“Loyal Hind,” “The Prince of Thieves” *Crime Pamphlets and Royalist Propaganda in the 1650s*

Lena Liapi

At the battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651, Charles II's army was crushed and he was subsequently forced to flee to avoid capture. Shortly afterwards rumours started spreading that James Hind, highway robber and a soldier in the royalist army, had helped the king escape. When Hind was captured in London on 9 November 1651, the public interest in him turned him into a cause célèbre: his arrest was mentioned by six newsbooks in November and by more in the subsequent months.¹ In the next three months, Hind's story – how he turned from highway robbery to fighting for the king in Ireland and Scotland, and even meeting the king in person – as well as his behaviour during imprisonment, was narrated in 13 short pamphlets about him. All these addressed and sustained an interest in Hind's fate; he was tried in three different courts of law before finally being executed in Worcester in September 1652, almost a year after his arrest.²

In recent years there has been a lot of scholarly interest in the emergence of a public sphere in the mid-seventeenth century, in dialogue with Jürgen Habermas's definition of it as a slightly later, and decisively bourgeois, phenomenon.³ The public sphere offered by a number of influential revisionist

1 *A Perfect Account*, 5–12 November 1651, p. 360; *Mercurius Politicus*, 6–12 November 1651, p. 1204; *Severall Proceedings in Parliament*, 6–13 November 1651, p. 1712; *Perfect Diurnall*, 10–17 November 1651, p. 1464; *The weekly Intelligencer*, 11–18 November, p. 346; *The faithfull Scout*, 7–14 November, p. 336. All newsbooks and pamphlets mentioned in this chapter have been accessed through *Early English Books Online (EEBO)*, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>.

2 Barbara White, “Hind, James (*bap.* 1616, *d.* 1652)” in Lawrence Goldman (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press), <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/13340> (accessed 27 September 2012).

3 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989); Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003).

accounts came into existence with the explosion of printed materials in the 1640s, or more accurately with the shift in print production from bigger volumes to smaller, cheaper items: usually pamphlets, newsbooks, and petitions.⁴ Cheap print interacted with the shifting political climate of the Civil Wars and the Interregnum, commenting upon and influencing events, and thus becoming an essential part of the increasingly public dialogue about political issues. This opening up of political issues to a broader public was not an unprecedented phenomenon, but before the 1640s such appeals to a broader public had been limited to specific instances or "pamphlet moments."⁵

The renewed interest in cheap print as a factor in the formation of public opinion has yet to provoke a similar interest in crime pamphlets; thus, in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture* – which treats various genres of cheap printed material with an emphasis on the 1640s – crime pamphlets are referred to, but not analysed as a distinct category.⁶ This is probably due to a residual unease about the appropriate characterization of crime pamphlets, whose contents occupy an uneasy ground between news pamphlets, chapbooks, and romances. Due to their combination of stereotyped stories and topical references, and their status as commercial products that cash in on sensational events, they are viewed by most scholars as heavily fictionalized accounts of urban depravity or highway derring-do.⁷ Even though there have been good analyses of the propagandist use of crime pamphlets in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, either by the state or particular interest groups, the 1640s and 50s lack any similar treatment.⁸ Despite the proliferating interest in pamphlets, petitions, and newsbooks, and their potential to engage with

4 Joad Raymond, "The Development of the Book Trade in Britain" in Joad Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture: Volume One: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 59–75.

5 Jason Peacey, "Pamphlets" in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, p. 459; Peter Lake and Steven C.A. Pincus, "Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England" in Peter Lake and Steven C.A. Pincus (eds.) *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 1–30.

6 Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*.

7 Linda Woodbridge, "Jest Books, the Literature of Roguery, and the Vagrant Poor in Renaissance England," *English Literary Renaissance*, 33 (2003), pp. 201–210; Steve Mentz, "Magic Books: Cony-Catching and the Romance of Early Modern London" in Craig Dionne and Steve Mentz (eds.), *Rogues and Early Modern English Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), pp. 240–258.

8 James Sharpe, "'Last Dying Speeches': Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England," *Past & Present*, 107 (1985), pp. 144–167; Peter Lake, "Puritanism, Arminianism and a Shropshire Axe Murder," *Midland History*, 15 (1990), pp. 37–64.

a varied readership and propagate particular viewpoints in this period, crime pamphlets are not included in such analyses.

I would like to suggest that it is more useful to avoid the oppositions of fact and fiction when dealing with crime pamphlets, and to focus instead on their function. In this chapter I analyse the mentions of Hind in newsbooks of the period, in order to show that Hind's fame at the time of his arrest was so widespread as to provide an extraordinary opportunity to transform him into a symbol of the power either of the state or the Royalist cause. By looking at all publications relating to Hind, I additionally show that the state's apparent unwillingness to exploit Hind's arrest, removing him from London and not using his capture and execution as an instrument of its propaganda, left Hind's case open to appropriation by anti-Commonwealth publishers, especially George Horton, whose advertisement of Hind's Royalist feelings was crucial. By comparing Horton's pamphlets with the other accounts of Hind and his infamous activities, I illustrate that other pamphleteers avoided explicit mentions of Hind's Royalism, instead focusing more on his robberies, whereas Horton actively promoted this aspect of Hind's persona and politics.

