

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-22,734

GOLDWATER, Ellen Davis, 1920-
TWO CROMWELLIAN PARLIAMENTS: POLITICS,
PATRONAGE AND PROCEDURE.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1973
History, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973

ELLEN DAVIS GOLDWATER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**TWO CROMWELLIAN PARLIAMENTS:
POLITICS, PATRONAGE AND PROCEDURE**

by

Ellen D. Goldwater

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in History in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy, The City University of New York

1973

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 18, 1973
date

Stuart E. Grall
Chairman of Examining Committee

5/23/73
date

Harold C. Lynett
Executive Officer

David E. Underdown

Paul J. Hilsenbrand

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

PREFACE

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the guidance of Professor Corinne C. Weston, who patiently supervised the research and writing of this work and whose helpful suggestions are greatly appreciated. My deepest thanks go to Professor Stuart E. Prall, whose interest and good judgment have meant a great deal to me and who brought this work to its ultimate conclusion. I wish also to thank Professor David Underdown for his careful and sympathetic reading and for his illumination of the subject, based on his detailed knowledge of the period. My eternal thanks are due to Dr. Leigh S. Cauman for her careful editing and much needed encouragement. The mistakes are my own, and I can only acknowledge all assistance with gratitude.

Helpful comments were made by Professor J. H. Plumb, who took time out of his busy schedule to read two chapters, and also by Professor J. R. Jacob. Thanks are also due to Joseph Bender of the Production Room of the Graduate Center for his careful duplication of this work at each stage and to Lenore F. Kahn for her valuable assistance.

With the assistance of a Schweitzer Fund grant given to me by the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, I was able to spend a summer in England, using both London libraries and local archives. I am grateful for this wonderful experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE COURT'S ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT	20
II. THE REPUBLICANS' DESTRUCTIVE OPPOSITION	86
III. THE COUNTRY'S STERILE OPPOSITION	125
IV. PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE: A TOOL OF POLITICAL MANAGEMENT	167
V. THE SCOTTISH AND IRISH MEMBERSHIP: MONOLITHIC TOOL OR DIVIDED DELEGATIONS?	220
VI. REWARDS IN IRELAND	268
CONCLUSION	309
APPENDIX: POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE PROTECTORATE PARLIAMENTS	324
The Civilian Court	335
The Military Court	378
The Republicans	389
The Country	404
BIBLIOGRAPHY	433

INTRODUCTION

Int-1

Seen through the mists of civil war and constitutional change, Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate parliaments are usually presented by historians as mysterious atypical products of an unsuccessful revolution.¹ Marred by two forced exclusions of recalcitrant members, held under the provisions of two successive constitutions, they are commonly seen only as evidence of a final futile effort to achieve a constitutional settlement before the restoration of the monarchy. No efforts have been made to trace their resemblance, either in the development of political groupings or in the use of management procedures and patronage, to earlier or later parliaments. The history of Cromwell's parliaments has been viewed as discontinuous with the rest of parliamentary history.

However, these two parliaments were not so different from other parliaments as they have seemed. A close look at the parliamentary record itself--at the details of parliamentary management and of political groupings and regroupings--rather than the troubled and exceptional circumstances under which these parliaments met, reveals a surprising amount of historical continuity.

The circumstances under which Cromwell's parliaments met were indeed troubled. Civil war and the execution of the monarch

Int-2

led to a series of constitutional experiments. The Long Parliament, under whose aegis the revolutionary changes had taken place, was purged by the army in 1648 and finally forcibly dissolved in 1653. Left with a political vacuum, Oliver Cromwell and the other army officers who had directed these purges were nevertheless unwilling to call elections for another parliament. Instead, they directed the convocation of the Nominated Parliament, whose membership they chose primarily from among their own faithful followers, although a few men recommended by the sectarian churches were included. When the proposals of this body proved to be too radical for their tastes, the officers again directed a forced dissolution and this time drew up a new constitution, the Instrument of Government, which they hoped would provide a more stable settlement. According to the provisions of this document, Cromwell assumed the title of Lord Protector, but his powers were limited by the constitutional appointment of a council of state dominated by the military establishment, and a provision stating that a constitutionally powerful parliament must be called in nine months.

It was under the provisions of this constitution that the Protectorate parliaments were elected in 1654 and 1656. But this was not the final constitutional experiment. Discontent with army dominance and a longing to return to the old ways proved to be so strong that the members of the second Protectorate parliament drew up another constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice.

Int-3

Originally this constitution had provided for Cromwell's assumption of the crown, but when, because of army opposition, he refused this offer, the office of Lord Protector was retained. The Protector's powers, vis à vis those of both the council of state and parliament, were strengthened, and a second chamber of parliament, entitled the Other House, was established to serve as a substitute for the House of Lords.²

Even these troubled circumstances, however, did not actually produce parliaments that were noticeably different in either management techniques or party development from other early modern English parliaments. It will be urged in this study, therefore, that the problem lay neither in a lack of willingness to use the parliamentary system, nor in a lack of effort to use political techniques either in the elections or in parliament once it was in session. Rather it lay in deeply rooted political differences, which were exacerbated by the nation's lack of intellectual preparedness for any form of government other than monarchy.

In carrying out this study, it was necessary to analyze the day-by-day proceedings of the parliaments. No other recent work has thus extensively scrutinized the parliamentary journals and diaries. The basic earlier work of Samuel Gardiner and Charles H. Firth, which does use these sources, needs to be supplemented and updated.³

The conclusions drawn in these monumental works remain sound, but new interests and recent historical research give them

Int-4

a curiously old-fashioned air. There is little interest in either patronage or procedure. The party terminology used is based upon religious rather than political differences.

The only major twentieth-century work on Cromwell's parliaments, H. R. Trevor-Roper's "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," is a brief, stimulating essay that ignores the fundamental issue--basic political differences which the nation was intellectually unprepared to deal with--and attributes the Lord Protector's difficulties to his political ineptitude. Little effort is made to trace the daily occurrences during the sessions.⁴

Two dissertations by Paul J. Pinckney and Margaret Tibbetts have been concerned with these parliaments, but neither attempts to cope with Trevor-Roper's thesis. His solution to the failure of these parliaments has thus remained largely unanswered, although Pinckney's work on the 1656 elections implies that it does not seem consistent with the picture presented by the evidence.

Tibbett's "Parliamentary Parties under Oliver Cromwell," issued in 1944, is a chronological treatment of the events. The identifications that she makes of the political affiliation of the members are apt to rely upon their activities during the Civil War period, which are not trustworthy indications of their Protectorate party identification. Neither the use of patronage nor the development of parliamentary procedure are discussed.⁵

Int-5

Pinckney's dissertation, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656," published in 1963, is a valuable study of these elections upon which I have drawn extensively, not only for the elections themselves but for knowledge of the backgrounds of the candidates. It touches only peripherally upon the actual proceedings once parliament was convened.⁶

Detailed investigation of the parliamentary records was essential in order to deal with the basic problem--the failure of these parliaments. Thus the issues that divided the members and the political techniques that they employed were illuminated.

It became apparent that the failure of the Lord Protector to reach a working relationship with the various political groups should be attributed to their insistence on maintaining certain fundamental tenets, such as the republicans' belief in parliamentary supremacy, and the Country's insistence on the parliamentary privilege of judging the qualifications of its own members, which doomed any effort at compromise.

The records also reveal that the Court employed traditional political techniques. Assiduous efforts were made both by Cromwell's supporters and by the opposition groups to elect loyal followers to the House. The Lord Protector's managers employed the same devices the Tudor and early Stuart monarchs had used to forward the passage of their legislative programs; the election of a loyal speaker and clerk and the manipulation of the committee

Int-6

system. The opposition countered these efforts by the use of parliamentary procedures developed by the revolutionary members in the 1620s and 1640s. Both the Lord Protector and his son, the commander of the army in Ireland, had agents in the House. The two most important political groupings in the House, the Court and the Country, bore a marked resemblance not only to these groups in earlier and later periods, but also to the early Whig and Tory parties.

Moreover, the recent conquest of Ireland and Scotland provided another previously unavailable source of influence and patronage. Recently conquered and incorporated into the Protectorate, their populations virtually disenfranchised, these countries were under military rule. Packed delegations were elected under military supervision, which were then controlled by the Court until its own members became divided over the issue of kingship in 1656. Since the Court's financial resources were limited, Irish land, confiscated from the conquered population, was its primary source of patronage.

* * *

In developing this analysis of the day-to-day parliamentary history of the period, two basic sources are relied upon: the Commons Journal, a formal daily record of events, and a pair of parliamentary diaries, that of Guybon Goddard, a Norfolk member

Int-7

for the 1654-1655 session, and that of Thomas Burton, a member from Westmoreland, for the 1656-1658 sessions. These have been supplemented by the examination of such other materials as pamphlets, newsletters, the state paper calendars, the correspondence of foreign observers and that of Henry Cromwell, the commanding general in Ireland. The papers of John Thurloe, the secretary to the council of state, contain a great deal of information about the elections and the various personalities involved. The memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, a prominent republican, and of Bulstrode Whitelocke, a Cromwellian supporter, provide useful, although biased material. In the diaries and correspondence of prominent Scots are discussions of their country's part in these political events. These documents can be correlated with local records, so as to provide clues to the backgrounds and characters of many members of parliament. All this other material, however, only supplements the two basic sources: the diaries and the journals of the House of Commons.⁷

The Commons Journal, kept by the clerk of the House, records the events of every day the House met; this record is limited. It does not report the debates in the manner of a modern parliamentary record, but only the formal proposal and passage of bills, the membership of committees appointed, and the results of the votes taken. Few names of participants in the debates are given. The names of tellers, however, are listed, and these give an important clue to the identity of the members of the power establishment. When there was a serious difference of opinion that could not be settled by

Int-8

voice vote, those in favor withdrew and those in opposition remained in their seats. The voters were counted by four tellers, two for each side, chosen by the speaker from among the most influential members of the House. Since the same men often served as tellers many times, the leadership of the House can be established.⁸

The diaries also are limited in the information they provide; neither covers a complete session, and Goddard's record of the 1654 parliament is merely a summary of the events, naming few of the participants. Knowledge of the second Protectorate parliament is much fuller; for Burton completely recorded the events of the session at which he was present. There are great gaps even in this information. For example, Burton took no notes at the sessions during which the Lord Protector was offered the crown, and so information about this period must be pieced together from widely disparate sources.⁹

* * *

Nevertheless, enough is known of what occurred on the floor of the House to see that the struggle between the king and parliament in the 1620s and 1640s was being reenacted, albeit in an altered form. The amount of power that the legislative branch of the government could wield vis à vis the executive was constantly in dispute. In the 1620s, opposition to the king's policies had come from a group known as the Country, dedicated to parliamentary privilege and power. This was the first broad-based opposition group to exist without aristocratic leadership. The Court, mainly office holders

Int-9

and royal connections, had supported the monarch.¹⁰ A similar, although more complicated division, occurred in the Protectorate parliaments.

The Court now consisted, as it had under the early Stuarts, of those men who held office or were in some way closely connected with the ruling powers of the central government. They often held executive or judicial posts and fulfilled the traditional function of managing for the Court in Commons. Typically, they supported the Cromwellian policies: a strong executive, a tolerationist religious policy, a large army, with sufficient taxation to support it, and a vigorous foreign policy. Expressions of these attitudes were such votes as those for increased power to the Lord Protector at the expense of parliamentary power and privilege, support of the recognition of the basic form of government required in 1654, of the exclusion of recalcitrant members in 1656, of the maintenance of the Other House in 1658, and for the collective ratification of the acts and ordinances passed by parliament and the council of state between 1642 and 1653. A substantial military budget was supported, to be collected in large part extra-legally by army officials. Other signs of Court support were votes in favor of grants of Irish land to Court favorites, the liberalization of the Scottish franchise and the retention of the franchise prescribed by the Instrument of Government.

The members of the Country were drawn together by their obsessive distrust of executive power, based on their experience with the Stuart kings. They were the spiritual descendants of the

Int-10

opposition of the 1620s, whose members had said that they were defending the "immemorial rights and liberties of which the King was the transgressor."¹¹ Intellectually, the Country members of the 1650s also based their opposition on tradition, or, as they put it, on their belief in the "ancient constitution." This constitution was a compendium of customs, privileges, and powers, claimed as sacred on grounds that they originated far back in the dim past.¹² Actually most were of relatively recent origin; yet the Country members defended their policies: fear of a standing army, reluctance to wage foreign wars and to pay taxes to finance them, downgrading of executive power, and a harsh interpretation of religious doctrine, as "ancient rights and fundamental privileges of the people."¹³

The Lord Protector's relationship with his parliaments was complicated by the development of two new opposition groups: the republicans and the military Court. His problems were, therefore, more difficult than those of the early Stuart monarchs, who had to deal with only one opposition group, the Country.

The republicans, because they had a strong political organization, bore an influence out of all proportion to their small numerical strength.¹⁴ Although, like the Country, they espoused the supremacy of parliament, their belief was based not on tradition but on a firm intellectual conviction that a republic should be established. This conviction was reenforced by the fact that many of them had a common political background. They had supported the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1649 and bitterly resented what they regarded as the Lord Protector's betrayal of the republic. This doctrine made them

Int-11

forceful activists. They acted together in a concerted manner, both on the floor of the House and in the 1656 elections. Of all the groups, they made the best use of the parliamentary techniques developed by the opposition in the 1620s. They acted as a catalyst for Country discontent, and their destructive opposition contributed strongly to the failure of the Lord Protector in establishing a good working relationship with his parliaments.

The military members of parliament gradually went into opposition. They had been among the Lord Protector's earliest supporters, and during the first Protectorate parliament had been an integral part of the Court. During the second Protectorate parliament, many of them formed the nucleus of a new opposition group, which was bitterly opposed to the downgrading of military influence that took place as the Protectorate government became more secure, and also to the Lord Protector's proposed assumption of the crown. They looked for leadership to the major-generals, especially to Generals John Lambert and Charles Fleetwood.

The differences among these parliamentary groups are ideological; except for the military, their members cannot be differentiated on social, religious, or occupational lines. Country gentlemen, lawyers, and merchants can be found in all the groups, as can those belonging to Presbyterian, Independent and Anabaptist churches. Only the military Court can be differentiated socially, an unusually large number of its members being "new men" who had risen through the army ranks from humble beginnings.¹⁵

* * *

Int-12

In discussing these political groups, some changes have been made in the descriptive terms applied to them: "Court" and "Country" are used here as the standard descriptions of the two major groups. (There is no question about how the republicans and the military are to be described.) Whereas contemporary writers speak of Cromwell's supporters both as "the Court" and occasionally as "Independents," only the term "Court" is used here. Whereas contemporaries often speak of "the Presbyterian party"; here the term "Country" is used.

These changes have been made because the terms "Court" and "Country" are more valid and useful for describing the political groupings of the Protectorate period than "Presbyterian" and "Independent," which are relics of the political history of the 1640s. Recent historical research has shown that these have serious defects as descriptive terms even for the earlier period. In the Protectorate period, they become meaningless. After 1648, "Independent" was seldom used as a political term, and was applied only to members of the old independent group, to which Cromwell had belonged in the 1640s. Since many other people now supported him in power, the term "Court" better describes his following.

The old presbyterians reacted in many different ways to the Protectorate government, some abstaining from political activity, some joining the Court, and others displaying various degrees of opposition.¹⁶ Samuel R. Gardiner, dean of Civil War and Interregnum historians, pointed out many years ago that this political term, as applied to a presbyterian layman of the Protectorate period was inaccurate, saying that such an individual was "merely a Puritan of a somewhat conservative temper."¹⁷

Int-13

The term "Country," which in the 1620s had been used to describe the entire opposition to the Court, can now be used in the same way, provided the republican and military opposition are excluded.

The use of "Court" and "Country" also avoids the confusion of religious and political terms entailed by the old terminology. Recent historical research has demonstrated that, despite the traditional view of the period, membership in the presbyterian and independent parties of the 1640s cannot be equated with membership in the Presbyterian and Independent churches. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians, believing that membership in church and party could be correlated, held that controversies among the Puritan members of the Long Parliament over the Solemn League and Covenant and the leadership of the New Model Army resulted by the winter of 1644 in the formation of two parties known as "Presbyterian" and "Independent." According to this interpretation, the conservative presbyterian majority of parliament, which was prepared to negotiate with Charles I, only to be expelled in Pride's purge by independent members of the army, also tried to negotiate a presbyterian system of church government on England. The independent party in parliament, a minority until Pride's purge, was backed by the independent soldiers of the New Model Army. Its membership belonged to Independent congregations, and they opposed a presbyterian church form of government and were in favor of religious toleration so long as Catholicism was not included.

This historical interpretation remained unchanged until J. H. Hexter published his influential essay, "The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents." Historians had been in basic agreement, although Samuel

Int-14

R. Gardiner and William A. Shaw never drew the line of religious cleavage as sharply as did Thomas Carlyle, Charles H. Firth, George M. Trevelyan, Francis C. Montague, and John Buchan. According to Hexter, membership in both political groups should be separated from religious belief or membership. Hexter demonstrates that political presbyterians were not backers of a genuinely presbyterian form of church government and even more surprisingly that many political independents were elders of Presbyterian churches. All that remains of the traditional interpretation is George Yule's contention that the issue of toleration did separate the true religious Presbyterian from the true Independent; but even on his showing the majority of the independent party in parliament were not religious Independents, and his scholarship has left unaffected Hexter's conclusions about the religious beliefs of political presbyterians.¹⁸

Thus the use of the terms "Court" and "Country" both avoids confusion of religious and political terminology, and points up the relationship between the political groupings of the Protectorate and those of earlier and later periods. The Country-Tory opposition of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries displayed the same obsessive distrust of executive power as did the Country of the Protectorate, and both derived this attitude from the Country of the 1620s. This opposition was sterile because it was based so largely on tradition and was therefore apt to run counter to constructive and forward-looking measures. Early eighteenth-century Tory isolationism, dislike of a standing army and of high taxation, and strict support of an established church are analogous to the Country doctrines of the Protectorate.

Int-15

They can be contrasted to eighteenth-century Whig doctrines that originated in the Protectorate Court: an interventionist foreign policy with sufficient taxation to support it and a tolerationist religious policy.¹⁹

* * *

In spite of the problems created by the deep ideological divisions within his parliaments, there is reason to believe that the Lord Protector wished to govern within the parliamentary framework. When the first Protectorate parliament was summoned on September 3, 1654, in obedience to a provision of the Instrument of Government, he had high hopes of its efficacy in healing the divisions in the country. The difficulties encountered in it made him less eager to summon another, but he did so on September 17, 1656, in order to finance the war that England was waging with Spain. The two forced exclusions of recalcitrant members in order to produce more docile parliaments and the provision in the new constitution written in this second parliament for the Other House are further evidence of Cromwell's desire to work within the parliamentary system. Although both of his parliaments ended on a note of acerbity caused by both the republican and Country opposition, there is evidence that, before his death, the Lord Protector had plans to summon a third one.²⁰

The task of government was made more difficult for him because the nation had no intellectual preparation for any form of government other than monarchy. Medieval theory had stressed the preservation of order in the state, and to this goal the monarch's position was

Int-16

always vital. Opposition to the ruling sovereign was easily viewed as disloyalty. Opposition to Cromwell, however, carried no such connotation. After all, he had recently risen from the ranks of the army, and he held the constitutionally ambiguous position of Lord Protector.

Nor did he have the advantage of a loyal house of lords. The lords had always been traditionally associated with the monarch in his task of maintaining order in the state, assisting in the management of parliament by means of their connections in the house of commons. They had been abolished immediately after the execution of the king, and the new Other House, established in 1657 to fill the constitutional void, did not last long enough to prove its worth. The same ingredients were to be essential to royal eighteenth-century management.²¹ Without them, the Lord Protector's task was one of insuperable difficulty.

His problems, therefore, lay neither in a lack of willingness to use the parliamentary system, nor in a failure to employ management techniques. It will be shown in this study that the traditional devices--patronage, procedure, electoral influence--were simply inadequate to deal with the fundamental political issue--the locus of sovereignty in the state. Not yet satisfactorily settled by a political theorist, it doomed any attempts at compromise during the Protectorate parliaments.

FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," in Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier, ed. by Richard Pares (London: 1956), pp. 11, 12. The characterization of the years 1640-1660 as "an incomplete revolution," in Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution (New York, 1961), pp. 187-189. The disassociation of the Cromwellian policy of borough charter manipulation from that of the later Stuarts in J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725 (Middlesex, 1967), p. 62, n.

2. For these political events, Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), II-IV, passim, and Austin Woolrych, "The Calling of Barebone's Parliament," English History Review, LXXX, 1965, 492, 509. For the provisions of the two constitutions, Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889).

3. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate; Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate (2 vols., London, 1909).

4. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments."

5. Margaret Joy Tibbetts, "Parliamentary Parties Under Oliver Cromwell" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr, April, 1944).

6. Paul F. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, August, 1962).

7. Journal of the House of Commons, VII (London, 1813); The Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828); Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials (4 vols., Oxford, 1853); The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1842); The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie, ed. by David Laing (Aberdeen, 1863); The Diary of Sir Alexander Johnston of Warriston, ed. by G. M. Paul, D. H. Fleming and J. D. Ogilvie (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1911, 1919, 1940); William Stephens, ed., Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry, Third Series of Publications of the Scottish History Society (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1930).

8. William Hakewell, "Memorials of the Method and Manner of Proceeding in Parliament, 1670," as quoted in Edward Porritt, The Unreformed House of Commons (New York, 1963), p. 536.

FIN-2

9. Goddard's account of the first Protectorate parliament runs from the beginning day, September 3, 1654, until December 18, 1654. The session ended January 22, 1655. The first session of the second Protectorate parliament was convened on September 17, 1656. Burton's account covers December 3, 1656--January 20, 1657, April 13, 1657--May 5, 1657, May 23, 1657--June 25, 1657. The session was adjourned on June 26. The diary covers the entire second session which met from January 20, 1658 to February 4, 1658.

10. Perez Zagorin, The Court and the Country (New York, 1970), pp. 1-119. He states (p. 74), "The Country was the first opposition movement in English history whose character transcended that of a feudal following or a faction." I add the term "broadbased" to eliminate the Puritan opposition under Elizabeth.

11. Ibid., p. 83.

12. J. G. H. Pocock, "Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the 18th Century," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII, 3d series (October, 1965), 571.

13. Burton, Diary, I, xxvi, 9/9/54.

14. Appendix,

15. For example, Edward Whalley, a woolen draper (DNB); John Barkstead, a goldsmith (DNB); James Berry, clerk in an iron works (DNB); Tobias Bridge, "a common dragoon in Yorkshire" (Burton, Diary, I, 331); Thomas Cooper, a shopkeeper or salter in Southwark; "A Second Narrative of a Late Parliament," in Harleian Miscellany, ed. by Thomas Parks, III (London, 1809), p. 483. ✓

16. David Underdown, "The Independents Again," Journal of British Studies, VIII, No. 1 (November, 1968), 83; George R. Abernathy, Jr., "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648-1663," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 55, Part 2 (1965), 22, for a description of the breakup of the presbyterian party during the Protectorate.

17. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 176.

18. J. H. Hexter, Reappraisals in History (New York, 1961), p. 18 n., pp. 163-164; George Yule, The Independents in the English Civil War (Cambridge, 1958), *passim*, especially pp. 45-46. Hexter's interpretation has been supported by the later works of Valerie Pearl, "Oliver St. John and the 'middle group' in the Long Parliament," English Historical Review, July, 1966, pp. 490-491, and David Underdown, Pride's Purge (Oxford, 1971), p. 64.

19. Pocock, "English Political Ideologies," p. 565, for the sterility of the Country ideology; Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics

FIN-3

in the Age of Anne (London, Melbourne and New York, 1967), pp. 65-108, and J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England, n. 155, n. for early eighteenth-century Whig and Tory policies.

20. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 406; Wilbur C. Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), III, 434; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 255. For plans to call a third parliament, Henry Cromwell to Broghill, 2/24/58, A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe (7 vols., London, 1742), ed. by Thomas Birch, VI, 820, as quoted in R. C. H. Catterall, "The Failure of the Humble Petition and Advice," American Historical Review, IX (October, 1903).

21. W. H. Greenleaf, Order, Empiricism and Politics (London, 1964), *passim*. Eighteenth-century parliamentary management is discussed by Sir Lewis Namier, England in the Age of the American Revolution (London, 1930), pp. 48-49, and Richard Pares, King George III and the Politicians (Oxford, 1953), p. 36.

I-1

CHAPTER I

THE COURT'S ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT

The most notorious event of the Protectorate parliaments--the exclusion of the recalcitrant members in 1656--has led to the impression that the Cromwellian Court had done little or nothing to ensure the election of men who could be relied on to support it. Nothing could be further from the truth. Both in 1654 and in 1656, the Court attempted in many ways to elect cooperative members. The new government had no firm philosophical justification for its existence and no legal justification whatever, having been improvised as a tentative solution in an unstable political situation, without adequate intellectual preparation for its establishment. The Court was therefore forced to place, if anything, undue emphasis upon political techniques. It never seems to have been wholly accepted by a majority of the electorate. The attempts to manipulate the voter, assiduous though they were, did not solve the basic problem--but they were made, and they were not wholly unsuccessful.

The techniques used in the two parliaments differed. In 1654, the Court relied primarily upon the electoral clauses of the Instrument of Government, hoping that the voters qualified under these provisions would be Court supporters. These clauses excluded all political and religious dissidents, remodeled the property qualifications of the English county franchise, reapportioned the English counties,

I-2

and brought into the House Irish and Scottish delegations selected in rigorously supervised elections. Only in the boroughs where the franchise was unchanged, did the Court, following tradition, manage in some cases to exert influence through the borough corporation. These methods failed to produce the desired results. Accordingly, in the next election in 1656, more directly political efforts, involving interference in both county and borough by Court-appointed officials, were employed. These efforts in the two elections were the mainstays of the Court's electoral management. They were supplemented by exclusions of undesirable members in both parliaments, by an organized attempt in 1658 to secure a good attendance of Court supporters, and by the establishment in 1658 of the Other House, a substitute for the House of Lords, designed as a counterpoise to the unreliable House of Commons.

Relying primarily upon the electoral provisions in 1654, the Court made no other concerted effort to win the elections and was only fitfully successful in electing its candidates. The reapportionment and the changed franchise in the English counties were designed to produce a substantial, independent voter who would support the Cromwellian Court. This voter, however, often supported the Country candidates who opposed the Court in Commons. In the boroughs, relying upon the cooperation of the governing bodies, the Court did somewhat better. The electoral provisions for Scotland and Ireland also produced good results. These countries, only recently conquered, were still under military government. A large section of the conquered population was disqualified from voting either for religious or political reasons. Elected under strict military supervision, the members from both countries

I-3

were, at least in 1654, loyal Court supporters.

Not enough members of the Court were elected under these new electoral arrangements to successfully support the Court legislative program. The Country drafted a constitution, which was never ratified and which embodied parliamentary supremacy. This the Court opposed, supporting recognition of the basic form of government in which the legislative power was shared by the Protector and parliament. In so doing, the Court members urged that the Protector have a larger share of power over both religious doctrine and the army. They advocated that the Protector be given a more powerful position in this constitution, with stronger powers of veto, dissolution, and pardon. They wished to retain the new £200 suffrage, prescribed in the Instrument of Government, which was designed to enfranchise supporters of the Lord Protector. They were in favor of a vigorous foreign policy and therefore supported a large army and were willing to vote for sufficient funds to support it. As far as can be discerned from the scanty sources, the members of the Court voted consistently to support this Court program.

The Court program was not enacted, simply because an insufficient number of its members were elected to this 1654-1655 parliament. Of 429 men who took their seats in the House, 183 were loyal members of the Court. The opposition consisted of 107 Country members and 31 republicans. Information in the parliamentary diary for this period is so meager that it is impossible to discern the political attitudes of the remaining 108 of the members. However, many of them must have been sympathetic to the opposition, for all the republicans

I-4

withdrew in the first month of the session and still the Court could not muster enough votes to defeat the Country opposition.¹

These results must have been a sad disappointment to the makers of the constitution, for this instrument had been designed not only to enfranchise the supporters of the Protectorate but the disqualify its enemies. Those who had fought against the parliamentary cause in the recent civil wars not only were forbidden to run for office, but were also disenfranchised. This category included those who had been hostile since January 1, 1641--unless they had since given some striking demonstration of loyalty--those who had aided in the Irish rebellion, and all Roman Catholics.²

The changes in the franchise and apportionment in the English counties were designed to produce a substantial, prosperous voter, independent of the aristocracy, which tended to be royalist in its sympathies. The framers of the constitution must have believed that these new voters would be the Court's natural constituency. Supporters of the parliamentary cause during the civil wars had come in great numbers from areas strongly Puritan in religion and specializing in commerce rather than agriculture. Their supporters in the counties were not apt to be retainers of some great landlord. The new franchise reflected the growth of these new interests in the country, whose wealth did not conform to the traditional property qualification or who lived in areas whose economic importance was not reflected in their parliamentary representation.

The new qualification for voting was property, personal or real, worth £200, rather than the traditional forty-shilling freehold. The

I-5

property requirement was raised; it was also changed to make acceptable property of a different kind. Its effect was to enfranchise such men as merchants, leaseholders, and "copyholders," men who held their land by dint of a feudal arrangement, whereby they paid a sum on succession which the landlord could raise at any time, provided that the property was worth £200. The traditional forty-shilling freehold was also a modification of a feudal arrangement, but in this case the estate passed without payment to the landlord from one generation to the next. In the early fifteenth century, when this franchise is first noted, the forty-shilling freeholder was probably fairly prosperous, but sixteenth- and seventeenth-century inflation had reduced the actual value of his property and increased the number of voters.

Contemporary observers agreed that the new voters were more politically independent than their predecessors had been. Prosperous county residents, whatever the source of their wealth, were enfranchised, while poorer men, whose franchise had been based on land held from a great landlord, lost their vote. Richard Baxter, a prominent Presbyterian clergyman, asserted that the smaller freeholder had been easily influenced, saying that they "ordinarily choose such as their landlords do desire them to choose." An anonymous pamphlet, written in 1654, praised the new franchise because it was no longer restricted to freeholders, whatever their degree of prosperity. Another, written in 1656, asserted that this property qualification would produce electors not only of better intellectual caliber, but also with a sufficient degree of prosperity to have a stake in the country.³

The changed county franchise was combined with a reapportionment

I-6

designed to lessen the influence of the aristocracy in the boroughs and enhance that of the substantial, independent voter. The number of county seats was increased from 90 to 259, and the borough seats dropped from 413 to 139. In the absence of contemporary comment, this drop can best be interpreted as an attempt to end the previous system of aristocratic patronage of the boroughs. By the seventeenth century, a seat in parliament had become coveted as a sign of political prestige and power. Since there were not enough county seats to go around, the landed gentry often represented the boroughs, and, to fulfill better the demand for seats, Queen Elizabeth, continuing a trend started by the early Tudors, had created thirty-one new boroughs. These had, at times, evolved into gifts from members of the aristocracy. The boroughs were thankful to be spared paying the expenses of their members and glad to be able to obtain favors in court through being represented by men with aristocratic connections.⁴

Another feature of the Protectorate reapportionment was an over-all change in the geographic apportionment of seats, designed to increase the power of the commercially important, traditionally Puritan areas. These areas, which paid the highest percentage of taxes, were given more representatives. The eastern counties, the political and economic center of Puritanism, gained in representation with the commercial coastal counties making the heaviest gains. In 1641, the eastern counties paid 37.8 per cent of the taxes and had fourteen representatives. This number was increased to twenty-one in 1654. The southwestern counties, which depended on trade with Catholic Europe, lost seats. In 1641, they paid 19.4 per cent of the taxes and had

I-7

28 representatives, which dropped to 16 in 1654. The northern counties, apt to be royalist in feeling, dropped from 62, or 12 per cent of the seats, to 43 or 9 per cent. They were still numerically over-represented, perhaps as a balance to the nonroyalist counties which were apt to be republican in sentiment. Moreover, in the large drop in borough seats, the southwest suffered a disproportionate loss, representation dropping from 108 to 23 seats, while in the eastern counties, the borough seats dropped only from 58 to 31.⁵

The theory behind these changes in the electoral provisions: the idea that representation to parliament should take into account the possession and distribution of personal as well as real property, had first appeared in the late 1640s. It is reflected in the provisions of the Puritan paper constitutions drawn up by the newly powerful army leadership. Although they are better known for their radical franchise proposals, two of these proposed constitutions, the "Heads of the Proposals" (August 1, 1647) and the second "Agreement of the People" (January 15, 1649) contain clauses that reflect a theory of reapportionment based on all taxable wealth.⁶ The "Heads of the Proposals" asked for a redistribution so that all counties might have a number of representatives "proportionable to the respective rates they bear," that "great counties" might have more members and "decayed or inconsiderable towns" fewer.⁷ Although the "Agreement of the People" ostensibly aimed at apportionment according to population, the triumph of the property idea may be seen in the increased representation given to the port towns, which benefited the new mercantile interests, and the general correlation between the proposed membership per county and the

I-8 county assessment totals.

These ideas directly influenced the framers of the Instrument of Government. Henry Ireton, the Lord Protector's son-in-law, who had a hand in the drawing up of the "Heads of the Proposals" was an associate of John Lambert, the principal framer of the Instrument of Government. Ireton was a staunch defender of representation based upon property, saying during the course of the Putney debates that the vote should be restricted to the prosperous voter who had "a permanent fixed interest in this kingdom."⁸ He originally drew up the "Heads of the Proposals," and the "Second Agreement" was a modified republican version of this first earlier document. Lambert had been associated with Ireton in drawing up an earlier proposal, the "Declaration of the Army," and was a member of the council of the army which amended the "Heads of the Proposals."⁹

The new county franchise had not produced outstanding results for the Court, and it would naturally be anticipated that the Country would have been in favor of its retention. Instead, during the course of both the Protectorate parliaments, the Country members pressed for the restoration of the traditional franchise. Two reasons may be suggested for this puzzling phenomenon: their traditional resistance to all constitutional innovation and their fear of the new politically conscious electorate.

The Country's political philosophy was rooted in a reverence for tradition. The Country members obsessively distrusted the power of the executive and consistently used precedent as a rationale for combating it. They revered what they termed the "ancient constitution,"

I-9

asserting that precedents--often relatively recent ones--extended far back into the dim past. Constitutional innovations, such as the new franchise, were therefore automatically suspect.

This attitude may well have been reenforced by hostility to the participation in politics of the prosperous voter, who was able to determine his own vote, free of gentry influence. It is difficult to prove this point, for the prosperous voters sometimes supported Country candidates. However, the leading landed families may well have regarded even the enfranchisement of such groups as a threat. Country members had always been chosen from these landed families, and county politics had been dominated by them. Lord Shaftesbury, active as a Country member during the Protectorate period as Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, called in the 1680s for a drastic reduction in the size of the electorate based upon a forty-shilling franchise. Moreover the electorate based upon the £200 franchise may well have been larger than has previously been thought, and the large groups that turned out at the polls, even if favorable to their candidacies, may well have seemed a disturbing factor to the Country leaders.

These large groups are a forerunner of the large, politically conscious group of voters, whom J. H. Plumb considers an important component of English politics from 1660 to 1715. In 1656, the Country candidates Sir Edward Harley in Hereford and Sir John Hobart in Norfolk received popular support when running against Court candidates. This must have been welcome, but must be balanced against the support given to republican candidates. A discussion of the 1656 election in Cheshire attributes the backing that John Bradshaw and Sir William Brereton

I-10

received to the fact that they were popular with a large group of voters who were all probably newly enfranchised. Large turnouts for republican candidates are described in the election of Henry Neville in Berkshire in 1656 and in Edmund Ludlow's tale of his opposition to Anthony Ashley Cooper in Wiltshire in both 1654 and 1656.

Owing to the Country opposition in the House, the £200 franchise was of short duration. The constitution, never implemented, framed by the Country in the course of the 1654-1655 parliament, would have restored the old franchise. The second Protectorate constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, which its members had a hand in drafting during the second Protectorate parliament, never mentioned the franchise. The £200 franchise was therefore dropped in favor of the old franchise in the elections to Richard Cromwell's parliament in 1658,¹⁰ which were held under the provisions of this new constitution.

The Court did very badly in the 1654 elections in the English counties, electing only 81 members out of 244. There were 83 known opposition members elected. Seventy-six of these were members of the Country and 7 were republicans. The political affiliations of 80 of the members remains undetermined. This defeat may be attributed both to the county voters' inclination toward the Country candidate who placed his faith in the "ancient constitution" and to the Court's lack of any concerted electoral effort. The majority of the substantial, independent voters, upon whom the Court had depended, were leery of the new constitution and had been frightened by many of the radical innovations proposed by the Nominated Parliament.¹¹ As a result of the Court's political inactivity, opposition members, who had formerly

I-11

represented boroughs, won seats in the counties. Both royalists and republicans were active. Caught between these two extremes and lacking any organization of its own, the Court was powerless to influence the results. The men who engaged in contests with the republicans were sometimes loyal followers of the Court, but others followed the Country line.

Opponents of the Protectorate, who had represented boroughs in the Long Parliament, were elected from the counties, rather than being eliminated, as had been hoped, when the number of borough seats were diminished. Forty-eight of the 244 county members had previously represented boroughs in the Long Parliament. At least 20 were known enemies of the Protectorate. Four were out-spoken republicans. Twelve either were excluded or protested against the exclusion of 1656. Two were to be well-known members of the opposition in the 1656 Parliament.¹²

Many letters were written to the Council of State by voters complaining that recently elected members were royalists and therefore disqualified to serve under the provisions of the Instrument of Government. These come from the southern and eastern parts of the country (Norfolk and Surrey), traditional centers of Puritanism, as well as from the traditionally royalist north and west (Hereford, Devonshire, and Wales). A letter written from Norwich to the Protector said that the Norfolk delegation was controlled by royalists, stating, "My lord, I humbly present to your highness the dissatisfaction of the well-affected in this county about the late election of knights. There be very few of the tenure we can confide in, and if the choice be in

I-12

other countyes, wee are like to be in a sad condition--the royall party--are perfect enemyes to your highnes as well as to us, and now they do lift up the head, and thinke al is their owne, because they have gott such men elected in this country [county] as they do desire."¹³ Colonel Robert Wood was castigated in a letter that came to the Council of State from Surrey, which said that "he is illegally chosen and is a derider of the people of God; is a profane swearer and of bad life--, has sided with the Cavaliers."¹⁴ Six justices of the peace, eight ministers and 201 others from Herefordshire signed a petition to the Council of State stating that Richard Read from the county and Bennet Hoskins from Hereford City were unworthy to be elected since they were "the worst sort of persons consisting of papists, malignants and men actually on arms for the late king."¹⁵ Similar complaints came from Wales. Sir John Price was accused of being a royalist in a petition from Montgomeryshire, and a petition from Merionethshire complained of the role of the sheriff in the election of John Vaughn. It stated that because of royalist influence the election was ordered by the sheriff in an inconvenient part of the county, that the candidate announced as defeated had actually been elected, but the sheriff falsified the results, refusing to announce the number of votes and counting them in "an obscure place."¹⁶

Evidence about the elections in 1654 is so scanty that even the identity of the opponents of these royalists is unknown, but some deductions can be made from extant information on contests waged against the republicans. Since the Court lacked any organization in the counties, it was powerless to influence these contests. Locally

I-13

important men, relying solely on their own influence, managed their own campaigns. The result was that, even when the republicans were defeated, sometimes the Country, rather than the Court, emerged victorious. The Court was wholly dependent on its local supporters.

Edward Montague's victory in Huntingdonshire in a contest against a republican proved to be a boon to the Court. A cousin of the Earl of Manchester and married to a daughter of the Earl of Warwick, Montague was in a position to exert local influence. There was considerable rioting at the hustings between his supporters and those of the republican regicide, Valentine Walton. Two of Montague's supporters reported that, when they were going up to vote, Walton's adherents struck them and that they would have been even more badly injured if their friends had not come to their rescue. Montague was to be one of the most consistent Protectorate supporters. He was in all the Protectorate councils of state, a strong supporter of kingship, and was to become an admiralty commissioner and then admiral of the fleet. He brought over the navy to the king at the Restoration and was rewarded with the title of Earl of Sandwich. His anti-republicanism was consistent; his appointment as admiral of the fleet was based on the specific task of purging radicals from the fleet, and he was soon on bad terms with Admiral Robert Blake, who was sympathetic to the republicans. The other Huntingdonshire members, Henry Cromwell, jr., the Lord Protector's cousin, and Stephen Phesant, were probably Montague's nominees.¹⁷

A republican defeat in Wiltshire, on the other hand, benefited the Country rather than the Court. Here, Anthony Ashley Cooper, the

I-14

future Earl of Shaftesbury, member of a wealthy landed family, headed a slate of Country members running against a group led by the republican, Edmund Ludlow. Ashley Cooper, although a member of the first Protectorate council of state, was soon to drop out and to go into opposition, and most members of his slate proved to be supporters of the Country.

Since Ludlow's memoirs are one of the main sources of information about this period, this election is well documented. There were two slates of ten candidates each. Ashley Cooper's slate was backed by cavaliers, clergy, lawyers, and the Court interest. Ludlow says that a large group of electors backed his slate at the poll at Stonehenge, but that the sheriff's influence tipped the balance in Ashley Cooper's favor. He describes the scene as follows, "The other party, finding mine greater than any of theirs when divided, unite in their first view for Sir. A. Cooper, whom the undersheriff on the view adjudged to be first chosen, though the party that appeared for me conceive themselves much injured therein."¹⁸

Ashley Cooper was able to enlist the support of the Presbyterian clergy, who favored the Country candidates. The Country backed their aims, which were to maintain the tithes and to call together an assembly of ministers who would formulate a compulsory religious creed. These clergymen aided Ashley Cooper by calling the members of Ludlow's slate anabaptists and levellers. When attacked for their part in the election, these clergymen denied their complicity, saying that the purpose of the attack was to slander Ashley Cooper.¹⁹

After being elected, Ashley Cooper and the other members of his slate espoused the most important Country doctrines. A few members of

I-15

the delegation supported the proposals to make Cromwell king, a usual Country position, but opposed most other Court measures. Several opposed any extension of the Lord Protector's powers. Alexander Thistlethwaite was against the wholesale confirmation by the parliament of the acts and ordinances that the council of state had promulgated before parliament had been convened. Thomas Grove did not want the Protector to have the power to define religious doctrine and favored cutting down the financial support of the army. Francis Hollis wanted to suspend the ordinance for ejecting unsatisfactory ministers and schoolmasters, because the Country wanted to introduce its own bill to the same purpose.²⁰ William Yorke criticized the "exorbitant and arbitrary powers" in the acts and ordinances "for relief of creditors and poor prisoners."²¹ Alexander Popham was not only excluded in 1656, but also maintained a standing flirtation with the royalists. Both James Ashe and Thistlethwaite protested the exclusion.²²

Ironically enough, the Court elected more members than its opponents in the English boroughs where the franchise was unchanged and did better there than in the counties where such great efforts had been made to produce a supportive electorate. The very nature of the borough franchise presented opportunities for political manipulation which were used by Court officials. Of the 134 borough representatives elected, 58 were members of the Court, 31 were of the Country, and 17 were republicans; the political affiliations of 28 remain undetermined.²³

The franchise used to elect these members varied according to the custom of the individual borough. In some boroughs, it was extended

I-16

to varying groups of citizens; in others it was confined to the officials of the corporation, the body which governed the town. In many, the franchise was disputed, the corporation endeavoring to prevent a larger group of citizens from exercising their franchise.

The governing corporation was therefore of great weight in determining the outcome of the elections. Evidence exists to show that the Court attempted to influence both the membership of these corporations and the attitudes of the members. As a result, government officials represented more than one-third of the boroughs. However these efforts were not always successful, and some corporations procured the elections of either republicans or royalists.

Two types of evidence exist that demonstrate how the Court took advantage of its influence with the borough corporations. The number of government officials representing the boroughs is too large to be coincidental. Accounts of elections in Reading, London, Leeds, and Great Yarmouth are replete with details illustrating Court interference.

The use of borough seats controlled by friendly corporations as safe spots for government officials was merely a continuation of an old custom. In the past, they had been used to provide places for friends and members of the nobility. Now 47 of the 58 Court seats were filled by government officials. Seven were members of the council of state, seven were government commissioners, eighteen were army officers, while fourteen held some other kind of government office. The steward of the Lord Protector's household also held a borough seat.²⁴

The franchise in Great Yarmouth, Leeds, and Reading was disputed, and members of the governing corporations elected Court candidates,

I-17

refusing to allow a larger body of citizens to participate in the elections. In Great Yarmouth, Colonel William Goffe and Thomas Dunne were chosen by the aldermen and the common council, although freemen who wanted a wider franchise chose two other representatives. In Leeds, although the seat was not contested, there was a dispute when the aldermen would not allow citizens outside the governing corporation to participate in the election. In Reading, the mayor and aldermen chose a prominent member of the Court as their representative, although a majority of the other citizens preferred the opposing candidate.²⁵

The Reading franchise had been in dispute since the 1640s, and a Court group in the corporation took advantage of this situation to elect a Court candidate. Citizens who paid taxes for the relief of the poor wished to exercise the franchise, but the corporation was adamant and refused to allow these citizens to participate. In 1654, the corporation elected Colonel Robert Hammond, a close friend of the Lord Protector, although the majority of the disenfranchised electors wished to have Colonel Robert Castle, a Country candidate, as their representative. The mayor refused to poll these voters, saying that the corporation had the sole power to choose the borough's representative.

Colonel Hammond may have been able to influence the outcome of this election, himself, since he held the office of High Steward. In Reading, it was customary for this official to have a hand in harmony with the corporation in the choosing of the representatives to parliament. This office derived from the medieval office of the Lord High Steward, who was originally a lawyer, holding court first

I-18

for the lord of the manor and then for the corporation. By the seventeenth century, the functions of the office had become divided. The High Steward was an honorary official, usually an influential man appointed by the corporation so that the borough would have a friend at court, while the Steward or Recorder was a barrister who was the corporation's chief legal adviser.

Hammond was doubtless appointed to this position both because of his impeccable Court connections and because he had local ties, having acted as the town's parliamentary governor during the civil wars. Besides being an intimate of the Lord Protector, he was related to the Earl of Essex and had married John Hampden's daughter. He was well known for his service in the late 1640's as the jailer of Charles I at Carisbrooke Castle.²⁶

London, less susceptible to Court influence than Reading since it had a wider franchise, elected six representatives to parliament. These were elected at Common Hall from a slate. The voters included not only the governing corporation, but also all the liverymen in the city, who numbered about 4,000 at the time. The position on which candidates were listed on the slate could be crucial in determining such elections. In 1654, six were selected out of forty-seven nominated, and the first two listed on the slate were the Court candidates. It has been suggested by Paul J. Pinckney that this arrangement indicates that there was a coalition of government opponents, after the Court candidates were elected, but it may equally well show a coalition of Country and Court, banded together against the royalists.

In London, the Court was forced to compromise with the Country,

I-18a

in order for each group to elect its own candidates and thus diminish the influence of the royalists. In 1654 two Court supporters, Thomas Foote and William Steele, were chosen, as well as two Country members, Samuel Avery and Andrew Riccard, and two royalist sympathizers, Sir Thomas Adams and Alderman John Langham. Foote and Steele were to be leading Protectorate supporters.

A protest against the outcome of the 1654 election plus the eventual exclusion of the royalists indicates the unsatisfactory nature of the compromise. Robert Tichburne, one of the more radical aldermen, angry both at the failure of his own candidacy and at the election of the royalists, refused to sign their indenture of election. His business partners successfully petitioned the council of state saying that Adams's and Langham's political sympathies disqualified them from serving as members of parliament under the provisions of the Instrument of Government.²⁷

Although, as we have seen, the Court generally benefited from the sympathetic support of the borough corporations, there is evidence to prove that in some cases royalist and republican candidates were the recipients of this support. Various complaints to the council of state assert that these candidates were unfairly favored by borough officials. Protests against the election of royalist candidates came from Peterborough, Barnstaple, and Bristol. A petition from Peterborough successfully contested the election of Hum. Orme, described as favoring cavaliers, "a swearer, drunkard and quarreller." It stated that Major Alexander Blake, "a person of known integrity," had been elected, although the borough officials had announced that Orme was the victor.²⁸

I-19

Blake was seated and later held a government post worth £300 a year.²⁹ In contrast, a petition from Barnstaple failed to unseat Colonel Robert Shapcote, described as a friend of the late king and an associate of the cavaliers. It implied that the election of Major John Blackmore, described by the Lord Protector as "a godly man and a good soldier"³⁰ had been nullified by the borough officials' permitting the intrusion of disqualified royalist voters. Colonel Shapcote's reputation was always somewhat shaky. A pamphlet entitled "The Speech of Col. Shapcott, Knight of Devonshire," which he denied writing, attacked the Lord Protector, stating that if England were to have a king, Charles II would be preferable to Cromwell. From Bristol, a petition was forwarded to the council protesting the election of Robert Aldworth and Alderman Miles Jackson. It stated that the mayor and sheriffs favored the royalists, abused the Court candidates, and refused to allow some of those duly qualified to vote. Jackson had a royalist background; he had signed the engagement to Charles I and had protested serving under the Earl of Essex.³¹

There are reports of two troubled elections in Norwich and Southwark in which borough officials were reported to have favored republican candidates. In both cases the republicans were elected.

In Norwich, internal dissension in the corporation worked to the advantage of the republican, John Hobart. Hobart was backed by the mayor and aldermen who controlled the sheriffs, while his opponent, Colonel Charles George Cocke, was supported by the steward. According to a petition to the council of 123 citizens, requesting the confirmation of Cocke's election, he had already won the election, when the

I-20

sheriffs proclaimed that all the freemen might come and vote in another place. The sheriffs spared no efforts to publicize this second election, taking the unusual step of employing trumpets and bellmen. Cocke was then forced to stand for election again, this time against Hobart, whom the petition describes as a "stranger." It further states that at this second election, many unqualified voters, including, "the disaffected, with a crew of hostlers, tapsters, etc., some no freemen, with many indigent people"³² were permitted to vote. By this time, many of Cocke's supporters had left, and the sheriffs proclaimed Hobart's victory. Hobart was especially opposed by the Court in the 1565 election and was then excluded from the House.

A petition from Southwark claimed that the election of the republicans, Samuel Highland and Robert Warcup, was due to the influence of the bailiff, Warcup's father. It stated that the hall in which the election was held was crowded with their republican supporters. When rain drove their opponents, who were standing outside, away, the bailiff closed the poll and declared the republicans elected.³³

In contrast to these confused results, the managed elections in Scotland and Ireland produced a solid body of Court supporters. In 1656, dissension within the Court itself was to mar the unquestioning loyalty of these delegations, but in 1654 all their members provided support for Court legislation. The distribution and number of representatives had been left to the Lord Protector and his council, and in ordinances promulgated in 1654, thirty were allotted and distributed to each. Since both countries were under English military rule, military influence was evident in their election.

I-21

This influence is shown in the choice of places of election for groups of burghs and shires in Scotland which were specified in the Protector's ordinance of June 27, 1654. These places all coincided with army garrisons except for Lauder, the place of election for the eastern border group, and there English troops were not far away.³⁴ The need for military control is shown by a statement of the Lord Protector's of November 23, 1654, "In general, the country [Scotland] was wholly very much disaffected to the present government. The Presbyterian and Cavalier interests were so complicated, as he did not see how any forces there could be lessened with any safety."³⁵

Few native Scottish citizens were qualified either to vote or to run for office. Since the Scottish burghs or towns had not held municipal elections since 1652, English commissions had appointed their magistrates and councils, who were instrumental in choosing the members of parliament.³⁶ According to Bulstrode Whitelocke, a prominent Protectorate supporter, "Five Sherifffdoms in Scotland returned, that not one fit to be a Parliament-man, was to be found within their Liberty."³⁷ A letter from an army officer, Captain R. Baynes, states that in the election for the shires of Aberdeen, Bamfe, and Cullen, inquiries revealed that no one was qualified to vote. There were no representatives from these shires in 1654, and Baynes concludes, "I believe this will be the result of most parts of Scotland." He also enclosed an account of "our diligence in doing what have been incumbent on our parts as Sheriffs," showing that in Scotland, as well as England, the office of sheriff was used for political purposes.³⁸

Since the franchise was limited to government supporters and

I-22

the country was under military control, the Scottish delegation was composed of English officials and their Scottish supporters. Of the thirty seats allotted to Scotland by the Instrument, nine were not filled. Of the twenty-one representatives, nine were English. Five of these, Colonels William Mitchell, Thomas Read, James Earl, John Okey and Major Jeremy Tollhurst were army officers stationed in Scotland. Four of the Englishmen, George Smith, John Thompson, Samuel Desborough, and George Downing, held government office, as well as three of the twelve native Scots, Colonels David Barclay and William Lockhart as well as Sir James MacDowell. A cooperative delegation was assured.³⁹

Military influence was also paramount in Ireland. Conditions there were so unsettled that the Lord Protector considered suspending elections and having the representatives appointed. A letter of May 9, 1654 from Cromwell to Charles Fleetwood, the commander-in-chief in Ireland, asked advice about the method of conducting elections. Cromwell stated that since the distribution of the thirty members of parliament and the method of their election was left to him by the Instrument of Government, he wished Fleetwood to consider with the commissioners governing Ireland the distribution and method of election, asking "whether you conceive any places or parts in Ireland to be capable of electing members themselves and if [so] under what qualifications, or whether the present condition of affairs be not such as that particular persons be called by writ for the next Parliament." Edmund Ludlow, the republican, who had already resigned as Civil Commissioner to protest against the establishment of the Protectorate, but was still continuing his military duties, states that some of the Commissioners wanted

I-23

Cromwell and the Council of State to name the Irish members. Ludlow writes that he was opposed to this and persuaded them to allow elections.⁴⁰ A "private junto" was held by Fleetwood which agreed on the nominees, and they had no difficulty having them elected, because they had named the "sheriffs and other officers for that purpose."⁴¹

As in Scotland, the provisions of the Instrument of Government limited the franchise and dictated the election of government supporters. The successful candidate in counties Kildare and Wicklow received only fifty-eight votes. Of the thirty representatives, twenty-four were English army officers stationed in Ireland. Two of them, John Hewson and Sir Hardress Waller, were regicides. Another, Ralph King, helped Henry Cromwell with administrative duties. Four, Sir John Temple, Vincent Gookin, Sir Charles Coote, and Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, were younger sons of prominent Anglo-Irish families who held either military or civil office with the English government.⁴²

Lacking from the first the numerical strength essential to success, the Court was not able to maintain control of the proceedings of the 1654-1655 parliament. After the republicans hindered the execution of all parliamentary business during the opening week, the Lord Protector, by a show of military force, made obligatory the taking of an oath to support the basic form of government, as prescribed in the constitution. The republicans refused to take this oath and withdrew from the House, but the Country members remained and, working within the framework of the constitution, prescribed changes that were so inimical to the Court program that the session was dissolved in January, 1655, after less than five months.

I-24

The Lord Protector, forewarned by this experience, was reluctant to call another parliament, and said afterwards that he did so only because his top military officials assured him that a sufficient number of Court supporters would be elected. These assurances proved to be correct; for a majority of the 449 members elected in 1656, 240 members, were supporters of the Court. There were 140 Country members and 29 republicans; the affiliations of 40 remain undetermined.

The dominant Court majority of this body consistently supported the Court program until a difference of opinion as to whether the Lord Protector should assume the crown divided its membership. Cardinal features of this program were support of the exclusion of dissident members and of a substantial military budget. When the Court split, its civilian members, cooperating with the members of the Country who had not been excluded, drew up a new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, which contained the same Court doctrines that had been manifested in the 1654-1655 parliament: increased power to the Protector and an assured military budget.

The successful outcome for the Court in these 1656 elections was the result of assiduous efforts to elect a more amenable body rather than rely as in 1654 on the new franchise. These efforts have been described in detail in Paul J. Pinckney's dissertation, and only selected topics will be dealt with here. In 1655, the Lord Protector had appointed a group of sixteen major-generals to keep order in the countryside, and these men soon assumed political functions. Under their auspices, local officials were appointed who would support Court parliamentary candidates. Many boroughs received new charters that would

I-25

ensure their support of the Protectorate. The members of parliament who represented the universities of Cambridge and Oxford were elected by small bodies of Court supporters and were always loyal Court officials. Important Court officials often ran in several constituencies, thus ensuring their election to the House. Even when there was no grant of a new charter or multiple candidacy, it will be seen that the Court was often heavily involved in borough politics, so as to make sure that loyal local officials would support Court parliamentary candidates.

The Court, however, refused to be satisfied with the majority that was the result of these efforts. Perhaps because there was usually a sparse attendance in the House, the Court members were uncertain about dominating the proceedings. The means were available to make the newly elected House more docile. The Lord Protector had made it a condition of the convening of this parliament that all members seated should be certified as trustworthy by the council of state. Approximately one hundred men who were unable to meet this requirement were immediately excluded, among them the most recalcitrant figures in both the Country and republican oppositions. The compliant body that finally met in 1656 was, therefore, the result of both the electoral management and the exclusion tactics that have been described above.⁴³

The appointment of the major-generals in 1655 in response to royalist uprisings afforded the Court a perfect opportunity to supervise the local political situations more closely and plan for the election of its own candidates. Under their auspices, men who would support the Protectorate were appointed to the offices of sheriff and

I-26

justice of the peace. Efforts were made to make sure that the borough corporations would be composed of Protectorate supporters. New charters were granted so that only men loyal to the Protectorate could exercise the franchise. To ensure the election of loyal members of parliament, the major-generals were active in the selection of candidates. All of them were members of the second Protectorate parliament, and so as to make certain that they would be elected, many were candidates in several places simultaneously.

It was originally planned that these men would assume mainly military functions. Following the suppression of Penruddock's Rising, a royalist insurrection in Wiltshire in March of 1655 and other abortive risings in the west of England, it was imperative to keep an alert military force present throughout the country; yet the financial problems of the Protectorate made it necessary to reduce the size of the army. The solution was the formation of local militia forces, made up of volunteer supporters, financed by the decimation tax, a capital levy on all former royalists. These groups were forced into eleven associations of counties, each under the command of a major-general, sometimes assisted by a deputy. They were headed by Charles Fleetwood and John Lambert, committed Protectorate supporters.

The major-generals were a close-knit group. Charles Fleetwood, John Desborough, Edward Whalley, and William Goffe were related by family connections to the Lord Protector. James Berry, Desborough, and William Packer, one of Fleetwood's deputies, all had commanded troops in Cromwell's original Ironsides regiment. Thomas Kelsey had been the lieutenant-colonel in the regiment of Richard Ingoldsby, a

I-27

cousin of Cromwell. John Barkstead had been in command of the regiment that guarded parliament and the City in 1650, and was governor of the Tower in 1652. Robert Lilburne, a brother of "Honest John," had been a regicide. Philip Skippon had been commander in chief of the London militia during the second Civil War. All were known personally to Cromwell as officers. They had burnt their boats politically and were wholehearted supporters of the Protectorate.

The major-generals performed an essential task in assisting the council of state to appoint local officials who would be loyal to the Court. It has been seen that the lack of men who could perform this function hindered the Court's electoral efforts in 1654, and, in assuming it in 1656, the major-generals were merely performing a duty that had always been essential. Before 1640 these local political tasks had been performed by the lord lieutenant of the county. This royal office, abolished by the Long Parliament, is first seen under the Tudors and also had its origin in military needs. Local magnates, closely connected with the Court, had been responsible for the organization and command of the militia, and under the supervision of the privy council took a leading part in local government and politics. This Tudor method of government persisted during the Protectorate,⁴⁴ despite the opinion of the modern historian J. H. Plumb, that these methods of managing the localities were "submerged by the Commonwealth."⁴⁵

Evidence about the appointment of justices of the peace in Sussex also illustrates the Court's determination, after the experiences of 1654, to prevent Country candidates from assuming power. Justices of the peace were appointed by the council of state around the same

I-28

time that the major-generals took office. Many were personally appointed by members of the council, and in Sussex Major-general Goffe tried to find out which gentlemen would most loyally support the Court. A letter he wrote to John Thurloe, the secretary of the council, is particularly enlightening, since some of the men discussed were members of parliament with whose politics we are acquainted.

Goffe states that "this business must lie upon the middle sort of men";⁴⁵ so that he did not recommend Colonel Herbert Morley, who spoke well but did not seem to want to take office, William Hay, who had been inactive, or Sir John Fagge, who was under Morley's influence. Morley and Fagge were brothers-in-law. Morley was one of the leading members of the Country, acting as opposition teller eight times during the 1654-1655 session. He was the Country leader in Sussex, and Goffe states that he "rules the roost by the help of a disaffected party."⁴⁷ Fagge demonstrated his opposition to the Court when he cast the deciding vote against a recognition of the establishment of the Other House. Both were excluded from the 1656 parliament. Hay was also a relative of Morley. Morley wrote to the corporation of Sandwich, before the 1656 election, recommending him for the vacant position of member of parliament for Sandwich, in opposition to the choice of Major-general Kelsey.⁴⁸ Goffe obviously knew who the opponents of the Court were. Appointments as justices of the peace went to Anthony Shirley, a "very honest gentleman,"⁴⁹ Sir John Stapely, son of the regicide, Anthony, and among others, Goffe, himself.

The Court exercised the same kind of care in selecting sheriffs who would loyally support their candidates. It has been seen by the

I-29

accounts of the elections in Merionethshire, Bristol, Norwich, and Wiltshire that the sheriff could exert a deciding influence in the election. With the abolition of the lord lieutenancies, the sheriff may have come to exert increased importance in influencing elections. If so, it was a return to past practice. In the first part of the sixteenth century before the office of lord lieutenant had been established, the sheriff had been the crown's chosen instrument to exert local influence at election time;⁵⁰ and Cromwell was following the royal pattern.

As early as November, 1654, there were indications that the Court was taking a hand in the effort to find amenable sheriffs. Whitelocke discusses the process, reporting that "The Protector and his Council considered of the Nominations of new sheriffs in the several counties." He mentioned "A List published of the several sheriffs for England and Wales agreed on by the Protector and his Council."⁵¹ Careful consideration must have been given to the selection of these men; for in the "Public Intelligencer" of November 24-December 1, 1655, it was stated that the list of sheriffs was complete, but in the issue of December 17-24, it was said that it was again up for revision.⁵²

How essential this task was of replacing hostile sheriffs and their assistants is demonstrated by the circumstances surrounding the appointment of new sheriffs in Middlesex in 1657. In 1656, as described by Paul F. Pinckney, the sheriffs had failed to keep order at the polls, and hostile crowds almost succeeded in manhandling the Court candidates. A contemporary letter reports, "It is certeyne that Mr. Kiffin, who stood and carried it in Middlesex, with all his company had been cut in pieces, if the soldiers had not been at hand to rescue them, the country people

I-30

fell upon them pelmel, cryeing out, Noe Anabaptist, very many were wounded."⁵³ As a result, in 1657, members of the council, one of whom was Colonel Philip Skippon, major-general in charge of the London area, met with the sheriffs of Middlesex to consult concerning the appointment of under-sheriffs, always appointed by the sheriffs, for the coming year.⁵⁴

In this 1656 election, three Protectorate supporters had contended with an opposition coalition. The Court ran a committed slate of supporters: Colonels William Kiffen and John Barkstead and Sir William Roberts. Kiffen was an anabaptist, who nevertheless was a loyal supporter of the Court. In 1653, he advised his baptist friends in Ireland to accept the Protectorate. He was a merchant of wool cloth, who traded with Holland on his own rather than in conjunction with the Merchant Adventurers, and his loyalty to the Court may have been due to special favors that made his independent trading ventures possible. Barkstead was the major-general of Middlesex and Lieutenant of the Tower; he was one of the commissioners for suppressing the printing press, and was castigated in a republican tract, "a Liar, one that deals more injuriously to the people." Roberts was a London merchant who held the post of commissioner for appeals in excise in 1654 and who from 1656 on was an auditor of the exchequer.

The opposition slate was composed of two members of the Country: Chaloner Chute and Richard Browne, and two republicans, Sir James Harrington and Josiah Berners. Chute, "the Lawier," was the son of the Speaker of Richard Cromwell's Parliament, who was excluded from the 1656 Parliament. Sir Richard Browne was a convinced member of the

I-31

presbyterian party in the 1640s. In 1648, he had been an alderman and sheriff of London, according to Clarendon "a great name and interest in the city and with all the presbyterian party."⁵⁵ In 1648, he was accused of plotting with the Scots, deprived of office and imprisoned for five years. He was excluded from the 1656 Parliament. Sir James Harrington (not the author of Oceana)¹ was known to have republican leanings. He acted as a commissioner at the trial of the king, refusing to sign the death warrant, was associated with Edmund Ludlow, Sir Arthur Haslerig, and Thomas Scott in Henry Neville's suit in August, 1656, against the Berkshire sheriff for allegedly unfair dealings in the elections of that month in Berkshire, and had been a member of the Rump Council of State. Josiah Berners was the sympathetic correspondent after the exclusion of his cousin John Hobart, who had been elected in Norwich in 1656 with the support of sectarian groups.⁵⁶

In order to find sheriffs loyal and wealthy enough to fulfill the demands of the office, the major-generals sometimes waived the legal requirements. Often hindered by their lack of acquaintance with the localities to which they were stationed, they sometimes appointed men who were serving as members of parliament and/or who lived in counties other than those to which they were appointed: both forbidden by law.

The financial requirements of the office had always made it necessary for a sheriff to be a wealthy man. Expenses were incurred on entry into office, in entertaining judges and country gentry at the assizes, and in the process of accounting into the exchequer.⁵⁷ Major-general Berry, bearing this consideration in mind, wrote as follows from

I-32

Worcester: "Mr. Turvey is a man of estate and would willingly be honored with the imployment of sherife and they think he may be lead, if any would undertake that worke."

A fifteenth-century statute, requiring that the sheriff reside in the county in which he served, was sometimes overlooked. Although "Thomas Foley, esq., had noe house or conveniency in the countrey," he was appointed as sheriff of Worcester by Berry because he was "an honest man."⁵⁸ Political considerations had always been uppermost in the enforcement of this statute, which had never been strictly observed until the Parliament of 1625-1626. At that time, Walter Long, a Puritan member, had been heavily fined in Star Chamber, because he did not live in the county in which he was sheriff.

Also circumvented was a fourteenth-century statute, embedded in the writs of election, which forbade members of parliament to serve as sheriffs. The importance of this double position is attested to by a victory of the Country in 1675, at which time it was declared a breach of privilege for a member also to be a sheriff. The original statute, never strictly enforced until 1626, was used in that year for political purposes when Charles I tried to exclude six of the most troublesome opposition members, including Sir Edward Coke, by appointing them to the post of sheriff. This apparently rankled in the breasts of the opposition; for in the 1654 parliament, a recommendation was made that a sheriff could be elected to parliament, as long as he did not sit for his own county. This was never put into effect, but the Court continued to countenance its adherents acting as sheriffs.

Several Protectorate members of parliament were sheriffs. Doubts

I-33

existed about this situation in 1654, for when Colonel Thomas Fitch was elected member from Carlisle, the mayor wrote to the Protector asking whether the election was legal in view of Fitch's other position of sheriff. Fitch served as member from Carlisle city in 1654 and from Inverness in 1656. Anthony Nichol, member from Cornwall, was the sheriff of the county. His assumption of the post demonstrates the Court's willingness to use its former opponents in the post if they conformed to the present regime. He had been a leader of the presbyterian party in the Long parliament, yet now he assisted Desborough in his task of governing the southwest and wielded power as the sheriff of the region.⁵⁹ Sir Thomas Pride, known for his part in Pride's purge, was sheriff of Surrey, and member for Ryegate, a Surrey town, in 1656. The Court attempted to use the influence of his office to defeat a Country candidate in 1656. Sir Richard Onslow, member for Surrey in both Protectorate parliaments, reported that he was elected, although Colonel Pride as sheriff, worked against him, having "had instructions to put him by from being returned."⁶⁰ Colonel Wroth Rogers, governor of Hereford during the civil wars, member in the 1656 parliament, was the sheriff in this county in both 1655 and 1656. Sir Edward Harley, one of the excluded members of the 1656 parliament, accused Rogers of bias in favor of the Court in the 1656 election and described his role in the following way: "The greatest number who were near the Sheriff when he declared Berry, etc. to be chosen, were servants to the Sheriff and soldiers."⁶¹

In spite of these waivers of the legal requirements, it was still difficult to find "suitable" men. Members of parliament were

I-34

aware of the problem as early as December, 1654, when a committee of the House was formed to consider how the offices of sheriff and under-sheriff could be made less burdensome.⁶² No solutions were found. In some cases, the major-generals, seeking loyal men, were not well enough acquainted with the local political situation. Berry wrote from Worcester, "For Haslewood, I cannot yet find any that knowes him."⁶³ From Chichester, Goffe lamented, "I am very much a stranger in these counties--and therefore I fear I shall not answer the expectation of his highness in giving information concerning the high sheriff fitt to be rested upon." Even when they knew the candidates in question, the problem still remained, Haynes writing from Suffolk, "The lists of sherriffs you sentt will be no meanes hold proportion with those quallifications you intemate. There is but one of all the four countyes I have relation to who is like to answer expectation--. Indeed, sir, its very difficult to finde fitt persons." And Boteler from Bedford, "I cannot sattisfie myself to offer any gentleman to be high shreefe.--I confesse I should be very gladd an honest man in every county were found for that service."⁶⁴

As was said earlier, to assure the election of members of parliament who would support the Court, as well as attempting to appoint loyal officials, the major-generals and other prominent officials often were candidates themselves in two or more constituencies. If such a candidate was successful in more than one place, either another loyal man could be nominated and elected for the vacant spot or the seat could be left vacant, which precluded an opponent from occupying it. In several cases, these members of the Court were candidates in boroughs

I-35

where decisive efforts had been made, either by a change in the charter or by involvement of prominent Court officials in local politics, to assure a majority for the Court.

Among the major-generals, James Berry ran for Worcestershire, Herefordshire, and Monmouthshire, all parts of the association he commanded, and chose to sit in Worcestershire. In Herefordshire, he was elected, as noted above, by the armed intervention of Wroth Rogers, serving both as sheriff and as member of parliament. In Monmouthshire, his place was taken by Nathaniel Waterhouse, the steward of the Lord Protector's lands, a place of great profit. The Herefordshire place was left vacant.⁶⁵

The final outcome of the multiple candidacies of Major-generals Charles Fleetwood and Thomas Kelsey, who ran, respectively, in Marlborough and Norfolk, and Dover and Guilford, reflects a division of opinion that took place among the members of the Court in 1657. Angered by attempts to crown the Lord Protector, the military members of the Court went into opposition. One way in which they demonstrated their hostility was disapproval of the regime of Henry Cromwell, the Lord Protector's son in Ireland. They patronized the republican army officers who were opposed to this administration. All signs point to the fact that Fleetwood and Kelsey gave the seats, which they had won, but did not choose to fill, to two of these officers, Colonels John Hewson and Jerome Sankey.

Fleetwood's hostility was no doubt aggravated by the fact that he had been replaced as commander-in-chief in Ireland by Henry Cromwell. Fleetwood had been entrusted with the task of establishing internal

I-36

security in 1652 at the end of organized resistance in Ireland, and he had earned the reputation of being lenient to the anabaptists and republicans. And so the Lord Protector, faced with the difficulties of conciliating people of Country sympathies who were antagonistic to these extremist groups, brought Fleetwood back to England, leaving his son Henry Cromwell in command.

The new commander was left in a difficult situation. Many of his officers, who had republican and anabaptist sympathies, were hostile to him and favored Fleetwood. After first trying unsuccessfully to placate them, Cromwell resolved to oust them. All signs point to the fact that he exerted his influence to keep some of these officers who had served as members in the 1654 parliament from representing Ireland in 1656. Among them were Hewson and Sankey, who in 1656 represented constituencies in England that were given up by Fleetwood and Kelsey.⁶⁶

Both these officers were associated with these extremist groups and were hostile to the Court. Sankey was a leader of the anabaptist group, characterized by a contemporary as "the most violent anabaptist of any army officer."⁶⁷ He was on intimate terms with Fleetwood, being related to him by marriage, and a republican tract reported that he "lives much in Fleetwood's house."⁶⁸ Henry Cromwell distrusted him, saying, "I have been so bitten by him, that I must treat him with care and circumspection." Hewson, a regicide who had signed the king's death warrant, organized a petition on Fleetwood's departure from Ireland, begging for his return. A prominent member of the Court characterized him as "an unquiet and dividing spirit."⁶⁹ Henry Cromwell

I-37

was correct in his estimate of these officers, for from their English seats they opposed the Court during the parliamentary session.

