

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

15 February 2017

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Unknown

Citation for published item:

Graves, C.P. and Annis, R. and Caffell, A.C. and Gerrard, C.M. and Millard, A.R. (2016) 'The Dunbar Diaspora : background to the Battle of Dunbar, and the aftermath of the battle.', Project Report. Durham University, Durham.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://www.dur.ac.uk/resources/archaeology/pdfs/DunbarDiaspora.pdf>

Publisher's copyright statement:**Additional information:**

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Palace Green Library excavations 2013 (PGL13)

The Dunbar Diaspora: Background to the Battle of Dunbar, and the Aftermath of the Battle

Pam Graves

With contributions from Richard Annis, Anwen Caffell, Chris Gerrard, and Andrew Millard

Department of Archaeology,

Durham University,

South Road,

Durham,

DH1 3LE.

c.p.graves@durham.ac.uk

October 2016

The Historical Background

The Battle of Dunbar took place on 3rd September 1650 between a Scottish Covenanting army and an English Parliamentary army led by Oliver Cromwell. Those unfamiliar with the period may find it strange that two armies, each ostensibly representing a severe Protestant religious stance, and who had formerly been allies against the king, should have fought each other, and with such bitter consequences. This report gives the background to these events.

There is a tendency to talk of the 'English' Civil War, but the events between 1637 and 1660 convulsed the greater part and population of the British Isles, and might more accurately be called the 'Wars of the Three Kingdoms' (Royle 2004, xi). Indeed, the Bishops' Wars that initiated the conflicts arose in Scotland. These were wars over authority, politics, and, in the first instance, predominantly, religion. 'When Charles I attempted to secure a semblance of religious uniformity throughout his kingdoms by imposing a Book of Common Prayer on the Scottish Kirk in 1637, a backlash took place, challenging royal authority and opening the door for the civil wars throughout the three kingdoms' (Spurlock 2007, 9). The conditions that led to the Battle of Dunbar, however, arose out of religious opposition between the Scots Presbyterians, on the one hand, and Cromwell's Independents, on the other. On the eve of the Battle of Dunbar, a contemporary English newsprint coined the Scottish viewpoint on the conflict *Bellum Presbyteriale* (T.B. 1650, 4; Spurlock 2007, 13).

Whereas the Reformation in England was long-drawn out and witnessed changes in confession until the middle-way sought by Elizabeth I, the wake of the Reformation in Scotland saw religious observance established at a state level (if not in universal practice) as Calvinist Presbyterianism. The reformed Scottish liturgy focused on the reading and exposition of The Word, defined in the Book of Common Order. The administration and authority of religion in Scotland was organized through the local Presbytery of elders, provincial synods, and a national General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. In May 1637, King Charles I sought to impose the Episcopal Service Book or Liturgy, intending it to replace the Kirk's Book of Common Order. The authority of the presbyteries was to be replaced by the royally-appointed hierarchy of bishops. Opposition was fierce and manifested, firstly in the leading signatories to the Renewal of the Second Covenant – known as the National Covenant – on 28th February 1638, at the former Greyfriars' Church, Edinburgh, and thereafter by subscribers of all classes and condition throughout the parishes of Scotland. Charles I's refusal to give way resulted in the first and second Bishop's Wars (1639-41 and August 1640-August 1641 respectively). By the resulting Treaty of Westminster, in August 1641, Presbyterianism was acknowledged as the religion of Scotland and the bishops were unseated. However, rebellion broke out in Ireland, the king and Parliament in London were now at loggerheads and Civil War resulted in August 1642.

Those of the Scots who sought common religious cause with the English Parliamentary side made a new Solemn League and Covenant with

Parliament and sent a Scottish army, under Alexander Leslie, into England in support. The Scots besieged Newcastle upon Tyne from late July to mid-October 1644 and a garrison occupied the town from then until February 1647 (Terry 1899a and b; Howell 1967).

The events of the following years in Scotland are convoluted, but explain how Parliamentary England and Covenanter Scotland ended up fighting at Dunbar in 1650 (see Makey 1979; Royle 2004; Reese 2006, 1-25). For some Scots, this second covenant was a betrayal of the aims of the 1638 National Covenant since it appeared to legitimise the Protestant Independents, or 'sectarians' rather than maintain the Scottish commitment to the theological ideal of Presbyterianism. They believed that the English only made the pact in order to gain the support of the Scots army. Whilst the Covenanting army was in England aiding Parliament, Scottish supporters of the Crown were given the opportunity to defend their cause under James Graham, Marquis of Montrose. After some success, his forces were defeated by the returning Covenanter army early in 1647. A further split and campaign arose when Scottish Royalists entered secret negotiations with the king, the so-called 'Engagement' of the winter 1647 (Royle 2004, 412-26). In return for support from the Scots army, the king promised to aid the establishment of Presbyterianism in England. The Engagers were defeated in August 1648 and the English New Model Army invaded Scotland in order to remove any lingering Royalist support from the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh.

After the execution of Charles I in 1649, Montrose made a renewed attempt at Royalist military invasion through Scotland March-May 1650. This failed, Montrose was executed and Charles Prince of Wales made the political expedient of vowing to uphold Scots Presbyterianism and the Solemn League and Covenant in June 1650 in order to accede to the Scottish crown as Charles II and in return for the support of the Scottish kirk, Parliament and army (Royle 2004, 553). Charles II took vows to observe, uphold and defend the practice and customs of the Church of Scotland in perpetuity for himself and his family. The man who claimed the English throne was now, to all political intents and purposes, a Covenanter, at one with the reforming aims of the Scottish Church and people to establish Presbyterianism in England. The English Parliament, Independents, other Puritan and Protestant interests in England could not accept this perceived threat to their own republican sovereignty and self-determination in religious observance. Parliament in England declared its intention of invading Scotland in order to pre-empt and prevent a Scots invasion of England and appointed Thomas, Lord Fairfax, and Oliver Cromwell to lead its army. This was the beginning of the campaign that led to the Battle of Dunbar in 1650. Cromwell led the English army as far as a line of fortifications linking Edinburgh and Leith, but was forced into a series of alternating retreats and advances in respect of the Covenanting army to the east and south of Edinburgh over July and August 1650, finally falling back to Dunbar at the beginning of September.

