

## **‘Citizens at the door’: mobilising against the enemy in Civil War London**

**Tom Leng<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract** This article considers how the image of the enemy was deployed by parliamentary activists in civil war London. It focuses on the ‘malignant party’ identified in parliamentary discourse as guilty of dividing crown and parliament and precipitating civil war. Endorsing the reality of this party became a means for activists to assert their status as those most ‘well-affected’ to parliament, and to legitimise their own political agency within the terms of parliamentary discourse. By learning to speak the language of parliament, these activists were able to participate in the construction of the parliamentary cause, and to shape its future.

\*\*\*\*\*

In the late spring of 1643, a point in the English Civil War when a parliamentary victory seemed very distant, a proposal was issued forth from the heart London. It came from Salters Hall, since March the meeting place of a subcommittee of the City’s militia committee empowered to raise volunteers and money for the war effort.<sup>1</sup> As the rival armies geared up for the summer’s campaign, the subcommittee proposed that London’s householders forbear one meal per week, the cost of which would be directed towards financing new regiments. And in order to bring this proposition into action, an anonymous pamphlet addressed to ‘well-affected Families and Persons’, suggested the following:

If two men in every Parish went with two Books, the one with a white book, and the other with a black book: and recorded in the white book the names of all that by this

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom Leng is a Lecturer at The University of Sheffield and may be contacted at [t.leng@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:t.leng@sheffield.ac.uk).

beneficence became benefactors unto their Countrey, and in the black book theirs that refused, to the perpetuall honour of the one, and infamy of the other and their posterities (as a wittie *Florentine* in time of famine adviseth to do) surely very few would be set down in the black book: for the greatest Malignants (beside the avoiding of such shame) would also fear lest the Parliament might impose more upon them, if they refused this, and thereby shewed the height of their malignancy, which moved them even with their own damage, to endeavour the undoing of the Common-wealth: and that all their neighbors would be ready to leavie what they were assessed at with zeal enough.<sup>2</sup>

This initiative would thus not only aid the beleaguered war effort; it would also serve to make clear the divisions that underlay this conflict. By exposing refusers, parochial activists would also identify the enemy within, who would be revealed to public view and thus neutralised (or at the very least forced to hide their true feelings and outwardly conform to the new political order).

This proposition can act as a snapshot of several novel features of civil war politics: political mobilisation emanating independently of parliament or crown whilst drawing legitimacy from one or other of them, building on existing institutional structures (the parish), cultural forms (the religious fast), modes of communication (the printing press), and values (public reputation, neighbourliness) to serve partisan ends, in the process potentially transforming their meanings.<sup>3</sup> But it also highlights another central factor of civil war politics: the identification of, and mobilisation against, a specific enemy, defined here by a term which had recently exploded into political usage: the ‘malignant’, whose ‘party’ was said by parliamentary commentators to have

been behind the outbreak of the war. Standing between this enemy and the parliament it sought to destroy were those ‘Families and Persons’ who collectively bore what had become the identity of choice for supporters of parliament, that of ‘well-affected’. The antithetical imagined communities of the malignant party and the well-affected occupied opposite poles of the political landscape as it was conceived within parliamentary discourse. Analysis of their meanings opens a window into the culture of the parliamentary cause, understood not so much as ‘a set of institutions, a group of personalities, or an ideology,’ than as ‘a cluster of powerful symbols and attitudes, a language and new forms of speech, new ways of behaving in public and private’.<sup>4</sup>

The word malignant was hardly novel, but the compound noun ‘malignant party’ was a recent addition to the political lexicon, forming a strategic part of the outline of the parliamentary cause subsequently known as the Grand Remonstrance, passed by the House of Commons in December 1641, prior to the outbreak of civil war in the following summer.<sup>5</sup> This narrative of the achievements and frustrations of the Long Parliament and its predecessors had sought to explain growing political polarisation with recourse to a conspiracy theory of recent history. By doing so, it brought into being what might be described as a ‘political landscape’ populated by three central actors, each standing in spatial relationship to the other: the crown, parliament, and in between them, the malignant party who had been guilty of dividing what should be a unitary whole.<sup>6</sup> This narrative subsumed that of its ideological and genealogical predecessor, the ‘popish plot’, to stigmatise the opponents of parliament (or rather of a faction within it) as contributors to a papist design whose ends were ever-extendable (to destroy the true religion; the ancient constitution; English liberties), but whose primary stance was defined politically, as opposition to parliament. Thus parliament could claim to be fighting against the malignant party rather than the king,

whilst acting ever more assertively in defence of the commonwealth. This political landscape, literally held together by the existence of the malignant party, would dominate parliamentary politics throughout the 1640s, and would contribute a key phrase to an evolving language of parliamentarianism, which developed its own distinctive vocabulary, grammar and syntax. It is the argument of this article that the acquisition and articulation of this language provided a means for those outside of the political nation as it was conventionally configured, or at least on its margins, to legitimise their political agency and thus to become active within a particular discursive realm, to occupy the territory implied by the Grand Remonstrance and other instances of parliamentary discourse. For many, this agency was assumed by embracing the identity of being well-affected to parliament, a stance which was explicitly defined in opposition to the malignant enemies of parliament. Evoking the existence of the malignant, and thus inhabiting the epistemic community outlined in the Grand Remonstrance, became a means for the self-proclaimed well-affected to emphasise their identity with parliament; they learned to speak the language of parliament, and in doing so, helped to shape its meaning.

## I

Seventeenth century political thought has offered a rich quarry for the study of political languages, as historians following in the wake of Pocock, Skinner and the ‘Cambridge School’ have excavated those of classical republicanism, the ancient constitution and so on. But it will here be suggested that the language of parliament in the 1640s was not reducible to that of godly Protestantism, republicanism, constitutionalism or any other of the discourses identified as central to seventeenth century political thought, although it could incorporate elements of them. Rather it should be seen as a discourse in its own right, capable of constituting knowledges and constructing subjects. My approach here draws on recent developments in the historiography of