Resigning his Marlborough seat to Sankey, Fleetwood chose to represent Norfolk, perhaps because he thought he could mitigate a situation there which boded badly for the Court. He may have hoped to use his influence with Sir John Hobart, the Country boss of the county, who for some incomprehensible reason favored Fleetwood. The Court badly needed any help it could get, for it won only two out of the ten county seats, Fleetwood and the other Court supporter coming in last.⁷⁰ This was in spite of the strong support of the deputy major-general, Hezekiah Haynes, who reported that the results were, "as bad as it could well have bin made, my lord deputie and Colonell Wood excepted."⁷¹

The reasons that prompted Kelsey to give up the Guilford seat he had won to Hewson and sit for Dover were perhaps similar. Dover was also a trouble seat for the Court. At the time of the 1656 elections, the candidacy of George Cony, central figure in an important suit against the government in 1654, caused unrest. Kelsey recommended that Cony be excluded from parliament.⁷²

In Wales, high Court officials engaged in this game of musical chairs with their parliamentary seats. Colonel Philip Jones, a member of the council of state, comptroller of the Lord Protector's household and one of his most trusted councillors, won seats in Brecon and Glamorgan and then turned the seat in Brecon over to Robert Nicholas, a judge. John Glynn, Lord Chief Justice of the Upper Bench, ran for Carnarvonshire and Flintshire. When he chose to sit for Flintshire, his place was taken by Henry Lawrence, Lord President of the council

I-38

of state and a relation of the Lord Protector, who then gave up Colchester to take the Wales seat.⁷³

Other shifts of seats took place throughout the country. Edward Salmon, an admiralty commissioner, chose Scarborough, Yorkshire, where he was military governor, over a Scottish group of boroughs including Dumfries. He was elected in Dumfries through the intervention of Lord Broghill, lord president of the council in Scotland. Since his place in Scotland was taken by Thomas Talbot, an army colonel, Talbot was presumably also acceptable to Broghill. William Sydenham, member of the council of state, chose to sit for Dorsetshire, rather than the Isle of Wight, perhaps because the Isle was already safely represented by Captain Thomas Bowreman, its military deputy governor. Two officeholders of the central government, Roger Hill and William Lawrence, then took his place.⁷⁴ An effort to weaken the influence of Sir Arthur Haslerig, the republican leader who had dominated the 1654 Northumberland delegation, may be behind the appearance in this delegation in 1656 of two prominent members of the Court, Sir Thomas Widdrington, speaker of the 1656 parliament and Walter Strickland, a member of the council of state. Widdrington, a member of an old Northumbrian family, chose to represent Northumberland rather than York city--a clear example of the Court's use of its own prominent adherents in areas in which they had local influence. Haslerig was replaced in neighboring Newcastle upon Tyne by Strickland. The corporation of this town, perhaps at Strickland's instigation, refused to let Haslerig represent them again, saying, "they intend to choose some other to serve for them."⁷⁵ In spite of this effort of Widdrington

I-39

and Strickland to control the local political situation, the other Northumberland city and county members probably remained under Haslerig's influence. Colonel George Fenwick, his son-in-law, the member from Berwick-upon-Tweed, was excluded from the 1656 parliament and then deprived of his regiment and governorships. The other two members were William and Robert Fenwick, probably related to George. Widdrington's place in York city was taken by a local supporter of the Court, John Geldart, a local alderman and merchant who was both a militia commissioner and a commissioner for ejecting scandalous ministers.⁷⁶

Members of the Lord Protector's family also had double candidacies, assuring their presence in the House. John Claypole, his son-in-law, ran in both Northamptonshire and Carmarthonshire and chose to sit for the former, where at election time, he had benefited by Major-general Boteler's activities. Colonel John Jones, the Protector's brother-in-law, ran for both Denbighshire and Merionethshire in Wales. His place in the former was taken by another active member of the military, Colonel Lunely (Simon) Thelwall.⁷⁷ Richard Cromwell, the Protector's younger son, won seats in both Hampshire and Cambridge University and chose to sit for the university, replacing his brother, Henry, who had held this seat in 1654 and was now serving in Ireland. Correspondence of Major-general Goffe, who commanded in the Southampton area, reveals that Richard Cromwell, who had local connections there, exerted his influence during the 1656 election. In the spring preceding the election, he was concerned about the situation in Southampton, where the borough corporation was

I-40

hostile to the Court; Goffe wrote, "My Lord Richard Cromwell and Mr. Major are very sensible of the wicked spirit of the magistrates and do judge it absolutely necessary that something be done against this."⁷⁸ Richard Major, a local magnate, was Cromwell's father-in-law, and a member of the council of state. The Protector's son was concerned about county as well as borough politics, discussing the choice of candidates in July with the grand jurors. After the election, Goffe's hard-won victory was attributed partially to Cromwell's support.⁷⁹

Several of these multiple candidacies involved interference by prominent Court officials, who had political influence in the boroughs in which the elections took place, with the membership of the governing corporations. It will be recalled that in 1654 the Court was more successful in the boroughs than in the counties, because in several cases the members of the corporation kept the franchise in their own hands and supported Court candidates. In 1656, no longer leaving these matters to chance, the Court deliberately interfered in borough affairs. In Reading, the appointment of a prominent Court official as High Steward was followed by changes in the membership of the corporation and the consequent victory of a major-general, who was running in two constituencies. In Southampton, a long history of local intransigence was followed in 1655 by the dismissal of the mayor and two other members of the borough corporation, after interference by Richard Cromwell and John Lisle, another prominent Protectorate official. In two of the boroughs in which the candidates were also running in another area, high Court officials instigated grants of new charters, in accordance with a clear policy of

I-41

borough charter manipulation which the Court employed.

Major-general John Barkstead was a candidate in both Middlesex and Reading. In Middlesex, as described above, he used armed intervention to obtain victory for himself and his ticket. The Court's political interference in Reading led to his victory over a republican candidate.

A prominent Court official always held the post of High Steward in Reading throughout the Protectorate, and through this officeholder the Court influenced local politics. Robert Hammond, a prominent Court supporter, held this position until his death, shortly after his election to the House in 1654. It was then filled by Bulstrode Whitelocke, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal, former ambassador to Sweden and member of parliament from Buckinghamshire. Like Hammond, Whitelocke could be useful to the Court in Reading because he had local connections reaching back over a period of years. He had owned land there as far back as 1639, as is shown by the following item in the "Catalogue of Reading Archives," "John Kendrick's Charity deeds relating to property at Henley and Bix purchased by the Corporation of Bulstrode Whitelocke and another in 1639 and reconveyed to Whitelocke by the Corporation in 1647."⁸⁰

Changes in the membership of the corporation followed Whitelocke's appointment. William Brackston was discharged as alderman and justice of the peace, and Joel Stephens was appointed in his place. Their respective politics are indicated by Brackston's restoration and Stephens' ouster, shortly after the Lord Protector's death in 1658. The office of recorder, the town's principal legal advisor, was also

I-42

given to a member of the Court. In the spring of 1656, Daniel Blagrove, a republican who was to oppose Barkstead in the coming parliamentary elections, was dismissed from this office for alleged inefficiency and neglect. He was replaced by a relative of Bulstrode Whitelocke,⁸¹ Richard Bulstrode, "on the recommendation of the Lords Whitelocke and Fleetwood."⁸²

Whitelocke attempted to solve the problem of the town's unsettled franchise, which had disturbed the 1654 elections, through a grant of a new charter, but was not successful. The corporation records state that "Lord Whitelocke advises that the Charter be renewed as speedily as possible."⁸³ Such a charter would no doubt have confined the franchise to the borough official whose appointments could be influenced by the Court, and disenfranchised voters who would have supported the republicans.

Barkstead's election was doubtless assured by Whitelocke's careful preparations, but the major-general took care the summer before the election to become involved in borough affairs. Sir Thomas Pride and he were arbitrators in a legal matter for the corporation in the summer preceding the election and the borough officials thanked him "for his pains therein."⁸⁴ Blagrove, a republican, is recorded as Reading's member of parliament, after Barkstead chose to sit for Middlesex, but there is no evidence of any parliamentary activity on his part, so he probably voluntarily absented himself from the session, knowing that he would be excluded.

Prominent officials of the Protectorate had struggled throughout the 1650s to control recalcitrant members of the governing corporation

of Southampton. At the instigation of John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal and Treasury, who had local connections, coming from a Hampshire family in the Isle of Wight, and who represented the borough in Parliament, the offices of recorder and town clerk were filled by loyal members of the Court. The political importance of these positions was to be demonstrated in 1661, when a parliament loyal to the Crown enacted legislation providing that all appointments to them be approved by the king. Richard Cromwell, assisted by other local Court supporters, supervised the dismissal of ministers, appointed by the hostile corporation to lecture at a Southampton church, and their replacement by members of the clergy approved by the Court.

Lisle himself filled the office of recorder after the dismissal of his royalist predecessor. John Hildesley, a member of the Court, wrote to the corporation in 1651, ordering them to choose a new recorder, and Lisle was appointed. Hildesley, member from Winchester in Hampshire in both Protectorate parliaments, was sheriff of Hampshire in 1656, justice of the peace in 1656-1657, and a commissioner of Prerogative Office and of the Army in 1656. The ousted recorder, Thomas Levingston, who had been appointed on the recommendation of King Charles in 1635, brought a writ of restitution from the Upper Bench after the Lord Protector's death and in 1659 regained the office by court order.

The town clerk was discharged in 1653 and his place taken by a deputy until a new clerk was appointed with Lisle's consent in 1658. The pretense given for this dismissal was the clerk's lack of the proper residence requirement, but, since in most corporations this office was filled by the mayor, it seems reasonable to believe that

I-44

this change was not made for the stated reasons.

The struggle for power between the corporation and the local members of the Court burst out again over the appointment of ministers to preach the "Thursday lecture" or sermon at Holy Rood Church. In the late 1640's, steps had been taken by the Long Parliament to supervise preaching, and, in accordance with these, a parliamentary committee appointed a local group to choose suitable ministers to give this sermon. All the men appointed to this committee were to be loyal members of the Court during the Protectorate. Richard Norton represented Hampshire in the House in 1654-1656, had been a parliamentary colonel during the civil wars, and was closely associated with the ruling circle of Puritan families; he was the Lord Protector's cousin, his wife was the daughter of Lord Say and Sele, and his son married the daughter of the Earl of Warwick. Richard Major was Richard Cromwell's father-in-law and he was a member of the council of state. Hildesley's background is described above.⁸⁵ Norton, Major, and Hildesley appointed Nathaniel Robinson and other "godly and well-affected ministers" to preach the sermon. Robinson is described in an eighteenth-century local history as one of the most prominent Nonconformists in seventeenth-century Southampton. However, when the Long Parliament was dissolved and its parliamentary committee ceased exercising its supervision, the corporation would no longer allow Robinson to preach, but instead employed men described in a complaining petition to the council of state as "for the most part notorious enemies to the Commonwealth or scandalous ignorant men."⁸⁶ The petition asked that Robinson be reinstated and given his back pay. The council complied with the request, ordering that Norton,

I-45

Cromwell, Major, Hildesley, Peter Legay (a Hampshire justice of the peace) and others or any three of them should again exercise general supervision over the lecture, appointing ministers and seeing to it they were paid. The mayor and aldermen were ordered to comply with this committee's direction.

Distrusting the loyalty of this corporation, the council dismissed three of its members including the mayor, in 1655, which action probably ensured Lisle's election to parliament for the coming year. In Southampton, the franchise was not confined to the corporation as in Reading, but the mayor still exerted great power at the parliamentary elections, certifying the results together with the bailiffs. The offending officials were brought in custody to the council to answer charges made against them by Robinson, and they were then examined by Richard Cromwell, Major, Norton and John Dunch, who was Richard Cromwell's brother-in-law.⁸⁷ Orders were given to hold new elections and return loyal men "of piety, integrity and well-affected to the present government."⁸⁸ The mayor, like the dismissed recorder, was to return to power after the Restoration.

Clearly, not enough members of the corporation had been purged, and Southampton continued to be a problem to the Court. Except for the three members deposed, the list of those attending meetings remained similar.⁸⁹ Major-general Goffe, reporting that the corporation still acted unsatisfactorily, wrote, "I met with very sad complaints concerning the unworthy carriage of the magistrates of the town of Southampton against the godly party."⁹⁰ The republicans cooperated with the Country opposition in the parliamentary election,

I-46

and Lisle won by only four votes. Thomas Cole, a republican who was a Hampshire member of parliament, worked for the Country candidate, John Bulkley, distributing pamphlets in an attempt "to have putt by my Lord Lisle from being burgesss for that town and to have brought in Mr. Bulkley in his roome."⁹¹ Bulkley, also a member of parliament from Hampshire, had been a consistent opponent of the Court in the 1654-1655 session, acting twelve times as an opposition teller, and was to be excluded after being elected from the county in 1656.⁹² Cole was characterized by Goffe as a republican, "a perfect leveller and soe well known in Southampton that he is called by the name of Comon Freedome."⁹³ He was a person of some local importance, acting as justice of the peace in 1656 and 1657.⁹⁴

Court officials running in more than one constituency won the elections in several boroughs as a result of a consistent Court policy of granting new charters that would enfranchise only their own supporters. Most of these charters are missing, and local history surrounding their inception is not known, but, in view of their connection with the contests about which information is available, it is hard to accept the dictum of J. H. Plumb that there is "no evidence that Cromwell ever intended to pursue a consistent policy of borough charter manipulation in order to secure a favorable Parliament"⁹⁵ or that of Samuel R. Gardiner that most cases of remodeling had local objectives in view. Local officials did apply for the charters, but they were supported by the major-generals and other prominent Court officials. This charter-making process took place in twenty-three boroughs during the Protectorate period, and only six of the members elected from these

I-47

boroughs were excluded from parliament; this is convincing evidence that charter change can be associated with favorable results for the Court. The process was not left wholly to the localities: a committee for corporations of the House was active in 1656 and 1657. Prominent Court officials served on this committee during this period, including Desborough, Sydenham, Jones, Wolseley, and Lisle.⁹⁶

John Desborough and Philip Skippon, both major-generals, won the election in King's Lynn owing to the franchise provisions of the newly renewed charter, granted on the eve of the election. These provisions, in dispute ever since 1642, confined the franchise to the mayor, aldermen, and eighteen common councilmen. Desborough sat on the committee appointed by the council of state to consider the renewal of the charter, which was approved with no change in the franchise provisions.

Popular opposition to the choice of the major-generals is shown by the disputed election of two slates, which was then resolved by the Committee on Privileges of the House in favor of the Court, and upheld by a vote in the House. Desborough and Skippon were chosen by the governing corporation, while Desborough and Guybon Goddard, the diarist for the first Protectorate parliament, were chosen by a larger group of voters. The Court must have been determined to elect Skippon, for Goddard was characterized by a republican tract as a lawyer who had "advantages from the state" and does not seem to have been a convinced opponent of the Court. Desborough, the victorious candidate, was one of the Court tellers in a division upholding the decision of the Committee on Privileges. One of the opposing tellers was Sir John Hobart, the Country boss of Norfolk in which King's Lynn is situated.⁹⁷

I-48

The Court's determination to elect Skippon from King's Lynn may be due to his defeat in London, where he also was a candidate. As major-general of the city and its outlying districts, he should have been an easy victor, but he was very unpopular there. Two royalist informers testify to this unpopularity, one writing of his regime, "Many gentlemen are leaving London, choosing rather to fall into the hands of the country Majors-General rather than those appointed for London and Middlesex,"⁹⁸ and the other of the election, "at the election for parliament in London, Major-General Browne had not one man against him, and Skippon only one for him."⁹⁹

Desborough was also victorious in three other constituencies, and these victories worked to the advantage of the Court; for he was replaced by loyal Court supporters. He sat for Somersetshire and his place in King's Lynn was filled by Sir John Thoroughwood, a government officeholder. In both Bridgwater and Gloucester, Desborough's place was filled by supporters of the kingship proposals, Sir Thomas Wroth and James Stephens.

In Colchester, a new charter, which narrowed the franchise, ensured the election of Henry Lawrence, Lord President of the Council, and John Maidstone, steward of the Protector's household. This change was instigated by members of the corporation, including the mayor, Thomas Lawrence, who may have been a relative of Henry's. When these officials wrote to the Protector, expressing fears that unsuitable town officials might be elected, he arranged that these elections be held while Major-general Haynes was present. Haynes later suggested that the borough should have a new charter, since he could not always

I-49

be in town to supervise the elections. Other petitions were sent by the governing officials to the council of state, blaming the problems on the existing charter which gave too much power to the people and stating that the town government was controlled by disaffected citizens. Gardiner believed that this opposition was composed of extreme elements, royalist and sectarian in nature, but J. H. Round felt that it was made up of men whose political views were more moderate. The group characterized in this work as Country strongly resembles his description of this opposition, and this is borne out by the fact that, as a result of the new franchise, Sir Harbottle Grimston, a member of the Country, who had represented Colchester throughout the civil wars, was forced to sit for the county. Since the Court could not rid themselves of him by the new franchise, he was then excluded from the House.¹⁰⁰

Control of the university seats was another method of ensuring the election of representatives who would support the government. As prescribed by the Instrument of Government, each university was represented in parliament by one member. Since at both Oxford and Cambridge, these men were elected by officers of the university, many of whom were appointed by the Court, their choice was peculiarly susceptible to political influence. Prominent members of the Court represented the universities in both Protectorate parliaments.

The Protector's sons represented Cambridge: Henry in 1654, Richard in 1656. Henry's electoral return is defaced; Richard's is missing; either fact could show upheaval or irregularity. It has been suggested that the election in 1656 may have encountered some opposition, although under the circumstances opposition was difficult. The

I-50

election took place in the afternoon, which suggests that the electing senate was slow to act, since elections usually began about eight or nine in the morning.

Men close to the Lord Protector also represented Oxford. In 1654, Dr. John Owen, his chaplain, was selected, but, under the provisions of the Clerical Disabilities Act of 1642, Owen was declared ineligible to sit because he was a clergyman. He was succeeded by Nathaniel Fiennes, a member of the council of state and a commissioner of the great seal.¹⁰¹

During the course of this 1656 session, the lack of philosophical unity which plagued the Cromwellian Court negated these political maneuverings. Unwilling to support proposals to have Cromwell assume the crown, the military members of the Court split from the civilian members. The civilians were therefore forced to align themselves with the members of the Country who had not been excluded, and as a result a compromise measure was enacted securing the return of the excluded members to a second session of the second Protectorate parliament which met in 1658. Moreover the establishment of the Other House, a substitute for the House of Lords, which was provided for in a new constitution, drawn up in 1657, stripped the Court in the House of many of its most loyal supporters.

The Lord Protector attached great importance to the establishment of this new chamber, and wrung from the House, over Country opposition, the right to nominate its members. As much care and planning went into the appointment of its members as into the preparations for the 1656 elections. Why Cromwell appointed many of his most valuable supporters

I-51

from the House to the new chamber has long been a subject of conjecture. The usual explanations given are political ineptitude and the difficulty of finding appropriate members. However, it can be argued that nineteen of the forty-eight men removed from the House were appointed either to win their support because they were troublesome, or because they would not have attended the House in any case.¹⁰²

Six of these members might have been prevented from attending because of their official duties. Perhaps it was felt that their presence would be missed less in the Other House than in Commons. Three had government posts in Ireland. Henry Cromwell was the Lord Deputy, William Steele the Lord Chancellor, and Thomas Cooper a military official. Henry Cromwell wrote that he, the lord chancellor, and another official had received writs of summons to the Other House, but no letter of advice about what to do, and added "I suppose it is not meant, wee should all three of us leave our charge and stations here to answer that call."¹⁰³ Cooper, who had been anxious to be nominated to the Other House, might not have been able to attend regularly, for he was in command of the military in the north of Ireland.¹⁰⁴ George Monck, in charge of both civil and military affairs in Scotland, was also reluctant to leave his post, saying "I have received lately a summons to bee one of the other house. . . . truly I thinke the condition of this country and his highnesse's affaires heere are such that I cannot well be spared."¹⁰⁵ Charles Howard, also a power in the north as a member of the Council for Scotland and ex-deputy major-general for Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Northumberland, might have been detained locally. William Lockhart was serving as ambassador to

I-52

France.

It has been observed that seven of the major-generals might have been given seats in the Other House as a bribe to them to acquiesce in its establishment. Those who were summoned were: John Desborough, Philip Skippon, Edward Whalley, John Barkstead, James Berry, William Goffe, and Charles Fleetwood. Since their prior office had been abolished, they might have felt that the new position would add to their dignity as well as giving them a veto power over their Country enemies in the Commons.¹⁰⁶ A contemporary journal observes, "to take them [the major-generals] off, one of the articles of government was the erecting of a House of Peers, to be nominated by the Protector, who doubtless was to make lords of the chief of the officers."¹⁰⁷

Six opponents of the Court were taken from the Commons and given seats in the Other House. Doubtless it was thought that they would prove less troublesome there. Their attitudes ranged from outright antagonism to dubious loyalty.

Openly antagonistic were Sir Arthur Haslerig and Colonel John Hewson. Haslerig had been the leader of the republican opposition during the first Protectorate parliament. He must have seen through Cromwell's motives; he refused the offer and led the opposition during the coming session. Hewson was the anabaptist officer who had lost his Irish seat because of Henry Cromwell's disapproval and who then opposed the kingship proposals. His support must have been considered of importance, for besides this seat in the House he received two other favors designed to win him over: financial rewards in Ireland and

I-53

knighthood.¹⁰⁸

Of dubious loyalty was Sir Thomas Pride, known for his part in Pride's purge. He cooperated intermittently with the Court, for he was the high sheriff in Surrey in 1655 and was knighted in 1656. However, in 1654, he seems to have been distrusted, for after he was ordered to go with his regiment to Scotland, the orders were countermanded, "his men sent away, when they were a hundred miles on that way, himself was commanded to stay."¹⁰⁹ In spite of the honors he had been given, he took a prominent part in organizing a petition against kingship in 1657, which was of primary importance in influencing the Lord Protector's negative decision.¹¹⁰

Three other opponents, of a different character, came from the lower to the Upper House. Sir Richard Onslow and Sir John Hobart were typical Country members, supporting the kingship proposals, but still opposing the Court. It would be hard to decide whether they were promoted to the Other House as a reward for favoring the kingship proposals or to dilute the Country influence in Commons. Alexander Popham was excluded from the second parliament and dabbled in royalist activities. Perhaps the Lord Protector wanted to keep an eye on him in the Other House. He certainly had no value to the Court in Commons.

Managers for the Court, realizing the dangers which the return of the excluded members and the loss of loyal Court supporters entailed, attempted to counter them, by securing a good attendance of Court members. Broghill and Thurloe, the Court leaders, realized that the situation was not hopeful and bestirred themselves to make the best of it.¹¹¹ Already in August, Broghill wrote to Thurloe, "If you see ther will be

I-54

need, you might without much inconvenience proroge the sittinge of the councill till the 10th of Jan. next (provided they lay the next six months asses before such prorogation) and thereby get soe many more friends to attend the house."¹¹² Broghill remonstrated with Montague, a member of the council of state, when he considered retiring, saying, "I conclude the game our mastere is to manage is either very desperate, that you give it over, or very certain since you think it needs not your help."¹¹³

By December, Thurloe embarked on an organized campaign of letter writing to ensure a good attendance of Court supporters at this second session. He appealed to Henry Cromwell to use his influence with the Irish delegation, writing, "But I beseech your lordship, doe not suffer our freinds of Ireland, who are of the house of commons to absent themselves, it is of absolute necessitye, that they be all there the first day of the sittinge. I heare we shall have a full house, all the members which were kept out resolvinge to come in; and considering the great number of our freinds which will be taken out of the commons-house, we had need want none of those who abide with us, least we goe backe againe, and loose all which we have gott."¹¹⁴ Cromwell replied, "Such of the parliament men as are willinge, and can bee spared are hasteing over,"¹¹⁵ and wrote to his father on the same day, "It having been advised me from England, that such parliament men as were thoroughly affected to your highness and the government should attend the first sitting of the house, I have hastened away major Morgan."¹¹⁶

Thurloe also called upon Lord Broghill, the Lord President of the Council in Scotland for assistance. Broghill replied favorably,

I-55

"The last night I received the honor and favor of yours of the first instant, and shall not fayle to use my best endeavors to get all my countrymen to attend this session of parliament; tho the greatest expenses they were lately at, and the great taxes they pay heere will render it very difficult if not impossible for som of them. But since ther is a liklyhoode of needinge their services, I shall turn every stone to obey your commands. . . . I will write to my lord-deputy [Henry Cromwell] also, to lay his commands upon all members of parliament neere him, to be at London the beginninge of the sessions."¹¹⁷

Cromwell replied to Broghill, "I am very sensible of the necessity that all our friends ought to attend the first sitting of the parliament, and nothing shall be wanting there unto in me"¹¹⁸ and to Thurloe, "I will do my endeavour, that no parliament man stay behind."¹¹⁹

Thurloe, doubtless, wrote to many individual members outside of the Irish and Scottish delegations. A reply exists from John Ashe, a Somersetshire member, who wrote, promising attendance, "upon your advise I am resolved (if the Lord be pleased to give me health) to be at Westminster the first day of the parliament, that I may give my best assistance after the perfecting the happy settlement."¹²⁰

However, these efforts could not outweigh either the hostility of the readmitted members of the House, who had been excluded in 1656, or the loss of Court support in that body. When the Other House met, it was so vehemently attacked by these readmitted members that its establishment certainly did not compensate for this loss of support.

The Court, lacking any philosophical justification for its own existence and forced to rely solely on political techniques, could not

I-56

control the republican and Country oppositions. The republicans, steadfastly opposed to the establishment of the Protectorate, longing for the reestablishment of a republic, assumed the leadership of the opposition as soon as they were readmitted to the House. They were joined by the most vehement members of the Country, who, in spite of their devotion to the "ancient constitution," were willing to join the republicans in opposition to the Court. Their recalcitrance forced a dissolution by an angry Lord Protector within three weeks.

The nature of this opposition will be discussed in the following two chapters. The ensuing discussion will seek to demonstrate that the Court's problems were based on deep philosophical divisions within the body politic which no political management techniques or machinations could assuage.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Appendix.
2. Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), p. 410.
3. Vernon F. Snow, "Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution," English Historical Review, LXXIV (1959), 430.
4. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 411; Carl Stephenson and Frederick Marcham (eds.), Sources of English Constitutional History (New York: 1937) (Henry VI, 1429), pp. 276-278; J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England (Middlesex, 1969), p. 39. Christopher Hill, A Century of Revolution (New York, 1961), p. 43, quotes Richard Baxter, A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth (London, 1654); A Letter from a Person in the Countrey to his friend in the City: upon a book entitled A healing question (London, 1656); Snow, "Parliamentary Reapportionment," p. 421; Sir John Neale, The Elizabethan House of Commons (London, 1949), passim, for creation of new boroughs, p. 131.
5. Snow, "Parliamentary Reapportionment," pp. 426-427, 430, 436-442. Areas are defined by Snow, pp. 426-427; Southwest: Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Wiltshire; Southeast: Hampshire, Sussex, Kent, Surrey, Cinque Ports; East: Middlesex, Hertford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex; Midlands: Bedford, Berks, Buckingham, Derby, Leicester, Nottingham, Oxford, Rutland, Warwick, Northampton; West: Gloucester, Worcester, Monmouth, Hereford, Salop, Cheshire, Stafford; North: Cumberland, Northumberland, Durham, Westmoreland, Lancaster, York; Wilbur Cortez Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, III (4 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), p. 185 discusses the over-representation of the northern counties.
6. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 316-326, 359-371. Both Snow and Louise Fargo Brown, "Ideas of Representation from Elizabeth to James II," Journal of Modern History, XI (March, 1939), agree that the "Heads of the Proposals" embodies in its apportionment proposals what Brown calls the "property idea." Snow points out that the "Second Agreement" also takes this factor into consideration.
7. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 317.
8. For the framing of the Instrument of Government, see George D. Heath, III, "Making the Instrument of Government," Journal of British Studies, VI, No. 2 (May, 1967), 20. Ireton is quoted by Hill, Century of Revolution, p. 131.

9. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, xlix, liii; Maurice Ashley, Cromwell's Generals (London, 1954), p. 99.

10. For the Country's reverence for the "ancient constitution," see J.G.A. Pocock, "Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII (October, 1965). Pocock does not point out that this feeling also existed during the Protectorate. For Shaftesbury's proposals, James R. Jones, The First Whigs (London and New York, 1961), p. 213, quotes Shaftesbury's Some Observations Concerning the Regulating of Elections for Parliaments, published in 1689 after his death. For the growing electorate, Plumb, Political Stability, p. 45. For Harley's election, Historical Manuscripts Commission Report, XIV, App. 2 (London, 1894), 208. For Hobart's election, Hudson Guernsey (ed.), "Poll for members to be returned to Parliament for the county of Norfolk, August 20, 1656," Norfolk Archaeology, I (1847), 67, as quoted by Paul J. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962), p. 100. For the Cheshire election, Paul J. Pinckney, "The Cheshire Election of 1656," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 49 (Spring, 1967), 418-419. For the Berkshire election, A True and Perfect Relation of the Manner and Proceeding by the Sheriffe for the County of Berkshire (London, 1656). For Wiltshire, The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. by Charles H. Firth (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), I, 389-390. For the Country opposition to the new franchise, Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons (London, 1813), VII, divisions on 11/27/54, p. 391 and 1/19/55, p. 420. For the Country constitution, Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 436.

11. Appendix. Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), III, 175.

12. The following were either excluded or protested against exclusion in 1656: Gewen, Northcote, Mildmay, Salisbury, Rossiter, Bulkley, Barnardiston, Morley, Fagge, Popham, Grove and Thistlethwaite. The last two were prominent Country leaders in 1656-1657. The republicans, Lister, Grey, Wallop, and Purefoy. Also in the Country opposition, Sir Thomas Fairfax, William Hay, William Ashurst, Francis Hollis.

13. A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, ed. by Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), II, Thomas Garrett to the Protector, p. 503.

14. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series (13 vols., London, 1875-1886), VII (1654), 315.

15. Ibid., p. 319.

16. Ibid., pp. 229, 346.

FI-3

17. DNB; Edward Montague; Victoria History of the Counties of England, ed. by W. Page, et al. (Westminster, 1900), Huntingdonshire II, 28, 29; Frank R. Harris, The Life of Edward Montague (2 vols., London, 1912), I, 73; Thomas Carte, ed., A Collection of Original Letters and Papers (London, 1759), II, 92, 95, 103, and J. R. Powell, ed., The Letters of Robert Blake, pp. 322-324, 393-396, as quoted by Christopher Hill, God's Englishman (London, 1970), p. 149. For Walton, Mark Noble, Memoirs of the Protectorate House of Cromwell (2 vols., Birmingham, 1894), II, 238.

18. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 389-390.

19. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 85; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 383-390; Copy of a Letter Sent out of Wiltshire (London, September 5, 1654); An Apology for the Ministers of the County of Wilts (London, 1654); DNB: A. A. Cooper.

20. For Thistlethwaite, Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828), I, 39, 4/24/57. For Grove, Commons Journal, VII, pp. 400, 12/3/54 and p. 502, 3/13/56. For Hollis, ibid., p. 382, 11/6/54; Burton, Diary, I, lxii.

21. Burton, Diary, I, lviii, 10/25/54.

22. For Popham, David Underdown, "The Independents Reconsidered," Journal of British Studies, III (November, 1968), 71. For Ashe, Appendix,

23. Appendix.

24. Neale, Elizabethan Commons, p. 151. Councillors: Whitelocke, Rous, Cooper, Mackworth, Fleetwood, Sydenham, Desborough. Commissioners: Lenthall, Blake, Lisle, Beake, Thomas Smith, Widdrington, Kelsey. Army officers: Hammond, Francis Ingoldsby, Fox, Blackmore, Fitch, Barkstead, Stone, Cox, Worsley, Skippon, Goffe, Chadwick, Gorges, Whetham, Fothergill, Purefoy, Baynton, Baynes. Government office: Bennet, Boone, Pridesaux, Hoskins, Parker, Ellis, Alexander Blake, Hildesley, Nathaniel and Francis Bacon, Christopher Lister, or Thurloe, Steward: Maidstone.

25. For Great Yarmouth, CSPD, VII (1654), 284-285. For Leeds, Roy Carroll, "The Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964), p. 338. For Reading, An Admirable Speech made by the Maior of Reading (London, 1654), p. 2.

26. A. Aspinall, et al., Parliament Through Seven Centuries (London, 1962), pp. 51, 56, 57; HMCRC, XI, App. 7, 192; Speech . . . Maior of Reading, pp. 2, 3; DNB: Robert Hammond. For the office of High Steward, Francis G. and J. F. Garner, Civic Ceremonial (London, 1953), p. 81 and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, English Local Government

FI-4

from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act (8 vols., London, 1906-1925), I, 321, 323.

27. For the London election, Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 270-274. For Foote and Steele, Appendix. For the exclusion of Adams and Langham and characterization of Tichburne, James Farnell, "The Politics of the City of London, 1649-1657" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963), p. 53, CSPD (1654), VII, 388.

28. CSPD, VII (1654), 313.

29. Narrative of the Late Parliament, p. 16.

30. S.A.H.R., VI, 18, as quoted by Margaret Tibbetts, "Parliamentary Parties under Oliver Cromwell" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1944), p. 218.

31. For Barnstaple, CSPD, VII (1654), 279-280. Colonel Shapcott, Knight of Devonshire, his Speech in Parliament (October 30, 1654). For Bristol, CSPD, VII (1654), 331.

32. CSPD, VII (1654), 331.

33. Ibid., pp. 66-68, 305.

34. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 409, 422-425; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 206, 215.

35. Burton, Diary, I, xciii, 11/23/54.

36. Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials of the English Affairs (London, 1792); Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 215.

37. Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 599.

38. John Y. Akerman, ed., Letters from Roundhead Officers written from Scotland and Chiefly Addressed to Captain Adam Baynes (Edinburgh, 1856), pp. 89, 91.

39. Appendix.

40. Irish Records, A/28, 26, p. 35, Cromwell to Fleetwood, 5/9/54, reprinted in Ludlow, Memoirs, I, 387 n.; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 10.

41. Ludlow, Memoirs, I, 387-388.

42. For Kildare and Wicklow, HMCR, Egmont, I, Part II, 553, as noted in Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate (2 vols., London, 1904), II, 13. For Ralph King, British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 247. For Irish MPs, Appendix.

FI-5

43. Burton, Diary, I, xvii-xxiv, 9/2/54-9/7/54; 384, 3/7/57. For attendance, Commons Journal, VII passim. The number of those voting in the divisions indicates a sparse attendance. Public Record Office, Venetian Transcripts, Giavarina to the Doge, July 4/14, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 256.
44. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 137; Maurice Ashley, Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate (London, 1934), p. 43. For the major-generals, Ashley, Cromwell's Generals; DNB. For the lord lieutenant, Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 42; G. S. Elton, The Tudor Constitution (Cambridge, 1962), 451-452.
45. Plumb, Political Stability, p. 105.
46. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 11/7/55, 161.
47. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341, quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 63.
48. For Fagge, Burton, Diary, II, 437: For Morley as opposition teller, Commons Journal, VII, 394, 395, 409, 412, 414, 418. For Hay, HMCR, 13th Report, IV, 288, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 199.
49. For Shirley and Stapely, Thurloe, State Papers, V, Goffe to Thurloe, p. 161.
50. Victoria County History, Huntingdonshire, II, 24.
51. Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 608.
52. Wilbur Cortez Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), IV, 57, 342.
53. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 8/26/56, 349, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 79.
54. CSPD, XI (1656-1658), 109.
55. Clarendon, Papers, X, 70, as quoted in DNB.
56. Appendix,
57. Cyrus H. Karraker, The Seventeenth Century Sheriff (Chapel Hill, 1930), p. 26.
58. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Berry to Thurloe, 11/17/57, 211.
59. For the residency requirement, 4 Henry IV, c. 5 discussed by Harold Hulme, "The Sheriff as a Member of the House of Commons from Elizabeth to Cromwell," Journal of Modern History, I (1929), 361,

FI-6

366-372. For the MP as Sheriff, Hulme, "Sheriff as a Member," pp. 367, 370; Anchitel Grey, Debates, IV, 16-27, 11/16/75, as quoted by Plumb, Political Stability, p. 59; Burton, Diary, I, lxxi-lxxiii. For Fitch, Thurloe, State Papers, II, The Mayor, et al., of Carlisle to the Protector, 8/10/54, 534. The purpose of this letter is obscure since Fitch is not listed as Sheriff from Cumberland; Great Britain, Public Record Office, List of Sheriffs for England and Wales (Lists and Indexes, IX [London, 1898]). For Nichol, Appendix.

60. HMCR, XIV, 9, 478.

61. HMCR, XIV, Appendix 2, p. 208, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 135.

62. Commons Journal, p. 394, 12/4/54.

63. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Berry to Thurloe, 11/17/55, p. 211.

64. Ibid., Goffe to Thurloe, 11/16/55, p. 208; Haynes to Thurloe, 11/19/55, p. 217; Boteler to Thurloe, 11/19/56, p. 218.

65. Narrative of Late Parliament, p. 17; Ashley, Cromwell's Generals, p. 154.

66. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 36; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 242. For Hewson and Sankey, Appendix.

67. William Stephens (ed.), Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1930), II, from Sharp, 3/19/57, p. 30.

68. Narrative of Late Parliament, p. 12.

69. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 6/16/57, 352.

70. Norfolk Archaeology, I (1847), 67, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 100.

71. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 7/16/56, 220, 8/15/56, 311.

72. Thurloe, State Papers, V, 311-312.

73. Appendix.

74. For Salmon, Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 349; Thurloe, State Papers, V, 8/9/56, 295. For Sydenham, Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 345-346.

75. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Lilburne to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 296.

FI-7

76. Appendix,
77. For Claypole, Appendix; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 116. For Jones, Appendix,
78. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Goffe to Thurloe, 5/5/56, 764.
79. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Goffe to Thurloe, 7/15/56, 215; 8/21/56, 329; John Sylvester Davies, A History of Southampton (London, 1883), p. 491.
80. Catalogue of Reading Archives, Acc. 171, bundle.
81. For Barkstead in Middlesex, p. 30. For Whitelocke, HMCR, XI, App. 7, pp. 191-193; DNB: Sir Richard Bulstrode (1610-1711) and Whitelocke Bulstrode (1650-1724). Sir Richard had five sons, one of whom was Whitelocke. Richard was probably one of the others. The names make it obvious that they were related to Bulstrode Whitelocke. Pinckney notes the influence of the High Steward in Reading, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 198.
82. HMCR, XI, App. 7, p. 192.
83. Ibid., p. 191.
84. Ibid.
85. CSPD (1660-1661), p. 582, as quoted in Plumb, Political Stability, p. 62; Davies, Southampton, pp. 184-185, for the change of recorder; p. 359 for the "Thursday lecture." For the town clerk, Garner, Civic Ceremonial, p. 8; Southampton Records, I, 9, 27; Davies, Southampton, p. 210. For Hildesley and Major, Appendix. For Norton, Victoria History of the Counties of England, Hampshire V, 340-341; D. Brunton and D. H. Pennington, Members of the Long Parliament (London, 1954), pp. 31, 32. By 1656, he displayed no enthusiasm for the Protectorate, refusing to work for the election of Major-general Goffe in Hampshire, but was never openly rebellious. Thurloe, State Papers, V, 215, 7/15/56; 329, 8/21/56. David Underdown, Royalist Conspiracy in England (New Haven, 1960), pp. 38, 218, 223.
86. Davies, Southampton, p. 359. Documents are given in John Speed, History and Antiquity of Southampton (Southampton, 1909, written about 1770). The reply of the Council is found in CSPD, 1655 p. 215, but the petition cannot be found.
87. CSPD, VIII (1655), 222.
88. Ibid., p. 285.
89. Davies, Southampton, p. 179; Southampton Assembly Books lists of attendance, 5/1/55, 6/20/55, 8/22/55, 9/7/55.

FI-8

90. Thurloe, State Papers, II, Goffe to Thurloe, 5/5/56, 764.
91. Ibid., V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/8/56, 287.
92. Commons Journal, VII, pp. 382, 385, 390, 394, 400, 401, 414, 417, 419, 420.
93. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Goffe to Thurloe, undated, 396.
94. Public Record Office, Chancery, 193/13/6, list of Southampton justices of the peace.
95. Plumb, Political Stability, p. 62, n.
96. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 76; B.L.K. Henderson, "The Commonwealth Charters," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 3rd series, VI (1912), 131, 142, 155-161.
97. HMC, XI, Appendix, Part 3, 34-35, 148-149, 158; CSPD, X (1656-1657), 22, 156; Commons Journal VII, pp. 428, 441-442, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 186. For Goddard, Hobart, Thoroughwood, Wroth, Stephens, Appendix. For the division upholding the Committee on Privileges, Commons Journal, VII, 74.
98. CSPD, IX (1644-1656), Nicholas to Jane, 3/21/56, 237.
99. Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers, III, ed. by W. D. Macray (4 vols, Oxford, 1869-1936), Titus to Hyde, 2/3/57, 118.
100. CSPD, VII (1655), 202-204; IX (1655-1656), 253, 330; Abbott, Writings and Speeches, IV, Cromwell to Haynes 12/4/55, 37, 38; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 55-76; J. H. Round, "Colchester during the Commonwealth," English Historical Review, XV (1900), 661; Appendix, Maidstone, Grimston.
101. Snow, "Parliamentary Reapportionment," pp. 411-412; Millicent B. Rex, University Representation in England 1604-1690 (London and New York, 1954), 159, 187-188. For Owen and Fiennes, Appendix.
102. Burton, Diary, II, 301, 6/24/57; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 22; Firth, Protectorate, II, 7-11; H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier, ed. by Richard Pares (London, 1956), p. 41.
103. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 1/6/58, 752.
104. For Steele, Howard, Lockhart, Onslow, Hobart, Popham, Hewson, Appendix. For Cooper, Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Cooper to Thurloe, 673; Firth, Protectorate, II, 173.

FI-9

105. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Monck to Thurloe, 1/9/57, 741.
106. George D. Heath, III, "An Essay in Constitutional Development, 1653-57" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1953), p. 389.
107. The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1843), I, 420.
108. Firth, Protectorate, II, 33; Burton, Diary, II, 316-464, *passim*, for the second session 1/20-2/4/58.
109. Thurloe, State Papers, II, Intercepted letter, anon., June, 1654.
110. Appendix.
111. Thurloe's activities to insure attendance are discussed by Wilson J. Hoffman, Jr., "Mr. Secretary Thurloe: His Role in the Domestic Affairs of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1963).
112. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Broghill to Thurloe, 9/19/56, 322.
113. Ibid., VI, Broghill to Montague, 11/20/59, 622, as quoted by Ralph C. H. Catterall, "The Failure of the Humble Petition and Advice," American Historical Review (October, 1903), pp. 46-47.
114. Ibid., Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 12/1/57, 648.
115. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 1/5/58, 730.
116. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to the Protector, 1/5/58, 730.
117. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Broghill to Thurloe, 12/11/57, 670.
118. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to Broghill, 12/15/57, 680.
119. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 12/16/57, 683.
120. Ibid., Ashe to Thurloe, 12/28/57, 709.

CHAPTER II

THE REPUBLICANS' DESTRUCTIVE OPPOSITION

The strength of the republicans in the Protectorate parliaments, as contrasted to the Court, lay in their firm belief in a well-defined philosophy. Numerically a small group--only between twenty-five and thirty of these men sat in each parliament--they were nevertheless strong enough to completely disrupt the parliamentary proceedings when they were not excluded from them by the Protector.¹ Not only did their doctrine give coherence to their participation in the parliamentary debates, but their members acted politically in a well-organized way. Their opposition was destructive, however, rather than constructive. Too small numerically ever to put their own program across, they were forced to act as a catalyst for the Country, whose program was essentially sterile and consisted in little more than a return to the "ancient constitution." This alliance foreshadowed the formation of the first Whig party.

The republicans believed unequivocally in the supremacy of parliament. They followed the doctrines of the political writings of the classical philosophers who believed that the safety and welfare of the state must rest on a mixed, but not necessarily balanced, government. Although such republican political writers as James Harrington and Edmund Ludlow would have preferred to see the executive power wielded by a council responsible to the House rather than by one man, the republicans in parliament were willing to acquiesce in Cromwell's assumption

of executive power, but they believed that it must be clearly subordinated to that of the House. For this reason, they were hostile to the Instrument of Government, which provided that both the parliament and the Lord Protector should share in the legislative authority.

The ideological record of the republicans in these parliaments consists solely of their advocacy of parliament's supremacy, with its practical implications of opposition to the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown, and opposition to establishment of the Other House. In 1657 a few republicans expressed opposition to oaths to support the Humble Petition and Advice, but, except for this, no other theoretical positions are expressed. None of the economic or social positions supported by the republicans in the late 1640's are even mentioned. Even their much vaunted desire for religious toleration gave way to political expediency when Sir Arthur Haslerig supported the establishment of a Country-sponsored Assembly of Divines in 1654. Ideologically, therefore, the members of this parliament must be judged solely on the criterion of support for parliamentary supremacy.

The lack of other ideological criteria is probably due at least in part to the fact that most of them actually sat in these parliaments only for a very short length of time. Most left the House in 1654 after having been there only a little over a week, when the Lord Protector required the members to subscribe to a recognition of the basic form of government. In 1656, most were excluded. They returned for the short session of 1658, which lasted less than three weeks. When present, they were in the forefront of the fight for parliamentary

supremacy and probably had little time to formulate any other doctrines.

Since the evidence for republican doctrine in this parliament is so scanty, it is also necessary to consider political activities in order to determine which men were republicans. Such evidence consists of their abrupt departure from parliament in 1654, their exclusion in 1656, their return in 1658, as well as their determined effort to be elected in 1656. The Irish army officers who opposed Henry Cromwell are classified here as republicans rather than as members of the Military Court. There is more convincing evidence of republicanism for some than for others, but their activities are so similar that it seems reasonable to treat them as members of the same group. The only other factors to consider in seeking to ascertain the identity of the republican members would be their past political records. Many, for example, had acted in connection with the king's trial, or had served in the Rump or Nominated parliaments. Since none of these activities is an infallible sign of republicanism, it will be necessary to focus upon political activity during these parliaments after a consideration of their cherished doctrine of parliamentary supremacy.²

Much theoretical discussion lay behind this belief of the republican politicians in the Protectorate parliaments that the legislature should be supreme. Writers on political theory, commencing with the ancients, had usually advocated the participation of three elements in the governmental process: executive, aristocratic, and democratic. Such republican writers as James Harrington pointed to Venice as an example of a balanced mixture of these three elements which had produced stable, prosperous government. However, such

Renaissance writers as Guicciardini strongly distrusted the executive element, and John Milton, in his defense of the Commonwealth, ultimately arrived at a theory that justified the supremacy of parliament in this governmental mixture. He stated that parliaments had a right to pass on the acts of the executive, because the executive was a creation of the parliament, which itself derived its authority from the sovereign people. Milton's ideal subordinate executive was a council of parliamentary committees, deriving their power from the legislative body, but he was willing to accept the Protectorate as a temporary expedient to restore order. Sir Henry Vane, reluctantly accepting the Protectorate, also insisted that the Protector's powers should be subordinate to those of parliament.³

None of these theoreticians were members of either of the Protectorate parliaments; so the beliefs of John Bradshaw, a leader of the 1654-1655 session, are of special interest here, showing as they do the application of these theories to a practical situation. Bradshaw's belief in parliamentary supremacy is expounded in a set of proposals to parliament, which commence by stating that "the supreme legislative power of this Commonwealth is and ought to be in the people assembled in Parliament."⁴ Had these proposals been accepted, all the Protector's ordinances since the dissolution of the 1653 parliament would have become illegal, as would also a proviso in the certificates of election of the present members, which states that they must uphold the present government, based on both the authority of parliament and that of a single person.

II-5

This doctrine of parliamentary supremacy was in direct conflict with the Instrument of Government. The Instrument expressly provided for the joint exercise of the legislative power by the Lord Protector and his council as well as parliament, with "supreme legislative authority . . . in one person, and the people assembled in Parliament."⁵ Specific powers given to the Protector limited the authority of the legislative body. The Protector had sole control of the militia in the intervals between parliamentary sessions, and shared this control with the members when parliament was sitting. Parliament had no share in the conduct of foreign affairs; with the consent of the council, the Protector conducted foreign relations and had the power to declare war or peace. He had some control over the summoning or dissolution of parliament, for he could dissolve it without the consent of the members after it had been in session for five months and was required to convene it only after three years had passed since the last session. Although parliament retained its taxing power, this was limited to some degree, because the constitution guaranteed to the Protector a fixed revenue for the conduct of government and the support of the military. Moreover, this power to raise revenue was curtailed, because the Protector's consent was necessary to sell land confiscated from the Crown. The council was of great importance under this constitution, and the Lord Protector retained some choice as to who should serve in it. With the consent of this council, before the first parliament had been convened, the Lord Protector had had the power to enact laws and ordinances, and, once it was summoned, he retained a twenty-day suspensive veto.⁶

In both the first and second Protectorate parliaments, the republicans fought to implement their belief in the supremacy of parliament. In 1654, they attacked the powers of the Lord Protector, declaring that these should be subordinated to those of the House. In 1658, their target was the newly established Other House, whose powers they feared as a rival to their own.

When parliament met in 1654, the republican efforts led immediately to a conflict with the Court. The republicans attempted to rewrite the Instrument of Government so that "parliament alone" rather than "a single person and a Parliament" should be the supreme authority.⁷ If this authority had to be shared, they wanted parliament to have the greater part, and they insisted that the power of the executive be qualified by whatever instructions they desired. The Court fought these attempts. Forced to fall back on "de facto" arguments, because they had no theoretical justification for their position, the spokesmen for the Court stated that the Lord Protector should not be asked to give up the powers which he had won by the sword and which had been sanctified by the election of members of parliament, held in accordance with the provisions of the new constitution.

The Protector, hindered by the lack of theoretical justification for his position and angered by what he believed was a plan of deliberate obstructionism, took arbitrary action. Less than two weeks after this parliament had been convened, he forced all the members to subscribe to a recognition of the basic form of government as prescribed in the constitution in which he shared the legislative authority with parliament. Unwilling to abandon their basic beliefs, the republicans

II-7

would not subscribe and only two appeared during the remainder of the parliamentary session.

This forced adherence, amounting to a loyalty oath, Cromwell had hoped to avoid; its advisability had been discussed before parliament was convened, and he had rejected it at that time; now it was brought about by the republican intransigence. Since the right of the Protector to force adherence had been implied in the writs of election, foreign observers, accustomed perhaps to more despotic Continental methods, had expected him to use these writs at once to remodel parliament to suit his own tastes. The Venetian ambassador reported, "He is issuing the writs in advance so that the country may see that he means to enjoy its ancient electoral privileges and if he see anything therein contrary to his personal interests, he will be in time to counteract it."⁹ Feeling, however, that the newly elected members would cooperate with him and observe the provisions of the writs testifying to their elections, the Lord Protector resolved initially to trust to their good will. In his opening speech he stated, "an owing of your call and of the authority bringing you hither, might have been required before your entrance into the House. But this was declined, and hath not been done, because I am persuaded scarce any man could doubt you came with contrary minds."¹⁰

This policy of trust was not to be repeated. In 1656, the Court, determined not to see a repetition of this situation, first made determined efforts to elect its own supporters and then excluded roughly one hundred members, including a majority of the republicans elected.

Only five of the twenty-nine republicans elected attended this 1656-1657 session. The rest either were excluded by the Court or voluntarily absented themselves. The names of fourteen appear on the exclusion lists. Henry Cromwell, acting from his position as commander-in-chief in Ireland, attempted to exclude five others informally: Thomas Sadler and Daniel Abbot were kept in Ireland, ostensibly on military duty, but more likely because their republican beliefs made their presence in parliament undesirable; John Hewson, Jerome Sankey and John Clark, all of whom represented Ireland in the 1654-1655 session, represented English constituencies in 1656. All signs point to these changes of seats as a move to rid the Irish delegation of republican members. There is no record of Daniel Blagrove, John Dixwell, Carew Mildmay, Robert Wallop, or Thomas Cole, all ardent English republicans who were not excluded, ever attending. Samuel Highland, Luke Robinson and the Irish members who had found English seats, were the only republicans who claimed their parliamentary seats in this session.¹¹

In 1658, the excluded republicans were readmitted to the second session of the second parliament and again advocated the principle of parliamentary supremacy. Their target this year was the Other House, established in the new constitution adopted in the first session. The Lord Protector placed great stress upon this new branch of the government, conceiving of it as a counterpoise to the extremist elements in the House.¹² The republicans attacked it bitterly, using as a pretext their fear that it would be called a House of Lords. This, of course,

was merely an excuse; for, as Anthony Ashley Cooper remarked, "Some are neither for another House, nor for the other title."¹³ In reality, they feared that this new chamber would threaten the supremacy of the House; as another opponent, Willaim Gibbs stated, "It imports either a co-ordination or a supremacy above you."¹⁴

Not only the substance of their debates, but the actions of republicans reflect an organized political plan. In the 1654 session, their obstructionism indicates a deliberate policy. In addition to their harassment of the Court in parliament, they also cooperated with disaffected elements in London, an alliance which was to continue after their withdrawal and was to reemerge in 1658. Not only did they deliberately decide after several meetings no longer to participate in the session after a subscription to the recognition was required, but their leaders embarked upon a course of dabbling at least at the fringes of subversive activities. In 1656, realizing that these methods would not further their aims, they resolved to elect as many members as possible to the newly summoned parliament. When these members were readmitted in 1658, all were urged to attend and to do their best to outvote the Court and thus to force the Protector to dissolve the session. During this session, they monopolized the proceedings with their attacks on the Other House, and they again cooperated both with their London allies and with some intransigent members of the Country in the House. This alliance with these discontented groups was a contributing factor to the Lord Protector's sudden, angry dissolution of this parliament less than three weeks after the convening of the second session.

John Bradshaw, who had been president of the parliamentary

commission that tried Charles I, was a leader of the republican obstructionists in 1654. Edmund Ludlow, the republican apologist, attests to this fact, especially singling out Bradshaw, when boasting that in this session the republicans educated members ignorant as to the true nature of the Court's nefarious designs. Bradshaw led the other members into the House of Commons after the opening service in Westminster Abbey and then was unsuccessfully nominated for the office of speaker.¹⁵

Deliberate petty harassment of the Court leadership by the republican members then ensued. In order to delay the proceedings, members argued about whether it was proper to open the session on a Sunday. When they were invited to meet with the Lord Protector in the Painted Chamber, dissenters cried, "Sit still,"¹⁶ and then delayed arrangements for a fast service, a usual proceeding during the Interregnum parliamentary sessions, by insisting that the service be held in the House rather than in a church. Leading republicans then pretended that an ordinance to prevent the open expression of treasonous sentiments would prevent free speech on the floor of the House, although it obviously was not intended to apply in this context.¹⁷

Support of the republican advocacy of supremacy of parliament, being expressed at this time in London, indicates collusion between the republican members and discontented elements in the city. Bradshaw was later very much involved with these opponents of the Court, so that indications are plentiful that he engineered this partnership. On September 11, when the debates in the House on the relative powers of

parliament and the Protector was at its height, there were prayers from the London pulpits for the members of parliament, but the Protector's welfare was generally ignored. The Lord Protector must have been worried about this support that his opponents were receiving. He was concerned at this time about the quiet of the city, discussing the situation in parliament with the Lord Mayor and other city officials and warning them to prevent disturbances. His anxiety is understandable, for Puritan ministers had been active during the Civil War in marshaling support for political measures and their activities had been connected with those of the members of parliament representing London.¹⁸

The republicans' withdrawal from this session in 1654 was the result of joint consultation. After the subscription to the recognition had been enjoined, they met in taverns to discuss their course of action. It was thus reported in one of the newsletters, "many refused to sign thereunto and presented their Reasons to the contrary. After which they withdrew and retired to several places in King Street."¹⁹ King Street was a regular republican meeting place at this time, being noted as a gathering spot of the Levellers, an extreme republican group, who had flourished in the later years of the civil war. In the early eighteenth century, particular taverns in particular areas assumed the character of habitual meeting places for various groups of members and the use of the King Street taverns indicates that this custom had already been established during the Interregnum.²⁰

The republicans not only withdrew from this parliament, but their leaders also embarked upon a course of flirting with subversive activities in the period preceding Penruddock's Rising, an extensive royalist

II-12

rebellion that took place in March, 1655. There were several months of subversive planning. Both royalists and Levellers, whose surviving members supported the rebellion because of their dissatisfaction with the Protectorate government, participated in this planning. These Leveller plotters made active and partially successful efforts to involve in their plans the republican members who had recently left the House. Republican members mentioned in this connection are: Sir Arthur Haslerig, John Bradshaw, John Weaver, Lord Grey of Grooby, George Fenwick, Thomas Scott, Jerome Sankey and William Eyre.

Bradshaw, the leader of the parliamentary obstructionists, now assumed leadership of the republican participation in these subversive activities. The Levellers relied upon him for advice and he lent his house as a meeting place for the plotters. A petition drawn up by the Leveller leader, John Wildman, was shown to Bradshaw by a friend of Wildman's, presumably for approval.

Also attending at least one of the meetings at Bradshaw's house was a Leicestershire member of parliament, Colonel Francis Hacker, probably the informant. Notes were made about both the proceedings and the participants by John Thurloe, who was in charge of intelligence for the Protectorate government. It is reasonable to assume that Hacker was the source of information, since he helped to terminate the plot the next February by arresting another of those attending these meetings, Lord Grey of Grooby.²¹ On the other hand, Hacker is characterized in 1659 as "Haslerig's creature"²² so he may have been more sincere than is generally believed.

The connections of these republicans with discontented elements in London are as evident after their withdrawal as when they were in the House. They were active in promoting a petition that the London Common Council was organizing to urge the House to set up a rigidly defined religious doctrine. When the Lord Protector saw this petition, he expressed great discontent, saying, "these will undo all."²³

There is evidence of further participation in these subversive activities by three of the men attending the meetings at Bradshaw's house. Colonel William Eyre and Lord Grey of Grooby were active in planning for the rebellion. Sir Arthur Haslerig was too cautious to commit himself so fully, but nevertheless encouraged the plotters.

Colonel Eyre made contact with a Leveller agent in December, then fled to Dublin where he was seized and sent to England to be imprisoned. The agent, who had been landed from the fleet to see what support might be found for a seamen's petition and possibly to arrange for contact with the rebels in the army, was sent to Eyre by William Prior. Prior had been in the forefront of the Leveller movement in 1649.²⁴ Eyre received the agent suspiciously, but expressed sympathy with his aims, saying, "he had fought for liberty, but had none, and that it was as good living in Turkey as here."²⁵

This discontented republican, who had a long record of radical activity, only managed to obtain a seat in the House because of the resignation of another Wiltshire member. He had originally been defeated in the 1654 election. He ran on the slate headed by the republican, Edmund Ludlow, which lost to that headed by Anthony Ashley Cooper.

The Presbyterian ministers who backed Cooper called Eyre an Anabaptist and a Leveller.²⁶

Lord Grey of Grooby was characterized by a servant of one of the Leveller leaders as the "head of this party,"²⁷ and his arrest in February lends weight to this statement. He was seized by Colonel Hacker, the informant of the meetings at Bradshaw's house, and taken to Windsor castle. Lord Grey is described by a contemporary historian as not an outstanding person, but useful to the radicals because of his wealth and local influence, so perhaps he was more gullible than the other republican plotters and therefore more willing to venture into dangerous territory.²⁸

Haslerig was more cautious than Grey and managed to escape official notice by the authorities. He told one of the Leveller leaders that he would not actively participate in the rebellion until he saw some signs of success, saying, "he was loth to begin the business, but as soon as he saw the candle lighted, the bishoprick of Durham should set it up."²⁹ However, at the same time, he undertook to distribute subversive propaganda.

After the failure of Penruddock's rising, the republicans took no further part in public affairs until the summoning of the second Protectorate parliament in 1656. Armed resistance had been futile, and their refusal to take part in the proceedings of the 1654-1655 session had left them without a public platform. Realizing the futility of this policy, they resolved to elect as many of their sympathizers as possible to the coming session of parliament.

II-15

There are several indications of this new development. Propaganda pamphlets were distributed. Republicans in different counties were in communication and encouraged each other to run for public office. Twenty-nine were elected, often after lively contests, eleven of whom were new members. Evidence shows the defeat of twelve more. Several of those defeated were republican leaders, who, rather than withdrawing as they had in 1654, were so determined to win that they were candidates in several places at the same time. Moreover, steps taken by the Court, both before and during the elections, to counteract this policy, show an awareness of its existence and a determination not to permit these republicans to obstruct the parliamentary proceedings again.

Two pamphlets, issued in the months before the election, spelled out this policy. Their publication resulted in summons before the council of state for their authors and subsequent imprisonment.

"England's Remembrancers," calling for the election of republicans, urged all Englishmen to vote in the coming elections. It specifically stated that no one should abstain from voting because he did not approve of the Protectorate government.

Efforts were made to see that this pamphlet received wide circulation. It was distributed on the streets of London at night and then dispatched in bundles to be circulated in the counties.

Two prominent republicans, Colonels Nathaniel Rich and Matthew Alured, were imprisoned two weeks after this distribution and charged with being either the authors or disseminators of this pamphlet. Both had only recently finished prison terms, Alured for sharing in the organization of a petition designed to stir up discontent in the army and

II-16

Rich for participating in a delegation, headed by the radical general, Thomas Harrison, which was asking for the release of a Fifth Monarchy preacher. Rich was distantly related to the Lord Protector, but not even this could save him.³⁰

"A Healing Question," published by Sir Henry Vane, Jr. the spring before the elections, did not seem dangerous to the Court until parliament was summoned. It called for the convocation of a parliament of all parties except the royalists to draw up a new constitution in which parliament would be supreme. The Court presumably was afraid that if the pamphlet was left to circulate undisturbed, members might be elected who would be inclined to follow its advice.

Vane, a leading member of the Long Parliament and once an intimate of the Lord Protector, underwent a series of persecutions on the eve of the elections.³¹ He was summoned before the council of state, charged with seditious intent in writing this book and asked to post bail to "do nothing to the prejudice of the present government."³² When he refused, he was temporarily imprisoned on the Isle of Wight. After his release, according to a republican diarist, in an attempt to discourage him, his rights to certain properties were threatened. According to this account, the Lord Protector was personally responsible for this persecution, encouraging members of the military to take possession of forest walks belonging to Vane and then ordering the attorney general, on pretence of a flaw in the title to the estate, to prosecute him. Vane was then privately informed that he would be freed of this inquisition if he would cooperate with the Court.³³

Several other leading republicans were summoned before the council of state during this summer in a move to keep them quiet during the pre-election period. John Bradshaw was summoned "in connection with elections."³⁴ Wary of him ever since his obstructionism during the 1654 parliaments, the council discharged him from his post as chief justice of Chester, a position he had filled since 1646. He refused to obey and went on circuit as usual, and the Court allowed him to do so rather than antagonize the rest of the bar.³⁵ Edmund Ludlow, who had been lieutenant-general of the army in Ireland and had only reluctantly acknowledged the establishment of the Protectorate, also was summoned before the council to discuss the elections. After arguing with the Lord Protector and refusing to give security for his loyalty, he was imprisoned for a short time and then went to Essex.³⁶ He wrote later that he was sent there so he could not interfere with the elections, saying, "My stay there did in some measure answer the design of Cromwell, which was to keep me out of the country [county], where he doubted I might obstruct the election of such persons as the Court had resolved by all methods to procure to be returned."³⁷ Sir Arthur Haslerig and Colonel John Okey were personally interviewed by the Lord Protector at about this time. Although nothing is known about the content of the interviews, it can be assumed that the roles of these men in the forthcoming elections were discussed. Haslerig, who had emerged unscathed from his participation in the 1655 plots, was about to be a candidate for parliament again. Okey, instrumental with Alured in organizing the army petition, had only recently been in close contact with Bradshaw,

II-18

who had encouraged him to continue his subversive activities.³⁸ Major Richard Salway, who had been on the commission to try the king and was about to run for the House, was interviewed by the Council at the same time as Vane.³⁹ Both were characterized as disloyal, rumor saying, "itt is said they have bin tampering with those people that would if possible involve the nation into blood againe."⁴⁰

In spite of these efforts of the Court to discourage republican participation in the coming session, these men persisted and embarked upon an organized drive to elect their candidates.⁴¹ This drive is revealed in a letter of Major-general Haynes, who while discussing the campaign of the republican candidate, William Fisher, from the Isle of Ely, states that Fisher is "under so many engagements from eminent persons of like principles to themselves in other counties (which were in great measure by Capt. Fisher acknowledged by myself to be so) and one great reason of fixing his resolution by standing."⁴² Evidence about the circumstances of the elections of seventeen of the twenty-nine republican members of this parliament bears out this statement. Eight of these men had not served in the first Protectorate parliament, a sign of continued interest and of an effort to bring in new blood.⁴³

Fisher was successful in the Isle of Ely, although his candidacy was opposed by Major-general Haynes, in charge of this area. The other candidate was John Thurloe, the secretary of the council of state. Haynes wrote to Thurloe that it was impossible to discourage Fisher from running. Fisher's republicanism can be

II-19

demonstrated. In 1653, a year in which the council of state was dominated by republicans, he was appointed high sheriff for Cambridge and Huntingdonshire. In 1656, he was associated with the noted republican, John Hobart, in organizing a petition asking for relief from taxation for the inhabitants of Wisbeach, a neighboring town. He was excluded in 1656 when the parliament convened.⁴⁴

Haynes also opposed the candidacies of the republicans, Philip Woodhouse and John Hobart in Norfolk, but, nevertheless, they were successful in their efforts. Hobart, who had been supported in 1654 by a discontented group in the corporation and by the Norwich rabble, now received the support of a sectarian minister named Boatman. The candidate was characterized by Haynes as being ruled by "an arbitrary power."⁴⁵ Hobart and Woodhouse were among the few Norfolk members who, following the republican line, did not initially return to the House in 1654 after the enforced subscription to the recognition of the Lord Protector's authority.⁴⁶ In 1656, an agent of Haynes' tried unsuccessfully to persuade Woodhouse not to run for office. This agent believed that the republican was unfit to sit in parliament, writing to Haynes that Woodhouse's judgement "would not suit with the government."⁴⁷

The republicans elected four candidates in Yorkshire, Richard and Henry Darley in the East Riding, Luke Robinson in the North Riding, and Francis Thorpe in the West Riding. These candidates probably benefited not only from an over-all strategy developed in conference between men from the East Riding and republicans in London, but from a background of unrest in all of Yorkshire. Many Yorkshiremen had

II-20

participated in Penruddock's rising in 1655. One of the republican candidates, Francis Thorpe, who had been a circuit judge at that time, had refused to try the rebels and was dismissed from the bench.⁴⁸

A candidate from the East Riding conferred with other republicans in London and this conference stirred up republican activity in this area. Lilburne discussed this activity, reporting that "Richard Darley and some others were at London lately, and had meetings with Sir Henry Vane, Mr. Nevell and some of that gang--and upon Richard Darley's return here was private meetings of severall discontented persons."⁴⁹ Richard Darley and his brother, Henry, both successful candidates, had a long record of republican activity. They came from a Puritan family closely associated with the opposition in the 1640s, which participated in the colonizing ventures of Lords Say and Sele, Brooke and Warwick. Henry had planned to emigrate to escape Laud's regime. Both sat in the Rump parliament, were excluded, and signed a remonstrance against exclusion in 1656. They returned to the second session in 1658, in conformity with republican policy, in order to oppose the Court. Another republican candidate, William Bradford, was defeated in this area, in spite of arduous efforts.⁵⁰

Luke Robinson was the only republican elected in the North Riding, where the troop concentration was heaviest. He had also sat in the Rump, and he showed his republican attitudes in 1656 by backing a parliamentary motion that any member who used the title "Lord" as a mode of address should be fined.⁵¹ He was an ardent opponent of the kingship proposals, serving as an opposition teller in two

divisions and saying that these proposals should be torn up and burned by the common hangman.⁵²

The republicans were also active in the West Riding. Major-general Lambert was elected there without opposition. But there was heated competition for the other five places and a poll had to be taken. Francis Thorpe, the circuit judge who had been dismissed from his position by the Court, was elected to one of the places. The other four successful candidates were all of Country persuasion, so it seems reasonable to assume that their defeated opponents were all republicans.⁵³

A republican was elected from Canterbury, which had elected another republican to the first Protectorate parliament, suggesting the support of the corporation for this ideology. Thomas Scott, the republican leader, had been elected to the first Protectorate parliament and now Thomas St. Nicholas was elected. He had been one of the most radical members of the Nominated Parliament and his exclusion in 1656 was castigated by a republican tract, which characterized him among others as just as "capable, and every way more likely to Council and advise for the good of their Countrey"⁵⁴ as others who were allowed to remain in the parliament. He returned with the other republicans to the second session of this parliament and moved that those responsible for the exclusion be called to account.⁵⁵

Several other known republicans ran for the first time in 1656. Thomas Cole, the rabid republican who was working for John Bulkeley, the Country candidate, was elected from Hampshire.

II-22

His victory was the result of republican cooperation with the Country in this county.⁵⁶ Proof of this cooperation is Cole's support of the Country candidate and Major-general Goffe's assertion that so many voters opposed him that he was only elected by "a special providence of God."⁵⁷ Daniel Blagrove, a convinced republican who fled to the Low Countries in 1660, was defeated by Major-general Barkstead through the use of Court influence, but since Barkstead chose to sit for Middlesex, Blagrove finally represented Reading.⁵⁸

Court pressure forced several republicans to seek out new constituencies to represent, rather than continue to stand for those they had been elected to in 1654. Their elections in these new constituencies are a proof of their determination to continue serving in the House.

Special efforts were made to prevent the nomination of the republican leaders, Sir Arthur Haslerig and Thomas Scott, in their 1654 constituencies. Court pressure must have been put upon Haslerig's 1654 constituency, Newcastle on Tyne: for he was replaced by a member of the council of state. The members of the corporation sent their respects to their erstwhile representative, but indicated their intention of choosing another candidate, and selected Walter Strickland, a member of the council of state. Haslerig represented Leicestershire in 1656. The borough of Chipping-Wycombe, which Scott had represented in 1654 and of which he was the recorder received a new charter on the eve of the election. In accordance with its provisions, the corporation was purged, presumably of Scott's supporters. Major-general Tobias Bridge represented this constituency in 1656 and

II-23

Scott was forced to serve for the borough of Aylesbury.⁵⁹

All signs point to Henry Cromwell's influence as the determining factor in forcing three republicans who had represented Irish constituencies in 1654 to represent English constituencies in 1656.

John Hewson and Jerome Sankey no doubt obtained their new English seats through the influence of Major-generals Fleetwood and Kelsey. Colonel John Clarke, who retained his military command in Ireland in 1659 when a republican regime was in power, a sign of republicanism, represented a Welsh, rather than an Irish constituency in 1656.⁶⁰

The determination of the republicans to send a large delegation to parliament is shown by the number of prominent republicans who were defeated, as well as by the number of those elected. There is no complete list of defeated candidates, but scattered evidence shows that eleven republicans ran unsuccessful races. In spite of the Lord Protector's efforts to discourage their candidacies, Bradshaw, Rich, Vane, Ludlow and Salway all attempted, although in vain, to become members of the House. Vane and Bradshaw were so determined that both were multiple candidates.⁶¹

A contemporary source notes that "Sir H. Vane poled for it in three places and mist it in all."⁶² The only information extant about these contests is in a letter from Major-general Whalley. He notes that Vane's friends had been working for him in Boston, a Lincolnshire borough, but since this was "fruitless," they did not openly appear for him there, but were now openly working for him in the county.⁶³ It was impossible for an open republican, such as Vane, to be elected in Lincolnshire in 1656. John Weaver, a

consistent republican, was elected from a Lincolnshire borough, but only because he employed some deception about his views, saying that "his mind was alter'd from what it was the last parliament."⁶⁴ His anti-Court record in 1658 shows that this was merely a campaign promise.⁶⁵

John Bradshaw was defeated in Cheshire, London and Staffordshire. In Cheshire, where he had originally been considered for the Court approved slate, his name was dropped after the intervention of Major-general Bridge, probably because he was too radical for the gentry establishment. At the election, the sheriff, Philip Egerton, a Court appointee, actively intervened against both Bradshaw and Sir William Brereton, who, like Bradshaw, had a great following among the poorer classes. Egerton had become sheriff in 1655, after the Court refused to appoint John Legh. Legh became sheriff in 1658 and then actively intervened to ensure Bradshaw's election to Richard's Cromwell's parliament.⁶⁶ From London, a letter of Major-general Barkstead tells of a meeting where "lord Bradshaw" was among the "most disaffected" who were nominated.⁶⁷ Here, Bradshaw's connections with London republicans are again manifested, but this year to no avail, for only wealthy Country merchants and Court supporters were elected in London. In Staffordshire, where he had "laid a good foundation to his minde-- as he passed" to Cheshire, Major-general Bridge again thwarted Bradshaw's ambitions.⁶⁸ Martin Noel, the Lord Protector's chief economic consultant, was returned to the Stafford seat, which Bradshaw had represented in 1654.

Edmund Ludlow was defeated again in Wiltshire in this year.

II-25

He reported that a "more numerous party" appeared for him than had been expected, a continuation of the strong support he had received against Cooper in 1654. Both deception and a threat of force were used by the Court to discourage Ludlow's adherents. They were told that he was a prisoner in the Tower and that he had stated that he did not wish to run for office, both manifest untruths. Then a representative of the major-general in charge of the district threatened "a new war," if Ludlow's supporters persisted.⁶⁹

The only information about the candidacies of Rich, Salway, and Major-general Thomas Harrison, comes from a royalist document which states, "In England there is much bustle about choosing Parl. men, some counties have chosen Bradshaw, Ludlow, Salloway, Harrison and Rich at which Cromwell is so incensed that he has ordered them to give bail to the MGs of their counties."⁷⁰ Since Bradshaw and Ludlow ran for office but were not elected, it is probable that the same holds true for these other known republicans. Rich and Salway had already appeared before the council of state, in an attempt to discourage them from pursuing their candidacies. Harrison was a radical parliamentary general, who had been the leader of the republicans in the Nominated Parliament and had split with Cromwell at the time of the establishment of the Protectorate.⁷¹

Henry Neville, a leading republican theorist, was defeated in Berkshire. Advocating parliamentary supremacy, his "Plato Redivivus," published at the time of the Exclusion Crisis in 1681, recommended the exercise of the royal prerogative through councils of state responsible to a parliament. He was unsuccessful at the election, although he

II-26

was favored by three-quarters of the voters present, because of the machinations of the sheriff, who was backed by the soldiers and the ministers who had been active for Hammond in 1654. A year later, he sued the sheriff in Common Pleas for damages. The leading republicans, Ludlow, Haslerig, Scott, and Sir James Harrington, accompanied Neville to the trial, and a verdict was pronounced against the sheriff, who was to pay £1500 to Neville and £100 to the Commonwealth. However, the payment of the damages was postponed, perhaps because the sheriff and his supporters appealed to the Lord Protector. The sheriff then seized both Neville's real and personal property, and the case was never determined, although it was discussed in the parliament of 1659-1660. Neville was elected to Richard Cromwell's parliament after the Lord Protector's death.