James Hind: Between Fact and Fiction

James Hind's most important achievement was that he managed to stay "on the stage of popularity" for longer than most highwaymen.⁹ Even though we have no clear record of his actions before 1650, he apparently practised highway robbery in the 1640s: according to *The declaration of Captain James Hind* (1651), Hind claimed that he had stopped his robberies by 1649.¹⁰ As we will see, he was particularly famous and his reputation was enhanced by rumours that he had been in the king's army and that he had helped Charles II to escape after the rout in Worcester. Hind was arrested in November 1651 in London, but was not executed until September 1652, after going through three different courts of law successively, in London, Reading, and Worcester.¹¹

9 *A Perfect Account* (1652), p. 496.

10 Anonymous, *The declaration of Captain James Hind* (1651), p. 2.

11 There are few mentions of Hind's death, unlike his life and imprisonment. One pamphlet, on the last page, mentions that Hind was "carried to Worcester and there drawn, hang'd and quarter'd, on Friday Sep. 24 1652," but does not give any further details about his death: Anonymous, *No jest like a true jest being a compendious record of the merry life and mad exploits of Capt James Hind the great robber of England* (1657), sig. B4^v. There was a more detailed description of his death in *A Perfect Account*, 22–29 September 1652, p. 728.

Most scholarly treatments of Hind tend to revolve around the dichotomy of fact and fiction: Hind is regarded as a real person who was turned into a fictionalized character in chapbooks circulating in the 1650s. According to such accounts, these publications aimed to attract a 'popular' audience by appealing to their secret wishes (a fantasy of living a life of luxury without working) or their conservative instincts and pro-Royalist sentiments. This explains the emphasis on myth-making, either in the sense that Hind was the archetype of the 'gentleman robber', a poor man who rose in society by highway robbery,¹² or as an expression of popular conservative feelings against the Commonwealth. Hind is described as "a Robin Hood figure, a patriot hero, whose exploits were a gesture of merry resistance to the Commonwealth," or, "the common man's hero" against Parliament.¹³ This is done by emphasizing the generic elements in the stories circulating about him, which were similar in style to earlier pamphlets about rogues, were depersonalized, and often fictitious.¹⁴ Viewing Hind from this angle prompted Lincoln B. Faller to argue that, "Hind was translated [...] into a world bearing only the most adventitious relation to the real world of the reader's experience."¹⁵

Running parallel to this interpretation is the assumption that the 'real' person re-emerges in the printed accounts of Hind's conduct during imprisonment: thus, those pamphlets that supposedly recorded his words and actions are treated as objective reportage. Scholars seem to take at face value George Horton's statement in *The declaration of Captain James Hind* (1651) that there have been various relations about the proceedings of Hind "fraught with impertinent stories, and new-invented fictions" and that Hind requested Horton to publish his true declaration.¹⁶ As a consequence, there is a tendency to accept Hind's words, as recorded in Horton's pamphlets, as true, and to

12 Gillian Spraggs, *Outlaws and Highwaymen: The Cult of the Robber in England from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century* (London: Pimlico, 2001), p. 172.

13 Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 49; Jerome Friedman, *Miracles and the Pulp Press during the English Revolution: The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies* (London: UCL Press, 1993), p. 204.

14 Lincoln B. Faller, *Turned to Account: The Forms and Functions of Criminal Biography in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Spraggs, *Outlaws and Highwaymen*, pp. 163–179; J.A. Sharpe, *Dick Turpin: The Myth of the English Highwayman* (London: Profile Books, 2004), pp. 49–55; Lois Potter, *Secret rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 103.

15 Faller, *Turned to Account*, pp. 123, 168.

16 Anonymous, *The declaration of Captain James Hind*, p. 1.

position Hind's Royalist sentiments, and statements in favour of the king as an attempt to justify his robberies. Faller claims that in the earlier publications about Hind, he was portrayed as a thief, until he "recast himself with the help of a certain Horton" as a patriot and a soldier, while Jerome de Groot considers Hind's royalist words as an example of "how marginalized, scandalous characters mitigated their social isolation by cleaving to a cause."¹⁷

Because Hind's depicted Royalism is viewed as either characteristic of the genre of the highwayman pamphlet, or as a mechanism allowing Hind to justify his actions, these treatments tend to overlook the potential for Royalist propaganda in this genre of cheap printed material. Royalist propaganda in cheap print form in the 1650s has been for the most part ignored by scholars working on Royalism due to a tendency to focus on major political figures on the Royalist side: David Underdown's work on *Royalist Conspiracy in England* concentrated on the part played by exiled members of the gentry or nobility, whereas Jason Peacey's analysis of propaganda from 1640–1660 defined the term narrowly, as "polemical works which appeared with the connivance of those political figures whose interests were best served by the existence of such books, tracts and pamphlets,"¹⁸ thus assuming a very top-down view of how propaganda was created and disseminated. Even more dismissively, Jerome de Groot suggested that Royalist writers aimed for a closed debate because they did not want to acknowledge, or appeal to, a popular audience, something similar to Lois Potter's statement that Royalist style was intentionally inaccessible to "the vulgar."¹⁹ The only notable exception to this general trend is an interest in Royalist newsbooks and especially *The Man in the Moon*.²⁰ It is however possible through the case study of the genre of crime pamphlets – typified in the example of Hind – to take a more nuanced and flexible view of the sites and operations of propaganda and political views, within a rich variety of literary and historical forms.

