 247-294.
- Dillingham, John. "Images of Ireland 1170-1600: The Origins Of English Imperialism." *History Today* 37 (1987), pp. 16-22
- Donagan, Barbara. "Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason in the English Civil War." *American Historical Review* 99 (1994), pp. 1137-1166.
- _____. "Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War." *Past & Present* 118 (1988), pp. 65-95.
- Donovan, Iain. "Bloody news from Ireland: The pamphlet literature of the Irish massacres of the 1640s." M.Litt. thesis. University of Dublin, 1995.
- Dore, R. N. *The Civil Wars in Cheshire*. Chester, 1966.
- Dunlop, Robert. "The depositions relating to the Irish massacres of 1641." *English Historical Review* 1 (1886), pp. 740-744.
- _____. "The Forged Commission of 1641." *English Historical Review* 2 (1887), pp. 527-33.
- Durston, Chris. "'Let Ireland Be Quiet': Opposition in England to the Cromwellian Conquest of Ireland." *History Workshop Journal* 21 (1986), pp. 105-112.
- Eccles, Mark. "Thomas Gainsford, Captain Pamphlet." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 14 (1982), pp. 259-270.
- Elkin, Robert E. "The Interactions between the Irish Rebellion and the English Civil Wars." Ph.D. thesis. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1961.
- Ellis, Steven G. *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*. London, 1985.
- Firth, C.H. *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*. London, 1901.

- Ford, Alan. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641*. 2nd ed., Dublin, 1997.
- _____. "The Protestant Reformation in Ireland." In *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641*. Edited by Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie. Dublin, 1986, pp. 50-74.
- Ford, Wyn. "The Problem of Literacy in Early Modern England," *History* 78 (1993), pp. 22-37.
- Fortesque, G.K., ed. *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War 1640-1661*. 2 vols. London, 1908.
- Fox, Adam. "Rumor, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England." *The Historical Journal*, 40, 3 (1997), pp. 597-620.
- Frank, Joseph. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660*. Cambridge, MA., 1961.
- _____. *Cromwell's Press Agent: A Critical Biography of Marchamont Nedham, 1620-1778*. Lanham, MD., 1980.
- Frearson, Michael. "The Distribution and Readership of London Corantos in the 1620s." In *Serials and their Readers, 1620-1914*. Edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Winchester, 1993, pp. 1-25.
- _____. "London Corantos in the 1620s." In *Studies in Newspaper and Periodical History, 1993 Annual*. Edited by Michael Harris. Westport, CT., 1993, pp. 3-17.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. 10 vols. London, 1883-1884.
- _____. *History of the Great Civil War*. 4 vols. London, 1893.
- _____. *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656*. 4 vols. London, 1903.
- Gaunt, Peter. *Oliver Cromwell*. Oxford, 1996.
- Gentiles, Ian. *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653*. Oxford, 1992.
- Gillespie, Raymond. *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster, 1600-1641*. Cork, 1985.
- _____. "Owen Roe O'Neill," in *Nine Ulster Lives*, ed. Gerard O'Brien and Peter Roebuck (Belfast, 1992), pp. 151-168.
- Gillingham, John. "The English Invasion of Ireland." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660*. Edited by Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield and John Maley, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 24-42.
- Greenberg, Stephen J. "Dating Civil War Pamphlets, 1641-1644." *Albion* 20 (1988), pp. 387-401.
- _____. "The Thomason Collection: Rebuttal to Michael Mendle." *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 95-98.
- Greg, W.W. *Some Aspects And Problems Of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650*. Oxford, 1956.