A defeated candidate in the East Riding of Yorkshire was probably a republican, for this was the area in which Richard Darley had organized political activity after his meeting in London with his fellow-republicans Vane and Neville. This was Captain William Bradford, an officer in Lilburne's regiment of horse, who had become a Quaker and converted some of his fellow officers. Abstention from politics became a feature of the Quaker movement only after 1660, at this time the movement was associated with radicalism. Bradford appeared at the polls at the head of four hundred officers who voted for him.⁷² He was defeated by Colonel Hugh Bethell, characterized as a political "moderate."⁷³

Two republicans, Sir James Harrington and Josiah Berners, who had been members for Middlesex in 1654, were defeated in 1656,

II-27

but only after a display of force by the Court. They ran on a slate with two Country members, against a slate headed by Major-general John Barkstead. Republican determination to win is shown by the following comment which states that their slate "should carrie it in despite of all, for his [Berner's] brother-in-law was at present the under-sheriffe and would doe whatever he would have him; and that himself with 7 or 800 did intent to be att Branford by 7 of the clock that morneing, where Mr. Shute and his brother had taken up their inn together."⁷⁴ The disorder was apparently great; "the Anabaptists tooke away the justices swords, and beate them meserabely, insomuch that a regement of horse was sent to part them."⁷⁵

Daniel Blagrove was defeated in Reading, where Lord Commissioner Bulstrode Whitelocke, as High Steward, controlled the corporation. Only Barkstead's choice of Middlesex, where he had just won such a hard-fought victory, enabled Blagrove to be declared technically the winner. However, since he never appeared in the House, it is a safe assumption that the Court exerted pressure to secure his absence.⁷⁶

In 1658, when the second session of this 1656 parliament was convened, the republicans were still determined to attend and to obstruct the parliamentary proceedings. Largely absent from the first session owing to the Court's deliberate exclusion, they resolved to take advantage of the provisions of the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, and to reenter the House. Two months before parliament met, a deliberate republican strategy had already been worked out.

An exchange of letters between Josiah Berners, the defeated

II-28

, candidate from Middlesex in 1656, and his cousin John Hobart, the republican member from Norwich, outlined the strategy. Attendance and a policy of obstructionism were urged. Berners wrote, "If you all could agree to go in at first--you might then outvote that party or faction which receive of the public more than they pay to it, and so perhaps make him to dissolve you, which is the best we can expect at present as things stand." Hobart replied, "None must be idle, but everyone must serve God and his country, according to his standing."⁷⁷

This republican policy was a success and events proceeded as Berners had predicted. The excluded republicans did return. The names of John Weaver, Francis Thorpe, Thomas Scott, Thomas St. Nicholas, one of the Listers and one of the Darleys, Samuel Highland and Sir Arthur Haslerig, appear in the records of the debates. Their behavior was so obstructive that, as they had planned, they forced the Lord Protector to dissolve the second session.

This dissolution was precipitated by a renewal of the alliance of the republicans in parliament with discontented elements in the city. Picking up the threads of the alliance promoted by Bradshaw in 1654 and 1655, they prepared a petition to be presented to parliament to restore the republic. This petition was promoted from their London pulpits by sectarian ministers. Estimates of the number of signatures collected vary, but they number in the thousands. A letter was sent out asking sympathetic members of parliament to be present when the petition was presented. Only the Lord Protector's precipitate dissolution of this parliament prevented the execution

II-29

of this plan.⁷⁸

The republicans would not have been able to be as effective as they were if they had been forced to rely wholly upon these extra-parliamentary allies. Too small numerically ever to have been able to control the proceedings of the House, they were willing to be expedient and to cooperate with the more intransigent Country members.

This alliance was forged in spite of the fact that the beliefs of the two groups were in many ways antithetical. Convinced of the necessity for a parliament that would be supreme in the governmental system, the republicans were not interested in precedent and wanted to establish new institutions. Their attitude is summarized in Harrington's castigation of tradition: "it signifies no other than their constancie and dear affection unto their Old Laws and ways, how fit so ever they be now become."⁷⁹ The Country, on the other hand, wanted to restore the "ancient constitution" and joined the Court in supporting the proposals to crown the Lord Protector. Nevertheless, in the short periods in which the republicans were actually present in the House, a working partnership was formed.

In 1654, the republicans were willing to cooperate with the Country in an effort to establish an intolerant, presbyterian system of church government, even though many of their members belonged to Independent religious sects. Haslerig made such a proposal in return for Country support of the destruction of the Instrument of Government. This alliance then produced a resolution in favor of the establishment of an Assembly of Divines, a body to be nominated by the members of the House which would give advice on religious matters. Recommendations

II-30

of the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1644 of a presbyterian form of church government had been an important divisive issue at that time. The Lord Protector must have felt that proposals for the formation of such a body were extremely hostile in intent; no doubt their introduction was a precipitating factor in his demand, the day after they were introduced, for a subscription to the basic form of government.

In 1658, this alliance took shape again in the heat of the debate on the powers of the Other House. While most Country members continued to support the new constitution, others cooperated with the republicans in an effort to destroy it. Active in these debates in alliance with the republicans were the following members of the Country: Robert Barrington, Richard Lucy, William Gibbs and Joachim Matthews. Their leader was Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper. All these men had ties with the Court which should have prevented their cooperation with the republicans or had previously shown their opposition to republicanism. Barrington was a relative of the Lord Protector. Lucy had backed the kingship proposals. Gibbs had been removed from the London Court of Aldermen by the republican controlled Rump. Ashley Ashley Cooper, an early backer of the kingship proposals, had run twice in Wiltshire against the republican candidate, Edmund Ludlow. Nevertheless, these men now entered into cooperation with the republicans.⁸⁰

The role of Ashley Cooper, the future Earl of Shaftesbury, reveals the true historical significance of this alliance: it was the progenitor of the first Whig party. At the time of the exclusion crisis in 1679-1681, Shaftesbury put together a similar coalition in

which these same two groups, the Country and the republicans, were the principal elements. He was doubtless groping toward the coalition he was later successfully to form.⁸¹

The Lord Protector understood the dangerous meaning of this partnership. The reason traditionally given for his dissolution of this parliament, the necessity of forestalling the republican partnership with their extra-parliamentary allies, is valid, but the threat of this Country-republican cooperation must not be overlooked.⁸²

Exerting through these ties an influence far out of proportion to their numbers, the republicans thus acted as the catalyst for discontent in the Protectorate parliaments. In 1654, they were the first group to express opposition to the Instrument of Government. When they left the House, opposition was carried on in a more traditional fashion by the Country, whose members expressed their discontents within the traditional framework of government. This continuity of opposition is symbolized by the relationship of Colonel John Birch, the Country leader in the first Protectorate parliament, to Sir Arthur Haslerig. Birch was lieutenant-colonel of Haslerig's regiment during the civil wars.⁸³ In 1658, the very presence of the republicans again served to destroy the Court program and provided Ashley Cooper, a pragmatic politician, the opportunity to forge the working partnership which would later become the first Whig party.

This alignment was short-lived and did not continue past the exclusion crisis of 1679-1681. After this time, many of the republican policies were espoused by their enemies of the Protectorate era, the Court, now known as the Whigs. By the 1690s, the Whigs supported

II-32

the republican positions of supremacy of parliament, an interventionist foreign policy, and a tolerationist religious settlement. The Country left Shaftesbury's coalition and, as Tories, retreated to the positions they had stood for during the Protectorate era: an isolationist foreign policy and a reliance on the "ancient constitution."⁸⁴

The Protectorate parliaments had provided the republicans with one of their few opportunities to be politically effective in the House, and they failed to take advantage of it because their policies were so destructive. Unable to put across their beliefs because of their lack of numerical strength, they refused to compromise with the Court and used their alliance with the Country only to oppose attempts being made to effectuate a working constitutional settlement. Wholly destructive, their function in the Protectorate parliaments was merely to serve as a catalyst for the discontents of the numerically larger group of Country members.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

FII-1

1. Appendix, p. 326.
2. The economic and social ideas of the republicans in the late 1640s are discussed in such books as that by H. N. Brailsford, The Levellers and the English Revolution (London, 1961). Members of the Court had also acted as regicides, the prime example being the Lord Protector himself. The composition of the Rump Parliament is discussed by David Underdown, Pride's Purge (Oxford, 1971). The Irish army officers are discussed further in Chapter V.
3. Zera Silver Fink, The Classical Republicans (Evanston, Illinois, 1945), pp. 10, 20, 34; Caroline Robbins, The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman (Cambridge, 1961), p. 47. For the Instrument of Government, Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), p. 405. For Milton's theory, First Defense, I, 15, 398, as quoted in Fink, Classical Republicans, pp. 103, 108. For Vane, Perez Zagorin, A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution (London, 1954), p. 153. For Harrington, Charles Blitzer, An Immortal Commonwealth (New Haven, 1960), p. 248.
4. "A paper of proposals made to the Parliament thereof" from Lord Braye's MSS, probably by John Bradshaw in Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), III, 184, 185.
5. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, Article I, p. 405.
6. Ibid., Article I, p. 405, Articles IV-VII, p. 406, Article XXVII, XXXI, p. 414, Article XXV, p. 413, Article XXX, p. 414, Article XXIV, p. 413.
7. The Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828), I, xxv, 9/7-9/8/54.
8. Ibid., pp. xxix, xxxiii, 9/11/54, 9/12/54. Although Philip Woodhouse and John Hobart, republican members, refused to subscribe, their names appear as committee members later in the session. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, Article XII, p. 410.
9. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, XXIX (1653-1654), Lorenzo Palucci to Giovanni Sagredo, 7/31/54. 29. 220.
10. Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, with Elucidations by Thomas Carlyle, ed. by S. C. Lomas, II, 389.
11. Excluded republicans: John Southby, Thomas Scott, William Fisher, Thomas St. Nicholas, Sir Arthur Haslerig, Thomas Lister, John Weaver, Philip Woodhouse, John Hobart, George Fenwick, Richard

FII-2

and Henry Darley, Francis Thorpe, John Hewson. Republicans attending the 1656-1657 session: John Clark, John Hewson, Samuel Highland, William Purefoy, Luke Robinson, Jerome Sankey. For the Irish exclusion: Paul J. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962), p. 242. For Hewson and Sankey, Chapter I,

12. Burton, Diary, I, 384, 3/7/57, for the Protector's views on the Other House.

13. Ibid., II, 378, 1/28/58.

14. Ibid., 402, 1/30/58.

15. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed., by C. H. Firth (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), I, 390, 391; A Perfect Account, E 813(6), 9/29/54 (No. 195, Sept. 27-Oct. 4, 1654), p. 1556; Robert Vaughan, ed., The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell and the State of Europe (2 vols., London, 1839), I, 68-71, Thurloe to Pell, 10/28/54.

16. Burton, Diary, I, xviii, 9/3/54.

17. Ibid., I, xx, xxii, 9/4/54, 9/5/54.

18. Ibid., xxviii, 9/11/54; The Faithful Scout, no. 196, E 233 (31), 9/8/54 (Sept. 8-15, 1654); Valerie Pearl, London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1961), 230.

19. Faithful Scout, 9/8/54-9/15/54.

20. A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, ed. by Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), III, 147; J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England (Oxford, 1961), p. 44.

21. David Underdown, Royalist Conspiracy in England (New Haven, 1960), pp. 112-124; Thurloe, State Papers, II, 147, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, n. 3, 228-229; DNB, Francis Hacker.

22. Hutchinson, Memoirs, II, 179, as quoted in DNB, Francis Hacker.

23. Thurloe MSS, Thurloe to Monck, 10/21/54, as quoted in The Clarke Papers, selections from the papers of William Clarke, ed. by C. H. Firth, (London, 1891-1901), II, xxxv-xxxvi.

24. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 227; Thurloe, State Papers, III, Eyre's examination, 1/27/57, 124, 126.

25. Ibid., Dallington's examination, 12/21/54, 35.

FII-3

26. Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Buccleuch and Queensbury at Whitehall (London, 1897), I, 311; Copy of a Letter Sent Out of Wiltshire (London, Sept. 5, 1654), E 809 (18), 9/5/54.

27. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Information of Samuel Dyer, late servant to the said Col. Sexby taken this 27th of Feb. 1657, 829.

28. Ibid., 829; DNB, Lord Grey of Grooby; Maurice Ashley, John Wildman, Plotter and Postmaster (New Haven, 1947), p. 90.

29. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 829, 832; DNB, Sir Arthur Haslerig. Haslerig had built up such a great estate from the ecclesiastical properties in Durham that he was often called the "Bishop of Durham."

30. England's Remembrancers, E 884, 885 (5), (August, 1656). Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 262. Gardiner bases the suspicion that Rich and Alured were associated with the writing or distribution of this pamphlet on the fact that there is no mention of their having been asked to put up bail in the record in the Council Order Book (I, 1, 239), which notes their imprisonment. He therefore concludes that their offense must have been especially serious. For Alured, Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 211, 217, 232. For Rich, ibid., 267, 268, 232; DNB.

31. Sir Henry Vane, "A Healing Question" in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts, particularly of the Late Lord Somers (2d ed. revised by Walter Scott, London, 1811), VI, 303; DNB, Sir Henry Vane, Sr.; Thomas B. Howell, ed., Complete Collection of State Trials (34 vols., London, 1816-1828), V, 791-799.

32. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 15-16.

33. Ibid., p. 30.

34. Clarke, Papers, III, 68, 8/2/56.

35. Mark Noble, Lives of the English Regicides (London, 1798), pp. 158-160; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 263; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 10, 11, 16; Paul J. Pinckney, "Bradshaw and Cromwell in 1656," Huntington Library Quarterly, XXX (May, 1967), 234.

36. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 205-206; IV, 204; Clarke, Papers, III, 68.

37. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 10, 11.

38. Clarke, Papers, III, 69; DNB, Okey.

39. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 15, 16; Noble, Regicides, 158-160.

FII-4

40. Clarke, Papers, III, 68.

41. Pinckney suggests the existence of this drive, when discussing Bradshaw, but does not further document it, saying, "the implication that Bradshaw had decided to participate actively in this Parliament rather than make gestures of defiance upon leaving as in 1654. If, as seems likely, other republicans felt this same determination to wield influence from within rather than without (shows especially in the second session in 1658 and in Richard Cromwell's parliament in 1659), the action of the Council in excluding so many of them becomes more understandable." Pinckney, "Cromwellian Parliament," p. 171.

42. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/28/56, 352.

43. The following republicans had not served before: Blagrove, Fisher, St. Nicholas, Cole, Richard and Henry Darley, Abbott, Robinson.

44. For Fisher, Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/28/56, 232; William Watson, A Historical Account of the Ancient Town and Port of Wisbeach in the Isle of Ely (Wisbeach, 1827), pp. 223, 447.

45. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/10/56, 297.

46. Chapter I, pp. 39-40; Burton, Diary, I, xxxv, xxxvi, 9/12/54.

47. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Balleston to Haynes, 9/1/56, 370.

48. Roy Carroll, "The Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964), pp. 343, 351, 352.

49. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Lilburne to Thurloe, 8/9/56.

50. For the Darleys, Carroll, "Yorkshire," 262, 263; George Yule, The Independents in the English Civil War (Cambridge, 1958), p. 94; Burton, Diary, II, 339, 429. For Bradford, Regimental History, II, 264, 272; Mercurius Politicus, August 2, 1656, p. 7192, as quoted in Carroll, "Yorkshire," p. 382.

51. Burton, Diary, I, 189, 12/20/56.

52. Carroll, "Yorkshire," pp. 351-352; Yule, Independents, p. 115; Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons, VII (London, 1813), 45, 107, 109; Wilbur C. Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), IV, Glavarins to the Doge, Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 294, p. 413.

FII-5

53. Mercurius Politicus, 8/28/56, quoted in Carroll, "Yorkshire," p. 352. The four Country members were: Tempest, Arthington, Gill, Stanhope.

54. Narrative of the Late Parliament, E 935 (5), p. 7.

55. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 309; Burton, Diary, II, 374, 1/28/58.

56. Chapter I, p. 66.

57. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/21/56, 329.

58. Chapter I, p. 62 ; DNB.

59. For Haslerig, Chapter I, pp. 58-59. For Scott, Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 53, 54, 270.

60. For Hewson and Sankey, Chapter I, pp. 55-57; for Clarke, Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1649-60, ed. by Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875-1886), XIII, 13, 14. Abbott also kept his Irish regiments at this time.

61. Defeated known republican candidates: Bradshaw, Rich, Vane, Ludlow, Salway, Harrison, Neville, Bradford, Harrington, Berners, Blagrove.

62. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 8/26/56, 349.

63. Ibid., Whalley to Thurloe, 8/11/56, p. 299.

64. Ibid., Whalley to Thurloe, 8/9/56, p. 296.

65. Burton, Diary, II, 377, 1/28/58; 422, 2/2/58; 429, 2/3/58.

66. Paul J. Pinckney, "The Cheshire Elections of 1656," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, No. 49 (Spring, 1967), pp. 393, 405, 406; Great Britain, Public Records Office, List of Sheriffs for England and Wales (Lists and Indexes, IX, London, 1898); Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 123, 275; Chapter II, p. 109.

67. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Barkstead to Thurloe, 8/12/56, 304.

68. Ibid., Bridge to the Protector, 8/15/56, 313.

69. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 17.

70. CSPD, 1656-1657, Ross to Nicholas, 8/7/56, p. 67.

71. DNB, Harrison; Chapter II, p. 103.

F-II-6

72. For Neville, DNB; A True and Perfect Relation of the Manner and Proceeding held by the Sheriffe for the County of Berkshire (London, 1656), E 891 (8); Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 35, 36; Caroline Robbins, Two English Republican Tracts (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 7, 8; A Aspinall, et al., Parliament Through Seven Centuries (London, 1962), p. 59. For Bradford, Charles H. Firth and Godfrey Davies, The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army (2 vols., Oxford, 1940), 264, 272; Mercurius Politicus, 8/2/56, 7192, as quoted in Carroll, "Yorkshire," p. 382; Hill, Century of Revolution, 167, 168.

73. Carroll, "Yorkshire," p. 353.

74. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Thomas Titon to Captain Kiffin, 8/8/56, 286.

75. Ibid., Waddell to Vanseare, intercepted letter, 8/22/56, p. 337.

76. Chapter I, pp. 61-62,

77. "Letters Concerning the Dissolution of Cromwell's Last Parliament, 1658, by J. H. Hobart," ed. by C. H. Firth from Hobart's correspondence among Tanner MSS, English Historical Review, VII (1892), 104.

78. Burton, Diary, II, 316, 464, 1/20/58-2/4/58; Chapter II, pp. 95-96; Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate, II (2 vols., London, 1909), 33, 34.

79. James Harrington, The Oceana and Other Works of James Harrington, ed. by John Toland (3d London ed., London, 1771), p. 6.

80. Great Britain, Public Record Office, French Transcripts, Bordeaux to Brienne, Sept. 7/17, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 182; Burton, Diary, I, xxvii, 9/11/54, II, 382-429, 1/29-2/3/58. For Barrington, Narrative Late Parliament, p. 17; for Lucy, "Monarchy Asserted to be the best, most ancient and legal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the late Lord Somers, VI, 2nd edition revised by Walter Scott, (London, 1811), 349, 351. For Gibbs, James Farnell, "The Politics of the City of London" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963), p. 46. For Ashley Cooper, Walker's Newsletter, December 28 and Clarke, Papers, III, 15, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, p. 225; Ludlow, Memoirs, I, 388-390, II, 17.

81. James R. Jones, The First Whigs: the politics of the exclusion crisis, 1678-1683 (London, New York, 1961), pp. 10-18. The groups in the coalition: the "old Presbyterians," the Country opposition, the "adventurers," Monmouth and his circle, the radicals. Members of the first two groups would be Country members during the

FII-7

Protectorate. Jones states that the second group formed a majority of the Whigs. It includes the Protectorate republicans.

82. Firth, Protectorate, II, 38-42; David Underdown, "Cromwell and the Officers, February, 1658," English Historical Review, 83 (1968).

83. DNB, Sir Arthur Haslerig.

84. Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne (London, Melbourne and New York, 1967), pp. 65-108.

CHAPTER III

THE COUNTRY'S STERILE OPPOSITION

The ideology of the Country of the Protectorate period resembled that of the republicans, but it was tempered by its adherents' respect for tradition and belief in the "ancient constitution." Their obsessive distrust of power, stemming from the experience of the opposition with the early Stuart monarchs, led them to emphasize parliamentary privilege and supremacy rather than innovative constructive solutions. However, because of their respect for the traditional method of government in which parliament participated with an executive, the Country members never withdrew from the governmental process as did the republicans, but always expressed their opposition within the walls of the House.

Like the republicans, in their emphasis on parliamentary supremacy they overlooked the idea of a balance between the legislative and executive branches of the government, ignoring the 1642 Answer to the Nineteen Propositions, a constructive solution to the problem, which had prescribed a balance between the three branches of government. The Country supported the new constitution drawn up in 1657, the Humble Petition and Advice, which gave the executive stronger powers, but only at the price of including the privilege of parliament to judge the qualifications of its own members. Because of this provision, the excluded members were readmitted. Although some

III-2

supported the new constitution, the republicans and the most intransigent Country members promptly attacked the Other House, the counterpoise in the balance, because they felt it undermined the supremacy of the Commons. Thus they forced the dissolution of the second Protectorate parliament.

Unlike the republicans, who depended upon political theory rather than history as a justification, the Country used precedent as a rationale for their actions. In all contingencies, they appealed to the past, and never admitted that their policies were in any way revolutionary. They believed that the rights and privileges of parliament enshrined in the ancient constitution to which they looked for guidance were sacred and had existed for many hundreds of years. In reality, most parliamentary privileges were of relatively recent origin, dating back no further than the mid-sixteenth century, and the ancient constitution was largely a myth. The Country attachment to the concept of the ancient constitution was to a great extent based on its association in their minds with the common law, which was the basis of their claim that their titles to their estates were also ancient and sacred.¹

The effect of this ideology, rationalized by appeal to tradition, was as sterile as that of the republicans was destructive. Extant documents demonstrate that, in the 1654-1655 parliament, the Country returned to the House after the enforced subscription to the existing form of government only in order to oppose the Court within the constitutional limits. In the second parliament, after the more

III-3

intransigent Country members were excluded, those remaining did support the formation of the new constitution, which attempted to balance the powers of the executive and legislative branches of the government. However, they ruined even this constructive solution by their insistence on the inclusion of their parliamentary privileges.

In the 1654-1655 parliament, under the leadership of Colonel John Birch, a rabid opponent of the Court, the Country drew up a constitution, never implemented because of the Protector's angry dissolution of this parliament, which is illustrative of all their major doctrines. In it are provisions that enhance parliament's powers vis à vis those of the Lord Protector. A rigid interpretation of religious doctrine would have outlawed the sectaries' religious practices and threatened the Independents who compromised the bulk of the Lord Protector's support. Emphasis on their own privilege as landed gentlemen led the Country members to return to the forty shilling qualification which enfranchised their own dependents, rather than retain the £200 franchise which gave the suffrage to new independent voters. Their taxation policy reflected the same bias; they preferred to tax commercial wealth rather than landed property. Their hatred of the Lord Protector's army, the basis of his regime, which had unleashed threats to their position in the late 1650s, led them to cut drastically the army's budget and the Lord Protector's control of the armed forces and the militia. This hatred of the military was reflected in a xenophobic foreign policy. Their belief in the supremacy of parliament caused them to provide for the succession by a Protector elected by the House.

III-4

The supremacy of parliament was asserted in this new constitution and the powers of the Lord Protector correspondingly reduced. No veto power was provided for, even though the Instrument of Government had given the Lord Protector only a twenty-day suspensive veto. He could not pardon councillors, judges, or officers of state who had been sentenced by parliament. His power of dissolution was weakened, for now parliament could not be dissolved without its own consent until twenty-six weeks had elapsed since it had been convened, whereas the Instrument of Government had prescribed a five month period. The power of judging the qualifications of its own members was given to the House rather than to the Council, all members of the Council must now be approved of by the House.

The religious settlement was less tolerant than that provided for in the Instrument of Government, and the Protector's power to protect those who did not conform to the established religion was weakened. Because of the Lord Protector's opposition, the establishment of an Assembly of Divines, which would have produced a rigid, intolerant doctrine, was dropped, and the Country constitution provided that any kind of worship that did not abuse others was to be tolerated. However, this apparent leniency was counterbalanced by parliament's power to ban heresies of all kinds. A combative Court insisted that the Protector have some share in the definition of these heresies, but the Country limited this share as much as was possible. The Lord Protector realized that these provisions threatened his own co-religionists, the Independents, and defended them in his angry speech dissolving this parliament.

III-5

The return to the traditional forty-shilling franchise was typical Country doctrine, reflecting their ideal of agrarian property-tied independence. The Country member might not have been willing to admit even to himself that this property owner, because of his poor economic condition, was likely to be less independent than a wealthier man who did not own freehold property.

Country taxation policy reflects the same outlook, exhibiting a reluctance to tax landed property and a desire to rely on those taxes which fell most heavily on commercial wealth. Proposals to raise revenue submitted by a Country-controlled committee stressed the customs and excise taxes and omitted entirely the monthly assessments on landed property that were the principal source of public revenue during the Protectorate.

Hatred and fear of the Lord Protector's army was cardinal Country doctrine. Efforts were made to cut the budget of the armed forces to the bone, and these were reflected in a constitutional grant, abhorrent to the Protector because it would terminate after five years had elapsed. A clause forbidding the Protector to raise the militia without the consent of parliament precipitated his dissolution of this session.

The problem of the succession was difficult for these Country members to deal with. A conflict was involved, for their belief in the supremacy of parliament clashed with their adherence to the ancient constitution. Although they later were to support the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown, in this parliament they opposed the first

III-6

tentative steps in this direction. The succession was provided for in their constitution by a Lord Protector selected by the House.²

This Country constitution was drawn up by a group of Country members who returned to the House, after the Protector's enforced subscription to the recognition, with the express purpose of opposing the Court. These men continued the republican struggle in behalf of parliamentary supremacy. Although the subscription forbade any change in the basic form of government by a "single person" and parliament, a compromise clause added by a Court controlled committee stated that it was permissible to alter the other provisions of the Instrument.³

Seizing this opportunity, the Country hesitated and then slowly returned. The purpose of this policy was clear to a foreign observer, who reported, "The majority signed the test, but it is now evident that most of the signatures were given with the covert object of investigating the present state of affairs and enabling Parliament to meet and confer to sift matters to the uttermost."⁴

The initial hesitation and slow return of the Country members is reported in several newsletters. Four hundred and twenty-nine members were actually elected to parliament, and, although there is no way of determining how many actually were in attendance before September 12, the day the subscription was required, it is known that on that day between 100 and 140 members subscribed. These must have been the hard core of the loyal Court membership; for 183 members of the Court had been elected to the House. Estimates differ as to how many finally did subscribe, but at least 300 and perhaps more were present by December; so a great many subscribers must have been Country adherents.

III-7

These Country members who hesitated and then returned were the hard core of the opposition to the Court after the republicans had left this parliament. A number are named in a letter of Thomas Gewen, a Cornish member, which urged his fellow-Country members to subscribe to the recognition in order to support measures that enhanced the power of parliament. Sir Richard Onslow, who was in the forefront of the Country opposition in this parliament, took over two weeks to decide whether or not to sign the recognition. When a group of Norfolk members met to chart their course of action, the Court member immediately subscribed, the republicans withdrew, while the Country members finally conformed, later to play prominent parts in opposing the Court.⁵

The Gewen letter is illustrative both of the Country members' hesitation about subscribing to the recognition and of their subsequent decision to do so in order to support measures enhancing the powers of parliament. Written to William Morrice, a member of parliament from Devonshire, it is dated October 10, 1654, almost a month after the subscription had first been required. Past conferences which had failed to produce a decision are mentioned as follows, "After your going downe we had divers other such scuffling conferences as we had whilst you was here." Morrice is urged both to attend and to press this course of action on his fellow Devon members in order to support the Country members who had already returned and were pushing through a series of measures enhancing parliamentary supremacy, stating that no taxation was to be imposed without parliament's consent, that the Council was to be chosen by parliament and that the members would have

III-8

the power to declare war or peace.

With few exceptions, the men mentioned in this letter as having just taken their seats in the House or intending soon to do so were prominent members of the Country opposition in this parliament. Colonel Birch, the Country leader, had already returned, as noted by Gewen who wrote, "The two Bacons, Alderman Gibbes, Boys, Birch, and divers other eminent and conscientious men are gone in already. I believe Judge Hales, Mr. Bankley, Mr. Grove, Sir George Booth, and many more will go in with us this week."⁶ Gewen and Morrice, themselves, were ardent Country members as was Sir John Northcote and perhaps John Quick, the Devon members, whose attendance was solicited by Morrice. The only exceptions were Francis and Nathaniel Bacon, members of the Court, and Sir George Booth, a Country member, whose name was mentioned, although his involvement was never proved, in the plots that culminated in Penruddock's Rising and who did not return to the parliament.⁷ Booth must therefore remain as exception to the Country rule of opposition within the constitutional framework.

These Country members had had difficulty in the past in conforming to a Cromwellian regime and were to have the same difficulty in the future. Most had belonged to the presbyterian party of the Long Parliament and all but Hales and Gibbs had been excluded at Pride's purge when most of Cromwell's opponents had been forced by the army to leave the House. Gibbs' exclusion by the republican controlled Rump parliament from the London Court of Aldermen shows that he also had been sympathetic to the presbyterian regime. All but Grove were to be excluded

III-9

from the second Protectorate parliament upon their elections in 1656. Their careers in the first Protectorate parliament illustrate all facets of Country policy.

John Birch was the leader of the Country in the 1654-1655 parliament. There were sixty-six divisions during the course of this session and he acted as opposition teller for twenty-two of them, that is, one third, more often than any other member of parliament. The tellers were acknowledged by a contemporary to be "the leaders of the two chief contemporary parties."⁸ Two were chosen by the speaker from each side, and, staff in hand, they counted the votes. Birch's record was approached only by that of Sir Richard Onslow, who was a teller for the Country eighteen times, and by two leaders of the Court, Lord Broghill and Colonel Philip Jones, who were tellers eighteen and nineteen times, respectively. Birch led temporary coalitions with both the republicans and the Court, attempting to gain Country objectives. His position as Country leader brought him financial rewards. A republican diarist noted that almost the only private business accomplished during the course of this session was an order given to the excise office to pay an old debt owed by the state to Birch, who was characterized as "a nimble gentleman, one who used to neglect no opportunity of providing for himself."⁹

Birch's position as opposition leader was consistent with his past activities, for he had been at odds with Cromwell's adherents since the institution of the New Model Army in 1645. He had been associated with Sir William Waller, one of the generals of aristocratic

III-10

background displaced at this time, in reducing Herefordshire before the formation of the New Model. He became governor of Hereford in 1645 and was associated in parliament with the presbyterian party in its opposition to the new army leadership. In March, 1647, this parliamentary majority, hostile to the army, wished to disband it with its wages unpaid and allow its members to volunteer to serve in Ireland. A regiment under Birch in Herefordshire, revolted in July before embarking. The soldiers had not been paid and probably distrusted Birch both as a leading presbyterian member from the borough of Leominster and as a landlord who had become wealthy from his speculations in Hereford land and from lending money to parliament at the high rate of 8 per cent. Birch was excluded from parliament in 1649, he then joined the royal army at Worcester, and his estates were sequestered. None of this activity prevented his election to the 1654 parliament.¹⁰

The divisions for which Birch acted as opposition teller in this parliament were crucial in the framing of the new Country constitution. He was the leader in the attempts to weaken the Protector's parliamentary powers and his authority over the armed forces and the militia, to cut the army's budget, and to impose taxation that would rely principally on the customs and excise taxes rather than on the monthly assessments.

Both before and after the subscription to the recognition, he attempted to whittle down the Lord Protector's powers in regard to parliament. While the republicans were still in the House, he formed a temporary coalition with them, acting as a teller in an attempt to

III-11

change the basic, existing form of government and establish the supremacy of parliament.¹¹ After they were gone, he inherited the mantle of opposition from their leaders, Bradshaw, Haslerig, and Scott. To safeguard this basic form of government, the Court wished a recognition of it to be included in the indenture of each new member of parliament. Birch was a teller for the Country, opposing this proposal.¹² The Lord Protector's veto power was a bone of contention. The Instrument of Government had provided for a twenty-day suspensive veto, unless the bill in question was unconstitutional. Birch acted as teller in two divisions which weakened this veto, by providing that parliament should be the judge of the bill's constitutionality.¹³ The Court believed that this weakened veto power would destroy the government and designated it "a fatal and mortal wound."¹⁴ The Protector's right to dissolve parliament was also in question. Birch opposed the Court's proposal that the Protector have this right if parliament should be in session for more than six months.¹⁵

Birch's influence was paramount in the Country's attempts to weaken the Protector's authority over the armed forces. As chairman of the subcommittee on revenue and as the spokesman for the committee to consider the retrenchment of the armed forces,¹⁶ he attempted both to reduce the number of troops and to give parliament the power to control them. If he had succeeded, the Lord Protector's authority would have been rendered untenable. These attempts therefore led to the dissolution of parliament.

The Lord Protector's refusal to consent to a substantial reduction in the number of troops led to the attack on his control of the

III-12

army by Birch and his Country followers. Initially, earlier in this session, the Protector had been given this control with the advice and consent of parliament, or the Council, if parliament was not sitting.¹⁷ Meanwhile, he had been negotiating with the committee to consider the retrenchment of the forces, of which Birch was the spokesman.¹⁸ As soon as Birch reported that the Lord Protector felt that a large reduction would be impossible for reasons of security,¹⁹ his power to enlist troops was attacked. The Country unsuccessfully attempted to give parliament a voice in the number of troops to be maintained.²⁰ Finally, with Birch acting as Country teller, the Lord Protector's lifetime command of the army was wrested away in a division that gave each successive parliament the power to confirm his control, by providing that revenue raised for military defense should be continued only until forty days after the commencement of the next parliament.²¹ However, the Court foiled this Country victory. The bill was sent to a committee, with the Court favoring this significant maneuver and the Country, with Birch acting as a teller, in opposition.²² It was thus shelved and never heard of again.

There has been some conjecture as to why the members of parliament reversed their original decision to give the Lord Protector this all-important lifetime control of the armed forces. It seems reasonable to assume that it was at least partially due to the Country reaction, guided by Birch, to the Lord Protector's refusal to reduce the number of troops, although it has also been attributed to resentment on the part of the members of parliament at the demands of a

III-13

group of army officers who protested several proposed changes in the Instrument of Government.²³

After this failure to weaken the Protector's control of the army, Birch and his cohorts now tried to attain their ends by cutting the army's budget. This budget had already been cut by the Lord Protector on the eve of the opening of parliament, probably as a conciliatory gesture to the incoming members. The Protector had sole control over a portion of the military budget; for the Instrument had provided for an army and navy of 30,000 men who could be supported without parliament's consent, although this consent was necessary for the support of any additional forces. The budget for the fiscal year, 1653-1654, had been £2,877,079. In September, 1654, it was cut to £2,517,079.²⁴

Birch attempted to cut this military budget by more than a half, which would have forced a reduction of the army from 57,000 men down to the 30,000 minimum prescribed by the Instrument. He proposed a budget of £1,340,000, which sum included £200,000 already voted for civil expenses. If this had gone through, the pay of the soldiers would have been lowered, and there would have been no provision for paying the members of the two fleets which had already sailed under Admirals Blake and Penn. This budget was bitterly opposed by speakers for the Court, who said that it underestimated both current revenue and expenditures. Finally, a temporary grant was made, for a length of time to be further discussed.²⁵

Not only did the budget thus drastically cut the revenue, but a change, illustrative of Country policy, was made in the method by

III-14

which this money was to be raised. The principal source of public revenue under the Protectorate was the monthly assessment, raised by county committees, which assessed the local property and decided on the rate needed to raise the sum required;²⁶ Birch's budget omitted this tax entirely, relying instead on the customs and excise taxes, which were levied on commercial transactions.

In an attempt to break the deadlock and provide the government with essential revenue, a Court-Country coalition was formed, with Birch appearing as a co-teller with different leading members of the Court in favor of a series of bills which formed the financial provisions of the new constitution. The total revenue allotted was somewhat higher than the temporary grant, but Country influence is seen in the provision that more than half this sum was guaranteed only for the next five years.²⁷

This temporary coalition lasted for less than a week. It was dissolved when Birch was a teller in a Country victory which took the control of the militia away from the Lord Protector. This vote was an appropriate climax to Birch's military and financial policies and a fitting ending for this parliament. It was the last division; the Lord Protector dissolved the session two days later. It had always been Birch's desire to reduce the standing army to the lowest possible level. National security would then be in the hands of the militia, raised and commanded by these same members of the Country who were the background of Birch's support. To take away the power of the Protector to control the militia and give these powers only to parliament would have been the Country's final victory.²⁸

III-15

The parliamentary career of John Bulkley, ("Mr. Bankley") who, as Gewen had predicted, returned to the House, illustrates a facet of Country policy lacking in Birch's record in this session--the opposition to a tolerant religious settlement.²⁹ Bulkley was a strong religious Presbyterian, as were the majority of the Country members who made their views on this question known in this parliament.³⁰ Although many of his twelve tellerships were concerned with the same subjects as Birch's--the enhancement of parliament's powers at the expense of those of the Lord Protector, Bulkley was especially distinguished for his interest in religious affairs. This interest was recognized by his fellow parliamentarians, who appointed him along with three other members to confer with and assist a group of ministers who were advising the House on religious matters. This group was established in order to advise the House on these matters after the idea of creating an Assembly of Divines was dropped. In commenting of this matter, the nineteenth century editor of the parliamentary diary characterized these four laymen as the "deep divines" of the House.³¹

The amount of deviation to be permitted from the state religion was a bone of contention between the Protector and the Country. Cromwell, as a religious Independent, was prepared to allow more religious toleration than was usual for a public figure of this period. This attitude was typical of Independency and also politically necessary, since the army, the ultimate source of the Lord Protector's strength, was made up of members of various religious groups. Not only were the majority of the soldiers and officers members of Inde-

III-16

pendent congregations, but also some of them were associated with the more extravagant religious sects.³² The Country favored strict adherence to Christianity, as defined in their new constitution as "the True Reformed, Protestant, Christian Religion, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures."³³

Since this "Religion" had never been authoritatively defined, the crucial question was who was to have the power to do so, and it was on this problem that Court and Country differed. Bulkley, acting both as a teller and as a committee member, fought to curtail the Lord Protector's powers to define these doctrines. The proposed clauses of the Country constitution dealing with religion stated that "damnable heresies" were not to be tolerated.³⁴ The Court succeeded in modifying this vague definition of heresy, which would have left open a loophole for persecution of the sects, by inserting a clause providing that the heresies be "enumerated,"³⁵ but Bulkley's committee insisted that they be particularly enumerated by this parliament.³⁶ The Court succeeded in reversing this decision at the time of the Court-Country coalition, when it was agreed that the Lord Protector and the parliament (not just this particular one) should have joint powers of enumeration.³⁷

Thomas Gewen, William Morrice, William Gibbs, Thomas Grove, John Hales and Sir John Northcote did not play roles as prominent as those of Birch and Bulkley in this parliament, but enough is known of their activities to prove that they were Country members. Nothing is known of John Quick, the Devonshire member. Gewen, an ex-royalist

III-17

office holder, excluded from parliament in both 1649 and 1656, showed his belief in the ancient constitution in 1658 by supporting the powers of the Other House and renewing the proposals to crown the Lord Protector, while more intransigent Country members cooperated with the republicans in an effort to destroy the constitution. As a religious Presbyterian at this time, he nevertheless also proposed the convocation of an Assembly of Divines, the project the Lord Protector had opposed so strongly in the opening days of the 1654 session. Morrice had similar royalist sympathies and played a key part in the restoration of Charles II. Gibbs was one of ten presbyterians of royalist sympathies removed in 1649 by the republican-dominated Rump parliament in an attempt to make the city government more cooperative with the ruling powers in parliament. After his return to the 1654-1655 parliament, he took the Country line of supporting the forty-shilling franchise. Excluded in 1656, he returned in 1658 to second Gwenn's motion to reconvene an Assembly of Divines. Grove, who was to be a leader of the Country in the second Protectorate parliament, had been a member of the Country slate headed by Anthony Ashley Cooper in Wiltshire which defeated the republicans headed by Edmund Ludlow. In this parliament, as a religious Presbyterian, he supported Bulkley in his endeavors to exclude the Protector from any share in the definition of religious doctrine. Hales and Northcote were excluded from parliament in both 1649 and 1656 and both signed a remonstrance against exclusion the second time.

Activities of another member mentioned in the Gwenn letter, John Boys, are illustrative of a hitherto undiscussed Country policy

III-18

of the first Protectorate parliament: opposition to the first tentative proposals to crown the Lord Protector. Boys had also been excluded from the Long Parliament in 1649. This exclusion had perhaps converted him to Country views, for up to this time his parliamentary record savored of Independency.³⁸ It has never before been demonstrated that the Country members' support of these kingship proposals in the second Protectorate parliament represents a change of policy. This early opposition is shown by the tellerships on the reapportionment of Kent of Boys and of Sir Richard Onslow, who became the leader of the Country kingship movement in 1657.

Like the members mentioned in the Gewen letter, Onslow had also hesitantly returned in 1654 in order to oppose the Court. Knowledge of his activities at this time comes from a contemporary newsletter. Dated September 27, over two weeks after the subscription to the recognition had been enforced, it states that Onslow had just taken his seat in parliament.³⁹

Onslow and Boys were victorious Country co-tellers in a division which eliminated the parliamentary seat of Augustine Garland, because he had made the first direct proposal that the Lord Protector assume the crown. This proposal was a trial balloon, abandoned at the first hint of opposition. In revenge, the Country eliminated Queensborough, Garland's constituency in Kent, from the scheme of apportionment in the Country constitution. There is no doubt that this was a pointed retaliation, for this constitution made few changes in the apportionment of seats as prescribed by the Instrument of Government, and this change

III-19

was opposed in two divisions by prominent members of the Court.

Boys and Onslow also supported other aspects of Country policy. Onslow was one of the most active Country tellers, serving in this capacity eighteen times during the course of the session. Both were in favor of enhancing the powers of parliament, serving as tellers in divisions to give the House the privilege of judging the qualifications of its own members and to weaken the Protector's veto and pardoning powers. Onslow, typically Country in his hatred of a standing army, was a teller in divisions to cut down military expenses and to limit the Protector's power over both the militia and the armed forces. In religious matters, a Presbyterian, he followed Bulkley's line; he favored giving the House broad powers in defining what beliefs should be considered heretical.⁴⁰

A group of Country members from Norfolk, like Onslow and the men mentioned in the Gewen letter, hesitated about subscribing to the recognition, and then subscribed in order to oppose the Court. According to Guibbon Goddard, himself a Norfolk member and the diarist of the first Protectorate parliament, most of the group dined together to decide on their course of action. Only one, Tobias Frere, a member of the Court, subscribed immediately; the three republicans, John Hobart, Bernard Church, and Philip Woodhouse, left the House. All the others finally decided to subscribe, and of these Sir Ralph Hare, Sir John Hobart, Sir William Doyley, Colonel Robert Wilton, Thomas Sotherton, and Goddard, can be identified as members of the Country who returned to play prominent parts in the opposition.⁴¹

III-20

Sir John Hobart was the political boss of the county. Hezekiah Haynes, the major-general of Norfolk in 1656, reported his opposition activities at that time, saying, "he is the darling of this country and chooseth, whom he please, and as he did the last tyme, it's believed he will againe putt in for the worst against the honest intent."⁴² Most of the opposition members from Norfolk were elected from the boroughs, where Hobart's influence did not extend.

Hobart's record in both Protectorate parliaments was typical of the Country. His three tellerships in the 1654-1655 session favored the limitation of the Protector's pardoning powers, the elimination of his lifetime control of the army, and stricter control by parliament of church doctrine. In the 1656-1657 session, he opposed the exclusion of the recalcitrant members and favored the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown.⁴³ It was said of him that he "didn't do much to overthrow the king, thow now very much for kingship."⁴⁴

Another Norfolk member with a reputation as a royalist was Sir Ralph Hare, the majority of whose fourteen tellerships during the first Protectorate parliament were concerned with the limitation of the Lord Protector's powers. He was also a teller in favor of two other Country policies; the establishment of the forty-shilling franchise and a reduction of revenue for the military establishment.

Sir William Doyley was also an active member of the first Protectorate parliament. He served on nine committees, attesting to his constant attendance. Haynes investigated him after the 1656 election and recommended that he be excluded.⁴⁵

III-21

The Country sympathies of Colonel Wilton, who was an active participant in the first Protectorate parliament, are shown by his activities in the second parliament. Wilton served on five parliamentary committees after he returned in 1654.⁴⁶ In 1657, he advocated the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown, after having directed the Country forces in Norfolk in the election to this parliament. He must have been an important figure in this effort, supplementing the activities of Sir John Hobart, for Wilton wrote that he was "in charge and command from the country."⁴⁷ The astuteness of his direction is attested to by Major-general Haynes, who, in reporting on the Country's extraordinary success in Norfolk in that year, lamented, "The election is as bad as it could well have bin made."⁴⁸

Nothing is known of Thomas Sotherton's activities during this first parliament, but his attitudes can be discerned from later information about him. In 1656, he was accused of having royalist sympathies and was then excluded from the second parliament.⁴⁹

Although there is not much information about Goddard's parliamentary activities, it is possible to tell something about his political attitudes from his diary and from information about the 1656 election in King's Lynn, the borough he represented in 1654. Although a contemporary record describes him as a lawyer who had "advantages from the State,"⁵⁰ his parliamentary record could not have been wholly satisfactory to the Court, for his election was voided in 1656 and he was replaced by Major-general Skippon. Anti-republican in feeling, he castigated the republican leaders, Haslerig and Scott and showed his

III-22

agreement with the anti-commercial policy of the Country in his description of a debate on the merits of amending the Navigation Act of 1651. The commercial interests, who were in favor of amendments, never were strong enough to effect their passage.⁵¹ Goddard scathingly referred to these interests as "citizens and late Parliament-men, who were in love with creatures of their own making," who were arrayed against the "country gentlemen."⁵²

In 1656, the Court, resolved not to allow these intransigent Country members to assume control again, did not allow them to take their seats in the second Protectorate parliament. Roughly one hundred men were excluded at the opening of the session. About eighty-five of this group were members of the Country, including the whole Country leadership of the first Protectorate parliament. Only about sixty Country members remained in the House. Although this number was augmented by a few men who applied to the council of state for readmission and were then allowed to return, the Country opposition was still limited by numerical weakness since due to the Court's organized campaign, only 140 Country members had been elected to this parliament, while 240 members of the Court had won seats.

The Country opposition in this parliament was therefore more moderate in nature than that expressed in the 1654-1655 session. Although its basic ideology, belief in the supremacy of parliament, tempered by devotion to the ancient constitution, remained the same, opposition to the enhancement of the powers of the executive was necessarily downgraded. The emphasis now was on the readmission of the excluded

III-23

members. As a price for Court support of this position, the Country backed the promulgation of a new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, which, until his refusal, provided for the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown. In return, the Court included in this constitution an article, affirming the House's privilege of judging the qualifications of its own members, thus banning exclusion by the executive.

The Court paid a heavy price for the inclusion of this parliamentary privilege. As a result of this provision, the excluded members were readmitted to the second session of this parliament, which took place in 1658. At this time, they repeated the obstructive tactics they had employed in the 1654-1655 session and again their conduct precipitated a speedy dissolution. This debacle has mistakenly been regarded as the result of the Lord Protector's political ineptness; actually it was an essential risk, necessary in order to win Country support for the new constitution.⁵³

The Country's assertion of this parliamentary privilege is a good example of their use of the ancient constitution to justify their own political ends. Contending that the Court had violated an inalienable right of the members, they "strongly urged that it was a breach of privilege of Parliament that any should be kept out of the House, and that none, sitting the Parliament, would be competent judges of any chosen by the people to be members, but only the Parliament."⁵⁴ The Country members regarded this privilege as sacred and ancient, although actually it was of relatively recent origin. No such

III-24

privilege was even asserted until the mid-sixteenth century, and it was not firmly established until the early seventeenth century. There is no record of a functioning Committee on Privileges, the committee of the House which judged cases involving disputed elections, until 1593.

With the exclusion of Colonel Birch, Country leadership was now assumed by a group of men headed by Thomas Bampffield, who was to be the speaker of Richard Cromwell's parliament. The other leaders were Lambert Godfrey and Thomas Grove. This group was referred to by a correspondent of Henry Cromwell as, "Bampffield, Godfrey, Grove and their gang."⁵⁵ This "gang" was the nucleus of Country opposition in the second Protectorate parliament. Its members worked together to secure the return of their fellow Country members, and also continued to press for some of the same policies Colonel Birch had espoused in the earlier session.

Unable in the changed circumstances to fight as strongly as before for the supremacy of parliament, the Country members continued to chip away at the Lord Protector's powers. The Humble Petition and Advice, now being drafted under the direction of a group of civilian members of the Court, gave more power to the Lord Protector and less to the council of state, which had been dominated by its military members. Basically in favor of this constitution because of their anti-military bias and their desire to include the anti-exclusion provision, the Country "gang" still strove to diminish the Lord Protector's authority. His powers of appointment were questioned. Godfrey felt that the members of the Other House, included in the new constitutional scheme

III-25

as a substitute for the House of Lords, should be appointed by the House.⁵⁶ Bampffield showed his distrust of the Lord Protector's choice of army officers.⁵⁷

The continued distrust of the Country for authority is shown by Bampffield and Godfrey's opposition to the wholesale confirmation in the new constitution of all the acts and ordinances passed by either parliament or the council since 1642. These were the legal foundation of the government, since they embraced all the changes that had been made since the monarch's power had been limited and the revolutionary forces had assumed power. The Country opposed this wholesale confirmation and insisted on debating these measures selectively.⁵⁸

The Country leadership continued to display its usual antipathy to the military and its reluctance to grant money for military purposes. Godfrey opposed the Militia bill, a proposal to transform the payments, which supported the forces commanded by the major-generals, into a permanent annual tax.⁵⁹ Both Bampffield and Godfrey fought against the grants made to finance the war with Spain, now being waged by the Lord Protector's forces. Not only did they oppose the purpose of these grants, but they pointed out that the government's method of collecting and disbursing these revenues was illegal, and gave too much power to the Protector.⁶⁰

The prescribed method of disbursement of revenue was through the exchequer, but this was circumvented during the Protectorate. The monthly assessments, out of which the army was paid, should have been collected in the counties, sent to the exchequer, and then sent

III-26

to the treasurers at war of the army to pay the troops. Since this legal method was indirect and time-consuming, a more efficient, although illegal method, deplored by the Country, was substituted for it. The assessments never went through the exchequer. They were collected in the counties by the treasurers at war and paid out directly as wages to the troops.⁶¹ Both Bampffield and Godfrey protested against this method, as "a dangerous precedent to put it in the power of any without doors to direct the management, levying and paying it." They unequivocally opposed a proposal that this circumvention of the exchequer be sanctified by law.⁶²

Despite this anti-court attitude, the main thrust of the "gang" leadership was in the direction of cooperation with the Court rather than opposition to it. In order to achieve their main objective--the inclusion of the provision in the constitution making the House the sole judge of the admittance of its own members--the "gang" supported the kingship proposals.

Country support of the kingship proposals was essential for their passage because they did not receive the undivided support of the Court. Originated and supported by a group of civilian Court members, they were opposed by a majority of the military members of the Court, who resented the proposed elevation of their ex-fellow commander, the Lord Protector. The backers of kingship were therefore willing to make concessions to the Country in return for the cooperation of its members.

Although the Country members were led to support the kingship proposals by considerations of political advantage, their belief in

III-27

the ancient constitution probably made the proposals emotionally and intellectually acceptable to them. A return to a monarchical form of government, limited as this one would have been by the powers of parliament, seemed to them an acceptable solution to the regime's constitutional problems. Their dislike of a standing army led them to welcome the downfall of the Lord Protector's military supporters, the major-generals, whose regime they had always abhorred. The Lord Protector had ensured the political downfall of his old-time allies by refusing in December of 1656 to explicitly support the Militia bill which they had introduced and supported and which would have ensured the continuance of their authority. He thus paved the way for this compromise with the Country.

Even though many of the Country members were sincere, then, in their advocacy of the proposed form of government, nevertheless, it is demonstrable that they received a price for their support. This price was the third article of the Humble Petition and Advice which provided that only parliament should have the right to judge the qualifications of its own members. The reality of this exchange can be proved both by the character of the Country support of the kingship proposals and by the fact that the Court could have eliminated the third article, which the Country desired, and deliberately did not do so.

Enough is known of the backgrounds of many of the Country members who supported the kingship proposals to prove that they bitterly resented the Lord Protector's exclusion of the intransigent members and wished to prevent the possibility of a recurrence. They

III-28

would not have supported the new constitution without the inclusion of the third article. These proponents of kingship included: the "gang" leadership, Sir Richard Onslow, who had opposed the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown in the first Protectorate parliament, ten members who had been excluded and then returned, and seven who had voted in favor of readmitting the excluded members.

Knowledge of the identity of the proponents of kingship comes from two sources. "A Catalogue of Kinglings," printed in a republican pamphlet, lists the members who voted in favor of serious consideration of the kingship proposals in a crucial division. There is also a list of ninety-nine members who conferred with the Protector later in the session, urging him to assent to the proposals and assume the crown.

Thomas Bampffield and Lambert Godfrey, the gang leaders, whose names appear on these pro-kingship lists, made two motions early in the session, to bring back the excluded members, without approval of the Council. A prominent Court member had invited all the excluded members to apply to the Council for readmission, but, considering this invitation degrading, only a few excludées took advantage of it. Since the gang's motions were made before the kingship question was being formally considered, they were opposed by the Court and Bampffield and Godfrey became involved in a heated argument with two members of the council, Sir Gilbert Pickering and Lord Walter Strickland. Pickering noted, in the course of this argument, that Godfrey had been excluded and had only recently returned to the House. Bampffield had not been excluded, but was one of twenty-nine members who had voted

III-29

earlier in the session to bring the excluded members back into the House.⁶³

Once kingship had formally been proposed, Onslow, now known as the head of "ye country party for kingship,"⁶⁴ ensured the inclusion of the third article in the constitution, in return for Country support of these proposals. In accordance with a plan that he proposed, it was agreed that the constitution should be considered as a whole before any votes were taken on the separate articles and that discussion of the article providing for the Lord Protector's assumption of the crown should be postponed until all else was agreed upon. Kingship was thus kept in abeyance until the Country members could see whether their valued parliamentary privilege would be included.⁶⁵

Ten members who had been excluded returned to the House and supported the kingship proposals. These are Lambert Godfrey, Charles Lloyd, William Hyde, the Earl of Salisbury, Sir Richard Lucy, Sir Francis Norris, John Aston, John Goodwin, Clement Throckmorton and John Harvey. Their names appear on both the kingship lists and the lists of excludees. Except for Godfrey and Lloyd, little is known of the parliamentary careers of these members and it may be that their exclusion had been unnecessary. A royalist observer maintained that the council of state had often acted on inaccurate information and he could not understand on what grounds Salisbury had been excluded.

The case of Charles Lloyd, the deputy-governor of the Merchant Adventurers, is a clear example of support for the kingship proposals bestowed in return for a political favor. The Merchants supported

III-30

the proposals in return for the disappearance of a bill rescinding their exclusive right to export woolen cloth to Germany and the Netherlands. There was a record of hostility between the Merchants and the Clothworkers, who also wished to have trading privileges. In December, 1656, the dispute came up before the House's Committee for Trade and was resolved in favor of the Clothworkers.⁶⁶ In spite of their victory, no bill was ever reported out of committee and a member of the committee, observing this disappearance, commented, "the merchants, by their influence and power at court, have always mastered them" [the Clothworkers].⁶⁷ The Merchants gave full value for this favor, for not only did Lloyd whole-heartedly support kingship, but Sir Christopher Pack, the governor of the organization, introduced the proposals to revise the constitution and crown the Lord Protector.⁶⁸

The political necessity for the inclusion of the third article in the constitution is shown not only by this support of the kingship proposals by these Country members whose bias against exclusion was so pronounced, but also by the Court's willing adoption of the clause. Both the third article and also the fourth, which prescribed the method of judging the members' qualifications, went smoothly through the House, under the astute direction of the Court leadership.

The Court was firmly in control of the House at the time these articles were adopted, and all legislation that was passed had the approval of the Court leadership. Lord Broghill, the guiding force behind the kingship proposals, was probably directing the progress of the legislative program.

III-31

On March 6, Articles 3 and 4 were read for the first time; on March 9, Article 4 was debated; and on March 10, a committee was appointed to consider the clause on judging the members' qualifications.⁶⁹ On the same day, two approving comments were made by members of the Court. Major Anthony Morgan, one of Henry Cromwell's intimates, wrote to him, "all is smooth and faire and looks towards settlement,"⁷⁰ while Colonel John Bridges, another Irish army officer, commented, "My Lord of Broghill hath gained to himself much honor by his prudent and dexterous deportment in the House."⁷¹ Henry Cromwell, himself, was pleased by the method of judging the members' qualifications, saying, "the distaste of rejecting such whom the country hath chosen will less reflect on his Highness."⁷²

The committee to whom the clause on the method of judging the qualifications of the members was referred was stacked with Cromwellian supporters and would not have drawn up a clause that was not approved of by the Court. Of the 33 appointed, 2 were members of the council of state, 3 were major-generals, 9 were army officers, and 12 held other government offices. Bampffield, Godfrey and Brooke also served on the committee, representing the exclusionist element which was backing the kingship proposals.⁷³

Once the third article was passed, two possibilities existed that would have enabled the Court to escape its inevitable consequence, the return of the excluded members, but neither course proved to be feasible. One would have been to dissolve the parliament at the end of the session, rather than adjourn it, and hold new elections, thus perhaps defeating many of the excluded members. The other would have

III-32

been to request an amendment to the constitution at a later period when the Country was more willing to make concessions.

The dissolution of the parliament was prevented inadvertently as a consequence of the members' deep-seated fears that the adoption of the new constitution would cause a breakdown in the governmental process. To ensure institutional continuity, the fourteenth article, which expressly stated that the adoption of the new constitution should not coincide with the dissolution of the present parliament, was adopted. This article, in conjunction with articles fifteen and sixteen, passed the same day,⁷⁴ were designed to prevent governmental breakdown. They ensured the validity of all acts and ordinances that were not contrary to the Humble Petition and Advice and of all legal writs and commissions.

This fear of institutional breakdown persisted despite the adoption of these articles and was demonstrated when the new constitution was presented to the Lord Protector for final approval. Edmund Fowell, a Country member, moved that before it be approved, "you present all the Bills that you have ready, for this Bill is a changing of the government."⁷⁵ He asked whether all bills that had already been approved would now have to be submitted to the Other House. Sir John Glynn, the Lord Chief Justice of the Upper Bench, and the chairman of the committee that had drawn up the fourteenth article, pointed out that these fears were groundless, saying, "There is a clause, already provided, against dissolving the Parliament, which will preserve your proceedings a-foot."⁷⁶

The final opportunity to bar the return of the excluded members

III-33

came when amendments to the constitution were approved later in the session in the form of the Additional Petition and Advice. The Country, anxious for the Lord Protector to assume the crown, was in a conciliatory mood and would perhaps have approved some modification of the third article. However, it remained unchanged, perhaps because at this time the Lord Protector received the sole right to fill vacancies in the Other House, rather than sharing this power with parliament. In return for this privilege, he may have been willing to allow the excluded members to return, for he attached great importance both to the establishment of the Other House and to its composition, probably believing that its appointed members would be a counterbalance to the returning excludées. However, when the new chamber met, it was so vehemently attacked by the readmitted members that its establishment certainly did not compensate for their presence.

The Country doctrine, thus manifested in both Protectorate parliaments, though with different emphases, is clearly related both to the Country policies that continually reappeared in parliament during the eighteenth century and to the Tory policies of Queen Anne's reign. At the time of the exclusion crisis, the Country of the Protectorate appeared in Shaftesbury's first Whig coalition, but, aside from this aberration, it can be clearly placed in the Country-Tory tradition.

The typical eighteenth century Country policies: dislike of a standing army and of high taxation, reflected in a xenophobic foreign policy, have their origins in the Country of the Protectorate parliaments. They are rooted in the fear of the Protectorate Country

III-34

member of a standing army, probably made up largely of unfranchised men, who now had an opportunity as a member of a valued branch of the government of making their opinions felt. The origin of these Country policies has been placed in the circle surrounding the Earl of Shaftesbury around 1675. It seems unnecessary to date their appearance so late for Shaftesbury, as Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, was a leading member of the Protectorate Country, which drastically cut the budget of the Lord Protector's army and whose ideal of national defense, as outlined by Colonel Birch, was by the county militia controlled by parliament.⁷⁷

During the exclusion crisis, these Country members, like the republicans, driven by fear of popery and absolutism, became members of Shaftesbury's first Whig coalition. Their appearance in this alliance should not be surprising for this was a reappearance of the Country-republican alliance engineered by Ashley Cooper in 1658. One of the leading Country tellers of both Protectorate parliaments, Sir John Hobart, is characterized as an "intransigent Whig"⁷⁸ during the exclusion crisis.

However, after this emergency was over, the Country members left this alliance and resumed their proper place as the progenitors of the early eighteenth century Tories. The policies that these Tories began to express in the 1690s are clearly related to Protectorate Country policies. Colonel Birch's xenophobia is related to the Tory isolationism evidenced during the wars of William III and to Tory dislike of the Whigs' lenient naturalization policies. The religious context is different, but the Tory support of an established

III-35

Church as vis à vis the rights of dissenters is analogous to the Country's desire to define clearly an intolerant religious creed.

Only the Tory belief in the executive's prerogative is missing, for the eighteenth century concept of the constitution as not only ancient but balanced does not appear in Protectorate Country doctrine. No Country member ever mentioned this concept. The Court tried unsuccessfully to preserve some power for the executive and to redress the balance through the establishment of the Other House, but, lacking the sanction of the ancient constitution, was unable to withstand the Country onslaughts. Only the lessons of time--the realization that the supremacy of parliament was not a realistic solution in this era and that the reaction to it could only lead to a renewal of despotism--taught even the Country that balance was necessary for the preservation of even the most ancient of constitutions.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. For a discussion of the "ancient constitution," J.G.H. Pocock, "Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII, 3d series (October, 1965), 549-583, and The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law (New York, 1957), Chapters II and III.

2. For the Answer to the Nineteen Propositions, Corinne C. Weston, English Constitutional Theory and the House of Lords (New York, 1965); Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), pp. 427-447. For the Country constitution, Wilbur Cortez Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), p. 586. For the financial proposals of Birch's committee, The Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828), I, lxxvi-lxxvii, 11/15/54), discussed by Maurice Ashley, Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate (London, 1934), p. 43. For the efforts to cut the army budget, Burton, Diary I, lxxvi-lxxix, 11/17-11/14/54, xci, 11/23/54, cvii-cviii, 12/5-12/6/54.

3. Recognition of the Government (Sept. 14, 1654), E 669, f.19(7). The compromise clause is printed in darker print of a different type, indicating that it was added later. For the members of the committee which drew up the compromise, Burton, Diary, I, xxxviii, n.

4. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, xxix (1653-1654) (London, 1929), Paulucci to Sagredo, 227, 11/14/54.

5. For the members' return: Burton, Diary, I, xxxv, 9/12/54, and cxiv, n., as noted in Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), III, 203; Faithful Scout, E 233 (31), 9/12/54, #196; A Perfect Account, E 813 (5), p. 1556, 9/29/54; Robert Vaughan, ed., The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell and the State of Europe (2 vols., London, 1839), I, 68-71, Thurloe to Pell, 9/28/54.

6. Henry Ellis, ed., "Three Letters Illustrative of English History," Archaeologia, XXIV (1832), 139-140.

7. For Booth; David Underdown, Royalist Conspiracy in England (New Haven, 1960), p. 118. His name is also mentioned by a Court informer as a man the plotters "built upon." A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, ed. by Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), III, 147, as quoted in Gardiner, p. 229 n.

FIII-2

8. Edward Porritt, The Unreformed House of Commons (New York, 1963), pp. 535-536.

9. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. by C. H. Firth (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), I, 393.

10. DNB, John Birch, John Duncumb, History of County of Hereford (Hereford, 1804), p. 110; W. Page, et al., eds. The Victoria History of the Counties of England (Westminster, 1900), Hereford, I, 397.

11. Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons, VII (London, 1813), 367, 9/7/54.

12. Ibid., p. 390, 11/24/54.

13. Ibid., p. 384, 11/9/54, 11/10/54; Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 413.

14. Burton, Diary, I, lxxvi, 11/10/54.

15. Commons Journal, VII, 385, 11/14/54.

16. Burton, Diary, I, lxxvii, n.; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, p. 223.

17. Commons Journal, VII, 386, 11/17/54.

18. Burton, Diary, I, lxxvii, 11/15/54.

19. Ibid., p. xci, 11/23/54.

20. Commons Journal, VII, 395, 12/5/54.

21. Ibid., p. 403, 12/16/54.

22. Ibid., p. 408, 12/23/54.

23. "Salvetti's Newsletter," from Add. MSS, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 219 n; ibid., p. 223.

24. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 414; Ashley, Financial Policy, pp. 47, 78.

25. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 236-238; Ashley, Financial Policy, p. 43; Commons Journal, VII, 413, 1/5/55.

26. Ashley, Financial Policy, p. 78.

27. Commons Journal, VII, 417, 1/15/55; 418, 1/16/55; Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 445.

FIII-3

28. Commons Journal, VII, 421, 1/20/55; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 223.

29. For John Bulkley: "Mr. Bulkley" is identified by the editor of the Gewen letter as Thomas Bampffield, an Essex member. Bampffield was a leader of the Country in the second Protectorate parliament, but does not appear in any record of the first parliament, either as a teller, a member of a committee or in Goddard. Bulkley, a very active member of the first parliament, is a more logical identification. His tellerships (Commons Journal, VII, 382, 385, 390, 394, 400, 401, 414, 417, 419, 420) must have been noted, for at the time of his exclusion in 1656, he was characterized as "a fiery spirit." Historical Manuscripts Commission Report, Egmont, I, 579, as noted in Margaret Tibbetts, "Parliamentary Parties Under Oliver Cromwell" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1944). In that year, he had formed an alliance with the republicans to oppose the election of John Lisle, Commissioner of the Great Seal, in Southampton. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/8/56, 287.

30. Gewen, Grove, and Onslow, whose positions on the religious question will be discussed, were all religious Presbyterians. David Underdown, Pride's Purge (Oxford, 1971), pp. 374, 375, 381. The religious affiliations of Gibbs and Sir John Hobart, also active in this matter, are unknown.

31. Burton, Diary, I, cviii, n.

32. For the religious Independents and toleration: George Yule, The Independents in the English Civil War (Cambridge, 1958), pp. 45-46. For the army: C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army (London, 1962), pp. 337-341.

33. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 442.

34. Commons Journal, VII, 399, 12/9/54.

35. Ibid., 12/11/54.

36. Ibid., p. 401, 12/15/54.

37. Ibid., p. 414, 1/12/55; Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 443.

38. For Gewen, D. Brunton and D. H. Pennington, Members of the Long Parliament (London, 1954), p. 134; Burton, Diary, II, 333, 1/21/58; 392, 1/29/58; 424, 2/3/58; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 374. For Morrice, DNB. For Gibbs, Yule, Independents, p. 99; James Farnell, "The Politics of the City of London (1649-1657)" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963), pp. 46, 47; Commons Journal, VII, 392, 11/27/54; Burton, Diary, II, 334, 1/21/58. For Grove, Copy of Letter out of Wiltshire (London: Sept. 5, 1654), E 809 (18); Commons Journal, VII, 400, 12/13/54; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 375.

FIII-4

For Northcote, Brunton and Pennington, Members; Commons Journal, VII, 425. For Hales, ibid. For Boys, His record in the Long Parliament is discussed by David Underdown, "The Parliamentary Diary of John Boys, 1647-1648," Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research, 39 (1966). His opposition to the 1649 exclusion perhaps influenced his tellership of 1/9/54 (Commons Journal, VII, 414), upholding parliament's privilege of judging the qualifications of its own members.

39. Perfect Diurnall, E 235 (1), 9/27/54, 23.

40. For Onslow, Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, XIV, Part 9, Onslow MSS (London, 1895) 487; Commons Journal, VII, 411, 1/2/55; Underdown, Pride's Purge, p. 381. For Garland's proposal, Walker's Newsletter, 12/28/54, and C. H. Firth, ed., The Clarke Papers, III, 15, as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 225. For the constitutional change, Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 441; Commons Journal, VII, 411, 1/2/55, opposed by Court tellers: Augustine Garland, John Worsley, Philip Jones. Onslow's tellerships: Commons Journal, VII, 384, 395, 396, 399, 401, 409, 411, 412, 413, 414, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421. For Boys' tellership, Commons Journal, VII, 414.

41. Burton, Diary, I, xxxv, xxxvi. Goddard states that members of the Court subscribed to the Recognition immediately, "His party [Cromwell's] that is, courtiers and officers of the army and some others, presently subscribed." Also, I base my assumption that Frere was a member of the Court on the fact that he was the only member of the 1654 Norfolk county slate who ran in 1656 and was not re-elected, a year in which the Country did very well in Norfolk (Norfolk Archaeology, I [1847], 67, as quoted in Paul J. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962), p. 102.

42. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 220, 7/16/56.

43. Commons Journal, VII, 396, 398, 403, 511, 520, 535.

44. Narrative of the Late Parliament, E 935 (5), 486.

45. For Sir Ralph Hare's tellerships, Commons Journal, VII, 385, 391, 392, 394, 396, 406, 409, 415, 418, 420. For Sir William Doyley, Thurloe, State Papers, V, Woolmer to Haynes, 9/1/56, 37. For committee memberships, Commons Journal, VII, 360, 368, 370, 371, 380, 381, 419.

46. Commons Journal, VII, 370, 374, 387.

47. Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Various Collections, II (London, 1903), 271.

48. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 3/15/56, 371.

49. Ibid., V, Woolmer to Haynes, 9/1/56, 371.
50. Narrative Late Parliament, p. 10.
51. Commons Journal, VII, 442, 10/2/56. For the election in King's Lynn, Chapter I, p.67. ; Manna Prestwich, "Diplomacy and Trade in the Protectorate," Journal of Modern History, XXII (June, 1950), 119; Ashley, Financial Policies, p. 165; Burton, Diary, I, xlix, xxv, 10/12/54.
52. Burton, Diary, I, 1, 10/12/54.
53. Appendix; Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 449; H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier, ed. by Richard Pares (London, 1956), p. 41; G. B. Elton, The Tudor Constitution, pp. 259, 260.
54. Clarke, Papers, III, 74.
55. British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, 882, f. 86, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 6/9/57.
56. Burton, Diary, II, 22-23, 4/24/57.
57. Ibid., p. 33, 4/24/57.
58. Ibid., pp. 38-47, 4/24-4/28/47. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. by C. H. Firth (2 vols., Oxford: 1894), II, 499; Ivan Roots, "Cromwell's Ordinances: The Early Legislation of the Protectorate," in The Interregnum, ed. by G. E. Aylmer (London and Basingstoke, 1972).
59. Burton, Diary, I, 234, 12/25/56.
60. Ibid., II, 23-31, 4/24/57.
61. Ashley, Financial Policies, pp. 81-82.
62. Burton, Diary, II, 173, 6/4/57.
63. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 449. The names of the seven members who voted to bring back the excluded are listed in Oxford, Bodleian, Tanner MSS, liii, f. 166. They are: John Buller, Peter Brooke, Thomas Bampfield, Francis Fiennes, Robert Jenkinson, Richard Lucy, Henry Markham. Kingship lists printed in "Monarchy asserted to be the best, most ancient and legal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the late Lord Somers (2d ed. rev. by Walter Scott, London, 1811), VI. For Godfrey's and Bampfield's motions, Burton, Diary, I, 194, 12/20/56; 290, 12/31/56.
64. British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 294, 2/24/57, as quoted in C. H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate (London, 1909), I, 139.

FIII-6

65. Firth, Protectorate, I, 139; Burton, Diary, I, 380, 2/28/57.

66. Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers, ed. by W. D. Macray (4 vols., Oxford, 1869-1956), III, Jennings to Hyde, 11/26/56, 584. For Charles Lloyd, Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series (13 vols., London, 1875-1886), IX, 335; Christopher Hill, Century of Revolution (New York, 1961), pp. 36-38; Burton, Diary, I, 116-117, 12/11/56; 309-310, 1/6/57; 345, 1/13/57.

67. Burton, Diary, I, 117, 12/11/56.

68. Commons Journal, VII, 496, 2/23/57.

69. Broghill's leadership pointed out by C. H. Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," English Historical Review, LXVIII (July, 1903), and George D. Heath III, "An Essay in Constitutional Development, 1653-1657" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, p. 394); Commons Journal, VII, 499, 3/6/57; 500, 3/9/57; 501, 3/10/57.

70. Lansdowne MSS, 823, f. 330, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 3/10/57, as quoted in Firth's "Cromwell and the Crown," EHR, LXVIII.

71. Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 350, Bridges to Henry Cromwell, 3/10/57, as quoted ibid.

72. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 3/4/57, p. 94.