17 Faller, *Turned to Account*, p. 10; Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 212–214. See also Spraggs, *Outlaws and Highwaymen*, p. 175.

18 David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960); Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

19 De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, pp. 60, 62, 74; Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, p. 209.

20 Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2007); David Underdown, *A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 98.

Fame and Newsbook Reporting

The great public interest in Hind's arrest was probably the result of mostly oral rumours circulating about him beforehand, in which he featured not only as a very active highwayman, but also as an important figure in the Royalist war effort. This can be glimpsed from some mentions of his name in newsbooks before and during his imprisonment. For example, *Mercurius Politicus* of December 1650 claimed that "Hind, the great Thief is come into Scotland, with 80 hors and doth much mischief," which suggested that Hind had horsemen under his command – something as unlikely as that he had helped Charles II escape.²¹ This, however, did not stop rumours from spreading after Charles II's defeat at Worcester: in a pro-parliamentary pamphlet titled *The declaration of Major Gen. Massey* (1651), it was supposedly reported "by some of the prisoners taken" (after the battle), that Charles II left "with Scoutmaster Gen. *Hind*, the grand Thief of *England*."²² *The Weekly Intelligencer* was more cautious when it reported that "Others will tell you, that Hind the famous Robber whom they call his Scout-master Generall, did provide him with a Bark at Pensey in Sussex," and commented on the untrustworthiness of the various rumours about Charles's escape ("in this contrariety and contradiction of Reports we know not where to ground").²³

What is interesting in all these publications is that their authors did not feel obliged to explain who Hind was, and that they boldly ascribed a military position to him, even when they did so tongue-in-cheek. Along with two pamphlets that appeared just before he was arrested, *Hind's ramble* (1651) and *The Prince of Priggs revels* (1651), these are the only mentions of his name in extant printed material which predate his arrest. This could be a matter of survival, or alternatively could show that newsbooks editors and pamphleteers responded to rumours spread orally about the infamous highwayman.²⁴ *Hind's ramble's* title page promised information about how Hind "was the onely man that conveyed the Scotch King to London," but it was clearly meant as an advertising ploy, since the publication contained no actual information about the escape.²⁵

21 *Mercurius Politicus*, 5–12 December 1650, p. 451.

22 Sir Edward Massey, *The declaration of Major Gen. Massey upon his death-bed at Leicester* (1651), p. 3. The information contained in this pamphlet lacks credibility: it falsely reported the death of Massey, and imaginatively how Charles II tried to escape (and his lack of success in rallying countrymen to his cause).

23 *The weekly intelligencer of the Common-wealth*, 30 September–7 October 1651, p. 308.

24 George Fidge, *Hind's ramble* (1651); J.S., *The Prince of Priggs revels* (1651).

25 Fidge, *Hind's ramble*, p. 41.

Hind's arrest on 9 November 1651 was followed by a flurry of publications about him: he was mentioned in six of the seven newsbooks of the period, usually described in terms of his fame, such as “the infamous High way man,” “the eminent [*sic*] High-way Robber,” “the notorious Robber.”²⁶ According to *A Perfect Account*, when Hind was apprehended:

he denied that he was such a man, but being so well known that there was not any likelihood that plea should hold to stand him in any stead, when it could not procure his present escape, being brought before a Magistrate and examined, he hath confessed that his name is Hinde, and that he is the man that hath committed many Robberies.²⁷

In the same period, four pamphlets about him were published, catering for the apparent interest in news about Hind.²⁸

In general, the newsbooks about Hind focused on his robberies; his service in the King's army was only mentioned because the question of whether Hind had indeed helped Charles II to escape was another popular preoccupation with his story. This is why the last paragraph of November's *A Perfect Account* (which sketched out the contents of the newsbook) mentioned that it contained information about “how he was instrumental in conveying away the Scots King from London,” even though in the main body of the text the editor acknowledged that:

It is *said*, that he denies that he was in Armes at Worcester against the Parliament, yet it is *thought* that he was instrumentall in conveying away the Scots King and Wilmot.²⁹

Hind's imprisonment and subsequent execution could have been an opportunity for the state to advertise its power, but does not seem to have been exploited by Parliament.³⁰ The state clearly wished to bury Hind in both a

26 *Severall Proceedings in Parliament*, 6–13 November 1651; *A perfect diurnall*, 10–17 November 1651; *The weekly Intelligencer*, 11–18 November 1651.

27 *A Perfect Account*, 5–12 November 1651.

28 Anonymous, *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind* (1651); Anonymous, *The declaration of Captain James Hind* (1651); Anonymous, *A second discovery of Hind's exploits* (1651), Anonymous, *The humble petition of James Hind* (1651).