the Soviet Union—an unlikely place perhaps to find inspiration for the study of the English Revolution, at least since revisionism made such comparisons taboo. In fact these developments in Soviet scholarship emerged in response to a revisionist wave internal to that field.<sup>7</sup> This revisionism had challenged the tendency to see Soviet society as in thrall to a totalitarian state, a picture which revisionists questioned by demonstrating how parts of society were complicit and even active in the construction of the repressive Soviet system. In reaction to such scholarship, Stephen Kotkin suggested that Stalinism was more than just repression, but represented a form of ‘civilisation’ in its own right: not just the constraint or abnegation of agency, but constructive of it, agency made possible through language. His phrase ‘speaking Bolshevik’ became shorthand within the field of Soviet studies for the ways in which people adopted and adapted to the language presented by the Soviet state, becoming skilled at playing ‘the state-sponsored game of social identity as the one permissible and necessary mode of participation in the public realm’.<sup>8</sup> Indeed for Kotkin the relationship between discourse and identity was critical. The Soviet worker was a highly politicised social identity constructed within Bolshevik discourse. Learning to identify oneself within this discursive realm was necessary for survival but was also potentially beneficial and empowering, allowing individuals to negotiate their position within Stalinist society and to achieve a kind of agency. The rules of the game of speaking Bolshevik were set out by the state but were (to a limited extent) manipulable by ordinary citizens: language, even when the property of a repressive state, enabled some forms of expression, even as it constrained others. The notion of the enemy pervaded this discourse and the identities it constructed, a product of the ‘adversarial process’ inherent in the task of building socialism that underpinned the Stalinist Terror.<sup>9</sup>

It is not the intent of this article to present the Long Parliament as somehow equivalent to the Soviet state in embryonic form, belonging to the same lineage of revolutionary regimes. Certainly, the parliamentary cause in the civil war was not informed by any developed revolutionary ideology, or policed by a disciplined party cadre seeking to establish absolute control over society; its discourse emerged piecemeal from multiple statements issued in reaction to events, texts that were subjected to multiple interpretations, creating something that was every bit as unstable and heterogeneous as the Elizabethan religious settlement before it.<sup>10</sup> Rather, my purpose is to draw on the idea of ‘speaking Bolshevik’ in order to reconsider the relationship between parliament and the people whom it purported to represent by focussing on language, considering how individuals engaged with the parliamentary-state through learning to speak in a way that it would find intelligible, and by adopting the officially sanctioned identities which had been established within parliament’s discursive framework. However my approach will be more constrained than that of Kotkin, who sought to place the population of an entire city within Stalinist ‘civilisation’. Instead, I will focus on the most committed supporters of parliament, those who identified themselves as the well-affected, within the parliamentary capital of London. Their activism often focussed on mobilising against the malignant party—military and political mobilisation went hand in hand. We might even go so far as to say that the existence of the enemy became bound up in the identity of these most committed parliamentarians: the well-affected were always opposed by and to their obverse, the ‘ill-affected’, whose very existence legitimised their activism.<sup>11</sup>

The term well-affected at first sight might seem to be ideologically neutral, simply meaning to be positively disposed to any specified object. However, there is evidence that long before the

outbreak of civil war it had become politically charged. In Richard Rainolde's early Elizabethan humanist work of pedagogy, it is cast in terms of classical virtue, both as part of the disposition towards an active as opposed to a 'sluggishe' life ('paine, labour, and studie...of vertue, arte, or science is moste pleasaunt to well affected mindes'), and the willingness to sacrifice all for one's country ('there is no subiect well affected, but that he onlie liueth to proffite his countrie, to liue & dye therein').<sup>12</sup> The examples of such patriotic behaviour given by Rainolde were classical, but Rainolde added a godly slant through the phrase 'well affected and Godlie mynded to their countrie'. This combination of active citizenship and godliness would characterise what Cust has called the early Stuart 'patriot' political narrative, which pitted the idealised patriot against the spectre of corruption in church and state and the threat of popery. There is evidence that the term well-affected was particularly associated with this discourse: Cust cites an example from the elections for the Short Parliament in 1640 in which the phrase 'such men as were well affected in religion and towards the commonwealth' was used to rally the electorate behind a particular candidate.<sup>13</sup> One of the first books to use the term on its title page was a collection of sermons by the Reading Puritan William Burton, with the telling title *The rovvsing of the sluggard...Published at the request of diuerse godly and well affected* (London, 1595, and several subsequent editions). Here, well-affected becomes an internal, subjective quality, but it also implies a collective entity, a moral community that was coterminous with 'the godly', and one which the Long Parliament in the 1640s would turn to for material and symbolic support. However this was not a one-way process, for well-affected would be embraced as the identity of choice of those seeking to present themselves as parliament's friends.<sup>14</sup> Such self-identification indicates a willingness to locate oneself within a discursive realm fashioned in part from the

diverse statements being issued by parliament, to position oneself in a particular relationship with that body and thus to claim a stake in the parliamentary cause itself.

This symbiotic relationship between the Long Parliament and those communities of activists outside of it who rallied under the title of the well-affected helped to expand the bounds of the political nation, making new types of political engagement possible. A milestone in the development of this enlarged public politics was the Protestation oath of May 1641, passed by the House of Commons in the face of a perceived conspiracy against its existence, whereby subscribers promised to defend from popish conspiracies the true religion, the crown, privileges of parliament, and liberties of the subject. By extending this promise to members of the public, parliament effectively endowed them with political agency, and it is notable that the order putting this into practice specified that the Protestation ‘is fit to be taken by every person that is well affected in Religion, and to the good of the Common-wealth’.<sup>15</sup> Following Kotkin, we might even see the identity of well-affected as ‘the one permissible and necessary mode of participation in the public realm’, given that the Commons went on to order that ‘what person soever shall not take the Protestation, is unfit to bear Office in the Church or Common-wealth’. By doing so, the Commons presumed to have the power to prescribe the limits of participation in political and religious office. But if this identity bore the stamp of parliamentary approval, it was sufficiently malleable to allow individuals and groups to act in ways that might go beyond parliament’s own stance, as happened in several instances of iconoclasm prompted by the Protestation, whose ambiguous wording could be interpreted in different ways.<sup>16</sup> For the rest of its existence, the Long Parliament would continually be tested by those activists seeking to influence or even direct it, often in more radical directions.



As the rest of this article will discuss, much of this activism was focussed on combating the enemy. Indeed it was the existence of ‘most pernicious and wicked counsels, practices, plots and conspiracies’ that had prompted the Protestation, creating a state of emergency that justified both parliament’s increasing assertiveness and the independent activism of the well-affected. The political public that statements like the Protestation brought into being was to be characterised by its watchfulness, its vigilance against the plotting of parliament’s enemies. Passed by the Commons six months after the Protestation, the Grand Remonstrance solidified its conspiratorial political landscape, and by being printed, offered further invitation to members of the public to occupy its territory—to assume the stance of defenders of parliament (and the public) against the malignant party. Evoking the reality of the malignant party, and the threat it posed to the commonwealth, was both a way to signal support for the agenda of parliament and a means to maintain a political landscape through which individual activists had acquired agency.