73. Commons Journal, VII, 501, 3/10/57. Fourth article committee listed members of council of state: Jones, Fiennes; major-generals: Bridge, Berry, Howard; army officers: Blackwell, Cock, Stone, Audley, Hatsell, Hawksworth, Tigh, Wilton, Cooper; government office: Broghill, Prideaux, Glynn, Thurloe, Steele, Parker, Blake, Lisle, Bodura, Bacon, Foot, Reynolds.

74. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 457-458; Commons Journal, VII, 512, 3/26/57.

75. Burton, Diary, II, 120, 5/25/57.

76. Ibid., p. 121, 5/25/57.

77. For the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Tory and Country policies: Geoffrey Holmes, British Politics in the Age of Anne (London, Melbourne, New York, 1967), p. 108; J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725 (Middlesex, 1967), p. 155. For the coalition of the Exclusion Crisis: J. R. Jones, The First Whigs: the politics of the exclusion crisis (London, New York, 1961), pp. 10-18. For the origin of Country policy: Pocock, "English Political Ideologies," pp. 558-566. Pocock attributes the reconciliation

FIII-7

of the idea of balance between the powers of the executive and parliament and the sanctity of the ancient constitution to neo-Harringtonian writers, 569-572.

78. Jones, The First Whigs, p. 182.

CHAPTER IV

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE - A TOOL OF POLITICAL MANAGEMENT

Parliamentary procedures, the formalized methods by which parliaments are conducted, developed rapidly in the one hundred years following the accession of Elizabeth, in response to the political pressures and needs of the times. This was the period that saw the genesis of the procedures used in legislatures today. These were forged in the struggle, characteristic of these times, between the executive and legislative branches of the government and were developed as weapons to be used in this struggle.

The parliamentary procedures used during the Protectorate parliaments form a unique part of this continuous development because they were a response to a unique situation. The Lord Protector was struggling to assert his authority in the framework of a novel form of government. Relying ultimately on the support of the army, he was still hoping to create a constitutional settlement that would satisfy the groups represented in parliament. Resenting his unprecedented powers and the military might that lay behind them, the members of parliament strove to diminish his influence and assert their own.

In this struggle, the parliamentary procedures used were a mixture of the traditional and the revolutionary. The Tudor monarchs had developed certain management techniques, which the Lord Protector now emulated. New factors, however, made it impossible to reproduce the

sixteenth century situation.

Both the Country and the republican oppositions were able to make good use of techniques that had been developed by the revolutionary opposition of the 1620s and 1640s in the parliamentary struggle with the Stuart monarchs. One such technique was the frequent use of the grand committee, or committee of the whole. In the 1620s, the opposition had developed this procedure in order to circumvent the power of the speaker in the legislature and of the privy councillors in the select committees. When the House went into grand committee, the regular rules were suspended, the speaker left the chair and the councillors were not so influential as they would have been in a smaller group.¹ Now the Protectorate opposition groups made strong use of this technique.

The Lord Protector was hindered in his ability to cope with these groups in parliament by the provision regarding the appointment of the council of state in the Instrument of Government. The Instrument had been drawn up by a group of army officers under the leadership of Major-general John Lambert. The Protectorate parliaments operated under the provisions of this constitution until 1658, when a short session took place under a new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice. By virtue of this provision, fifteen of the twenty-one members of the council of state were named in the constitution. The Lord Protector, therefore, did not have the freedom to name the majority of his own council which was chosen by the army officers who drafted the constitution. Although he ratified this constitution, the opinions of all the framers were doubtless taken into account in the selection of the councillors.²

Thus lacking a council responsive to his leadership, the Lord

Protector could not rely upon all these men to carry out his program in parliament. The Tudor and Stuart monarchs had had the advantage of being able to use as their parliamentary agents the privy councillors whom they had appointed. Cromwell used only a few of his councillors as parliamentary agents and also used John Thurloe in this capacity before he became a member of the council. These men held positions in or near his household--a situation reminiscent of medieval household government. There was no organized group capable of dominating the committee system, as had the privy councillors of the Tudor monarchs.³

The Lord Protector was more successful in emulating another feature of Tudor parliamentary management, the use of the speaker and the clerk as parliamentary managers for the executive. He always admired Elizabeth and it seems natural that he would take over her successful method of exerting influence over Commons. The role of these officials had been considerably modified in the 1640s, when the speaker came to feel that his primary loyalty was to the members of the house of commons.⁴

This development had occurred in the course of the struggle between king and commons. Although the House was restive in the 1620s at the speaker's exercise of his powers on behalf of the crown, nevertheless he remained the king's servant. In 1629, he had to be held in his chair by members of the Country opposition, in order that they could reiterate their principles as embodied in the Petition of Right before the House was forcibly dissolved.⁵ In 1642, however, the tradition of speaker as servant of the crown was broken by the rebellious Long Parliament. When Charles I came to the House to arrest five members of the opposition, he asked William Lenthall, the speaker, if any of them were present. Lent-

hall, who was also to be the speaker of the first Protectorate parliament, replied, "I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me whose servant I am."⁶

Although the Protectorate opposition made some attempts to maintain this revolutionary concept, it was unable to do so. Cromwell's speakers and clerks became the principal bastion of his power in parliament.

However, the role of the Cromwellian speaker is either misunderstood or overlooked in the texts. It is taken for granted that he was always responsible to the legislature after the 1640s, but this is far from the case. On occasion, he may have been even more openly partisan on behalf of the executive than the Tudor speaker, for Sir Thomas Smith, the sixteenth-century constitutional expert, had expounded a non-partisan ideal. Describing the legislative process, he stated, "The Speaker hath no voice in the House, nor will they suffer him to speak in any bill to move or dissuade it. But when any bill is read the Speaker's office is, as briefly and as plainly as he may, to declare to effect thereof to the House."⁷ An order of Elizabeth's last parliament had reiterated this interpretation, saying, "That if any doubt arise upon a bill, the Speaker is to explain but not to sway the House with argument or dispute."⁸

This concept of an impartial speaker was not, however, actually established until the nineteenth century, and the Protectorate speaker was an open servant of the Court. Like his predecessors, he was paid £100 a year, as well as five pounds for every private bill enacted. He attempted to keep the Court's enemies under control in debate and made rulings favorable to its measures. This was possible because his powers

were enormous. He determined the order in which the bills were to be read and could either select the motion which he liked and put it to the question or frame the question himself, collecting it from the sense of the House. His decision as to whether the yeases or noes carried a vote was likely to be undisputed, and, although he could not vote in a division, he could declare for the yeas or nays and vote in case of a tie. He made rulings on procedure, declared for adjournment, and, when many committees were ready to report, he could determine which was to have the floor. Nor was his opinion confined to formal rulings. He could give his partisan opinion both in committee and on the floor of the House.⁹

Cromwell's republican opposition understood how important the power of the speaker could be, and, during the meeting of the first Protectorate parliament in 1654, attempted to elect one of their own members to this office. This was contrary to custom for it was traditional that although the choice theoretically rested in the House, members always followed the recommendation of the executive. A Stuart tract noted that, "One of His Majesty's Council doth use to propound that it is His Majesty's pleasure that they shall freely choose a speaker for them; and yet commendeth, in his opinion, some person by name."¹⁰ Cromwell followed this example, and, although "he gave a freedom to choose a Speaker," he still took care that a government stalwart, William Lenthall, who had been the speaker of the Long Parliament, was elected.¹¹

The French ambassador noted this episode as an example of the astuteness of the Protector's political management, writing that, "By this beginning one may judge what the authority of the lord protector

will be in this parliament."¹² The method of Lenthall's nomination bears a close resemblance to that of his Tudor predecessors, who were usually nominated by the senior Privy Councillor present.¹³ In this case the nomination was also made by high government officials, characterized by the French ambassador as "the commissioners with whom I treat ordinarily and another of the Council."¹⁴ The republicans nominated John Bradshaw, the president of the parliamentary commission that had tried the king and an ardent republican whom Cromwell was to take pains to keep from running in the 1656 elections. There was no open contest; after a few disgruntled remarks on the part of the opposition, Lenthall was called unanimously to the chair.¹⁵

Historians have always regarded Lenthall as a government stalwart, so it is of interest to discover indications that his tenure as speaker was not satisfactory to the Court. Perhaps he was blamed for the debacle of the 1654 parliament. It was said that he would have been excluded from the 1656 parliament, "if he had not a good friend to assist him."¹⁶ He was asked only at the last moment to be a member of the Other House in 1657, and was exceedingly disturbed when he thought that the Lord Protector might not include him.¹⁷ A replacement was found for him in the second Protectorate parliament, although his long years of service as speaker might seem to have entitled him to another term.

Sir Thomas Widdrington, the speaker of the second Protectorate parliament, was not only a consistent supporter, but an open advocate of the Court program. His election was ensured by his nomination by a high Court official, and this time there was no contest.¹⁸ Widdrington opposed the program of the Country, the opposition of the first session,

and that of the republicans in the second session. His partisan reflections on legislation led him into an open feud with Thomas Bampfield, the Country leader.

Widdrington was a well-known lawyer, with a long record of loyalty, not only to the parliamentary cause, but to the Lord Protector, who had chosen him before to undertake a difficult political task. He had taken part in delicate negotiations on Cromwell's behalf in 1649 to try to secure a moderate house of commons after Pride's purge. He served both as Lord Commissioner for the Great Seal and as a Treasury Commissioner during the Protectorate. He had a reputation with his contemporaries as a timid man, but was willing to openly advocate Court legislation during the 1656 parliament.¹⁹

His powers were essential to the success of the most important Court projects of this parliament: the barring of the excluded members, the defeat of the militia bill, and the passage of the proposals that would have given the Lord Protector the title of king. In these cases, he cooperated closely with other members of the Court, often planning ahead with them in order to gain their objectives in the face of opposition on the floor of the house.

He was successful in blocking the Country's most cherished project, the return of the excluded members. Country "gang" leaders continually pressed this point, for it was a test of their parliamentary privilege of judging the qualifications of their own members. When Bampfield moved that these members be readmitted, a quarrel arose between him and one of the councillors. Widdrington disposed of this troublesome motion; he "very discretely laid aside the old resolve in this case, to

prevent further debate, and so ended the dispute."²⁰ Some days later, he killed another such motion by leaving the chair.²¹

In order to defeat the militia bill--the taxation legislation to support the militia introduced in 1656 which was anathema to the civilian members of the Court--Widdrington worked closely with Lord Claypole, the Lord Protector's son-in-law. When the bill was brought to the floor, he first postponed the discussion²² and then in a surprise move introduced it at the moment when Claypole was ready to attack it. The opposition saw through this move, observing, "This was not the Bill intended to be brought in by the order. But, Mr. Speaker directed it to be read first, and then any might speake against the Bill that pleased."²³ When this attack failed, he adjourned the house for a few days by deciding for the "yeas" in a close division vote.²⁴

Widdrington's support was also essential to the introduction of a motion designed to test the reactions of the members of parliament to the kingship proposals. He must have been one of "a few of the Protector's fastest friends, not above five"²⁵ who laid these plans, for it would have been impossible to carry them out without him. When it was apparent after introduction of this motion that it was not received enthusiastically, Widdrington abruptly closed the debate, thus retrieving the situation and allowing the proponents of kingship to plan for another day.²⁶

When the kingship proposals did reach the floor at a more opportune moment, Widdrington's open support for the Lord Protector brought him into constant conflict with both military and Country leaders. The military members criticized the speaker's rulings because they opposed

kingship. The Country supported kingship, but, when it became clear that Cromwell would not accept it, delayed and obstructed the proceedings as much as possible.

Widdrington's partisan support of kingship was opposed by Colonel Francis White, who was closely connected with Major-general Desborough, one of the most prominent opponents of kingship. White had replaced Desborough's son when he left the house to join the army. When Widdrington selected the strongest of the kingship proposal motions on the floor and then strengthened it, White objected. In spite of this protest, Widdrington brought the motion to the floor and resolved a disputed vote in its favor.²⁷

Although they supported the kingship proposals, the Country leaders objected to Widdrington's arbitrary methods of backing them. A speaker's rulings on disputed votes usually went unchallenged, but Bampffield on one occasion forced Widdrington to apologize over a decision he made in favor of bringing the proposals to the floor. When it became evident that the Lord Protector would refuse the offer of the crown, Bampffield, the Country leader, and other members of the Country fought Widdrington's repeated motions to adjourn in order to hear the Lord Protector's final decision.²⁸

The Country members had no choice but to support the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, which incorporated Cromwell's decision to retain the title of Lord Protector, but were critical of some of the clauses proposed by the Court. Their stated aim was to uphold the honor of parliament; their underlying aim was to shape the evolving new constitution to their own liking. A crucial question was the collec-

IV-10

tive ratification of the acts and ordinances that had been promulgated since 1642.²⁹

Widdrington worked for the collective ratification of these ordinances, vital to the Court because they embodied the legal and constitutional changes that had taken place since the beginning of the civil war.³⁰ The Country succeeded, over Court opposition, in having them considered separately; so that the task of ratification became more difficult. The Country members felt that parliamentary liberties were being infringed if the ordinances were ratified "by the lump,"³¹ feeling they should have the chance to consider them one by one. Widdrington compromised with the Country members in order to get the ordinance for the approbation of preachers approved, allowing them to bring their own "proviso" or amendment to the floor, rather than have the ordinance amended in committee. His open partisanship of the marriage ordinance brought him a rebuke from one of the members, who said, "such as this ought not to be. It has not been usual in Parliament." Undaunted, Widdrington continued his open support, saying, "you will make void all the marriages of England,"³² and then after a tie vote, cast his deciding vote in favor of ratification.³³

After the Humble Petition and Advice was ratified in the first session of the 1656-1657 parliament, Widdrington had to use all his skills in the second session in 1658 to keep the readmitted excluded members from rewriting it. The aim of these hostile members was to question the status of the new "Other House" and so to destroy the new constitution.

To prevent this, Widdrington thwarted their attempts to vote on the question, selected favorable motions and voted when there was a tie.

IV-11

Blocking a vote on the admittance of messengers from the Other House, which might have questioned its constitutional status, he said, "To divide the House without a reason, is without all reason."³⁴ He delayed debate on rewriting the constitution by picking out a motion he preferred.³⁵ When the republicans endeavored to execute their favorite tactic, forcing the house into grand committee, in which form they could have more easily rewritten the constitution, Widdrington cast his tie vote against this maneuver.³⁶

Besides using his powers to steer the Court's legislative programs, Widdrington also expedited the enactment of grants of Irish land to Court favorites. He spoke to a motion to press for an extra grant to the judge-advocate of Scotland, Henry Whalley,³⁷ and he declared for the yeas in favor of grants to Lord Broghill, recognized as the leader of the kingship movement,³⁸ to Major-general Fleetwood, Cromwell's son-in-law and a member of the council of state,³⁹ and to Colonel John Carter,⁴⁰ a protege of Lord Chief Justice Glynn and an ardent proponent of kingship.

All these activities led Widdrington into a running quarrel with Thomas Bampfield, the Country leader, who neglected no opportunity to speak in behalf of those parliamentary powers which the Country believed were being threatened by the Court. Disputes arose over Country positions, supposed infringements of Bampfield's rights as a member, and the prerogatives of the Speaker's office.

The Country resented, above all, the Lord Protector's absolute control of the army. When the clause of the Humble Petition and Advice which stated that the appointment of the principal civilian officers should be approved by parliament⁴¹ was being debated, Bampfield moved that

IV-12

parliament should also pass on the appointment of army officers. This was a direct hit at the Lord Protector who kept a close eye on army appointments. Widdrington quashed this motion, for he "either did not or would not understand this question."⁴²

Bampffield also lost no opportunities of chiding Widdrington for what he felt were infringements of his rights as a member. He complained of unprecedented delays, saying that he had to wait for over a month to report from a grand committee and that he was not given an opportunity to bring a bill to the floor that had been ready for some months.⁴³ Widdrington retaliated by quashing bills in which Bampffield was personally interested. When the Country leader brought in a bill against gaming and betting, Widdrington discarded it, saying "he was not able to play at all those games without a brief."⁴⁴

Widdrington was accused by Bampffield of taking advantage of one of his office's most cherished prerogatives, the payment of five pounds for every private bill introduced. The Country leader intimated that the speaker had introduced a private bill to naturalize aliens in order to collect these fees, and Widdrington was forced to apologize.⁴⁵ Naturalization bills were extremely profitable to the speaker, for each alien naturalized would have to pay the speaker a fee. In spite of the members' expressed wishes that private business be excluded so that public matters might be expedited, Widdrington had insisted on the processing of this lengthy naturalization bill.⁴⁶

Colonel William Jephson, a member of the Court, rebuked Bampffield for his disrespect to the speaker. The Country leader had chided Widdrington for speaking to the clerk during the course of the debates, and the

speaker was forced to apologize, although he said he was only seeking information about the order of the proceedings.⁴⁷ Jephson characterized Bampfield's action as not "civil."⁴⁸

It can thus be seen that the speaker's role was a difficult one, because it was in a state of transition. Widdrington's concept of his position as a parliamentary manager for the Court seems to be derived, perhaps consciously, from the period of Tudor absolutism. The Country and the republicans on the other hand looked back to the days of the Long Parliament, when the concept of the speaker's responsibility to the house had been established. They resented Widdrington's loyalty to the Court and attacked his behavior.

The same conflict arose with respect to the role of the clerk, another position of importance in the Court's management of parliament. The clerk was the speaker's principal assistant. His office also was in a state of transition. As in the past, he was assigned to the house by the executive.⁴⁹ The opposition members in Commons now asserted their power and attempted to control the clerk's appointment and make him responsible to parliament rather than to the Court. They resented his open partisanship and wished to supervise his activities. The republicans maintained that the house should have the right to appoint its own clerk. They first attempted to do so when they were in power in the beginning weeks of the first Protectorate parliament in 1654. After they were readmitted to the House in the second session of the second parliament in 1658, they immediately reopened the issue.

These moves were connected with their attempts to control the election of the speaker. After their attempt to elect Bradshaw as speaker

IV-14

failed in 1654, they were forced to acquiesce in the Court's choice of a clerk as well. In 1658, they could not attempt to elect a new speaker, since they were not members of a newly elected parliament and Widdrington remained in his post. However, they asserted their right to do so, saying, on the opening day of the session, "It is our undoubted right to choose a Clerk as well as a Speaker,"⁵⁰ and attempted to choose a new clerk since the former clerk had resigned.

In 1654, although they were unsuccessful in blocking the appointment of Henry Scobell, who had been appointed clerk for life by the Long parliament, they succeeded in asserting parliament's right of appointment. When Scobell appeared to take up his post at the beginning of the session, he was ordered to withdraw and "not to come in upon any pretence of title," until he was "chosen and commanded by the House."⁵¹ After the republican attempt to elect Bradshaw failed, Lenthall and Scobell were elected, but at the same time, the clerk was rebuked for presuming to take his place before he was chosen by the house.⁵² Scobell, who was also assistant secretary to the council of state, was undoubtedly singled out for attack because of his Court connections. He certainly was well qualified for the position, being the author of the Memorials of Method and Manner of Proceedings of Parliament in Passing Bills, published in 1656, the main procedural source for the period, and the editor and collector of the acts and ordinances of the Long and Inter-regnum parliaments.⁵³

In 1658, when the republicans were readmitted to the house, they revived the issue. Scobell was now clerk of the Other House and a new clerk, John Smythe, appointed by the council of state, was waiting to

IV-15

take up his position. The republicans, backed by the Country, said that this appointment should be a parliamentary privilege.⁵⁴ The matter was compromised by electing Smythe and specifically telling him "that the House themselves do make choice of him for their clerk."⁵⁵ Both Country and republican members were unhappy with this solution and succeeded in stalling Smythe's admission for three days.⁵⁶ A Country member moved that the new clerk take an oath of secrecy. The Speaker, opposed to this move, ruled that the Journals should be searched for precedents,⁵⁷ and Scobell made difficulties about releasing these records.⁵⁸ There is no evidence as to whether the clerk did take an oath, but he finally took up his duties.

In spite of this seeming defeat, the house now signified its intent of supervising the clerk more closely. A committee, including some prominent republican and Country members, had been appointed to draw up the clerk's oath.⁵⁹ They extended their activities, entered into communication with Scobell, examined the records which he ultimately produced and expressed dissatisfaction with what he gave them.⁶⁰ They then signified their intent of looking over the current records every week.⁶¹

The opposition's attempt to control the clerkship may have been partly a way of asserting themselves and annoying the Court, but there was also substantial reason behind it. Like the speaker, the clerk acted as a partisan Court servant. Paid by the executive, he also collected fees when private bills were introduced, and Scobell, at least, held other Court offices. He used the powers of his office to forward the legislative programs of the Court.

His partisan position became obvious during the course of the debates. When a republican member called directions to the speaker in the course of debate on a bill regulating Sabbath observance, Scobell reproved him, saying, "if such words had been spoken in some Parliaments, he would have been called to the bar."⁶² He was able to be useful in quietly disposing of a bill to regulate religious instruction put through by the Country over Court opposition. By putting this bill at the bottom of a list submitted to the Lord Protector for his approval, he gave Cromwell the opportunity of quietly shelving it.

Members of the opposition resented these tactics. Godfrey, the Country leader, reproved Scobell for postponing the bill on religious instruction.⁶³ As a result of this resentment, when the house went into grand committee, the chairman of the committee, rather than the clerk, recorded the votes.⁶⁴

Working in conjunction with the speaker and the clerk, four men acted as agents in Commons for the Lord Protector: two--John Desborough and Charles Wolseley--related to him, and two--Philip Jones and John Thurloe--managing his affairs and household. They were all personally close to him, a situation reminiscent of medieval household government when members of the king's household were the mainstay of government. These agents proposed and supported the legislation that he desired and acted as tellers for the Court.

There were at least 183 members of the Court in the first Protectorate parliament and 240 in the second, so a central mechanism for the management of the Court's legislative program was a necessity. Drawn together by adherence to the Court's program and respect for the Lord

IV-7

Protector, these men came from disparate political backgrounds. Many had never been active in parliamentary politics before. These include a group of army officers, led by the major-generals, who went into opposition when the Lord Protector considered the assumption of the crown. Many of these men were politically republican and Anabaptist in their religious beliefs. Religion, however, was not a sign of political affiliation; for some of the most committed members of the Court were also religious Anabaptists and it has long since been proved that religious difference did not divide the political presbyterians and independents. Among the Court membership can also be found members of the old independent party, a few of the old political presbyterians and many members of the so-called "middle group" which had attempted during the civil war period to balance the demands of the "war" and "peace" parties in the House, as well as the ex-royalist Lord Broghill.

Holding government office cemented the bonds of loyalty of many of these members to the Court. One hundred and seventy-seven of the 289 members of the Court who sat in one or another of the Protectorate parliaments held either military or civilian office. To maintain contact with these members and to get the legislation he was most interested in through the House, it was necessary for the Lord Protector to rely upon his agents.⁶⁵

This method of managing parliament was distinct from Tudor management, which used as managers a large group of councillors of state. Three of these agents were members of the council of state at the time they were acting as managers, but most of the councillors were relatively inactive in parliament. In Elizabethan times, the councillors of state

IV-18

had been the principal managers for the crown in commons. They had introduced and spoken on all the important legislation, served on all the committees, and let the other members know which legislation the crown favored.

Their influence had waned in the Stuart period. James turned to favorites and ministers for advice because the majority of his councillors disagreed with his foreign policy. He neglected to see that a sufficient number of them sat in the House to manage his legislative program.⁶⁶

The Lord Protector, like James, unsure of the loyalties and abilities of all his councillors, also preferred to rely on a few men whom he could trust. Colonel Philip Jones, the controller of the Lord Protector's household, was the principal agent in the parliaments. His parliamentary role has been overlooked in the standard texts. This is an example of the neglect usually accorded to the parliamentary records, since Jones is otherwise well known as a strong supporter of the Lord Protector, who rose from lowly origins and became rich in the Cromwellian service. After the Lord Protector's death, he was accused by the returning republicans of having acquired his wealth through corrupt means, but he was cleared. He and John Thurloe were Richard Cromwell's principal advisers after Oliver Cromwell's death. Jones served as teller for Court votes more often than any other councillor, and he steered the matters in which the Lord Protector was most interested through the second parliament. He was assisted in the first parliament by two of the Lord Protector's relatives, Sir Charles Wolaeley and Major-general John Desborough.

IV-19

In 1657, when Desborough's vehement opposition to the kingship proposals alienated him from the Court, his place was taken by John Thurloe, who did not even become a councillor until 1658. Thurloe, involved with the management of the Lord Protector's personal affairs and active as secretary of the council of state, should also be considered a member of the official household.⁶⁷ Because of the multitudinous state papers he left behind which derive from his role as secretary of the council of state, he is far better known than Jones. However, his parliamentary role is actually much less important.

This reliance on a few personal agents, rather than on the councillors as a group, occurred because the Lord Protector was not free to choose his own councillors as his monarchical predecessors had been. Fifteen of his councillors were named in the Instrument of Government, and those still serving were continued in their posts in 1658 according to the terms of the Humble Petition and Advice. With the consent of this council, the Lord Protector named three more men before the convening of the first parliament, one of whom was not a member of parliament, and two more on the eve of the second session in 1658. Apologists for the Protectorate praised this feature of the new constitution as an improvement over arbitrary Stuart government, but did not note that it changed the course of parliamentary management.⁶⁸

Only one third of the eighteen men appointed to the Council of State in 1654 were both active in parliament and in favor of the Lord Protector's policies. The two noble members: Philip Sidney, Lord Lisle, and Edmund Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave were not members of the House. Three men: Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Humphrey Mackworth, and Richard

IV-20

Major did not attend meetings of the council after 1654. Mackworth died in December, Major was inactive after October and Ashley Cooper, disliking the government's policies, stopped attending council meetings in December and became an active member of the Country opposition. Generals John Desborough, John Lambert and Charles Fleetwood became the leaders of the military opposition to the Court, espousing the rule of the major-generals and opposing the kingship proposals. They were supported by three civilian councillors, Gilbert Pickering, Walter Strickland, and William Sydenham. Seven loyal councillors remained: Philip Jones, Sir Charles Wolseley, Nathaniel Fiennes, Edward Montague, Francis Rous, Philip Skippon and Henry Lawrence. The last two were inactive in the House; the Lord Protector leaned heavily on the first two as his parliamentary agents.⁶⁹

This new method of management--reliance on a few parliamentary agents--was unforeseen. All indications point to the fact that the Lord Protector, like his monarchical predecessors, had planned to use all his councillors as his managers in parliament. Efforts made to elect them to parliament show that their presence was deemed essential. Financial rewards granted to them show that no effort was spared to enlist their support. Yet, either because of their lack of skill or their disagreement with Court policy, most councillors in these parliaments did not fulfill the traditional role of managers for the executive.

Efforts were made to ensure their election to both parliaments. Stuart parliamentary management had faltered because James I had not seen to it that a sufficient number of his councillors sat in the House, and the Cromwellian Court was determined not to repeat that mistake.

IV-21

Information is scanty about the 1654 elections, but it is known that sixteen of the eighteen councillors were candidates. To make sure that they would be successful, three of them ran in three different constituencies and two more in two. In 1656, three had double candidacies, six benefited from the political exertions of the major-generals, and the election of two more was ensured by charter renewal, and that of a third by running for a university seat.⁷⁰

These councillors, like the speaker and the clerk, received financial rewards for their services. Contemporaries suspected that they were being paid to manage the Court legislative program, a republican tract describing them as "well seasoned with the salt of his [Cromwell's] palace."⁷¹ In addition to being paid £1,000 for their services as councillors, the majority of these men held some other kind of paid government office. Thirteen of the twenty men who served on the Protectorate councils held some other government post.⁷²

In spite of these rewards the majority of these councillors were not active as parliamentary leaders, and the burden of the direction of the Court legislative program fell on Cromwell's agents. They acted as tellers for the Court in the division votes much more frequently than any of the other councillors. In the 1654-1655 session, the house divided sixty-six times, Jones being teller for the Court sixteen times, Desborough and Wolseley each eight times; no other councillor acted as a teller for the Court more than three times. Councillors acted as tellers on Court issues only fourteen times during the 1656-1658 parliament, and Jones accounted for nine of these occasions, with no other councillor accounting for more than three.⁷³

IV-22

The relative inactivity of even the agents as tellers in the second parliament is an indication of a change in the nature of the legislative direction in the two parliaments. In the 1654-1655 session, the Lord Protector's agents were firmly in charge of the Court legislative program. In the 1656-1657 session, when the kingship question became of overriding importance, a new Court group assumed leadership for Cromwell's agents reflected his own ambivalence on the subject and many of the other councillors were opposed to kingship.

Even before the first protectorate parliament convened, planning by the council had commenced. Prominent members of the Court were summoned to participate in these discussions. An entry of the Council Order book of August 28, 1654 reads, "President Lawrence to Lord Chief Justice St. John and Lords Commissioners Whitelock and Lisle. The near approach of Parliament and the Weightiness of matters to be considered of before it meets, requiring your advice, it is therefore desired that you repair hither forthwith, and be ready to attend the pleasure of his Highness and Council."⁷⁴

Once parliament had convened, the role of the agents as tellers in the important divisions is clear. Issues that were particularly important to the Court were at stake in these divisions. The Court attempted to hold back the republican attempts to control the government and to prevent the Country from eroding the Protector's position and cutting the government revenue.

The sources are not clear, however, about the roles of the individual councillors in these debates, and it is impossible to tell whether leadership was assumed by the agents or by the other councillors.

IV-23

This is because the diary for this 1654-1655 session is merely a synopsis of events and usually does not name the participants. It sometimes records the participation of the councillors in the proceedings, but does not name them individually. It is evident that the councillors were active in behalf of the Court.

These councillors attempted to prevent first the republicans and then the Country from completely destroying any chance of a constitutional settlement. Beating back the republican attempts to nominate John Bradshaw as speaker, they put through the nomination of the Lord Protector's choice, William Lenthall.⁷⁵ It was then their business to introduce the government program, the ratification of the constitution with an expression of thanks to the Lord Protector for his opening speech.⁷⁶ They were diverted from this program by the onslaught of the republicans, who pretended that the members' freedom of speech was being threatened. The councillors denied this charge⁷⁷ and then participated in the Lord Protector's decision to block these tactics by forcing the members to subscribe to the basic form of government as established in the Instrument of Government.⁷⁸ Once rid of the republicans, the councillors fought the Country attempts to weaken the Lord Protector's powers, by arguing for hereditary succession and the strengthening of the veto power.⁷⁹

The kingship question dominated the 1656-1657 session and modified the leadership role of the Lord Protector's agents. It was in the air from the very beginning of the session, and as a result the Court legislative program floundered. The relative inactivity of the agents reflects the Lord Protector's indecision. They initiated only a few

IX-24

essential matters at his especial request, while leadership on the kingship question slipped into the hands of a group of Anglo-Irish members, led by Lord Broghill. Once the kingship proposals were out in the open, the agents were more active, proposing the matters which the Lord Protector wished to see incorporated in the new constitution and also steering through various rewards to loyal members of the Court.

During the first period of legislative inactivity, foreign observers noted that plans to crown the Lord Protector were being discussed. Nine days after the opening of the session, the Venetian ambassador wrote that "one who should know" told him that in a few days either Cromwell would be king or the Protectorate would be made hereditary in his house. Similar rumors persisted until the first open kingship proposal in January.⁸⁰

Cromwell's ambivalent feelings about assuming the role of king are shown by the fact that while his agents, Jones and Thurloe favored the proposals once they were made, they were not important in initiating them. Thurloe supported the militia bill, which was abandoned by the other members of the Court who supported the kingship proposals. In spite of his modern reputation for omniscience, he was not of the inner circle that planned the kingship strategy. On the eve of its adoption by the House, he proclaimed his ignorance, writing, "I do not understand the steps by which that business does advance."⁸¹

During this period of indecision, little progress was made with the legislative program. The members took up first one project, then another. The councillors were split, first on the Naylor matter, a semi-judicial case involving the punishment of a religious fanatic, and then

IV-25

on the militia bill. The agents, relatively inactive, first defended the Council's exclusion of recalcitrant members⁸² and then devoted their efforts to introducing legislation requested by the Lord Protector in his opening speech to parliament.

In this state of the nation address, the Lord Protector requested additional revenue to carry on the war that England was waging with Spain and condemned Charles Stuart's support of this foreign enemy.⁸³ In response, his agent, Wolseley, introduced a bill to nullify Charles's title.⁸⁴ Thurloe told of glowing victories and other councillors introduced legislation to provide the revenue which the Lord Protector deemed essential.⁸⁵

The councillors' requests for revenue made slow progress due to feelers that were being made at this time about kingship and a belief that, if Oliver were crowned, revenue would be immediately forthcoming. These reports of victories and an estimate of expenses were not followed up for six weeks, when Councillor Fleetwood noted the delay, saying, "You have voted a war with Spain long since, and have made no provision for monies to carry it on. I desire a day may be appointed to consider of that business with all speed."⁸⁶ In spite of this request, no money was granted for almost another six weeks.⁸⁷

During this interval, the house inched slowly toward kingship. Shortly before the first request for revenue was made, a motion was made to debate the constitutional clause that provided that the office of Lord Protector should be elective. Three weeks later, a kingship supporter suggested that Cromwell be given the power to name his own successor. The French ambassador reported that parliament was occupying

IV-26

itself with trifles until the kingship proposals were introduced, but then it was rumored that they were being held up by the Naylor case and it was perhaps only because of this final delay that Fleetwood made his attempt. It was not until the first open offer of kingship was made that the grant of £400,000 was made for the conduct of the war.⁸⁸

The Lord Protector's essentially passive role in the formation of the new constitution in which these kingship proposals were included is reflected in the activities of his agents. Since there is a gap in the diary from January 20 until April 20, 1657, the period when the constitution was being drafted, there is no record of whether they participated in its original formation, but they did propose additions and amendments that he made a condition of its acceptance.

Cromwell wished to make certain of sufficient revenue both for the ordinary expenses of the government and for the prosecution of the Spanish war. A fixed yearly sum of £1,300,000 was granted in the new constitution plus whatever extra supplies parliament should consider necessary. Since the £400,000 granted earlier provided for the military expenses for less than a year, the Lord Protector requested both that £600,000 extra a year be provided for three years and that legislation be immediately enacted to raise the sum provided for in the constitution.⁸⁹ Jones and Thurloe proposed motions to fulfill these requests, Jones putting through the £600,000 grant and both of them prodding the house to settle the exact details of how all these sums should be raised. Then two other councillors, Major-general Desborough and Colonel Sydenham led the fight to allow the additional necessary taxation to be collected out of exchequer course, an efficient method, which the Country considered

IV-27

a "dangerous precedent."⁹⁰

Jones and Thurloe also took care of another of the Lord Protector's conditions of acceptance of the constitution, the ratification of the acts and ordinances enacted since the beginning of the civil war. Jones made a motion to this effect; then, to appease the Country, which was opposed to a wholesale ratification, Thurloe seconded a motion made by Wolseley that any ordinances contrary to the provisions of the new constitution be void.⁹¹

Certain changes requested by the Lord Protector on the same day were incorporated into a supplementary document, known as the Additional Petition and Advice. The majority of these were proposed by either Jones or Thurloe or both. They include the Protector's authority to nominate for vacancies in the Other House, a penalty for nonqualified members who attempted to sit in the house, and the broadening of the qualifications of Scottish voters.⁹²

The Lord Protector's approval of the new constitution is shown by his agents' desire to have it approved in the final month of the session. Jones and Thurloe were now joined by Desborough, who had acted as an agent in 1654-1655 and was now reconciled to the Court by Cromwell's decision to refuse the title of king and retain that of Lord Protector. In the beginning of the month, Jones and Desborough asked for the postponement of private business, for "your time will not afford it."⁹³ A week before the end of the session, Jones and Thurloe repeated the request and said that members who did not attend the proceedings should be fined.⁹⁴

As well as attending to these vital matters on behalf of the Lord

IV-28

Protector, Colonel Jones also was in charge of a more routine affair, the granting of Irish land to Court stalwarts. These grants were the Court's principal means of rewarding its loyal members. On Jones's motion, grants were made to Charles Lloyd, Dr. John Owen, Sir Charles Coote, Colonel John Reynolds, Colonel Jerome Sankey, and Lord Broghill.⁹⁵

In spite of the valiant efforts of the Court stalwarts in the House, the speaker, the clerk, and the Lord Protector's agents, the Court had difficulty in dominating the political machinery of the House, because it did not control the committee system. In the select and standing committees, legislation was prepared, examined, and amended; in the grand committees, or committees of the whole, all members informally participated in a discussion of legislation. Since the days of Elizabeth, when this form of organization was developed, control of committee proceedings had become vital to the political dominance of the House.

The Court attempted to employ the committee techniques successfully used by the monarchy in the sixteenth century, while the Country and republican oppositions countered with new methods developed by the opposition in the 1620s. Since the councillors had been named in the Instrument of Government, the Lord Protector did not have enough councillors loyal to him to dominate the select and standing committees, as Elizabeth's privy councillors had done. At times, the opposition members even managed to control these committees and name their chairmen. Meanwhile, they used the grand committees to obstruct the Court legislative programs.

The use of the councillors to dominate the select and standing committees was developed by the Elizabethan Court. It became policy at

IV-29

that time to remove as much of the debate as possible from the floor of the house to the committee chamber, where it could be more easily controlled by the privy councillors who sat on all the committees. The privy councillors were appointed by the speaker, of course, a loyal servant of the Court himself, from among the Court stalwarts. Overawing the less important committee members, they brought in most of the reports to the House and they were the first to be recorded as favoring a measure.

To break the dominance of the speaker on the floor of the House and of the privy councillors in the committees, the Country opposition in the early Stuart parliaments transformed the committee system. The early Elizabethan committee was a small "select" group which was appointed for a particular task and which disappeared after its work was done. By the end of the century, three larger standing, or "grand" committees on Grievances, Trade, and Privileges or Elections had been formed which dealt with all the legislation in these areas throughout the session. There were many complaints about the speaker's appointments of Court stalwarts to these committees, and members who had not been appointed began to attend and listen to the deliberations. Soon all the standing committees except the Committee on Privileges were allowed to coopt members, and eventually these new members were allowed to vote. It was then merely a step from a large "grand" committee in which all who came could vote to the House transforming itself into a committee of the whole or "grand" committee to deal with a particular matter. By 1622, it was established that all taxation bills and any other matters of crucial importance should first be discussed in grand committee.

The Country was freer to voice its opposition in these grand

IV-30

committees than either in the smaller select committees or on the floor of the House. The privy councillor could not overawe the ordinary member as easily as in a smaller group. The ordinary rules of House procedure, which worked to the advantage of the Court, were in abeyance. The speaker left the chair, the mace was removed, and the House chose its own chairman, who in the 1620s was usually one of the new leaders of the House, rather than a privy councillor. The clerk did not record the proceedings so there was less constraint in speaking. There were more flexible rules of procedure; a member could speak more than once to the same question; a motion did not require a seconder. Votes were counted more informally and a member could still argue against a vote after it was taken.⁹⁶

Not only was the Court forced to contend with the grand committee, as a new parliamentary development, but the Lord Protector's lack of sufficient loyal councillors made it impossible to control the smaller select committees. Opposition leaders frequently seized control of the committees and used them for their own ends. The Court councillors were relatively inactive. Contrary to Tudor practice, they were rarely the first members of the committee listed in the Commons Journal, and they rarely reported from the committees on which they served.⁹⁷

That the opposition members realized the importance of the control of the committees is shown by their immediate seizure of the committee structure during the periods in which they were strong in the house. In September, 1654, when the republicans were in control of the first Protectorate parliament, a contemporary newsletter reported that the republican Sir Arthur Haslerig was chosen as chairman of the Committee

IV-31

on Privileges. Later in the session, Colonel John Birch, the Country leader, dominated the committee to cut down the financial support of the armed forces to such an extent that a leading modern historian calls him its chairman. Birch reported from this committee twice and is the first member listed on it. Thomas Bampffield, the Country leader of the 1656-1657 session, is recorded as being in the chair of a select committee and as reporting from two standing committees. When the republicans were readmitted in 1658, prominent members of this group were immediately added to the Committee on Privileges, and Thomas Scott, a leading republican, chaired the committee for Ministers' Maintenance.⁹⁸

Notwithstanding this opposition use of the select committees, the most marked use of parliamentary procedure as a political weapon during the Protectorate parliaments was the reliance on the grand committee. It was the major opposition tool and was also used occasionally by the Court. The importance of the chairmanship of these grand committees is shown by the efforts of the contending groups to have one of their members in the chair.

When the opposition was in control, the House always spent a large part of its time in grand committee. The republicans, struggling to seize control of the 1654 session, were the first group to use this technique. When they left the House, after the forced subscription to the basic form of government, the Country emulated their use of this political weapon. Over a month and a half of this four-and-a-half-month session was spent in grand committee, endlessly debating the constitution. When these same recalcitrant members were readmitted to the House in 1658, they immediately resumed their past activities and strove to

IV-32

dissolve the House into a grand committee.

When the Court was in firm control of the House, the grand committee was only sparingly used. After the exclusion of the recalcitrant members in 1656, the Court was clearly the dominant group. Only fourteen days of this ten month session was spent in grand committee.⁹⁹ The Court used the grand committee, for the most part, in the traditional manner for the discussion of finance bills.

The republicans' immediate use of the grand committee in 1654 shows their reliance on this technique. Two days after parliament had convened, they proposed that the House go into grand committee in order to debate more freely the basic form of government. This was "strongly opposed" by the Court,¹⁰⁰ and a division vote had to be taken, which the republicans won by a small margin. For four days this situation persisted, the Court protesting each day as the House adjourned into a grand committee to radically revise the constitution. The situation was only resolved when the Protector forced the members to subscribe to a recognition of the basic form of government and most of the republicans left the parliament.

The Court's efforts, during this period, to maintain control of the chairmanship of this grand committee demonstrates the importance of this post. The Court did not have the strength to dissolve the grand committee, but succeeded in electing Nathaniel Bacon, a loyal member of the Court, to the chair and kept him there until the intervention of the Protector.¹⁰¹

The republicans passed the mantle of opposition to the Country, which quickly adopted the grand-committee technique and used it to attempt

IV-33

to alter the constitution to their own liking. As a compromise measure, a declaration was adopted that nothing in the forced subscription prevented the members from altering anything except the basic form of government. Given this opportunity to destroy the existing constitution, the Instrument of Government, the Country forced the house to go into grand committee, and, for most of the next three months, kept it there.¹⁰² In these successive grand committees, the Country devised a new constitution, which was to prove so unpalatable to the Lord Protector that he finally forcibly dissolved this parliament.

It is noteworthy that the chairman of all these successive grand committees, which were dominated and controlled by the Country and which drafted a constitution based on Country principles, was Bennet Hoskins, a close associate of John Birch, the Country leader. Hoskins was the co-member with Birch from Hereford. Like many of the Country members, he probably was at least sympathetic to the royalists. When he was elected in 1654, 192 citizens of Herefordshire sent a petition protesting his election to the council of state, stating that he was among "the worst sort of persons consisting of papists, malignants and men actually in arms for the late king."¹⁰³ The Court endeavored to break Hoskins' grip on this committee, elect its own chairman, and thus perhaps wipe out the more obnoxious sections of this Country constitution. Court adherents nominated John Glynn, a loyal member of the Court, who was shortly to be appointed as Lord Chief Justice, but Hoskins won the ensuing contest.¹⁰⁴

Another equally implacable member of the Country, Edward Turnor, chaired the grand committee on assessments during this session. Turnor

IV-34

was a "versatile lawyer," known for the vituperativeness with which he prosecuted the regicides after the Restoration. In return for this service, he was knighted and made attorney-general by Charles II. Under his aegis, a bill was adopted which cut the monthly assessment from the £90,000 proposed by the Court to £60,000. This was a severe blow, since Cromwell, as a conciliatory gesture, had already cut the proposed tax by £30,000 a month on the eve of the opening of the parliament. Even the reduced assessment was probably accepted by the Country only as an alternative to free quarters for the military, which the Lord Protector threatened.¹⁰⁵

In the 1656-1657 session both the diminished Country opposition and the new military opposition occasionally attempted to go into grand committee, but the Court members, firmly in control, resisted these attempts. They permitted this form of organization only when they felt it desirable. They always took care that such a committee should be under the aegis of a chairman of their own choice.

The first unsuccessful effort of the opposition to go into grand committee was a preview of an acrimonious argument which was to take place later in the session between the Country and the Court. This was the dispute about whether all the acts and ordinances promulgated since 1642 should be ratified collectively. At this time, the Court was strong enough to prevent all argument, and a vote on whether to send a resolution on this subject to a grand committee was lost by the Country. The resolution was referred to a select committee, headed by Cromwell's "alter ego," Colonel Jones, and heavily stacked with councillors and other loyal members of the Court.¹⁰⁶

IV-35

The Court permitted the House to go into grand committee only to discuss financial matters. This was the traditional method of organization to discuss such bills, established in the days of Elizabeth.¹⁰⁷ The House debated in grand committee the financing of the war with Spain, the method of collecting the monthly assessments that provided the major part of the revenue for the Protectorate, and the excise bill.

The Court succeeded in maintaining control of the chairmanship of these grand committees. There was no dispute when William Lenthall, the former speaker of the House, assumed the chairmanship of the grand committee which, at the Lord Protector's request, discussed the financing of the Spanish war.¹⁰⁸ However, arguments over the chairmanship of the grand committee on assessments and on the excise arose first with the Country and then with the military.

The Country wished to change the method of collecting assessments and for this reason tried to capture the chairmanship of the grand committee on this subject. It was necessary for the Court to invoke the power of the speaker in order to have its choice, Nathaniel Bacon, selected as chairman, rather than either Thomas Bampfield or Edmund Fowell, both Country members. In case of a dispute, the speaker had the power to choose the chairman of a grand committee.¹⁰⁹ The speaker chose Bacon, even "before they could come to any resolution."¹¹⁰

Either Bampfield or Fowell would have attempted, as a committee chairman, to force the government to deposit the assessments in the exchequer, as prescribed by law, rather than distributing them to the troops in the counties in which they were collected, as was usually done.¹¹¹ Some days earlier, both men had unsuccessfully opposed a proviso that

IV-36

would have legalized this efficient but extra-legal method. Since neither of them was selected as chairman, Bampffield's protests were ignored.¹¹²

Although the Court and the Country continued to have their differences, they joined forces when the session was a few months old to oppose the military members of the Court. They fought the passage of a "Militia Bill," which would have perpetuated the power of the major-generals, and backed the Lord Protector's proposed assumption of the crown. They themselves used a grand committee to attain these ends, and then opposed the attempts of the military members to set one up to delay the discussion of kingship.

When the militia bill was first proposed, the Court, backed by the Country, immediately suggested the establishment of a grand committee as a delaying device. Since taxation to support the militia was in question, Lord-Commissioner Bulstrode Whitelocke, a Court stalwart, pointed out that, "the way has been, first to debate the grounds and reasons for a tax before it be laid, and that in a Grand Committee," and he was backed, first by the speaker and then by Lambert Godfrey, a Country leader. They were opposed by military members, headed by Major-general Lambert, who questioned, "Must every Bill pass a Grand Committee before it is read in the House."¹¹³

To delay discussion of this question further, the Court adjourned the House into a grand committee on the excise. As a token of their cooperation with the Country, they selected as chairman Edmund Fowell, the Country member whom they were later to oppose as chairman of the grand committee on assessments. Four major-generals opposed the organi-

IV-37

zation of this grand committee and it took both a special ruling of the Lord Chief Justice and a disputed ruling of the speaker to enable the Court to win its point.¹¹⁴

The military Court also was prepared to use a grand committee when expedient. Its members forced a division on whether the house should go into grand committee to discuss the kingship proposals and lost by only fifty-five votes. Those who voted in this division against going into grand committee were characterized in a republican tract as "kinglings," and, if its adherents had won, the Lord Protector would never have been offered the crown.¹¹⁵ The Dutch ambassador recognized the importance of the use of the grand committee device at stake in this division, reporting that, "those who opposed it [kingship] brought many reasons, to have the same first examined in a grand committee, where they may speak and reply more than once; but it was voted by plurality of voices, that it should be distinctly and particularly debated in the parliament."¹¹⁶

In January of 1658, when the republicans were readmitted to parliament, they attempted to repeat the tactics of 1654 and again to revise the constitution radically. Their methods were the same: the use of the grand committee as a procedural device and a political alliance with the more obstructive Country members. Their aim was to prevent the Court from calling the "Other House" a "House of Lords"; their underlying object was to disrupt the constitutional settlement attained in the Humble Petition and Advice.

John Weaver, a consistent republican, revealed that they had a well thought out plan. He commented, "In 1654, upon the Instrument of

IV-38

Government, after you had spent two days upon the merit, you went into a Grand Committee, where much of the bottom of the business was found out."¹¹⁷ He referred to Ludlow's boast in 1654 that the republicans, especially Bradshaw, had educated the ignorant members as to the true nature of the Court's nefarious designs.¹¹⁸ Since the republicans in 1658 were not numerous enough alone to defeat the Court, they now wished to educate and to win over the Country.

The Court understood the gravity of this threat. Adjournment into grand committee was first proposed by the leading republican, Thomas Scott, and he was backed by a group of republican and Country members. The Court defeated this alliance in three separate divisions.¹¹⁹ Major Anthony Morgan, a Court member, commented, "A Grand Committee has been observed to be destructive to a business, or dilatory, to lay it aside by a side wind, rather than to prosecute it with vigour. It is not so fit at present."¹²⁰ The alliance being forged between the Country and the republicans no doubt contributed to the Lord Protector's decision to dissolve this parliament.

It seems fitting that the opposition's last dispute in parliament with the Court should have been over the formation of a grand committee. This dispute illustrates that Court, Country, and republicans all valued and understood the use of parliamentary procedure. The use of the speaker and the clerk by the Court, the republican attempt to nominate a speaker, the Lord Protector's use of personal agents, the use of the committee system by all three groups--all show their political aptitude and awareness and their ability to take advantage of the developing rules of parliamentary procedure.

IV-39

These rules could not in themselves solve the kinds of problems confronting these parliaments. The Country and the republicans used them to destroy the constitutional settlement desired by the Court. None of the methods employed by the Court, the use of the speaker and the clerk copied from the Tudor monarchs, the use of personal agents by the Lord Protector to take up the slack created by the Instrument of Government, were sufficient to cope with the situation. The Court was confronted by a group of men bred in a revolutionary tradition. Convinced that parliament should be supreme, they were willing to give only the dregs of power to the executive. The use of parliamentary procedures, no matter how adroit, could not reconcile so basic a conflict as that over the locus of sovereignty in a state.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Wallace Notestein, "The Winning of the Initiative in the House of Commons," Studies in History, ed. by Lucy S. Sutherland (London, 1966), p. 172.
2. Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), p. 413; History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (London, 1905), II, 319, 330.
3. Notestein, Initiative, pp. 147-166, passim; Sir John Neale, The Elizabethan House of Commons (London, 1949), p. 320.
4. J. R. Tanner, English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, 1962), p. 114; Christopher Hill, God's Englishman (London, 1970), p. 26.
5. Josef Redlich, The Procedure of the House of Commons (3 vols., London, 1908), II, 161.
6. Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 114.
7. Sir Thomas Smith, The Commonwealth of England, as quoted in Redlich, Procedure, II, 167.
8. D'Ewes, pp. 683, 684, as quoted in Josef Redlich, Procedure, II, 167.
9. Redlich, Procedure, II, 151, 156, 157; I, 159. Notestein, Initiative, p. 160; Henry Scobell, Dopping, Anthony, Bishop of Meath, Modus tenendi parliamenta in Hibernia, Published out of an ancient record by the Right Reverend Father in God, Anthony, lord bishop of Meath. To which is added the Rules and Customs of the House gathered out of the journal books, from the time of Edward VI, by H.S.E.C.P. (a new edition, Dublin, 1772), p. 42.
10. "The Orders, Proceedings, Punishments and Privileges of the Commons-House of Parliament in England, 1641," Harleian Miscellany, ed. by Thomas Park (London, 1818), V, 259, as quoted in Redlich, Procedure, II, 158.
11. The Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828), p. xix, 9/4/54.
12. A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe (7 vols., London, 1742), ed. by Thomas Birch, II, 588, Bordeaux to Brienne, 9/14/54.

FIV-2

13. Sir John Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliament, I, 97.
14. Thurloe, State Papers, I, Bordeaux to Brienne, 9/14/54, 588.
15. For Bradshaw, DNB, Chapter II, pp. 102-110, Burton, Diary, I, xx, 9/4/54.
16. The Clarke Papers, selections from papers of William Clarke (4 vols., London, 1891-1901), ed. by C. H. Firth, III, 73.
17. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), ed. by C. H. Firth, p. 586.
18. Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons, VII (London, 1813), 423, 9/17/56.
19. DNB, Sir Thomas Widdrington; David Underdown, Pride's Purge (Oxford, 1971), p. 169.
20. Burton, Diary, I, 195, 12/20/56.
21. Ibid., p. 291, 12/31/56.
22. Ibid., p. 243, 12/25/56.
23. Ibid., p. 310, 1/7/57.
24. Ibid., p. 324, 1/8/57.
25. The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1842), II, 419.
26. Burton, Diary, I, 365-366, 1/19/57.
27. Ibid., II, pp. 9-10, 4/23/57. For Colonel White, Paul J. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962), 194.
28. Notestein, Initiative, p. 160; Burton, Diary, II, 9, 4/23/57; 107, 5/5/57; 111-116, 5/5/57.
29. Ibid., pp. 46-56, 4/28/57.
30. Ibid., pp. 49, 50, 54, 55, 4/28/57.
31. Ibid., p. 47, 4/28/57.
32. Ibid., p. 69, 5/29/57.
33. Ibid., p. 71, 5/29/57.

FIV-3

34. Ibid., p. 340, 1/22/58.
35. Ibid., p. 378, 1/28/58.
36. Ibid., p. 435, 2/3/58.
37. Ibid., I, 223, 12/24/56.
38. Ibid., II, 179, 6/5/57.
39. Ibid., p. 200, 6/8/57.
40. Ibid., p. 304, 6/24/57.
41. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, p. 454.
42. Burton, Diary, II, 34, 35, 4/24/57; C. H. Firth, Cromwell's Army (London: 1962), pp. 49-50.
43. Burton, Diary, I, 295, 2/2/57; ibid., II, p. 35, 4/24/57.
44. Ibid., p. 229, 6/12/57.
45. Ibid., pp. 195, 196, 6/8/57.
46. Redlich, Procedure, II, 158; ibid., pp. 133, 134, 5/26/57; p. 192, 6/6/57.
47. Ibid., p. 149, 5/29/57.
48. Ibid., p. 187, 6/6/57.
49. Redlich, Procedure, II, p. 177.
50. Burton, Diary, II, 317, 1/20/58.
51. Ibid., I, xx, 9/4/54.
52. Loc. cit.
53. DNB, Henry Scobell.
54. Burton, Diary, II, 316, 318, 1/20/58.
55. Ibid., p. 318, 1/20/58.
56. From 1/22/58 until 1/25/58; ibid., p. 336, 1/22/58. Commons Journal, VII, 587, 1/25/58.
57. Burton, Diary, II, 318, 1/20/58.
58. Ibid., p. 336, 1/22/58.

FIV-4

59. Commons Journal, VII, 579, 1/21/58.

60. Ibid., p. 581, 1/23/58; p. 587, 1/25/58, p. 590, 2/1/58; Burton, Diary, II, 330-331, 1/21/58; 336, 1/22/58; 344, 1/23/58; 403-404, 1/30/58.

61. Commons Journal, VII, 588, 1/26/58.

62. Burton, Diary, II, 268, 6/20/58.

63. Ibid., pp. 203, 205, 206, 6/9/57.

64. Scobell, Rules, p. 49.

65. Table II, Appendix, for memberships and offices of individual members of the Court. Anabaptist army officers who followed the major-generals are listed in the appendix among the members of the Military Court and the republicans. They include such men as William Briscoe, Thomas Cooper, Jerome Sankey, Daniel Axtell, and John Hewson. Prominent Anabaptist members of the Court were: Henry Lawrence, the Lord President of the Council; William Steele, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; and William Kiffin. For identifications of the political affiliation of members who had sat in the Rump Parliament, who now were members of the Court, David Underdown Pride's Purge, pp. 366-390. Examples of independents: John Lisle, Edmund Prideaux, Sir William Strickland; of presbyterians, John Glynn, Francis Drake, Anthony Nicoll; of the "middle group," Nathaniel Fiennes, Edward Montague, Richard Norton.

66. Notestein, Initiative, pp. 147-166, *passim*, 172, 179; Neale, House of Commons, p. 320; David Harris Willson, The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629 (Minneapolis, 1940), p. 19.

67. For councillors' tellerships, Chapter IV, Appendix 2. For Jones, DNB. For Thurloe, DNB; Hill, God's Englishmen, p. 144; Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate (2 vols., London, 1909), II, 3.

68. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 413, 453; Firth, Protectorate, II, 1, 3, 7. Pamphlets praising this feature of the constitution: A Letter from a Person in the Country to his Friend in the City: upon a book entitled A healing question (London, June 14, 1656); Samuel Richardson, Apology for the Present government (London, 1654).

69. For Sheffield, Cooper, Desborough, Fleetwood, Lambert, Pickering, Sydenham, Skippon, Lawrence: DNB. For Mackworth and Major: Firth, Protectorate, II, 1. For the tellerships and parliamentary record of Jones, Wolseley, Fiennes, Montague, Rous and Strickland, Chapter IV, Appendix 2, and Burton, Diary, I and II, *passim*.

FIV-5

70. Chapter IV, Appendix I, p. 214.

71. Narrative Late Parliament, pp. 8-9.

72. Richard Cromwell, Desborough, Fiennes, Fleetwood, Jones, Lambert, Mackworth, Montague, Pickering, Rous, Skippon, Walter Strickland, Sydenham, Thurloe. See Appendix for details.

73. Chapter IV, Appendix II, pp. 217-219.

74. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series (13 vols., London, 1875-1886), VII (1654), 337, 8/28/54.

75. Thurloe, State Papers, II, Bordeaux to Brienne, 8/14/54, 588.

76. Burton, Diary, I, xxi, 9/5/54, "from Court, especially."

77. Bordeaux to Brienne, Sept. 17/7, French Transcripts, R. O., as quoted in Samuel R. Gardiner, The History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), III, 182.

78. Burton, Diary, I, xxxiii, 9/12/54.

79. Ibid., pp. lv-lviii, 10/23/54; lxiv-lxvii, 11/10/54.

80. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, XXX, 269, as quoted by George D. Heath, III, "An Essay in Constitutional Development, 1653-57" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1953), p. 298; Charles H. Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," English Historical Review, XVII (1902), 429-442; XVIII (1903), 52-80, discusses the antecedents of the kingship proposals, and Heath further elaborates this theme.

81. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 2/10/57, 53.

82. Ibid., V, 427, Bordeaux to Mazarin, 9/28/56, as discussed in Firth, Protectorate, I, 15, for Thurloe's defense of exclusion on 9/22/56. Desborough acted as a Court teller, defending the move on the same day; Commons Journal, VII, 426.

83. Burton, Diary, I, cxlviii-clxxxix, 9/17/56.

84. Commons Journal, VII, 424, 9/18/56.

85. Ibid., p. 432, 10/2/56; p. 440, 10/17/56, p. 450, 11/7/56.

86. Burton, Diary, I, 174, 12/18/56.

87. Commons Journal, VII, 483, 1/30/57.

88. Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," pp. 433-434, 438; French Transcripts, Bordeaux to Brienne, Dec. 18/8, and Carte MSS, ccxxviii, f. 79, Burton to Lord Wharton, as quoted in Heath, "An Essay in Constitutional Development," pp. 301 and 304; Burton, Diary, I, 174; Commons Journal, VII, 483, 1/30/57.

89. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 452-453; Commons Journal, VII, 523, 4/24/57.

90. Burton, Diary, II, 26, 32, 4/24/57; 160, 5/30/57; 201, 6/8/57; 247, 6/13/57. For the struggle to collect the assessments out of exchequer course, Burton, Diary, II, 173, 6/4/57, Chapter III, pp. 149-150.

91. Commons Journal, VII, 523, 4/24/57; Burton, Diary, II, 86, 4/30/57.

92. Commons Journal, VII, 459-464; Burton, Diary, II, 22, 4/24/57; 306, 6/25/57.

93. Ibid., p. 170, 6/4/57.

94. Ibid., p. 259, 6/20/57.

95. Ibid., pp. 95, 97, 98, 5/1/57; pp. 157-158, 5/29/57, p. 178, 6/5/57. For further details, Chapter VI.

96. For the Elizabethan committee system, Notestein, Initiative, 162-165. For the transformation in the early Stuart period, ibid., 172-189; Redlich, Procedure, II, 207-209; Scobell, Rules, 30, 49; Sir Thomas Erskine May, The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliaments (15th ed., London, 1950), p. 579.

97. Commons Journal, VII, passim; Notestein, Initiative, p. 162.

98. For Sir Arthur Haslerig, "Severall Proceedings of State Affaires," British Museum, Burney Collection, II, No. 258, Sept. 5, 1654. For Birch, Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 65, 80; Commons Journal, VII, 385, 11/15/54; 387, 11/22/54; 388, 11/23/54. For Bampffield, ibid., p. 453, 11/12/56; p. 455, 11/17/56; p. 457, 11/21/56; p. 464, 12/4/56; Burton, Diary, I, 352. For the republicans: Richard or Henry Darley, Scott, St. Nicholas, Commons Journal, VII, 580, 1/21/58. For Scott as chairman, Burton, Diary, II, 372, 1/26/58; 441, 2/3/58.

99. Commons Journal, VII, passim. Grand committees of the whole house are counted, not standing committees, sometimes also called "Grand committees" to which "all that come may have voices."

100. Burton, Diary, I, xxiv, 9/7/54.

101. Ibid., pp. xxiv-xxxi, 9/7-9/12/54.

FIV-7

102. Ibid., p. xxxviii, 9/14/54; Commons Journal, VII, passim. Days spent wholly or partially in grand committee to revise the constitution: Sept. 19-23, 25-30, Oct. 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, Nov. 1, 2, 4, 8, 13, 17, Dec. 23, 25-27, Jan. 4.

103. CSFD, VII (1654), 109, 110.

104. Commons Journal, VII, 408.

105. Burton, Diary, I, cii, n., 12/1/54. He chaired this grand committee on Nov. 29 and Dec. 1, Commons Journal, VII, 392-393. For the assessment bill: ibid., p. 392; Maurice Ashley, Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate (London, 1934), pp. 75, 78.

106. Commons Journal, VII, 429, 9/27/56.

107. Kenneth Mackenzie, The English Parliaments (Middlesex, 1950), p. 51.

108. For Lenthall's grand committee, Commons Journal, VII, 440, 10/17/56; 443, 10/21/56. For the Lord Protector's speech, Burton, Diary, I, cxlviii-cxcix, 9/14/56.

109. Scobell, Rules, p. 49.

110. Burton, Diary, II, 254, 6/15/57.

111. Ashley, Financial Policy, pp. 81-82.

112. Burton, Diary, II, 173, 6/4/57.

113. Ibid., I, 234, 12/25/56.

114. Ibid., pp. 321-324, 1/8/57.

115. Commons Journal, VII, 496, 2/25/57. Vote discussed with list of supporters in "Monarchy Asserted to be the best, most ancient and legal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the Late Lord Somers (2d ed. revised by Walter Scott, London, 1811), VI, 348-349.

116. Thurloe, State Papers, VII, Nieupoort, Dutch Ambassador in England to the States-general, Westminster, 3/9/57, 84.

117. Burton, Diary, II, 429, 2/3/58.

118. Ludlow, Memoirs, I, 391.

FIV-8

119. Burton, Diary, II, 382, 1/29/58. Republican-Country alliance: republicans: Haslerig, St. Nicholas, Weaver, Henry or Richard Darley. Country: Cooper, Matthews, Gibbs, Mr. Richard Lucy, Barrington, Dodderidge. This alliance was defeated on Jan. 29 (Commons Journal, VII, 589) and twice on Feb. 3 (ibid., 589, 591).

120. Burton, Diary, II, 435, 2/3/58.

A-I-IV-1

APPENDIX I--CHAPTER IV

ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL OF STATE

List of members of council of state, Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate, Vol. II, p. 1, note. John Thurloe and Richard Cromwell who were added to the council in 1657 (Ibid., pp. 3, 7) did not run for parliament as members of the council.

-- no information about the election

X not in Parliament

	<u>1654</u>	<u>1656</u>
Cooper	triple candidacy ¹	Not a member of council of state
Desborough	triple candidacy ²	quadruple candidacy ³
Fiennes (added 4/27/54)	--	University seat ⁴
Fleetwood	triple candidacy ⁵	Influence, Major-general Haynes ⁶
Jones	double candidacy ⁷	double candidacy ⁸
Lambert	double candidacy ⁹	--
Lawrence	--	Charter change to promote candidacy. Took Lord Chief Justice's seat. ¹⁰
Lisle	X	X
Mackworth (added 2/7/54)	--	X
Major	--	X
Montague	--	--
Mulgrave (added 6/30/54)	X	X

A-I-IV-2

	<u>1654</u>	<u>1656</u>
Pickering	--	Influence, Major-general Boteler ¹¹
Rous	--	Influence, Major-general Desborough ¹²
Skippon	--	Charter change to promote candidacy. Double candidacy ¹³
Strickland	--	Replaces prominent republican ¹⁴
Sydenham	double candidacy ¹⁵	double candidacy ¹⁶
Wolseley	--	Influence, Major-general Bridges ¹⁷

FOOTNOTES TO
APPENDIX I--CHAPTER IV

1. Wiltshire, Poole, Tewksbury (Commons Journal, VII, 372)
2. Cambridgeshire, Somersetshire, Totnes (Commons Journal, VII, 372).
3. Somersetshire, Gloucester, King's Lynn, Bridgwater (Official Return).
4. Oxford University (Millicent Rex, University Representation in England, 184).
5. Oxfordshire, Woodstock, Marlborough (Official Return, William Cobbett, The Parliamentary History of England, vol. 3, 1428-1432.
6. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, p. 311, Balleston to Haynes, 9/1/56, p. 370.
7. Glamorganshire, Monmouthshire (Commons Journal, VII, 373).
8. Glamorganshire, Breconshire (Official Return).
9. Surrey, Yorkshire (Official Return).
10. Charter change in Colchester promoted his candidacy. (Chapter I, pp. 68-69.)
11. Peter Whalley, The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire, Oxford, 1971, II, 383, quoted in Paul F. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656," p. 116.
12. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, 451, 462.
13. Chapter I, pp. 67-68.
14. Replaces Sir Arthur Haslerig, probably as a result of Court effort to weaken his influence in Northumberland (Chapter I, p. 58).
15. Dorsetshire, Isle of Wight (Official Return).
16. Dorsetshire, Isle of Wight (Official Return).
17. Memoirs of the Verney Family, III, 283-284, as quoted in Paul F. Pinckney, "The Cheshire Elections of 1656," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 49 (Spring, 1967), p. 405.

APPENDIX II--CHAPTER IV

Number of times Councillors acted as tellers in votes of special interest to the Court.

Abbreviations--Issues indicating political affiliation (appendix, p. 4).

1654-1655 Parliament

- Fiennes, 1 tellership
 - Anti-republican (Sept. 6, CJ 366)
- Lawrence, 1 tellership
 - Anti-republican (Sept. 6, CJ 366)
- Strickland, 3 tellerships
 - Anti-republican (Sept. 7, CJ 367)
 - Pro-IPP (Dec. 8, CJ 398)
 - Pro-additional powers to the Council (Jan. 9, CJ 414)
- Desborough, 8 tellerships
 - Pro-A & O (Nov. 6, CJ 382)
 - Pro-IPP (Nov. 9, CJ 384)
 - Pro-NF (Jan. 1, CJ 411)
 - Pro-constitutional settlement (Jan. 10, CJ 414)
 - Pro-SMB (Jan. 16, CJ 418-2 votes)
 - Pro-IPP, power to command militia (Jan. 19, CJ 420 and Jan. 20, CJ 421)
- Wolseley, 8 tellerships
 - Anti-republican (Sept. 7, CJ 367)
 - Pro-IPP (Nov. 10, CJ 384, 385; Nov. 14, CJ 385; Nov. 30, CJ 393; Dec. 29, CJ 409; Jan. 8, CJ 413)

AII-IV-2

- Lambert, 3 tellerships
 - Pro-IPP (Nov. 14, CJ 385)
 - Pro-SMB (Dec. 21, CJ 406)
 - Effort to improve constitution (Dec. 23, CJ 408)
- Cooper, 1 tellership
 - Pro-NF (Nov. 27, CJ 391)
- Rous, 2 tellerships
 - Pro-NF (Nov. 27, CJ 391)
 - Pro-IPP (Dec. 13, CJ 400)
- Jones, 16 tellerships
 - Pro-IPP (Dec. 2, CJ 394; Dec. 6, CJ 396; Dec. 9, 11, CJ 399; Dec. 29, CJ 409; Jan. 9, CJ 414; Jan. 10, CJ 414; Jan. 13, CJ 415; Jan. 15, CJ 417, Jan. 19, CJ 420)
 - Pro-SMB (Dec. 21, CJ 406; Jan. 16, CJ 417)
 - Pro-kingship (Jan. 2, CJ 411)
 - Anti-parliamentary privilege (Jan. 9, CJ 414)
- Montague, 3 tellerships
 - Pro-IPP (Dec. 11, CJ 399; Dec. 16, CJ 403; Jan. 16, CJ 418)
- Sydenham, 1 tellership
 - Pro-IPP (Jan. 19, CJ 420)

1656-1658 Parliament

- Desborough, 2 tellerships
 - Pro-Excl. (Sept. 22, CJ 426)
 - Pro-Oath (June 23, CJ 570)
- Fiennes, 1 tellership
 - Pro-Excl. (Sept. 22, CJ 426)

AII-IV-3

- Jones, 9 tellerships
 - Pro-religious toleration (Dec. 17, CJ 469; Dec. 27, CJ 476)
 - Pro-kingship (Feb. 24, CJ 496)
 - Pro-SFP (March 9, CJ 500)
 - Pro-A & O (April 30, CJ 528)
 - Pro-ILG (June 5, CJ 546)
 - Taxation bill (June 19, CJ 563)
 - Pro-Oath (June 23, CJ 570)
 - Adjournment of parliament (June 26, CJ 575)
- Montague
 - Pro-kingship (April 14, CJ 520)
 - Pro-A & O (April 28, CJ 524)
 - Pro-ILG (June 8, CJ 550)

CHAPTER V

THE SCOTTISH AND IRISH MEMBERSHIP:
MONOLITHIC TOOL OR DIVIDED DELEGATIONS?

The role of the Irish and Scottish delegations is a subject of comment in any discussion of the Protectorate parliaments. The peculiar situation of these members of parliament as representatives of conquered countries, the fact that they were elected only by the small number of voters enfranchised by the English conqueror, the large number of English army officers who served as representatives of the countries they had conquered--all these factors have given these men the reputation of being subservient tools of the English. Their seats have, in fact, been recently described as "safe pocket boroughs for government nominees."¹

Investigation reveals that these members did not always vote alike and did not always support the Cromwellian Court. They voted similarly on many issues, especially those they conceived to be in the best interest of their constituencies, such as the lowering of taxes. During the winter of 1656-1657, however, they were sometimes divided. This breach followed a division in the Court between those members who joined the Country in urging Cromwell to become king and the major-generals and their military followers, who bitterly opposed them.

The situation developed somewhat differently in the two conquered countries. In Ireland the breach was minimized through the astute electoral and parliamentary management of Henry Cromwell, the military

V-2

and civilian head of the government. Cromwell saw to it that troublesome members from the first Protectorate parliament were not returned and that those in attendance received guidance from his agents. In Scotland, the division was deepened by a local factor, the existence of two church parties, the Resolutioners and the Remonstrants, both professedly Presbyterian, but bitterly struggling for control of the church livings.

This rift between these parties was political, rather than doctrinal in origin, commencing in the quarrels among the Scots during the second Civil War. In 1649, when Charles II came to Scotland to head a rising in his favor, he was accepted by the Resolutioners and disavowed by the Remonstrant officers and clergy, who signed a protest against the king and became allies of Cromwell. After the English conquest, this quarrel degenerated into rivalry over the dominance of the Presbyterian church and its livings. It was natural that the English conquerors should at first favor the Remonstrant ministers, although they were outnumbered by the Resolutioners five to one.²

Each of these parties was tied to one of the English Court groups: the Resolutioners to Lord Broghill, the Lord President of the Council in Scotland, and some of the Court members supporting kingship; the Remonstrants to Major-general Lambert and other members of the military. Moreover, each of these church parties had its agents in London who lobbied among the Scottish members. There is conclusive evidence in the correspondence and diaries of Scots who were in London at the time that these lobbyists managed to split the delegation on at least one issue: the Scottish qualification clause in the Additional Petition

V-3

and Advice, which determined the voting qualifications in Scotland.

Court electoral and parliamentary management had been designed to produce compliant delegations and might well have succeeded completely if the English political situation had been more harmonious. A new system of government had been established for Scotland in August, 1655, and Lord Broghill, one of Cromwell's most tactful and competent supporters, was named Lord President. Broghill exerted his influence to try to heal the rift in the Scottish church and to see that suitable members would be elected to the forthcoming parliament. At about the same time, Henry Cromwell, the Lord Protector's son, had been sent to Ireland, as commanding general of the armed forces and President of the Council.³ He endeavored to counteract the influence of major-general Charles Fleetwood, the previous commander, who had been sympathetic to the republicans and Anabaptists in the army. A milder policy toward the native Catholics was also promoted. It was perhaps these efforts at management besides the unanimity in local matters that gave contemporaries the distorted impression that the Scottish and Irish delegations were completely united and wholly subservient.