29 *A Perfect Account*, 5–12 November 1651. Emphasis mine.

30 On states using executions as a way of advertising their power, see Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), pp. 65–67; Sharpe, “Last Dying Speeches.”

literal and figurative sense: even though Hind was initially charged with treason and imprisoned in Newgate, there was no indictment drawn against him, but he was sent to Reading to be tried for manslaughter. Only when this did not suffice to have him executed was he finally tried for high treason.³¹ The state pursued Hind's execution with a bloodthirstiness that seems surprising for the prosecution of a highwayman, something that was sarcastically noted in *A Perfect Account*:

Capt. Hind the great robber having continued two Sessions in Newgate, and no indictment preferred against him there, is the next Circuit to go from Sizes to Sizes, in those Countries where it is thought he hath committed his chiefest pranks, where any one that he hath wronged may prefer their indictments against him.³²

This passage suggests that at least some commentators thought that the state was going out of its way to make an accusation stick.

According to Barbara White, Hind's removal from London and his trial for manslaughter were prompted by the authorities' reluctance to turn him into a martyr for the Royalist cause,³³ and this assumption is substantiated by the cautious stance most newsbooks kept towards Hind. *Mercurius Politicus* – the main instrument of Commonwealth propaganda – mentioned Hind only once, when he was arrested, explaining that the only reason news about Hind was included was "because many odd reports have run up and down touching Hind, the notorious High-way-man, and his perambulation."³⁴ *The Weekly Intelligencer* chose another approach, attempting to use Royalist statements issued by Hind when he was led to Newgate, against the king's cause:

Although he was sufficiently laden with Irons before, and had money little enough about him, and look't but heavy at his entrance, yet immediately after he cheered up, and in full bowles began his healths to the King [...]. However, amongst those numbers that thronged in to see him, there was not one would pledg him on that Account, his fellow prisoners only

31 State Papers 10 November 1651, 15 December 1651, 18 February 1652, 21 July 1652 in Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1651–1652*, British History Online (<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=647>).

32 *A Perfect Account*, 15 January 1652, p. 430.

33 Barbara White, "Hind, James (bap. 1616, d. 1652)" in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

34 *Mercurius Politicus*, 6–12 November 1651, p. 1204.

excepted, who were all of his Complexion: And when they are to suffer, the world is to take notice that they dye all true Subjects to the Scots King. *A great honour for him*[...] ³⁵

The last snide remark about the dubious “honour” of having a notorious robber as a follower (along with the characteristic stereotypes of Royalist health-drinking) shows how Hind could be used as Commonwealth propaganda, but no other newsbook editor followed Collins’s (the editor of *The Weekly Intelligencer*) example. Hind’s name kept cropping up in newsbooks until his execution in September 1652, but he was merely mentioned as a robber, and the reports consisted of the details of his trials.³⁶ The only exception, apart from the anti-establishment newsbook *The Faithfull Scout* (explored below), was *A Perfect Account* from September 1652: this recorded Hind’s dying speech where Hind’s Royalism was expressed clearly but with no editorial comment.³⁷ Had the regime wished to turn Hind’s trial into a showcase of either its power or the pitiful status of the king’s followers, there would have been newsbooks or other publications following such a line. But the establishment’s silence on Hind’s case left him open to appropriation by those who wanted to criticize the Commonwealth.

Horton’s Hind: Royalism and Popular Writing

This opportunity for appropriation was seized upon by the bookseller George Horton, who actively promoted and advertised Hind’s subscription to the Royalist cause in order to criticize the Cromwellian government. Horton was a prolific publisher in the 1650s, mostly of newsbooks and other news pamphlets. His, however, was no disinterested trade: in 1653 he was one of the booksellers arrested for printing material the authorities found unpalatable.³⁸

35 *The weekly Intelligencer*, 11–18 November 1651, p. 346.

36 *A Perfect Account*, 15–22 January 1652, p. 430; *The Faithfull Scout*, 9–16 January 1652, pp. 404–405; *A Perfect Account*, 21–28 January 1652, p. 448; *The Faithfull Scout*, 16–23 January 1652, p. 414; *The French Intelligencer*, 20–27 January 1652, p. 70; *The Faithfull Scout*, 6–13 February 1652, p. 438; *A Perfect Account*, 3 March 1652, p. 496; *A Perfect Account*, 25 August–1 September 1652, p. 696; *The Faithfull Scout*, 27 August–3 September 1652, p. 665; *A Perfect Account*, 22–29 September 1652, p. 728.

37 *A Perfect Account*, 22–29 September 1652, p. 728.