## II

The Grand Remonstrance emerged during the political crisis of the winter of 1641-2 which saw Charles I depart from his capital city, along with a substantial number of members of parliament. Many of the latter had been encouraged to depart from Westminster by what they perceived as a growing willingness of their parliamentary rivals, notably the circle around John Pym, to advertise commonly held grievances about the state of the kingdom to an audience beyond parliament. The Grand Remonstrance was a case in point, and Pym justified its publishing by arguing that this would ‘bind the people’s hearts to us’.<sup>17</sup> Such active courtship of popular affection suggests that the political language of love was not confined to the Caroline court or the

royalist side in the civil war, in which contexts it has largely been studied.<sup>18</sup> Summations of the parliamentary cause would in fact be infused with love—for the commonwealth, the true religion, parliament—and the bond between parliament and its well-affected supporters was presented as an emotional one, forged in the heart.

An exemplary visualisation of this relationship appears on the frontispiece of a pamphlet published in 1643, entitled *Londons Love to her neighbours*.<sup>19</sup> Here, the union between ‘Parliament’ and ‘Commonalty’ is represented by an emblem of one hand clasping another, with a heart ascending above them, whilst around it three representatives of each of the two parties face each other. It is a perfect representation of the reciprocal relationship that had by then been fashioned between parliament and its supporters, for although the three laymen are said to represent the commonalty, their martial vigour and generosity (emblemised by upwards-thrusting weapons and a bulging purse) marks their status as well-affected. In the accompanying text, ‘Parliament’ promises that ‘For Religion, Lawes and Liberties wee’l strive’, whilst ‘Commonalty’ replies ‘with heart and hand, and purse, whilst we remaine alive’—a neat summary of the kinds of statements that had travelled back and forth between parliament and its supporters over the previous two years, in the form of petitions, declarations and so on.

The pamphlet itself was a rallying call to the ‘well-affected’ in London’s neighbouring counties to ‘rouse up your drooping harts’ and ‘shew your selves like men’.<sup>20</sup> Against these courageous ‘Citizens and Countrymen’ is arrayed a formidable enemy of bloodthirsty ‘cursed men’ including ‘*Irish Cavaliers, some Vallouns some Blackmoores*’. As well as racially stigmatised, the enemy

is dehumanised, ‘devouring Drones’ seeking to rob the ‘provident Bees’ of their honey. They are sexually predatory too, seeking to ravish the wives of the well-affected. As well as continuing to stand up to their enemies on the battlefield, the well-affected are advised to remain vigilant at home, to ‘have a watchfull eye over them that you trust, see that they be Religious, and well grounded men’, and to fight vice: ‘when you have removed disorder, set your selves in order, put your selves every one into a posture of defence, fit for warre’. The ideal parliamentarian is thus an epitome of self-mastery, masculine and moral, courageous in battle and commanding at home. In fact an example is given of ‘Two hundred valiant hearted women’ of Gloucester who ‘manfully withstood’ the besieging royalists, but this ultimately serves to shame the implied male reader into action: ‘if such vertue, such Religion, such courageous hearts remained in women, much more doth it belong to men, to stand in defence against the enemies of the Gospell and true Religion’.

This pamphlet made only a passing reference to ‘the Grand Malignant’ who had already lost his head (presumably the Earl of Strafford), but its representation of the nature of the enemy was very much in line with those pamphlets which had emerged in the wake of the Grand Remonstrance offering further descriptions of the character and ends of the malignant party. One example had a representative of that faction describe himself as ‘an enemy to God, my King, my Countrey, nay to my selfe, my wife, my children, every body’, encapsulating what had been the central defining feature of the malignant party in the Grand Remonstrance, its opposition to all forms of legitimate authority.<sup>21</sup> Such self-destructive enmity was also associated with the malignant in another pamphlet, where he is defined as ‘no mans friend, and his owne enemy’; the antisocial character of such a figure—‘he is the danger of society’—meant that the malignant

was positioned outside of the moral community of the kingdom, and so ‘not worthy to live among men’.<sup>22</sup> But these are just two of numerous such pamphlets offering similar caricatures of parliament’s enemies. Over seventy pamphlets published in 1642 contained the word malignant or a variant on the title page, the vast majority of them supporting the parliamentary cause; many more used the word in their contents.

We might see this literature as evidence of the credulity of a populace long exposed to far-fetched narratives of popish machinations. But these publications were not simply passive reactions to parliamentary propaganda; rather they were active political interventions in themselves. Because the narrative of the Grand Remonstrance was questioned from the beginning, restating its veracity was a political act whereby authors placed themselves within parliament’s epistemic community, upholding the interpretation of recent history which justified its stance. Naturally, therefore, print was an ideal technology to propagate these representations of reality, a social resource used to convince others of the truth of the parliamentary cause and world-view, a cause which one author summed up as ‘The happy maintaining of truth’.<sup>23</sup>

Most of these pamphlets were produced in London, the centre of the printing industry, and often they implicitly situated the malignant party in the provinces, contributing to a sense that the city was surrounded by its enemies without. Cultivating a siege mentality could serve parliament’s cause, appealing to the citizens’ loyalty to their embattled mother-city. Parliamentary pamphlets frequently drew on the motifs of civic culture to mobilise London’s citizenry behind their cause. Civic patriotism was ranged against factionalism and private interest; the city, ‘while it remains

intire without rents and divisions, all joyntly combining for the good of the publique, it is like an impregnable Fort'.<sup>24</sup> The physical manifestations of this spirit were the city's defensive fortifications, constructed under parliamentary order to encompass the entire metropolis, so that 'London was never truly London till now, for now she sits like a noble lady upon a royall thron'.<sup>25</sup> One pamphlet eulogised the Lord Mayor responsible for supervising this construction, the enthusiastic parliamentarian Isaac Pennington, as a civic patriarch infused with the wisdom and spirit necessary to 'oppose the malignitie of the times with an invincible patience and magnanimity'.<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere, he was compared with the biblical Nehemiah, builder of the walls of Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> As civic chivalry dictated, the Lord Mayor was to be an epitome of the city's virtues, and a model for its citizenry 'not to hang backward when any matter of cost or charge propounded for the defence and fortification of the Citie'.<sup>28</sup>