It may be, however, that this historical tradition began not as an error in historical interpretation, but as a piece of deliberate political propaganda. The contemporary writers who fostered it were all republican in their sympathies. A republican pamphlet referred to "packing" of the 1656 parliament with "a sort of conquered Scotchmen" and said that the "present Trustees" of the Scots are "interested Mercenary Men" who should not be sitting in parliament.⁴ Edward Ludlow, the republican diarist, pointed out that none of the Scottish or Irish members

V-4

were excluded from the 1656 parliament, noting that "about a hundred of those who were elected by the country were excluded from the discharge of their trust, whilst those for Ireland and Scotland who were chosen by and for the sword, were admitted without any scruple."⁵

The republicans perpetuated this tradition of the Scottish and Irish delegations as puppet groups in an altercation over seating them in the 1658 parliament. John Hobart protested against their admittance, saying, "it hath bin often evidenced to you that the Scots and Irish are neyther of them in a Condition of freedome to choose theyr owne Representatives. He seeth very litle who observes not a necessity of theyr dependence upon the cheife Magistrate for their support out of and interest in Parliament. We have seene already how fitt Instruments they may be in the hand of any future tyrant for the Ruine of our Libertyes-- Theyr sitting here in 1654 and 1656 were meere Intrusion with Force."⁶ The republicans thus overlooked all differences of opinion both within these delegations and vis à vis the Lord Protector, and this historical interpretation has persisted to this day with only some slight modifications.

Historians have been misled by the circumstances of the elections of these members and their support of native interests, overlooking their actual behavior in parliament. Standard Irish and Scottish histories stress the fact that they were preponderantly government nominees and then examine their conduct no further. Gardiner succinctly states that, "The Irish representation, and to a great extent the Scottish, served the purpose of the Ministerial pocket-boroughs of the eighteenth century."⁷ C. H. Firth modified this interpretation, realizing that the

V-5

Scottish members, whether English by birth or native born, worked to improve the lot of the Scots. He pointed out that, "in questions of taxation and the privileges of the burghs, English officials and native Scots advocated the interests of Scotland with equal vigour."⁸ In a recent article, Paul J. Pinckney has examined the background of the Scottish delegation and concluded that "Scotland did have a semblance of valid representation in the 1656 parliament, and that even some of the English representatives were capable of working for Scottish interests."⁹ These authors still, however, overlook the split in the delegations, which stemmed from the division between military and civilian interests that ran through English politics.¹⁰

This division of interest became evident in December, 1656, during the first session of the second Protectorate parliament. Until this time, the military and civilian members of the Court had been united in their support of the Cromwellian regime. On Christmas Day of 1656, Major-general Desborough introduced the Militia Bill, a proposal for a permanent annual tax, which would support the militia and thus perpetuate the rule of the major-generals. Although this bill was backed at first by some civilian members of the Court, most of them soon joined the Country in opposing it; the bill was defeated at the end of January.

The bitterness engendered in the debates on the Militia Bill continued into the discussions about whether the Lord Protector should assume the crown. One Country member noted that "it was the distinguishing character of those that were against the Bill, that they were for hereditary rank."¹¹ Most of the military men indignantly opposed the kingship proposals. It is believed that this opposition was the decisive

V-6

factor in Cromwell's decision to reject the crown.

During this struggle, Cromwell was forced to shift his base of support, and this shift was reflected both in his administration of Scotland and Ireland and in the alignments that took place within the delegations. During the winter of 1656-1657, Cromwell came to rely less on his military followers and more on those civilian officials and Country members who supported the kingship proposals, some of whom were ex-royalists. Although armies of occupation continued in strength in Scotland and Ireland, by this time regimes were installed which truckled less to the opinions of the army officers and were somewhat more conciliatory toward the conquered peoples. The members of the Scottish and Irish delegations who opposed Court bills were also apt to be less conciliatory in their attitudes.

The new civilian government, installed in Scotland in August of 1655, had to deal with a discontented population ruled by an army of occupation. This army had been commanded since May of 1654, by General George Monck, a loyal supporter of Cromwell. Few native Scots had participated in the parliamentary elections of 1654, and most of the elections had taken place at or near army garrisons. Even though thus subjected, the Scottish clergy refused to observe the fasts appointed by the English government and told the people to forget the offenses of the Stuarts.¹² When the Lord Protector was asked by economy-minded members of parliament to reduce the army in Scotland, toward the end of 1654, he replied, "In general, the country was wholly very much disaffected to the present government. The Presbyterian and Cavalier interest were so complicated, as he did not see how any forces there could be lessened

V-7

with any safety."¹³

The Protector's new Council in Scotland was headed by a man well fitted to deal with this state of affairs. Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, a wealthy Anglo-Irish nobleman, was an ex-royalist, but a faithful Cromwellian. His record as a Court teller in the 1654 parliament was exceeded only by that of Colonel Jones, Cromwell's principal agent.¹⁴ He was to be one of the foremost advocates of kingship, and he was typical of the men Cromwell was to rely upon more and more as he moved away from his military supporters. The other members of the Council were English officers, among them Monck, and two native Scots, described by a fellow-countryman as "our complying gentleman."¹⁵

Broghill succeeded in moderating the rift in the Scottish Presbyterian Church between the Resolutioners and the Remonstrants that was causing unrest throughout the country. A year after his arrival, he was "reported by all to be a man exceeding wise and moderate, and by profession a Presbyterian. He has gained more on the affections of the people than all the English that ever were among us."¹⁶ His efforts were in the direction of conciliating the larger group, the Resolutioners, which was at least partially ex-royalist in sentiment.

It became apparent that the quarrel was impeding all chances of attaining peaceful conditions in Scotland. Several attempts at ameliorating the conditions failed. An ordinance had been passed by the council of state in England in August of 1654 to oversee the selection of Scottish ministers. This ordinance divided Scotland into five districts and appointed fifty-one "Triers," commissioners who were to pass on the qualifications of the ministers.¹⁷ It was very much like the

V-8

plan used in England to select ministers, but the Resolutioners called it "Mr. Gillespie's charter" after a prominent Remonstrant minister, and complained that the majority of the ministers and laymen appointed as Triers were Remonstrants.¹⁸ The quarrel continued. Plans for a conference of representatives of the two parties with the Lord Protector in May, 1654, did not materialize.¹⁹ In February, 1655, Cromwell commented on the bad effect that the Resolutioner ministers' discontent was having on the Scottish people. When the Scottish members of parliament complained to him in 1655 about the large army of occupation stationed in their native land, his reply was, "the reason thereof was because the Ministry did preach uppe the interest of Charles Stuart and did much inveigh against the present authority."²⁰

Broghill ameliorated the situation by lending a more sympathetic ear to the Resolutionist ministers, who actually controlled about 750 of the country's 900 parishes. Many of the Remonstrants, in spite of their past alliance with the English Commonwealth, he considered so radical as to be untrustworthy allies for the Protectorate government, comparing them to the more extreme religious sects in England and saying "I may call them Fifth-monarchy presbiterians, and according to their principles (setting aside some little shewe of presbiterian discipline, which yet they allow none to practise over them, but would it over all others), they are neerer a closure with the late All-hallowse men then any others."²¹ To make sure that it would no longer be necessary to cooperate with such unsuitable allies, the new Lord President used a mixture of force and persuasion with the Resolutionist ministers so that they would no longer pray for the king by name and devised a compromise

V-9

plan of selecting these ministers. By the end of 1656,²² the Resolutioners were so well satisfied that one of their leaders, an erstwhile opponent of the Protector, wrote, "all who are wise thinks that our evils would grow yet more if Cromwell were removed."²³

The Remonstrants were naturally displeased with this new state of affairs. When they received word of the compromise, they decided to appeal to their erstwhile ally, the Lord Protector. As Broghill wrote, "For the remonstrators haveinge got notice of what the rest of the ministry have lately agreed unto with me--they have called a meetinge, and as my lord Warreston is com to informe me, are resolved to employ some commissioners to his highness."²⁴ They sent as emissaries some of their principal ministers and laymen, and they were soon joined in London by their opponents, a group of Resolutionist ministers.

From the correspondence and notes of these emissaries, it is possible to gather a detailed picture of their activities. This provides a kind of background for decisions made in Parliament and in the council of state, which is rare for Protectorate affairs. The fiery Lord Johnston of Warriston, the former Clerk Register of Scotland and leader of the Remonstrators, kept a diary. James Sharpe, the wily Resolutionist minister who was to become an archbishop after the Restoration, reported to his fellow ministers in Scotland and there were comments and answers. From these accounts can be gathered some idea of the actions of their fellow Scots in parliament.

The election of this delegation and its composition have been discussed by Paul J. Pinckney in his dissertation, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656" and in an article entitled,

V-10

"The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656."

Pinckney concludes that the delegation had been nominated and elected under the supervising eye of the Lord President and his council.²⁵ As was remarked sarcastically by a contemporary, there were "persons designed to al shires."²⁶ Over half of the group were English army officers and civilian office holders. The Scots were mainly what he calls "second-class aristocrats,"²⁷ members of the most influential and wealthy families who were willing to cooperate with the Protectorate government.

These members voted as a bloc, except when the two Court groups, civilian and military, were pulling them in opposite directions. When the Court was united, they usually followed its lead. Occasionally, however, they took an independent line, voting together in accordance with the instructions of a Scottish organization, the Convention of Royal Burghs.

Following Court leadership, the delegation voted "en masse" on many Scottish issues. A Scottish observer had predicted at the time of the election that they would behave in this way, saying, "It's like there shall be none of the whole number more cordiall for all the protector's desyres, be what they may than those that come from Scotland."²⁸ They acted with the other Court members on the establishment of the Scottish Union, the abolition of wardships,²⁹ and the establishment of a very limited religious toleration for England, Scotland, and Ireland. For this they received criticism from both wings of the Scottish Presbyterian church; so their votes must have been cast at the behest of the Court. Warriston noted for the Remonstrants, "I heard this daye of the Parliaments slighting and slightly going throw the mater of religion

V-11

by settling no other thing in it but universal toleration which was destructive to it,"³⁰ while Baillie chimed in for the Resolutioners, "That this [religious provisions of the Humble Petition and Advice] should be concluded in a Civill judicatorie for Scotland by so many of our Nationall commissioners, with thier absolute silence--not long ago would have been considered a wonder if not simply impossible."³¹

At the request of the Convention of Royal Burghs, the Scottish delegation voted together, but not in conformity with the majority of the Court, on two issues concerning Scotland. This organization elected the members for the towns and cities. It issued a set of instructions, among which were requests that the monthly assessment for Scotland be lowered and that the privileges of the burghs be confirmed.

The monthly assessment in Scotland was lowered from ten to six thousand at the request of two Scottish members, John Vincent and Dr. Thomas Clarges as well as George Downing, who served for Scotland in 1654. Clarges and Downing were strong Court supporters on financial as well as other matters. Downing had served for eleven separate days as chairman of the grand committee to raise money for the Spanish war,³² a position that would have been entrusted only to a staunch Court adherent who thoroughly understood and sympathized with the Protectorate's financial problems. These men must, therefore, have thought the Scottish situation very parlous to have requested this reduction in taxes. A contemporary description confirms this explanation of their attitude. On the eve of the opening of parliament, a Scottish minister wrote, "The trueth is, money was never so scarce here, and groweth dailie scarcer."³³ These members were supported by Monck, who, as commanding general

V-12

in Scotland, certainly understood the English need for revenue. He wrote, "Unless there be some course taken that they may come in an equality with England, it will go hard with this people; and it will be one of the greatest obligations they can have to the present government, to bring them into an equality."³⁴ This understanding attitude of those in power toward the Scottish financial problem was also shown by another Scottish member, Colonel Nathaniel Whetham, a member of the council of Scotland. When the excise was being discussed in parliament, Whetham recommended that the people of the isles of Scotland be excused from paying it because they were so poor.³⁵

The Scottish members also took an independent position on the issue of confirming the liberties of the Burghs, again as recommended by the Convention. This bill was discarded in grand committee, mainly because the English members felt that they were ignorant of the privileges they were being asked to confirm. Six of the Scottish members spoke in favor of the bill and none were against it.³⁶

The Scottish members were divided, however, on the issues that were destroying the unity of the Court. Some followed the civilian Court and its Scottish ally, the Resolutioners, some the military Court and its ally the Remonstrants. The great national issue that caused this division was Cromwell's proposed assumption of the Crown. And, when the Humble Petition and Advice, incorporating this proposal, was being drafted, Scottish members and their English allies divided again, along the same lines, on the clause defining the qualifications of the Scots to vote and hold office.

This controversy is typical of those which ensued when the Lord

V-13

Protector was torn between the civilian and military members of the Court. As with the kingship question, Cromwell did not take a firm stand until the last possible moment. At first, his own position on these qualifications was backed by the Court, but then changes were made by and under the influence of the English military and the Scottish Remonstrants. While the Lord Protector remained silent, a split developed both in the Scottish and in the English delegations. A Scottish issue that reached back many years became enmeshed in English power politics.

The problem to be resolved was which and how many adherents of the Stuart cause in Scotland should be allowed to vote or hold public office. Since sympathy for the Stuarts had been widespread, this was a thorny problem. It was taken up in 1656 by the church parties, with the Resolutioners, royalist in background, in favor of a broad base, and the Remonstrants, backed by the English military group, for a more limited base. However, this problem had existed since the Scots first divided over the English cause.

The first official piece of legislation relating to Scottish disenfranchisement was the Act of Classes, passed by the Scottish Parliament in January, 1649. Its genesis lay in the Engagement, a secret treaty signed by Charles I and a group of Scottish Commissioners a year earlier, which promised Scottish support in return for a church settlement pleasing to the Presbyterians. This treaty, which was popular with the educated classes, was repudiated by the Scots, under the leadership of Scotland's most powerful nobleman, Archibald Campbell, first Earl of Argyll, after Cromwell's victory at Preston. The Acts of Classes disenfranchised not only all the Engagers, who had signed the secret treaty,

V-14

but even those who had not actively opposed the Engagement and forbade them to hold office, for varying numbers of years, depending on their class in society. Also penalized was a class made up of those whose conduct did not meet the strictest Puritan standards.

The Act of Classes was repealed in June, 1651, under the influence of Charles II, who had come to Scotland to fight for the Stuart cause and then the issue of enfranchisement remained dormant until 1656. No more Scottish parliaments were to meet until the Restoration. The military officers who drew up the Instrument of Government, which provided for the elections to the first Protectorate parliament, effectively disenfranchised most Scots under a blanket provision applying to all (with a very few exceptions) who had fought against Parliament. The drawing up of the enfranchisement provisions of the Humble Petition and Advice provided the Scots with their first opportunity in many years to make their voices heard on this subject.

The enfranchisement clause, as originally proposed on March 6, 1657, was drawn up along conciliatory lines in accordance with the policy Lord Broghill was following in Scotland. All who had lived quietly under English rule since March, 1652, the date of the union of Scotland and England, could vote for or run as candidates for parliament. Chances of this clause being approved seemed good; it was read twice and then referred to committee. Keen observers reported that the government program was going smoothly through the House under the astute direction of Lord Broghill.³⁷

The Remonstrant agents in London, however, condemned this provision, insisting that it enfranchised too large a group of royalist

V-15

sympathizers. They opposed the government policy of reconciliation. On March 9, when the provision was read in the House for the second time, Lord Warriston wrote, "I heard at desner of the Houses vote that al Scotsman are capable of trust who haive lived peaceably since 1652 and thereby has shewed their good affection to the Gouverment, which remembered my Lord Argyle and me of the word anent Malignants and incendiaryes not coming within the verge of the court wherby to mak division or disturbance of the peace between the King and his people. Heir I saw the one half of our desyres and a godly magistracye cutt off, wee need not devyde on it, they knew it weal enough." The Resolutioners were jubilant. Warriston added the next day, "I was heavye about the vote, . . . Mr. Sharpe . . . jeered us upon the vote and asked when wee was going to Scotland."³⁸

The Remonstrants were able to draw upon a group of military men in London to help in their cause. General Monck, the commanding general in Scotland, was known to be sympathetic. A letter to him refers to "The tender respect which your Lordship have borne to them in Scotland." Scottish officers who had been sent to London to represent the interests of the army followed his lead. The same letter reports on "the busynes of the honest Remonstrators who came from Scotland whose case is much condoled here by many of our chief officers and others, as being a bussines allyed with the same interest which is here also striving against the spirit of malignancy in this nacion."³⁹ The letter is signed H. D., identified as probably Major Henry Dorney, a Scottish officer, representing the army and described by one of the Resolutioners as "a sectarian preacher, but in time with that partie [Remonstrants], the Gouverneur of

V-16

the Castle of Dumbartane, an anabaptist as they say."⁴⁰ Dorney and two other army officers are later named as acting as agents for Warriston. One of these officers, "Major Eleis,"⁴¹ was probably one of the "chief officers" whom Dorney mentions and who may be Lt. Thomas Ellis, an army radical of the late '40s. Also working on behalf of the Remonstrants was Colonel Jerome Sankey, another army radical, who had represented an Irish district in 1654. Henry Cromwell had refused to let Sankey run again from Ireland, and he was forced to represent an English borough which Fleetwood, patron saint of the Anabaptists, had probably obtained for him.⁴² A Resolutionist letter describes Sankey as "the most violent anabaptist of any officer in the army. He was once a minister and chaplain to Colonel Lowthian's Regiment. married one related to the L. Fleetwood, upon which score he staves in his family at this tyme. This man is one of Guthree's [a Remonstrant minister] agents, who court L. Lambert and Col. Sydenham, a man for religion, etc."⁴³

Only pressure from the Remonstrants and their army officer allies can account for a tightening up in the enfranchisement clause, now proposed by the Lord Protector. In a speech, given on April 21, recommending changes in the proposed constitution, Cromwell is reported to have "hinted that hee thought we had beene too gentle to the Scotch."⁴⁴ In response to this hint, additional proofs of loyalty from ex-rebels were considered and referred to committee on April 23. Three of the Scottish members protested against this extended exclusion.⁴⁵

The Remonstrants lobbied vigorously when the clause came out of committee two months later. Both Scottish and English members now participated on both sides of the debate. An unknown factor is the amount of

V-17

influence exerted on behalf of the Remonstrants by Archibald Campbell, the eighth Earl of Argyll.

Argyll had been Scotland's foremost nobleman for many years and had been for a period regarded as an ally by the Lord Protector. He had lost his popularity by changing sides too often during the English Civil War and now was regarded with disfavor by the council in Scotland, which exerted influence to keep him from running for parliament in 1656. He was in London at this time, greatly in debt and pushing a suit for payments promised him by acts of the Scottish parliament.

Argyll was the architect of the Act of Classes, which had prescribed the first Scottish disenfranchisement, and it seems natural that he would have wanted to see it renewed.⁴⁶ A Resolutionist minister referred to him and Warriston as members of the same "faction,"⁴⁷ and they discussed the original lenient enfranchisement clause disapprovingly when it was first read.⁴⁸ Dr. Thomas Clarges, a Scottish member of the Court, hinted that Argyll was involved in the changes made in the bill. In an analysis of the situation, he concluded, "The condition of Scotland is now between those of the public resolution and the remonstrators. It is not your interest to give a greater encouragement to one than to another, though both contend for the most godliness. Argyle is a crafty man."⁴⁹ He seems to be insinuating that the Earl was lobbying with the Remonstrant agents to strengthen the disenfranchisement clause.

A new and harsher disenfranchisement clause, prepared by Warriston, was presented in the House on June 15 by members of the Military Court in lieu of the provisions prepared by the committee to whom the latter

V-18

had been referred two months earlier. This new clause was so restrictive that its opponents said "it would exclude all Scotland"⁵⁰ and, in Warriston's own words, would have reestablished the Act of Classes. It was based on a memorandum prepared by the Remonstrants and distributed to the Lord Protector, Fleetwood, and some other members of the House. It was supported by the military group, Majors-general Goffe, Kelsey and Colonels Sydenham and Cooper, all opponents of kingship, and it was opposed unsuccessfully by Robert Shapcott and Edmund Fowell, two Country supporters of kingship, and Major-general Desborough, who overcame his military bias in this case, perhaps at the instigation of Samuel Desborough, his brother and member of the council in Scotland.

Approached by lobbyists from both sides, the Scottish delegation split on this clause. Three Scottish members: Dr. Clarges, Colonel William Lockhart, and Colonel Robert Stewart all spoke unsuccessfully against its recommitment.⁵¹ Warriston reported that they had been influenced by the agents of the Resolutioners, saying, "I heard Mr. Sharpe spak to Mr. Clargis and uther Parliament men as if ther whol business laye upon it."⁵² The Remonstrants also had their agents. A Resolutionist minister refers to "friends--whom their [the Remonstrants'] diligent agents Garthland and Tweddall made for them."⁵³ "Garthland" was Sir James MacDowell of Garthland, the first Scottish member to talk in favor of the more restrictive franchise. He obtained a lucrative post the next summer through the influence of one of the Remonstrant ministers.⁵⁴ "Tweddall," John Hay, the second earl of Tweeddale, has been characterized in a recent article as a "young, needy, pliant presbyterian,"⁵⁵ an example of the type of minor aristocracy whom Cromwell could enlist to his

V-19

cause. However, his adherence to the parliamentary army as early as 1644, his association with the Remonstrants, and a later career after the Restoration "in defence of the covenanters" all point to a devotion to strict Presbyterianism rather than to "pliancy."⁵⁶

Tweeddale, a member of the committee to consider the disenfranchisement clause, originally appointed on April 23, now reconsidering it on June 15, succeeded in making the provisions introduced by Warriston's military allies even more restrictive. Originally intended to apply only to the selection of members of parliament, they were now extended to apply to any public office. Lambert, also a committee member, had at first refused to introduce this amendment, but seemingly, convinced by the Remonstrants, did introduce it in the House and vehemently defended it.

The Remonstrants' aim in making this change was to win the local elections in Glasgow. Here, one of their prominent leaders, Patrick Gillespie, the principal of the college, had been feuding for some years with the Resolutioners who controlled the city government and who would be disenfranchised by this clause.⁵⁷ A Resolutionist minister described it as a renewal of "the Act of Classes to the end the places of civill power should be in the hands of their party.--It was intended chiefly for the changing of our Glasgow magistrates."⁵⁸

Lambert was able to carry this further disenfranchisement through the House in a close division on June 15 because he was supported by the enemies of the Court. Warriston reported that the military members, their Scottish allies, and some members of the Country were among Lambert's adherents. Tellers supporting the resolution were Captain Adam Baynes, a close associate of Lambert's from York, and Colonel Stephen

V-20

Winthrop, a Scottish member with radical antecedents who probably voted against kingship. The opposing tellers were both staunch members of the Court: John Maidston, the Lord Protector's steward and Colonel John Blackwell, the Treasurer of the Army, who had originally been in Cromwell's regiment.⁵⁹

The Resolutioners made a last effort to remedy these setbacks to their position. First in committee and then by introducing a proviso through their friends in the House, on June 25 they tried to liberalize the enfranchisement. Their efforts were supported by the English Court, but to no avail. The Remonstrants, backed by the English military, were successful in keeping the harsh provision unchanged.

The influence of Lambert and Tweedale was again decisive in committee. The Resolutioners gave to their supporters on this committee, Thurloe and Jones, the Court agents, a paper stating their position. Lambert, on a motion of Tweedale, adjourned the meeting in the midst of an altercation between himself, Fleetwood, and the Court agents. When the committee readjourned, not enough Resolutioner supporters were present to adopt a favorable position on the motion. It is reported that Andrew Ramsey, a Scottish member on the committee, supported Sharpe, the Resolutionist agent, and was angry with Tweedale.

After their failure in committee, the Resolutioners prepared a new proviso, which they arranged to have supported by their friends in the House. This proviso would have excepted from the provisions of the disenfranchisement clauses all "who have been employed or authorized by the Council or Commander-in-Chief, and such also who are of a blameless and godly conversation." This won the approval of Whitelocke, Thurloe, and

V-21

Jones, who said, "It is so reasonable, it cannot be refused" and promised that one of them would introduce it in the House. Lord Broghill arranged for the support of the Irish delegation, and Sharpe lobbied among the Country members, whom he seemed to believe, Warriston's opinion notwithstanding, had been against the original passage of the bill.⁶⁰

Strenuous efforts by the Remonstrants were needed to upset these arrangements and defeat this proviso. As Warriston wrote, "The Lord knows what raging and wryting and solliciting I susteained in that busynes, and with what faynting, wearying, distrusting and despayring, somtymes giving it quyte over and uther tymes using al the meanes and praying God,"⁶¹ When he heard of the discussion in committee, he "ran" to the House to speak to his agents, Tweeddale and MacDowell, but was exceedingly disturbed because he found them talking to the Resolutioners, Sharpe and Desborough. Finally, he obtained assistance from his officer allies, who must have acted as his lobbyists, for "after speaking to them, they went to advertise some of our freinds."⁶²

When the Resolutioners' clause was introduced into the House, every bit of the Remonstrants' hard work proved to be necessary, for they were able to defeat it in a close division by only four votes. It was introduced as promised by Thurloe, backed by the Court, and opposed by the military group, Lambert acting as the head of the opposition group against it. Tweeddale had remained faithful notwithstanding the Resolutioners' blandishments, and had informed Lambert in time.⁶³ Sharpe expressed his resentment at Tweeddale: "I told him he might miss his end which for all his fawning he is like to doe."⁶⁴

This victory of the Remonstrants seems to have been partially due

V-22

to Warriston's hard work, but also to a fortunate (for them) illness of Lord Broghill. Both Sharpe and Warriston comment on it, Sharpe saying mournfully, "And so it was dashed and the proviso of exclusions standeth as it was ingrossed in the Bill . . . Verily I find that my Lord Broghill's absence by his gout . . . hath lost that matter to us."⁶⁵ Warriston laid it to the designs of providence, "Blissed be the Lord that hes layd asyde thes 3 weekes Brochill by the gout or els he had stopped both our publik and privat business," also, "I cast the care and management of that busine on the Lord who hes layd Brochill aside by the goutt upon his bed."⁶⁶ Broghill himself accepts this responsibility, writing, "yet God having visited me with a violent fitt of the gout, I could not be in the Parliament to hinder some prejudiciall things (as I fear) which afterwards were passed and which, had I been there to have rightly informed them, might not have been consented unto."⁶⁷

This split among the Scottish members, which can be seen so clearly in their reaction to these enfranchisement proposals, is also evident in their attitude toward the proposals to make Cromwell king. It has always been assumed that they unanimously supported these proposals, but there is reason to believe that a good number of Scots opposed them. On February 23, the very day that kingship was formally proposed, Warriston wrote, "I heard from E[arl] Tweeddale that wee [the Remonstrants] were called great enemyes to this."⁶⁸ The parliamentary opposition thus showed the same ties to the English military group and the Remonstrants that was shown by the opponents of the extended enfranchisement.

The evidence for the view that the Scots all favored kingship

V-23

comes from a list of 120 "kinglings" contained in a republican pamphlet. These members voted to promote the kingship cause two days after it was first introduced in the House. Thirteen Scots are on the list. But this meager evidence does not warrant the conclusion drawn that all the Scots voted for kingship. There were thirty Scottish representatives; the votes of seventeen of them are unknown; and an examination of the records of these seventeen does not make it seem likely that they were all in agreement. Moreover, outside evidence shows that of those listed as voting for kingship at least one was against it.⁶⁹

This evidence, a contemporary letter, shows that John Hay, Earl of Tweeddale, and perhaps Colonel David Barclay are erroneously listed by the republicans as "kinglings." The letter notes four Scots who opposed the kingship proposals during the debates in the House. It reads, "In the debates four of their countrymen dissented from the rest, viz. Lord Chadell [Earl Tweeddale], Newton Carr [William Ker, laird of Newton], Sir James McDougall [Sir James MacDowell of Garthland], Col. Barclay."⁷⁰ Not enough is known of Colonel David Barclay's parliamentary record to judge which list is correct. However, Tweeddale's connections with the Remonstrants, which have already been traced, and the fact that he acted as an opposition teller, in cooperation with the Military Court, in support of the Militia Bill, all point to his being an opponent of kingship.

In addition to Tweeddale, of the seventeen Scots whose votes are not recorded, at least nine: MacDowell, Ker, Thomas Fitch, George Talbot, Henry Whalley, Stephen Winthrop, John Vincent, John Swinton, and William Mitchell, may be suggested as probable opponents of kingship.

V-24

Most of these men are either Scottish Remonstrants or English republicans. MacDowell and Ker have been noted above and MacDowell's career as a Remonstrant agent lends credibility to this report. Colonel Fitch has been identified with the republican group in the army. Both Colonel Talbot and Judge Advocate Whalley were associated with Major-general Edward Whalley, a prominent member of the Military Court. It has been thought that the major-general's initial opposition to kingship had turned to acquiescence by the end of March, but on the fourth of April Edward Whalley acted as an opposition teller trying to defeat the kingship proposals. Talbot acted as co-teller with him, and it seems likely that Henry Whalley's vote would have been influenced by that of his powerful elder brother. Colonel Winthrop is known to have taken two positions espoused by the Military Court and the Remonstrants. On June 15, during the debates on the Scottish enfranchisement clauses, he acted as a teller in favor of adding Lambert's clause, which included all public officials rather than only members of parliament under their provisions. Also, he opposed the inclusion of a loyalty oath for members of parliament in the constitution, a position steadily held by the republicans and the Military Court. A "Mr. Vincent," who may have been John Vincent, the Scottish member, was also associated with officers with republican proclivities. With Baynes, a follower of Lambert, he supported the inclusion of a clause, stating that no tax could be levied without the consent of parliament, in the Scottish Union bill. The inclusion of this clause in a bill that the Lord Protector could not possibly veto was a maneuver which his opponents had used before. Also, Vincent was associated with Sir Arthur Haslerig, the foremost republican leader,

V-25

in a move in the second session to put the House into grand committee and thus destroy the Other House.⁷¹ Swinton's support of kingship has been taken for granted because a late seventeenth-century historian described him as "the man of all Scotland--most trusted and employed by Cromwell"⁷² and because a Resolutionist minister referred to him as one of "our complying gentlemen"⁷³ on the Scottish Council. However, the same minister later characterized him as one of Warriston's "faction," and a Remonstrant minister supported him when he tried to obtain an important office.⁷⁴ Lt. Colonel Mitchell, one of Lambert's officers in 1659, was associated with Adam Baynes, a strong Lambert supporter and is therefore a probable opponent of kingship.⁷⁵ In conclusion, it seems unlikely that all these Scottish members who are not specifically listed as supporting kingship, did so.

As contrasted to these opponents of kingship, the kingship supporters were either native Scots with Resolutionist ties or royalist inclinations, some of whom held government office; or Englishmen with Court connections. Scots listed as voting for kingship are: William, Lord Cochran, Sir Alexander Wedderburn, Andrew Ramsey, Sir John Wemyss, Dr. Alex Douglas, William Lockhart, and either George or John Lockhart. Cochran had ties to the Resolutioners. Like Wedderburn and the Lockharts, he had shown sympathy to the royalist cause. William Lockhart became a prominent member of the Court and Wemyss also held government office. The Englishmen (including one Irishman) listed are Lord Broghill, Henry Markham, Robert Wolseley and Godfrey Rhodes. Broghill, an Irishman, was, of course, the leader of the kingship movement; Markham was an intimate friend of Henry Cromwell. Both Wolseley and Rhodes were rela-

V-26

tives of important Court officials. Of the unlisted members of the Scottish delegation, six Englishmen with Court connections undoubtedly supported the kingship proposals. These were: Dr. Thomas Clarges, Richard Beake, Samuel Desborough, Edward Rhodes, Robert Stewart, and Nathaniel Whetham. Clarges, linked with the Resolutioners, was the brother-in-law of General George Monck. Beake was captain of the Lord Protector's life guard. Three others held high government office: Rhodes and Whetham as members of the council in Scotland and Desborough as holder of the Great Seal of Scotland.⁷⁶

In Ireland, only firm management by Henry Cromwell prevented a repetition of the Scottish situation. The Irish members were not so monolithic in their behavior as the tradition implies, being split on the kingship issue, and the degree of unity attained was reached only because the Protector's son kept careful watch both on the composition and on the activities of the delegation. After the Protector's refusal of kingship, General Fleetwood, a prominent opponent of these proposals, now mollified, assisted in the task of parliamentary management.

Henry Cromwell had been sent to Ireland to replace Fleetwood in order to assuage a troubled situation. The policy of transplantation of the native Irish to the west of Ireland, which Fleetwood had been vigorously attempting to execute, was proving to be impractical. This policy was supported by a group of English Anabaptist army officers, republican in their political sympathies, whom the former commander had favored. Practically the whole Irish administration was in their hands, and it was even said that soldiers were rebaptized in order to be promoted. These religious extremists were unpopular with all elements of

V-27

the population. The new general, on his arrival, first tried to conciliate this group, and, when that proved impossible, patronized, like Broghill in Scotland, the more moderate elements.⁷⁷

The composition of the Irish delegation to the second Protectorate, which has been discussed by Paul J. Pinckney in his dissertation, shows the result of this policy. Further investigation, here reported, supports his conclusions that dissidents, many of whom were Anabaptists, were carefully weeded out, that loyalists were brought in, and that unreliable members who were elected were kept in Ireland.

Six members, with republican or Anabaptist affiliations, who had sat in the first Protectorate parliament, did not run again in 1656 in Ireland, and their seats were filled by loyal Court supporters. Three of them (Jerome Sankey, John Hewson, and John Clark) managed to obtain English seats, but Colonels Thomas Scott, Daniel Axtell and William Purefoy never sat in parliament again. Scott had been in command of a troop in Ludlow's regiment and was in political accord with this prominent republican.⁷⁸ In 1655, the colonel was arrested by Henry Cromwell and kept in custody for being "liberall in seditious revileinge expressions against the gouvernement" until "he gave assurances of his quiet and peaceable behaviour."⁷⁹ He was replaced by Major Henry Owen, who was rewarded with Irish land⁸⁰ and who was so strong an advocate of kingship that he was characterized as an "Irish champion."⁸¹ Axtell, an Anabaptist, was a left-wing army officer in the late 1640s, commanding the troops at the king's trial. He accompanied Cromwell to Ireland and was appointed governor of Kilkenny. He resigned his commission when the Anabaptists lost power, although Thurloe attrib-

V-28

uted this to disappointed greed and ambition. After the Restoration, he was condemned to death for his part in the king's trial. Axtell was replaced by Major Daniel Redman, also rewarded by Irish land. In the summer of 1659 when the army was purged by the restored Rump parliament, his regiment was taken from him, partly on Axtell's instigation, but in 1660 he regained it, when he supported Monck. He was knighted at the Restoration.

Colonel William Purefoy, related to the regicide of the same name, was succeeded by Walter Waller, a supporter of kingship and a son of Sir Hardress Waller, an old associate of the Lord Protector's who had been richly rewarded with Irish lands. He kept his command in 1659 and was one of the officers the Irish parliament wanted exempted from the act of indemnity in 1661, both signs of republicanism.

Two of the three members who represented Irish districts in the first Protectorate parliament and English in the second, Colonels Jerome Sankey and John Hewson, both well-known republicans, probably obtained their English seats through the intervention of General Fleetwood. Hewson may have been excluded from this newly won seat. Their connections with Fleetwood are notorious. Hewson, one of the regicides, organized a petition to the Protector, begging for Fleetwood's return. Sankey was associated with Fleetwood as a Remonstrant agent. Hewson was replaced by John Byasse, the recorder of Dublin, praised by Henry Cromwell and a supporter of kingship. Henry Cromwell may well have regretted his replacement of Sankey by Colonel Daniel Abbott, who later displayed sympathy with the republican cause. Abbott may have been kept in Ireland, for there is no evidence that he ever attended the parliamentary

V-29

session. In 1659, when the republican restored Rump parliament purged the army, Abbott kept his command, and he was then included in a list of thirty persons whom the Irish parliament proposed to exclude from the act of indemnity in 1651.

It is not known how Colonel John Clark, who lost his Irish seat, obtained an English seat, but like Scott, Axtell, Purefoy and Hewson, he was succeeded by a Protectorate supporter. He sat for a group of Irish counties in the first parliament and for Cardiganshire in Wales in the second. His votes are difficult to identify because there was another Colonel John Clark from Suffolk, who was a loyal Court officeholder. However, he, also, kept his regiment in 1659, and there was a vote in favor of the Militia Bill which is probably his. These facts plus his replacement by Lt. Colonel Tristram Beresford, a kingship supporter praised by Henry Cromwell, makes it probable that Clark was forced to obtain a seat outside of Ireland in 1656.⁸²

In spite of Henry Cromwell's careful planning, some undesirables were elected; indications are that these men were kept from attending the session. The case of Colonel Abbott has already been mentioned. That of Colonel Thomas Sadler is similar. Sadler was absent at the time of a rollcall in December and there is no evidence that he ever attended parliament. Ludlow regarded him as a "sound republican,"⁸³ and he kept his position as governor of Galway, and was one of the thirty excluded from the Act of Indemnity.⁸⁴ Another type of criticism was levelled at John Davies: after he was elected it became known that he was a royalist. How he was originally selected is unknown, but after the election Thurloe wrote to Henry Cromwell that the new member was "an intel-

V-30

ligencer to the royall partie,"⁸⁵ and Cromwell replied, "I have taken care for the present stoppe of him."⁸⁶ It is known that Davies never took his seat, for on June 22, in the course of a debate, Thurloe remarked, "Though this Davis was chosen, yet he never attended here."⁸⁷

Also to be noted are a number of members who arrived in Ireland shortly before the election and who seem to have been imported to bolster up the administration and the delegation. Colonel John Bridge had sat for an English constituency in the first Protectorate parliament. Thurloe recommended him to Henry Cromwell as "a very honest, sober man,"⁸⁸ and his anti-republicanism is vouched for by a republican pamphlet. Colonel Thomas Cooper had been sent from Scotland, where he commanded a regiment of foot, to Ulster in order to ameliorate conditions there and to be of help to the new administration.⁸⁹ He recommended to Thurloe another of the new members, Lt. Colonel James Trayle, as "a Scotchman, but I hope godly and purely upon the English interest and noe wayes intangled in the snares of his countrymen."⁹⁰

After the election, Henry Cromwell still had to contend with Fleetwood's influence. The ex-commander of Ireland was now in London, serving on the council of state which after the 1656 elections selected those to be excluded from serving in parliament. Fleetwood must have used his influence to suggest the exclusion of some of the replacements, for Cromwell wrote to London in distress asking why the new members Tristram Beresford, John Byssie and Richard Tigh should be excluded. His influence must have prevailed rather than Fleetwood's for the names of these members do not appear on any of the exclusion lists.⁹¹

Henry Cromwell's supervision did not cease once parliament had

V-31

convened. There are 105 letters in existence, which form a correspondence between him and the Irish member.⁹² Typical are two letters written to him by Major Anthony Morgan acknowledging directions and giving news of the parliamentary session. On April 14, Morgan wrote, "I received yrs. of ye 1st of Apr: I shall observe yr directions about ye Conaught land, though ye Gloster bill if it pass as it is now ordered to be engrossed will engage all ye land and houses in Ireland" and on June 16, "I have herewith sent you an Act of Parl. attested by ye Clerke of ye parl.--It is yet questionable whether ye House will adiorne on Saturday next. I feare wee shall not by ye time have dispatched our bills for money."⁹³

Almost two thirds of these letters were correspondence with three members who were not only prominent advocates of the Court legislation, but who also directed the Irish business in the House. The confidential nature of the business is indicated by the fact that much is written in cipher. These members were Major Anthony Morgan, Sir John Reynolds, and Colonel William Jephson.

Twenty-five of the letters were between Cromwell and Morgan, who emerges as the most frequent proposer and advocate of legislation relating to Ireland and can therefore be designated as Henry Cromwell's principal agent in the House. Thirty of the letters were between Cromwell and the man he called "his right hand,"⁹⁴ his brother-in-law, Sir John Reynolds. However, Reynolds was appointed commanding-general of the English expedition to Flanders and left the country in early May, after which time Morgan, assisted by Jephson, managed the Irish business.

Morgan gave the official position on most of the routine business relating to Ireland, proposing, supporting or introducing legis-

V-32

lation. He spoke twelve times on such matters, Reynolds twice and Jephson once. This business included the Irish Union, the excuses of absent members, the attainder of Irish rebels, opposition to English investors' claims in Ireland, and discussion of the Irish franchise.⁹⁵

Aside from this business, which did not arouse much controversy, much of the time of Morgan and the other Irish members was spent in attempting to have the Irish assessment lowered, and as a concession for the granting of this assessment, in obtaining a satisfactory Irish land settlement. All the Irish and ex-Irish members, including those with republican sympathies, joined in these efforts. The situation resembled that of the Scottish members, who, regardless of differences in political opinion, were united in pressing for lower taxation for their constituencies.⁹⁶ The sums requested by the Court on February 7 were a continuation of the £10,000 a month assessment for three years, as well as an extraordinary tax of £20,000 requested on June 10, to be collected in a three month period to help meet the expenses of the Spanish war.⁹⁷

The Irish agents were joined in these efforts by Major-general Charles Fleetwood, who had held the honorary title of Lord Deputy of Ireland since his replacement by Henry Cromwell. Fleetwood's opposition to the kingship proposals has led to the impression that he was universally hostile to the Court after his return to England. His cooperation with the Irish Court agents, after the Lord Protector's final refusal of the crown, has been overlooked. This cooperation was essential to a satisfactory conclusion of the Irish business.

A factor in Fleetwood's cooperative role may have been a grant of £1500 a year from Irish lands, which was proposed on June 8 by the

V-33

Irish agents, Morgan and Aston.⁹⁸ Morgan's role in this affair was the price of the support of the military members, for he wrote to Henry Cromwell that he did this "by advise of my Lord Lambert."⁹⁹ The proposal was passed, although it met with a great deal of disapproval.

With this support, the Irish members were successful in having grants of land that had been settled on English officers and investors confirmed before the extraordinary tax was imposed. Their fear was that, once the assessment was decided upon, their other interests would be neglected. Morgan and Aston moved for the confirmation on May 26¹⁰⁰ and then three days later Morgan and Fleetwood made it a condition of the granting of the assessment, stating, "Before you lay Assessments upon Ireland, you should dispatch the Bills for the settlement of Ireland."¹⁰¹ As a result, the land grants were confirmed on May 29 and the next day Aston fulfilled the Irish members' part of the bargain, introducing a bill for the three-months' assessment. This bill was rushed through so fast that Jephson's request that it be heard before a grand committee, according to the usual custom for money bills, was denied.¹⁰²

However, in order to have the three-year assessment lowered, Fleetwood and the Irish agents had to win Court as well as military support. To obtain this, it was necessary for Fleetwood to offer to give up his grant, attributing his dramatic gesture to the "great sufferings"¹⁰³ of Ireland. Until he did this, no progress could be made with the reduction of the proposed assessment. The Irish members were so fully in accord on this matter that even Sankey, the republican, ex-Irish member spoke in favor of it, but they were decisively defeated in a

V-34

division on June 10. After Fleetwood had obtained this Court cooperation, the three-year assessment was lowered from ten to nine thousand a month. Proof of the support of the Court is the presence of Colonel Philip Jones, the Lord Protector's foremost agent, as co-teller with Fleetwood in two divisions, on June 12 and 13, which forced the reduction.¹⁰⁴ The unity that the Irish delegation displayed on this matter is commented on in a report written to Henry Cromwell by his agent, Morgan on June 16. In probably somewhat exaggerated terms, Morgan states, "The assesmt on Ireland for 3 years is 9000£ per mensem. It was moved ye members serving for Ireland might be sent to ye Tower for their contest about ye proportioning ye Assesment twixt Engl. and Ireland."¹⁰⁵

It has always been taken for granted that this same degree of unity was shown in the issues surrounding Cromwell's proposed assumption of the Crown. This is because the prominent Irish members were among the earliest and most vehement supporters of kingship. Lord Broghill, a prominent Anglo-Irishman, although serving for Scotland in this parliament, was one of the most important backers of the kingship proposals. Henry Cromwell's agent, Jephson, was the earliest proposer of kingship in this parliamentary session and Reynolds also vehemently supported it. Bridge, brought to Ireland to strengthen the delegation, was an early proponent of the Lord Protector's power to name his own successor.¹⁰⁶ Sixteen of the twenty-nine Irish members are listed either as "kinglings" in a republican pamphlet or as members of the committee appointed by the House to persuade the Lord Protector to accept the new title.¹⁰⁷ Jephson must have thought that most of the delegation was united, for he wrote in one of his reports to Henry Cromwell that "most of the officers here

V-35

of your [Irish] Army," attended a meeting called to express support for the proposals."¹⁰⁸

This evidence seems at first conclusive, yet it overlooks the fact that this degree of unity was achieved only because of Henry Cromwell's manipulation of the delegation. The same differences of opinion existed here as among the English and Scottish members. The backgrounds of the Irish members indicate that the members who were kept from running again, those who were forced to find English seats, and those detained in Ireland would have voted against the kingship proposals. These dissidents had the same ties with the English Military Court in parliament as did the Scottish opponents of kingship. Fleetwood, whose patronage of the Remonstrants has been documented, had patronized these Irish members when he had been in command in Ireland. However, because almost all native Irishmen were excluded from politics, the dissident Irish members did not, like the Scottish, have the support of a native party. So the Irish dissidents were silenced even more effectively than the Scottish.

Henry Cromwell probably stifled ten votes against kingship in the twenty-nine man Irish delegation, in spite of the fact that a contemporary report read, "the Irish all for it, but Cooper, Huson. [Hewson] and Sankey."¹⁰⁹ Cromwell was able to deal with these three dissidents and with seven others: Daniel Abbott, Thomas Sadler, John Davies, Daniel Axtell, Thomas Scott, William Purefoy, and John Clark, by persuasion, informal exclusion, or discouragement from parliamentary attendance. He was not able to stop Hewson and Sankey from opposing kingship, but he had already attempted to do so, for they were no longer members of the

V-36

Irish delegation.

It is significant that these men are still referred to as Irish members. Their contemporaries must have taken for granted the fact that they had changed their constituencies for political reasons, but still really belonged with the Irish delegation. From their new English seats, probably obtained for them by Fleetwood's influence, they opposed the kingship proposals. Hewson, noted by the royalists as an opponent of kingship, was in favor of the Militia Bill and acted as a teller in opposition to the adoption of the Humble Petition and Advice. When the new constitution was finally adopted, Sankey opposed the taking of oaths by members of parliament, a position taken by the military members and the Remonstrants, also opponents of kingship.¹¹⁰ Even when they were no longer members of the Irish delegation, Henry Cromwell continued to distrust them. He wrote of Sankey, "I have been so bitten by him, that I must treat him with care and circumspection,"¹¹¹ and of Hewson at the time kingship was first discussed, "having bin well satisfied of Hewson's alarumeinge his sons Lawrence and Jones (whoe have at present their residence in Dublin castle and have all wayes hade an influence uppon the company that guards itt) with strange and black clouds, which he sayes hange over the heades of the godly, I shall forthwith drawe out that company."¹¹²

The case of Colonel Thomas Cooper, the third member mentioned as opposing kingship, is entirely different. His loyalty was never doubted, for his opposition stemmed from those sincere, heartrending doubts which many Cromwellian adherents felt about his becoming king. Devotion to Cromwell and perhaps persuasion from his fellow Irish members caused

V-37

Cooper to change his mind and to "approve myself with as much faithfulness to it, as if I had been never soe much for the thinge in the first promoteinge of it."¹¹³ Positions which he took after the new constitution was adopted show that he still had reservations about the amount of power that Cromwell should wield as Lord Protector.

Cooper's career is easily traced. A member of the council in Scotland, he was sent to Ireland in 1655 to be of assistance to Henry Cromwell. Automatically taking his seat in 1656, he is mentioned as opposing kingship immediately after the first proposals were made, and a month later he acted as a teller, attempting to cut off debate on the proposals. A few days later, he was probably one of a group of officers who asked the Lord Protector to accept the new title even though they had opposed this assumption in the House.¹¹⁴ The next day he wrote to Henry Cromwell, announcing his conversion and giving his reasons for it, "this I doe not upon a politick but a Christian account, well knowinge that if a haire of a man's head fall not to the ground without the Lord's providence, much less soe for great thinges to the governments of the world suffer alterations without speciall providence."¹¹⁵ There was never any doubt after this time about Cooper's loyalty to either Oliver or Henry Cromwell, but his continuing reservations can be seen in a move he made at the end of the session to limit the Lord Protector's freedom to pick members of the Other House and by his opposition to the liberalization of the Scottish franchise.¹¹⁶

Aside from this mention of Hewson, Sankey, and Cooper, basic information about the attitudes of the Irish members towards kingship can be drawn from the kingship lists, which seem to be accurate. One of

V-38

these lists was drawn up by the republicans and the other includes the names of members of a committee appointed by the House to persuade the Lord Protector to accept the crown. Sixteen Irish members are listed, including Henry Cromwell's principal agents and also many of those just brought into the Irish delegation to assure its loyalty.¹¹⁷

Of the thirteen unlisted members,¹¹⁸ three: Colonels Cooper, Abbott, and Sadler, were known opponents of kingship; Abbott and Sadler were detained, perhaps intentionally in Ireland. Seven were probably proponents of the measure. The opinions of two are unknown. John Davies¹¹⁹ never took his seat in the House.

This seems like a convincing show of support for the Court's kingship proposals. Yet, it must be remembered that, besides the three known opponents who were members of the delegation, there were five others who, like Hewson and Sankey, had been barred from the delegation and would certainly have marred its record by voting against kingship. Four did not attend parliament at all. Royalist sympathies precluded Davies' attendance; their republican views had probably prevented Axtell, Scott and Purefoy from running for their 1654 seats. Henry Cromwell must have been glad that Axtell was not a member of parliament at the time kingship was being discussed; his old suspicions of the republican had been reawakened, for he wrote at that time, "I cannot well tell how to interpret Axtell's selling of all his stocke, and letting longe leases of all his land, together with his too sudden slipping away from hence, which course diverse others of that party were alsoe upon."¹²⁰

Clark, who had been an Irish member in the 1654 parliament, like Hewson and Sankey opposed Cromwell's proposed assumption of the crown from his English seat. His advocacy of the Militia Bill was a sure

V-39

indication of his anti-kingship feelings.¹²¹

It can thus be seen that hostility to the Court existed in the Irish as well as the Scottish delegations. Although the Court had planned to use these delegations as tools of parliamentary management, the split in the English Court between its military and its civilian members made these plans less than completely successful. Far from being completely subservient to the Court, as is stated in the tradition, both the Irish and Scottish delegations were divided. A substantial number of members followed the lead of the English military opposition.

Only the management efforts of Henry Cromwell in Ireland and of Broghill in Scotland could bring about even an outward appearance of unity. By using their influence both in the elections and during the debates, these men attempted to form groups that would support the Lord Protector's policies. The English military members hindered these efforts by supporting both the Scottish Remonstrants and the Irish republican Anabaptist army officers.

Again, basic philosophical differences hindered the Court's management efforts. The opposition of the military group to the Lord Protector's assumption of the Crown split both the Irish and Scottish delegations. And these delegations, instead of being subservient monolithic unities, turned out to comprise men of varying shades of opinion who often differed both with one another and with the Cromwellian Court.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

FV-1

1. H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier, ed. by Richard Pares (London, 1956), p. 31.

2. Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), I, 345; III, 87; Wilbur C. Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), IV, 400.

3. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, ed. by C. H. Firth (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), I, 394; The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1842), III, 288.

4. Narrative of the Late Parliament, E 935 (5), pp. 7, 20.

5. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 18.

6. Bodleian Library, Tanner MSS 51, f. 36 v, as quoted in Paul F. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Parliaments of 1656" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962), p. 244.

7. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, III, 173.

8. Charles H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate (2 vols., London, 1909), II, 85, 86.

9. Paul J. Pinckney, "The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656," Scottish Historical Review, LI (October, 1967), 113. A recent article states that by the time of Richard Cromwell's parliament in 1659, the delegation had no independent influence. James Casada, "The Scottish representatives in Richard Cromwell's parliament," Scottish Historical Review, LVI (October, 1972).

10. Further examples: Gordon Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII (New York, 1960), p. 345: "Scots who had been in arms against the parliament of England or who had abetted war against it were in general disenfranchised and the Scots who went to Westminster were preponderantly nominees of the government." Richard Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts (2 vols., London, 1963), II, 349: "In Ireland the army was so completely master that there was not much difficulty about getting thirty suitable members."

11. Burton, Diary, I, 321, 1/7/57.

12. For conditions in Scotland, Ludlow, Memoirs, pp. 395-397, Chapter I, pp. 41-42.

FV-2

13. Burton, Diary, I, xciii, 11/22/54.

14. Boyle acted as a Court teller eighteen times during the 1654-1655 session; Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons, VII, 382, 384, 385, 392, 394, 395, 403, 409, 412, 413, 418, 419, 420, 421.

15. Baillie, Journals, III, 288-289, as quoted in Pinckney, "Cromwellian Parliament," p. 206.

16. Ibid., p. 315.

17. List of triers printed in Scotland, Laws, Statutes, The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government during the Commonwealth, VI, Part 2 (Printed by authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, 1872), p. 83.

18. Baillie, Journals, III, 282.

19. William Stephen (ed.), Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry (Edinburgh, 1930), I, xviii.

20. The Clarke Papers, selections from papers of William Clarke, ed. C. H. Firth (4 vols., London, 1891-1901), III.

21. Scotland, Acts, p. 899, 2/26/55, Broghill to the Protector. Broghill seems to be referring to a group of soldiers who met to pray at the church of Allhallows the Great in Thames Street in January, 1653, a few months before the dissolution of the Rump Parliament. At that time, led by army preachers, they openly expressed their dissatisfaction with parliament's conduct and openly prayed for a new form of representation. Pauluzzi to Morosini, Jan. 6/10, Letter Book, R. O.; Erbury in The Bishop of London (E 684, 26) as quoted in Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, II, 232.

22. For private conferences with Resolutioners: A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, ed. by Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), IV, 49, 56, 58, and Baillie, Journals, III, 281, 295, 321. For the compromise plan: Thurloe, State Papers, V, Broghill to the Protector, 11/26/56, 323; "every presbiter should certify to the councill heer, the fitness in all respects of him, who within their limitts is to have a benefice, and that the minister certified for shall voluntarily engage to live peaceably and inoffensively under the present government."

23. Baillie, Journals, III, 318.

24. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Broghill to Thurloe, 11/26/56, 323.

FV-3

25. For the elections: Chapter I, pp. 41-42. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 216-226, and "The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656," Scottish Historical Review, LI (October, 1967).

26. Ibid., p. 101.

27. Ibid., p. 113.

28. Baillie, Journals, III, 115, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," 214.

29. For the Scottish Union: C. Stanford Terry (ed.), The Cromwellian Union (Edinburgh, 1902), p. lxvi. For wardships: Commons Journal, VII, 427, 9/23/56; 447, 10/29/56; 458, 11/22/56.

30. Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston, ed. by G. M. Paul, D. H. Fleming, J. D. Ogilvie (Edinburgh, 1911, 1919, 1940), III, 73.

31. Baillie, Journals, III, 340.

32. Terry, Union, lxv; Burton, Diary, II, 213, 6/10/57. For Downing's chairmanship: Commons Journal, VII, 485, Feb. 3; 486, Feb. 4, Feb. 5; 487, Feb. 6, Feb. 7; 489, Feb. 11; 490, Feb. 13; 493, Feb. 17; 494, Feb. 19; 502, March 12; 533, May 12.

33. Baillie, Journals, III, 318.

34. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Monck to Thurloe, 6/4/57, 330.

35. Burton, Diary, I, 325, 1/8/57.

36. For the confirmation of the liberties of the burghs: Burton, Diary, I, 12-19. Scottish members recorded in favor of the bill: Desborough, Swinton, Cochran, Tweeddale, Downing, Smith.

37. William Law Mathieson, Politics and Religion: A Study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution (2 vols., Glasgow, 1902), II, 82, 103, 148-149; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, I, 352. For the Scottish enfranchisement provisions: Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), pp. 410, 449-450; Commons Journal, VII, 499, 3/6/57; 500, 3/9/57; 501, 3/10/57. For Broghill's direction: British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 350, "My Lord of Broghill hath gained to himselfe much honor by his prudent and dexterous deportment in the House," Colonel John Bridges to Henry Cromwell, 3/10/57 and 823, f. 330, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 3/10/57, "all is smooth and faire and looks towards settlement" as quoted by Charles H. Firth "Cromwell and the Crown," English Historical Review, XVIII (1903).

38. Warriston, Diary, III, 72, 3/9/57; 73, 3/10/57.

FV-4

39. Clarke, Papers, III, pp. 96-97, 3/10/57.
40. Baillie, Journals, III, 361.
41. Warriston, Diary, III, 86.
42. For Ellis, Clarke Papers, I, 33, 79, 88, 438, as quoted by Charles H. Firth and Godfrey Davies, Regimental History of Cromwell's Army (2 vols., Oxford, 1940), I, 83. For Sankey, Chapter I, pp. 56-57.
43. Stephen, Consultations, II, Sharpe to----, 3/19/57, 30.
44. Lansdowne MSS, 822, f. 51, Jephson to Henry Cromwell, 4/21/57, as quoted by Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," p. 73.
45. Burton, Diary, II, 11, 12, 13, 4/23/57. The protesting Scots were Desborough, Clarges, Stewart.
46. DNB, Argyll; Firth, Protectorate, I, 120.
47. Baillie, Journals, III, 361. A recent article states that Argyll was backed by the Remonstrants in his election to parliament in 1659. Casada, "Scottish Representatives," p. 130.
48. Warriston, Diary, III, 72, 3/9/57.
49. Burton, Diary, II, 250, 6/15/57.
50. Stephen, Consultations, II, 39.
51. Warriston, Diary, III, 81-82; Burton, Diary, II, 249-251, 6/15/57.
52. Warriston, Diary, III, 83.
53. Baillie, Journals, III, 354.
54. Pinckney, "Scottish Representation," p. 104; Burton, Diary, II, 251, 6/15/57; Stephen, Consultations, II, Sharpe to -----, 8/11/57, 90.
55. Pinckney, "Scottish Representation," p. 107. Casada agrees with this interpretation of Tweeddale. Casada, "Scottish Representatives," 132.
56. DNB, John Hay, second earl of Tweeddale.
57. Commons Journal, VII, 523, 4/23/57; 557, 6/15/57; Stephen, Consultations, II, 43; Burton, Diary, II, 253, 6/15/57; George Eyre-Todd, History of Glasgow (2 vols., Glasgow, 1931), I, 315.

FV-5

58. Baillie, Journals, III, 353-354.
59. Warriston, Diary, III, 81, 6/15/57; Commons Journal, VII, 551, 6/15/57.
60. Stephen, Consultations, II, 42, 43; Sharp to Douglas, 24, 6/20/57; Warriston, Diary, III, 86. For Warriston's opinion of the Country whom he refers to as "honest man," Diary, III, 81, 6/15/57.
61. Ibid., p. 83.
62. Ibid., p. 86.
63. Commons Journal, VII, 575, 6/25/57; Burton, Diary, II, 306-308, 6/25/57; Warriston, Diary, III, 88.
64. Stephen, Consultations, II, 44.
65. Ibid., p. 43.
66. Warriston, Diary, III, 84.
67. Stephen, Consultations, II, 91, Broghill to Dickson, 8/3/57.
68. Warriston, Diary, III, 65, 2/23/57.
69. "Kingling" list from "Monarchy asserted to be the best, most ancient and most loyal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable tracts particularly of the Late Lord Somers (2d ed. revised by Walter Scott, London, 1811), VI, 348-349. Listed as voting for kingship: Cochran, Wedderburn, Ramsey, Wemyss, Tweedale, Douglas, Barclay, Wolseley, William Lockhart, Godfrey Rhodes, Lockhart (George or John), Markham, Broghill. Unlisted: Beame, Clarges, Samuel Desborough, Fitch, Ker, Lockhart (George or John), MacDowell, Mitchell, Sir Edward Rhodes, Smith, Stewart, Swinton, Talbot, Vincent, Whalley, Whetham, Winthrop.
70. Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers, ed. by W. D. Macray (Oxford, 1869-1936), III, 767. Drummond to Lockhart, March 2/12/1657.
71. For the members of parliament: Appendix. For opposition position on oaths; Warriston, Diary, III, 86.
72. Gilbert Burnet, Bishop Burnet's history of his own time (London, 1840), I, 86.
73. Baillie, Journals, III, 361.
74. Ibid., pp. 356; Appendix.
75. Appendix.

FV-6

76. For kingship lists: see #69. For Cochran, Pinckney, "Scottish Representation," p. 100. For Wedderburn, DNB. For the Lockharts, their royalist background: Pinckney, "Scottish Representation," p. 110; their Court connections: Appendix. For Wemyss, Broghill, Markham, Wolseley, Godfrey Rhodes, Clarges, Beake, Whetham, Desborough; Appendix. Stewart served on the kingship committee, as did Markham, Wemyss, Douglass, Beane and Sir Edward Rhodes.

77. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, IV, 115-119; Louise Fargo Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum (Washington, 1912), pp. 136, 137. Brown quotes Thurloe, State Papers, IV, 90-91, Dr. Harrison (Independent minister) to Thurloe, 10/17/55, saying that the Anabaptists held the following offices: governors of at least 12 towns, 10 colonels, 10 majors, 19 or 20 captains, two salaried preachers, 23 officers on the civil list. Brown quotes Reliquiae Baxterianae, I, 74, on the soldiers' baptisms. Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 36.

78. Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," pp. 236-243. For Scott, Appendix. Pinckney characterizes him as "left-wing" and notes that he did not run again.

79. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Henry Cromwell to the Lord Protector, 10/9/55, 79.

80. Appendix.

81. Lansdowne MSS, 822, f. 21, 5/12/57.

82. For Owen, Appendix; DNB. For Axtell, Appendix; DNB; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," characterizes him as "left-wing" and notes that he did not run again. For Redman: Appendix; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 203. For Hewson: Appendix, characterized by Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 242, as "left-wing." For Sankey, ibid.; Appendix. For Byssie: Appendix. For Abbott: Appendix; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," states he was kept in Ireland to preclude "swelling of the republican ranks." For Purefoy: Appendix. For Waller: Appendix. For Clark: Appendix. For Beresford: Appendix.

83. Ludlow, Memoirs, 210.

84. Appendix; Burton, Diary, I, 288; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 242, states that he was kept in Ireland to prevent swelling of republican ranks."

85. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, 9/9/56, 398, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 240.

86. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 9/23/56, p. 443, as quoted in Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," p. 241.

FV-7

87. Burton, Diary, II, 269, 6/22/57.
88. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Thurloe to Henry Cromwell, undated, 316.
89. Appendix.
90. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Cooper to Thurloe, 8/23/56.
91. Ibid., Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 10/6/56, pp. 477-478; Pinckney, "A Cromwellian Parliament," notes that Fleetwood's influence may have been felt in the proposed exclusion of Byss (p. 239).
92. Lansdowne MSS, folios 821-823. These letters are scattered through these folios.
93. Lansdowne MSS, f. 45, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 4/14/57; f. 92; ibid., 6/16/57.
94. Thurloe, State Papers, IV, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 9/16/55, 54.
95. For Morgan's participation: Burton, Diary, I, 288, 337, 367; II, 124, 155, 157, 169, 177, 196, 224, 248; Commons Journal, VII, 542. For Reynold's participation: Burton, Diary, I, 148, 284. For Jephson's participation: Burton, Diary, II, 177.
96. Chapter V, p. 230.
97. Commons Journal, VII, 487, 2/7/57; 554, 6/10/57.
98. Firth, Protectorate, II, 128; Burton, Diary, II, 197-200, 6/8/57.
99. Lansdowne MSS, 822, f. 86, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 6/9/57.
100. Burton, Diary, II, 124, 5/26/57.
101. Ibid., p. 155, 5/29/57.
102. Ibid., p. 162, 5/30/57; p. 167, 6/1/57; Commons Journal, VII, 542, 5/29/57.
103. Burton, Diary, II, 224, 6/12/57.
104. Ibid., pp. 207-212, 6/10/57; 224-224, 6/12/57; Commons Journal, VII, 554, 6/10/57; 555, 6/12/57; 557, 6/13/57. The Commons Journal lists General Montague as Fleetwood's co-teller on June 13, while Burton (p. 247) lists Colonel Jones. In any case, Fleetwood was paired with a prominent member of the Court.
105. Lansdowne MSS, 822m f. 92, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 6/16/57.

FV-8

106. For Broghill: Appendix. For Jephson: Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," 434-438. For Reynolds: Appendix. For Bridge: Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," p. 438, quoting Lansdowne MSS, 821 f. 89, Bridge to Henry Cromwell.

107. For the kingship lists: Appendix. 329 Irish members listed: Aston, Beresford, Bridge, Broghill, Byssie, Fowke, Gookin, Halsey, Jephson, Jones, Morgan, Owen, Reynolds, Tigh, Walter Waller, Ingoldsby.

108. Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 312, Jephson to Henry Cromwell, 3/3/57.

109. Ibid., 821, f. 294, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 2/24/57, as quoted in Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," p. 55.

110. Chapter V, p. 247. . For Hewson: Appendix; Commons Journal, VII, 520, 4/4/57. For Sankey, Burton, Diary, II, 296.

111. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 9/9/57, 506.

112. Ibid., p. 94, 3/4/56.

113. Ibid., Cooper to Henry Cromwell, 3/31/57, p. 157.

114. Commons Journal, VII, 511, 3/25/57; Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 294, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 2/24/57, quoted by Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," pp. 55, 66.

115. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Cooper to Henry Cromwell, 3/31/57, 11.

116. Burton, Diary, II, 301, 6/24/57; 306, 6/25/57.

117. See #106

118. Unlisted Irish members: Hardress Waller, Sadler, Redman, Cooper, Trayle, Newburgh, Blaney, Abbott, Robert King, Coot, Bret, Davies, Ralph King.

119. Unlisted probable supporters of kingship: Sir Charles Coot and Daniel Redman, strong Court supporters, could not be excused from army service in Ireland. (Burton, Diary, I, 288). Sir Robert King and Thomas Newburgh were ill (ibid.). Ralph King had returned to Ireland to assist Henry Cromwell with administrative problems (Lansdowne MSS, 821, f. 247). James Trayle: see Appendix. Sir Hardress Waller, a relative of the Lord Protector (Stanley F. Weyman, "Oliver Cromwell's Kinsfolk," English Historical Review, VI [1891], p. 53), was a strong Court supported (Appendix). Unknown: Richard Blaney, John Bret. For Davies, #86.

FV-9

120. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Henry Crowwell to the Lord Protector, 4/22/57, 233.

121. For Purefoy, Commons Journal, VII, 529; Burton, Diary, II, 106. For Clark, Burton, Diary, I, 241.

VI-1

CHAPTER VI

REWARDS IN IRELAND

The conquests of Ireland by Cromwell's army and the subsequent redistribution of Irish land to the English conquerors was an important tool of the Court in the Protectorate parliaments. Many members of parliament and their relatives had claims of various kinds to Irish land. The various devices by which land had been apportioned to the conquerors were so complicated and there were so many conflicting claims and counterclaims that ample opportunity existed for the use of influence and special favors. The Court was able to take advantage of this opportunity to reward its supporters in parliament and to either punish or bribe its enemies.

The Cromwellian conquest of Ireland, practically completed by 1652, ushered in a drastic revolution in the ownership of land. More than half of Ireland was confiscated by the Commonwealth, which governed England after the execution of Charles I, and the major Irish landowners either left the country or were forced to emigrate to the westernmost province of Connaught. It has been impossible to ascertain the exact number of English settlers, but there was fear at the time when the major part of the redistribution was taking place that there would not be enough land to settle their claims.¹ This redistribution, known as the Cromwellian settlement, was sketched out in a series of acts, extending over a decade, some of which predated the Cromwellian conquest.

VI-2

This revolution in the ownership of Irish land was ostensibly a punishment for the Irish rebellion that took place in 1642, with its accompanying alleged massacre of English settlers. In reality, it was the climax of a policy of colonizing Ireland with English Protestant settlers which dated back to the days of Elizabeth. In order to safeguard her western coast against a Catholic country, always prone to make alliances with the Catholic enemy on the continent, England was determined to populate this country with friendly inhabitants. In the 1650s, this determination was reenforced by the financial exigencies of the Interregnum governments, which could be satisfied only by the seizure of Irish land. That the rebellion was only an excuse for the confiscation is proved by the fact that all areas of the country were treated with equal severity although actually some were more rebellious than others.²

This conquered country was governed by men sent over from England to establish order and to preside over the land distribution. By 1652, organized resistance was practically over. In July, General Charles Fleetwood, Cromwell's son-in-law, was dispatched by the Commonwealth to preside over the administration. He was assisted by three commissioners. The Protectorate, established in 1653 to succeed the Commonwealth, organized a new administration in Ireland to make some changes in the Irish policy. Strict enforcement of the transplantation policy, which would have forced the majority of the more prosperous natives to emigrate to the western province of Connaught proved to be impractical and was ameliorated. Fleetwood was believed to be excessively partial to the Anabaptist, republican

VI-3

officers who had been favored by the Rump parliament, the ruling power during the Commonwealth period. A new Irish council of state was therefore established in August of 1654, and during the next year Fleetwood was recalled to England and given the honorary title of Lord Deputy of Ireland. His place as the head of government in Ireland was taken by Henry Cromwell, the Lord Protector's son, who presided over the establishment of a more moderate form of government, in line with the transformation which was taking place under the Lord Protector's guidance in England.³

Before the establishment of the Protectorate in 1653, three great acts had already been passed which provided the basic legal underpinnings of the land redistribution. The first group to have a legal foothold in Ireland was a group of investors, or "Adventurers," who in 1642 lent money to the state to put down the Irish rebellion, with the promise of being granted land in Ireland. Drawn from many walks of society, this group was nevertheless dominated by the London commercial interest, adherents of the parliamentary cause. Next the soldiers and officers who conquered Ireland had to be provided for, for the Commonwealth never had enough funds on hands to pay their wages in full. These tentative arrangements made in the 1640s were formalized upon the conquest of Ireland by the act of settlement of 1652 and the act of satisfaction of 1653. These acts regulated the details of colonization for both adventurers and soldiers.⁴

The financial exigencies of the Interregnum governments made these arrangements essential. Recent historical research has proved that Cromwell was correct when he stated that the Long Parliament on

VI-4

its dissolution in 1653 left debts of £700,000. The financial necessities of the Spanish war which broke out in 1656 compounded the situation. The original right of the soldiers and officers, serving in Ireland, to receive Irish land for their arrears was gradually transformed into an obligation.⁵

Many of the members of the Protectorate parliaments had been either adventurers or soldiers, and their claims to Irish land were based on the provisions of the act of satisfaction. Their positions in the parliament were useful to them when the time came to make good their claims. It has been said that there was scarcely a valuable estate in Ireland for which two claimants could not be found.⁶ Members could speak on the floor in support of their claims. Moreover, those who were loyal supporters of the Cromwellian regime could expect to be rewarded by decisions in their favor when claims had to be settled.

In addition to those members of parliament whose claims to Irish land rested on their careers as adventurers or soldiers, there were many members who had received special grants in Ireland for various other reasons. Some of these grants had been made during the Commonwealth period (1649-1653) by the commissioners ruling Ireland on behalf of the Commonwealth government, by the Rump parliament, and by the council of state. Others were made later during the Protectorate period by the Lord Protector himself, by the English council of state and by the Irish Council. These special grants were made for various kinds of service. The claims to many of them were confirmed by the Protectorate parliaments.

VI-5

The Court used the settlement of these claims as a major tool of parliamentary management. By allowing its friends to change their allotments to more favorable localities and settle favorably conflicting claims with ex-royalists, by overlooking burdensome technicalities, by granting extra land or longer leases, and by confirming old grants, the Court rewarded its supporters. The petitions of its enemies were apt to be overlooked unless a bribe was absolutely necessary. The Court had in this situation a useful tool with which to reward its supporters and punish its enemies.

The men sent by the English council of state to rule Ireland realized that these special favors granted to members of parliament compounded their difficulties. Fleetwood referred to Ireland as a "great temptation" and begged for only "self-denying spirites" to be sent over to settle the claims of the adventurers and soldiers.⁷ When Captain John Blackwell and Colonel John Hewson, loyal Court supporters, received a very advantageous settlement of their claims, Fleetwood did not know how to satisfy them without offending others. He wrote to John Thurloe, the secretary of the council of state, as follows, "the commissioners are in a strait what to doe in setting out lands to captain Blackwell and colonel Hewson, for the one's assigned bill of adventurers, and the other his arreares, in regard the places chosen by both are in places of so great advantage to themselves, being so neare this place [Dublin], and the lands for others so very doubtfull, how farre they will satisfye both the souldiers and adventurers,--They can be nothing sayde but the merritts of the person, the difference from others in point of satisfaction, being extreme great."⁸ Henry Cromwell complained in 1657 that the revenue had been

VI-6

dislocated by the large number of land grants, many of them to members of parliament, which had been made either by parliament or by the Lord Protector himself. He believed that the grants were excessive, writing, "We have been much startled of late with the number of grants for land which have lately been sent us over by his highness or the parliament: they are many of them very exorbitant satisfactions for old debts, I believe in some cases above 20 times more than ever was expected."⁹

This disordered situation afforded ample opportunity for conflict between the different groups who had claims to Irish land. Adventurers, soldiers, Irish landowners, and recipients of special grants often had claims to the same territory. The situation was complicated by the fact that, when the various grants were made, Ireland was a vaguely known, unsurveyed country. Land had been allocated before the donors knew how much there was to give.