- Hadfield, Andrew. "Giraldus Cambrensis and English Writing about Ireland." In *Strangers To That Land: British Perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine*. Edited by Andrew Hadfield and John McVeagh (Gerard's Cross, 1994).
- _____. "Was Spenser's View of the Present State of Ireland Censored? A Review Of The Evidence." *Notes and Queries* 239 (1994), pp. 459-463.
- Hanson, Laurence. "English Newsbooks, 1620-1641." *The Library*, 4th series, 18 (1938), pp. 355-384.
- Hamilton, Charles L. "Scotland, Ireland and the English Civil War." *Albion* 7 (1975), pp. 120-130.
- Harrison, G. B. "Books and Readers, 1591-4." *The Library*, 4th series, 8 (1927), pp. 273-302.
- Hayes MaCoy, G.A. *Irish Battles. A Military History of Ireland*. Belfast, 1989.
- Hazlett, Hugh. "The Financing of the British Armies in Ireland, 1641-9." *Irish Historical Studies* 1 (1938), pp. 21-41.
- _____. "The Recruitment and Organization of the Scottish Army in Ulster, 1642-9." In *Essays in British and Irish history in honour of James Eadie Todd*. Edited by H.A. Cronne, T.W. Moody and D.B. Quinn. London, 1949, pp. 107-131.
- Hexter, J.H. "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents." In *Reappraisals in History*. London, 1961, pp. 163-184.
- _____. *The Reign of King Pym*. Cambridge, Mass., 1941.
- Hickson, Mary. "The depositions relating to the Irish massacres of 1641." *English Historical Review* 2 (1887), pp. 133-137.
- Hill, Christopher. "Censorship and English Literature." In *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Writing and Revolution in 17th Century England*, vol. 1. Edited by Christopher Hill, Amherst, MA., 1985, pp. 32-71.
- _____. "Seventeenth-Century English Radicals and Ireland." In *A Nation of Change and Novelty. Radical Politics, Religion and Literature in Seventeenth-Century England*. London, 1990, pp. 133-151.
- Hirst, Derek. *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658*. London, 1986.
- Howell, Jr., Roger, and David E. Brewster, "Reconsidering the Levellers: The Evidence of *The Moderate*." *Past and Present* 46 (1970), pp. 68-86.
- Hughes, Anne. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. London, 1991.
- Kaplan, Lawrence. *Politics and Religion during the English Revolution. The Scots and the Long Parliament 1643-1645*. New York, 1976.
- _____. "Steps to War: the Scots and Parliament, 1642-1643." *Journal of British Studies*, 9 (1970), pp. 50-67.
- Kearney, Hugh. *Strafford in Ireland, 1633-41: A Study in Absolutism*. Manchester, 1959.
- Kenyon, John. *The Civil Wars of England*. London, 1988.
- Lambert, Sheila. "The Beginning of Printing for the House of Commons, 1640-42." *The Library* 3 (1981), pp. 43-61.

- _____. "Coranto Printing in England: The First Newsbooks." *Journal of Newspaper and Periodical History* 8 (1992), pp. 3-19.
- _____. "The Printers and the Government, 1604-1637." In *Aspects of Printing from 1600*. Edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Oxford, 1987, pp. 1-29.
- _____. "State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers' Company before 1640." In *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France, 1600-1910*. Edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Winchester, 1992, pp. 1-32.
- Levy, F.J. "How Information Spread among the Gentry, 1550-1640." *Journal of British Studies* 21 (1982), pp. 11-34.
- Lindley, Keith. "The impact of the 1641 rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641-5." *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972), pp. 143-176.
- Little, Patrick. "The English Parliament and the Irish Constitution, 1641-1649." Unpublished paper delivered at the Cregan Conference. Dublin, March 1999.
- Love, Walter D. "Civil War in Ireland: Appearances in Three Centuries of Historical Writing." *Emory University Quarterly* 22 (1966), pp. 57-72.
- Lowe, John. "Charles I and the confederation of Kilkenny, 1643-9." *Irish Historical Studies* 14 (1964), pp. 1-19.
- _____. "The Earl of Antrim and Irish Aid to Montrose in 1644." *Irish Sword* 4 (1960), pp. 191-198.
- _____. "The Glamorgan Mission to Ireland 1645-6." *Studia Hibernica*, 4 (1964), pp. 155-196.
- MacCarthy-Morrogh, Michael. *The Munster Plantation: English Migration to Southern Ireland, 1583-1641*. Oxford, 1986.
- McCavitt, John. "The Political Background To The Ulster Plantation, 1607-1620." In *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*. Edited by Brian MacCurtain. Belfast, 1993, pp. 7-23.
- Malcolm, Joyce Lee. "All the king's men: the impact of the crown's Irish soldiers on the English civil war." *Irish Historical Studies* 83 (1979), pp. 239-264.
- _____. *Caesar's Due. Loyalty and King Charles 1642-1646*. London, 1983.
- Maley, Willy. "How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's View." In *Representing Ireland*, pp. 191-208.
- Mendle, Michael. "Grub Street and Parliament at the Beginning of the English Revolution." In *Media and Revolution*. Edited by Jeremy D. Popkin, Lexington, KY., 1995, pp. 31-47.
- _____. "The Thomason Collection: A Reply to Stephen J. Greenberg." *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 85-93.
- Moody, T.W. *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609-41: The City of London and the Plantation of Ulster*. Belfast, 1939.
- Morgan, Hiram. *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland*. Suffolk, 1993.
- Morrill, J.S. *Cheshire 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution*. Oxford, 1974.