Such literature also deployed the common identification between London and Jerusalem, exhorting the citizens to support the civic reformation spearheaded by Pennington's mayoralty, which encompassed efforts to purify the city's symbolic geography by removing idolatrous monuments such as Cheapside Cross, for example.<sup>29</sup> But the Jerusalem comparison could be double-edged, a warning to the citizens to repent as much as a celebration of their piety, and the comparison took on added significance in times of war.<sup>30</sup> Disobedience of God would lead to London suffering the same fate as Jerusalem, one author warned, its children massacred and buildings razed.<sup>31</sup> Jerusalem's fall was caused by internal division, and this had a particular meaning in London as the sufferings of civil war encouraged a campaign of petitioning and demonstrating on behalf of a peace settlement, which many of the well-affected feared would betray their cause.<sup>32</sup> One way to counter this sentiment was to represent it as the work of enemies

within, 'evill affected Malignants' who were the equivalent of 'the seditious *Jewes in Jerusalem*'.<sup>33</sup> The peace movement of winter 1642-3 was stigmatised as '*the Malignants Peace*', its supporters identified with those on the margins of civic society: '*Papists, Atheists, and Proctors...Monopolizers, Publicanes, or Custom-house-men, Drunkards, Players, debauched villaines, the whole filth, trash, and Colluvies of this City*'.<sup>34</sup> Their number was said to include 'the Master of the Beare-garden, with his royall retinue, of Bearwards, Stage-players, Proctors, Promoters, and Pettifoggers, a very tall company of Tapsters, Tiplers, and honest Ale-drapers, and some of the ancient society of Chimney-sweepers', as well as 'shee Malignants' comprising 'our Turnbull-street-trulls, and the Banke-side Bawds, with the Queenes of Kent-street'.<sup>35</sup> Thus proponents of peace were associated with both the malignant party and the dregs of London's society, who must be expelled from the moral communities of kingdom and city respectively. When several Londoners became implicated in plots against parliamentary rule, it seemed only to confirm the conspiratorial character of the 'Citie-malignants' and their desire to bring division to Jerusalem.<sup>36</sup> The aim of such conspiracies, one pamphlet suggested, was explicitly to *Divide and Destroy the Parliament and the City of London*.<sup>37</sup>

### III

The alliance between parliament and London which such conspiracies allegedly hoped to rent asunder had arisen before the outbreak of war, in the midst of the same crisis that had given birth to the Grand Remonstrance. It was to London that the Long Parliament had turned for protection in the aftermath of the king's attempted coup of 4 January 1642, a date which one pamphleteer demanded should be commemorated alongside that of the Gunpowder Plot.<sup>38</sup> In the immediate aftermath of this episode the Puritan divine Simeon Ashe was quick to pin the blame on the 'insolencies of the Malignant party', an early adoption of the discursive framework outlined in

the Grand Remonstrance two months previously, in a city sermon.<sup>39</sup> Another author represented this as a conspiracy against London as much as parliament, although it had roused her inhabitants' vigilance, 'whereupon the Citizens, having great suspicion thereof, do watch day and night in defence of themselves'.<sup>40</sup> Thereafter, supporters of parliament presented the safety of city and parliament as yoked together: the 'wealthy and well-affected Citizens' were warned that they were 'the Indies which those bloodthirsty Cavaliers have aimed at, your wealth, your plate, and other riches'.<sup>41</sup> Whereas London's streets and inhabitants had traditionally played the roles of stage and audience to the spectacle of royal majesty, now, symbolically, the city's populace could embody 'the people' whom parliament was said to represent.<sup>42</sup> Arguably, gestures of popular affection were needed to endorse parliamentary legitimacy, which could not be secured by arguments, constitutional or otherwise, alone. In this case, the well-affected played an important role, their performances embodying the popular will in which parliamentary legitimacy was rooted.

London's importance was also financial, however, and parliamentarians expended considerable energy in exhorting its citizens to be liberal with their ample riches. It was the responsibility of the City's rulers to 'animate the Citizens and able persons resident within your walls, to contribute largely to the maintenance of these warres'.<sup>43</sup> Generosity was to be a defining feature of the well-affected, a quality to which the frontispiece of *Londons Love to her Neighbours* gave visual form. The House of Commons had sought to harness the resources of this group as early as June 1642, calling on them to lend money and plate to pay for military mobilisation, and although it was keen to stress that 'no Man's Affection shall be measured according to the Proportion of his Offer', this was clearly intended to become a badge of loyalty against the

enemy.<sup>44</sup> Once war had broken out, the principle was extended to provide for reparations: if the well-affected were bearing the cost of defending the kingdom, then clearly they should be compensated from the estates of ‘Delinquents, and of the malignant and disaffected Party in this Kingdom’.<sup>45</sup> Identifying such enemies within thus became a part of the war effort, as was the case with the proposal cited at the start of this article. According to this logic, malignancy was not confined to outward opposition to parliament: it could also encompass failure to actively support its war efforts, fiscally or otherwise. Those who failed to contribute fully were castigated as ‘*Hostes intra muros*, enemies within the walls’.<sup>46</sup>

Ultimately the administrative machinery which the Long Parliament erected to mine the financial resources of its enemies was through the sequestration of the estates of ‘delinquents’, a stock term for an enemy named in person by parliament or its delegated representatives, but one which was less ideologically charged than malignant, not so deeply implicated in the Grand Remonstrance’s conspiratorial reading of history. The term malignant never became so institutionally enshrined as delinquent, therefore—perhaps it was more difficult to imagine negotiating with such an absolute enemy as a malignant, as the Committee for Compounding with Delinquents was to do with those labelled delinquent. However, a scattering of state papers exist suggesting that this category was deployed to classify individuals on an interpersonal level, including a list of the names of London attorneys evidently drawn up in order to assess their estates, which categorized them with terms such as ‘a great Malignant and very rich’, ‘a peevish Malignant & well able to contribute’, and ‘a most malicious Malignant without childe or charge, able to contribute largely’.<sup>47</sup> Another paper simply lists names of individuals in the suburban parishes of Limehouse, Shadwell and Ratcliff, noting them either as ‘Malignant’ or ‘don little’.<sup>48</sup>



