

EDITORIAL CHOICES AND CONVENTIONS

THE problems of providing a text which is both faithful to Ludlow's original and tolerably easy to read are considerable, and I have had throughout to choose between a variety of unsatisfying compromises. The character of the Bodleian manuscript—as of most manuscripts—can only be fully appreciated in the original, and some nuances are inevitably lost in print.

Numbers in bold print

The numbers inserted into the text in bold print are the page numbers of 'A Voyce from the Watch Tower'. They are placed at the points where the pages concerned begin.

Page numbers of Ludlow's Memoirs

In the headings of the pages of the text printed below, there will normally be found three page numbers. The first (VOYCE) is the number of the page of the manuscript from which the first word on the printed page is reproduced. The second and third page numbers are of the 1698–9 edition of Ludlow's *Memoirs* (DARBY) and of the 1894 edition (FIRTH) respectively. They are provided to help the reader to compare the manuscript with the *Memoirs*. The page numbers of the *Memoirs* refer to the opening words on the page beneath, or to the first passage on that page to which a passage in the *Memoirs* corresponds. Pages which are headed only by a page number of the manuscript are those which contain no passages to which there are corresponding passages in the *Memoirs*. I have deposited in the Bodleian Library a guide (MS. Eng. hist. c. 966) designed to facilitate a comparison between the *Memoirs* and those portions of the Bodleian manuscript which are not reproduced in the present volume.

Italics

Passages in italics are those added or substituted by Ludlow when he revised the scribe's text. I have recorded such corrections only when they tell us something about Ludlow's views, about his sources, or about the process by which the manuscript was composed. I have not recorded them when they involved only changes of grammar or improvements of presentation: in those cases I have merely reproduced the wording in the form in which Ludlow finally left it. Where names are italicised, it can be taken that Ludlow has filled in spaces in the manuscript previously left blank. Sometimes he had left them blank because he had not yet discovered or checked the names concerned: at other times, when the names eventually inserted belonged to his friends or contacts, his initial decision to omit them had evidently sprung from a fear lest his manuscript should be seized by his enemies.

Spelling

The spelling of the manuscript has been retained (except that 'i' has been modernised to 'j', and 'u' to 'v'), but the abbreviations used by Ludlow and his scribe have been extended (except in the case of biblical references, which have been extended only in the table of contents in Appendix A).

Punctuation

Punctuation has proved the most difficult textual problem. To have reproduced the punctuation of the original would have been to present the reader with a dauntingly and at times impenetrably deterrent text. No author who ends paragraphs with semi-colons, as Ludlow does, can expect his punctuation to be faithfully reproduced. Indeed Ludlow, as we have seen (above, p. 55), wished his text to be amended so that it should be made suitable for publication. On the other hand, to impose twentieth-century punctuation on Ludlow's enormous sentences would have been impossible. Even if it had been possible, the exercise would have distorted the rhythms (uneven as they are) of the original. In revising Ludlow's punctuation I have tried to present a text of which I think Ludlow would have approved, and which at the same time is as easy as possible to follow. The result is the least unsatisfactory of the various solutions which have suggested themselves, but I have been able to think of no solution which would merit enthusiasm. I have usually succeeded in ensuring that sentences have main verbs, but there are a few points at which one can only echo the insertion which Carlyle was wont to place in Cromwell's speeches: 'sentence gone'. I have employed more parentheses than Ludlow does, and have used them to try to make some of his longer sentences navigable. Passages thus confined to parentheses are all subordinate or explanatory, but Ludlow would not have regarded any of them as insignificant. As all editors who amend punctuation know, and as one of the most distinguished of them has remarked in the Latham–Matthews edition of Pepys's *Diary* (i. lxii), 'punctuation involves interpretation'. I have endeavoured to preserve as far as possible the pace and the emphases of Ludlow's manuscript. When, as sometimes happens, his punctuation makes his meaning ambiguous, I have preserved the ambiguity.

I have modernised the use of capital letters, although I have left in capital letters passages which in the manuscript are emphasised by large handwriting.

Paragraphs

It is not always possible to identify the points in the manuscript where Ludlow wished new paragraphs to begin. Where he clearly wanted

one, I have always provided it. But I have also very frequently broken down long paragraphs into shorter ones.