Initially, several acts were passed which merely stated how much land was to be placed at the disposal of the adventurers or soldiers without spelling out how or where these claims would be satisfied. The 1642 act for adventurers offered two-and-one-half million acres, or eighteen percent of the total profitable land in Ireland at low rates. Not as much money was raised as had been anticipated; so two "doubling ordinances," one passed in 1643 and another in 1647, attempted to squeeze more money out of the pockets of the original investors. Under their terms, adventurers who subscribed extra money would receive more land at lower rates. Officers in Ireland were permitted to subscribe for land at the same rates as

VI-7

the adventurers. The act of settlement of 1652, which provided for the transplantation of the Irish landowners to Connaught, opened the door to still further prospects of enrichment. This act granted some discretion in the enforcement of its provisions to the commissioners who were to execute it and so led to new opportunities for conflict between landowners and English colonists. The act opened up large amounts of land for colonization, but still did not spell out exact methods for allocating this land to the colonists.¹⁰

Logically, this allocation should not have been made until an exact survey of land was available, but, although such a survey was ordered in 1653, the claims on the state were far too pressing to wait for its results. The act of satisfaction, passed September of that year, regulated the details of the colonization scheme. It provided for the claims of both adventurers and soldiers. Several lotteries were held in London, through which the adventurers received their allotments. These allotments were in ten Irish counties set aside for the two groups. The ignorance about how much land was available is attested to by the fact that confiscated land in an eleventh county was set aside to be used if the claims of the soldiers could not be met from the first ten. A competent survey of the lands available was not completed until 1655.

This survey, made under the direction of William Petty, physician-general to the army, was the basis of the distribution of land to the soldiers, but the adventurers were not willing to make use of it until 1658. They preferred the inaccuracies of the earlier "gross survey"¹¹ which did not distinguish between profitable and

VI-8

unprofitable land and which often resulted in unfairly favorable allotments to them.

The soldiers' settlement, also provided for in the 1653 act, was not so generous as that made to the adventurers. Since the soldiers' pay was always in arrears, they were forced to accede to less favorable terms. There were approximately 35,000 soldiers and 1,500 adventurers; yet adventurers were to be satisfied first in the ten allocated counties. Since there was not enough land available for the soldiers, they were forced for a period to accept land at lower rates than had been prescribed in the 1653 act, in effect receiving less land for the same amount of money due them. After Petty's survey revealed how little land there really was after the adventurers had been satisfied, the soldiers were forced to be content with only a part of what had originally been promised to them.¹²

The stage was set in this way for a conflict over their claims to Irish land between the soldiers and adventurers, which was reflected in the proceedings of the Protectorate parliaments. Debates reveal the latent hostility between the two groups.

Differences of opinion between two Irish officers who were members of parliament and a group representing the London interests illustrate this conflict. Modern research has shown that Londoners were the clearly preponderant geographic group in the adventure, that they subscribed more than one-half of the total moneys collected, and that they had a tendency to act for the group as a whole. A bill for the "Adventurers for Lands in Ireland" was supported in June, 1657 by Alderman Thomas Foot, a London member, who had been treasurer of

VI-9

the Irish Adventurers in 1643. This bill was backed by Sir Christopher Pack of London and the Welsh member, Charles Lloyd, an Irish adventurer himself, tied to the Londoners by his association with the Merchant Adventurers. Major Anthony Morgan, Henry Cromwell's chief agent in parliament,¹³ and Major William Aston, another Irish member, vigorously opposed the bill, Morgan saying, "You have need to attend to this Bill. I hope it will never pass; it is such a bill."¹⁴ Since it never did pass, its contents are unknown, but the debate indicates that it would have given additional favors to the adventurers at the expense of the soldiers.

Another case involving a conflict of claims between the military and the adventurers was settled in such a way as to win a vote by an adventurer member of parliament in favor of Cromwell's assumption of the crown. The claims of Sir Hardress Waller, a prominent parliamentary general who represented an Irish constituency, and John Whiteway, a Dorchester member of parliament, who represented a group of Dorset adventurers, were settled by requiring Waller to give up part of his claim to the adventurers. Similar cases indicate that so loyal a follower of the Court as Sir Hardress should have been more generously rewarded. There must have been some politically pressing reason to satisfy the demands of the adventurers.

Sir Hardress had a long record of service to the Cromwellian cause. He was a regicide, with a long record of service in the parliamentary army. After settling in Ireland in 1630, he became a colonel in the forces fighting against the Irish in the 1641 rebellion. He then went to England and served under Fairfax in the New Model

VI-10

Army. During the civil war, he returned to Ireland twice, once briefly in an abortive attempt at conquest in 1647 and finally as an important member of Cromwell's staff in 1649. He wholeheartedly supported Cromwell's assumption of the office of Lord Protector in 1653 and was the only important officer present when the Protectorate was proclaimed the next year in Dublin. He served as a member of both Protectorate parliaments, but his military services were so essential in Ireland that he did not attend the second. His interests there were represented by his son, Walter Waller, also a member of parliament, who pressed his father's claims to Irish land.

These claims were based on grants made to him by the Long Parliament to pay his arrears and also as a reward for outstanding military service. Since he had lost property in County Limerick during the rebellion, the Rump parliament in 1650 ordered that lands in this location worth £1200 a year be set out for him by the commissioners in Ireland.¹⁵ The execution of this gift took many years. Waller was not satisfied with the lands assigned to him, saying that they were "wasted and without inhabitants,"¹⁶ and he was harassed by the conflicting claims of the Dorset adventurers.

The conflicting claims were based upon an adventure of £1200 subscribed by Dennis Bond, a Dorchester member of parliament, in trust for a number of Dorsetshire citizens. This adventure must have been drawn for in the lottery by John Whiteway, another Dorchester member, representing the same group. There is a record of Bond's original investment, but none of his drawing for it. There is, however, a record of Whiteway's drawing for land in Limerick and another of his

VI-11

representing the claims of a group of adventurers in Limerick in negotiations with Walter Waller, on behalf of Sir Hardress.¹⁷ Since Bond and Whiteway had close ties in Dorsetshire, there is no reason to doubt that they represented the same group of adventurers and that Bond's interest in the adventure was still active, although he did not draw for it.

These close ties derived both from their activities in Dorset and from their family relationships. Both had been members of the Dorset standing committee that had ruled the county on behalf of the parliamentary government during the civil war, and both had served as mayor of Dorchester. They were cousins, members of a family that engaged in the manufacture of woolen cloth, Dorchester's chief manufacture at the time. Both Bond and Whiteway's brother were actively employed in this business. Bond was much more politically prominent on the national scene, Whiteway's influence being confined to local affairs.

Bond was an active member of parliament both during the Commonwealth period when he also served on the council of state, and during the Protectorate. He has been called a friend of Oliver Cromwell, and he did support the proposed assumption of the crown in 1657,¹⁸ yet his parliamentary record reveals republican attitudes that are not consistent with his support of these kingship proposals. His republicanism is revealed by his opposition to a number of Court positions and by his use of republican clichés. He wanted the acts and ordinances of the Long Parliament to be confirmed only selectively and for short periods, whereas the Court wanted them all confirmed together

VI-12

for an indefinite period. He disliked the establishment of the Other House and did not want the Lord Protector to have the sole power of nominating its members. Like the republicans, he praised the record of the Rump parliament and disliked the use of titles, calling for another member to be fined for using the nomenclature "Lord."¹⁹ Since, in spite of this lack of enthusiasm for all things monarchical, he supported the kingship proposals, there are ample grounds for suspicion that this action was part of a political deal, the payment for the favorable settlement of the Dorset adventurers' claims.

These claims were discussed on the floor of parliament, and Waller did not receive so generous a settlement as might have been expected. The Dorset adventurers had drawn land in county Limerick that had been tentatively assigned to Waller. Although Waller had actually been empowered to use these lands until a determination of their value had been made and was so using them at the time, 200 acres were taken away from him and given to the Dorset adventurers.²⁰ Contemporaries realized that he was being shabbily treated; and Henry Cromwell wrote to his father that "your old servant, Sir Hardress Waller, thinks himself forgotten."²¹

Eight days after this favorable settlement of the Dorset adventurers' claims, Dennis Bond, the convinced republican, voted in favor of the kingship proposals. His name appears on the list of 118 "kinglings," probable testimony of the ability of Irish land grants to sway parliamentary votes.²²

Most Irish land cases did not involve slighting anyone as loyal to the Protectorate as Sir Hardress. Special favors could usually

VI-13

be granted to members of parliament without slighting other loyal supporters. This was often done by allowing members to choose the location of their land grants. Four adventurers, Henry Whalley, John Blackwell, Samuel Desborough, and Charles Lloyd, benefited in this way, as well as two soldiers, John Hewson and Sir Theophilus Jones. Jerome Sankey, who was hostile to the Protectorate, did not get such favorable terms.

Henry Whalley, judge advocate general of Scotland, was willing to settle for another plot of land rather than the one he had originally drawn in order to get his case settled after a two-year wait and expenses of £500. Whalley had drawn land in Ulster to which two Irish lords, who had submitted to the English, also had a claim.

Hugh Montgomery, Lord of the Ards, and James Hamilton, second Lord Claneboy, both Presbyterians, had taken an active part in the wars against the rebellious Irish in Ulster, then joined the royalists, but, since they soon surrendered to the Commonwealth forces, the English government was willing to show them a certain amount of consideration. Claneboy was allowed to compound under the terms of an ordinance of September 2, 1654, which permitted Protestant rebels in Ireland to keep their estates if they paid to the state a fine of no less than two years' full value of the property. Ards had been given permission by the Committee on Articles, especially set up to pass upon the "articles," or terms of surrender of important personages, to enjoy his estates until Parliament should legislate upon the matter.

Whalley protested against the Irish lords' occupancy of the land he had drawn. He said that he had drawn for the land before

VI-14

Claneboy was allowed to compound and that neither the commissioners in Ireland nor the parliament had confirmed Ards' claims. He presented several petitions to the council of state, asking for a favorable settlement; these were accompanied by a covering letter of recommendation from the Lord Protector himself. It proved to be more financially profitable to the government, however, to allow the lords to keep their lands, after paying fines, and to satisfy Whalley elsewhere. Whalley had indicated his willingness to accept other lands and must have been grateful for this expeditious settlement of his claims.

This favorable settlement, besides being financially profitable to the state, may have been designed to appease Major-general Edward Whalley, Henry Whalley's brother. The major-general was a prominent member of the military group in the House, which was increasingly at odds with the Lord Protector as the session progressed.²³

Captain John Blackwell, another adventurer, was given such valuable grants of land that the Irish council of state protested when setting them out, but the English council and the parliament reiterated their order. Blackwell's services must already have been especially valued in 1653, for the act of satisfaction of that year singled out by name for the granting of special favors only Blackwell and two others.

Blackwell had been in Cromwell's own regiment; he was one of the two treasurers at war, first filling this post for the New Model army and then holding it throughout the Protectorate. These treasurers managed the financial affairs of the army. They were of

VI-15

special importance during the Protectorate, for they served also as central receivers-general for the assessments, taking them in and disbursing the appropriate sums to the paymasters of the regiments. Legally this money should have been sent after collection to the central exchequer before disbursement; so the treasurers at war had assumed an important extra-legal function, a policy always deplored by the Country. Blackwell also served as an agent for the Lord Protector on the floor of the House, when financial military affairs were discussed.

The land granted to Blackwell by the act of satisfaction was from the most valuable area in Ireland. He was given his choice of any land in Dublin, Kildare, or Cork or any other county not reserved for the adventurers or soldiers or granted to anyone else; he chose 4,000 acres near Dublin. When the land in the various provinces was valued in the act of satisfaction, it was provided that land in Leinster, where Dublin was located would be worth £600 per 1,000 acres, as against £450 in Munster and £200 in Ulster for the same amount.

Blackwell's lands were finally granted to him as prescribed by the act of satisfaction in June, 1657, but not before both the commissioners in Ireland and members of the House had pointed out how much he was being favored. Fleetwood stated that it would be unfair to grant lands so near Dublin at the rates prescribed for the adventurers when it had been necessary to reduce the soldiers' rates because there was not enough land available for them.²⁴ When the matter came to be debated in the house, it was said that Blackwell's "adventure was not above £2,000, now worth £20,000, will be worth £60,000

VI-16

because near Dublin,"²⁵ but the grant was finally approved before the end of the session.

Two soldiers, Sir Theophilus Jones and Colonel John Hewson, presented the Irish Council with the same problem as Captain Blackwell: their grants near Dublin were so valuable that the Councillors hesitated about settling them at the original adventurers' rates. Like Blackwell, Jones and Hewson had the privilege of choosing their own lands. Both had their choices confirmed, Jones as a reward for faithful service and support of the kingship proposals and Hewson as a bribe to ensure his cooperation.

Jones had a long record of support of the Protectorate in Ireland. He had fought there in the parliamentary army and in 1649 had been appointed governor of Dublin by Cromwell. He was a brother of Bishop Henry Jones, the publicist of the alleged Irish atrocities. He served in both Protectorate parliaments and was a faithful supporter of the kingship proposals. In spite of the hesitations of the Irish Council, the lands he had chosen were granted to him in 1657 with no recorded debate. He received 3,000 acres near Dublin.²⁶

Edmund Ludlow, the republican diarist, believed that the Lord Protector had unsuccessfully attempted to "bribe" Hewson for his support after the dissolution of the first Protectorate parliament in 1654, by payment of his English arrears in cash and his Irish arrears in Dublin land.²⁷ Hewson was a convinced republican and he continued to be noncooperative, yet Cromwell tried again to bribe him in 1658, by naming him to the Other House. His support was greatly desired, for he was a leader of the Anabaptist, republican army officers who

VI-17

had supported Fleetwood and were troublesome to Henry Cromwell.

Hewson's background was humble, and he rose through the army to become a colonel of foot and the governor of Dublin. He was a regicide of the most extreme type, attending all the sessions of the court that condemned the king and signing his death warrant. He was greatly attached to Fleetwood, and, when that general was recalled to England, supposedly because of his sympathy with the Anabaptists, Hewson organized a petition begging for his return. In spite of the bribe of Irish lands that he received, Henry Cromwell did not trust him and saw to it that he was not a member of the Irish delegation to the second parliament; so he was forced to sit for an English constituency, which Fleetwood obtained for him. Cromwell's feelings proved correct, for Hewson's opposition to the kingship proposals was well known.

The claim upon which his bribe was based was similar to Blackwell's. He was specifically mentioned in the act of satisfaction, which provided that he be entitled to choose his own lands near Dublin at adventurers' rates. Although the Irish Council expressed doubts about the justice of this claim, it was confirmed and ratified again by the second Protectorate parliament. Hewson's case proves that Irish land could be used as a bribe, as well as a reward.²⁸

Usually, it was used as a reward. Samuel Desborough and Charles Lloyd, for example, were allowed to change the locations of the lots they had drawn as adventurers to more desirable locations. Desborough was granted 1,500 acres of land in another part of Ireland, because it had not been possible to satisfy his claim in the county

VI-18

in which his lot had fallen. Lloyd was given 3,500 acres in a new location, rather than 1,500 where it had been originally assigned to him.²⁹

Desborough, the younger brother of Major-general John Desborough, was a client of Lord Broghill, President of the Council in Scotland. He obtained his Scottish seat through Broghill's intervention and was appointed by him to the Scottish Council and as a Commissioner of the Great Seal of Scotland. He backed a proposal on the floor of the House that Broghill receive additional lands in Ireland as a reward for his services. The major-general opposed the Court in the 1656-1657 session, but the rewards that Samuel reaped through his connection with Broghill, including settlement of his claim to Irish land, proved more important to him than his family connections.³⁰

The favor bestowed upon Lloyd was due to his connection with the group of merchant adventurers who were influential supporters of the kingship proposals. He was the deputy-governor of this group and was closely associated with Sir Christopher Pack, its governor, who formally proposed Cromwell's assumption of the crown. Lloyd backed these proposals and was rewarded by having the Court support the change of location he desired in Ireland. The passage of the bill embodying these changes was managed by Colonel Philip Jones, the Lord Protector's principal agent in the house. Colonel John Carter, who reported it out of committee, was also a member of the inner management circle. A client of Lord Chief Justice John Glynn, he backed the kingship proposals and, much to the dismay of the house,

VI-19

had recently been voted an income of £300 a year for his arrears of £5,000.

Lloyd's Irish grant also aroused indignation in the house. Major-general Whalley, an opponent of the kingship proposals, asked why the grant of 1,500 acres had been changed to 3,500,³¹ and even Major Anthony Morgan, Henry Cromwell's agent, said, "I could tell you something of that gentleman's allotment, how unreasonable it is."³² This revelation, blurted out in the heat of debate, came to light in the course of an exchange between Morgan, representing the soldiers' interests in Ireland and Lloyd, the adventurers' interests.

The handling of Irish land claims could be used to punish as well as to reward: a request for a change in the location of a lot could be denied if the petitioner was not in favor in Court circles. Such was the fate of Colonel Jerome Sankey. Sankey was a member of the same Anabaptist, republican circle as Hewson, and also an opponent of the kingship proposals. A grant of land that had been made to him by the Rump parliament was probably confirmed by the second Protectorate parliament only because it was one of a group of grants that were ratified collectively. Sankey was very much out of favor at this time. Yet, in spite of this disfavor he tried to reject the 3,000-acre grant he had received and choose land in another area. He was prevented from doing so by Sir William Petty, the surveyor-general of Ireland.³³

As well as being able to select the location of their land grants, members of parliament were able in other ways to exploit their

VI-20

positions in the legislative body, in particular by pressing their own claims and those of their connections on the floor of the House. Cases in point are Robert Barrington, Sir William Masham, and Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill. In contrast, Colonel Daniel Axtell suffered from having lost his seat.

In 1656 a group of adventurers, led by Sir John Barrington, no longer in parliament but a relative of Robert Barrington, member from Essex,³⁴ and Sir William Masham were involved in a controversy which they brought to the floor of the House. Serjeant Edward Dendy had received a grant of Irish land worth £200 per year for his "eminent services"³⁵ from Fleetwood and his commissioners. He complained in 1656 that he was being harassed by suits of these adventurers, many of whom were members of parliament. When the problem was brought up before a committee of the House, many of these adventurers refused to testify, claiming the privilege of speaking to the question on the floor of the House, rather than before a committee. In this way, they were able to press their claims more strongly.³⁶

The claims of Lord Broghill, an intimate of the Lord Protector and a foremost advocate of the kingship proposals, were also brought to the floor of the House. Not only were Lord Broghill's claims to lands given him by Fleetwood's commissioners confirmed; he also received a gift of additional acreage. This grant was the cause of an acrimonious debate on the floor of the House, but the Court pushed through the gift, Thurloe stating that Broghill had been insufficiently rewarded.

Broghill was being recompensed for pay due to him for his

VI-21

military service. It was said at the time that "he maintained two regiments at his own charge and suffered much for you."³⁷ Fleetwood's commissioners had ordered land worth £1,000 a year set out to him in recompense. When this grant was confirmed in 1657, Sir Charles Wolseley, one of the Court's principal managers on the floor of the house, proposed that 2,000 more acres be added which would add £400 more income. Major-general Desborough, now reconciled to the Court because of Crowwell's refusal of the kingship proposals, maintained that the original grant had been overvalued because Broghill would not bribe the surveyors.

Whatever the justice of this gift, its political nature is shown both by the debate it aroused and by the amount of time taken for its final approval. It was supported by the Lord Protector's agents in the House, Colonel Jones, Sir Charles Wolseley and Secretary Thurloe, as well as by Henry Crowwell's agents, Anthony Morgan and William Jephson. Its principal opponents were two members inclined to republicanism, Samuel Highland and Joachim Matthews, and the principal opponents of the kingship proposals, Major-generals John Lambert and Thomas Kelsey and Colonel William Sydenham. After the bill was finally passed after an acrimonious debate, secret influence must still have been at work against it, for it was reported that it waited for an unprecedented three weeks in an engrossed form before it finally was approved.³⁸

The political factors that worked in favor of Lord Broghill were hostile when Colonel Daniel Axtell endeavored to clear his claims.

VI-22

Axtell's lands were also originally granted to him by a special order of Fleetwood's commissioners, but there is no record that his requests were granted when he tried to counter the conflicting claims of alleged royalists.

Axtell was a member of the republican, Anabaptist group of Irish officers, who were unfriendly to the establishment of the Protectorate. He had taken an active part in the king's trial, commanding the troops at Westminster Hall, where it was held. He resigned his commission on Henry Cromwell's arrival when the Anabaptists ceased to be the ruling sect in Ireland, and his behavior at the time of the kingship proposals is said to have caused Cromwell uneasiness. When Henry Cromwell dropped the republican members from the Irish delegation to parliament in 1656, Axtell was replaced by a more cooperative representative. Having lost his seat, he was not able to press his claims to Irish land from the floor of the house and suffered thereby.³⁹

Various special favors were done for other supporters of the Court in parliament. Bothersome technicalities in the members' grants were overlooked, longer and better leases granted, and arrears settled without proper papers. In this way, adherence to the Court's programs was rewarded.

The recipients of these favors took an active part in managing the Court's legislative program. Sir John Reynolds, an enthusiastic proponent of the kingship proposals, was one of Henry Cromwell's principal agents until he left to command the expeditionary force sent to Flanders in January, 1657. Vincent Gookin was also an agent, employed by Henry Cromwell to arrange Irish parliamentary business in

VI-23

conjunction with John Thurloe, and a proponent of kingship. Colonel Robert Hammond had died by the time the second parliament was convened, but was a loyal Court supporter during the 1654 election in Reading. John Owen, Cromwell's chaplain, a member of the 1654-1655 parliament, was the House's foremost adviser on religious matters. He never actually was a member of parliament, being declared ineligible to sit because he was a clergyman. John Fiennes, himself a member both of the parliament of 1656 and of the Other House, was wholly under the influence of his brother, Nathaniel Fiennes, the Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal and a leading advocate of the kingship proposals. Daniel Redman was a compliant member of the Irish delegation, and Henry Owen, another member from Ireland, was a fervent backer of kingship. John Jones, the Lord Protector's brother-in-law, served on the Committee on Privileges and backed the gifts of Irish land to Broghill and Lloyd. Ralph King, also a member of this important committee, was an active member of parliament. All of these men received favorable adjustments to their claims to Irish land in recognition of their service to the Protectorate in parliament.

Relatives of Court members also were favorably treated when their claims to Irish land were settled. Captain Robert Gookin, Vincent's son, received favorable consideration, as did Richard Lawrence, brother of the president of the council of state, and Ellinor Jephson, the widow of the brother of Colonel William Jephson, one of Henry Cromwell's parliamentary agents.

The settlement of Sir John Reynold's claims was of especial concern to the Court because it benefited his widow, who was closely

VI-24

related to its most influential members. Reynolds, after enthusiastic support of the Court program in parliament, died in Flanders, where he had been sent to command an English expeditionary force. His wife was the daughter of Sir Francis Russell, a locally important supporter of kingship, whose other daughter was married to Henry Cromwell. Henry Cromwell corresponded with his father-in-law, who referred the matter to John Thurloe, in an effort to ensure a favorable settlement of the claims of his sister-in-law.⁴⁰

Reynold's case rested on the assertion that he had not been fully recompensed for his claims, yet at the time they were settled it was said that the state was overgenerous. Desborough commented, "It were just for us to confirm those orders, if we knew what they were: but not that, under color of them, the parties should get into possession of twice as much as was fairly and clearly given."⁴¹

Before his death, Reynolds petitioned for the satisfaction of the arrears owing to him for military service, saying that monies due to him for his services in England had not been paid because he was serving in the Irish army and that he was poorly compensated for his role in putting down the Irish rebellion. This was in spite of the fact that parliament had provided in 1649, on the eve of the departure of Cromwell's army for Ireland, that the arrears of the members of that army for service since 1645 should be satisfied before any other claims. Reynolds complained of the land he drew as recompense for his pay in Ireland, saying that it was inconveniently located.

Shortly before he left for Flanders, he received valuable land near Dublin as a reward for his Irish services, but he had not taken

VI-25

possession of it at the time of his death. This grant was substituted for the inconveniently located land that the common soldiers of his regiment were forced to content themselves with.⁴²

A favorable settlement was expeditiously arrived at on behalf of his widow. At Henry Cromwell's suggestion, his arrears were satisfied out of "land and houses here in Ireland,"⁴³ and an ordinance of 1654, granting him a manor worth £500, was confirmed. The settlement of this claim was supported by prominent members of the Court. It was introduced on the floor of the house by Lord Broghill and backed by Bulstrode Whitelocke, Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, Colonel Carter, who had recently received a financial grant from the government, and Sir Charles Wolseley, one of the Protector's managers.

There are indications that this settlement was indeed overly generous. Reynolds already owned many acres of Irish land. His personal estate at the time of his death consisted of land granted to him by patent and other acreage in Carrick and Carbury. He had bought land in Waterford with debentures received in lieu of his military pay. Moreover, it had already been decreed that the greater part of his arrears were to be satisfied with desirable land from county Cork, which, along with counties Dublin, Kildare, and Carlow, had been put at the disposal of the Commonwealth by the act of satisfaction. Land from these areas was often used to reward the Court's servants and was of itself a mark of favor.⁴⁴

Robert Hammond's grant, also in this area, was a reward both for the maintenance of Court power in Reading in 1654 and for his service on the Irish Council. A relative of the Cromwells, he was

VI-26

well known for his role as Charles I's jailer at Carisbrooke castle in 1647-1648. Lands were to be settled on him from one of the four government counties, worth £600 a year.

In Reading, it was always necessary to run a prominent member of the Court; for the administration was not really popular with the majority of the electorate. In 1654, only Hammond's prominence as governor of Reading during the Civil War and the support of the corporation brought about a victory. After his death, it was necessary to import another Court notable, Major-general John Barkstead, in order to defeat the republican, Daniel Blagrove in 1656. It was undoubtedly planned that Hammond should take an active part in parliamentary affairs on behalf of the Court, but he died before the end of the first parliament.

The grant was, no doubt, also intended as a bonus for his service on the Irish Council, to which he had been appointed at its inception in August of 1654. If Hammond had not died shortly after his appointment, his family relationship to Henry Cromwell would probably have made him especially helpful to the new, young ruler.

Members of the Council were to be paid £1,000 a year, so the grant of lands in Ireland to the value of £600 a year must be regarded as an extra bonus. Hammond's services must have been regarded as especially valuable, for there is no record of the other members of the council receiving such a bonus.⁴⁵ Hammond had always been liberally rewarded; there is an earlier record of his being given the right to dispose of wines left in a prize ship "free from customs and excise."⁴⁶ Moreover this £600 represented an increment over an

VI-27

earlier gift. Hammond had previously been granted a pension of £400 a year, as a reward for guarding Charles I, during his captivity at Carisbrooke Castle in 1647-1648. This was now commuted into the Irish grant. Since the cost of living had decreased in these years, the net gain was even more than £200.

After Hammond's death, the same grant was used to reward another member of the Court, who was a prominent supporter of the kingship proposals. Hammond's widow married Sir John Hobart, a teller in three pro-kingship votes and a member of the committee that urged Cromwell to accept the crown. The ordinance granting Hammond his gift in Ireland was confirmed in June, 1657, and could only have been intended to benefit Sir John and his wife.⁴⁷

It was specially decreed that land in these four government counties: Dublin, Kildare, Carlow, and Cork should be granted only on a year-to-year lease,⁴⁸ but a supporter of the kingship proposals in parliament, his son, and a brother of a loyal member of the Court were allowed to evade this ordinance and obtain more favorable terms. Vincent Gookin, Robert Gookin, and Richard Lawrence all were granted long leases in these counties.

Vincent Gookin was an especial favorite of both Oliver and Henry Cromwell. When Henry Cromwell replaced Fleetwood as the Protector's deputy in Ireland in 1655, he needed the firm support of such Anglo-Irish landowners as were untainted by hints of royalism. Many of the republican, Anabaptist army officers who were loyal to Fleetwood were hostile. They were fearful for their religious beliefs and resented the mitigation of the transplantation policy that

VI-28

was ushered in by the new regime. They believed that their claims to the lands of the transplanners were threatened. Gookin, the son of a wealthy Anglo-Irish landowner, spoke out strongly against the strict enforcement of the transplantation policy.

In order to win the support of the members of the first Protectorate parliament on behalf of the new policy, Gookin published a vindication of it while parliament was in session. In a pamphlet, "The Great Case of Transplantation Discussed," he maintained that it was impossible, without totally ruining the country, to remove so many Irish natives to Connaught. A copy of this pamphlet was sent to every member of parliament.

Moreover, Gookin was a strong supporter of the Court in the 1656-1657 session of parliament. He arranged parliamentary business with John Thurloe on behalf of Henry Cromwell, and he voted for the kingship proposals. For this support of Court policy, he received his reward in the government lands in Cork.⁴⁹

Gookin's petitions to the Irish Council for better terms for a lease he held there were favorably received. These lands were originally granted to him in 1650 "for favour."⁵⁰ At his request, when the lease had three more years to run, it was converted to a ninety-nine year lease at an advantageous purchase price.⁵¹

Vincent Gookin also personally attended to the presentation of his son, Robert's petition for better terms for a lease in Cork. The omnipresent Lord Broghill was offered as a witness to the veracity of the case. As a result of the use of these Court connections, Robert's year-to-year lease was commuted into a longer one,

VI-29

and he was allowed to use the debentures he had received for his military arrears as partial payment.

When young Gookin had first started to improve this property in 1652, he had thought he would receive it as payment for his military arrears, but since, by the Act of Satisfaction of 1653, county Cork was assigned to the government, a new arrangement was essential. When Vincent Gookin was in London to attend the parliamentary session in 1657, he presented his son's petition to the Protector. It stated that Robert would lay out more money to improve the property if he could have a lease for "three lives."⁵² He requested that his debentures, which were held up by technicalities, and the expenses already incurred, be applied against the purchase of the lease.

The arrangements made on Robert Gookin's behalf were so advantageous that he took pains on the eve of the Restoration to make sure that these lands would remain in his possession. At that time, he again invoked the family friendship with Lord Broghill, who had made his peace with Charles II, and conveyed the lands to Broghill, taking a lease on them for one hundred years.⁵³

Colonel Richard Lawrence, the brother of Sir Henry Lawrence, Lord President of the council of state, also received a long lease in the four counties and a favorable settlement of other Irish claims. He was able to have his arrears stated without submitting the legally necessary papers; he received a longer lease for lands he already held elsewhere in Ireland; and he was granted a long lease on government lands on most favorable terms in lieu of undesirable lands he had drawn for his military arrears.

VI-30

Lawrence asked the Lord Protector, to whom he was related, to intervene personally so that he could collect on his arrears without submitting the required papers. A special act was passed to enable him to do so. He stated that the papers had been lost and that to collect the necessary information would entail more expense than it was worth.

After these technicalities were settled, Lawrence was given a twenty-one-year lease on a house and lands in an unstated area of Ireland, which he had held for seven years. This was to settle part of his Irish arrears, but the rest was still owing to him as well as all the pay due him for service in the army in England.

For these, he received an extremely favorable lease for ninety-nine years in the four counties. The rent for this land was to be based on a valuation assigned to it in 1640, since which time land values had been steadily falling.⁵⁴ In exchange for this property, Lawrence gave up land that he considered undesirable. He described it as being "in the mountainous part of Limerick and Kerry which likely never to be safely habitable to me."⁵⁵ It must be borne in mind that this was the land which the ordinary soldier, without Court connections, was forced to be contented with.

Long leases could also be obtained on government land in other parts of Ireland if the Court was favorably inclined. Such a lease was obtained by Henry Cromwell for two of his favorite officers, both of whom were members of parliament, and one of whom was so staunch a supporter of the kingship cause that he was called an "Irish champion."⁵⁶

Henry Cromwell used Vincent Gookin as his agent when requesting

VI-31

this favor. He asked Secretary Thurloe to discuss with Gookin the grant of twenty-one-year leases in Tipperary to Majors Henry Owen and Daniel Redman, stating that they already occupied the property on year-to-year leases.

Owen and Redman were both loyal members of the Court. They were picked by Henry Cromwell to serve in the second Protectorate parliament and replace radical members who were not allowed to run again. Redman was so busy with his military duties in Ireland that he did not attend the parliamentary session of 1656-1657, but Owen was present. There he made his mark as a champion of kingship, supporting it with his vote and engaging in a violent debate on its merits with Sir Thomas Pride.

The case of Owen and Redman is somewhat unusual since it is an outright reward and does not mention the payment of arrears, the most common excuse for a grant of land to a Court favorite. Two other such grants can be cited; one to John Owen, the Lord Protector's chaplain, and the other to Ralph King, an active parliamentarian and administrator in Ireland.

John Owen was no longer a member of parliament at the time of his gift but was used by the members as an advisor on religious legislation. He was among the foremost Independent ministers of his day. He had been elected to the first Protectorate parliament, but he was declared ineligible to sit because of his status as a clergyman. However, he continued to be active. A committee of divines appointed to draw up a statement of religious fundamentals in November 1654 was said to be practically in his hands; he wrote a book against heresy in 1655 at the request of the Council of State; and during the same

VI-32

year served on the committee established to consider the admission of the Jews into England.

Owen's original gift of £100 a year was commuted by the second Protectorate parliament into a grant of Irish land. It had originally been bestowed, at least ostensibly, upon him as a reward for preaching a thanksgiving service in Colchester after the parliamentary army had taken the town. The payment of the gift had fallen into arrears, and it was perhaps for this reason that, when it was paid up, it was arranged that Irish lands worth £100 a year be settled upon Owen. This arrangement was supported in parliament by members of the Court and questioned by the Country. It was proposed by Colonel Jones, the Court's foremost manager and backed by two members of the council of state.⁵⁷ Lambert Godfrey demurred, saying, "I would have the order examined, before you confirm it," yet it was passed instantly.⁵⁸

Ralph King's gift, which also fails to mention the payment of arrears, is evidently a reward for faithful service in parliament and as an administrator in Ireland. It is listed as a "letter of land in Ireland,"⁵⁹ worth £300 a year.

King's services were valuable to the state both in parliament and in Ireland. At the opening of the second Protectorate parliament, he was appointed to the important committee on privileges. There is every reason to believe that he was in favor of Cromwell's assumption of the crown, but he was recalled to Ireland to help with administrative matters before the proposals were raised in the first session.⁶⁰ He did attend the short second session. When he returned to London to do so, he brought with him a bill to settle certain arrears, which

VI-33

friends in a neighboring county were interested in. He was characterized by them as "an honest gentleman and a friend."⁶¹

Most grants, unlike those of Henry Owen, Daniel Redman, John Owen, and Ralph King, although essentially rewards, were at least ostensibly based on the payment of arrears. Sometimes they were settled upon the relatives of prominent members of the Court; such grants must be looked upon as favors to the famous relatives. Cases in point are John Jones, John Fiennes, and Ellinor Jephson.

Neither John Jones nor John Fiennes was active in the legislative process, although both were recipients of Irish land as settlement for their arrears. Jones was the brother-in-law of the Lord Protector and Fiennes the brother of Nathaniel Fiennes, commissioner of the great seal, member of the council of state and one of Cromwell's most trusted councillors. Jones even had ties with the republicans; so it could only have been his ties with the Protector's family that enabled him to reap his reward.

An attempt in the past to gain the Cromwells' assistance in settling John Jones's land claims had failed; he was not successful until after he married the Protector's sister in 1656. In 1654, Jones offered Henry Cromwell property that he owned in Wales in return for help in settling his Irish claims. This offer was part of a complicated land deal. Jones had been one of a group of soldiers and officers in North Wales who took conveyance of a number of royal properties for their arrears in 1650. He would have been willing to give Cromwell his share in one of the properties if the Protector's son would buy the other soldiers out. He then wished a lease he

VI-34

already held in Ireland confirmed and a grant of additional lands in the same area. Cromwell was interested enough to look at the Welsh lands, but the deal did not go through. These must have been the same lands he finally received in 1657, after he had become closely related to the Lord Protector.

In spite of their parliamentary inactivity, both Jones and Fiennes were appointed to Cromwell's Other House. These appointments, like the Irish land grants, should be interpreted as indirect favors to their prominent relatives.⁶²

Ellinor Jephson's case was favorably settled as a result of the influence of her brother-in-law, Colonel William Jephson, a fervent supporter of the kingship proposals and one of Henry Cromwell's agents. Mrs. Jephson was pressing for the settlement of the arrears of her late husband, Norris Jephson, William's brother.

A certain technicality was overlooked in order to settle this claim. The late Norris Jephson had served in Ireland until 1643, but the Commissioners of Accounts would not verify his arrears as required by the act of satisfaction, because he had left Ireland and then enrolled in the English army. He was then only partially paid in England. As a result of a petition of Ellinor Jephson to the Protector and the council of state, it was provided that the claims should be verified and settled. William Jephson furnished a certificate that supported this claim.

Jephson's ability to exert his influence for the benefit of himself and his family had not escaped the notice of the republican pamphleteers. They stated that, in return for his support of the

VI-35

kingship proposals, Jephson had been made ambassador to Sweden and a commander of a troop of horse, and that his son had been given a foot company. They overlooked the settlement of the claims of Ellinor Jephson.⁶³

The most flagrant gift of Irish land to an important member of the Court was the grant to Charles Fleetwood, the Lord Deputy of Ireland. To mollify the military clique in the house and thus obtain the passage of a desired bill which would confirm the claims of English investors to Irish land, Major Morgan, Henry Cromwell's principal agent, proposed to parliament a gift to Fleetwood, "as a mark of your favour."⁶⁴

This gift of £1,500 of the forfeited lands in Ireland, at the value of 1640, was so blatant that many members were aghast. Some protested against it, in spite of Fleetwood's evident popularity. To disguise the obvious favoritism, it was proposed that the sum be designated as payment of Fleetwood's arrears rather than as an outright gift.

Much has been made of the fact that Fleetwood offered to give up this grant in order to obtain the lowering of the Irish assessment.⁶⁵ However, it has been overlooked that there is no real evidence that he did give it up; in fact, two weeks later, Cromwell consented to "An Act for the Indemnifying of such Persons as acted for the Service of the Publick" which may well mask Fleetwood's grant.⁶⁶

The use of these grants as tools of parliamentary management is thus easily seen. That Irish lands were used as rewards for friends

VI-36

of the Protectorate has always been recognized, but their effectiveness in the management of parliament has been insufficiently stressed. It is interesting that the possibilities for the use of such influence did not escape contemporaries.

These possibilities were spelled out by William Petty in the course of a quarrel with Jerome Sankey on the floor of the House in March, 1659. If the law was evaded, he said, "some friends would have been found satisfied, unto whom the Laws allow none; some to have their fill, when others had but half: some for postponed services to have been placed in the most preferred counties; some to have choice before others had Lots; many to have twenty times richer satisfactions than others upon equal grounds, some to have had liberty to reject at pleasure, what God had predetermined for their Lot, and to elect at their pleasure what themselves thought fit in lieu of such their Lot, some Lands were with-held from Survey because in our friends possession."⁶⁷

In the confusion that accompanied the Irish settlement, such evasions, gained by political influence, were necessary in order to obtain the richest prizes. Those members of parliament who had even the slightest claim to Irish land used their positions to enrich themselves. In return for their gains, they supported the programs of the Protectorate and, above all, the kingship proposals.

For a financially insolvent administration, the importance of these lands as rewards for loyalty was inestimable. In debt, with London merchants reluctant to lend it money after their experience with the financially irresponsible Long Parliament, with no more

VI-37

money to be gained from fining royalists or selling crown or ecclesiastical lands,⁶⁸ the Protectorate government leaned heavily upon Ireland to reward its supporters, including the members of the Court in parliament.

This use of Irish lands once more demonstrates the Protectorate's employment of political management. The Court again used whatever resources were available to win support for its positions in parliament.

FVI-1

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Karl S. Bottigheimer, English Money and Irish Land (Oxford, 1971), pp. 131, 139.

2. Ibid., p. 128; Richard Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts (2 vols., London, 1963, xxi-lxxi; Charles H. Firth and Robert S. Rait (eds.), Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-60 (3 vols., London, 1911), 723. For the most recent treatment of Interregnum finance: H. J. Habakkuk, "Public Finance and the Sale of Confiscated Property during the Interregnum," Economic History Review, 2d series, XV, No. 1 (August, 1962).

3. Bagwell, Ireland, II, 304, 326-330.

4. Bottigheimer, English Money, pp. 127-142. The acts of settlement and satisfaction are printed in Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, pp. 618, 722.

5. Habakkuk, "Public Finance"; Wilbur Cortez Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), IV, 275; Bottigheimer, English Money, 118; Charles H. Firth, Cromwell's Army (London, 1962), p. 200.

6. Great Britain, Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers--Ireland, 1603-1670, ed. by C. W. Russell, F. P. Prendergast and R. P. Mahaffey (13 vols., London, 1872-1908), VIII, xxviii.

7. A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, ed. by Thomas Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), II, 493, Fleetwood to Thurloe, 7/27/54.

8. Ibid., 6/7/54, 357.

9. Ibid., VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 12/16/57, 683.

10. Act for adventurers printed in Statutes of the Realm, 16 Car. I, c. 33, as quoted by Bottigheimer, English Money, p. 41 n. For "doubling ordinances," ibid., pp. 85 and 111, also Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, I, 1028.

11. Thomason Tracts, BM, E. 1062(3), as quoted by Bottigheimer, English Money, p. 132. The "gross survey" was ordered by the Council of State on June 22, 1653.

12. Ibid., pp. 130-142.

FVI-2

13. Ibid., pp. 64-75; J. R. MacCormack, "The Irish Adventurers and the English Civil War," Irish Historical Studies (March 1956); Diary of Thomas Burton (4 vols., London, 1828), ed. by John Towill Rutt, II, 223, 224, 6/12/57. For Foot: Valerie Pearl, London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1643 (Oxford, 1961), p. 316. For Lloyd's association with Pack: Chapter, 153-154. For Morgan's association with Henry Cromwell, Chapter V, p.250.

14. Burton, Diary, II, 196, 6/8/57.

15. DNB, Sir Hardress Waller; Burton, Diary, I, 203, 12/22/56, 288, 12/31/56; Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons (London, 1813), VI, 433, 6/27/50.

16. Robert Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth (Manchester, 1913), II, 289, 10/23/52.

17. Bond's adventure noted in Great Britain, Public Record Office, State Papers, Ireland, quoted in MacCormack, "The Irish Adventurers," p. 45; Bottigheimer, English Money, pp. 175-213, for tables of "Original Investors in Irish Land" and "Adventurers who drew Irish Land," compiled from State Papers, Ireland, the list of adventurers in John P. Prendergast, The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland, and the barony tables in Marsh's Library, Dublin; Commons Journal, VII, 492.

18. The Minute Books of the Dorset Standing Committee, September 23, 1646-May 8, 1650 (Exeter, 1902), ed. by Charles H. Mayo; "The Commonplace Book of a Dorsetshire Man," ed. by William M. Barnes, Dorsetshire Natural History and Archaeological Society, Proceedings, XVI, 60, 65, 76; A. R. Bayley, The Great Civil War in Dorset, 1642-60 (Taunton, 1910); DNB, Dennis Bond.

19. Burton, Diary, II, 21, 39, 4/24/57; 396, 1/30/58; 189, 12/20/56.

20. Commons Journal, VII, 492, 2/16/56.

21. Thurloe, State Papers, VII, Henry Cromwell to the Lord Protector, 1/7/57, 734.

22. Appendix: Dennis Bond.

23. For drawing of land: Bottigheimer, English Money, 212 and CSP, Ireland, VIII, 588-590. For negotiations of claim, ibid., 614-615. For Claneboy and Ards, DNB and Dunlop, Ireland, II, 352; n. and 590 n., 591. For ordinance of September 22, 1654, ibid., 444. For Committee on Articles: CSP, Ireland, VIII, 507; Cromwell's letter, ibid., 589.

24. For Blackwell's grant: Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 722; Dunlop, Ireland, II, 358; Maurice Ashley, Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate (London, 1934), pp. 9, 82. For Blackwell as Cromwell's agent: Burton, Diary, II, 32,

FVI-3

4/24/57. For land values: Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, p. 724. For reaction to grant: Thurloe, State Papers, II, Fleetwood to Thurloe, 6/7/54, 357; Dunlop, Ireland, II, Irish Council to the Protector, 9/19/54, 451. Approval of grant: Commons Journal, VII, 6/9/57.

25. Burton, Diary, I, 282, 12/31/56.

26. Dunlop, Ireland, II, Irish Council to the Protector, 9/19/54, 451; DNB: Sir Theophilus Jones; Burton, Diary, I, 299, 1/5/57; Commons Journal, VII, 478, 1/5/57; 491, 2/16/57; 499, 3/6/57; 510, 3/24/57.

27. Edmund Ludlow, The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), ed. by C. H. Firth, p. 401, "he [the Protector] began by bribes to corrupt others to his interest; and to this end ordered the arrears of Col. Newetson for his English service to be paid in ready money, and his Irish arrears to be satisfied out of forfeited lands in the County of Dublin, at the rate of the adventurers in such places as he should choose."

28. Chapter I, p.72. DNB: John Hewson. For his change of seat, Chapter I, I, p. 56. For opposition to kingship: Appendix. For land grant: Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 738, 1133; Great Britain, Public Records Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series (13 vols., London, 1875-1886), VII, 33.

29. CSP, Ireland, VIII, 814; Burton, Diary, II, 95, 5/1/57.

30. DNB: Samuel Desborough; Thurloe, State Papers, V, Broghill to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 295; Burton, Diary, II, 95, 177; Scotland, Laws, Statutes, The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government During the Commonwealth (Printed by authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, 1832), VI, Part 2, 893.

31. For Lloyd, Pack, and the kingship proposals: Chapter III, pp. 154-155. For the bill: Burton, Diary, II, 95, 5/1/57; Commons Journal, VII, 529, 5/1/57. For Carter: ibid., p. 549, 6/6/57; Appendix.

32. Burton, Diary, II, 157, 5/29/57.

33. For Sankey: Appendix. For ratification of grant: Burton, Diary, II, 96, 5/1/57; CSPD, XI (1657-1658), 16. Henry Cromwell's opinion: Thurloe, State Papers, VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 9/9/57, 506; Sir William Petty, Reflections upon Some Persons and Things in Ireland (London, 1660), p. 66.

34. Mary F. Keeler, The Long Parliament: 1640-41 (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 97.

35. Burton, Diary, I, 202, 12/22/56.

FVI-4

36. Ibid., 198, 12/22/56; II, 66, 4/28/57; CSP, Ireland, VIII, 821, 834. Barrington and Masham had invested in Irish land and received large allotments. Bottigheimer, English Money, pp. 186, 199, 207.

37. Burton, Diary, II, 177, 6/5/57.

38. Dunlop, Ireland, II, 294; Burton, Diary, II, 175-179, 6/5/57; 304, 6/24/57.

39. CSP, Ireland, VIII, 656-657. For Axtell: Appendix.

40. DNB: Sir John Reynolds; Appendix; Thurloe, State Papers VI, Henry Cromwell to Sir Francis Russel, 1/27/57, 761.

41. Burton, Diary, II, 96.

42. CSP, Ireland, VIII, 613, 614, 833, 11/18/56; Commons Journal, VII, 105, 3/12/57.

43. Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 1/27/57, 761.

44. Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 1136; Burton, Diary, II, 96, 5/1/57; Commons Journal, VII, 529, 5/1/57, 542, 5/29/57; CSPD, XI (1657-1658), 16.

45. DNB: Robert Hammond. For his grant: CSPD, VII (1654), 321. For the Reading elections, Chapter I, pp. 36-37. For council salary: Dunlop, Ireland, II, 443.

46. CSPD, VI (1653), 46, 7/23/53.

47. CSPD, VII (1654), 321. For cost of living: Rogers, History of Prices, V, 826, as quoted in Firth, Cromwell's Army, p. 185. For Hammond's widow's marriage: Stanley J. Weyman, "Oliver Cromwell's Kinsfolk," English Historical Review, VI (1891), 53. For Sir John Hobart: Appendix. For confirmation of grant: Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 1134.

48. CSP, Ireland, VIII, 796, 4/7/54.

49. Louise Fargo Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum (Washington, 1942), p. 136, for the Anabaptist officers and transplantation. DNB: Vincent Gookin; Vincent Gookin, "The Author and Case of Transplanting the Irish into Connaught Vindicated from the unjust Aspersions of Col. Richard Laurence" (Thomason Tract, E 837 (7), London, 1655). For publication: Richard Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts (2 vols., London, 1963), II, 329. For relationship with Henry Cromwell: Thurloe, State Papers, V, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 11/24/56, 653; Narrative of Late Parliament, p. 14.

50. Carte MSS, XLIV, f. 360, as quoted in DNB: Vincent Gookin.

FVI-5

51. CSP, Ireland, VIII, 573, 842, 843.
52. Ibid., p. 625.
53. DNB: Robert Gookin; CSP, Ireland, VIII, 623-625, 815, 837.
54. Dunlop, Ireland, I, 29 n.; CSPD, IX (1655-1656), 178; Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 1136; CSPD, XI (1657-1658), 320, CSP, Ireland, VIII, 857. For the steadily falling value of land: Bottigheimer, English Money, p. 119. Note comment on Blackwell's land grant (Burton, Diary, I, 282), "the land is now worth £20,000. It will be worth £50,000 for so it was in the time of peace."
55. CSPD, XI (1657-1658), 111.
56. British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, 822, f. 21, Morgan to Henry Cromwell, 5/12/57.
57. Thurloe, State Papers, V, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 11/24/56, 653. For Owen and Redman: Appendix.
58. DNB: John Owen; Millicent B. Rex, University Representation in England, 1604-1690 (London and New York, 1954), pp. 159, 187-188; William A. Shaw, A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth (2 vols., London, 1960) II, 86; Burton, Diary, II, 97-98; CSPD, IX (1655-1656), 288.
59. Burton, Diary, II, 97.
60. Narrative of Late Parliament, p. 14.
61. Commons Journal, VII, 424, 9/18/56; Lansdowne MSS, 421, f. 247, 10/56.
62. CSP, Ireland, VIII, Rawdon to Conway, 1/23/58, 660.
63. For Jones and Fiennes: Appendix. For Jones' land grant: Commons Journal, VII, 543, 573, 577; Burton, Diary, II, 304. For projected land deal in Wales: Joseph Mayer, "Inedited Letters of Cromwell, Col. Jones, Bradshaw and other Regicides," Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, New Series, I (1860-1861), 221-256, as quoted in H. J. Habakkuk, "The Parliamentary Army and the Crown Lands," Welsh History Review, III (1966-1967). Fienne's land grant: CSP, Ireland, VIII, 849.
64. Appendix: Commons Journal, VII, 419. For Ellinor Jephson's claim: CSP, Ireland, VIII, 626-627.
65. Burton, Diary, II, 197; Chapter V,
66. Chapter V, pp. 251-253. Burton, Diary, II, 197-200, 224; For usual interpretation of Fleetwood's refusal, Firth, Protectorate, II, 161.

FVI-6

67. Commons Journal, VII, 577.

68. Petty, Reflections upon some Persons and Things in Ireland,
p. 84.

69. Habakkuk, "Public Finance"; Christopher Hill, The Century
of Revolution (New York, 1961), 161; Ashley, Financial Policy, pp. 98,
104.

C-1

CONCLUSION

The failure of Oliver Cromwell's parliaments stemmed from a lack of a political philosophy that would provide a rationale for his regime, rather than from an omission of employment of political techniques. Proof of this is that the most important issue that arose was his proposed assumption of the crown. The extensive use of electoral and parliamentary management, the development of parliamentary procedure, and the use of patronage particularly in Irish land refute H. R. Trevor-Roper's thesis that the members of these parliaments did not in sufficient numbers support the Lord Protector simply because he failed to employ the traditional management techniques.¹ Historians have always been inclined to look upon the Protectorate period as an aberration, unrelated to the course of England's constitutional development;² parliamentary management as here presented places Cromwell's parliaments firmly in the continuum of the development of the early modern house of commons.

The leaders of the Court always recognized the need for electoral management in order to secure a working majority in parliament. The franchise and apportionment provisions of the Instrument of Government were designed to enfranchise their supporters and disenfranchise their opponents. Relying on these provisions and failing to organize any local political activity, the Court elected only two-fifths of the members of the House in 1654. This lesson was not lost when the decision was made to convene parliament in 1656.

C-2

Prominent Court officials ran in several constituencies at the same time in order to ensure their elections. Others were placed in safe university seats, an early Stuart innovation continued after the Restoration.³ Under the leadership of the major-generals, extensive local political activity was undertaken, of the type that had been employed since the Tudor period by the lord lieutenant of the county.⁴ Court supporters were placed in local offices, and Court candidates were backed during the elections. In the boroughs, where the outcome of the parliamentary elections depended upon the attitude of the officials of the governing corporation, every effort was made to ensure the presence of officials who were Court supporters. The Stuarts were to pursue this same policy after the Restoration.⁵

Even when there was no election or the election had produced unsatisfactory results, the Court used political devices to create a body of supporters. The famous exclusions, although examples of outright military interference, were nevertheless also legalistic devices to create a body of supporters. A contemporary pamphleteer, citing precedent, argued that the Lord Protector was empowered to bar members of parliament who would disturb the peace of the state, saying, "It appertaineth to the Prince to prevent all causes of dissension in the Commonwealth, for he is the supreme 'conservator pacis' and by the advice of his Council may bar, and frustrate the Election of those whose malignancy and dissatisfaction to the state, he hath received certain and infallible intelligence and that by way of preventing future discord and distraction;--and accordingly in the turbulent time of Henry the third,--the wise king called the best affected onely to Parliament."⁶ In 1654, the subscription to the recognition of the

C-3

basic form of government was thought of not as outright exclusion, but as enforcement of a provision in the certificate of election of each member. In 1656, the Court again attempted to give legal form to the exclusion, and asserted that the excludées were disqualified by a provision of the Instrument of Government.⁷ Thurloe's attempts in 1658 to guarantee a good attendance by members of the Court when the second session of the second parliament was convened is also a case in point. Even more important is the Lord Protector's insistence that the appointments to the Other House be kept solely in his own hands. He used this power not only to appoint loyal supporters, but also to rid the House of disloyal and inactive members.

The Court used parliamentary procedure also in its efforts to establish political control of the House. When the speaker of the 1654 parliament did not succeed in maintaining control, a new speaker, loyal to the Court was appointed, continuing the Tudor policy of using the speaker as a servant of the crown.⁸ The new speaker used every possible procedural device to ensure the passage of the Court's legislative program, and was assisted by the clerk, also a Court appointee. A provision of the Instrument of Government which named the members of the council of state made it impossible to follow the Tudor custom of using all the councillors as parliamentary managers for the crown. Instead, the Lord Protector had his own agents in the House who oversaw the progress of the sections of the legislative program in which he was especially interested. His son, Henry Cromwell, used his commanding position in Ireland to place his agents in the House as well; they supervised the legislative activities

C-4

of the Irish members and supported his father's programs. When the Court was in control of the House, its members were appointed to the committee chairmanships as in Elizabethan times and the House was permitted to go into grand committee only under the chairmanship of a loyal Court supporter.⁹

Patronage was used extensively, as in the eighteenth-century parliaments, to secure the support and cooperation of the members.¹⁰ Members of the council of state, as well as other prominent members of the Court who sat in Parliament, held lucrative appointments. Irish land, won in the recent Cromwellian conquest, was used to reward favored members.

The Victorian interpretation of Samuel R. Gardiner, which attributes the failure of the Protectorate experiment to the fact that the nation had not been educated in political thought,¹¹ remains valid. Although they had rebelled against the arbitrary rule of Charles I, Englishmen were not able, except for the numerically insignificant republicans, to grasp the idea of a government without a king. The Lord Protector could hardly conceive of a government without "something monarchial"¹² in it. The Country and all but the military members of the Court warmly supported the proposals that the Lord Protector assume the crown.

The Lord Protector, asserting an indifference to what form a government should take, nevertheless tended to think in terms of a monarchy.¹³ As early as 1651, he said that "a settlement of somewhat with monarchical power in it would be very effectual."¹⁴ He was at first inclined to favor the kingship proposals which originated

C-5

with his closest supporters and finally refused them only because of the opposition of the military.¹⁵ Named in the constitution the "Lord Protector," a traditional term implying the impending presence of a monarch, Cromwell was always referred to as "His Highness." His sons and closest associates were addressed as "Lord." He knighted thirty-five of his most loyal supporters and created twelve baronets, a baron, and a viscount.¹⁶ Faced with a troublesome house of commons, his traditional solution was to establish an Other House, a substitute for the House of lords.

All but the military members of parliament embraced with delight the idea that the Lord Protector assume the crown. This idea, which originated with a group of Court members, was immediately warmly supported by the Country. Their delight was a preview of the emotions with which they welcomed the Restoration.

No acceptable political theory had been developed to justify the existence of the Protectorate form of government and counter the obsessive distrust of power that characterized both the Country and the republicans. Milton, disillusioned by the course of events, was silent. When Harrington discussed the desirability of a balance of power between the branches of the government, he alluded only to the relationship of these branches to the economic distribution of power within the nation. No theorists defended the desirability of such a balance, as a group of Court writers were to do in the 1740's, while vindicating the influence of the Crown in parliament. Locke's "contract" theory, whereby the people gave up certain freedoms in return for protection, was still in the future. Only the Hobbesian

C-6

doctrine, which, like that of the Protector, held the form of government to be irrelevant and which justified force to alleviate disorder, was perhaps adequate. But the Puritan Court detested Hobbes.¹⁷ A member of the Court, testifying before a parliamentary committee, branded the "Leviathan" as "a most poisonous piece of atheism."¹⁸

Devoid of significant intellectual support, the Court propounded several mutually contradictory theories to justify the existence of the government. The official doctrine, expounded by a group of second-string political theorists, was that the regime rested upon the consent of the people. However, since various sections of the population had been restrained by superior force, this theory was never completely tenable, and another group argued, in the manner of Hobbes that any "de facto" power was entitled to obedience. Neither the Lord Protector nor his followers wanted to admit that their regime was founded upon military might; so, although the claim of possession by conquest was never completely given up, it was subordinated to a general-welfare theory based upon the benefits that the government bestowed upon the people.

Both the Lord Protector and his followers were happiest with the argument that the government was founded upon the consent of the people. In addressing the first Protectorate parliament, Cromwell stated that the people had called him to be Lord Protector and that all their rights and liberties were provided for in the Instrument of Government. John Goodwin, an Independent minister, also cited the Instrument of Government, saying that it secured the peoples' rights. Pamphleteers and members of parliament generally found it

C-7

necessary, however, to fall back upon certain "de facto" recognitions as evidence of consent. They cited the presence of important military figures, judges, London officials, and the commissioners of the Great Seal, when Cromwell was invested with the title of Lord Protector; the appointment of justices, commissioners, sheriffs, and grand juries; the renewal of charters;¹⁹ and the "addresses and approbation of the nation from several counties and cities,"²⁰ naming, especially London and York. Of special importance as a sign of recognition of the regime was the election of members to the parliaments and their signed certificates of election.²¹

The Hobbesian argument always presented the Court with difficulties. The Lord Protector abhorred the doctrine. He ordered "The Grounds of Obedience," written by Thomas White, a friend of Hobbes, which expounded the theory that possession was the only right to power, to be burned. Nevertheless, the legend goes that when Harrington asked the Protector to erect a commonwealth, he replied that he would not quit the power he had won by the sword for a little paper shot.²² Cromwell's supporters in the House repeatedly stated that he could not be expected to give up the powers he had won, saying, "it could not be expected that he would lay down his sword, and subject himself to the will of a Parliament."²³ John Goodwin attempted to solve the difficulty in the same terms monarchs had used when asserting divine right, saying that the people should obey their Protector as children obey parents and that they should obey the magistrate as commanded by Paul.²⁴ Michael Hawke, another contemporary pamphleteer, quoted Grotius as saying, "A private man ought by no means to take

C-8

upon himself to judge, but follow the Possession."²⁵

Finally, the Court was forced to resort to the general-welfare doctrine. Since the use of force made the consent theory untenable and since the Hobbesian theory was disliked as atheistic, Court pamphleteers argued that the people were benefited, regardless of their desires. This argument was necessary to justify the suppression of Penruddock's rising in 1655, the 1656 exclusion of the recalcitrant members, and the arrests of such prominent republicans as Sir Henry Vane, Thomas Harrison, and Robert Overton.

Court apologists eulogized the provisions of the Instrument of Government as conducive to the general welfare. Marchamont Needham, the official pamphleteer, wrote that the peoples' safety and freedom were well preserved in this document. Anonymous pamphlets argued that more people were represented in the Protectorate parliaments than in the Rump. Certain features of the constitution were said to make government under its aegis better for the people than royal government. Especially commended were: triennial parliaments, the new franchise, the disqualification of rebels, the suspensive veto, the provision forbidding the dissolution of parliament for five months without the consent of the members, the provision for succession by election, the need for parliamentary consent to impose taxation, dispose of the militia, and make war or peace, and the increased religious freedom.²⁶

The most convincing general-welfare argument was the relative stability achieved by the Cromwellian regime. Samuel Richardson, a Baptist pamphleteer, wrote, "I doe from my heart believe, that it is

C-9

best for this whole Nation, to bee content with this Government, and quietly to sit down under it, and to thanke God that things are no worse than they are."²⁷

Since all these doctrines were basically unsatisfactory, the nation, as a whole, turned to tradition as a justification for action. The only truly accepted doctrine was that of the Country--belief in and reverence for the ancient constitution. This took the place of any logically developed political theory. It was, for the time being, an adequate substitute; for, if no precedent existed, an innovation could always be explained by resorting to the mythical past.

Lacking any adequate theory of its own, the Court was forced to resort to this doctrine, when the Lord Protector was considering the assumption of the crown. One of his supporters urged him to accept the offer, saying, "Those Governments are best which are upon proof and long experience of our ancestors."²⁸ Marchamont Needham wrote that experiments had been in vain and that the best course was "to revert upon the old bottom and foundation."²⁹ A collection of prophecies, allegedly a thousand years old, was published in a contemporary newsletter, tracing Cromwell's descent from the ancient princes of Britain and "clearly manifesting that he is the conqueror those ancient prophecies speak of."³⁰ Although Cromwell refused the crown, he relied upon the same doctrine to justify his enhanced powers in the new constitution, saying, "That which brought me into the capacity I now stand in, was the Petition and Advice given me by you, who in reference to the ancient Constitution did draw me to accept of the place of Protector."³¹

C-10

Reverence for the ancient constitution and for the monarchy that was a vital part of it was so strong that there is little doubt that, if the Lord Protector had accepted the offer of the crown, his line would have been legitimized. Contemporary pamphleteers listed the English kings who had seized the throne by force and whose title was recognized after they were crowned. They recommended implicitly that the Lord Protector adopt this procedure. "So Henry the Fourth," Hawke wrote, "with one party of this nation, conquered Richard the Second and his party, after which conquest he was made King of England--and so Henry the Seventh--conquered Richard the Third."³²

Although the seventeenth century is renowned for innovation, it was still heavily wedded to tradition. Cromwell's unwillingness or inability because of military opposition to accept the crown proved to be the downfall of his line and enabled the Stuarts to return after his death. His acceptance would have put his government in the mainstream of the ancient constitution, still the most potent intellectual force of his time.

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. H. R. Trevor-Roper, "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments," Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier, ed. by Richard Pares (London, 1956), pp. 11, 12.

2. Ibid. "The failure to recognize that the same political techniques were used in the localities; the disassociation of the Cromwellian policy of borough charter manipulation from that of the early Stuarts (J. H. Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability in England [Middlesex, 1967], p. 62, n); the conclusion that the Interregnum was an interruption in the natural development of York parliamentary representation (Roy Carroll, "The Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire" [unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964], p. 336); the lack of interest in relating Protectorate political groupings and ideas to late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century developments (J.G.H. Pocock, "Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII, 3d series [October, 1965]).

3. Millicent Rex, University Representation in England (London and New York, 1954), pp. 143-220; Vernon F. Snow, "Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution," English Historical Review, LXXIV (1959), 411.

4. Sir John Neale, The Elizabethan House of Commons (London, 1949), pp. 27-42.

5. Plumb, Political Stability, p. 62; Christopher Hill, The Century of Revolution (New York, 1961), p. 236.

6. Michael Hawke, Killing Is Murder (London, 1657), p. 4.

7. Samuel R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution (Oxford, 1889), pp. 410, 412; Commons Journal, VII, 368, 9/18/54; 426, 9/22/56.

8. Josef Redlich, The Procedure of the House of Commons (3 vols., London, 1908), II, 157-158.

9. Wallace Notestein, "The Winning of the Initiative in the House of Commons," Studies in History, ed. by Lucy S. Sutherland (London, 1966), pp. 162-165.

10. E. N. Williams, The Eighteenth Century Constitution (Cambridge, 1965), p. 174; Betty Kemp, King and Commons, 1660-1832 (London, 1957), pp. 53-64, 153-158.

FC-2

11. Samuel R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate (4 vols., London, 1903), III, 193.

12. Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials of the English Affairs (4 vols., Oxford, 1853), III, 374.

13. The Clarke Papers, ed. by C. H. Firth (4 vols., London, 1891-1901), I, 396.

14. Whitelocke, Memorials, pp. 372-374.

15. The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, ed. by David Laing (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1842), II, 419.

16. For Cromwell's title: The Diary of Thomas Burton, ed. by John Towill Rutt (4 vols., London, 1828), I, II, *passim*; J. S. Roskell, "The Office and Dignity of Lord Protector of England," English Historical Review, LXVIII (April, 1953). Use of titles: "Lord Claypole" (Burton, Diary, I, 77); "Lord Richard Cromwell" (*ibid.*, p. 84); "Lord Strickland," (*ibid.*, p. 87); "Lord Lambert," "Lord Whitelock," (*ibid.* p. 127). For his creations: Wilbur Cortez Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (4 vols., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945), IV, 952-953.

17. For Milton: Perez Zagorin, A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution (London, 1954), pp. 113-117. For Harrington: Caroline Robbins, The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman (Cambridge, 1961), p. 34; Charles Blitzer, An Immortal Commonwealthman (New Haven, 1960), *passim*. For the 1740s, Pocock, "English Political Ideologies," p. 578. For Hobbes, Zagorin, Political Thought, pp. 181, 429.

18. Burton, Diary, I, 349.

19. Abbott, Writings, III, 452, 587; Zagorin, Political Thought, p. 86; Hawke, Killing, pp. 8, 14.

20. Burton, Diary, I, xxix.

21. Ibid.

22. G. P. Gooch, English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, 1954), p. 199; Zagorin, Political Thought, p. 142, quoting introduction by John Toland to Life of James Harrington, Works, XVII.

23. Burton, Diary, I, xxvi.

24. John Goodwin, or Dissatisfaction Satisfied (London, 1654), pp. 4, 10.

25. Hawke, Killing, p. 10.

FC-3

26. Marchamont Needham, A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth, 1654, as quoted in Zagorin, Political Thought, p. 88; A Letter from a Person in the Countrey to his friend in the City upon a book entitled A healing question (June 14, 1656), pp. 9, 17; A True State, p. 30.

27. Samuel Richardson, Apology for the Present Government (London, 1654).

28. Burton, Diary, I, 363, 1/19/57.

29. Mercurius politicus #26, quoted in Zagorin, Political Thought, p. 127.

30. Mercurius politicus #392, quoted in Burton, Diary, II, 424, n.

31. Ibid., p. 465, 2/4/58.

32. Hawke, Killing, pp. 11, 13. This same idea is echoed by John Hall in The True Cavalier (London, 1656), pp. 113-116, 118-120, 122-124.

Ap 1

APPENDIX

POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
PROTECTORATE PARLIAMENTS

The political affiliations of the members of the Protectorate parliaments have been determined by means of the information that follows. This includes factual data about each member drawn both from the parliamentary records and from other primary sources, as well as the stands the member took on various key issues. Almost three-quarters of the members of the 1654-1655 session have been identified as belonging to a particular group. Since better records are available for the 1656-1658 parliament, more than nine-tenths of its membership can be politically identified.

These identifications rely primarily on the member's activities during the course of the Protectorate parliaments. In no way do they pretend to be complete biographies. Often further material about the individual member can be found in the Dictionary of National Biography or in studies of the Long Parliament, if he was a member of that body. Such information has not been included here because activity during the Civil War period or in 1660, such as membership in the Presbyterian or Independent parties, exclusion in 1648, acting as a regicide in 1649, or supporting the Restoration, is not a trustworthy indication of political affiliation in the 1654-1658 period. These are the indications most generally relied upon for identification of party membership

Ap 2

by an earlier study, Margaret Tibbetts' "Parliamentary Parties Under Oliver Cromwell." Further identifications are made here: Tibbetts' dissertation identifies only 276 members; while 487 are listed here.

However, here as in Tibbetts' dissertation, holding government office is taken to be a sign of Court affiliation unless there is strong indication to the contrary. Very few Country members or republicans held government office during the Protectorate period. Table I supports this contention; it charts the members of parliament who held government office (central government) during the time of the two Protectorate parliaments, presenting a count of both those who held civilian office and those who were military officers (excluding militia). There is some overlapping; men who held both civilian and military office have been counted twice. The major-generals and military governors are recorded as military officers.

TABLE I

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO HELD GOVERNMENT OFFICES

	<u>Civilian Office</u>	<u>Army Office</u>
Civilian Court	91	72
Military Court	14	22
Country	6	
Republicans	5	13

The descriptive categories are divided into two classes. "Membership" lists factual data. "Issues" lists controversial issues that came before the House; the positions that a member took on these issues are trustworthy indications of his political affiliations. A

Ap 3

key to the sources most frequently cited follows:

Table II lists the total number of members in each group and is followed by the key. The Instrument of Government, under the terms of which these members were elected (Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, pp. 407-408, 422-424) provided for a body of 460 members, but all the seats were never filled.

TABLE II

Parliament of 1654-1655

	<u>Borough</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Irish and Scottish</u>	<u>Total</u>
Court	58	81	44	183
Country	31	76	--	107
Republicans	17	7	7	31
Unknown	28	80	--	108
	—	—	—	—
	134	244	51	429

Parliament of 1656-1658

	<u>Borough</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Irish and Scottish</u>	<u>Total</u>
Court	65	119	56	240
Country	39	100	1	140
Republicans	12	15	2	29
Unknown	11	29	--	40
	—	—	—	—
	127	263	59	449

KEY TO DESCRIPTIVE DATE

Membership

1 - First Protectorate Parliament (September 3, 1654 - January 3, 1655)

2 - Second Protectorate Parliament (First session - September 19, 1656 - June 26, 1657. Second session - January 20, 1658 - February 4, 1658)

Ex - Excluded in 1656. There are four lists of excluded members which vary in number, so that not every excluded member is on all the lists. They are noted as follows:

CJ - Commons Journal VII, 425, also printed in
Thurloe V, 453. 65 names.

NLP - "A Narrative of the Late Parliament" in
Harleian Miscellany, Vol. III, 442.
89 names.

SP - State Papers 18/130, Public Record Office.
From the papers of Secretary Nicholas.
95 names.

T MSS - Tanner Manuscripts 52, f. 156 in the
Bodleian Library. Probably by John Hobart.
105 names.

OH - Appointment to the Other House by the Protector in 1658.

ID - Irish delegation. Pro-Court in the first Protectorate parliament. (Chapter V, p. 245).

SD - Scottish delegation. In the first Protectorate parliament, this delegation was solidly pro-Court. (Chapter V, p. 224).

NLP - A Narrative of the Late Parliament (see above). A republican pamphlet printed while the second Protectorate parliament was in session which lists members of the parliament who held office or received some kind of patronage from the state and who therefore, according to the author, were Court supporters. Although extremely biased, it contains priceless information. Some republican army officers are listed, but inclusion on it can usually be considered a sign of Court affiliation.

2nd NLP - "A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament" in Harleian Miscellany, III. Another piece of republican propaganda which lists the names of forty-three members of parliament who were taken out of the House and appointed to the Other House in 1658. Also biased, with much valuable information.

HC - Henry Cromwell, correspondence to and from the Protector's son in Ireland.

Issues

Positions on these issues are trustworthy indications of political affiliation.

A and O - Acts and Ordinances passed by parliament and the council of state between 1642 and 1653. The Court wished them all to be approved collectively while the Country wished each to be considered separately.

CAEC - Collection of assessments out of exchequer course. The Court supported this efficient although extra-legal method of collecting the assessments. The Country opposed it. (Chapter VI, p. 282).

Exclusion - The exclusion on September 19, 1656 of the recalcitrant members of the second Protectorate parliament. It was supported by the Court and opposed by the Country, whose members wanted those excluded to be readmitted. (Chapter III, p. 150).

ILG - Irish land grant. Members of the Court supported grants of Irish land to Court favorites, the Country and republicans opposed them. (Chapter VI, p. 268).

IPP - Increased powers to the Protector. At the expense of parliamentary power and privilege. Supported by the Court and opposed by the Country and the republicans. (Chapter II, p. 91).

KC - Kingship Committee. From the Narrative of the Late Parliament and reproduced in Monarchy Asserted, a contemporary tract which described the endeavours to persuade the Protector to accept the crown. A list of ninety-nine members appointed by the House on April 9, 1657 to persuade the Protector to accept the crown and the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice.

KL - Kingship List. Also from Monarchy Asserted. It lists the names of one hundred and twenty-one members of parliament, described as "kinglings," who voted on February 25, 1657 against dissolving the House into grand committee and thereby made possible the discussion of Cromwell's assumption of the crown.

MA - Merchant Adventurers - A chartered trading company. Their members in the House supported the kingship proposals in return for Court support in their dispute with the Clothworkers. (Chapter III, pp. 153-154).

Ap 7

MB - Militia Bill. Bill introduced on December 25, 1656, to support the militia by a permanent annual tax on ex-royalists and thus perpetuate the rule of the major-generals. It was supported by the Military Court and opposed by the Country. The Civilian Court was divided over it. Later on, its adherents generally opposed the kingship proposal, a contemporary observer stating that "It was the distinguishing character of those that were against the Bill that they were for hereditary rank." (BI, 321)

NF - New franchise, the £200 franchise provided for in the Instrument of Government. The Court wished to retain it while the Country wished to abolish it. (Chapter I, pp. 27-28).