Such papers, though seemingly not voluminous, at least demonstrate the potential for parliament's classifications to enter into social relations, with local activists identifying malignants based on their personal knowledge and reporting this back to the state, although it does not seem that this kind of practice became institutionalised. But activists did evoke the malignant party in their negotiations with parliament, as well as in print. In late 1642, the self-proclaimed well-affected of London made a number of strategic appearances at the House of Commons, acting under the leadership of the city activist Richard Shute, where they displayed their loyalties and made their fears known. On 13 November they appeared claiming to 'come in the Name of the Godly and Active Part of the City', and to 'speak in the Language of many Thousands; That they fear they are bought and sold'.<sup>49</sup> Expressing their concern about dangerous moves towards 'accommodation' with the enemy, Shute and his cohort presented themselves as parliament's truest friends: 'they will man out every Man his Man, and make their own Captains and Officers, and live and die with the House of Commons, and in Defence thereof'. But this apparently submissive declaration was the pretext for demands that the lines between friend and enemy be drawn more sharply, in parliament as well as outside of it, with lukewarm Lords being compelled to 'declare themselves, and that they were with the King'. This zeal must also extend to monitoring the conduct of army officers, as well as a worrying threat lurking in the heart of the city, the growing number of prisoners. A further request, that a 'more severe Course might be taken with Malignants; and, amongst them, with the malignant Ministers', seems to have been heard by parliament: previously ministers had been deprived due to their 'scandalous' behaviour, but now their political stance would also be taken into account.<sup>50</sup>

The power of the well-affected rested on their ability to successfully display their zeal for the parliamentary cause, combined with their willingness to translate this into material support, weapons they could turn against their rivals for parliament's affection. On 9 December the Commons were once again informed 'that divers Citizens were at the Door'. Shute and his party had returned to restate their willingness to 'subject our Monies, and Lives, to the utmost Drop of our Blood in our Veins, to be disposed of by you', whilst also complaining of 'an Imputation cast upon us by the Malignants; "That we petition against Peace."'”<sup>51</sup> Rather, they went on to argue, it was the peace petitioners themselves who were aiding the 'Malignant Party' by stalling parliament and buying them time. Thus parliamentary lobbying accompanied printed propaganda in a concerted effort to undermine the peace movement, deploying the image of an enemy that was being defined by an increasingly broad range of political stances, from open hostility to parliament, to simple failure to support it financially.

During 1643, this community of activists laboured to entrench the conflict, seeking to raise forces and resources through projects such as that which opened this article.<sup>52</sup> In the process, many of them began to voice more radical political attitudes, reflecting a wider trend in parliamentary discourse at this point in the war.<sup>53</sup> Emerging from just this milieu was another remonstrance presented to London's common council and intended to be ultimately addressed to parliament, although it was rejected before it could reach that stage.<sup>54</sup> This was later published under the title *Remonstrans Redivivus*, purportedly to clear itself of negative aspersions cast upon it in the royalist press, but the titular 'revival' perhaps had a double meaning, for as well as reviving the abandoned city remonstrance, the pamphlet aimed to revitalize the parliamentary cause as it flagged under the burden of war. Explicitly mimicking the format of the Grand

Remonstrance, it opened with a historical account of how parliament had begun to reverse ‘the Injuries done by Papists and others of the Malignant party’, only to be thwarted by the continued ‘inveterate malice of our restles enemies’.<sup>55</sup> For the authors, this enmity must be countered by a fuller statement of the principles which parliament was fighting to uphold, supported by marginal references to parliament’s own pronouncements (a very literal instance of ‘speaking parliament’ that was also adopted by the Levellers). The radical content of these principles reveal why common council refused to endorse it: ‘originally the Supreme power being in the whole people, Parliaments were by them constituted to manage the same’.<sup>56</sup> The parliamentary cause, the pamphlet suggests, was not the exclusive property of parliament itself: indeed by inviting the ‘well affected party...to adhere unto you’, parliament had given them a license to state their own conception of what this cause was. Furthermore, this party had a responsibility to publicise their cause to a wider audience, particularly to the ‘*lesse knowing sort of men*’, for whom it would act as a ‘*Candlesticke*’, although the source of its ‘*borrowed light*’ light was ultimately parliament.<sup>57</sup> And this educational endeavour should not be for the English people alone: *Remonstrans Redivivus* demanded ‘That the justnes of the present warre, which (for the glory of God, the Government of Christ, the regaining and maintenance of our liberties, and the Kingdomes defence against utter desolation) is undertaken by you, may be more fully yet made knowne to the world’, adding that ‘the eyes of Christendom are upon *Englands* Parliament’.<sup>58</sup> Its authors presented the civil war as an ideological contest, in which the English people would be made conscious of where their true friends and enemies lay, but such comments suggest these ideals could be exported throughout the world.

The rejection of this remonstrance by the civic authorities suggests that this activism was of limited appeal to London's governors. Nonetheless, for some it was a schooling in political engagement, amongst them the future Leveller William Walwyn.<sup>59</sup> Walwyn later recalled that this remonstrance had been intended to 'move the Parliament to confirm certain infallible maxims of free Government: wherein the power of Parliament was plainly distinguished from the Kings Office', a task later taken up by the Levellers.<sup>60</sup> Tellingly, Walwyn recollected this as a time when 'the common enemy was at the highest, and the Parliaments forces at the lowest', when 'I with many others petitioned the Parliament for the generall raising and arming of all the well affected in the Kingdom, and though that also took not its proper effect, and came not to perfection: yet it mated the common enemy, and set all wheels at work at home'. For Walwyn at least, political and military mobilisation were mutually reinforcing, with the spectre of the enemy acting as a focal point for such agitation. This makes it all the more notable that the Levellers would essentially transcend the binary terms of the Grand Remonstrance in their own *Remonstrance of Many Thousands of Citizens*.<sup>61</sup>

#### IV

More mainstream than the Levellers were London's political Independents, who supported the trial and execution of the king and the declaration of a Commonwealth in 1649. Their success within the shifting alliances of parliamentary politics reflects, in part, their ability to adopt parliamentary discourse in order to communicate a vision of their cause that would ultimately win approval amongst members of parliament and the army. But this success also rested on their ability to undermine alternatives, such as the peace movement. The next major fissure within

parliamentary ranks came with the closing stages of war and the opening of negotiations with the king, during which the major rivals to the London Independents—the city’s Presbyterians—presented their own remonstrance demanding a rapid settlement, this time with official corporate sponsorship, in May 1646. One Independent response to this remonstrance presented it as a usurpation of parliamentary discourse, complaining that as a result ‘*London is fild with the Malignants language!*’<sup>62</sup> For evidence, the author advised his readers to ‘look into the prisons, where Malignants are, what is their dialect? all will be well, the day is ours, the times face about, round-heads must fall, the Parliament must down, the City declines them’. This diagnosis of malignancy as itself a language gives an interesting parallel to the idea of ‘speaking parliament’, suggesting that we might see the latter as much as an attempt to purify, as to enable, discourse.