In the period leading up to the battle, print propaganda from both sides proliferated. From the Scots viewpoint, the Kirk was the 'champion of Reformed religion, defending Protestantism against the "sectaries" and

“heretics” who had overthrown the English Church, killed the king and assailed Reformed orthodoxy’; Cromwell and the Independents, on the other hand, promoted their themselves as advocates of ‘religious freedom, toleration and the preservation of Protestant diversity’ (Spurlock 2007, 13).

The Men who made up the Scots Army at Dunbar

At the beginning of 1650 the Scottish army was extremely short on men with 2,500 cavalry and 3,000 foot, and it was decided that a far greater levy of 19,000 men should be created from the nation’s population of fit men (Reese 2006, 38). Twelve years of war had depleted the forces raised from Berwickshire, Teviotdale, Dumfriesshire and the South-West. Each county appointed a shire Committee of War to decide what proportion of manpower could feasibly be raised whilst maintaining necessary farming and industry.

The principal source for those Scots who took part in the battle is an English survey, BM Harleian 6844 fol.123. The Scots infantry regiments raised from the summer of 1650 were generally smaller than those of the English. Only small numbers were raised from Edinburgh, Berwickshire and Roxburghshire to join the Teviotdale men, and very few came from Haddingtonshire (Reid 2004, 25). Support for the king was weak in Dumfriesshire, the South-West as a whole, and parts of Ayrshire, so that few men were recruited from these areas. Larger numbers came from Fife and Kinross, Linlithgow, Stirling and Clackmannan; Perthshire, Forfarshire (about 600 men). Regulars from the respective clans led by Lovat and Argyle from the Highlands took part. Only about 110 men were raised from Aberdeenshire and the Mearns (Reid 2004, 24-26).

During the 1620s and 1630s many Scots went to fight in the wars in the Netherlands and Germany in particular (some went as far as Poland and Muscovy) whilst a great number fought in Sweden. However, many of those who went to the Netherlands and Germany especially, because of the related religious persuasions (Calvinist in particular) stayed there to live and rear families. Many returned to Scotland solely to fight in the Bishops’ Wars from the late 1630s and early 1640s, and it is not inconceivable that sons of some of these men came over in 1650 to uphold the Covenant and oppose Cromwell. Hence, some of those who were raised in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden may have had Scots parentage. In the 1638-40s wars almost every Scottish regiment raised, no matter the commander, had a veteran of or returnee from these German and Netherlandish wars as second-in-command, and every company also had a veteran of, or returnee from, these campaigns as ensign and one or two others as sergeants (Catterall 2002; Grosjean 2003; Grosjean and Murdoch 2005; Murdoch 2006). Therefore we should expect a fair leavening of returned Scots or possibly sons of ex-patriots in the Scottish forces at Dunbar.

As in any battle of the time, there would have been a considerable ‘baggage train’, i.e. people who made the army work and move. These would include specialist tradesmen who maintained the weaponry, the considerable carpentry and wheelwrighting necessary to keep supplies and materiel

moving, farriers, blacksmiths, leather-workers; and probably many boys and youths who carried out multiple and varied tasks. It is therefore possible that some of the individuals who were found buried at Durham came from this wider group accompanying the combatants. Married women would have accompanied their husbands, and in normal circumstances there would be camp-followers: it is unclear if this was the case at Dunbar or not.

Whilst travelling to Fyvie Castle in Aberdeenshire, Anne Murray, who had been a maid to Charles I's Queen Henrietta Maria before the wars, encountered a group of wounded men and boys from the Scottish army who had fled after Dunbar and were walking on the road. When Anne Murray's party stopped at Kinross in central Scotland, she set up a station to treat the wounded, including a man who was suffering from a head injury and a teenager who had been stabbed through his body with a rapier (Hacker and Vining 2012).

The Battle

The battle was preceded by a period of stalemate: Leslie was camped on Doon Hill, to the south of Dunbar, and whilst he stayed there Cromwell could not engage. Neither could Cromwell retreat further south as Leslie had a force at Pease Bridge/Cockburnspath, barring the way. When, however, Leslie gave up his advantage and the Scots descended Doon Hill, Cromwell took his opportunity with a surprise attack at first light. The actual location of the engagement has been identified as lying between the hill and the London road, on the basis of the (Fitz)Payne Fisher plan drawn up in c.1652, itself based on eye-witness accounts (Firth 1900; Reese 2006, 121-2; Reid 2004). The site of the battle was bisected by the A1 road upgrade and has been partially quarried away (Banks and Pollard 2011, 129, 135).

The action of the battle need not be repeated here as it is well-discussed elsewhere (Reid 2004; Reese 2006). The Scottish army was defeated in less than an hour, and it is generally agreed that Cromwell's troops were better trained and disciplined, and that Cromwell's tactics were far superior to those of the Scots army (Firth 1900, 47; Reid 2004; Reese 2006). The basic statistics of the battle, as far as they can be agreed, are these: the English (3500 horse and 7500 foot) were outnumbered by the Scots (6000 horse and 16000 foot); 20-30 English casualties against 3000 Scottish. Afterwards 10,000 Scots were taken prisoner, 5000 'sick and wounded' were released to go home, said to be 'wounded old men and boys' (Miller, various dates 1830, 1844, 1859, 140), and the remaining 5000 marched south towards Durham. The evidence is largely from correspondence from Cromwell and those associated with him; there is no official Scottish narrative, but vague and isolated accounts are scattered through Scottish correspondence, diaries and memoirs (see Banks 1927; Firth 1900, 52).