Oaths - Oaths to support the new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, which was adopted in 1657. The Civilian Court was in favor of members of parliament and of the council of state taking these oaths. The republicans and the Military Court opposed this position. Their attitude is summarized by Archibald Johnston of Warriston who said that the oaths were, "designed by som to debarre honest men from publik imployments and to be a purge of their airmye afterward." (Warriston III, 86)

OH - Other House. Established according to the terms of the Humble Petition and Advice in 1657. In the 1658 session, the republicans attempted to eliminate this second chamber by changing the constitution. The Court resisted this move while the Country was split.

One of 29 - Taken from a list of twenty-nine members who voted on September 23, 1656 to readmit the excluded members. Tanner Manuscripts liii, f. 166 in the Bodleian Library.

Ap 8

Recognition of the basic form of government

As a result of republican obstructionism in 1654, members of the first Protectorate parliament were required by the Lord Protector to subscribe to this Recognition on September 12, 1654 if they were to continue to sit in the House. The reactions to this demand indicate political allegiance:

ERR - Early return after Recognition. Immediate compliance with the Lord Protector's request, a sign of Court affiliation. (Chapter III, p. 130).

RR - Refusal to sign Recognition. The consequent abstention from the House denotes republicanism. (Chapter II, p. 91).

LRR - Late Return after Recognition. Hesitation and finally delayed subscription indicate Country affiliation. (Chapter III, p. 130).

Rem. vs. Excl. - Remonstrance against Exclusion. This list is printed in Whitelock's Memorials. It has been asserted (Ralph C. H. Catterall, "A Suspicious Document in Whitelock's Memorials," English Historical Review, XIV, [1901], 737-739) that this list was drawn up by republican propagandists after the Exclusion in 1656, was never made public, and that all the signatures are not authentic. However, since no prominent members of the Court are listed, inclusion on it is at least a sign of disaffection.

SFP, Res., Rems. - Scottish franchise provisions, Resolutioners, Remonstrants. The Scottish Resolutioners and members of the Civilian

Sp 9

Court were in favor of a liberalization of these provisions in the Humble Petition and Advice in order to allow more Scots to vote and run for office. The Scottish Remonstrants and the Military Court were against this extension of the franchise. (Chapter V, p. 232).

SMB - Substantial military budget. Favored by the Court, opposed by the Country. (Chapter III, p. 129).

Key to sources most frequently cited

Abbott - Abbott, Wilbur, C. The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.

A and O - Firth, C. H. and Rait, R. S. (eds.). Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum.

Akerman - Akerman, John Y. (ed.). Letters from Roundhead Officers Written from Scotland and Chiefly Addressed to Captain Adam Baynes.

Archaeologica - Ellis, Henry (ed.). "Transcripts of Three Letters Illustrative of English History," Archaeologica XXIV (1832), 137-147.

Ashley, RCP - Ashley, Maurice. Financial and Commercial Policy under the Cromwellian Protectorate.

Baillie - Laing, David (ed.). The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie.

Brunton and Pennington - Brunton, D. and Pennington, D. H. Members of the Long Parliament.

Burney - Burney Collection of Newspapers Manuscript.

B - Rutt, John, Towill (ed.). Diary of Thomas Burton.

CCSP - Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library.

CSPD - Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1649-1660.

CSP, Ireland - Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers--Ireland, 1603-1670.

Ap 10

- CSPV - Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers --Venice.
- Carroll - Carroll, Roy. "The Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire."
- Carte - Carte, Thomas (ed.). A Collection of Original Letters and Papers --among the Duke of Ormonde's Papers.
- Clarendon Papers - State Papers Collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon.
Edited by R. Scrope and Thomas Monkhouse.
- Coate - Coate, Mary. Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum.
- CJ - Great Britain. Parliament. Journals of the House of Commons.
 Volume VII.
- EHR - English Historical Review.
- F.-Firth, Charles H. The Last Years of the Protectorate.
- Firth, S and P - Firth, Charles H. Scotland and the Protectorate.
- Firth and Davies - Firth, Charles H. and Davies, Godfrey. Regimental History of Cromwell's Army.
- Gardiner - Gardiner, Samuel R. History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.
- Heath's Chronicle - Heath, James. A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine Wars in the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland.
- HMCRC - Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.
- Lans MSS. - Lansdowne Manuscripts.
- Ludlow - Firth, Charles H. (ed.). The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow.
- "Monarchy Asserted" - "Monarchy asserted to be the best, most ancient and legal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the Late Lord Somers.
- NLP - "A Narrative of the Late Parliament," Thomason Tract E 935 (5).
- 2nd NLP - "A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament." Harleian Miscellany. Edited by Thomas Park. Volume 3.
- OR - Official Return. Great Britain, House of Commons, Members of Parliament. Vol. I, Part I--known as Official Return.

Ap 11

- Pearl - Pearl, Valerie. London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution.
- Pinckney - Pinckney, Paul J. "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656."
- Pinckney, SR - Pinckney, Paul J. "The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656."
- Pinckney, CE - "The Cheshire Elections of 1656."
- PRO Lists and Indexes 9 - Great Britain. Public Records Office.
List of Sheriffs for England and Wales.
- Scot. Statutes - Scotland. Laws, Statutes. The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government during the Commonwealth.
- Stephen - Stephen, William (ed.). Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry.
- Terry - Terry, C. Stanford (ed.). The Cromwellian Union.
- Thurloe - Birch, Thomas (ed.). A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe.
- TT - Thomason Tracts.
- Tibbetts - Tibbetts, Margaret. "Parliamentary Parties under Oliver Cromwell."
- Vaughan - Vaughan, Robert (ed.). The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell--illustrated in a series of letters between Dr. John Pell,-- Sir Samuel Morland, Sir William Lockhart, Mr. Secretary Thurloe.
- VCH - Victoria History of the Counties of England. Edited by W. Page, H. A. Doubleday and others.
- Warriston - Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston, 1632-39, 1650-54, 1655-60. Ed. by G. M. Paul, D. H. Fleming, and J. D. Ogilvie.
- Weyman - Weyman, Stanley J. "Oliver Cromwell's Kinsfolk," English Historical Review VI (1891), 48-60.
- Yule - Yule, George. The Independents in the English Civil War.

G-1

THE CIVILIAN COURT

Supporters of Court positions: a strong executive, a tolerationist religious policy, a large army with sufficient taxation to support it and a vigorous foreign policy. A large number of these men held government or army office and were related by blood or long association to the Lord Protector.

Somersetshire

John Ashe

1, 2 KL. Moves that Cromwell assume the crown (BI, 362).
Thurloe urges him to be present at second session in
1658 (Thurloe VI, Ashe to Thurloe, 12/28/57, 709).
Pro-OH (BII, 400).

Ireland

William Aston

2 KL. KC. Army officer (NLP, 13). In favor of
granting land in Ireland to Court favorites, Broghill
(BII, 178) and Fleetwood (BII, 197). Pro-MP oath
(BII, 196). Assists Henry Cromwell's agents in intro-
ducing bills for Ireland (BI, 95; BII, 163, 200).

Surrey

Lewis Audley

2 KC. Deputy major-general (NLP, 15).

London

Samuel Avery

1 Governor of MA, 1654. Pro-NF (teller, CJ, 391).

Ipswich

Francis Bacon

1, 2 Master of Requests at £500/year (NLP, 10). KL. KC.
Pro-OH, 2/3/58 (BII, 429). ERR (Archaeologica, XXIV, 140).

C-2

- Ipswich Nathaniel Bacon
- 1, 2 Master of Requests at 1500/year (NLP, 10). Pro-OH, 2/3/58 (BII, 428). ERR (Archaeologica, XXIV, 140). Chairman of grand committee, September 7-11, 1654 (CJ 367; Chapter IV, p. 198). Pro-kingship: KL, KC, in debates, 4/23/57 (BII, 8,9).
- Worcestershire Talbot Badger
- 1 Captain of militia for Major-general Berry (Tibbetts, 217).
- Maldstone John Banks, Jr.
- 1, 2 Navy victualler, a government office (Kent Archives office, Aylesford Papers, as quoted in Pinckney, 265).
- Scotland David Barclay
- 1, 2 Commissioner for forfeited royalist estates (DNB). SD. It is uncertain whether he was in favor (KL) or anti-kingship (CCSP III, Drummond to Lockhart, 3/2/57, 767).
- Colchester John Barkstead
- 1
- Middlesex Major-general. Knighted, 1/19/56 (Abbott V, 952).
- 2
- OH Steward of Cromwell's household (DNB).
- Huntingdon John Barnard
- 2 Supported by brother-in-law, Nicholas Pedley (VCH, Huntingdon II, 29), a member of the Court (see: Pedley).
- Richmond Dr. John Bathurst
- 2 KL. Cromwell's personal physician (DNB).
- Scotland Richard Beake
- 2 SD. Captain of Cromwell's lifeguards and married to

C-3

his niece (Carte, 81; NLP, 17).

Coventry

Robert Beake

1, 2

Admiralty commissioner at £500/year (Abbott, IV, 954).
 KL. KC. NLP, 15. Pro-OH (BII, 414). Renewal of
 kingship efforts in 1658 (BII, 377 ff.). As mayor of
 Coventry, worked closely with Major-general Whalley
 (MSS diary microfilmed for Yale University library from
 original mss. among Coventry corporation records).
 Agent for pro-Court Scottish Res. after Sharpe's de-
 parture (Stephen II, Sharpe to Douglas, 10/6/57).

Bedfordshire

Samuel Bedford

1, 2

KC. KL. Receiver of the revenues at £500/year
 (NLP, 16). Court teller in favor of £200 franchise,
 11/27/54, CJ, 392. Chapter I, pp. 23-27.

Derby

Gervase Bennet

1, 2

KL. Committee on preservation of excise and customs
 at £300/year, "great place" in wine office, committee
 of the army (NLP, 16). Militia commissioner (Thurloe
 IV, Whalley to Thurloe, 2/7/55, 12).

Ireland

Tristram Beresford

2

KL. Army officer (NLP, 13). Henry Cromwell praises
 his loyalty (Thurloe V, HC to Thurloe, 10/6/56, 477-478).

Gloucestershire

George Berkeley

1, 2

Pro-kingship (CJ, 530) and pro-OH tellership (BII, 344).

C-4

Pro-Court in debate on granting temporary supply
(BII, 29).

Worcester-
shire

James Berry

Major-general (NLP, 11). KC.

2

OH

Shaftesbury

John Bingham

1, 2

KL. Governor of Guernsey (NLP, 14). Strong supporter of Protector (Thurloe III, 122). Financial gain through association with Committee for Compounding (Brunton and Pennington, 171).

Surrey

John Blackwell

2

Treasurer of the army at £600/year (NLP, 11). Rewarded with Irish land (Chapter VI, p. 281). Court teller, June 9, 15, 25, 1657 (CJ, 551, 557, 573).

Eastlow and
Westlow

John Blackmore

1

Cromwell said of him, "A godly man and good soldier" (as quoted in Tibbetts, 218).

Peterborough

Alexander Blake

1

Receiver of the revenues at £300/year (NLP, 16).

Northampton-
shire

Supported by Major-general Boteler in 1656 election (Pinckney, 116).

2

C-5

Bridgwater

Robert Blake

1 Noted admiral. As general at sea received salary of
 Taunton £1,095 (NLP, 15). Court satisfied with his election
 2 in 1656 (Thurloe V, Desborough to the Protector,
 8/12/56, 302).

Ireland

Richard Blaney

2 ID.

Anglesey

Griffith Bodurda

2 "A Commissioner of the Wine Office and an advocate of
 the projected royalty" (NLP, 15). KL. Pro-kingship
 in debates (BI, 365; BII, 9). Pro-OH (BII, 393, 430).
 Court teller (CJ, 573).

Hardness

Thomas Boone

1 Ambassador to Russia (Yule, 89).

Poole

Edward Boteler

2 Receiver of the revenues at £300/year (NLP, 16).

Isle of Wight

Thomas Bowreman

2 KL. Deputy governor of Isle of Wight with command of
 one or two regiments of foot (NLP, 14).

Ireland

Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill

1, 2 Leading Court teller in 1654-1655 parliament (Chapter
 OH III, p. 133). Leading opponent of MB and proponent
 of kingship (FI III). KL. President of council in

C-6

Scotland at £1,000/year and colonel of horse in Ireland at £474 (NLP, 15). Rewarded with Irish land (BII, 75, ff).

Cornwall William Braddon

2 County troop (NLP, 14).

Scotland Benjamin Bressey

1 SD. Captain in English army (Terry, lvi).

Ireland John Brett

2 ID. Army officer (Pinckney, 342).

Dunwich Francis Brewster

2 Highly commended by Major-general Haynes (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 7/19/56, 230).

Worcestershire John Bridge

1 Captain of a foot company (NL, 13). Praised as a

Ireland "very honest, sober man" (Thurloe V, Thurloe to HC,

2 undated, 316). Proponent of kingship: KL; KC; early suggestion that Cromwell be given power to name own successor (Chapter V, p. 253).

Chipping Tobias Bridge
Wycombe

2 Major-general (NLP, 11). KL. MA (BI, 309).

Yorkshire Sir John Bright

West Riding Governor of Hull. A follower of General Lambert

1 (DNB; CSPV, 31, Gieverina to the Doge, 8/24/57, p. 103).

C-7

Great Yarmouth	William Burton
2	Navy commissioner (Abbott IV, 954). KL. KC.
Westmoreland	Thomas Burton
2	KC. Diarist of second Protectorate parliament.
Grantham	William Bury
1	Member Irish Council (Ludlow I, 394); recommended by Henry Cromwell to be its vice-president (Thurloe VI, HC to Thurloe, 7/15/57, 404).
Ireland	John Bysse
2	KL (NLP, 14). Vouched for by Henry Cromwell (Thurloe V, HC to Thurloe, 7/15/57, 477).
Ireland	William Cadogan
1	ID. Governor of Trim (DNB).
Westminster	Edward Carey
2	Government office (NLP, 16). Backed by military force at 1656 election (Clarke, III, 70). Pro-Court in granting supply (BII, 26).
Wales	John Carter
Denbighshire	KL. KC. Army officer, granted £3,000 out of Prize Office for arrears through influence of Lord Chief Justice Glynn (NLP 15; BII, 304). Backs grants of Irish land to Court members, Charles Lloyd and Sir Charles Coote (CJ, 549; BII, 96). Pro-OH, opposed the republican Thomas Scott (BII, 378).
1, 2	

C-8

Cornwall

Richard Carter

1, 2

KL. Private bill passed in his favor (BII, 304).

Nottingham

James Chadwick

1

Government office (NLP, 16). "Very forward to serve

Nottingham
Town, 2

his highness" (Thurloe IV, Whalley to Thurloe, 11/7/55, 211).

Scotland

Dr. Thomas Clarges

2

Brother-in-law of General Monck (DNE). Chairman of grand committee for Court (BI, 208). Links with Res. (Chapter V, p. 236). Pro-liberalization SFP (Chapter V, p. 237 ; BII, 11, 250: Warriston II, 83).

Suffolk

John Clarke

1, 2

Colonel of foot at £365/year, commissioner of admiralty

OH

at £500/year, committee of the army, brother-in-law of secretary Thurloe, "deeply engaged to uphold the Court Interest" (NLP, 12).

Carmarthon-
shire

John Claypole

1

Son-in-law of Protector. KL. KC. Master of the horse (NLP, 16). Made baronet, 7/16/57 (Abbott IV, 952).

Northampton

2

OH

Nottinghamshire

Edward Cludd

2

Committee of the army (NLP, 16).

C-9

Scotland William, Lord Cochran

2 KL. KC.

Great Yarmouth Charles George Cocke

2 Judge of the Admiralty at £500/year, commissioner of the Prerogative Court at £300/year (NLP, 15).

Ireland John Cole

1 ID. Army officer.

Ireland Sir Charles Coote

1, 2 "Next to Broghill, ablest friend of commonwealth in Ireland" (DNB). Rewarded with Irish land (CSPD 1657-1658, 6/26/57, 16). President of Connaught (Thurloe V, HC to Thurloe, 10/14/56, 493).

Barnstaple Sir John Coplestone

2 Had a county regiment. High sheriff for 3 or 4 years. Knighted 6/1/55 (NLP, 14; Abbott IV, 952). Major-general Desborough satisfied with his election (Thurloe V, Desborough to Protector, 8/12/56, 302).

St. Albans Alban Cox

1, 2 Captain of county troop at £100/year (NLP, 14). Renewed offers of kingship in 1658 second session (BII, 437). Pro-liberalization SFP (BII, 307).

Northamptonshire Thomas Crew

2 Supported by Major-general Boteler in 1656 election

C-10

(Peter Whalley, History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire, Oxford, 1791, II, 383 as quoted in Pinckney, 116).

Gloucestershire

John Crofts

2 Has a county troop (NLP, 14).

Oxford

Richard Croke

1, 2 Took place of Court supporter, Bulstrode Whitelocke, in 1654 (OR). Pro-SMB (BII, 26, 30). KL.

Staffordshire

Thomas Crompton

1, 2 Court supporter (Underdown, Pride's Purge, 342)

Cambridge
University

Henry Cromwell

1 Son of Protector. Commander in Ireland, July, 1655; appointed lord deputy, November 1657. KL. KC.
OH

Huntingdonshire

Henry Cromwell, jr.

1, 2 Nephew of Protector. Opposes MB and casts aspersions on major-generals (BI, 369 n.; CJ 481; Court teller vs. MB, 1/29/56 (CJ 483; Thurloe VI, Gookin to Thurloe, 20-21).

Hampshire

Richard Cromwell

1 Son of Protector. Member, council of state, 12/31/57
Cambridge (FII, 7). Court teller: pro-NF (CJ, 391, 11/27/54);
University pro-SMB (CJ, 417, 1/15/54).

2

OH

C-11

Wales	Ronald Dawkins
Carmarthen-shire	Deputy major-general, governor of Carmarthen, captain of a militia troop (NLP, 14).
1, 2	
Southwark	Peter De la Noy
2	KL.
York	Sir Thomas Dickenson
1, 2	Knighted by Protector, 3/3/57 (Abbott, 952). "Strong partisan of Oliver Cromwell" (Carroll, 329).
Scotland	Samuel Desborough
1, 2	Brother of John, member of Scottish Council (NLP, 15); keeper of Great Seal of Scotland (Baillie, 318; DNB). Client of Lord Broghill (Chapter VI, p. 285): obtains seat in parliament and office through his influence (Thurloe V, Broghill to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 295; Scot. statutes, 9/27/55, 893); anti-Rem and pro-liberalization SFP; supports grant of Irish land to Broghill (BII, 177); received Irish land grant (CSP, Ireland, 814; BII, 95).
Scotland	Dr. Alex Douglas
2	KL. KC.
Scotland	George Downing
1, 2	NLP, 11, lists remunerative offices. Foreign policy missions to France, 1655, and to The Hague, 1657 (DNB).

Pro-kingship: KL. KC. Supports Ashe motion (BI, 363, 364); meeting of officers at his house to back kingship (Lans MSS 821, f. 312, Jephson to HC, 3/3/36). Friendly to Res. (Stephen II, Sharpe to Douglas, 7/14/57, 49.) Pro-ILG (BI, 260).

Surrey

Francis Drake

1, 2

KL. KC. Anti-MB: teller (CJ, 1/29/56, 483); in debates (BI, 313-314). Pro-OH (BII, 378, 409). Pro-oaths (BII, 275).

Nottingham

William Drury

2

Ex (SP, TMSS). His exclusion was probably considered an error, for he was readmitted by October 23 (CJ, 444), and Major-general Whalley had approved of his election ("For the towne of Nottingham, I have a great influence upon it: they will not chuse any without my advice." Thurloe V, Whalley to Protector, 8/11/56, 299-300).

Berkshire

Edmund Dunch

1, 2

Army officer. Related to Protector (NLP, 17). KL. KC. Made Baron Burnel (Abbott, III, 952).

Berkshire

John Dunch

1, 2

Related to Protector (Weyman, 54, NLP, 17).

Surrey

George Duncombe

II

KL.

Great Yarmouth

Thomas Dunn

- 1 Seated by Committee on Privileges on 9/21/54 after he and Major-general Goffe were chosen by the "godly," a small group of officials, while a wider body of voters chose two other candidates, Chapter I, p. 36 ; CSPD, 1654, 8/3/54; 284-285; CJ, 369; Severall Proceedings, Burney, 47, 9/26/54.

Scotland

James Earl

- 1 SD. Army colonel (Terry, lvi).

Boston

Sir William Ellis

- 1 Solicitor-general at £3,000/year (NLP, 10). Created
Grantham baronet 8/13/58 (Abbott, IV, 952). Pro-OH (BII, 418).
2

Northumberland

Robert Fenwick

- 1, 2 Either he or William Fenwick is listed in NLP, 16 as the salaried master of a hospital.

Oxfordshire

Nathaniel Fiennes

- 1 Commissioner of Great Seal. Council of State. KL.
Oxford KC. £3,000/year from offices (NLP, 9). Pro-Excl:
University teller, 9/22/56 (CJ, 426); speaks in behalf of Council
2 (CJ, 426). Speaker of Other House (CSPD, 1657-1658,
OH xii).

George Fleetwood

1 Knighthd by Protector, 9/15/56 (Abbott IV, 952).

OH

Miles Fleetwood

2 KL, KC. Clerk of the private seal at E300 or E400/
year (NLP, 10).

Thomas Foot

1, 2 KL. KC. Knighted 12/5/57 (NLP, 18; Abbot IV, 952),
probably in connection with lending money to exchequer
(Pinckney, 256). Pro-MA (BI, 221). Pro-liberalizing
SFP (6/25/57, CJ, 575).

John Fothergill

1, 2 Pro-kingship teller (CJ, 529, 5/1/57). On the same day given debentures for his arrears (BII, 95).

John Fowke

1, 2 KL. KC. Colonel of foot and governor of Drogheda
 (NLP, 12).

John Fox

1, 2 Captain of horse, governor of Pendennis Castle, married to a relative of Protector (NLP, 11). Found by Major-general of area "very hearty and cordiall" (Coate, 293).

Tobias Freere

1 ERR (BI, xxxvi). Chapter III, n. 41.

C-15

Queensborough

Augustine Gerland

- 1 Proposed that Protector assume the crown (Gardiner, III, 225, n. 2). Chapter III, p. 142.

York

John Geldart

- 2 Chosen in place of Court supporter, Sir Thomas Widdrington (OR). A commissioner to try offenders under the act for the security of the Lord Protector (Carroll, 355). Pro-MA (BI, 309).

Worcester

Edmund Giles

- 2 Married to a relative of the Protector, Master of Chancery in Ordinary, "a place of great value." (NLP, 17).

Wales

Sir John Glynn

- Flintshire Lord chief justice of upper bench (NPL, 10, 2nd NLP).
 Carnarvonshire Pro-kingship: KL, KC, long speech urging Protector
 1, 2 to assume crown ("Monarch Asserted," 359). Supported
 OH Pack motion (Ludlow, I, 22).

Ireland

Vincent Gookin

- 1, 2 Surveyor-general of Ireland (DNB). Author of The Great Case of Transplantation discussed, 1655, supporting Henry Cromwell's Irish policy. Strong supporter of Henry Cromwell (Thurloe V, Gookin to the Protector, 11/22/56, 646). KL. Rewarded with Irish land (NLP, 14, see Chapter VI, p. 295).

C-16

Taunton John Gorges
 1 KL. KC. Captain of a country troop (NLP, 14).

Somerset

2

Taunton Thomas Gorges
 1, 2 NLP, 16, Desborough satisfied with his election (Thurloe V, Desborough to the Protector, 8/2/56, 302).

Westminster Edward Grosvenor
 2 KL. KC. Quartermaster General and captain at horse pay (NLP). Backed by military force at 1656 election (Thurloe V, Waddall to Vanseare, 8/22/56, 327; Clarke III, p. 70, NLP, 11).

Leicestershire Frances Hacker
 2 KL. KC. Colonel of horse at £474/year (NLP, 11). Informant on republican plots (Chapter II, p.97).

Gloucestershire Sir Matthew Hale
 1 Chief justice of Commons Pleas. Attempted to effect a compromise on form of government between Court and republicans in 1654 debates. (BI, xodi).

Ireland William Halesy
 1, 2 KL. NLP, 13. Army officer.

Scotland James Hamilton
 1 SD

C-17

Reading

Robert Hammond

- 1 Related to the Protector (A. Aspinall, et. al., Parliament Through Seven Centuries, 57). Member of Irish Council (Ludlow I, 394). ILG worth £600/year (CSPD 1654, 321, 328; CJ V, 524; VI, 2, 257; VII, 316; see Chapter VI, p. 292). Engages in local politics on behalf of Court (Chapter I, p. 36).

Buckinghamshire

Richard Hampden

- 2 KL. KC. Related to the Protector (NLP, 17).
OH

Bedfordshire

John Harvey

- 1, 2 KC. Court teller: CJ, 384, 11/10/54; CJ, 388, 11/22/54.

Lincolnshire

Thomas Hatcher

- 1, 2 Characterized by Major-general as pro-Court (Thurloe V, Whalley to Protector, 8/11/56, 299).

Devonshire

Henry Hatsel

- 1, 2 Commissioner of the Navy at Plymouth at £300/year (NLP, 15).

Warwickshire

Joseph Hawksworth

- 2 Governor of Warwick castle, one or two companies of foot (NLP, 14).

Scotland

James Hay

- 1 SD

C-18

Monmouthshire

Sir Edward Herbert

2

KL. Overseer of the Protector's lands in Wales
(NLP, 17).

Wales

Henry, Lord Herbert

Brecknock-
shire

Pro-IPP (teller, CJ, 420).

1

Winchester

John Hildesley

1, 2

Commissioner of the army and of the prerogative office
at £300/year (NLP, 16). Sheriff of Hampshire (PRO
Lists and Indexes 9). Engages in Hampshire politics
on behalf of Court (Chapter I, pp. 63-64).

Ireland

Arthur Hill

1

ID

Lancashire

Richard Holland

1, 2

Pro-Court's position on religious doctrine (teller,
CJ, 504). Pro-MB (BI, 236).

Essex

Sir Thomas Honeywood

1, 2

"hopeful principles for the new Court interest" (2nd
OH NLP, 486).

Dartmouth

Edward Hopkins

2

Commissioner of the admiralty at £500/year (NLP, 15).

C-19

Cumberland

Charles Howard

1, 2

Major-general, Lambert's deputy. Offices worth £465/year (NLP, 13). Council of Scotland (Ludlow I, 394). Pro-kingship: KL; KC; CSPV, 35, Giavarina to the Doge and Senate, 4/6/56; Lans MSS 821, f. 312, Jephson to HC, 3/3/56; f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57. Pro-kingship Court teller: CJ, 498, 3/2/57; CJ, 511, 3/25/57; CJ, 520, 4/4/57.

Monmouthshire

Thomas Hughes

1

Replaces Philip Jones who chose another constituency. (OR). Indication of arrangement in Monmouthshire where Richard Cromwell also ran and gave up seat.

Ireland

Daniel Hutchinson

1

ID

Buckingham

Francis Ingoldsby

1, 2

Relative of the Protector (NLP, 17). KL. KC.

Ireland

Henry Ingoldsby

1, 2

Relative of the Protector, colonel of foot (NLP, 13). Made a baronet (Abbott IV, 952). Pro-kingship: KC; Lans MSS 821, f. 312, Jephson to Henry Cromwell, 3/3/56. Pro-OH: teller (CJ, 589, 2/3/58).

Buckingham-
shire

Richard Ingoldsby

1, 2

Relative of the Protector, army officer (NLP, 11).

OH

2nd NLP. Pro-kingship: KL; KC; CSPV, Giavarina to

the Doge, 4/6/56, 35; French Transcripts, R. O. Bordeaux to Mazarin, 3/28/57.

Lancashire

Gilbert Ireland

1, 2

Great friend of the Protector (Bean, William, Parliamentary Representation in the Six Northern Counties as quoted in Tibbetts, 247). Captain of a county troupe (NLP, 14), KL. KC.

Wells

John Jenkins

2

Divulges republican plot to Thurloe (EHR VII, 107 as quoted in F II, 33). Desborough approves of his election (Thurloe V, Desborough to the Protector, 8/12/56, 302). Army officer (NLP, 11).

Ireland

William Jephson

1, 2

Parliamentary agent for Henry Cromwell (Chapter V, p. 250). Pro-kingship: KL; KC; voted for kingship and became ambassador to Sweden in return (NLP, 14); proposal to make Protectorate hereditary (Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," EHR, XVII [1902], 443-444); attends meeting at Downing's house to support proposals (Lans MSS 821, f. 312, Jephson to HC, 3/3/56); expresses disappointment at refusal (Lans MSS 822, f. 69); teller (CJ, 520, 4/4/57); in debate (BII, 140). Claims of sister-in-law settled, a measure of his influence (Chapter VI, p. 301).

C-21

Wales

John Jones

Denbighshire Brother-in-law of the Protector. Army officer.

1 Thurloe and Reynolds recommend him in connection with
Merionshire the 1656 election (Lans MSS, 823, folios 88 and 273).

2 Favorable settlement of Irish land claims (Chapter VI,
OH p. 300). Governor of Anglesey (NLP, 16).

Monmouthshire

Philip Jones

1 The Protector's principal parliamentary agent in both
Glamorgan- Protectorate parliaments (Chapter IV, p. 187; Court
shire teller seventeen times in 1654-1655 session, nine times
2 in 1656-1657 session). Double candidacy in 1656 elec-
OH tion (Chapter I, p. 57). Controller of Lord Pro-
tector's household, superintended his funeral, named
his son after him (DNB). KL. Council of state at
£1,000/year and steward of the Protector's lands in
Wales (NLP). Army officer. Accused of greatly en-
riching himself (2nd NLP; BI, 331; George Grant Francis
(ed.), Memoirs of Colonel Philip Jones, 193). Pro-
A & O (BII, 47).

Ireland

Sir Theophilus Jones

1, 2 KL. KC. Major of horse at over £358 (NLP, 12).
Favorable settlement of Irish land claims (Chapter VI,
p. 283).

C-22

Newcastle

Edward Keeling

- 1 Master of Trinity house, has relations at Court
(NLP, 18)

Middlesex

William Kiffin

- 2 Received military support from Court in 1656 election
(Chapter I, p. 49 ; Thurloe V, Thurloe to HC, 8/26/56,
349). NLP, 18, states that supported Court because of
special favors granted to him in connection with his
activities as a wool merchant. A Baptist, wrote to
Baptist friends in Ireland recommending that they ac-
cept the Protectorate (Richard Bagwell, Ireland under
the Stuarts, I, 327). Strong personal attachment to
the Protector (Louise F. Brown, The Political Activities
of the Baptists as quoted in Tibbetts, 223).

Ireland

Ralph King

- 1, 2 State official, commissioner for leasing government
lands (Robert Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth,
II, 552, 12/3/55); on committee to look into adven-
turers complaints (Dunlop II, 675, 1/26/58); assists
HC with disposal of revenue and forfeited land (Lans
MSS 821, f. 247). Granted land in Ireland worth
£300/year (NLP, 14; Chapter VI, p. 299).

Ireland

Sir Robert King

- 1, 2 "Commissary of the Musters, a place of good advantage."
(NLP, 13).

C-23

Northampton-
shire

James Langham

2

Supported in election by Major-general Boteler.

(Peter Whalley, The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire [Oxford, 1791], II, 393 as quoted in Pinckney, 16).

Cornwall

James Launce

1

Appointed as commissioner to assist Major-general Desborough (Thurloe IV, 1/24/56, 451 as quoted in Coate, 293).

Pembrokeshire

Edward Lawrence

2

Son of Henry. NLP, 18. KL. KC. "Lawrence of virtuous Father virtuous Son" (Milton, twentieth sonnet).

Herefordshire

Sir Henry Lawrence

1

Lord President of council of state at £1,000/year (NLP, 9). One of the Protector's chief advisers

Colchester

2

(CSPD, 1655-1666, Ross to Sec. Nicholas, 12/29/55, 76). "Great adorer of kingship" (2nd NLP).

OH

Isle of Wight

William Lawrence

2

Judge in Scotland at £600/year (NLP, 15; BI, 246). Pro-liberalization SFP (BII, 307).

Worcestershire

Nicholas Lechmere

1, 2

Attorney general to the duchy of Lancaster (NLP, 10). KC.

C-24

Gloucester

William Lenthall

- 1 Speaker of first Protectorate parliament (DNB).
 Oxfordshire Master of the Rolls at £2,000/year (NLP, 10). Com-
 2 missioner of Great Seal (Abbott IV, 954). KL. KC.
 OH 2nd NLP. Pro A & O (BII, 50). Pro-ILG (BII, 176).

Wales

Evan Lewis

- Breconshire Captain of a county troop (NLP, 14).
 2

Durham

George Lilburne

- 1 Sheriff of Durham, 1656 (P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, 9).
 Probably relative of Thomas and Robert (Pinckney 127,
 n. 3).

Durham

Thomas Lilburne

- 2 Captain of horse at £273/year (NLP, 11). KL. KC.

Southampton

John Lisle

- 1, 2 Lord Commissioner for Great Seal, Treasury Commission.
 OH (Abbott IV, 954). KL. KC. Administered oath to
 Cromwell as Protector (2nd NLP).

Westmoreland

Christopher Lister

- 1, 2 Teller of exchequer at £500/year (NLP, 16; BII, 523)

Yorkshire
West Riding

Martin Lister

- 1 Brother-in-law of Lambert (Carroll, 341). One of his
 troop commanders (Phillips, C.E.L., Cromwell's Captains,
 342 as quoted in Tibbetts, 223).

C-25

Kingston upon
Hull

William Lister

1, 2

A lawyer who had "advantages from the state." (NLP, 10).

Scotland

George Livingston, Earl of Linlithgow

1

SD

Montgomery-
shire

Charles Lloyd

1, 2

Deputy-governor of Merchant Adventurers. Pro-kingship: KL; KC; support of kingship in return for favor to MA (Chapter III, p. 154). Favorable settlement of claim to Irish land (Chapter VI, p. 285).

Scotland

George Lockhart

2

Pro-liberalization SFP (Warriston III, 81) Brother William and John.

Scotland

John Lockhart

2

KL. Brother of William and George (Pinckney, SR, 110).

Scotland

William Lockhart

1, 2

OH

Brother William and John. Married to Lord Protector's niece. Ambassador to France (DNB). Knighted. (Abbott IV, 952) KL. Council of state of Scotland (Baillie, III, 288-289). Anti-Rem., pro-liberalization SFP (Chapter V, p. 237 ; Baillie, III, 361).

Wells-1

Sir Lislebone Long

Somerset-2

KL. KC. Knighted by the Protector (Abbott IV, 952).

C-26

Master of Requests and Recorder of London at £2,000/year (NLP, 10). Pro-OH (BII, 343). Court teller: CJ, 418, 537.

Wiltshire

William Ludlow

2

Captain of country troop (NLP, 14).

Shropshire

Humphrey Mackworth, Senior

1

Council of state (Gardiner III, 171).

Shrewsbury

Humphrey Mackworth, jr.

1, 2

Governor of Shrewsbury. Loyal to the Protector, prominent in suppressing insurrection of 1655. (EHR, XXVI, 1911 as quoted in Tibbetts, 224).

Shropshire

Thomas Mackworth

2

Son of Humphrey, Jr. Elected with support of Major-general Berry in contested election (Publick Intelligencer, No. 46, 771 as quoted in Pinckney, 132). Farmer of the excise in Lancashire by special order (NLP, 16).

Colchester

John Maidstone

1, 2

Steward of the Protector's household, "a place of great advantage" (NLP, 17). Court teller: for the strengthening of the Protector's powers, over the armed forces (CJ 395, 418), over religious doctrine (CJ 398, 400, 412), for increased revenue (CJ 417); pro-liberalization SFP (CJ 557). Pro-CAEC (BII, 173).

C-27

Hampshire

Richard Major

- 1 Council of state. Richard Cromwell's father-in-law, (John Sylvester Davies, History of Southampton, 491.). Engaged in local politics on behalf of Court (Chapter I, pp.64-65).

Scotland

Henry Markham

- 2 KL. KC. Revenue commissioner in Ireland at £300/year (NLP, 15). Friend of Lord Broghill and supporter of Henry Cromwell (Thurloe VI, HC to Broghill, 12/1/57, 661; BI, 260). Granted indemnification against suit of Irish landowner (CJ, 469-470). "Very high words" with Luke Robinson, Lambert adherent (BI, 207). Pro-ILG (BI, 282).

Bedford

Thomas Margets

- 2 Judge advocate of the army at over £173/year (NLP, 11).

Wiltshire

Gabriel Martin

- 1, 2 KL.

Essex

Sir William Masham

- 1 Treasury commissioner (Abbott IV, 954). A cousin of the Protector (Yule, 108).

Herefordshire

Benjamin Mason

- 2 KL. "Lieutenant to Hereford troop, and would get higher, if he could." (NLP, 14). Supported by Major-general Berry and Sheriff at election (HMCR 14,

C-28

App. 2, p. 208).

Ireland

William Meredith

1

ID

Huntingdon-
shire

Edward Montague

1, 2

OH

Personal friend and prominent supporter of the Protector. Council of state: Accompanied Blake at sea, August, 1656 and then admiral of fleet, August 1657 (DNB). KL. KC. Offices at £3,095/year: Council, commission of Treasury, general at sea (NLP, 9). 2nd NLP. Court teller in both parliaments (CJ, 399, 403, 418, 520, 524, 550, 557).

St. Edmundsbury

Samuel Moody

1, 2

KC. Pro-ILG (BII, 176). Pro-MA (BI, 221).

Ireland

Anthony Morgan

1, 2

Henry Cromwell's principal agent in the House (Chapter V, pp.250-252). KL. KC. Major of horse at £358/year (NLP, 12). Pro-ILG (BII, 177, 197). Pro-OH (BII 393, 435).

Monmouthshire

Thomas Morgan

1

Replaces Richard Cromwell who chose another constituency (OR). Indication of arrangement in Monmouthshire where Philip Jones also ran and gave up seat.

C-29

Ireland

Thomas Newburgh

1, 2

NLP, 13

Cornwall

Anthony Nichols

1, 2

High Sheriff of Cornwall, "as is reported, lately received a reward from O.P." (NLP, 18). One of twelve men in Cornwall appointed as commissioners to assist Desborough (Thurloe IV, 451 quoted in Coates, 293). Desborough says he is especially cordial (Thurloe IV, 1/25/56, 426).

Monmouthshire

John Nicholas

2

Married to the Protector's niece, governor of Chepstow castle, has one or two companies of foot "beside other advantages," captain of a militia troop, treasurer general of all South Wales (NLP, 17). In charge of county troop for Major-general Berry (Pinckney, 131).

Wales

Robert Nicholas

Breconshire

Baron of the exchequer (NLP, 10).

2

Stafford

Martin Noel

2

The Protector's chief economic consultant (Ashley, FCP, 2). Brother-in-law of Secretary Thurloe (Ibid., 8) and his partner in the post office." Deeply engaged with the Court Interest" (NLP, 16). KL. Obtained parliamentary seat through influence of Major-

C-30

general Bridge in order to defeat the republican,
John Bradshaw (Chapter II, p. 109).

Hampshire

Richard Norton

1, 2

Cousin of the Protector (Wayman, 56). Army command,
governor of Portsmouth (NLP, 14). Local political
activity on behalf of Court (Chapter I, pp. 64-65).
Court teller (CJ, 390).

Ireland

Henry Owen

2

Major of horse at over £358 (NLP, 12). Pro-kingship:
KL, "an Irish champion" (Lansdowne MSS 822, f. 21,
Morgan to HC, 5/12/57). Substituted by Henry Cromwell
for republican member (Chapter V, p. 246). Favorable
settlement of Irish land claim (Chapter VI, p. 298).

Oxford

John Owen

1

The Protector's chaplain. Vice chancellor of Oxford.
Wrote book against heresy at request of council of
state, January, 1655 (DNB). Irish land grant (Chapter
VI, p. 299).

London

Sir Christopher Pack

2

Governor of Merchant Adventurers. Knighted by the

OH

Protector, September 20, 1655. Lord Mayor of London,
1654. Commissioner of customs. Introduces kingship
proposals, February 23, 1657 (DNB). KL. KC. In
return for introduction of kingship received discharge

C-31

of debt he owed as customs commissioner (2nd NLP; Heath's Chronicle, 480; Whitelocke's Memorials, 647), also Merchants retained exclusive export rights (Chapter III, p. 154).

Rochester

John Parker

1, 2

Baron of exchequer at £1,000/year (NLP, 10). KC.

Huntingdon-
shire

Nicholas Pedley

Sergeant-at-law (VCH, Huntingdon II, 29). Commissioner of the Wine Office (Pinckney, 110). Long speech in favor of the OH (BII, 381-382).

Huntingdonshire

Stephen Phesant

1

On slate with prominent Court member, Edward Montague, and the Protector's nephew, Henry Cromwell, jr., in disturbed election. Probably Montague's nominee (VCH, Huntingdon II, 28-29; Frank R. Harris, The Life of Edward Montague, I, 73, Chapter I, p. 32).

Cardiganshire

James Phillips

1

KL. KC. Committee of the Army (NLP, 15).

Pembrokeshire

2

Cambridgeshire

Henry Pickering

2

KC. Knighted by the Protector, February 11, 1658 (Abbott IV, 953). Pro-MA (BI, 221).

C-32

Nottinghamshire

William Pierrepont

1, 2 Reputation as one of the Protector's chief behind the
 refused OH scene advisers (CSPD 1655-1656, Ross to Nicholas, 76;
 Whitelocke's Memorials, IV, 289).

Montgomeryshire

Hugh Price

2 KL. KC. Captain of a militia troop. Governor of
 Redcastle (NLP, 14).

Lyme Regis

Edmund Prideaux

1, 2 Attorney general. According to NLP, 10, had income
 of nearly £6,000/year. Commissioner for farming
 customs (CSPD 1657-1658, 94). Created a baronet by
 the Protector (Abbott IV, 952). KL. KC.

Scotland

Andrew Ramsey

2 Provost of Edinburgh. KL. KC. Recommended by Lord
 Broghill as "a very sober man, and one who will be
 right." (Scot. statutes, Broghill to Thurloe, 8/19/56,
 903). Ties to Scottish Res. (Stephen II, Sharpe to
 Douglas, 6/20/57, 43,44).

Scotland

Thomas Read

1 SD. Governor of Stirling (Terry, lvi, n. 3)

Ireland

Daniel Redman

1, 2 Substituted by Henry Cromwell for republican member
 (Chapter V, p. 247). Major of horse of over £358/

C-33

year (NLP, 12). Favorable settlement of Irish land claim (Chapter VI, p. 297).

Ireland

Sir John Reynolds

1, 2

Married to Henry Cromwell's sister-in-law and one of his principal, parliamentary agents (Chapter V, p. 250). Knighted by the Protector (Abbott IV, 953). Commander of expeditionary force to Flanders (DNB). Pro-kingship: KL; KC; tellerships: CJ, 498, 511, 530, NLP, 12 lists army salaries of over £700/year. Favorable settlement of Irish land claims (Chapter VI, pp. 290-292). Pro-A & O (BII, 50).

Scotland

Sir Edward Rhodes

2

Member of Council for Scotland at £500/year (NLP, 15), KC.

Scotland

Godfrey Rhodes

2

KL. Commissary of Edinburgh, 1656 (Tibbetts, 225). Son of Sir Edward (Pinckney, SR, 104, n.).

Middlesex

Sir William Roberts

1, 2

OH

Commissioner for preservation of excise and customs at £300/year, comptroller of exchequer at £600/year, commissioner at wine office and Committee of the Army (NLP, 16). Received military support from Court at 1656 election (Chapter I, p. 50). KL. KC. 2nd NLP, 485 states that he is of the "Court-interest."

C-34

Hereford	Wroth Rogers
2	Sheriff, 1655-1666 (PRO List and Indexes 9). Governor of Hereford, captain of county troop (NLP, 14). Accused by Edward Harley of unfair dealings in 1656 election (HMCR 14, App. 2, 208). His arrears paid by Council order (CSPD 1656-1657, 8/7/56, p. 65). NLP, 14.
Devonshire	Robert Rolle
1, 2	Pro-MA (BI, 221).
Cornwall	Anthony Rouse
1, 2	Admiralty and navy commissioner (Abbott IV, 955). Vice admiral of the north and south coast of Cornwall, "a place of good value." (NLP, 15).
Truro-1	Francis Rouse
Cornwall-2	Council of state at £1,000/year. Provost of Eton at
OH	£500/year (NLP, 9). KC.
Worcestershire	Sir Thomas Rouse
1, 2	KL. KC.
Berwick	John Rushworth
2	Officeholder, central government (Pinckney, 348).
Cambridgeshire	Sir Francis Russel
1, 2	Father-in-law of Henry Cromwell. KL. Chamberlain
OH	of Chester supposed by worth £500/year (NLP, 17).

C-35

Herefordshire

William Cecil, Earl of Salisbury

1, 2

Ex (CJ, TMSS, SP) probably a mistake. Royalist agent wonders why he was excluded (CCSP III, Titus to Hyde, 10/24/56, 584). Had returned by October 22 (CJ 443). KL.

Devonshire

Thomas Saunders

1, 2

Major of foot. Governor of Plymouth Fort and Isleland (NLP, 13).

Devises

Edward Scotten

2

Captain of horse (NLP, 11).

Honyton

Samuel Searle

2

Major-general Desborough is satisfied with his election. (Thurloe V, Desborough to the Protector, 8/12/56, 302).

Arundel-1

Anthony Shirley

Sussex-2

Esteemed by Major-general Goffe in 1656 election (Thurloe IV, Goffe to Thurloe, 11/7/55, 161; Ibid., V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341).

Lynn Regis

Philip Skippon

1, 2

Council of state. Major-general. Pro-kingship

OH

(Lans MSS 821, f. 294, 2/24/57). NLP says he has income of over L1,666/year from offices (NLP, 9).

Essex-1

Sir Samuel Sleigh

Derbyshire-2

A supporter of the Protector (Thurloe IV, Whalley to Thurloe, 11/7/58, 211).

C-36

Durham

Anthony Smith

1, 2

Master of a Hospital and a Register at about £200/year (NLP, 16). KL.

Scotland

George Smith

1, 2

Judge in Scotland at £600/year (NLP, 15). Register of Scotland (Baillie I, 318). Elected with Boyle's backing in 1656 (Thurloe V, 295). Pro-Res. (Stephen II, from Sharpe, 8/11/57, 90) and pro-liberalization SFP (BII, 308).

Portsmouth

Thomas Smith

2

Commissioner of the navy at £300/year (NLP, 15). KL.

Cornwall

John St. Aubyn

2

Vice admiral southern coast of Cornwall (Coate, 294). "A salary man" (NLP, 16). Member of group of commissioners helping Major-general Desborough (Thurloe IV, 451).

Peterborough

Francis St. John

2

Son of the Chief Justice and related to the Protector (Weyman, 55).

Wiltshire

Sir Walter St. John

2

Son-in-law of Chief Justice, related to the Protector (Weyman, 55).

C-37

London

William Steele

1 Recorder of London (Yule, 119). Nominated for speaker,
 OH 8/3/54 ("Weekly Post," TT, p. 1560). Lord Chancellor
 of Ireland, 8/26/56, and stayed there for three years
 (DNB). Irish council of state, 8/27/54 (Ludlow I, 394).

Gloucester

James Stephens

2 KL.

Scotland

Robert Stewart

2 KC. Pro-liberalization SFP (BII 251, 308; Chapter V,
 p. 237). Pro-ILG (BII, 197).

Cirencester

John Stone

1, 2 KL. KC. Teller of Exchequer at £500/year "and
 great fees besides." Receiver general of taxes at
 £300/year. Comptroller of excise and customs at
 £400/year. Commissioner at the Wine Office and of
 the Army (NLP, 16).

Scotland

James Sword

1 SD.

Ireland

Sir John Temple

1 Master of rolls in Ireland (See Chapter I, p. 43).

Denbighshire

Simon Thelwall

1, 2 KL. KC. Pro-ILG (CJ, 546).

C-38

Glamorganshire

Edmund Thomas

1, 2 "a friend of Philip Jones [the Protector's chief
OH parliamentary agent]---of complying principles" (2nd
NLP, 485).

Scotland

John Thompson

1 SD, Auditor-General of the Revenue of Scotland (Terry
lvi, n. 5 as quoted in Tibbetts, 226).

Scotland

William Thompson

1 SD

Isle of Ely

John Thurloe

1, 2 Secretary of the council of state. Council of state,
7/13/57. Correspondence chief authority for the
Protectorate period (DNB). One of the Protector's
parliamentary agents in the second Protectorate parlia-
ment (Chapter IV, 182-185). KL. KC. "a vast
income" (NLP, 9). Pro A & O (BII, 42).

Ireland

Richard Tigh

2 Recommended by Henry Cromwell (Thurloe V, HC to
Thurloe, 10/6/56, 477-478). KL. KC.

Scotland

Jeremy Tollhurst

1 SD, Governor of Carlisle (Firth, S and P, 15)

Ireland

James Trayle

2 NLP, 13. Arrived in Ireland shortly before election
probably to support administration (Chapter V, p. 249).

C-39

Recommended by Thomas Cooper (Thurloe V, Cooper to
Thurloe, 8/23/56, 343).

Dorsetshire

John Trenchard

1, 2

Father in law of John Bingham and William Sydenham
(Yule, 121).

Arundel

Sir John Trevor

2

KL. Relative of the Protector (NLP, 17).

Flintshire

John Trevor

1, 2

Relative of the Protector (NLP, 17). Anti-MB (BI,
314; teller CJ, 483). Pro-kingship: KL; KC; backs
introduction of proposals as teller (CJ, 496); renews
kingship offer in 1658 session (BII, 412). Pro-OH
(BII, 411, 412, 430, as teller, CJ, 591).

Berkshire

William Trumbull

2

KL. KC.

Wales

George Twistleton

Anglesey

KL. Army officer (Pinckney, 349).

1, 2

Haverford-West

John Upton

1, 2

Commissioner of the Customs at £800/year (NLP, 16).

Ireland

Robert Venables

1

General of forces sent to attack Spainards in West
Indies (DNB).

C-40

Bedfordshire

Richard Wagstaffe

2 Captain of foot and of a county troop at £392/year
(NLP, 13). KC.

Ireland

Sir Hardress Waller

1, 2 Regicide (DNB). Relative of the Protector. Supported him in Ireland on accession to Protectorate (DNB). Essential military service in Ireland (BI, 288). Major-general and colonel of foot at £730/year (NLP, 13). Warmly recommended by Henry Cromwell (Thurloe VI, Henry to Oliver Cromwell, 1/7/57 and 2/13/58, 734 and 774). Settlement of Irish land claim (Chapter VI, pp.276-9)

Ireland

Walter Waller

2 Son of Hardress (NLP, 18). Substituted by Henry Cromwell for republican member (Chapter V, p.247). Pro-kingship: KL; KC; BI, 365. Pro-OH; BII, 398; as teller, CJ, 589. Pro-CAEC (BII, 173). Pro-A & O (BII, 93). Represents father in settlement of Irish land claim (Chapter VI, p. 277).

Bridgenorth

Edmund Waring

2 Sheriff of Shropshire (BI, 285). NLP, 11 identifies him as either a major of horse or the captain of the county troop and a farmer of the excise.

Monmouthshire

Nathaniel Waterhouse

2 Steward of the Protector's lands (NLP, 17).

Scotland

Sir Alexander Wedderburn

1, 2

KL.

Scotland

Sir John Wemyss

2

"Tenant to the State of the Salt-pans neer Leeth, and hath a good advantage thereby." (NLP, 15). KL.

KC. Recommended by Broghill as "an honest sober man." (Thurloe V, Broghill to Thurloe, 8/19/56, 322).

Exeter

Thomas Westlake

2

Town clerk. A lawyer who has "advantages from the State." (NLP, 9, 10). Pro A & O (BII, 56).

Chester

Charles Whalley

1

Favor from the state, "discharged from all proceedings against him or his estate on the orders to Majors-General." (CSPD 1655-1656, 3/4/57, 208).

Portsmouth

Nathaniel Whetham

1

Council of Scotland at £500/year (NLP, 15).

Scotland

2

Staffordshire

Thomas Whitgrave

1, 2

Captain of a county troop (NLP, 14). KL. KC. Pro-OH (BII, 395, 462). Pro-IPP (teller, CJ, 393).

Buckinghamshire

Bulstrode Whitelocke

1, 2

Swedish embassy (1653-1654), Commissioner of Great

OH

Seal (1654-1655), resigned in dispute over chancery reform (DNB). Commissioner of Treasury, recently

C-42

knighted (NLP, 10). Pro-kingship: KL, Chairman of KC (FI, 170). Anti-MB (BI, 318). Pro-ILG (BI, 259), pro-oath (CJ, 572), pro-A & O (BII, 42).

Oxfordshire

James Whitelocke

- 1 Son of Bulstrode. Captain (NLP, 10). Knighted by the Protector (Abbott, IV, 953).

York-1

Sir Thomas Widdrington

Northumber-
land

2

Speaker of the 1656-1658 parliament at £1,829/year, Commissioner of the Treasury at £1,000/year plus other benefits as speaker amounting to £1,500/year. Recorder of York (NLP, 10). For open support of Court program as speaker, see Chapter IV, pp.172-79 Anti-MB (BI, 234), pro-CAEC (BII, 173), pro-OH (BII 394, 435). Long speech in favor of kingship (BI, 397-413).

Scotland

John Wilkie

- 1 SD.

Wales

Radnorshire

Henry Williams

1, 2

KL (or Robert, listed as Mr. Williams).

Wales

Carnarvonshire

Robert Williams

2

Relative of the Protector (NLP, 17).

Staffordshire

Sir Charles Wolseley

1, 2

Council of state at £1,000/year (NLP, 9). One of the

OH

Protector's parliamentary agents. (Chapter IV, p.182) Court teller eight times in the 1654-1655 parliament and five times in the 1656-1658 sessions. Pro-kingship: KL; KC; Lans MSS 821, f. 294, 2/24/57; teller for introduction of Remonstrance (CJ, 496). Pro-Oath (BII, 275-276). Pro-A & O (BII, 40).

Surrey,
Norfolk

Robert Wood

1

Norfolk

2

KL. KC. Supported by Court in 1656 election (Thurloe V, Balleston to Haynes, 9/1/56, 370) and one of few members elected in Norfolk that met with Court approval (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, 311).

Scotland

Robert Wolseley

2

KL. Brother of Sir Charles Wolseley (Pinckney, SR, 104).

Manchester

Charles Worsley

1

Major-general (DNB). Court teller: pro-kingship (CJ, 411; see Chapter III, P. 143); pro-SMB (CJ, 415, 417).

Somerset

William Windham

2

Anti-MB (teller, CJ, 475). Pro-OH (CJ, 589; BII, 394).

MC-1

THE MILITARY COURT

Supporters of the Court in the 1654-55 parliament, many of whom were longstanding military associates of the Protector. They broke with him in 1656 over the question of how much influence the military was to continue to wield in the government. These men initially opposed the kingship proposals, but some eventually were reconciled to them. Acting with them were a group of Scottish members, associated with the Remonstrants, a Scottish church party.

Leeds

Adam Baynes

1, 2

Friend and follower of John Lambert (Carroll, 337). Anti-kingship (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57), anti-OH (BII, 342), anti-oath for Protector (BII, 277). Army officer. Commissioner of excise and customs (NLP, 11). Captain of horse at £273/year (NLP, 11).

Yorkshire

Hugh Bethell

East Riding

1, 2

Distinguished military career (Carroll, 340). Anti-kingship (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57).

Northampton-
shire

William Boteler

2

Major-general. Pro-MB. Knighted (Abbott IV, 952). Anti-kingship: teller, 3/27/57 (CJ, 311); then abandons opposition (FI, 151), and pro-OH in second session (BII, 342, 407).

MC-2

Cumberland

William Briscoe

1, 2

Colonel of foot at £365/year. Pro-Excl: inspected members' credentials at door of House at time of 1656 exclusion (NLP, 12; Clarke III, 73). KL. KC. Anti-OH (BII, 410). One of officers conferring with Lord Protector when Anabaptist officers were dismissed after the dissolution of the 1658 session. Unlike the others, he did not agree and made a brave reply (Underdown, "Cromwell and the Officers, Feb. 1658"; EHR, 83, January, 1968).

Ireland

Thomas Cooper

2, OH

Member of Council of Scotland (appointed August 1655, Ludlow I, 394). Sent by Lord Protector to command forces in Ulster and advise his son, Henry, December 1655 (Lans MSS 821, f. 246; Thurloe I, 726). At first anti-kingship (Lans MSS, f. 294, 2/24/57), then abandons opposition (Fl, 149, 150, "Cromwell and the Crown," EHR, XVIII, 1903). NLP, p. 13. 2nd NLP. See Chapter V, pp. 255-256.

Cambridge-
shire

John Desborough

1

Brother-in-law of the Lord Protector. Major-general.

Somerset-
shire

Council of state (FII, 1). NLP, p. 9, and 2nd NLP list remunerative offices. Agent for the Lord Pro-

2, OH

tector in 1654-1655 parliament and frequent court teller (see Chapter IV, pp. 184-185). Pro-IPP (BI, lxiv).

MC-3

In 1656-1658 parliament supported MB (FI, 107) and opposed kingship proposals (FI, passim). Pro-A & O (BII, 47). Pro-CAEC (BII, 173).

Yorkshire

George, Lord Eure

North Riding Under Lambert's influence. Pro-MB (teller, 12/25/56, 1, 2 CJ, 475). Anti-kingship (teller, 3/2/56, CJ, 498; OH Lans MSS 821, f. 294).

Oxfordshire

Charles Fleetwood

1 Son-in-law of the Lord Protector. Major-general.
Norfolk Council of state. Lord Deputy of Ireland. His support of republicans and sectaries in Ireland led to 2 his replacement there by Henry Cromwell (Chapter V, OH p.245 , Chapter VI, p.269). Leader of anti-kingship movement (Lans MSS 821, f. 274, Fleetwood to Cromwell, 2/24/57; Thurloe, VI, Thurloe to HC, 28; teller, 2/25/56, CJ, 496). NLP p. 9 lists remunerative offices totaling over £6,573.

Derbyshire

Edward Gill

Yorkshire One of 29. In Lambert's circle, officer in the parliamentary army in the North. Court supporter in 1654, 1 but beginning to have doubts in 1656 (Carroll 340, 342, Yorkshire 352) and absented himself after Exclusion (Pinckney 2 322, 344).

MC-4

Great Yarmouth

William Goffe

1 Court teller in 1654-1655 parliament (CJ, 401;
 Hampshire 12/14/54; CJ, 413, 1/13/55; CJ, 418, 1/16/55). Pro-
 2 A & O (BII, 43). Anti-kingship, then abandons opposi-
 OH tion (Lans MSS, Reynolds to HC, 3/24/57, as quoted in
 Fl, 148). KC. NLP, p. 11, lists offices worth over
 £1,100. Pro-CAEC (BII, 173).

Essex

Hezekiah Haynes

2 Major-general. Fleetwood's deputy. NLP, p. 11,
 lists offices worth over £1,000. Anti-kingship
 (Clarendon Papers III, Broderick to Hyde, 3/30/54).

Salisbury

James Heeley

2 Lieutenant to county troop (NLP, 14). Proposed for
 post of commissioner for three months' assessment, by
 Wm. Sydenham, prominent member of the Military Court
 (BII, 173). Anti-OH; Griffith Bodurda, OH supporter,
 says Heeley should not be elected on a double return
 and should not be allowed to vote against the recogni-
 tion of the Other House (BII, 436).

Sandwich

Thomas Kelsey

1 Major-general. Commissioner of admiralty and governor
 Dover of Dover Castle at over £1,100/year (NLP, 12). Pro-MB
 2 (BI, 232). Anti-kingship (BIII, 407).

MC-5

Scotland

William Ker

2

Anti-kingship (CCSP, Drummond to Lockhart, March 2/12, 1657, 767; see Chapter V, p.242). Connection with Rems. (Warriston III, 41, 93).

Yorkshire

John Lambert

1, 2

Principal author of Instrument of Government. Council of State. Major-general. Thought of as Cromwell's successor (DNB). Offices worth over £5,000/year (NLP, 9). Then broke with the Protector and became leader of the Military Court: pro-MB (BI, 319); opposition to kingship, stripped of office (DNB). Connection with Rems. (Chapter V, pp. 235, 238-240.)

Yorkshire

Francis Lascelles

North Riding

1, 2

In Lambert's circle, officer in parliamentary army in the North (Carroll, 330, 340). Court supporter in 1654-1655 session (Carroll, 342). Anti-kingship (Lans MSS, 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57).

Durham

Robert Lilburne

1

Deputy major-general for Lambert. 2nd NLP lists

Yorkshire

offices worth over £1,100/year. Under Lambert's in-

North Riding

fluence, anti-kingship: "All ye Yorkshiremen are

2

against it but Charles Howard" (Lans MSS, 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57. Wrote to fellow York member to work against kingship in army in York (Thurloe VI, Lilburne to Robinson, 5/19/57, 292); co-opposition

MC-6

teller with Lambert, 6/10/57 (CJ, 554). Anti-ILG (BI, 260).

Scotland

Sir James MacDowell of Garthland

1, 2

Commissioner on forfeited estates (Pinckney, SR 108). Remonstrant agent. Anti-liberalization of SFP (Chapter V, pp. 237-240). Probably opposed kingship (Chapter V, pp. 242-243). Through Remonstrant influence, obtained office of commissioner of Galway (Warriston III, 93; Stephen II, 90).

Scotland

William Mitchell

1, 2

Colonel of foot at £365/year, "besides other advantages in the Regiment" (NLP, 13). Connections with Military Court and possible opponent of kingship (Chapter V, p. 244); connections with Baynes (Ackerman 9G, J. to A. Baynes, 9/9/54); officer in Lambert's brigade in 1659 (Phillips, C.E.L., Cromwell's Captains, London, 1938, as quoted in Tibbetts, 247). After dissolution of 1658 session, loyal to Protector (Thurloe VI, Thurloe to HC, 2/16/58, 806).

Woodstock

William Packer

2

Deputy major-general. Military office worth over £1,100/year (NLP, 11). Pro-MB (BI, 236). Deprived of command after dissolution of 1656-1658 parliament because of share in circulation of petition against government (FII, 45-57; 2nd NLP, 472; CSPD 1657-1658,

MC-7

288; BIII, 165).

Northampton-
shire

Sir Gilbert Pickering

1, 2

OH

Council of State at £1,000/year, chamberlain of Court, steward of Westminster (NLP, 9). Pro-MB (FI, 103, 123). Anti-kingship (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/14/57). Dubious about taking oath as member of council of state, but finally did so (FII, 3).

Wales

John Price

Cardiff

1, 2

Receiver general of South Wales, "one of the Admiralty," commissioner of appeals (NLP, 15).

Ryegate

Sir Thomas Pride

2

High sheriff of Surrey (Abbott IV, 247). Colonel of foot at £365; brewer for state; daughter married to Lord Protector's nephew (NLP 12). Anti-kingship: in debates (Lans MSS, 822, f. 21, Morgan to HC, 5/12/57); helped organize army petition vs. kingship (Ludlow II, 25). 2nd NLP states he "changed his mind and principles" and entered OH.

Scarborough

Edward Salmon

2

Colonel of foot and admiralty commissioner at £855/year (NLP, 12). Anti-kingship: teller, 3/27/57 (CJ, 511); "All ye Yorkshiremen are against it" (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57).

MC-8

Yorkshire

Walter Strickland

East Riding

1

Newcastle-
upon-Tyne

2

OH

Council of state at £100/year and captain of grey coat
foot guard at Whitehall (NLP, 9). Pro-Excl (Clarke
III, 85, n. 3). Pro-MB (BI, 239; teller, CJ,
483). Anti-kingship: opposed initial introduction as
teller (2/24/57, CJ, 496); "All ye Yorkshiremen are
against it" (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC,
2/24/57); then changes mind (KC). Anti-oath for
Protector (BII, 279); pro-A & O (BII, 40).

Yorkshire

Sir William Strickland

East Riding

1, 2

OH

Anti-kingship: teller, 3/25/57 (CJ, 311); "Sir William
Strickland against it" (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan
to HC, 2/24/57); then changes mind (KC). Anti-oath
for Protector (BII, 281).

Scotland

John Swinton

1, 2

Council of state for Scotland (Ludlow I, 394) and
judge at £600/year (NLP, 15). In spite of identifi-
cation by seventeenth-century historian as "the man
of all Scotland . . . most trusted and employed by
Cromwell" (Gilbert Burnett, History, I, 86), ties with
Rems. (Baillie III, 356, 361) and possibly anti-Excl
(Clarke III, 73); therefore a possible opponent of
kingship (Chapter V, p.244).

MC-9

Dorsetshire

William Sydenham

1, 2

OH

Council of state at £1,000/year, commissioner of treasury at £1,000/year, also "government of Isle of Wight" (NLP, 9). Commissioner of admiralty (Abbott IV, 955). Pro-MB (BI, 233). Pro-CAEC (BII, 173). Anti-kingship: teller against introduction (CJ, 496). Next to Lambert, most vehement anti (Lans MSS 821, f. 274, Fleetwood to HC, 2/24/57). Absents himself from House when opposition hopeless (Lans MSS 821, f. 314, Morgan to HC, 3/3/57). Then changed mind and listed on KC. Anti-oath for Protector and member of council of state (BII 275, 289; CJ 570, 572). Opposition and ultimate compliance noted in 2nd NLP (478).

Scotland

(Thomas) George Talbot

2

Colonel of foot at £365/year (NLP, 13). Initially anti-kingship (co-teller with Major-general Whalley, CJ, 520), then supported the Lord Protector: pro-OH (CJ, 573); support after dissolution of 1658 session (Thurloe VI, Thurloe to HC, 2/16/58, 806). See Chapter V, p.243.

Scotland

John Hay, Earl of Tweeddale

2

Remonstrant agent (Chapter V, pp.237-41). Pro-MB: teller (CJ, 483). Original opposition to kingship proposals (Chapter V, 242), then compliance (KL, KC).

MC-10

Nottingham-
shire

Edward Whalley

1, 2

OH

Major-general and other military offices worth over £1,414/year (NLP, 11). Related to the Lord Protector (Weyman, 53). Court teller in 1654-1655 parliament: pro-NF (CJ, 391); pro-IPP (CJ, 399, 401); pro-SMB (CJ 417). Opposes kingship (teller, CJ 520), then abandons opposition (KC; Lans MSS 822, f. 19, 3/31/57; Clarendon Papers III, Broderick to Hyde, 3/30/57). Pro-MB (BI 235); pro-Excl (BI 290); pro-CAEC (BII 173); pro-A & O (BII, 43).

Scotland

Henry Whalley

2

Judge advocate of army in Scotland at over £273/year, and Edward's brother (NLP, 13). Related to Lord Protector (Weyman, 54). Favorable settlement of Irish claim (Chapter VI, pp.280-281). Possible opponent of kingship (Chapter V, p. 243).

Tewksbury

Francis White

2

Colonel of foot at £365/year (NLP, 12). Connection with Desborough, replaced his son in parliament (Pinckney, 194). Pro-MB (teller, CJ 483). Anti-kingship (BII 9). Pro-CAEC (BII, 173). Pro-ILG (BII, 176).

Scotland

Stephen Winthrop

2

Colonel of horse at over £474/year (NLP, 11). Tie with Lambert and Remonstrants: teller vs. liberalization

MC-11

of SFP (CJ, 557); See Chapter V, 238. Anti-oath
for members of parliament (BII, 293). Possible op-
ponent of kingship (Chapter V, 243).

THE REPUBLICANS

Intellectually convinced of the necessity of restoring the republic, these men opposed the kingship proposals and acted as a group to destroy the viability of the Protectorate parliaments. Acting with them were a number of Irish army officers, Anabaptist in religion, all opposed in some degree to the Court. Since the republicanism of most of these Irish members is proven and all behaved similarly, they are all classed as republicans.

Ireland

Daniel Abbott

- 2 Colonel of dragoons (NLP, 12). "Undoubted republican" (F and D II, 621). Henry Cromwell opposed promise of extra pay to him (Thurloe VI, HC to Thurloe, January, 1658, 744). Kept command when Protectorate fell and officers were purged by republican-oriented restored Rump (CSPD, 1659-1660, 13). Among 39 persons whom Irish parliament proposed to exclude from Act of Indemnity in 1660 (Carte, IV, 53, as cited by F and D, II, 623). See Chapter V, p. 247.

Ireland

Daniel Axtell

- 1 Irish army officer. An Anabaptist, who resigned commission when Henry Cromwell assumed power in Ireland (Thurloe IV, HC to Thurloe, 12/3/56, 370). Replaced in 1656 parliament by Major Daniel Redman, loyal Court member (Chapter V, p. 246). Behavior causes HC uneasiness at time of kingship proposals (HC to Thurloe,

R-2

3/4/57, 94; HC to the Protector, 4/22/57, 222; both Thurloe VI). Irish land claim denied (CSP, Ireland, December 16, 1657; Chapter VI, p. 289). Said on scaffold that murdered for "good old cause" (DNB).

Launceston

Robert Bennett

- 1 Member of Rump council of state, republican (Yule, 88). Army officer. Desborough pleased at his defeat in 1656 (Thurloe V, Desborough to the Protector, 8/12/56, 302). An Anabaptist. In his letters evidence that officers did not unanimously fall in line after dissolution of 1658 session (Underdown, "Cromwell and the Officers," EHR 83 [January 1968], 102).

Middlesex

Josiah Berners

- 1 On republican slate in Middlesex in 1656 (Thurloe V, Titon to Kiffen, 8/8/56, 286). With cousin John Hobart, plans republican strategy for 1658 session ("Letters concerning the Dissolution of Cromwell's Last Parliament, 1658, by J. Hobart," ed. C. H. Firth, EHR VII, 1892, 104; see Chapter II, pp.112-113).

Reading

Daniel Blagrove

- 2 Regicide. Recorder of Reading, dismissed in 1656 when Court put own members on corporation (Chapter I, p. 62). Lost election to Major-general Barkstead, but took seat when Barkstead chose another seat. However, never attended parliament, probably feared

R-3

exclusion (Chapter II, p. 112).

Weymouth

Dennis Bond

- 1 Court ties and supporter of kingship, comptroller of
 Dorchester receipts of exchequer at £500/year (NLP, 16); friend
 2 of the Protector (Yule, 89); KL, KC; yet in opposition:
 Country teller in 1654-1655, opposing IPP and an extension of the franchise (CJ, 393, 398, 411; Chapter III, p. 129); opposed Protector's sole power to select members of OH (BII, 21); anti-ILG (BI, 282); anti-A & O (BII, 44). Republican attitudes: anti-use of title "Lord" (BI, 289); defended record of Long Parliament (BII, 369 n.). In spite of republicanism, probably bribed to support kingship by favorable land settlement to Dorset adventures he represented (Chapter VI, pp. 277-279).

Stafford

John Bradshaw

- 1 Lord president of court that tried king. A leader of republican obstructionists in 1654 session (Ludlow I, 390-391; Chapter II, pp. 94-96), and their unsuccessful nominee for speaker (Thurloe II, Bordeaux to Brienne, 9/14/54, 588; Chapter IV, p. 172). Key figure in republican peripheral connections with Penruddock's Rising (Thurloe II, 147, ed. by Firth in G III, n. 3, 228-229; see Chapter II, pp. 97-98). Summoned before council of state in 1656 in attempt to keep him quiet

in pre-election period. Refused council's request to take out new commission as judge in Chester in order to secure his loyalty (Clarke III, 68; Noble, Regicides, 158-160; Ludlow II, 10, 11, 16; see Chapter II, p. 102. Court used influence to defeat him in three constituencies in 1656 elections (Thurloe V, Bridge to Protector, 8/15/56, 313; Pinckney, CE, 393, 405-406; PRO Lists and Indexes IX; Thurloe V, Barkstead to Thurloe, 8/12/56, 304; Pinckney, 123, 275; see Chapter II, p.109). Connection with disaffected London elements (BI, xxvii, "Faithful Scout," TT, September 8 and 18; Pearl, 230; Thurloe V, Barkstead to Thurloe, 8/12/56, 304; Chapter II, p. 109.

Norwich

Bernard Church

1, 2

RR (BI, xxxvi). Elected in 1654 with republican John Hobart, with support of dissident borough officials (CSPD, 1654, vol. LXXIII, #89, July(?); Chapter I, p. 39.)

Ireland

John Clarke

1

Governor of Londonderry (1654 official return). Army officer. Replaced as Irish member in 1656 by Tristram Beresford, loyal Court member. Pro-MB (BI, 241). Kept command when Protectorate fell and officers were purged by republican-oriented restored Rump (CSPD, 1659-1660, 13, 14, 7/8/59, as quoted in F and D, p. 638).

R-5

Hampshire

Thomas Cole

2

Characterized as republican by Major-general Goffe, "a perfect leveller and soe well known in Southampton that he is called by the name of Comon Freedome" (Thurloe V, Goffe to Thurloe, undated, 396). Campaigns against Court candidate in 1656 elections (Thurloe V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/8/56, 287).

Yorkshire

Henry Darley

East Riding

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Republican

2

(Yule, 94). Opposed king for many years after 1660 (Pinckney, 125).

Richard Darley

Yorkshire

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Assisted in

East Riding

organization of republican campaign in York in 1656

2

(Thurloe V, Lilburne to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 296). Anti-OH (or Henry Darley) (BII, 339, 429).

Kent

John Dixwell

1, 2

Regicide. Not active in these parliaments, but past activity and flight to America in 1660 testify to his republican beliefs (DNB, Yule, 94). NLP, 7 intimates that he is excluded, but his name does not appear on any exclusion lists.

Wiltshire

William Eyre

1

Leveller activity in late 1640's (Gardiner, Civil War, IV, 22. Commonwealth I, 54). On defeated republican

R-6

slate in 1654 elections, took seat when vacancy occurred (Copy of Letter out of Wiltshire. HMCR Buccleuch and Queensbury, I, 311). Involvement in plots in late 1654 and early 1655. Arrested and imprisoned (Thurloe III, Dallington's exam., 35 as quoted in Gardiner III, 227. Ibid., Herbert to Thurloe, Eyre's exam, January 27, 124, 126; Chapter II, pp. 98-99.