Peace demonstrators too had been denounced by their language. *The Image of the Malignants Peace* had reproduced several overheard statements from the crowd of demonstrators as evidence of their malevolent character, comments that slighted parliament as ‘a Trunk, a Body without a Head’, and Lord Mayor Pennington as ‘my Lord Fart’, for example. Verbal and physical violence were symptomatic of the intentions of the demonstrators, and ‘their speeches and carriages (which were very insolent) manifested their *malignancy* and desire of an uprore’.<sup>63</sup> But even before the outbreak of war, malignancy had been identified with a way of speaking that exhibited disrespect for parliament and its supporters, in much the same way that the profane had traditionally been characterised by their smirking slights against the godly. A pamphlet of 1642 described those *Prophane Malignant Spirits; Who Reproach True Protestants with the name of Round-heads* as ‘tongue persecutors’, and offered examples of divine punishment for such ‘uncivill tongues’.<sup>64</sup> In one instance, a woman from Creechurch parish with a history of anti-

Puritanism—she was ‘commonly noted to be an enemy to, and a mocker of goodnesse and good men’—was brought to a fatal frenzy by her ‘bitternesse, for the malignant spirit did thrust out so fast, that as those that observed her best, did verily beleieve it stopped her breath’.<sup>65</sup>

Uncontrolled discourse could threaten the parliamentary war effort in other ways, too. The risk of emphasising the danger to London was the fear that it might generate within the city. The parliamentarian divine Hezekiah Woodward portrayed a London riddled with misinformation. His point of reference was Nehemiah’s Jerusalem, where ‘The adversaries’ spread rumours, and ‘hired light fellows’ to bring fear to the inhabitants. Likewise in present-day London, ‘what tongue or hand can doe hee doth, *to cause terrour on every side; Their tonge walketh about the City and all to disquiet the inhabitants thereof*’.<sup>66</sup> For Woodward, these spectral, fleshly fears needed to be distinguished from a real and righteous fear of a vengeful God, a fear which his servants could use to drive them on against their eternal adversaries. Meanwhile parliament took such rumour-mongering seriously. In July 1642 the House of Lords imprisoned one Lieutenant Bodley, who had been heard spreading rumours of arson attacks in the city by unknown parties.<sup>67</sup> However, such gossip could also be useful to a parliament needing to convince the public of the reality of the conspiracies it faced, something that did not escape one pamphleteer, who published the case as evidence of how ‘The malignant party hath alwayes been pregnant in their Inventions, against the Legall and Reall intentions and Proceedings of Parliament’. But it was not entirely clear whether the malignancy being unveiled lay in the plot that Bodley had reported, or in his act of reporting it, ‘Which words were of great danger and hazzard, and did very much concern the safety of the City of *London*’.<sup>68</sup>

Such reported conversations demonstrate how the spoken word could become present in the world of print, and give hints of how the vocabulary of parliament, and its antonyms, might enter into everyday encounters, allowing the ideological contests of the civil war to become rooted in social relations in a way that might outlive the military conflict itself. For an example of where such quotidian encounters might lead, we have the case of one John Summersall of St Leonard's Shoreditch. In July 1646, as war was winding down, Summersall presented his own remonstrance to the Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, regarding one Dr Hurst, doctor of divinity and a former royal chaplain.<sup>69</sup> Hurst had entered into negotiations with the committee following the sequestration of his estates, for which he was willing to compound in return for the required token gesture of political conformity. Summersall, however, alleged that Hurst was not yet cured of his previous condition, citing his 'malignant and invective speeches uttered against the State, & the well affected since his coming to towne'. As evidence of 'the doctor's malignancy', he recalled some words 'vented' in his presence, when Hurst had said 'these Roundheads were the most pestilent people that lived, and as for puritans he could not abide them'. Furthermore, Hurst had allegedly reported that 'they (meaning the malignantes) made a full accompt to have beaten us, but now we having beaten them, they must stoope unto us whether they would or noe, and that they hoped for his *Majesties* sudden coming to town, which makes them delay to bring in their moneys, and many other words savouring of strong malignancy'. Such political deviancy was only confirmed by Hurst's 'prodigall manner of livinge' before the wars: keeping a coach and a footboy, and entertaining gentlemen at his table with a musical accompaniment to each course.

Summersall's motives, we should not be surprised to learn, were at least partly financial: Hurst had been the executor of his uncle's estate, allegedly worth £10,000, and supposedly Hurst had persuaded the dying man to disinherit his 'Roundhead' relatives. Here, parliament provided a language which allowed Summersall, a weaver (although probably a wealthy one), to challenge a university educated cleric, and to that extent it was empowering. But Summersall's act of informing on Hurst's 'malignant speech' suggests a darker side to political engagement, in which people might participate in state power through identifying personal enemies, a form of political engagement very familiar in the twentieth century but one with corollaries in the early modern period, notably witchcraft persecution and the policing of religious minorities.

The impulse to denounce was perhaps inherent in the form of political activism that parliament had been implicitly sanctioning since at least the Protestation, manifested in the 'watchful eye' of the well-affected, whose sights were trained on signs of political, as well as social or religious, deviancy. But any such denunciatory impulse was accompanied by a desire to proselytise the truth of the parliamentary cause against its enemies, which created a process of ideological escalation, as 'revolutionary readers' could be transformed into 'revolutionary speakers' capable of speaking parliament's words back to it and thus holding that institution to account.<sup>70</sup> For them, the civil war was an ideological conflict to be won by convincing others of the truth: that parliament as well as the king was the victim of a conspiracy against its existence; that it had fallen to parliament to defeat this conspiracy and restore the moral integrity of the commonwealth; perhaps even that this task was ultimately the responsibility of a people roused into action by the dangers that they faced. The existence of public enemies opened up spaces for political activism and engagement, therefore, predicated on the notion of the state of emergency



and the need for the public to mobilise in defence of itself, begging the question of how this activism should be channelled once the enemy had been defeated. John Summersall had very personal motivations for seeking to maintain the cultural landscape of the conflict, but those activists who had acquired a political voice within its bounds might equally have an interest in continuing to evoke the existence of the malignant party, as a way to sustain their agency.