38 “Warrants of the Council of State (C.O.S.), General of the Fleet, &c.: 1653 Oct 21; To apprehend Mrs. Clowes, Geo. Horton, John Perkins, Isaac Grey, and Thos. Spring, and bring them before Council to answer objections” in *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*:

His earlier publications might have been slightly more circumspect, but were equally subversive: Horton was associated with Daniel Border, a newsbook editor who in 1651 and 1652 was becoming a nuisance for the Commonwealth with the newsbooks he was editing – *The Faithfull Scout*, *The French Intelligencer*, and *The French Occurrences* (the *Intelligencer's* successor) – to the extent that Border was questioned twice in 1652 about offensive articles and probably was briefly imprisoned.³⁹

All three newsbooks had Royalist sympathies and maintained a critique of the establishment by printing, on several occasions, the slogan "GOD SAVE THE KING" in capitals (and excusing themselves by alleging that the phrase came from France); by including references to prophecies which had anti-Commonwealth overtones; and by depicting Lilburne, the leader of the Levellers, in a positive light.⁴⁰ The latter could be a radical or a Royalist move, since it was not unusual for Royalist publications – especially newsbooks – to praise Lilburne when it suited them, in order to criticize the establishment.⁴¹

Horton published *The French Occurrences* and some of *The Faithfull Scout's* issues, and his own publications in the same period echoed their pre-occupations. In the three months that followed Hind's arrest – during which time most of the pamphlets about him circulated – the rest of Horton's published material included news about the King of Scots (including some of his declarations and letters from other European royal personages), Leveller tracts, and other texts relating to Lilburne.⁴² In these publications, Horton tried to keep the King's name continuously in the spotlight by showing the support Charles received from significant political figures and emphasizing the opposition to the Commonwealth by radicals. It is not clear whether Horton was a Royalist or a radical bookseller: he did publish *The Faithful Post*, edited by Border, which was favourable to sectaries and the Baptists in

---

1653–1654 (1879), pp. 427–449. In 1649 an "Act against Scandalous and Unlicensed Books" was passed in order to control the press, see Raymond, "News" in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, p. 390.

39 Joseph Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620–1660* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 227–228.

40 Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper*, p. 222. Prophecies could be used as portents of God's displeasure against Parliament, see Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England*, p. 107.

41 McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, p. 64.

42 [G.K. Fortescue (ed.),] *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640–1661*, 2 vols (London: the Trustees, 1908), vol. 1.

particular.⁴³ It is very difficult to reconstruct a bookseller's political allegiance with any degree of certainty,⁴⁴ but his publications were clearly political, and in this period were staunchly anti-Commonwealth. This last could support both interpretations, since many radicals, and especially the Levellers, felt as bitter towards the Commonwealth in the 1650s as the Royalists did.⁴⁵

Regardless of his exact position, an examination of Hind's pamphlets that distinguishes between those printed by Horton and those by other booksellers, shows the extent to which Horton's were meant as anti-Commonwealth propaganda. Horton showed a great interest in Hind, publishing 6 out of the 13 pamphlets about him. None of these featured an author's name save for *We have brought our hogs to a fair market* (1652), which was penned by Horton, leaving open the possibility that he might have been the author of the others as well. By focusing more on Horton's role in the pamphlets we can see that Hind's Royalism was repeatedly brought to the fore by Horton and that Horton's reportage was anything but objective.

Where others focused on Hind's robberies and toned down his Royalism, Horton emphasized the latter. In *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind* (1651), published by Horton, his Royalism shines through in a detailed description about Hind's dialogue with the crowds visiting him in prison. When a gentleman from his hometown told him:

*Truly Countrey-man I am sorry to see you in this place, he answered That imprisonment was a comfort to him, in suffering for so good and just a Cause, as adhering to the KING.*⁴⁶

The gentleman's refusal to drink a health to "*my Master the King*":

43 L.F. Brown, *Political Activities of the Baptists & Fifth Monarchy Men during the Interregnum* (Washington: American Historical Association, 1913), p. 237. *The Faithful Post* circulated from March 1653 to June 1655.

44 On attempts to explain the importance of publishers in the production of ideologically inflected texts and to understand the ideological commitment and specialization of particular publishers, see Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 28–55; Peter McCullough, "Print, Publication, and Religious Politics in Caroline England," *The Historical Journal*, 51 (2008), pp. 285–313.

45 Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, p. 103.

46 Anonymous, *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind* (1651), p. 3.

moved Hind to passion, who said; the Devill take all Traytors: Had I a thousand lives, and at liberty, I would adventure them all for King Charles.⁴⁷

Hind went on to say:

I value it not a three pence, to lose my life in so good a cause; and if it was to do again, I should do the like.⁴⁸

This closely resembles *The Weekly Intelligencer's* issue mentioned earlier; in this version however, Hind's statements in support of the King are quoted at length and given prominence, thus making them the focal point of this account. This emphasis on the pro-monarchical character of Hind's declaration is underlined typographically by using capital letters for the King's name.⁴⁹ Hind protests that he only robbed rich men, and especially greedy lawyers whose fees were extracted from poor cottagers, a clear use of the Robin Hood stereotype.⁵⁰ In addition, the reaction of the audience is described in completely different terms: when Hind is reported to have said that he wished "that thing were as little used in England amongst Lawyers, as the eating of Swines-flesh was amongst the Jews," the pamphlet reports that "this expression caused much laughter, and many such witty Gingles would be often put forth."⁵¹ This description of the shared laughter between the highwayman and his audience at the expense of his victims was clearly meant to emphasize that Hind's audience was on his side, sharing his criticism against lawyers and tacitly justifying his actions. Barbara White views *The true and perfect relation* as "a journalist's first-hand account of his words on this occasion," which I think misses the gloss put over Hind's words by Horton.⁵²

47 Anonymous, *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind*, p. 3.

48 Ibid. p. 6.

49 This was not a convention since in many other pamphlets of the same period, the name of the King was not capitalized. However, in Horton's pamphlets, mentions of the King are capitalized, which may indicate that Horton was attempting to make the King's presence more obvious typographically.

