



CROMWELLIANA

The
Cromwell Association
1975

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION

President: Mr. MAURICE ASHLEY, D.Phil.(Oxon.), B.A.

Vice-President: THE LORD CARADON OF ST. CLEER.

Chairman: Mr. TREWIN COPPLESTONE.

Council:

Mr. ESMOND S. DE BEER, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.,

The Rev. D. A. GREEVES, M.A., Miss J. S. HENDERSON,

Mr. R. HENDON,

Mr. F. E. LEESE, M.A., B.Litt., Mr. G. G. LILBURN, B.A.(Oxon.),

The Rev. ROBERT S. PAUL, M.A., D.Phil., Mr. A. W. SMITH,

Mr. & Mrs. R. E. SHERWOOD, Miss J. SOLOMON, M.B.E.

Hon. Secretary: Miss H. PLATT, B.A.

Combe Lodge, Ringley Park Avenue, Reigate, Surrey.

Hon. Treasurer: Mr. S. J. P. THOMAS, B.A.

Oak Lodge, Blanford Road, Reigate, Surrey.

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION was founded in 1935 by the late Rt. Hon. Isaac Foot and others to help to preserve the memory of Oliver Cromwell the great puritan statesman, and to encourage study of the history of the Commonwealth protectorate and its leaders. It is not a political organisation and its aims are principally historical and antiquarian. The Association has at present over 300 members. It is anxious to extend its membership in order to widen its influence and increase its work.

Since the Association has come into existence it has: —

1. Put up commemorative tablets at Dunbar, Edgehill, Naseby, Preston, Worcester, the Huntingdon Grammar School, and elsewhere, to mark the sites of Cromwell's victories or famous episodes in his career.
2. Helped to constitute a Cromwellian Museum at present housed in the Old Grammar School, Huntingdon. It arranges for lectures to be given, leaflets issued, etc., as required on Cromwellian subjects.
3. Established an Annual Service held on September 3rd each year, by Cromwell's Statue outside the Houses of Parliament, when the address is given by a distinguished Cromwellian.
4. The Association has also formed a small reference library from which books can be borrowed on written application, enclosing postage, from the Hon. Secretary, to whom communications and enquiries can be made.

The minimum annual subscription is £1.00. Life Membership £10.50.

N.B. A number of Members paying by Banker's Order have not yet notified their Bank of the increased payment. The Hon. Treasurer asks that they might do this without delay.

CROMWELL'S DAY, September 3rd, 1974

(The Address given by Dr. Maurice Ashley,
President of the Association at the Annual Commemoration Service
held in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster)

CROMWELL AND THE CHURCH

A good many years ago I gave a talk about Cromwell on what was then called the Third Programme of the B.B.C., which I entitled 'the Spiritual Anarchist'. The phrase was not my own and on reflection I consider that it was misapplied. It is of course true that Oliver, although a strict Calvinist himself, was extremely tolerant of all forms of Christianity except of that of the Irish 'papists' whom he believed were barbarians. He said for example, in a speech which he delivered when he was Lord Protector in 1656:

That men that believe in Jesus Christ — that's the form that gives the being to true religion, faith in Christ and walking in a profession answerable to that faith...

and he went on to quote as one of the three examples of conflict that were to be avoided among those who had true 'religion'

if an Independent (and Cromwell himself was an Independent or Congregationalist)... will despise him under Baptism (that is to say a Baptist) and will revile him and reproach and provoke him, I will not suffer it in him.

Any peaceable Christian, he insisted, was entitled to liberty to worship as he thought fit.

Earlier in a private letter which he wrote to Robin Hammond he said:

I profess to thee I desire from my heart I have prayed for it, I have waited the day to see union and right understanding between the godly people (Scots, English, Jews, Gentiles, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and all).

Here the keynote is not liberty but union. And clearly what Cromwell desired in the Church of England of his time was comprehension, together with freedom for extreme sectarians — and even Jews — who were unable to join the Church, to remain unmolested outside it.

The Church of England has of course long been latitudinarian. In our own times it has comprehended Modern Churchmen who, like my late Uncle, Sir William Ashley, did not believe in an after-life as well as, at the other extreme, Anglo-Catholics who date back at least to Archbishop William Laud.