- Murphy, John A. "The Politics of the Munster Protestants, 1641-49." *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society* 76 (1971), pp. 1-20.
- Nelson, Carolyn., and Seccombe, Matthew. *British Newspapers and Periodicals 1641-1700. A Short-Title Catalogue of Serials Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and British America*. New York, 1987.
- Ó Danachair, Caoimhin. "Montrose's Irish Regiments." *Irish Sword* 4 (1959), pp. 61-67.
- Ó Siochrú, Micheál. *Confederate Ireland 1642-1649. A Constitutional and Political Analysis*. Dublin, 1999.
- _____. "The Confederation of Kilkenny." *History Ireland*, 2, no. 2 (1994), pp. 51-56.
- Ohlmeyer, Jane. *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Kingdoms: The Career of Randall MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683*. Cambridge, 1993.
- _____. "Irish Privateers during the Civil War, 1642-50." *Mariner's Mirror* 76 (1990), pp. 119-133.
- _____. "'The Dunkirk of Ireland': Wexford Privateers during the 1640s." *Journal of the Wexford Historical Society* 12 (1988-89), pp. 23-49.
- _____. "The wars of religion, 1603-1660." In *A Military History of Ireland*. Edited by Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery. Cambridge, 1996, pp. 160-187.
- Pearl, Valerie. "Oliver St. John and the 'middle group' in the Long Parliament: August 1643-May 1644." *English Historical Studies* 81 (1966), pp. 490-519.
- Perceval-Maxwell, Michael. "Ireland and the Monarchy in the Early Stuart Multiple Kingdom." *Historical Journal* 34 (1991), pp. 279-295.
- _____. *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*. Montreal, 1994.
- _____. *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I*. London, 1973.
- _____. "The Ulster Rising of 1641, and the depositions." *Irish Historical Studies* 21 (1978-79), pp. 144-167.
- _____. "Ulster 1641 in the Context of Political Developments in the Three Kingdoms." In *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, Edited by Brian MacCuarta, Belfast, 1993, pp. 93-106.
- Plomer, Henry R. "An Analysis Of The Civil War Newspaper 'Mercurius Civicus'." *The Library* 6 (1905), pp. 184-207.
- _____. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. Oxford, 1968.
- Pollard A.W. and Redgrave, G.R. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland: And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*. 3 vols. London, 1976-1991.
- Pollard, Mary. "Control of the Press in Ireland through the King's Printer's Patent 1600-1800." *Irish Booklore*, 4, no. 2 (1980), pp. 79-95
- Potter, Lois. *Secret rites and secret writing. Royalist literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge, 1989.