Dots and square brackets

Especially in the earlier pages and in the table of contents, damp at the top outside corner of the Bodleian manuscript has rendered some passages irretrievable. Where I have provided three dots, there is probably or certainly one missing word which cannot be reclaimed. Four dots indicate that more than one word is missing. I have placed in square brackets readings which I believe to be almost certainly correct, but about which the damp makes complete confidence impossible. In the early pages the missing passages often consist of several words, and the text can consequently be difficult to follow, but thereafter the problem gradually diminishes.

Blanks

Blanks in the printed text correspond to passages left void in the manuscript.

Chapter headings

Ludlow indicates in his table of contents, but not in the main body of the manuscript, the points at which he wants new chapters to begin. Sometimes he makes errors, and the first chapter of part five cannot begin at the precise point Ludlow indicates. I have opened the chapter at the point which I think Ludlow had in mind.

Corrections

In a few instances, all of them trivial, I have silently corrected obvious errors of wording which Ludlow failed to notice when he checked the scribe's text.

Ludlow's sources

The text of part five is likely to be consulted for a variety of purposes, most of them specialist ones, and it would have been difficult (and costly) to provide explanatory footnotes on a useful scale. The reader who is sufficiently interested in one of Ludlow's statements to wish to follow it up in other works will know where to look. I have preferred not to burden the text with editorial apparatus. One subject on which readers may welcome guidance, however, is Ludlow's use of his sources. His resort to newspapers, tracts and declarations has already been discussed (above, pp. 13, 59–60, 64). His references to such documents rarely present problems, but a word of explanation about a few of them may be helpful. Some of Ludlow's additions to the scribe's text are taken from Thomas Gumble's *The Life of General Monck* (1671): compare 'Voyce', pp. 721, 731, 733, 786, 796, 892, 911,

1095, 1236, with Gumble, pp. 265, 268, 275–7, 383, 387–97, 401–2, 407–10, 453, 476. The reference to parliamentary records on ‘Voyce’, p. 810, can be compared with *Journals of the House of Commons*, 13 September 1660. I have not identified the ‘Quaeries’ and the ‘Answer’ to which Ludlow refers on p. 811.

The printed works of which Ludlow makes most use in part five are the tracts which concern the trials and executions of the regicides, above all *An Exact and most Impartial Account of the . . . Trial . . . of Nine and Twenty Regicides* (1660) and *The Speeches and Prayers of some of the late King’s Judges* (1660). Ludlow borrows very extensively from these works, and it is interesting to watch him working through them, selecting the passages he thinks most deserving of reproduction, and interspersing them with his own comments (e.g. ‘Voyce’, pp. 838–9, 854, 857, 859, 889). We learn from the Bodleian manuscript (pp. 948–50, 993) that it was Ludlow who organised the French translation (*Les Juges Jugez*, Geneva, 1663) of *The Speeches and Prayers*—an operation in which he encountered many difficulties with his printers. At the back of the translation Ludlow inserted material about the death of Sir Henry Vane which appears in English in ‘A Voyce from the Watch Tower’. At some points in the manuscript Ludlow quotes the anti-regicide tract *A Compleat Collection of the Lives . . . of those Persons lately Executed* (1661): compare ‘Voyce’, pp. 863–4, 869, with *A Compleat Collection*, pp. 77, 117–18, 120, 133–4. Ludlow makes considerable use, too, of the martyrological tracts *The Speeches, Discourses and Prayers of Col. John Barkstead, Col. John Okey, and Mr. Miles Corbet* (1662) and *The Life and Death of Sir Henry Vane Kt.* (1662). At the end of part five he draws on the tracts of 1661–2 which record the sufferings of John James.

J. G. Muddiman, in *The King’s Journalist* (1923), pp. 141n., 169–70, and in a series of contributions to *Notes and Queries*—written under the name J. B. Williams—between May and September 1913, attempted to show that the martyrological works of 1660–2, which he regarded as ‘a mass of horribly blasphemous lies’, were ‘forgeries’; see also Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism*, p. 544. Obviously the accounts of the dying speeches and prayers of the regicides owed a great deal to the imagination and to the propagandist aims of their partisan reporters. Even so, the similarities between the accounts given by the friends of the regicides and those written by their enemies are at least as striking as the differences. Muddiman and Whiting had no difficulty in exposing the manufacture of the ‘prodigy’ literature on which Ludlow drew (above, p. 10 and n. 39). Ludlow’s decision to reproduce material from martyrological tracts and from prodigy literature in ‘A Voyce from the Watch Tower’ was either naive or disingenuous.