Each side fielded infantry and cavalry, and were equipped in a similar way, if distinctive in aspects of dress (Reese 2006, 40-42; Reid 2004). The English made an inventory of the Scots artillery pieces remaining after the battle (Reese 2006, 41). Each infantry regiment had cannon of various sizes,

mortars, and the men were armed with matchlock and flintlock muskets which used gunpowder and lead bullets, swords and pikes (wooden shafts with steel points) (Foard and Partida 2005; Reid 2004). The equipment of the Civil War musketeer in the North-East of England is typified by the excavated finds from the 17th-century bastion at the castle in Newcastle upon Tyne: a pottery grenade, musket rest, an iron blade from some form of pole arm, lead shot – both musket balls and pistol balls – and powder flasks for a musket of the ‘Twelve Apostles’ type (Goodhand 1983, 202). The Scots, in particular, were known to have used the latter (Reese 2006, 40). The Scots also used ‘small and great Leather Guns’, the small guns being light and designed to be carried on a single horse.

The injuries that might be inflicted during the battle of Dunbar, therefore, and which might leave traces on the human skeleton include the major trauma, dismemberment and bone shattering caused by the artillery, and firearm projectiles, loss of limbs and severe cuts caused by swords, deep wounds and cutting caused by pikes, and possibly knife wounds (Carlton 1992; Bull 2008). Furthermore, the matchlock muskets of the time were prone to cause injury to their own users, as well as the danger of burns wounds caused by flying sparks in the vicinity of gunpowder carried both on the soldier’s person, and in quantity in the baggage train (Reese 2006, 139-40). Cavalry charges could inflict serious injuries. Any identified Civil War-related mass-grave skeletal populations should be used for comparison, e.g., that from All Saints’ church, Fishergate, York which had a similar age range, revealed little evidence of healed trauma or violent battle wounds, and are more likely to have been casualties of infectious disease in the wake of the siege of York from April to July 1644 (see McIntyre and Bruce 2010, 36- 37). [A mass grave of about 30 individuals was encountered at Cockfield (Slaughter Close), County Durham in 1775, believed to have been the remains of soldiers from the battle at Raby Castle in 1648 – the whereabouts of the material is now unknown – County Durham HER D2024]. However, it must be remembered that any prisoners involved in the march to Durham will have been the relatively unscathed and less-severely wounded. Muskets, bullets, swords, human bones, and cloth were reportedly continuing to be found nearby in the 19th century (Miller 1830, 1844, 1858, 140). No specific mention is made of women or children present as camp followers on the day or on the march south, although they were a commonplace of campaigns at this time. Presbyterian ministers accompanied Leslie’s troops in earlier engagements, and, notoriously, encouraged the slaughter of some 300 Irish women, and their children, after the battle of Kilsyth in August 1645 (Reese 2006, 43).

The military, political and religious results of the battle were momentous. The Scots army was effectively destroyed, its leadership taken captive: the names of the officers taken prisoner are known (BM Harleian 1460; Reese 2006, 125-9). Cromwell was able to press his advantage, ultimately, to take Edinburgh and occupy large parts of Lowland Scotland, where he built fortresses in key strategic towns. The victory was hailed as the manifestation of Providence, justifying Cromwell, the Parliamentary cause, and in particular, divine rejection of Presbyterianism in favour of the Independents (Worden 1985, 69; Royle 2004, 585-603; Spurlock 2007).

After the Battle

The numbers of dead vary between sources, and accurate figures will probably never be known. One of Cromwell's own messengers estimated "near four thousand" killed (Carte 1739, vol.1, 383), whilst the English political newspaper *Mercurius Politicus* for 12th-19th September 1650 estimated between 4,000 and 5,000 dead (Reese 2006, 101).

Sources are more agreed over the number of soldiers captured as 10,000. In the earlier Civil Wars prisoners were often released on parole, promising that they would never take up arms against their opponent in future, but Cromwell did not risk this with the Scots on this occasion. Since Leslie had laid waste the countryside in August there was little in the way of food to be scavenged from the land, and Cromwell's ships could not land provisions. The shortage of food available to feed his own army made the additional responsibility to feed 10,000 captives too problematic. Cromwell, therefore, decided to release between 4,000 to 5,000 of the most sick, wounded and starving prisoners (Carlyle 1846, vol.2, 222). The townspeople of Dunbar were allowed to use carts to fetch back wounded from the field. The larger number of more able-bodied men were to be sent to Sir Arthur Hesilrige, Cromwell's governor at Newcastle, under escort of four troops from a regiment led by Colonel Hacker, their fate afterwards to be determined by the English Council of State (Reese 2006, 103). Over 4,000 already undernourished and battle-worn prisoners were to be marched on a 90-mile route to Newcastle.

In a letter to Hesilrige, Cromwell ordered that the officers should be kept at Newcastle, 'some sent to [Kings] Lynn, some to Chester' (Carlyle 1846, vol.2, 222). This amounted to, perhaps, some 200 men (Reese 2006, 103). A letter from Hesilrige dated 31st October 1650 is the main source for what happened to the prisoners thereafter, and since he was obviously justifying his actions and accounting for events to his political superiors in the Committee of the English Council of State for Irish and Scottish Affairs, the document must be treated with a certain amount of historical caution. In this letter he mentions 140 prisoners left at Newcastle, and 60 officers 'at the Marshal's in Newcastle'; it is unclear whether the officers are included in the 140 total or were an addition to that number (Banks 1927, 10).