Cromwell did not seek to overthrow or abolish the Church of England by revolutionary means, but to make it more comprehensive than ever before. No serious theological differences then existed among the mass of English Christians; indeed before the civil wars the vast majority of clergy and churchgoers were, like Cromwell, Calvinists. The real differences among English Christians were organizational. The bishops were first deprived of their secular privileges and then were abolished altogether; in 1646 an ordinance was passed providing for the election of Presbyterian lay Elders; earlier a Directory of Worship was substituted for the Book of

Common Prayer but its use was not compulsory. This system never came into full effect in England along the rigid disciplinary lines that then existed in the Scottish Lowlands. Cromwell, in fact, halted the proposed conversion of the Church of England into a Presbyterian establishment. Apart from the election of lay elders in London, there is little evidence that much notice was taken of any of these religious ordinances. For example, no one was compelled to attend his parish church as was the case before the civil war.

In Cromwell's time the parish clergy might have been Presbyterians or Independents or Baptists or even former Episcopalians who toed the new line. We are all familiar with the famous Vicar of Bray. A counterpart of his was Ralph Josselin, the vicar of a parish in Essex. In 1645 he took up the Directory and rejoiced at the abolition of the Book of Common Prayer. Yet in 1662 he accepted with equanimity the request from his churchwardens that he resume the use of the Book of Common Prayer. He once attended a conference about the introduction of lay elders, but he did not object to the return of the bishops in 1660. Yet unquestionably he was a sincere Christian and fulfilled all of his pastoral duties.

Let us consider the quantitative facts about the Church of England in Cromwell's time. During the Interregnum about two thousand clergy out of nine thousand parishes in the country gave up their benefices. And in 1660 about two thousand clergy refused to accept the new Act of Uniformity and left their parishes. In other words, a substantial majority of English clergy carried on much as usual. I would hazard the guess that the names of bishop or elder did not mean a great deal to the average parson.

What happened under Cromwell was that two new controls over the Church were introduced. First, there were Triers, most of them respected Christian ministers, who had to vet new incumbents; secondly, there were the Ejectors — prominent civilians with local knowledge — who could deprive clergy of their benefices if they led immoral lives or neglected their duties.

Let me give you one instance of what happened in Cromwell's day. Nicholas Monck, the younger brother of General George Monck, was notoriously a Royalist; even more so was Sir John Grenville who as patron presented Monck to a valuable rectory in Cornwall. Nicholas Monck was duly summoned before the Triers, who confirmed his appointment. After the Restoration, Nicholas Monck became a bishop.

Again there is the evidence of John Evelyn's diary. Evelyn was also a well-known Royalist who wrote Royalist propaganda. He lived outside London but regularly came to London, sometimes attended churches, sometimes services in private houses. He was able to celebrate the traditional feasts of the church — Christmas, Easter and Whitsun, though they were not observed by the Puritans. As early as August 1656 he heard a sermon in a house in Fleet Street and then took Holy Communion according to the rites of the Church of England. He wrote:

We had a great meeting of zealous Christians, who were generally more devout and religious than in our greatest prosperity.

Such a meeting in Fleet Street must have been known to the Cromwellian authorities, but it was not interfered with any more than were the Masses according to Roman Catholic rites celebrated privately in London. Indeed Roman Catholics were better off than they had been at any time since 1558.

As Lord Protector Cromwell maintained the system of paying clergy out of tithes: he allowed lay patrons to appoint parish clergy; and he only permitted the arrest of Quakers and Fifth Monarchy men when they tried to break up church services, the Quakers then being less peaceable than they are now.

Therefore it seems to me that as Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell sought to maintain order in the Church, just as he tried to obtain order in the State, but without restricting harmless individual liberties. One reason why Cromwell was disappointed with the rule of the Saints in what is known as Barebones Parliament of 1653 was because it abolished tithes without proposing any other workable method for the payment of the clergy and because it rejected Dr. John Owen's scheme — Owen was a close friend of Cromwell — for a really comprehensive Church.

Cromwell — we must remember — only wielded executive power for five years. He did not have the time to carry out widespread reforms. Some people will say, of course, that one man could hardly hope to do so. I think that is true. But after the interval of Charles II's and James II's reigns — and both of them of course were themselves Roman Catholics — the Church of England as it existed under William and Mary and Queen Anne was, I think, the kind of comprehensive Church that Cromwell would have liked to see, coupled with tolerance for nonconformists outside it.

Cromwell did not indeed approve of a Church hierarchy of bishops, deans and archdeacons, but this after all is largely a question of names. A national Church must have a government; it just happened that the Triers and Ejectors were the kind of governors whom Cromwell preferred. Thus he did honestly strive after diversity in unity. Under the umbrella of the national church he would have liked to gather as many shades of Christian belief as possible; naturally enough, there was a temporary reaction when the Stuarts returned and nonconformists looked back upon the Cromwellian Protectorate as a golden age of liberty and peace.