For a parliament engaged in fashioning a settlement with the king and his party, this continued activism could be problematic. But such mobilisations had always possessed the potential to challenge parliament's discursive monopoly, that institution's ability to define itself and the cause which it represented. One potential narrative of the period would see parliament in the early 1640s asserting its authority to name and to prosecute the commonwealth's enemies, against the claims of a king who understood this power as an essential mark of royal sovereignty. In the resulting clash of wills, parliament was willing to relinquish some of this authority to a public that was now also entrusted with the task of guarding against the enemy, with the 'well-affected' representing those who responded to such solicitations most enthusiastically. But by appropriating its discourse, these activists might come to rival parliament's own claim to embody the cause they were fighting for, making parliament keen to reinstate its discursive monopoly, to claw back the authority to name and to act against its enemies from a potentially insurgent public. As it happened, the Long Parliament was arguably too divided to accomplish such a task, as factions within were prepared to ally with external activists against their rivals. More successful in this respect was the regime that replaced the Long Parliament and its successors in the 1650s, the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, whose watchful monitoring of its enemies is legendary, but one which was equally committed to the goal of settlement, to the extent that many former

royalists came to associate it with peace and stability. The dissatisfaction of so many enthusiastic parliamentarians with this regime can be difficult to interpret given that the Protectorate seemed to deliver so many of the key aims of the 1640s, notably liberty of conscience for Protestant dissenters. But it becomes more explicable if we see their dissatisfaction as a sign that their opportunities for independent activism were becoming constrained by a regime defined by the security it promised to provide. Conflict had opened up the space for political activism in the 1640s, space that would be closed down by the relative stability in the following decade.

This article has sought to do two things; firstly, to show how political engagement could be made possible through language—by adopting and appropriating the language of legitimate political institutions, and assuming the semi-authorised political identity of well-affected, activists could achieve a kind of legitimate political agency. ‘Speaking parliament’ was a way to engage with parliamentary discourse, but the act of speaking was capable of transforming its meaning, and parliament’s failure to effectively control the usage of its discourse in the 1640s contributed to the particularly fissiparous nature of its cause. Some caveats should be mentioned here; firstly, this article has concentrated on certain key-words in the parliamentary lexicon, but they found meaning within a whole constellation of terms barely touched on here, and so it has only scratched the surface of ‘parliament speech’. A case in point would be the term ‘delinquent’, an alternative way to describe the enemy of parliament, but unlike malignant one which did become effectively institutionalised and left a much larger paper trail, generated by those committees responsible for prosecuting legislation against that group. And this links to a second caution:

Kotkin's original configuration of 'speaking Bolshevik' was not simply a means to understand the engagement of the most committed Soviet citizens with the state, but rather to assess the ways that ordinary people, those who we would usually describe as non-activists, interacted with it, to consider how they might have learned the rules of the game of speaking Bolshevik. This article has focussed on the most self-conscious users of parliamentary discourse, those who claimed to speak on behalf of a larger community of those who were well-affected to parliament, often in order to goad that institution into taking a more radical path, but this language could be used in other ways too. By assuming the stance of well-affected in their negotiations with parliament, individuals or groups of very different political shades could signal their conformity and acquiescence, something that became a matter of survival after parliament's military victory, but such compliance does not necessarily amount to passivity. As Kotkin showed for the much more extreme example of Stalinist society, adopting officially sanctioned identities and discourse could enable subtle resistance, too, and amounted to a form of activism in its own right. As Weil has noted in regards to parliament's post-war procedures for dealing with potentially criminal acts committed during the conflict, 'A royalist who successfully redefined himself as well-affected to parliament might then seek legal revenge on his former enemies, whose chances of obtaining indemnity would be reduced by the former royalist's new-found status as one of the 'well-affected''.<sup>71</sup> Perhaps it is on the level of language and identity that we can find a means to assess the cultural impact of the English civil war and revolution that goes beyond the crushing binary of success and failure, allowing us to see how people learned to operate within (and to subvert) parliament's discursive realm. Such encounters are likely to have been concentrated in and around those committees entrusted with prosecuting political nonconformity, and it is here that we might see signs of how parliamentary discourse could percolate into practical usage.

Secondly, this article has considered how the circumstances of conflict could lead to a heightened degree of politicization. The 1640s are famed in English history as a period when political engagement reached new heights, but it perhaps needs restating that political and military mobilisation were intertwined. Mobilising against the enemy generated a spectrum of political activity that could encourage new and creative ways to think about the nature of the public as a political community, for example, and to pioneer ways to encourage it to act as such. But it could also enable victimisation and scapegoating, a politics of denunciation and surveillance grimly familiar from the age of modern mass political mobilisations. We might be regretful that contemporary western liberal democracies, characterised by their detached publics and their anaemic public spheres, seem to lack the political vibrancy apparent in crisis moments such as the 1640s. Perhaps this regret should be balanced by relief that these apparently depoliticised societies are largely unburdened by the darker instincts that such moments might also breed.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Mike Braddick, Miriam Dobson and Gary Rivett for their comments, as well as the anonymous reader for this journal.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Keith Lindley, *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London* (Aldershot, 1997), 311-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Peace and Plenty comming unto us* (London, 1643), 3.

<sup>3</sup> Mike Braddick, 'Mobilisation, Anxiety and Creativity in England during the 1640s,' in John Morrow and Jonathan Scott (eds.) *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political Ideas and Culture, 1600-1900* (Exeter, 2008), 175-194.

<sup>4</sup> Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain. Stalinism as Civilisation* (Berkeley et al, 1995), 14.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Leng, 'The Meanings of "Malignancy": the language of enmity and the construction of the parliamentary cause in the English Civil War and Revolution', article in preparation.

<sup>6</sup> For the idea of the political landscape and the place of the enemy within it in modernity, see Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The passing of mass utopia in east and west* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 2000), 12.

<sup>7</sup> See Igal Halfin and Jochen Hellbeck, 'Rethinking the Stalinist Subject: Stephen Kotkin's "Magnetic Mountain" and the state of Soviet historical studies', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 44 (1996), 456-63.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as civilisation* (Berkeley et al, 1995), 221.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 281.

- <sup>10</sup> Peter Lake, 'Defining Puritanism—again?', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: transatlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith* (Boston, 1993), 3-29.
- <sup>11</sup> Rachel Weil, 'Thinking about allegiance in the English Civil War', *History Workshop Journal*, 61, 1 (2006), 183-191.
- <sup>12</sup> Richard Rainolde, *A booke called the Foundacion of rhetorike* (London, 1563), fols. 19r, 32v.
- <sup>13</sup> Quoted in Richard Cust, "'Patriots'" and "'popular'" spirits: narratives of conflict in early Stuart politics', in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The English Revolution c.1590-1720: politics, religion and communities* (Manchester, 2007), 45.
- <sup>14</sup> See William Cliftlands, 'The "well-affected" and the "country": politics and religion in English Provincial Society, c.1640-c.1654', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Essex (1987).
- <sup>15</sup> Quoted in David Cressy, 'The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642', *Historical Journal* 45, 2 (2002), 266.
- <sup>16</sup> John Walter, *Understanding Popular Violence in the English revolution: the Colchester Plunderers* (Cambridge, 1999), 292-6.
- <sup>17</sup> Quoted in Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, 1981), 150.
- <sup>18</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: the culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000), 110; Malcom Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture', in Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (eds.), *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester, 2006), 45.
- <sup>19</sup> [Captain John Williams], *Londons love to her neighbours* (London, 1643).
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 4, 8,
- <sup>21</sup> *The Cities Warning-peece: in The Malignants Description and Conversion* (London, 1643), 2.
- <sup>22</sup> Nicholas Breton, *Englands selected characters* (London, 1643), 13-14.