50 See also Sharpe, *Dick Turpin*, p. 52.

51 Anonymous, *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind*, pp. 5–6.

52 Barbara White, "Hind, James (bap. 1616, d. 1652)" in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. White's comparison with *The Weekly Intelligencer* "confirms that these pamphlets were at most elaborating rather than imposing on Hind a stance of defiant Royalism."

Another pro-Royalist publication, *The trial of Captain James Hind* (1651), was probably published by Horton as well, though no publishing agent is identified on the title-page. This followed the same style of 'journalistic' account characteristic of Horton's publications, and it used the same phraseology as *The true and perfect relation*. When describing Hind's words after his trial, it commented that his "expression caused much laughture," which supports the assumption that it was published by Horton. In addition, it highlighted Hind's Royalism by appending the comment "this is observable," to Hind's claim at the beginning of the trial: "my name is honest and loyal James Hind."⁵³ The author also inserted a personal comment in favour of Hind, saying, "truly I am of this Opinion, that the mercy of the Parliament will extend the severity of Justice."⁵⁴

The attempt to emphasize Hind's connection to the Royalist cause was continued in *The humble petition of James Hind* (1651), also published by Horton. Despite the misleading title, Hind's petition-asking for more humane conditions during his imprisonment-covers just a page, while five pages are devoted to an account of the execution of 31 Royalists in Ireland. Even though Hind's petition is neutral, the report of the long dying speech by the Bishop of Clonwell in favour of the King had an obvious propaganda value, since he claimed that God willed "the establishing of the Royal Posterity in their just Rights and Liberties." The assumption that this was not neutral reportage is further justified by the pamphlet's attempt to cast the Bishop as a martyr, by stating that he was "the first that tasted of the Cup" (of martyrdom).⁵⁵

Where Horton really brought the message home, however, is in the pamphlet *We have brought our hogs to a fair market* (1652), which was not only published but was written by Horton.⁵⁶ The title page advertised that it contained Hind's orders "to all his royal gang," as well as "the appearing of a strange vision on Munday morning last, with a crown upon his head." It is interesting that highwaymen would be described as a "royal gang," but apparently Horton was trying to exculpate them, or at least to show that they could direct their

53 Anonymous, *The trial of Captain James Hind* (1651), pp. 5, 8. According to McElligott, "loyalist" was the usual term Royalists used for themselves, McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, p. 5.

54 Anonymous, *The trial of Captain James Hind* (1651), p. 5.

55 James Hind, *The humble petition of James Hind* (1651), p. 5. (This was not necessarily written by Hind.)

56 G.H., *We have brought our hogs to a fair market: or, Strange newes from New-Gate; being a most pleasant and historical narrative, of Captain James Hind* (1652).

activities towards deserving targets. Hind admonishes them to refrain from robbing anyone apart "from the Caterpillars of the Times, viz. Long-gown men, Committee-men, Excize-men, Sequestrators, and other Sacrilegious persons." Using the term "caterpillars" – which was used for those who preyed upon society (quite often robbers) – to characterize professionals who were supposed to be pillars of the government, is a deliberate use of inversion with direct reference to the tradition of Robin Hood. It is meant to discredit the regime by identifying its bureaucrats as the 'real' robbers, while highwaymen are presented as enforcers of moral justice.⁵⁷

Even more seditious was the description of a vision Hind had while in prison, which follows closely the pattern of political prophecies popular in this period. The pamphlet alleges that whilst Hind was in prison:

there appeared a Vision, in the likeness and portraicture [*sic*] of the late King Charles, with a Crown upon his head, saying, *Repent, repent, and the King of Kings will have mercy on a Thief*.⁵⁸

Such an overt play upon the idea that the King was God's agent in the world, even after his execution, was as clear a piece of propaganda as could be used in such a printed work. The effect was further accentuated by the inclusion on the same page of a small image of the King, and on the next page, images of Hind and of a lion, which was the symbol of the Stuarts (see Figs 5.1 and 5.2 respectively). Parts of this pamphlet (and, importantly, both of the passages commented upon here) were reprinted in two consecutive issues of *The Faithfull Scout*, the newsbook edited by Border, who apparently followed Horton's initiative in using Hind as a way to criticize the Commonwealth.⁵⁹

Contrary to Horton's pamphlets, the other cheap texts that appeared after Hind's arrest focused on his status as a robber, totally ignoring his Royalism. Pamphlets such as *A second discovery of Hind's exploits* (1651), *The last will and testament of James Hynd* (1651), *A pill to purge melancholy* (1652), *The English Gusman* (1652), and *Wit for mony* (1652), narrated generic stories of deceit and robbery, presenting Hind in a long tradition of rogue heroes. The only hints of Hind's Royalism were the mention of his travels to Ireland and Holland,

57 About inversion and the "alternative popular vocabulary," see Underdown, *A Freeborn People*, p. 93.

58 H., *We have brought our hogs to a fair market*, p. 5.

59 *The Faithfull Scout*, 9–16 January 1652, pp. 404–405; 16–23 January 1652, pp. 414–415. Some of *The Faithfull Scout*'s issues were printed for George Horton (see for example the 27 August to 3 September issue).