Berwick

George Fenwick

upon

Ex (T MSS, CJ). Rem. vs. Excl. Married to daughter of Sir Arthur Haslerig (DNB). Mentioned in Thurloe's notes on Wildman's plot (Thurloe, III, 147 as quoted in Tibbetts, 229). Army officer, deprived of regiment and governorships after exclusion (Clarke III, 71, as quoted in Pinckney, 131).

Tweed

1, 2

Isle of Ely

William Fisher

2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Association in 1656 with the republican, John Hobart (William Watson, A Historical Account of Wisbech, 223). Involved in concerted republican drive to elect candidates in 1656 (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/28/56, 232; Chapter II, p. 103).

Scotland

Thomas Fitch

1, 2

One of republican group in army (Firth and Davies, I, 342) as quoted in Tibbetts, 220. Considered republican by Whitelocke and Ludlow (Ludlow, II, 61; Whitelocke, Memorials,

R-7

IV, 351). Colonel of foot at £365/year and Governor of Inverness (NLP, 13).

Leicester

Thomas, Lord Grey of Grooby

1

Regicide with republican background (DNB). Ludlow says he was excluded from the 1654-1655 parliament, which probably means that he refused to sign the Recognition (Ludlow I, 390). Participated in republican plotting connected with Penruddock's Rising, arrested and imprisoned (Thurloe II, as quoted in GIII, n. 3, 228-229; Thurloe VI, 829; DNB, Chapter II, p. 99).

Middlesex

Sir James Harrington

1

Commissioner at king's trial, refused to sign death warrant (Yule, 100). With other leading republicans, supports Henry Neville in his suit against the Berkshire sheriff for unfair treatment at the 1656 election (Ludlow II, 35). Member of republican slate defeated in Middlesex in 1656 by a Court state backed by military force (Thurloe V, Titon to Kiffen, 8/8/56, 286).

Newcastle
on Tyne

Sir Arthur Haslerig

1

Leading figure during Commonwealth period (DNB).

Leicester

2

Ex (CJ, TMSS, NLP, SP). Rem. vs. Excl. A leader of republican obstructionists in parliament in 1654 (Chapter II, p. 94 ; Ludlow, 390-391). Involved in plots leading to Penruddock's Rising. (Thurloe II, 147 as

R-8

quoted in Gardiner III, n. 3, 228-229, Thurloe VI, 829, 832. Chapter II, p. 99). Summoned before council of state in attempt to quiet him in pre-election period. (Clarke, III, 69, Chapter II, p. 102). Under probable Court pressure, his 1654 constituency chooses a Court candidate and he represents another constituency. (Thurloe V, Lilburne to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 296, Chapter II, p. 107). A leader in republican obstructionism when readmitted to 1658 session (BII, 316-470, passim).

Ireland - 1

John Hewson

Guilford - 2

OH

Ex. (NLP. Regicide (DNB). Colonel of foot and governor of Dublin (NLP, 13). An Anabaptist who was a strong supporter of Fleetwood during his tenure in Ireland. (DNB). Unsympathetic to Henry Cromwell's regime and replaced by him as member of parliament by a loyal Court supporter. Probably obtained English constituency through Fleetwood's intervention (Chapter I, pp. 56-57; Chapter V, p. 247) Pro-MB. (BI, 236). Anti-kingship. (Lans MSS, 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57), Clarendon Papers, III, 4/26/57. In spite of opposition, Court bribed him for support by giving him seat on Other House and favorably settling Irish land claim. (Ludlow I, 401; Chapter I, p. 72 ; A and O II, 738, 1133: CSPD, 33, 3/16/54, Chapter VI, p. 283).

R-9

Southwark

Samuel Highland

1, 2

Elected in 1654 in spite of Court opposition (CSPD, 1654, 315, Chapter I). According to Ludlow, excluded 1654, which probably means he refused to sign Recognition (Ludlow I, 390, Chapter I). Pro-MP (teller, CJ, 483) Anti-kingship (BI, 364). Anti-ILG (BII, 175). Anti-oath (BII, 276-277). Anti-OH (BII, 343).

Norwich

John Hobart

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. supported in 1654 election by sectaries and poorer people (Chapter I, pp.39-40; CSPD, 1654, Vol. LXXIII, #89, July ?). Refused to sign Recognition (BI, xxxv), yet committee memberships attest to his attendance (CJ, passim). Major-general Haynes opposes his election in 1656 (Thurloe V, Balleston to Haynes, 9/1/56, 370); Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, 311). With cousin Josiah Berners, plans republican strategy for 1658 session ("Letters Concerning the Dissolution of Cromwell's Last Parliament, 1658. By J. Hobart." ed. C. H. Firth. EHR VII, 1892, 104; Chapter II, p. 113).

Lincolnshire

Thomas Lister

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, TMSS, SP). Rem. vs. Excl. (Commissioner at king's trial but refused to sign death warrant (Yule, 107). Association as teller with Haslerig (CJ, 589). Anti-OH after being readmitted in 1658 (teller, CJ, 573. In debate, BII, 407, 441).

Essex

Carew Mildmay

1, 2

Active with republican obstructionists in 1658 session. Allied with Darley, Scott and St. Nicholas (teller, CJ, 581, BII, 196, 318, 339-343).

Scotland

John Okey

1

Regicide. Army colonel, arrested in 1654, 1656 and 1658 in connection with plots against the government (DNB). Appeared before council in connection with 1656 elections (Clarke, III, 68, Chapter II, p. 102).

Coventry

William Purefoy

1, 2

Regicide. Classified as "radical" and "revolutionary" in civil war and commonwealth period. (Underdown, Pride's Purge, 35, 231). Anti-exclusion (teller, CJM, 426). Anti-kingship (teller, CJ, 529).

Ireland

William Purefoy

1

Army officer in Ireland. Replaced in 1656 by loyal Court supporter (Chapter V, p. 247). Kept command when Protectorate fell and officers purged by republican oriented Rump (CSPD, 1659-1660, p. 13 as quoted in F and D, p. 638). Among thirty persons whom Irish parliament proposed to exclude from Act of Indemnity in 1660 (Carte, IV, p. 53 as quoted in Firth and Davies, p. 640). Related to Colonel William Purefoy, the regicide (F. L. Colville, Worthies of Warwickshire [London : 1870], p. 601).

R-11

Yorkshire

Luke Robinson

North Riding Follower of Lambert and intimate of republican
 2 admiral John Lawson (Carroll, 414). Shows republican
 attitude when proposing that any member of parliament
 using "Lord" as a mode of address should be fined
 (BI, 189). Pro-MB. (BI, 230-232). Vehemently
 anti-kingship (BI, 363. Teller, CJ, 496. CSPV,
 1657-1659, Glavarina to Doge, February 27/March 9, 22).
 Lilburne writes to him to work in army in York against
 kingship (Thurloe VI, Lilburne to Robinson, 5/19/57,
 292). Anti-ILG (BI, 260, 282). Anti-OH (BII, 437-
 439).

Ireland

Thomas Sadler

1, 2 Colonel of foot (NLP, 13). Governor of Galway
 (Firth and Davies, 582). Regarded by Ludlow as a
 "sound republican." (Ludlow II, 210). Kept command
 when republican oriented Rump purged army on fall of
 Protectorate. (CSPD, 1659-1660, 12, as quoted in
 F and D, 638). Made prisoner on fall of parliament
 in 1659 and turned out of governorship (Ludlow II, 187).
 Irish parliament wishes him exempted from Act of Oblivion
 in 1660 (Carte IV, 53).

Canterbury

Thomas St. Nicholas

2 Ex. (TMSS, NLP, SP). Rem. vs. Excl. Praised by NLP
 (7). Returns in 1658 and moves that those responsible

R-12

for exclusion be called to account (BII, 374). Anti-OH (BII, 339). See Chapter II, p. 113. Government office holder (Pinckney, 348).

Ireland, 1

Jerome Sankey

Marlborough

2

Colonel of foot (NLP, 12). An Anabaptist who was a strong supporter of Fleetwood to whom he was related by marriage. Unsympathetic to Henry Cromwell's regime. (Thurloe VI, Henry Cromwell to Thurloe, 9/9/57, 506). As a result did not represent Ireland in the 1656-1658 parliament and probably obtained an English seat through Fleetwood's intervention (Pinckney, 242, Chapter I, p. 56). Maintained his close relationship with Fleetwood and acted as a Rem. agent (Stephen II, from Sharpe, 3/19/57, 30, Chapter V, p. 235). Anti-kingship. (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, 2/24/57). Anti-oath (BII, 296. Teller CJ, 570). Does not obtain favorable settlement of Irish land claim. (Petty, Reflections upon Some Persons and Things in Ireland, 66, Chapter VI, p. 286). Among thirty persons whom Irish parliament proposed to exclude from Act of Indemnity in 1660 (Carte, IV, 53, as quoted in Firth and Davies, 640).

Chipping-Wycombe

Thomas Scott

1

Ex (NLP, CJ, SP, TMSS) Rem. vs. Excl. Regicide who was influential during Commonwealth period (DNB).

R-13

Aylesbury

2

Leader of republican obstructionism in 1654-1655 session. (Ludlow I, 390-391; CJ VII, 366). Involved in plots leading to Penruddock's Rising. (Thurloe II, 147 as quoted in G III, n. 3; 228-229, Chapter II, p. 97). In order to defeat him in the 1656 election the Court remodels the charter of Chipping-Wycombe (Chapter II, p. 107). Readmitted to the 1658 session and again acts as a leader of the republican obstructionists (BII, 316-464, passim.)

Ireland

Thomas Scott

1

Lieutenant-colonel in Ludlow's regiment in Ireland. Protested against assumption of authority by Protectorate government and arrested by Henry Cromwell (Ludlow I, p. 416; Thurloe II, 139; Thurloe IV, Henry Cromwell to the Protector, 10/9/55, 74). Replaced in parliament by loyal Court supporter (Pinckney, 242; Chapter V, p. 246.

Berkshire

John Southby

1, 2

Ex. (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Henry Neville, the prominent republican theorist, praised his record during the 1654-1655 session (A True and Perfect Relation of---Berkshire, E 891 (8), p. 5)

Beverly

Francis Thorpe

1, 2

Yorkshire

Ex. (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS) Rem. vs. Excl. Republican background in late 1640s (DNE). A circuit judge who,

R-14

West Riding

2

because he doubted the authority of the Protectorate government, refused in 1655 to try the rebellious participants in Penruddock's Rising. Dismissed from the bench (Thurloe III, 359 as quoted in DNB). Anti-kingship (Lansdowne MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 821). Anti-OH. (BII, 445-448).

Hampshire

Robert Wallop

1, 2

Regicide with republican background (DNB, Yule, 23). Commended by Ludlow when he took seat in 1654. (Ludlow I, 388). No record of any parliamentary activity during Protectorate.

Southwark

Robert Warcup

1

Due to the influence of his father, the bailiff, Warcup and Samuel Highland, known republican, won the 1654 election in Southward (CSFD, 1654, 66-68, 305).

Stamford

John Weaver

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS, among "most considerable" according to Clarke Papers III, 73). Rem. vs. Excl. Involved in plots leading to Penruddock's Rising (Thurloe II, 147 as quoted in G III, 228-229; Chapter II, p. 97). Concealed political views in order to be elected in 1656 (Thurloe V, Whalley to Thurloe, 8/9/56, 296). When readmitted in 1658, anti-OH (BII, 377, 422, 429) and in favor of restoring republic. (Thurloe VII, 269 as quoted in F. II, 33).

R-15

Scarborough

John Wildman

1 Republican background, associated with Lilburne in late 1640s (DNB). In response to petition from local enemies, council of state forbids him to take seat (HMC, Egmont, I, 546; CSPP 1654, 310. Ludlow I, 390 as quoted in Ashley, Wildman, 84).

Philip Woodhouse

Norfolk

Ex. (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Arrested

1, 2

in early 1655 in connection with plot to overthrow government (DNB). Refused to sign Recognition in 1654, yet attended in November (CJ, 382, 383). Major-general Haynes opposes his election in 1656 (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 9/15/56, 311; Balleston to Haynes, 9/1/56, 370).

THE COUNTRY

Ct-1

Dedicated to parliamentary power and privilege. Because these men were in general traditional in their outlook and many somewhat royalist in their sympathies, they were willing to cooperate with the Court and support the kingship proposals in 1657 in order to prevent the establishment of a military regime.

London

Sir Thomas Adams

1, 2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Exclusion in 1654 by council of state on grounds that he is a royalist concurred in by parliament. (A Perfect Diurnall, E, 233.(26) as quoted in Heath, "An Essay in Constitutional Development," 63).

Leeds

Francis Alanson

2

Ex (SP, T MSS). Burgess of corporation. Opposed revision of charter which would have given franchise to larger electorate (Baynes Corres., 21, 427/415; Merc. Pol., 8/28/56, 7192; as quoted in Carroll, 357). Both he and Adam Baynes elected in disputed double returns which was decided in Baynes' favor (BII, 405).

Bristol

Robert Aldworth

1, 2

KL. Rumor after 1654 elections that he is a royalist. (CSPD 1654, 14, 8/24/54).

Ct-2

Yorkshire

Henry Arthington

West Riding

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Son-in-law of Lord Fairfax, perhaps excluded for this reason (Carroll, 362).

2

Wiltshire-1

James Ashe

Bath-2

Anti-MB (CJ, 482, 483 as quoted in FI, 122). Anti-Excl. (One of 29). Took part in Country-republican coalition in 1658 (BII, 347).

Newton

William Ashurst

1

An agent of Thurloe's states that Ashurst is a member of the opposition "Presbyterian interest." (CCSP III, Burton to Browne, June, 1655, 127).

Ludlow

John Aston

1, 2

Ex (SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. KL.

Devizes

Edward Baynton

1

Anti-IPP (Teller, CJ, 418).

Exeter

Thomas Bampffield

1, 2

KC. Leader of Country in 1656-1657 session from which position he conducted a running quarrel with the Speaker, Sir Thomas Widdrington (Chapter III, p. 148, Chapter IV, pp. 177-79). Anti-excl. (One of 29. BI, 194, 290). Anti-SMB (teller, CJ, 502; BII, 27). Anti-IIG (teller, CJ, 550). Anti-CAEC (BII, 173). Anti-oath (BII, 287, 405). Anti-A & O (BII, 145).

Ct-3

Rutlandshire

Abel Barker

- 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Attacked prior to 1656 election by William Jephson, one of Henry Cromwell's agents (HMCR V, 395, 397, 398 as quoted in Pinckney, 117. Chapter V, p.250).

Suffolk

Sir Thomas Barnardiston

- 1, 2 Anti-excl. (One of 29. Teller, CJ, 426).

Essex

Robert Barrington

- 2 One of 29. Anti-OH (Teller, CJ, 589; BII, 439).

Westmoreland

Jeremy Baynes

- 1 Reputation as royalist. Election in 1656 invalidated by Committee for Privileges in favor of Thomas Burton, Court supporter (HMCR VII, 687 as quoted in Pinckney, 129).

Kent

Richard Beal

- 1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Halifax

Jeremy Bentley

- 1, 2 Ex (NLP). Rem. vs. Excl.

Leicestershire

Thomas Beaumont

- 1, 2 One of 29. Accused of royalist sympathies in protest against his election in 1654 (CSFD 1654, 8/21/54, 316).

Norfolk

Philip Bedingfield

- 1 LRR (BI, xxxv).

Ct-4

London	Theophilus Buddulph
2	EX (NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl.
Hereford-1	John Birch
Leominster-2	Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Leader of Country in first Protectorate parliament. Opposition teller in twenty-two divisions. Attempted to weaken the powers of the Protector and cut the army budget (Chapter III, pp.133-38).
Liverpool	Thomas Birch
1, 2	Ex (NLP). Rem. vs. Excl.
Suffolk	William Bloys
1, 2	Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl.
Cheshire	Sir George Booth
1, 2	Royalist ties, when elected in 1654, Charles II congratulates him. (CCSP II, King to Sir George Booth, 9/22/54, #2003). Rumor that he will return after enforced subscription to Recognition (<u>Archaeologica</u> , Gewen to Morrice, 140), yet no record of attendance. Ex (CCSP III, Titus to Hyde, 10/25/56, 584, "one of the most considerable," but not on any exclusion list). Presents Rem. vs. Excl. to speaker (CJ, 424). Casti-gates major-generals as "Cromwell's hangmen." (CCSP III, Titus to Hyde, 2/3/57, #718).

Ct-5

Bedfordshire

Sir William Boteler

1, 2

Rumor in 1654 that the Protector did not want him elected (CSPD 1654, 8/24/54, 334). Country teller in 1654-1655 session opposing IPP, revenue grants for government and extended franchise (CJ, 408, 417, 418, 420). Dies the day after election in 1656 (Mercurius Politicus, #325, 9/4/56, 7221).

Essex

Sir Thomas Bowes

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Newcastle
under Lyme

John Bowyer

2

Major-general Worsley opposes his proposed appointment as sheriff (Thurloe, IV, 224, 300 as quoted in Pinckney, 123). Ex (SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Kent

John Boys

1, 2

Country teller in 1654-1655 session opposing kingship (CJ, 411, Chapter III, p.142) and in favor of parliamentary privilege. (CJ, 414; Chapter III, p. 143). Ex (NLP, CJ, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Chester

Edward Bradshaw

2

One of 29.

Cheshire

Peter Brooke

2

Anti-Excl. (One of 29. Seconds motion to bring back excluded members [BI, 190]). KL. KC.

Ct-6

London

Sir Richard Browne

2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Castigates major-generals (BI, 331). Royalist ties: exclusion made him a royalist (CCSP III, Titus to Hyde, 9/24/56, 584); characterized as "very good, religious man" in intercepted letter from plotters (Thurloe V, 337); proposal by plotters that he be rewarded if plot succeeds (CCSP III, Levellers to King, 2/12/57, 730).

Somersetshire

John Buckland

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Hampshire

John Bulkeley

1

One of most active Country tellers in 1654-1655 session, with emphasis on the House's power to define and enforce religious doctrine (Chapter III, 139-140). Opposes Court candidate, John Lisle, in 1656 (Thurloe, V, 287).

2

Ex (CJ, SP, NLP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

East and West

John Buller

Low-2

Victory over republican candidate, Robert Bennet (Coate, 294). One of 29. KL.

Norfolk

John Buxton

2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Ran for office at instigation of brother-in-law, Col. Robert Wilton, who was Country boss of county (HMCR, Various II, Wilton to Buxton, 7/13/56, 270).

Ct-7

Cambridgeshire

Robert Castle

1, 2

Major-general Haynes suspicious of him before 1656 election. (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, 311). Anti-ILG (BII, 176). Perhaps the same "Capt. Castle" who opposed Court candidate, Robert Hammond, in Reading in 1654 (An Admirable Speech Made by the Maior of Reading---, E 745[17]).

Middlesex

Chaloner Chute

2

Ex, among "most considerable." (Clarke, Papers, III, 73). (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Won contested election with difficulty against display of armed force by Court candidates (Heath's Chronicle, 705). Cooperates with Sir Arthur Haslerig, leading republican, in attacking Other House (BII, 421).

Durham

James Clavering

2

Ex (CJ, NLP). Rem. vs. Excl. Royalist inclinations. (Bean, W. W., Parliamentary Representation of Six Northern Counties, 114, as quoted in Tibbetts, 123).

Lincolnshire

Francis Clinton (Fiennes)

1, 2

One of 29. KL.

Wiltshire

Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper

1, 2

The future Earl of Shaftesbury. Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Member of council of state and Court supporter until December 1654 when he ceased attending

Ct-8

council, probably because he felt military rule inevitable after failure of motion he seconded to have the Protector assume the crown. (K.D.H. Haley, The First Earl of Shaftesbury, 87.) Leader of Country members of Country-republican coalition which opposed Other House in 1658 session (Chapter II, 114-116).

Sussex

George Courthope

2

Ex (NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. His election opposed by major-generals, who afterwards petitioned that he be excluded. Complained and reinstated through intervention of Philip, Lord Lisle (Memoirs of Sir George Courthope, 1616-1685). Edited by Mrs. S. C. Lomas, Camden Misc. XI, Camden Third Series XIII, 1907, 141-145 as quoted in Tibbetts, 129 and Pinckney, 84. Thurloe, V, Goffee to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341).

Ireland

John Davies

2

Described as a royalist and was never allowed to take his seat in parliament. (Thurloe, V, Thurloe to HC, 9/9/56, 398; HC to Thurloe, 9/23/56, 443; BII, 269).

Norfolk

Sir William Doyley

1, 2

LRR (BI, xxxv). Anti-IPP: does not wish Protector consulted about ratification of new constitution (teller, CJ 420, French Transcripts, R. O., Bordeaux to Mazarin, January 18/28, as quoted in Gardiner III,

Ct-9

244). Major-general Haynes opposes his election in 1656 (Thurloe, V, Woolmer to Haynes, 9/1/56, 371). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. States that will not take seat unless freely admitted (HMCR, Various Collections, II, 271).

Barnstaple

John Doddridge

1 Wrote pamphlet in 1658, Opinions of Sundry Learned
 Devonshire Antiquaries touching the Antiquity, Power, etc. of
 2 the High Court of Parliament (Pinckney, 193). Des-
 borough probably attempted to force him to resign as
 Recorder of Bristol in 1655 (Thurloe IV, Desborough
 to the Protector, 1/7/55, 396) and later wrote saying
 he should be kept out of the House (Pinckney, 193, n.)
 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Anti-OH
 (BII, 418, 457).

Essex

Sir Richard Everard

1, 2 One of 29. Listed by republican pamphlet as a rela-
 tive of the Protector, who did not hold office, per-
 haps because of lack of support (NLP, 17).

Sussex

Sir John Fagge

1, 2 Distrusted by Major-general Goffe who kept him off
 militia commission (Thurloe, IV, Goffe to Thurloe,
 11/7/55, 161). Ex (NLP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.
 (However, Herbert Morley, Fagge's brother-in-law,

Ct-10

denies that they signed it [Thurloe, V, 456 as quoted in Catterall, "A Suspicious Document," EHR, XIV, 1901, 739]). Cast deciding vote in crucial division with the purpose of destroying the Other House (CJ, 589; BII, 436).

Dorsetshire

John Fitzjames

1, 2

Anti-IPP concerning religion (CJ, 415, 509), although pro-IPP concerning suspending powers (CJ 411). Pro-kingship: KL; teller for introduction of kingship proposals (CJ, 496). Pro-OH (teller, CJ, 591).

Devonshire

Edmund Fowell

2

Elected chairman of grand committee on assessments, when as a delaying device, Court and Country united and voted to go into grand committee in order to defeat the Militia Bill (BI, 324; Chapter IV, p.202). Defeated as chairman of grand committee on excise by Court supporter, Nathaniel Bacon, when Court and Country in opposition. Anti-MB (BI, 241). Anti-CAEC (BII, 33, 173). Pro-OH (BII, 448-450). KC.

Derbyshire

Sir John Gell

1, 2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Cornwall

Thomas Gewen

1

LRR. Urges fellow Country members to return to House

Lancaston

and sign Recognition in 1654 in order to oppose the

2

Ct-11

Court. (Archaeologica, 140; Chapter III, pp. 131-132).
 Ex (CJ, SP, TMSS). Supports Court in 1658 session:
 defending OH (BII, 392) and renewing kingship proposals
 (BII, 424).

Suffolk

William Gibbs

1, 2

LRR. Anti-NF. (teller, CJ, 392). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP).
 Rem. vs. Excl.

King's Lynn

Guybon Goddard

1

Diarist of 1654-1655 parliament, who exhibits anti-
 republican tendencies in diary (BI, xxv, xlv). De-
 scribed by NLP (10), as a lawyer who had "advantages
 from the state," but LRR (BI, xxxvi) in 1654 and in
 1655 his election voided by Committee on Privileges
 so that Major-general Skippon can take seat (Chapter
 I, pp. 67-68; Chapter III, p. 145).

Kent

Lambert Godfrey

1, 2

A leader of the Country in the 1656-1657 session
 (Chapter III, p. 148); anti-excl. (BI, 194, 290),
 anti-MB (BI, 234), anti-CAEC (BII, 173), anti-oath
 (BII, 405), anti-A & O (BII, 39, 42). Ex (CJ, SP,
 TMSS). KC. A supporter of the Res., who describe
 him as "most cordiall to the Presbyterian interest of
 great respect in the Parliament." (Stephen II, 97).

Ct-12

East Grinstead

John Goodwin

2 Ex (CJ, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Pro-kingship: KL; attacked by Thomas Pride for his support of the kingship proposals (Lans MSS 822, f. 21, Morgan to HC, 5/12/57). Pro-ILG (BI, 260).

Hertfordshire

Sir John Gore

2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Sussex

Samuel Gott

2 Ex (NLP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Buckinghamshire

Richard Grenville

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Essex

Sir Harbottle Grimston

2 Ex (CJ, SP, NLP, TMSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Most important member in Colchester where charter probably remodelled to ensure his absence, from 1640-1681 he usually represented this borough (Pinckney, 108-109).

Wiltshire

Thomas Grove

1, 2 A leader of the Country in the 1656-1657 session. (Chapter III, p. 148): LRR; anti-SMB (teller, CJ, 502); pro-kingship (KC; teller, CJ, 537).

Gloucestershire

Christopher Guise

1 Co-teller with John Birch, Country leader, in division

Ct-13

attempting to curb Protector's powers and cut military budget (CJ, 388; BI, xc).

Devonshire

John Hale

1, 2

LRR (Archaeologica, 140). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS)

Rem. vs. Excl.

Lincolnshire

Charles Hall

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Lincolnshire

Thomas Hall

1, 2

One of 29.

Norfolk

Sir Ralph Hare

1, 2

LRR (BI, xxxv). Leading teller in 1654-1655 session with fourteen tellerships supporting Country positions: anti-IPP, anti-NF, anti-SMB (Chapter III, p. 144). Signs a protest against exclusion, supported by 160 unnamed members (SP 18/130).

Herefordshire

Sir Edward Harley

2

Opposed by Court in 1656 election (HMCR, 14 App. 2, 208). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Yorkshire
North Riding

Sir Thomas Harrison

1

Involved in Penruddock's Rising (Vaughan I, Thurloe to Pell, 3/16/54, 48).

Ct-14

Middlesex

Edmond Harvey

- 1 Commissioner of customs, charged in November 1655 with
Suffolk embezzling and dismissed from office (DNB). Ex
2 (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Northampton

Francis Harvey

- 1 Proposed as commissioner by Thomas Bampffield, the
Country leader (BII, 172). Anti-OH (BII, 341).

Sussex

William Hay

- 1 Supported by Country leader of county, Col. Herbert
Rye Morley (Thurloe, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341)
2 in 1656. Opposed by Major-general Kelsey (HMCR 13,
IV, 228 as quoted in Pinckney, 199).

Berkshire

William Hide

- 2 Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS). KL.

Norfolk

Sir John Hobart

- 1, 2 Country leader of county, will not help Court.
OH (Thurloe, V, Haynes to Thurloe, 7/16/56, 226). LRR,
(BI, xxv). Three anti-IPP tellerships in 1654-1655
session (CJ, 396, 398, 403). Pro-kingship: KC; 2nd
NLP, 486; tellerships, CJ, 511, 520, 535. Anti-
excl. (Teller, CJ, 426) Anti-MB (teller, CJ, 475).
See Chapter III, p. 144.

Wiltshire

Francis Hollis

- 1 Country teller with John Bulkeley on religious doctrine
(CJ, 382).

Ct-15

Abingdon

Thomas Holt

1, 2

Castigated by Major-general Goffe, "an ill man and noe friend to the protector" (Thurloe, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 4/15/56, 215). On king's bench for twenty-one years. (Robert O'Byrne, Representative History of Great Britain and Ireland, 53). Ex (T MSS).

Hampshire

Edward Hooper

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Hereford

Bennet Hoskins

1

Chairman of grand committee which drafted Country

Hereford-
shire

constitution in 1654-1655 session (Chapter IV, p. 199).

2

Charge made after 1654 election that he is a royalist (CSPD 1654, xi). Deputy judge in Wales (NLP, 15).

Wiltshire

Henry Hungerford

2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Anti-OH (BII, 441).

Lincolnshire

Charles Hussey

2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Boston

Sir Anthony Irby

2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Bristol

Miles Jackson

1

Rumor after his election that he is a royalist (CSPD 1654, 331).

Ct-16

Kent

William James

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Oxfordshire

Robert Jenkinson

1, 2 One of 29. KL. KC. Anti-religious toleration.
tellership (CJ, 507).

London

John Jones

2 Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Shrewsbury

Samuel Jones

2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

London

John Langham

1 Excluded by council of state on grounds that he is a
royalist. House concurs (A Perfect Diurnal, E. 233,
26) as quoted in Heath's Chronicle, 163). Presbyterian
party background (Pearl, 321).

Westminster

Thomas Latham

1 Defeated in 1656 by Court candidate, Edward Grosvenor,
who was backed by military force while the citizens
supported Latham. (Thurloe, V, Waddall to Vanseare,
8/22/56, 357).

Cheshire

Richard Legh

2 KL. KC. Locally influential. (Pinckney, CE, 403).

Ct-17

Shropshire

Andrew Lloyd

2 Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. In contest against Major-general Berry's "well-affected" slate (Publick Intelligencer, No. 40 [25 August 1656], 771. "From Shrewsbury, Aug. 20" as quoted in Pinckney, 132).

Somersetshire

Robert Long

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Hertfordshire

Sir Richard Lucy

1, 2 Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS). Pro-kingship: KC; tellership (CJ, 535).

Warwickshire

Richard Lucy

1, 2 KL. KC. In spite of holding office, Commissioner of the Prerogative Office at £300/year and Commissioner of the Army (NLP, 16); seems to be in opposition: one of 29, Rem. vs. Excl., anti-OH (teller, CJ, 589).

Hertfordshire

Rowland Lytton

2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Cheshire

Thomas Marbury

2 One of 29. Locally influential (Pinckney, CE, 403).

Malden

Joachim Matthews

1, 2 Country teller in 1654-1655 session: anti-IPP concerning religion (CJ, 399), anti-IPP (CJ, 415, 418), anti-SMB (CJ, 417). Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS). In 1656-1657

Ct-18

session: anti-kingship (teller, CJ, 498), anti-OH (teller, CJ, 573; BII, 341, 429, 450), anti-ILG (teller, CJ, 540; BII, 175).

Plymouth

John Maynard

2 Ex (among "most considerable" [Clarke III, 73], CJ, SP, T MSS). Serjeant-at-law in 1658 (DNB), according to Whitelocke this office a reward for an expressed desire for Cromwell's assumption of the crown (BII, 461; Whitelocke, Memorials, 673). Pro-OH (BII, 458). Argued for two republicans in important cases against the government. In 1654, his defense of George Cony, a merchant who had refused to pay taxes, amounted to an attack on the legality of the government. (Abbott, III, 498). In 1656, he represented the republican, Henry Neville, in his suit against the Berkshire sheriff for unfair behaviour at the polls (Ludlow II, 35, 36).

Kent

Richard Meredith

2 One of 29.

Essex

Sir Henry Mildmay

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Litchfield

Thomas Minors

1, 2 Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Ct-19

Shropshire

Samuel More

- 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. In contest against Major-general Berry's "well-affected" slate (Public Intelligencer, No. 46 [25 August 1656], 771. "From Shrewsbury August 20." as quoted in Pinckney, 132). Denounced major-generals (BI, 331).

Sussex

Herbert Morley

- 1, 2 County boss of Sussex (Thurloe, V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341). Teller for Country eight times in 1654-1655 session (CJ, 394, 395, 409, 412, 414, 417, 418). Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS), but denied signing Rem. vs. Excl. (Thurloe V, 456 as quoted in Catterall, "A Suspicious Document," EHR, xiv [1901], 739). Anti-OH (BII, 456.)

Devonshire

William Morrice

- 1, 2 Urged to return in 1654 after requirement of signing Recognition in order to support Country program (Archaeologica, 140). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Cornwall

Walter Moyle

- 1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Worcestershire

John Nanfan

- 2 Ex (SP, T MSS).

Suffolk

Henry North

- 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Ct-20

Oxfordshire

Sir Francis Norris

2

Ex (SP, T MSS). KL. KC.

Devonshire

Sir John Northcote

1, 2

Urged to return to support Country program after enforced signing of Recognition (Archaeologica, 140).

Ex (CJ, NLP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Surrey

Arthur Onslow

1, 2

Son of Sir Richard Onslow. Pro-OH (BII, 456).

Surrey

Sir Richard Onslow

1, 2

LRR (Perfect Dirunall II, 171, 9/27/54). Acted as a

OH

Country teller eighteen times in 1654-1655 session, opposing kingship, anti-IPP, anti-SMB (Chapter III, p. 143). Anti A & O (BII, 11). His election in 1656, opposed by Colonel Pride, sheriff for the county (HMCR XIV, 9,478). In 1656-1657 session, head of "ye country party for kingship." (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57). KL. KC. Author of compromise to secure adoption of kingship (Venetian Transcripts R. O., Giavarina to the Doge, March 6/16; teller, CJ, 496; Chapter III, p. 153).

Lincoln

Origen Peart

1, 2

One of 29.

Chichester

Henry Peckham

1, 2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Ct-21

Warwickshire

Edward Peyto

2 Ex (SP, T MSS). Country teller (CJ, 489).

Buckinghamshire

Sir Richard Piggot

1, 2 One of 29.

Worcestershire

Edward Pitt

1, 2 Denounces Protector in public in August, 1654 (W. A. Williams, The Parliamentary History of the County of Worcester, Hereford, 1897 as quoted in Tibbetts, 238).
KL. KC.

Derbyshire

German Pole

2 One of 29.

Bath

Alexander Popham

1 Voluntarily absented himself from 1654-1655 session.

Somerset and
Wiltshire

(HMCR Buccleuch and Queensbury at Whitehall, I [1892],

2

311). Involved in plots leading to Penruddock's

OH

Rising (Thurloe, III, 147 as quoted in Gardiner III,

228; Underdown, Royalist Conspiracy, 117). In spite

of this behaviour, typical of the republicans, identified by royalists as a powerful "Presbyterian." (Or-

monde to Hyde, 2/5/58 as quoted in Abbott IV, 725).

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Lancaster

Henry Porter

1, 2 One of 29.

Hertford

Isaac Pulter

1, 2 One of 29.

Ct-22

Berkshire	Sir Robert Pye
1	Anti-NF (CJ, 391).
Devonshire	John Quick
1	Urged to return after enforced requirement of signing Recognition to support the Country program (<u>Archaeologica</u> , 140).
Manchester	Richard Radcliffe
2	Ex (NLP). Rem. vs. Excl.
Essex	Oliver Raymond
1, 2	Ex (CJ, NLP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.
Herefordshire	Richard Read
1	Accused after 1654 election of being a royalist. (CSPD, 1654, XI). On Harley's slate in 1656. Defeated because of machinations of the sheriff, Court supporter Wroth Rogers. (HMCR 14, App. 2, 208).
Devonshire	Thomas Reynell
1, 2	One of 29. Anti-MB (BI, 236). Anti-OH (BII, 342).
London	Andrew Riccard
1	A leading London merchant. Compromise member on a slate which also included Court supporters and excluded royalists (Chapter I, p. 38).

Ct-23

Sussex

Sir Thomas Rivers

1, 2

Probably under influence of Colonel Herbert Morley who in Sussex "ruled the roost." (Thurloe V, Goffe to Thurloe, 8/23/56, 341). When elected on a writ in 1654 to fill a vacancy, at Morley's behest admitted to the House without approval of the council of state (CJ, 394). Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Lincolnshire

Edward Rossiter

1, 2

Not excluded in 1656, but refused "to take any ticket to go in." (CCSP III, 10/24/56, 584).

Derbyshire

Thomas Saunders

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Lincolnshire

William Saville

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Herefordshire

John Scudamore

1

On Harley's slate in 1656. Defeated because of machinations of the Sheriff, Court supporter Wroth Rogers (HMCr 14, App. 2, 208, 8/20/56).

Tiverton

Robert Shapcote

1, 2

Complaint to council of state after 1654 election that he is a royalist (CSPD 1654, 8/1/54, 278-280). Denies that he wrote pamphlet issued October 30, 1654 which attacked the Protector and stated that Charles II would be preferable if there must be a king (BI, lxii, note;

Ct-24

The Speech of Col. Shapcott, Knight for Devonshire, 10/30/54, E816(7); Severall Proceedings, Burney 47, 11/7/54, 4237; Vaughan, Thurloe to Pell, 11/24/54, 85). Seconds renewal of kingship proposals in 1658 session (BII, 37). Pro-OH (BII, 377, 393, 422, 436). Commissioner for building act (NLP, 10).

Kent

Daniel Shatterden

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Suffolk

John Sicklemore

1, 2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Called a "Presbyterian" by an agent of Secretary Thurloe, who tells of complaints and meetings with other discontented citizens after exclusion (CSPD 1656-1657, Thomas Barret to Thurloe, 12/13/56, 196).

Norfolk

Thomas Sotherton

1, 2

LRR (BI, xxxv). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Disliked by Court, "the election is as bad as it could well have bin made [in Norfolk in 1656]" (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, 311). An agent of Major-general Haynes states that Sotherton is a royalist sympathizer (Thurloe V, Woolmer to Haynes, 9/1/56, 371).

Leicestershire

Henry Grey, first Earl of Stamford

1

Accused after election in petition to council of state in 1654 of being a royalist (CSPD 1654, 8/21/54, 316).

Ct-25

Admitted to House by order of House without certificate from council. Council later sends certificate (French Transcripts, R. O., Bordeaux to Brienne, September 7/17, as quoted in Gardiner III, 183).

Lancashire

Richard Standish

1, 2

One of 29. Present at beginning of 1656 session, but "out of temper" and left (BI, 285).

Yorkshire

John Stanhope

West Riding

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Anti-kingship
2 (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57).

Sussex

John Stapeley

1, 2

Engaged in royalist plot in 1657 (DNB).

Kent

Sir Thomas Style

2

Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Anti-OH
(teller, CJ, 581; BII, 342).

Kent

John Syliard

1, 2

Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Yorkshire

Henry Tempest

West Riding

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Anti-kingship
2 (Lans MSS 821, f. 294, Morgan to HC, 2/24/57).

Wiltshire

Alexander Thistlethwaite

1, 2

Anti-Excl., supports motion to admit excluded members

Ct-26

(BI, 290). Anti-SMB, (CJ, 417), Anti A & O (BII, 39). KL.
KC.

Lynn Regis

Sir John Thoroughgood

2

Although he held government office as a trustee for disposing Augmentations towards Ministers' Maintenance (NLP, 16), all his tellerships show opposition to the Court. He opposed the Protector's powers to deal with religious doctrine, acting as teller for a bill which was afterwards vetoed (CJ, 509, 551; BII, 203, 206).
Anti-OH (teller, CJ 589, 591).

Gloucestershire

Baynard Throckmorton

2

One of 29.

Warwick

Clement Throckmorton

2

Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). KL.KC.

Sandwich

James Thurbane

2

Ex (CJ, NLP). Rem. vs. Excl.

Salisbury

Edward Tooker

1

New Sarum

Ex (NLP). Rem. vs. Excl.

2

Norfolk

Sir Horatio Townshend

2

Disliked by Court, "the election is as bad as it could well have bin made." (Thurloe V, Haynes to Thurloe, 8/15/56, 311). An agent of Major-general Haynes called him "a common swearer." (Thurloe V, Woolmer

Ct-27

to Haynes, 9/1/56, 371).

Essex

Edward Turnor

1, 2

Chairman of grand committee in 1654-1655 session, which cut Court proposed monthly assessments (Chapter IV, pp. 199-200). Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Pro-OH (BII, 435).

Wales

John Vaughan

Merionethshire Complaints when elected that he is a royalist (CSPD

1

1654, xi).

Scotland

John Vincent

2

A "Mr. Vincent," either John or Walter, wished to have a clause stating that no taxation could be laid without the consent of parliament included in the Scottish Union bill (BI, 347) and with the noted republican, Sir Arthur Haslerig, declared against the Other House (BII, 435).

Cornwall

Walter Vincent

2

See above--John Vincent. Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem vs. Excl.

Essex

Dionysius Wakering

1, 2

One of 29.

Lincoln

Humphrey Walcot

1, 2

One of 29.

Ct-28

Suffolk	Daniel Wall
2	Ex (SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Locally influential. (Hobart to Berners, 1/1/58, in Firth (ed) "Letters--- by J. Hobart" <u>EHR</u> , VII, 1892).
Lincolnshire	William Welby
1, 2	Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.
Norfolk	Thomas Weld
1	LRR. (BI, xxxv).
Kent	Ralph Weldon
1, 2	One of 29. Anti-ILG (CJ, 546).
Suffolk	Edward Wenieve
2	Ex (CJ, SP, T MSS).
Cambridgeshire	Robert West
2	KL. Anti-MA (BI, 221).
Nottinghamshire	Peniston Whalley
2	Ex (NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Involved in 1655 royalist plot (Underdown, <u>Royalist Conspiracy</u> , 145).
Norfolk	Robert Wilton
1, 2	LRR (BI, xxxv). KL. KC. Country leader in county in 1656 (HMCr, <u>Various</u> II, Wilton to Buxton, 7/13/56, 270).

Ct-29

Hertfordshire

Sir John Wittewrong

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Country
teller in 1654-1655 session, six tellerships: anti-
IPP (CJ, 406, 409, 420); anti-kingship (CJ, 411), anti-
SMB (CJ, 417, 418).

Lincolnshire

William Wooley

1, 2 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl.

Bridgewater

Sir Thomas Wroth

2 Anti-IPP (BII, 47. Opposes introduction of kingship
proposals [teller, CJ, 496], although listed as voting
for them [KL]).

Honiton

Sir John Young

1 Ex (CJ, NLP, SP, T MSS). Rem. vs. Excl. Pro-OH
Devonshire (CJ, 581).

2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts (by location)

B-1

London

British Museum

Lansdowne MSS 821-823 (Letters written to and by Henry Cromwell in Ireland)

Public Record Office

Chancery 193/13/4-6 (List of justices of the peace, 1652-1658)

Chancery 220/9/4 (List of justices of the peace, 1660)

State Papers 18/73 (123 signatures asking for confirmation of election of Charles George Cocke in Norwich)

State Papers 18/74 (126 signatures protesting election of Richard Read and Bennet Hoskins in Hereford)

State Papers 18/75 (95 signatures protesting election of Robert Aldworth and Miles Jackson in Bristol)

State Papers 18/126 (Petition for new charter in Colchester, list of members of the Colchester corporation)

State Papers 18/130/73-75 (Domestic State Papers, Interregnum)

State Papers 25/130/75, 76 (Council Record Book, Interregnum)

Oxford

Bodleian Library

MS Rawlinson A 33, 37, 41, 42, 59, 68, 72, 73 (Thurloe Papers)

MS Tanner 51-53 (Papers of John Hobart including 1656 exclusion list and list of twenty nine members who voted to bring back the excluded on September 23, 1656)

B-2

Reading

Reading Corporation Archives

Bundle of Papers Relating to Elections 178/R/AO

Corporation Diary, 1647-1659

Southampton

Southampton Corporation Archives

Assembly Book, 1642-79

Private Nomination Books, 3/7/27-35

Register of Burgesses, 1496-1704

Printed Sources

Abbott, Wilbur C. The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.
4 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945.

Akerman, John Y. (ed.). Letters from Roundhead Officers Written from
Scotland and Chiefly Addressed to Captain Adam Baynes.
Edinburgh, 1856.

Barnes, William (ed.). "The Commonplace Book of a Dorchester Man,
1625-35," Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society,
Proceedings, XVI, 59-74.

_____. "Diary of William Whiteway of Dorchester, 1618-1634,"
Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society Proceedings.
XIII, 57-81.

Birch, Thomas (ed.). A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe,
Esq., Secretary, First to the Council of State, Afterwards to
the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell. 7 vols.
London, 1742.

Bunce, Cyprian R. Translation of the Charters of Canterbury. Canter-
bury, 1791.

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian
Library. Vol. I, ed. by O. Ogle and W. H. Bliss; Vols. II and
III by W. D. Macray. Oxford, 1869-76; Vol. IV by F. J. Rout-
ledge, 1936.

Carte, Thomas (ed.). A Collection of Original Letters and Papers Con-
cerning the Affairs of England from 1641-1666 found among the
Duke of Ormonde's Papers. 2 vols. London, 1739.

B-3

Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston, 1632-39, 1650-54, 1655-60. Ed. by G. M. Paul, D. H. Fleming, and J. D. Ogilvie. 3 vols. Scottish History Society Publication, LXI, 2nd Ser. 18, 3rd Ser. 34. Edinburgh, 1911, 1919, 1940.

Dunlop, Robert. Ireland Under the Commonwealth, "Publications of the University of Manchester Historical Series," No. XVIII. Manchester, 1913.

Ellis, Henry (ed.). "Transcripts of Three Letters Illustrative of English History," Archaeologica, XXIV (18-32), 137-147.

Firth, C. H. and Rait, R. S. (eds.). Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-60. 3 vols. London, 1911.

Firth, C. H. (ed.). The Clarke Papers, selections from papers of William Clarke, secretary to Council of Army, 1647-9, to General Monck and commanders of the Army in Scotland, 1651-60. Camden Society. 4 vols. London, 1891-1901.

_____. "Letters Concerning the Dissolution of Cromwell's Last Parliament, 1658. By J. Hobart." Ed. by Firth from Hobart's Correspondence among Tanner MSS. English Historical Review, VII, 1892.

_____. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow. 2 vols. Oxford, 1894.

_____. Scotland and the Commonwealth. Publications of the Scottish History Society, XVIII. Edinburgh, 1895.

_____. Scotland and the Protectorate. Publications of the Scottish History Society, XXXI. Edinburgh, 1899.

_____. "Thomas Scott's Account of his Actions as Intelligencer during the Commonwealth," in EHR, XII (1897).

Francis, George Grant (ed.). Memoirs of Colonel Philip Jones included in Charters granted to Swansea. London, 1867.

Gardiner, S. R. Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-60. Oxford, 1889.

Gibson, A. Craig. "Original Correspondence of the Lord President Bradshaw; with Other Documents Illustrating His Personal History," in Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Transactions, N.S. II (1861-2). Liverpool, 1862.

Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Series 58, II, Bath, Marquess of. "A Game of Picquet," pp. 114-17. London, 1904.

B-4

- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports. Buc-
cleuch and Queensbury at Whitehall, I. London, 1897.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Appendix
to 6th Report. Miss Ffarrington MSS. Letters from James
Waynwright at London to Richard Bradshaw [British Resident]
at Hamburg. London, 1878.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Reports, XIV,
Appendix 2. Harley Family. Portland MSS. at Welbeck Abbey,
III. London, 1894.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports. House of
Lords MSS. 1450-1678. The Journal of the House of Lords of
the Protectorate, 1657-9 is in IV, new series. London, 1908.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, XIV, Part
9. Onslow MSS. Anecdotes, etc., by Arthur Onslow, copied by
George Onslow, 1769, pp. 458-524. London, 1895.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, XI,
Appendix 7. Reading Corporation. London, 1888.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission. The Manuscripts
of the Corporations of Southampton and King's Lynn. Report.
11th, Appendix, pt. III. London, 1887.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, Appendix
to 5th Report, Part 1. Sutherland MSS, IV. Letters from
Stephen Charlton to Sir R. Leveson. London, 1876.
- Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports. Various
Collections, II. London, 1903.
- Great Britain. Parliament. Journals of the House of Commons. VII,
1651-1659. London, 1813.
- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers,
Domestic Series, 1649-60. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green.
13 vols. London, 1875-86.
- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers---
Ireland, 1603-1670. Edited by C. W. Russell, F. P. Prendergast
and R. P. Mahaffy. 13 vols., 1870-1910, includes Addenda,
1625-1660, Adventurers for Land, 1642-59. London, 1872-1908.
- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers and
Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs existing in the Archives
and Collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern
Italy. Ed. by Allen B. Hinds. London, 1929. XXIX, 1653-4;
XXX, 1655-6; XXXI, 1657-9.

B-5

- Great Britain. Public Records Office. List of Sheriffs for England and Wales. Lists and Indexes, IX. London, 1898.
- Gurney, Hudson (ed.). "Poll for members to be returned to Parliament for the county of Norfolk, August 20, 1656," Norfolk Archaeology, I (1847), 67.
- Haller, Wm. and Davies, Godfrey. The Leveller Tracts, 1647-53. New York, 1944.
- Heath, James. A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine Wars in the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland. London, 1663.
- Howell, Thomas B. (ed.). Complete Collection of State Trials. 34 vols. London, 1816-1828.
- Laing, David (ed.). The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1842.
- _____. The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie. ("Spalding Club.") Aberdeen, 1863.
- Lomas, S. C. (ed.). Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell with Elucidations by Thomas Carlyle. London, 1904.
- Mayo, Charles H. (ed.). The Minute Books of the Dorset Standing Committee, September 23, 1646-May 8, 1650. Exeter, 1902.
- Mayer, Joseph. "Inedited Letters of Cromwell, Colonel Jones, Bradshaw and other Regicides." Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Transactions, N.S., I, (1861), 171-231.
- McNeill, Charles (ed.). The Tanner Letters, Original Documents and Notices of Irish Affairs in the 16th and 17th Centuries extracted from Collection in Bodleian. Dublin, 1943.
- "Monarchy asserted to be the best, most ancient and legal form of government," in A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the Late Lord Somers. 2d edition revised by Walter Scott. Vol. VI. London, 1811.
- Morrice, T. (ed.). A Collection of the state letters of---Roger Boyle, the first earl of Orrery, lord president of Munster in Ireland. 2 vols. Dublin, 1743.
- Nicoll, John. A Diary of Public Transaction, 1650-1667. Edinburgh, 1836.
- Park, Thomas (ed.). "The Orders, Proceedings, Punishments and Privileges of the Commons-House of Parliament in England, 1641," in Harleian Miscellany, V. London, 1810.
- _____. "A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament." Harleian Miscellany. III. London, 1809.

B-6

Petty, Sir William. Reflections upon some persons and things in Ireland. London, 1660.

Reeve, Henry (ed.). A Journal of the Swedish Embassy, in the years 1653 and 1654, from the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland. Written by the Ambassador, the Lord Commissioner Whitelocke. New edition. 2 vols. London, 1855.

Rutt, John Towill (ed.). Diary of Thomas Burton. 4 vols. London, 1828.

Scobell, Henry. Dopping, Anthony, bp. of Meath. Modus tenendi parliamenta in Hibernia. Published out of an ancient record by the Right Reverend Father in God Anthony, lord bishop of Meath. To which is added the Rules and customs of the House, gathered out of the journal books, from the time of Edward VI. By H. S. E. C. P. A new edition. Dublin, 1772.

Scotland. Laws, statutes. The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government During the Commonwealth. Volume VI, Part 2, Printed by Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, 1872.

Smith, Sir Thomas. The Commonwealth of England. London, 1640.

State Papers Collected by Edward Earl of Clarendon. Edited by R. Scrope and Thomas Monkhouse. 3 vols. Oxford, 1767-86.

Stephen, William (ed.). Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry. Publications of the Scottish History Society, 3rd series I, 1652-7, Vol. II, 1657-60. Edinburgh, 1930.

Stephenson, Carl and Marcham, Frederick George. Sources of English Constitutional History. New York, 1937.

Terry, C. Stanford (ed.). The Cromwellian Union. Publications of the Scottish History Society, XL. Edinburgh, 1902.

Vane, Sir Henry. "A Healing Question propounded and resolved upon occasion of the late publique and seasonable call to Humiliation, in order to Love and Union amongst the honest Party, and with a Desire to apply Balsome to the Wound before it becomes incurable." A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts particularly of the Late Lord Somers. 2d edition revised by Walter Scott. VI, # London, 1811.

Vaughan, Robert (ed.). The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell and the State of Europe---illustrated in a series of letters between Dr. John Pell, resident ambassador with the Swiss cantons, Sir Samuel Morland, Sir William Lockhart, Mr. Secretary Thurloe. 2 vols. London, 1839.

B-7

Whitelocke, Bulstrode. Memorials of the English Affairs from the beginning of the reign of Charles the First to the Happy restoration of King Charles the Second. London, 1792.

Bibliographical References

Abbott, W. C. Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell. Cambridge, 1929.

Archives of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Compiled by Hampshire Archivists' Group, 1963.

Barnes, T. G. and Smith, A. Hassel. "Justices of the Peace from 1558 to 1668: A Revised List of Sources," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XXXII, No. 86 (November, 1959).

Dublin. Public Record Office in Ireland. Fourteenth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, Ireland. Dublin, 1882.

Fortescue, G. K. (ed.). Catalogue of the Pamphlets---collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661 (in the British Museum). 2 vols. 1908.

Gillett, Charles Ripley (ed.). Catalogue of the McAlpin Collection of British History and Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. 3. 1653-79. New York, 1928.

Gilson, Julius. A Student's Guide to the Manuscripts of the British Museum. London, 1920.

Guide to Huntingdonshire Record Office. Prepared by County Archivist, G. H. Findlay. Huntingdonshire County Council, 1958.

Guide to the Kent County Archives Offices. Prepared by Felix Hull, County Archivist. Maidstone, 1958.

Guide to the Middlesex Sessions Records, 1549-1889. Prepared for the Standing Joint Committee of the County of Middlesex. K. Goodacre, Clerk to Comm. E. Doris Mercer, County Archivist. Greater London Record Office. Middlesex Records. London, 1965.

Macray, William D. (ed.). Rawlinson Mss. Catalogue: Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae. Oxford, 1782.

McNeill, Charles. "Reports on the Rawlinson Collection of Manuscripts Preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford," Analecta Hibernica, No. I, March, 1930.

Revised Catalogue of the Records of the City of Norwich. Compiled by William Hudson and J. C. Tingey. Norwich, 1898.

B-8

Roberts, R. A. The Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.
London, 1870.

Southampton Records I, published by Southampton Corporation, 1964.
Guide to Records of the Corporation and Absorbed Authorities
in the Civic Record Office.

Upton, E. S. and Winship, G. P. Guide to Sources of English History
(1603-1660) in Early Reports of the Royal Commission on
Historical Manuscripts. Revised ed. New York, 1964.

Parliamentary Histories

Cobbett, William (ed.). The Parliamentary History of England (1066-
1803). 36 vols. 1806-20.

O'Byrne, Robert H. The Representative History of Great Britain and
Ireland. London, 1848.

The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England from the Earliest
Times to the Restoration. By Several Hands, commonly known as
the Old Parliamentary History. 2d ed. 24 vols. London, 1763.

Wedgwood, Josiah C. History of Parliament, 1439-1509. London, 1936.

Parliamentary Representation

Bean, W. W. Notices of Various Errors and Omissions Found in Official
Returns. The Parliamentary Returns of Members of the House of
Commons from 1213 to 1874. London, no date.

Brunton, D. and Pennington, D. H. Members of the Long Parliament.
London, 1954.

Gooder, Arthur (ed.). The Parliamentary Representation of the County
of York, 1258-1832, Vol. II. Yorkshire Archaeological Record
Series, Vol. XCVI, Wakefield, 1935-38.

Great Britain. House of Commons. Members of Parliament. Official
Return. Vol. I, Part I (Parliaments of England, 1213-1702),
known as Official Return. Ordered by the House of Commons
to be Printed, 1878.

Keeler, Mary Frear. The Long Parliament, 1640-41. Philadelphia,
1954.

A Perfect List of the Names of the Several Persons returned to serve
in this Parliament, 1656. London, 1656. E 498 (5).

B-9 Yule, George. The Independents in the English Civil War. Cambridge, 1958.

Dissertations

Carroll, Roy. "The Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964.

Farnell, James. "The Politics of the City of London (1649-57)." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Heath, George D. III. "An Essay in Constitutional Development, 1653-57." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, March, 1953.

Hoffman, Wilson J., Jr. "Mr. Secretary Thurloe: His Role in the Domestic Affairs of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Western Reserve University, June 1963.

Pinckney, Paul J. "A Cromwellian Parliament: The Elections and Personnel of 1656." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, August, 1962.

Snow, Vernon F. "The Public Career of Edmund Ludlow, 1642-1660." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1953.

Tibbetts, Margaret Joy. "Parliamentary Parties Under Oliver Cromwell." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr, April, 1944.

Newsletters and Pamphlets

An Act for the Exportation of the Breed, Growth and Manufacture of this Commonwealth. E 669 f. 20 (50), 1656.

A Letter from a Person in the Contrey to his friend in the City: upon a book intituled A healing question. London. June 14, 1656.

A True and Perfect Relation of the Manner and Proceeding held by the Sheriffe for the County of Berk: at Redding, upon the 20th of Aug. last 1656 being the Day upon which five knights to serve in Parliament for the said county, should have been elected. E 891 (8). London, 1656.

A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth. London, 1654.

B-10

"An Apology for the Ministers of the County of Wilts in their Actings at the election of Members for the approaching Parliament. In answer to a letter sent out of the said County--Wherein is showed the notorious falsehood of the said letter. By some of the Defamed Ministers, Humphrey Chanthbas, D.D., John Strickland, Adoniram Bifield, Peter Ince. E 808 (9). London, 1654.

Burney Collection of Newspapers. Vol. I, 1603-83. British Museum.

Certain Passages of Every dayes Intelligence, No. 39, September 29-October 5, 1654. E 235 (6).

Colonel Shapcott, Knight of Devonshire, his Speech in Parliament, October 30, 1654. E 816 (7).

Copy of a Letter sent out of Wiltshire to a Gentleman in London; wherein is laid open the dangerous Designes of the Clergy in reference to the approaching Parliament. E 809 (18). London, September 5, 1654.

"A Modest Vindication of Oliver Cromwell from the unjust Accusations of Lieutenant Gen. Ludlow, in his Memoirs." 1698. In Lord Somer's Tracts. Vol. VI, edited by Walter Scott. London, 1811.

England's Remembrancers or A word in season to all Englishmen about their Elections of the members for the approaching Parliament. E 884 (5), Aug. 1656.

The Faithful Scout. September 8-September 15, 1654, E 233 (31); September 15-22, 1654, E 233 (36).

Fowler, Christopher. Daemonium Meridianum, Pt. I. May 23, 1655 (Proceedings vs. John Pordage). E 840 (1).

. Daemonium Meridanum, Part 2. Includes The Answer of the Mayor, Aldermen and Assistants of the Burrough of Reading, to the Scandalous Pamphlet, intituled the Case of the Town of Reading Stated. February 1656. E 868 (7).

Goodwin, John. or Dissatisfaction Satisfied. London, 1654.

Gookin, Vincent. The Author and Case of Transplanting the Irish into Connaught Vindicated from the unjust Aspersions of Col. Richard Laurence. London, 1655. E 838 (7).

Hall, John. The True Cavalier. London, 1656.

B-11

Harrington, James. A Discourse Shewing That the Spirit of Parliaments, with a Council in the Intervals, Is not to be trusted for a Settlement: Lest it introduce Monarchy. London, 1659.

Hawke, Michael. Killing is Murder. London, 1657.

Mercurius Fumigosus. E 826 (14), No. 35, January 24, 1655.

A Narrative of the Late Parliament. E 935 (5).

A Perfect Account. No. 195, September 27-October 4, 1654. E 813 (6).

The Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings in some relation to the Armies. No. 267, January 22, 1654. Burney #48.
E 235 (1), September 25-October 2, 1654, No. 23.

A Proclamation of Assistance to the Merchant Adventurers. E 669 f.21 (8).

Prynne, William. King Richard the Third Revived. E 896 (5*).

The Publick Intelligencer, September 15-22, 1656 in Burney Collection, #50.

An Admirable Speech Made by the Maior of Reading upon the occasion of the late choice of a Burgess for that Town, June 28, 1654.
"With a True and impartial Narrative of the whole proceedings thereupon wherein is discovered the designe of the said Maior, with the Aldermen and Priests of the said Town, to deprive the Inhabitants of their vote of chusing. Published by a well-wisher to the present Government in the making good of former ingagement to defend the free born people of England in their Laws and Liberties," London, 1654.

Recognition of the Government. September 14, 1654. E 669 f. 19 (7).

Richardson, Samuel. Apology for the present government. London, 1654.

Severall Proceedings of Parliament, No. 160. September 20, 1654.
Burney Collection, 1654, Vol. II #47BM, No. 267, November 1, 1654.

Severall Proceedings of State Affaires, No. 258, Thursday, September 5, 1654 in Burney Collection, 1654, #47.

The Weekly Post. No. 194, August 29-September 15, 1654. E 233 (21).

Secondary Works

- Ashley, Maurice. Cromwell's Generals. London, 1954.
- _____. England in the Seventeenth Century. London, 1952.
- _____. Financial and Commercial Policy Under the Cromwellian Protectorate. London, 1934.
- _____. The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell. New York, 1962.
- _____. John Wildman, Plotter and Postmaster. New Haven, 1947.
- Aspinall, A., Dodwell, B., Lambert, M. E., Slade, C. F. and Smith, E. A. Parliament Through Seven Centuries (Reading and Its MPs). London, 1962.
- Aylmer, G. E. (ed.). The Interregnum. London and Basingstoke, 1972.
- Bagwell, Richard. Ireland under the Stuarts. 2 vols. London, 1963.
- Bayley, A. R. The Great Civil War in Dorset, 1642-60. Taunton, 1910.
- Blitzer, Charles. An Immortal Commonwealth. New Haven, 1960.
- Bottigheimer, Karl J. English Money and Irish Land. Oxford, 1971.
- Brown, Louise Fargo. The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum. Washington, 1912.
- Burnet, Gilbert. Bishop Burnet's history of his own time. 2 vols. 1724-34. Later edition by M. J. Routh. 6 vols., Oxford, 1823 and 1833. Ed. by O. Airy [to 1685]. 2 vols., Oxford, 1897-1900, suppl. by H. C. Foxcroft, Oxford, 1902.
- Campion, Sir Gilbert. An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons. London, 1950.
- Carte, Thomas. The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde. New edition, 6 vols. Oxford, 1851.
- Clarendon, Edward, Earl of. The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Edited by W. Dunn Mackay. 6 vols. Oxford, 1888.

B-13

- _____. The Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon. Oxford, 1760.
- Coate, Mary. Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum. Oxford, 1933.
- Colville, Frederick Leigh. Worthies of Warwickshire. London, 1870.
- Coonan, Thomas L. The Irish Catholic Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution. Dublin, 1954.
- Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts (1603-60). Oxford, 1959.
- Davies, John Sylvester. A History of Southampton. London, 1883.
- Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. by L. Stephen and S. Lee. 63 vols. 1885-1900.
- Donaldson, Gordon. Scotland, James V to James VII. New York, 1960.
- Duncumb, John. History of County of Hereford. Hereford, 1804.
- Elton, G. B. The Tudor Constitution. Cambridge, 1962.
- Everitt, Alan. The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion. Leicester, 1966.
- Eyre-Todd, George. History of Glasgow. 2 vols. Glasgow, 1931.
- Fink, Zera Silver. The Classical Republicans. Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities, 9. Evanston, 1945.
- Firth, Charles H. Cromwell's Army. London, 1962.
- _____. The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656-1658. 2 vols. London, 1909.
- Firth, Charles H. and Davies, Godfrey. Regimental History of Cromwell's Army. 2 vols. Oxford, 1940.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656. 4 vols. London, 1903.
- Garner, Francis G. and Garner, J. F. Civic Ceremonial. A Handbook of Practice and Procedure. London, 1953.
- Gooch, G. P. English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. 2d edition by H. J. Laski. Cambridge, 1954.
- Greenleaf, William Howard. Order, Empiricism and Politics. London, 1964.
- Grieve, Hilda E. P. Examples of English Handwriting, 1150-1750. Essex Record Office Publications, No. 21, 1954.

B-14

- Haley, K. D. H. The First Earl of Shaftesbury. Oxford, 1968.
- Harrington, James. The Oceana and Other Works of James Harrington.
Edited by John Toland. 3d London edition. London, 1771.
- Harris, Frank Reginald. The Life of Edward Montague, First Earl of Sandwich, 1625-1672. 2 vols. London, 1912.
- Hector, L. C. The Handwriting of English Documents. London, 1958.
- Hexter, J. H. Reappraisals in History. New York, 1961.
- Hill, Christopher. The Century of Revolution. New York, 1961.
- _____. God's Englishman. London, 1970.
- _____. Puritanism and Revolution. New York, 1958.
- Holmes, Geoffrey. British Politics in the Age of Anne. London, Melbourne, New York, 1967.
- Howell, Roger, Jr. Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution. Oxford, 1967.
- James, Margaret. Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution. New York, 1966.
- Jones, James R. The first Whigs: the politics of the exclusion crisis, 1678-1683. London, New York, 1961.
- Karraker, Cyrus H. The Seventeenth Century Sheriff. Chapel Hill, 1930.
- Kemp, Betty. King and Commons, 1660-1832. London, 1957.
- Kenyon, J. P. The Stuart Constitution. Cambridge, 1966.
- Lipson, Ephraim. The Economic History of England. 4th edition.
3 vols. London, 1947.
- Lynch, Kathleen M. Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery. Knoxville, 1965.
- Mackenzie, Kenneth. The English Parliament. Middlesex, 1950.
- Mathieson, William Law. Politics and Religion: A Study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution. 2 vols.
Glasgow, 1902.
- May, Sir Thomas Erskine. The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament. 15th ed. London, 1950.
- Merriman, C. B. Six Contemporaneous Revolutions. Oxford, 1938.

B-15

- Namier, Sir Lewis. England in the Age of the American Revolution. London, 1930.
- Neale, Sir John. Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments. 2 vols. New York, 1958.
- _____. The Elizabethan House of Commons. London, 1949.
- Noble, Mark. Memoirs of the Protectorate House of Cromwell. 2 vols. Birmingham, 1894.
- _____. Lives of the English Regicides. London, 1798.
- Notestein, Wallace. The House of Commons, 1604-10. London, 1971.
- _____. "The Winning of the Initiative in the House of Commons," Studies in History. Ed. by Lucy S. Sutherland. London, 1966.
- Pares, Richard. King George III and the Politicians. Oxford, 1953.
- Pearl, Valerie. London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-43. Oxford, 1961.
- Plumb, J. H. The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675-1725. Middlesex, 1967.
- Pocock, J. G. H. The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law. New York, 1957.
- Porritt, Edward. The Unreformed House of Commons. New York, 1963.
- Prendergast, John P. The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland. London, 1870.
- Ramsey, Robert W. Henry Cromwell. London, 1933.
- Redlich, Josef. The Procedure of the House of Commons. 3 vols. London, 1908.
- Rex, Millicent B. University Representation in England, 1604-1690. London and New York, 1954.
- Robbins, Caroline. The Eighteenth Century Commonwealthman. Cambridge, 1961.
- _____. Two English Republican Tracts. Cambridge, 1969.
- Speed, John. History and Antiquity of Southampton. Southampton, 1909.
- Shaw, William Arthur. A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660. 2 vols. London, 1900.

B-16

- Tanner, J. R. English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, 1962.
- Taylor, Eric. The House of Commons at Work. Harmondsworth, 1951.
- Trevor-Roper, H. R. "Oliver Cromwell and His Parliaments." Essays Presented to Sir Lewis Namier. Ed. by Richard Pares. London, 1956.
- Turner, Edward Raymond. The Privy Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1603-1781. 2 vols. Baltimore, 1927.
- Underdown, David. Royalist Conspiracy in England. New Haven, 1960.
- _____. Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution. Oxford, 1971.
- Victoria History of the Counties of England. Ed. by W. Page, H. A. Doubleday and others. Westminster, 1900.
- Watson, William. A Historical Account of the Ancient Town and Port of Wisbech in the Isle of Ely, in the County of Cambridge. Wisbech, 1827.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act, 1689-1855. 8 vols. London, 1906-29.
- Wedgwood, C. V. Poetry and Politics Under the Stuarts. Ann Arbor, 1964.
- Weston, Corinne C. English Constitutional Theory and the House of Lords. New York, 1965.
- Williams, E. N. (ed.). The Eighteenth Century Constitution. Cambridge, 1965.
- Williams, J. B. A History of English Journalism. London, 1908.
- Willson, David Harris. The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-29. Minneapolis, 1940.
- Wolfe, Don M. Milton in the Puritan Revolution. New York, 1941.
- Zagorin, Perez. The Court and the Country. New York, 1970.
- _____. A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution. London, 1954.

Articles

- Abbott, W. C. "The Origin of English Political Parties," American Historical Review, XXIV (April, 1919), 578-602.
- Abernathy, George R., Jr. "The English Presbyterians and the Stuart Restoration, 1648-63." Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, Vol. 55, Part 2 (1965), 5-101.
- Bottigheimer, Karl S. "English Money and Irish Land." Journal of British Studies (November, 1967), 12-27.
- Brown, Louise Fargo. "Ideas of Representation from Elizabeth to Charles II," Journal of Modern History, XI, No. 1 (March, 1939), 23-40.
- Casada, James. "The Scottish representatives in Richard Cromwell's Parliament," Scottish Historical Review, LI (October, 1972).
- Catterall, Ralph C. H. "The Failure of the Humble Petition and Advice," American Historical Review, October, 1903, 36-65.
- _____. "A Suspicious Document in Whitelocke's Memorials," English Historical Review, XIV (1901), 737-739.
- Farnell, J. E. "The Navigation Act of 1651, the First Dutch War and the London Merchant Community," Economic History Review, Second Series, XVI, No. 3 (April, 1964), 435-454.
- _____. "The Usurpation of Honest London Householders, Barebone's Parliament," English Historical Review, LXXXII (January, 1967), 24-46.
- Firth, C. H. "Account of Money Spent in the Cromwellian Reconquest and Settlement of Ireland, 1649-56." English Historical Review, XIV (1899), 105-108.
- _____. "Cromwell and the Crown," English Historical Review, XVII (1902), 429-442; XVIII (1903), 52-80.
- _____. "Cromwell's Regiments," Journal of Society of Army Historical Research, VI (1927), 141-146, 222-228.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. "The Transplantation to Connaught," English Historical Review, XIV (1899), 700-734.
- Habbakuk, H. J. "The Parliamentary Army and the Crown Lands," Welsh History Review, III (1966-7), 83-94.

B-18

- _____. "Public Finance and the Sale of Confiscated Property during the Interregnum," Economic History Review, 2nd Series, XV, No. 1 (August 1962), 70-88.
- Hardacre, Paul. "William Boteler, A Cromwellian Oligarch," Huntington Library Quarterly, XI (1948), 1-11.
- _____. "Writings on Oliver Cromwell Since 1929," Journal of Modern History, XXXIII (March, 1961), 1-14.
- Heath, George D. III. "Cromwell and Lambert, 1653-7," The Historian, XXI (1959), 372-391.
- _____. "Making the Instrument of Government," Journal of British Studies, VI, No. 2 (May, 1967), 15-34.
- Henderson, B. L. K. "The Commonwealth Charters," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 3d Series, VI (1912), 129-162.
- Hulme, Harold. "The Sheriff as a Member of the House of Commons from Elizabeth to Cromwell," Journal of Modern History, I (1929), 361-377.
- Jameson, J. Franklin. "Origins of the Standing Committee System in the American Legislative Body," Political Science Quarterly, Columbia College (1894), 245-267.
- MacCormack, J. R. "The Irish Adventurers and the English Civil War," Irish Historical Studies, X (March, 1956), 21-58.
- Pearl, Valerie. "Oliver St. John and the Middle group in the Long Parliament," English Historical Review, LXXII (July, 1966), 490-519.
- Peters, Marie. "The 'Monitor' on the Constitution, 1755-65," English Historical Review (October, 1971), 706-27.
- Pinckney, P. J. "Bradshaw and Cromwell in 1656," Huntington Library Quarterly, XXX (May, 1967), 233-40.
- _____. "The Cheshire Elections of 1656," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 49 (Spring, 1967), 387-426.
- _____. "The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656," Scottish Historical Review, XLVI (October, 1967), 95-114.
- Plumb, J. F. "The Electorate in England from 1600 to 1715," Past and Present, No. 45 (November, 1969), 90-116.
- Pocock, J. G. H. "Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the 18th Century," William and Mary Quarterly, XXII, 3d Series (October, 1965), 549-83.

B-19

- Prestwich, Manna. "Diplomacy and Trade in the Protectorate." Journal of Modern History, XXII (June, 1950), 103-121.
- Rannie, David Watson. "Cromwell's Major-Generals." English Historical Review, X (1895), 471-506.
- Roskell, J. S. "The Office and Dignity of Protector of England," English Historical Review, LXVIII (April, 1953), 193-233.
- Round, J. H. "Colchester during the Commonwealth." English Historical Review, 15 (1900), 641-664.
- Snow, Vernon F. "Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution." English Historical Review, LXXIV (1959), 409-442.
- Underdown, David. "Cromwell and the Officers, February, 1658," English Historical Review, 83 (January, 1968), 101-107.
- _____. "The Independents Again." Journal of British Studies, XIII (November 1, 1968), 83-93.
- _____. "The Independents Reconsidered." Journal of British Studies, III (May, 1964), 57-84.
- _____. "The Parliamentary Diary of John Boys, 1567-9." Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research, 39 (1966).
- _____. "Party Management in the Recruiter Elections, 1645-8." English Historical Review, 83 (April, 1968), 235-264.
- Vann, Richard T. "Quakerism in the Interregnum." Past and Present, May 1969, 71-91.
- Weyman, Stanley J. "Oliver Cromwell's Kinsfolk." English Historical Review, VI (1891), 48-60.
- Woolrych, Austin. "The Calling of Barebone's Parliament," English Historical Review, LXXX (1965), 492-513.
- Yule, George. "Independents and Revolutionaries." Journal of British Studies, May, 1968, 11-32.