In reality, it is unclear what happened to many, if not all, of the officers as they seem to have been separated from the troops on or before the march, leaving the prisoners with no advocates and exacerbating the breakdown of discipline. Having marched the first 28-30 miles to Berwick without anything to eat at all, some of the prisoners collapsed and refused to move unless they could eat something. Thirty were shot for this on the spot and the rest of the column were marched further south without food until they arrived at Morpeth. Here they were corralled into a walled garden. Hesilrige's letter states that the starving men pulled up raw cabbages that were growing in the garden, and ate them, bolting down leaves, muddy roots, seeds and all, such that they 'poysoned their Bodies' (Hodgson 1806, 339-46).

By Hesilrige's own account, about 1,000 men must have died from the combination of privations, exhaustion, severe gastric problems – 'the Flux', probably dysentery – and execution. He housed them for one night in St Nicholas's church, Newcastle, then sent the remaining 3,000 men to Durham by foot, to be lodged in the cathedral church.

Hesilrige claimed that he had daily supplies of bread and milk sent from Newcastle and other surrounding towns to feed the prisoners in Durham cathedral, and that they received medical treatment. He stated that he removed the sick to the former bishop's castle, where they occupied 'several Rooms'. He detailed the meat, vegetables and oatmeal that he ordered to be provided to prisoners in both the cathedral and the castle, with 'old Women appointed to look after them' (Hodgson 1806, 339-46). There is no other evidence to support the detail of his provisions. He blamed a lot of the deteriorating conditions on the behavior of the prisoners themselves, being 'unruly, sluttish and nasty', and including murder between the captives. By his own estimation, of the 3,000 men brought from Newcastle, 1,600 were already dead and buried, and the mortality continued at a desperate rate due to illness. Hesilrige clearly believed 'the Flux' still to be the principal malady, and he claimed that he supplied straw for the prisoners to sleep on. By now, however, there may have been a range of diseases caused by starvation, severely diminished strength and depleted immunity, those caused by humans having to live and defecate in close confinement with limited fresh water and sanitation. He estimated that there were 'about Five hundred sick in the Castle, and about Six hundred yet in health in the Cathedral, the most of which are probably Highlanders, they being hardier then [sic] the rest' (Hodgson 1806, 344-46; Reese 2006, 104).

It is still not entirely clear how long the prisoners were held in the cathedral and the castle. Although so many died in each building, there are no contemporary accounts of where the dead were buried. As neither the cathedral nor castle functioned as a religious institution or episcopal residence at this time, it may have been decided to create mass graves in open space appended to each or either structure (see Millard, topographical report). As a footnote, it has become a common belief that the Scots prisoners destroyed a lot of the remaining fabric in the cathedral, particularly the woodwork (for fuel) and the Neville tombs (as acts of Calvinist iconoclasm or anti-English sentiment, due to the association with the victor against the Scots at the Battle of Neville's Cross in 1346). There are no contemporary accounts to substantiate the extent or attribution of such damage. A great deal of image-stripping took place earlier in the process of Reformation under the 16th-century puritan dean of the cathedral, and it may be doubted how much damage prisoners stripped of weaponry could inflict on stonework, even the softer alabaster used on the tombs. Hesilrige's letter claims that he supplied coals to the prisoners on a daily basis, but the context implies that he was perhaps only referring to the sick in the castle. There is at least one visible scorch mark in the south aisle of the cathedral that may have been caused by the fire of a brazier whilst the prisoners were there (Norman Emery, pers. comm.).

Other catastrophic events in Durham City

In terms of the archaeological material in question here, it is important to consider alternative explanations. One is that this is the burial of Scottish soldiers billeted in Durham during 1643-4 who died of the 1644/5 plague (Scott and Duncan 2001). We do not know where these soldiers were billeted or buried, although other victims are recorded in the parish registers of Durham churches (where their deaths are marked with the letter 'P' to indicate 'plague'), nor do we know how many soldiers there were. However, there are two main reasons to discount them. The first is that plague burials were generally more carefully interred, usually on consecrated ground and, secondly, it is very unlikely that plague burials would have been left open or shallowly buried (thus allowing rodent gnawing as the osteological evidence indicates). The city was already well accustomed to dealing with outbreaks of plague (now better described as lethal infectious epidemics) and understood how to take appropriate measures to minimise any spread. For example, plague was also present in Durham city in 1589 and continued at intervals for eight years. On this occasion burials were also dug in parish cemeteries with the remainder being interred 'on the moor' (*i.e.* outside the city). Among the key precautions at this period was to prevent the entry of strangers and to isolate the infected. Bringing them to the heart of the city to die is wholly unlikely on this or any subsequent occasion. For the sake of completeness, however we can confidently rule out the 1589 outbreak because a plague population would likely be representative of the balance of population in the city, but in the assemblage from Palace Green all the sexed skeletons are male and the age profile is narrow. In addition there is also the isotope data to consider, the dating evidence provided by pipe smoking as well as the location of burial itself.

The Diaspora – the Fate of Prisoners beyond Durham

Tracing the fate of the prisoners is difficult. We have good records of the orders and permissions from the Council of State in London, but the number in these total several times the 1400 men known to have survived until 31st October 1650. The problem is thus discerning which orders were carried out and which were not.