- <sup>23</sup> W.S., *A True Declaration and just Commendation of the Great and Incomparable care of the Right Honourable Isaac Pennington, Lord Major of the City of London* (London, 1643), 1.
- <sup>24</sup> *The Doctrine of Unitie* (London, 1643), unpaginated.
- <sup>25</sup> William Lithgow, *The present surveigh of London and Englands state* (London, 1643), unpaginated.
- <sup>26</sup> W.S., *True Declaration*, 4.
- <sup>27</sup> Hezekiah Woodward, *The Cause/Use/Cure of Feare* (London, 1643), epistle dedicatory.
- <sup>28</sup> W.S., *True Declaration*, 6. For civic chivalry, see Ian Archer, 'Popular Politics in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries', in P. Griffiths and M. Jenner (eds.), *Londinopolis* (Manchester and New York, 2000), 26-46.
- <sup>29</sup> David Cressy, 'The Downfall of Cheapside Cross: vandalism, ridicule, and iconoclasm', in *Agnes Bowker's Cat: travesties and transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 2000), 234-250.
- <sup>30</sup> For this tradition, see Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), 281-325.
- <sup>31</sup> *Examples for London* (London, 1642), 4.
- <sup>32</sup> Ian Gentles, 'Parliamentary Politics and the Politics of the Street: The London peace campaigns of 1642-3', *Parliamentary History* 26, no. 2 (2007), 139-159.
- <sup>33</sup> *Examples for London*.
- <sup>34</sup> *The Image of the Malignants Peace* (1642), unpaginated.
- <sup>35</sup> *A Medicine for Malignancy* (London, 1644), 18.
- <sup>36</sup> *A True Discoverie of the Kings Majesties Proceedings* (London, 1643), 6. See also *A Brief Narrative of the late Treacherous and Horrid Design* (London, 1643); *A Discovery of the great*

- Plot for the Utter Ruine of the City of London, and the Parliament* (London, 1643); *The Malignants trecherous and Bloody Plot against the Parliament and City of Lo:* (London, 1643).
- <sup>37</sup> *A Cunning Plot* (London, 1644).
- <sup>38</sup> *Image of the Malignants Peace*.
- <sup>39</sup> Simeon Ashe, *A support for the sinking heart in times of distresse* (London, 1642), 26.
- <sup>40</sup> *Matters of note made known to all true Protestants* (London, 1642), 3.
- <sup>41</sup> *Look about you* (London, 1644), 7.
- <sup>42</sup> For the former, see R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Public Ceremony and Royal Charisma: the English royal entry in London, 1485-1642', in A.L. Beier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim (eds.), *The First modern society* (Cambridge, 1989), 65-93.
- <sup>43</sup> *Look about you*, 6.
- <sup>44</sup> Commons Journal, vol. 2 (10 June 1642), 617-9.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid. (5 Sept. 1642), 751-3.
- <sup>46</sup> W.S., *True Declaration*, 6.
- <sup>47</sup> The National Archives, London (hereafter TNA), SP 16/540/3, fol. 254r.
- <sup>48</sup> TNA, SP 16/497, fol. 244r.
- <sup>49</sup> Commons Journal, vol. 2 (13 Nov. 1642), 847-8.
- <sup>50</sup> I.M. Green, 'The Persecution of 'Scandalous' and 'Malignant' Parish Clergy during the English Civil War', *English Historical Review* 94, no. 372 (July 1979), 507-31.
- <sup>51</sup> Commons Journal, vol. 2 (9 Dec. 1642), 881-3.
- <sup>52</sup> *A Declaration and Motive of the persons trusted, usually meeting at Salters Hall* (London, 1643); *Instructions and propositions drawne up and agreed on by divers well affected persons in the City of London* (London, 1643).



- <sup>53</sup> David Wootton, 'From Rebellion to Revolution: the crisis of the winter of 1642/3 and the origins of civil war radicalism', *English Historical Review* 105, no. 416 (1990), 654-69; Michael J. Braddick, 'History, Liberty, Reformation and the Cause: Parliamentary military and ideological escalation in 1643', in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds.), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011), 117-34.
- <sup>54</sup> Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: commercial change, political conflict, and London's overseas traders, 1550-1653* (Cambridge, 1993), 445-7.
- <sup>55</sup> *Remonstrans Redivivus* (London, 1643), 2.
- <sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. A2r.
- <sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* 7-8.
- <sup>59</sup> Lindley, *Popular Politics*, 396.
- <sup>60</sup> William Walwyn, *A Whisper in the eare of Mr. Thomas Edwards Minister* (London, 1646).
- <sup>61</sup> Leng, 'Meanings of Malignancy'.
- <sup>62</sup> [John Price], *A Moderate Reply to the Citie Remonstrance* (London, 1646).
- <sup>63</sup> For contemporary understandings of the violent capabilities of words, see Catherine Marshall, 'Verbal abuse in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England: the cultural significance of scolding and slander', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Sheffield (2010), 49-56.
- <sup>64</sup> *A Sad Warning to all Prophane Malignant Spirits* (London, 1642), 1, 4.
- <sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.
- <sup>66</sup> Woodward, *Cause/Use/Cure of Feare*, 4-5.
- <sup>67</sup> Lords Journal, vol. 5 (30 July 1642), 248-50.
- <sup>68</sup> *Exceeding Joyfull Newes from Holland* (London, 1642), sig. A2r-v.

<sup>69</sup> The National Archives, London, SP 23/118, 691.

<sup>70</sup> Sharon Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton, 1994).

<sup>71</sup> Weil, 'Thinking about allegiance', 190. See also Ann Hughes, 'Parliamentary Tyranny? Indemnity Proceedings and the Impact of the Civil War: a case study from Warwickshire', *Midland History*, 11 (1986), 49-78.