- Powell, William S. *John Pory 1575-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts*. Chapel Hill, NC., 1977.
- Ranger, Terence. "Strafford in Ireland: A Reevaluation." In *Crisis in Europe 1560-1600*. Edited by Trevor Aston. New York, 1965.
- Raymond, Joad. "The Crisis of Eloquence: Reading and Writing English Newsbooks, 1641-1649. D.Phil. thesis. Oxford, 1994.
- _____. "The Daily Muse; Or, Seventeenth-Century Poets Read The News." *The Seventeenth Century* 11 (1995), pp. 1-30.
- _____. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649*. Oxford, 1996.
- _____, ed. *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-1660*. Moreton-in-Marsh, 1993.
- Read, James Morgan. "Atrocity Propaganda And The Irish Rebellion." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 2 (1938), pp. 229-244.
- Robinson, Philip S. *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670*. Dublin, 1984.
- Rostenberg, Leona. "Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne, First 'Masters of the Staple.'" *The Library*, 3rd series, 12 (1957), pp. 23-33.
- Roy, Ian. "England Turned Germany? The Aftermath Of The Civil War In Its European Context." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 28 (1978), pp. 127-144.
- Russell, Conrad. "The British Background to the Irish Rebellion." *Historical Research* 61 (1988), pp. 166-182.
- _____. "The British problem and the English civil war." *History* 72 (1987), pp. 395-415.
- _____. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. Oxford, 1990.
- _____. *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642*. Oxford, 1991.
- Scott, David. "The 'Northern Gentlemen', the parliamentary Independents, and Anglo-Scottish relations in the Long Parliament." *Historical Journal* 42 (1999), pp. 347-375.
- Seaver, Paul S. *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London*. London, 1985.
- Shaaber, Matthias. "The History of the First English Newspaper." *Studies in Philology* 29 (1932), pp. 551-587.
- _____. *Some Forerunners of the Newspaper in England, 1476-1622*. Philadelphia, 1929.
- Shagan, Ethan Howard. "Constructing Discord: Ideology, Propaganda, and English Responses to the Irish Rebellion of 1641." *Journal of British Studies* 36 (1997), pp. 4-34.
- Siebert, Frederick. *Freedom of the Press in England 1476-1776. The Rise and Decline of Government Controls*. Urbana, IL., 1952.
- Simmons, Judith. "Publications of 1623." *The Library*, 5th series, 21 (1966), pp. 207-222.
- Simms, Hilary. "Violence in County Armagh, 1641." In *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising*, pp. 123-138.

- Sommerville, C. John. *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information*. Oxford, 1996.
- Spufford, Margaret. "First Steps in Literacy: The Reading and Writing Experiences of the Humblest Seventeenth-Century Spiritual Autobiographers." *Social History* 4 (1979), pp. 407-35.
- Stevenson, David. *Revolution And Counter-Revolution In Scotland, 1644-1651*. London, 1977.
- _____. *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates: Scottish-Irish Relations in the mid-seventeenth Century*. Belfast, 1981.
- Stoyle, M.J. "'Pagans or Paragons?': Images of the Cornish during the English Civil War." *English Historical Review* 111 (1996), pp. 299-323.
- Thomas, Keith. "The Meaning of Literacy in Early Modern England." In *The Written Word: Literacy in transition*. Edited by Gerd Baumann. Oxford, 1986, pp. 97-131.
- Thomas, P.W. *Sir John Berkenhead 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics*. Oxford, 1969.
- Treadwell, Victor. "New light on Richard Hadsor: Richard Hadsor and the authorship of 'Advertisements for Ireland', 1622/3." *Irish Historical Studies* 30 (1997), pp. 305-336.
- Underdown, David. "The Man in the Moon. Loyalty and Libel in Popular Politics, 1640-1660." In *A Freeborn People. Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford, 1996, pp. 90-111.
- _____. *Pride's Purge. Politics in the Puritan Revolution*. Oxford, 1971.
- Varley, Frederick John. *Mercurius Aulicus*. Oxford, 1948.
- Webb, H.J. "Military Newsbooks during the Age of Elizabeth." *English Studies* 33 (1952), pp. 241-251.
- Wedgewood, C.V. *The Trial of Charles I*. London, 1964.
- Wheeler, Scott. "Four Armies In Ireland." In *Ireland from independence to occupation 1641-1660*. Edited by Jane H. Ohlmeyer. Cambridge, 1995, pp. 50-51.
- Wiener, Carol Z. "The Beleagured Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism." *Past And Present* 51 (1971), pp. 27-62.
- Williams, J.B. *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette*. London, 1908.
- _____. ed. *The Times [London] Tercentenary Handlist of English & Welsh Newspapers, Magazines & Reviews*. London, 1920.
- Woolf, Daniel. "Conscience, constancy, and ambition in the career and writings of James Howell." In *Public duty and private conscience in seventeenth-century England: essays presented to G. E. Aylemer*. Edited by John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf. Oxford, 1993, pp. 243-278.
- Worden, Blair. "'Wit in a Roundhead': the dilemma of Marchamont Nedham." In *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*. Edited by Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester, NY., 1995, pp. 301-337.

- Wright, Louis B. "Propaganda Against James I's 'Appeasement' of Spain."
Huntington Library Quarterly 6 (1942-43), pp. 149-163.
- Young, Peter. *Edgehill 1642: The Campaign and the Battle*. Kineton, 1967.
- Zagorin, Perez. *The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution*. London, 1969.