The order sent to Hesilrige on 19th September 1650 required him to deliver to Major Samuel Clarke 900 Scots for transportation to Virginia, and 150 more for transportation to New England (Banks 1927, 8). A further 200 were to be sent to Isaac le Guy in Virginia. On 26th October, the Council required another 2,300 prisoners to be sent to Ireland for military service (excepting any Highlanders whose religious and cultural affinities to the Irish were deemed to make them too unreliable). Another 300 men were to be sent to France for military service (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1650, 402). The New England contingent were to be under the charge of Joshua Foote and John Becc of London, who were 'interested as managers of the iron works at Lynn' (Banks 1927, 8).

However, due to the enormous number of deaths in Durham, Hesilrige did not have this many men to disperse. Hesilrige's 31st October reply states that 'Three hundred from thence [i.e. Durham], and Fifty from Newcastle of the Sevenscore left behind, were delivered to Major Clerk' in London for transportation to Virginia (Banks 1927, 10; Hodgson 1806, 339-46).

Hesilrige also claimed to have sent forty prisoners to [South] Shields to serve as (indentured) servants to people who ran the salt-pans (Banks 1927, 10; Hodgson 1806, 339-46). This may not mean that all the men ended up working in the salt works themselves; as elsewhere, they may have been given any number of domestic or related labour in and around the salt works, or the managers' houses. He released twelve weavers to establish a linen industry to produce cloth similar to 'Scotch-cloth' in the North-East of England, and a further forty were to be labourers in unspecified tasks (Hodgson 1806, 344-46). Banks considered that some of these latter were released on parole rather than bound by indenture (Banks 1927, 11). Cowan (2013) states that 100 were retained to work in coal mines in the region (source unspecified). The Council of State had included working in coal mines as an option for the fate of the prisoner (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1650, 334) but we have found no contemporary record of this being enacted. There was a substantial and growing investment in coal mining in Fife and the Lothians in the 17th century, and it is quite possible that coal workers had been recruited to the army that fought at Dunbar.

In reply to Hesilrige's letter, the Council of State reduced the number required for Ireland to 500, but there is no further record of this in the State Papers, so whether they went or not is currently unknown. On 23rd March 1651 the Council of State requested Hesilrige to send 300 prisoners to Colonel Rokeby, and 200 to his Lieutenant Colonel Killigrove to serve in France under Marshal Turenne (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1651, 105). Rokeby was issued with a pass to sail to France on 25th March, so it seems likely that at least 300 and probably all 500 of these prisoners were sent to fight in France.

In October 1651, following the Battle of Worcester, the Council of State directed that some prisoners from that battle should be sent to work for the Adventurers draining the fens (Emery, n.d., 10). On 14 October they also offered the Adventurers some of the Durham prisoners (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1651, 475) but they were apparently not sent before January 1652 when reference is made to 500 Scottish prisoners at Durham being sent to Kings Lynn. It seems that the prisoners in the Fens were released in 1652 or 1653 and replaced by Dutch prisoners of war (Emery n.d., 10).

By July 1652 the Council of State became concerned with the ongoing cost of holding prisoners in Durham, and ordered Hesilrige to release the remainder with passes to go home (Emery n.d., 11; Cal. S.P. Dom 1652, 313).

However, in March 1655 there were still Dunbar prisoners at Tynemouth Castle, presumably some of those initially held in Newcastle. The Council of State gave orders "Directing the Governor of Tynemouth Castle, to certify to the Council the number of prisoners taken at Dunbar, that those who are fit

may be delivered to Martin Noell, to be sent to Barbadoes” (Cal. S.P. Colonial 1655, 421). The number delivered is not recorded in the State Papers but secondary sources claim that 100 were sent to Barbados (Pugh 2003, 186; Reese 2006, 105), where Cowan (2013) claims they were drafted into the army to fight the French, (although he does not cite any sources).

After 1655 there are no further records of prisoners from the Battle of Dunbar continuing to be held in prison.

The prisoners deported to New England

Three days after the Council received Hesilrige’s letter of 31st October, it ordered him ‘to deliver 150 Scotch prisoners to Augustine Walker, master of the *Unity* to be transported to New England’ (Banks 1927, 11). Banks thought that the ship was probably built in Boston by Benjamin Gillam the shipwright, because he sold a quarter of a ship of that name to one John Leverett in 1646. Augustine Walker had settled in Charlestown, Massachusetts, in 1640, having come from Berwick-upon-Tweed on the Anglo-Scottish border (admitted to the church in Charlestown in 1640 (Wyman Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown II, 990; Banks 1927, 11 n.4)). Walker made frequent voyages to London, and his presence there was probably happenstance. After the prisoners bound for transportation were sent by water to London there was a flurry of correspondence regarding the advisability of sending any prisoners to the colonies who might be considered enemies of the Commonwealth and a potential danger to the colonists, their settlement and industry. This caused a delay whilst the Admiralty Committee examined the prisoners. [In the meantime, sickness continued to take its toll of the prisoners awaiting the sea voyage to Virginia, held in Blackwall and on hulks on the River Thames]. On November 7th 1650 the Council ordered Major Clarke to submit a report on the ‘ill-usage of the Scotch prisoners now on board ship’ (*Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1650, 397). He was given orders to sail on 11th November 1650. Banks (1927, 12, n.7) raised the question as to whether those on the *Unity* in November, waiting to sail, constituted the same contingent of 150 prisoners Hesilrige delivered to Samuel Clarke, when the order to sail was issued, or whether a second contingent was sent.