(5)

morning very early *Hind* calls for his horse, to be gon; being now mounted, he takes leave of the Gentlemen; but as he rode along *Hatfield*, at the Towns-end, an old woman asked an alms of him, his horse was so charitable minded that he presently staid, and would go no further; Sir, said the old woman, *I have something to say to you, and then you shall be gon*; *Hind* not liking her countenance, pul'd out 5 s. and gave her, thinking she would but like a *Gipsee*, tell his fortune: said, *Good woman I am in hast*: Sir, said she, *I have staid all this morning to speak to you*; and would you have me lose my labour: speak your mind, said *Hind*. Then the old woman spake as followeth:

Captain Hind,

You ride and go in many dangers; wherefore by my poor skill, I have studied a way to preserve you for the space of three years: but that time being past, you are no more then an ordinary man, and a mischance may fall on you, as well as another: but if you be in *England*, come to me, and I will renew the Vertue of this Charm again; In saying these words, she pul'd out of her bosom a box like a Sun-Diall, and gave it *Cap Hind*, saying; *When you are in any distress, open this, and which way you see the Star turn (being set at the end of a needle like a Diall) ride or go that way, and you shall escape all dangers*: So she switch'd him with a white Rod that was in her hand, strook the horse on the buttocks, and bid him farewell. The horse leaped forward with such courage, that *Hind* had much ado to turn him to give her thanks. The time of this Charm was expired in the year 1649.

Since which time, many strange Visions have appeared unto him, but especially since he came to Newgate; where, on Munday last in the morning, falling into a Dream, there appeared a Vision, in the likeness and portraiture of the late King *Charles*, with a Crown upon his head, saying, *Repent, repent, and the King of Kings will have mercy on a Thief*.

The next morning (being *Tuesday*) he told one of the Keepers, That he had heard of many men going to Heaven in a string; but he had bin there in a dream, where he saw his Master the King, the noble Lord *Capel*; but could not see Duke *Hamilton*. The Keeper reply'd, Mr *Hind*, *was you mad to leave such a glorious place, for to come again to this dark Dungeon*: Truly, I am afraid you will scarce ever come there again; and so they parted with a jest.

Haw

FIGURE 5.1 We have brought our hogs to a fair market: or, Strange newes from New-Gate (1652), part of p. 5, showing the image of Charles I. This item is reproduced by permission of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

set about the said Inn, which he perceiving, came into the Gallery, and inquired the cause thereof; answer was returned, That they came to make search for one who had committed a great Robbery, and that there was great suspicion that he was the man. Who I, said *Hind*; No, I will make it manifest to the contrary; standing in this posture:

Gentlemen, I am a man sent to do Wonders; and many Visions have appear'd; and sundry voices have I heard, saying, *O thou great and mighty Lyon, thou art decreed to range the Countries to work and manifest to the people strange Wonders*: At which instant, a Rampant Lyon appeared visible, but immediatly vanished; to the great admiration of the spectators; who peaceably departed to their severall Habitations, to tell the strangeness of this Wonder.

FIGURE 5.2 We have brought our hogs to a fair market: or, Strange newes from New-Gate (1652), p. 7, showing images of James Hind and a lion. This item is reproduced by permission of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

and occasional references to his service in the army, but not with the same pro-Royalist tenacity Horton's pamphlets show. For example, *The English Gusman* (1652) included passages from Horton's pamphlets, such as *The true and perfect relation of the taking of Captain James Hind* (1651) and *The humble petition of James Hind* (1651), but at the same time had no problem with cynically stating that Hind's reason for getting a post with the Royalist army was so he could continue robbing: "he got many mad lads together and did many robberies with authority."⁶⁰

The tendency to trivialize Hind and obscure his Royalism can be more explicitly found in *A second discovery of Hind's exploits* (1651). In this pamphlet, various robberies and cozenages committed by Hind are described in almost every corner of the land, but the pamphlet tells us nothing about his political affiliation. One of the stories is even titled "how Hinde [...] robbed a Countryman in Glocestershire, by laughing." In addition, the woodcut that accompanied this publication showed a Cavalier being assaulted by a Roundhead, the Cavalier being in a very compromised position, with a shepherd's crook around his neck. This was clearly a recycled image from an earlier anti-Cavalier satire, and its inclusion in a pamphlet about the Royalist Hind cannot have been accidental: it subverted the image of Hind as an active and (to a certain degree) successful robber.⁶¹ Even though Horton's pamphlets contained similar stories, the omission of almost any trace of Royalism in the other pamphlets makes Horton's insistence on Hind's pro-monarchical attitude even more glaring.