Ultimately, only 150 prisoners boarded the ship destined for New England, 60 of whom were intended for the Saugus Ironworks owned by *The Company of Undertakers of the Iron Works in New England*. The journey is estimated to have taken about six weeks in favourable seasons at that time, and so Banks thought that the *Unity* could not have made Boston harbor before the end of December 1650 (1927, 13). Hamilton (2009, 152, n.75) states that 62 Scots were noted on 24 December 1650 when an inventory of the assets of the Iron Works company was taken. Also, the Scots Charitable Society of Boston was founded by free Scots on 6 January 1657/8 (Adams 1896, 9), which, if they arrived in late December 1650, would be immediately after the end of seven years servitude. No contemporary list of these prisoners exists, but some names are known from lists from the following years and for the others, ‘it is possible to give them a tentative identification, from the earlier termination of

their terms of servitude, and the absence of their names from the known list of those who came the following year' (Banks 1927, 13).

Reese (2006, 105) has claimed that about a third of the men died on the voyage, many from scurvy. Although the Rev. John Cotton stated that some "were sick of the scurvy or other diseases" on arrival (Banks 1927, 14), he does not mention any deaths. Moreover, the genealogist George Sawin Stewart in the early 20th century identified 147 names of men of likely Scots origin who were certainly or possibly transported on the *Unity* (SPOW 2016a), and there are an additional three in names in the Saugus records that he missed (see below). Some of Stewart's list may not have been Dunbar prisoners, but it seems likely that most, if not all, of the 150 arrived safely in New England.

Writing to Cromwell from Boston on 28th July 1651, the Rev. John Cotton said that: 'we have been desirous (as we could) to make their yoke easy... They have not been sold for slaves to perpetuall servitude, but for 6 or 7 or 8 yeares, as we do our owne; and he that bought the most of them (I heare) buildeth houses for them, for every 4 an house...' (Hutchinson 1865, 264; Banks 1927, 14; see also Gwynn 1930). He states that land was allocated to each four-man house for use by the men on four days of the week on condition that they worked for the owner for three days. He promised that 'as soone as they can repay him the money he layed out for them, he will set them at liberty' (Banks 1927, 14).

The 'most of them' were sixty-two men sent to the agent for the Saugus ironworks at Lynn, Massachusetts. By 1653 it was stated that of these men, 35 were sent to the ironworks itself, 17 to work for William Aubrey at the Company's warehouse at Charlestown, and the others appear to have been sold on to other masters (Banks 1927, 15). However, we also know that one man, "Davison y^e Scott", died en route from Charlestown to Saugus (Regan and White 2011, 38; Rapaport 2005 46). Two versions of a 1653 inventory of the ironworks are known, one naming 35 men and the other with an additional two names (see below for name lists).

Some of these men were sold on for three years' service at Lynn: 'Old Tingle' (suggested to be one William Tingley), who was a collier, hired four prisoners on this term. This raises a question as to whether these men were coal-miners or coal-carriers originally in Scotland, or expected to turn to new tasks. (As mentioned above, there was an extensive contemporary coalmining industry in Fife and Lothian). Later litigation showed that some servants worked in domestic service or as farm or general labourers (Banks 1927, 15).

Those not employed by the ironworks company were sold for between £20 and £30 each to purchasers and distributed to 'numerous towns in Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine'. (Banks 1927, 13). Fifteen to twenty-five men were sent to a sawmill on the Piscatagua River, Maine; the rest were sold as indentured servants in the town of York nearby, most serving for a period of seven years (Banks 1927, 14-16). Those at the Saugus works were able to gain their freedom if they earned and saved enough to

redeem the price for which they were sold. Some became successful farmers in Maine (Reese 2006, 105).

Some prisoners, again, were sent to the sawmills in Berwick, formerly part of Kittery, Maine, and Banks suggested that Unity Parish was no doubt named by the prisoners who had sailed to New England on the ship of that name (1927, 16). The mills on the Asbenbedick River (called the Great Works) were managed by Richard Leader, who had formerly worked on saw mills feeding the Lynn iron works. Leader left the saw mills for Barbados in 1656, and grants of land in the upper part of Kittery/ Berwick were made to some Dunbar prisoners in the same year, suggesting that they had been released (Banks 1927, 16).

Banks relates another group of Scots in the nearby town of York a few years later, including Alexander Maxwell, who had been in Kittery, and had been in the service of Richard Leader's brother, George (1927, 16). Most of these men had been bought in Dover or Exeter, New Hampshire, and may have come to York when their original indentures expired.

Banks (1927, 4, 5, 6) records that altogether between 300 and 400 Scottish prisoners from the Battles of Dunbar and Worcester were transported to New England and he refers to them all as 'Highlanders' though this is clearly not the case. The prisoners of war seem to have been regarded as convicts and 'transportation of convicts beyond the sea to the colonies was an accepted policy of longstanding and the Colonies, especially Virginia and the West India islands had been used for this purpose in the past' (Banks 1927, 8).

Prisoner name lists

Preface to name lists: Banks made a note of the way in which Scottish names were changed in transcription. According to him, most of the Scots were unable to write, and knew little English (1927, 19). This need not imply that they were all Gaelic-speaking, as Lowland Scots and the Doric of the North-East would have seemed very foreign to southern English speakers, not only by accent but also by vocabulary. It seems that the prefix 'Mac' was very often dropped, and 'the remaining part of a name was Anglicised in a convenient phonetic substitute' (Banks 1927, 19). Banks' examples of transcriptions and transformations are few, hence the author has suggested possible cognomens for some of the prisoners listed below.

Known Dunbar prisoners in New England

"**Davison** ye Scott", a man who is reported to have died en route between Charlestown and Saugus (Regan and White 2011, 38), or shortly after arriving at Saugus in early 1651 (Rapaport 2005, 46).

Thirty-seven men named in an Inventory of 1653 for the Saugus Ironworks, Lynn, Massachusetts (Banks 1927, 15; Regan and White 2011, 39):

James Adams, John Archbell [Archibald], **John Banke, Alexander Braband** [Brabant], **Alexander Burgess, John Clarke***, **James Danielson***, **George Darling, Micam** [Malcolm] **Downing, Alexander Dugle** [Dougal], **James Dunsmore** [Dunsmuir?], **Alexander Eaton, Alexander Ennis** [Innes/Annis], **James Gourdan** [Gordon], **Peter Grant, Thomas Gualter** [Walter], **Alexander Grimes, Andrew Jempson** [Jamieson/Jameson], **William Jourdan** [Jordan], **Thomas Kelton, James Luddle** [Liddell?], **John Mason, James Mackall** [McCall], **John MacMallen** [MacMillan/MacMullen?], **John Mackshane** [McShane?/MacShane?], **William Mackwater** [McWhirter/McQuhirter?], **Micam** [Malcolm] **MacCallum, Richard Meeme, Engram** [Ingram] **Moody, John Pardee** [Purdie/Purdy?], **John Rupton, John Steward*** [Stewart], **George Thomson***, **James Thomson, James Taylor, John Toish*** [MacIntosh?], **Thomas Tower.**

John Clarke*, John Toish*, James Danielson*, George Thompson*, Robert MacIntire, testified concerning management of The Saugus Company's management of their business. The first four names also appear in the 1653 inventory, but MacIntire does not so it is unclear if they were all at Saugus itself or if MacIntire was at the Company warehouse in Boston (Banks 1927, 15 n.12 from *Essex Antiquarian* XII, 69-70).

Thomas Holme§ or Hume [Home], sold to Henry Sayward of York (York County Court Records, 2nd July 1672).

John Stewart* is separately attested (in a petition dated 19th September 1688), as having fought at Dunbar, and then having worked at Saugus, subsequently being purchased by John Pynchon of Springfield; then in John Gifford's service in his house (Gifford was manager of Saugus Iron works). He died 21st April, 1691, leaving no family that was known by Banks (1927, 13-15).

Those believed to have been Dunbar prisoners in Kittery, now Berwick, Maine (Banks 1927, 16):

Niven Agnew, James Barry [Barrie?], **Alexander Cooper, William Furbush** [Forbes], **Daniel Ferguson, Peter Grant***, **George Gray, William Gowen, David Hamilton, Thomas Holme§** [Hume?], **John Key, Alexander Maxwell, John Neal** [Neil?/Neill?], **John Ross, John Taylor, William Thomson, James Warren.**

Those who may have been prisoners who ended up in York, Maine (Banks 1927, 16), also known as the Oyster River Scots (Stinson 2016), though some of these (marked °) appear on the list of prisoners from the Battle of Worcester transported on the *John and Sara* (see below):

John Carmichael°, **James Grant** ['the Scot'], **James Grant°?** ['the Drummer'°?], **James Jackson°**, **Robert Junkins** [Jenkins], **Alexander Maxwell** [see above], **Micum** [Malcolm] **MacIntire, Alexander MacNair, Andrew Rankin**

Thus we have certain or very likely names for 63 of the 150 men transported. In the early 20th century George S Stewart compiled a list of 147 names he believed were prisoners from Dunbar, including 55 of those above. Stewart's evidence is not recorded, but many of them are identifiable as men with Scottish surnames, or explicitly identified as Scots, who appear in New England records from the mid-1650s onward. This is the point at which the Unity prisoners would have been released from their servitude and would be expected to start appearing the church and court records. Much of the biographical information that has been compiled on these men is collated by the Scottish Prisoners of War group on their website (SPOW 2016b).

Lists of officers

In addition to the lists of New England transportees, there are three versions of a list of captured officers. Two were printed, probably as handbills, in London shortly after the Battle, and reproduced in the 19th century (Anon. 1806, 280ff, 306ff), the other survives in the Lothian Muniments at the National Archives of Scotland (reference GD40/2/16, p.20, and a copy is available online¹). The lists published in London contain 291 and 240 names respectively, whilst the one in Edinburgh has 237 names. The three lists overlap but also differ in the names they include. John Cleary (pers. comm.) has collated the names in the three lists and there appear to be about 315 distinct names. Clearly there are many more names here than the number of officers imprisoned in Newcastle. Whether these lists were taken before or after the wounded were released is not known, or perhaps some of the lower ranks listed were sent to Durham rather than Newcastle.

Scots Prisoners from the Battle of Worcester, 3rd September 1651

The Scottish Soldiers Project has thus far concentrated on prisoners from the Battle of Dunbar, but exactly one year after the battle, Scots in the army of Charles II fought and lost to Cromwell at Worcester. Banks, again, deals with the treatment and destination of these prisoners, many on the ship the *John and Sara* of London, and gives lists of named men (1927, 17-30).