Despite the fact that other booksellers did not follow Horton's example in their treatment of Hind, other robbers were used to create pieces of Royalist propaganda, albeit in less obvious ways. In January 1652, a pamphlet titled *Hinds elder brother* was published, recounting the adventures of another Royalist highwayman (the pamphlet gives him the title of "Major"), Thomas Knowls. This short pamphlet was intended to cash in on Hind's notoriety, but showed a similar Royalist inclination by including a story about "How Knowls robbed the Scotch Commissioners." The poem that concludes this story follows the usual pattern of the trickster tricked, attributing the initial fraud to the Scots Commissioners:

thus witty Knowls did borrow plate
of those which cozen'd King and State.

⁶⁰ Fidge, *The English Gusman* (1652), p. 35.

⁶¹ *A second discovery of Hind's exploits* (1651). I am grateful to Dr Helen Pierce for her help with this woodcut.

The one they sold, the others thought to cheat,
but now repent, since they are soundly beat.⁶²

In this poem, the Scots Commissioners are portrayed as the greater thieves, who tricked the King and State, while Knowls is depicted, not as a thief, but as a corrector of injustice. The same passage was appended in *The Faithfull Scout's* issue, used there more clearly as Royalist propaganda. Border prefaced the story by commenting that "Major Knowls" was fighting against Moss-troopers because he:

bears an inveterate hatred against the Jockies, and is resolved to pay them home for their late perfidiousnesse and trechery to their Sovereign Lord the King.⁶³

Even more obvious was the pamphlet *The knight errant*, published in March 1652, with the story of the tricks and robberies of William Hart. The publisher of this pamphlet was E.C., who was more than likely Edward Crouch (no other publisher in this period has the same initials), the Royalist printer who, together with John Crouch, published various newsbooks (including the *Man in the Moon*).⁶⁴ The author attacks the Scottish Stool of Repentance, claiming that by punishing small sins severely the Scots created actual criminals – Hart resorted to robbery after leaving Scotland in order to escape persecution for fornication. In addition, the pamphlet describes how Hart was among the first to welcome Charles II in Worcester:

comes the Scotch King with his tarpallians to town,⁶⁵ and then hey boyes, who but our Knight proclaims him at the market Cross and

62 *Hinds elder brother, or the master thief discovered. Being a notable pithy Relation of the life of Major Thomas Knowls his many Exploits Escapes, and witty Robberies* (1652). Knowls was a real robber as well: in *A Perfect Account* (3 March 1652): "There was apprehended in London, and carried to Newgate (the latter end of the last week) one Knowls, a notorious thief charged to be one of those that robbed the Speaker, the Charter house, and did many other great robberies," p. 496.

63 The Scots were apparently called "Jockies," see for example the ballad *Jockies Lamentation, VVhose seditious work was the loss of his Country, and his KIRK* (1657).

64 J.B., *The knight errant: being a witty, notable and true relation of the strange adventures of Sir William Hart now prisoner in the tower: his severall exploits, cheats, and most witty tricks by him acted ever since his first beeing untill his proclaiming the Scotch king at Worcester, in August last. Written by J.B. Gent* (1652).

65 It is not clear what "tarpallians" means. The word "tarpaulian" denoted a marine or sailor in this period: "† tarpaulian, n. and adj." *OED Online* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

the next day to Court as Bravely harnessed as one of the Goulden fellowes?⁶⁶

The familiar tone and the mention of “our” knight seem to suggest that the author expected the readers to side with him in favour of the King.

In conclusion, crime pamphlets appearing in the charged political atmosphere of the 1650s could be easily appropriated by both contesting sides to serve as propaganda for their respective causes. James Hind, whose name was so recognized and who had been the focus of widespread speculation, presented an ideal vehicle for propaganda purposes. The authorities however did not choose to make an example out of his trial and punishment, but on the contrary preferred to keep him away from the public eye. Most pamphleteers and newsbook editors, even if they did not completely ignore such a popular subject, carefully avoided mentions of Hind’s Royalism, which was the crux of the problem.

This, on the other hand, left the field open to opponents of the Commonwealth, most notably George Horton, who exploited Hind’s fame in order to propagate the Royalist cause. Using the stereotype of the highwayman and the claim to provide reportage on current affairs, Horton’s pamphlets cleverly appropriated older forms of writing about criminals in order to make a political statement more effective, while appearing less harmful. Thus, these pamphlets attempted to advertise Hind’s Royalism and connect it to a popular idiom of resistance, in order to influence public opinion in the King’s favour. The choice to turn a highwayman into an almost emblematic figure of Royalism was risky, since it could bring the accusation that only people of that ilk would support the King. We cannot be certain how the audience responded to this attempt to valorize the King and discredit the establishment. Judging by the popularity of the pamphlets, as well as the crowds that gathered to see the notorious highwayman and hear what he had to say at his execution, we can assume that the gamble was not unreasonable.

<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/Entry/197879?rskey=RmmHgM&result=7> (accessed 12 November 2013). Here it is probably used to denote the followers of Charles II.

66 B., *The knight errant*, sig. B4^r.