¹ <http://www.scan.org.uk/researchrtools/military.htm>

References

- Adams, R.B. 1896. *The Constitution and By-Laws of the Scots' Charitable Society of Boston*. Boston: Farrington.
- Anonymous (ed.) 1806.) *Original Memoirs written during the civil war: being the life of Sir Henry Slingsby and Memoirs of Capt. John Hodgson*. London: Constable & Murray. Available online: <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=Li46AAAAcAAJ>
- Banks, C.E. 1927. 'Scotch Prisoners deported to New England by Cromwell 1651-2'. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 61, 4-30.
- Banks, I. and Pollard, T. 2011. 'Protecting a Bloodstained History: Battlefield Conservation in Scotland'. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 6:2, 124-45.
- Bull, S. 2008. *The Furie of the Ordnance: Artillery in the English Civil Wars*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Cal.S.P. Dom.: *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Interregnum, 1649-50*, ed. Green M.A.E. (London: HMSO, 1875), British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/domestic/interregnum/1649-50> Last accessed 5 October 2016.
- Cal.S.P. Colonial: *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies: Volume 1, 1574-1660*, ed. Sainsbury W.N. (London: HMSO, 1860), British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/colonial/america-west-indies/vol1> Last accessed 5 October 2016.
- Carlton, C. 1992. *Going to the Wars: the Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-1651*. London: Routledge.
- Carlyle, T. 1846. *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*. London: Chapman & Hall, 3 vols.
- Carte, T. 1739. *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers concerning the Affairs of England from the Year 1641-1660*. London: James Bettenham/Society for the Encouragement of Learning, 2 vols.
- Catterall, D. 2002. *Community Without Borders: Scots Migrants and the Changing Face of Power in the Dutch Republic, c.1600-1700*. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic.
- Cowan, P. 2013. *Scottish Military Disasters*. Neil Wilson Publishing (Kindle edition of 2008 publication).
- Emery, N. n.d. *Scottish Prisoners from the Battle of Dunbar, 1650*. Durham Cathedral: unpublished typescript.
- Firth, C.H. 1900. 'The Battle of Dunbar'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 14, 19-52.
- Foard, G. and Partida, T. 2005. *Gazetteer of Selected Scottish Battlefields*, produced for Historic Scotland. Canmore MS 6876/3 and MS 2522.

- Goodhand, S. 1983. 'Military Finds of the English Civil War' in Ellison, M. and Harbottle, B., 'The excavation of a 17th-century bastion in the castle of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1976-81'. *Archaeologia Aeliana* (5th ser.) 11, 202-7.
- Grosjean, A. 2003. *An Unofficial Alliance: Scotland and Sweden, 1569-1654*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Grosjean, A. and Murdoch, S. (eds) 2005. *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Studies in Early Medieval and Reformation Traditions). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Gwynn, A. 1930. 'Cromwell's policy of transportation'. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 19, 607-623.
- Hacker, B. and Vining, M. (eds) 2012. *A Companion to Women's Military History*. History of Warfare 74. London: Brill.
- Hamilton, M.L. 2009. *Social and Economic Networks in Early Massachusetts*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Hodgson, J. 1806. *Memoirs of Captain John Hodgson*. Edinburgh:
- Howell, R. 1967. *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution: A Study of the Civil War in North England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hutchinson, T. 1865. *A Collection of Original Papers relative to the History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*. Albany, New York, vol.2.
- Makey, W. 1979. *The Church of the Covenant 1637-51: Revolution and Social Change in Scotland*. Edinburgh: John Donald.
- McIntyre, L. and Bruce, G. 2010. 'Excavating All Saints' – a Medieval Church Rediscovered'. *Current Archaeology* 245 (August 2010), 30-37.
- Miller, J. 1830 (1859?) *The History of Dunbar, from the earliest records to the present period*. Dunbar.
- Miller, J. 1844. *The Lamp of Lothian, or The History of Haddington: in connection with the history of East Lothian from the earliest records to 1844*. Edition of 1900. Haddington: W. Sinclair.
- Murdoch, S. 2006. *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603-1746*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Pugh, R.J.M. 2003. *Swords, Loaves and Fishes: A History of Dunbar from Earliest Times to the Present*. Balerno: Harlaw Heritage.
- Rapaport, D. 2005. Scottish slavery in 17th-Century New England. *History Scotland* 5:1 44-52.
- Reese, P. 2006. *Cromwell's Masterstroke: Dunbar 1650*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword.
- Reid, S. 2004. *Dunbar 1650: Cromwell's Most Famous Victory*. Oxford: Osprey.

- Reid, S. 2012. *Crown, Covenant and Cromwell: The Civil Wars in Scotland, 1639-51*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword.
- Regan, J., White, C. 2011. Hammersmith Through the Historical Texts. Chapter 2, p.27-55 in Griswold, W.A. and Linebaugh, D.W. (eds.) *Saugus Iron Works: The Roland W. Robbins Excavations, 1948-1953*. Saugus: National Parks Service.
<https://www.nps.gov/sair/learn/historyculture/upload/03Chapter2.pdf>
- Royle, T. 2004. *Civil War: The Wars of the Three Kingdoms 1638-1660*. London: Abacus. 2013 reprint.
- Scott, S., Duncan, C.J., 2001. *Biology of Plagues: Evidence from Historical Populations*. Cambridge University Press.
- SPOW (Scottish Prisoners of War group). 2016a. *George Sawin Stewart Documents*. <http://scottishprisonersofwar.com/george-sawin-stewart-documents/>. Last accessed 04 Oct 2016.
- SPOW (Scottish Prisoners of War group). 2016b. *Battle of Dunbar POWs in America* http://scottishprisonersofwar.com/battle_of_dunbar_pows_america/ Last accessed 05 Oct 2016.
- Spurlock, R.S. 2007. *Cromwell and Scotland: Conquest and Religion, 1650-1660*. Edinburgh: John Donald.
- Stinson B.C. 2016. *Oyster River Scots*. <http://scottishprisonersofwar.com/oyster-river-scots-by-b-craig-stinson/>. Last Accessed 05 Oct 2016.
- Terry, C.S. 1899a. 'The Scottish campaign in Northumberland and Durham between January and June 1644'. *Archaeologia Aeliana* (2nd ser.) 21, 146-79.
- Terry, C.S. 1899b. 'The Siege of Newcastle upon Tyne by the Scots in 1644'. *Archaeologia Aeliana* (2nd ser.), 21, 180-258.
- Worden, B. 1985. 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England'. *Past and Present* 109:1, 55-99.