The fundamental problem of government, that is to arrange how order can be combined with liberty and reform has never been resolved, not even during our own lives. But Cromwell's ideal was to resolve it in the Church as well as in the State by sensible rather than by bigoted means.

Note:

Those who are interested in this subject should read the essay by Dr. Claire Cross on 'The Church of England 1646-1660' in *The Interregnum* (edited by G. E. Aylmer, 1972) to which I am much indebted. M.A.

THE COURT OF OLIVER CROMWELL

(The Address given by Mr. R. E. Sherwood at the Annual General Meeting of the Association, April 25th, 1975)

May I begin by saying that I feel doubly privileged to be speaking today, Cromwell's birthday. Dunbar and Worcester apart, I personally feel that the day of Oliver's arrival has a greater right to celebration than the day of his departure. Certainly one group of individuals would have thought

so. These were the office holders and servants of the protectoral court which provided Cromwell as Lord Protector with his domestic servants and added lustre to his office.

Although so much material on the subject of the protectoral court is wanting there exists a sufficient body of evidence to give us some idea of its essential form and structure. In achieving this a comparison between what we know of Cromwell's court and the vastly more documented Stuart courts has proved invaluable. From this the first and strongest impressions gained are of the differences both in size and in certain aspects of organisation between the protectoral and royal courts.

The numbers involved in the maintenance of the protectoral court, whether high office holders or the lowest menial servants, were only a fraction of those employed in the preceding and succeeding royal courts. Cromwell's court was also less corporate. Royal courts were divided into three distinct semi-autonomous departments, that of the chamber, or household above stairs, under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain, the household, or household below stairs, under the Lord Steward and the stables under the Master of the Horse, with the Lord Chamberlain as the effective head of the entire court.

Only the protectoral stables and the household below stairs seem to have functioned as distinct departments as their royal equivalents did, although the hierarchical structure of the household was rather different. The chamber seemed to differ in this respect.

Like its corresponding department in a royal court, the work of the protectoral stables involved the acquisition and maintenance of the ruler's horses and carriages and the furnishing of these when they were required. The most regular of these duties would have been to supply the coaches to transport the Protector and his retinue from Whitehall to the protectoral country retreat at Hampton Court and to furnish Cromwell with a suitable mount when he went out riding in St. James's and Hyde Parks or hawking, for which the Protector possessed a particular liking.

Less frequent would have been the provision of coaches and horses for ceremonial or state occasions. These included the openings of the two Parliaments of Oliver's Protectorate and Cromwell's investiture as Lord Protector in June 1657 when he used a "coach of State". For the Lord Protector's state funeral a carriage, drawn by six horses covered with black velvet, was furnished for the conveyance of the Protector's effigy from Somerset House, where it had lain in state, to Westminster Abbey. Coaches would also have been supplied for the very many dignitaries that attended the obsequies.

The protectoral stables, like its royal equivalents, provided transport for such people as a matter of course. It had also put carriages at the disposal of foreign ambassadors and their entourages when they came to Whitehall for an audience with the Protector or to be entertained by Cromwell and members of the government. On these occasions the Protector's "chief coach", which was a six horse "rich" affair was furnished for the ambassadors' own use. It was driven by his Highness's coachman and postillion. Also in attendance, and running alongside the carriage when it was in motion, were the ambassadors' own footmen accompanied by ten others belonging to, and wearing the livery of, the Lord Protector.

Exercising jurisdiction over the protectoral stables was the Master of the Horse. Traditionally in previous royal courts the Master of the Horse had been the third-ranking officer in the household after the Lord Chamberlain and the Lord Steward. In charge of the stables administration there was "his Highness's Avenor". And in late 1657 the designation Gentleman of Horse reappears. In royal courts this post ranked next to the Master of the Horse, the occupant being in effect the first equerry which means that he was responsible specifically for the acquisition and care of the monarch's horses. One feels that such a person would have been an invaluable addition to the protectoral stables establishment to cater for Oliver's equine fancies, which included the desire to establish the Arabian breed of horse in England.

The protectoral household below stairs, which was referred to as either "his Highness's household" or "his Highness's family" and sometimes as simply "the household" was, as its royal predecessors had been, a large catering establishment responsible mainly for the acquisition, preparation, and distribution of food and wine for the ruler, his family and the household in general. But the staff of the protectoral household below stairs numbered only a fraction (probably about a quarter) of those employed in that of, say, Charles I. Nevertheless all the more essential of the numerous sub-departments of the royal household below stairs were represented, albeit on a reduced scale.

As in former times the household kitchen was the largest of these. Its function was to prepare food for all the court tables except the Protector's. For Oliver there was a privy kitchen the staff of which would have removed themselves from Whitehall to Hampton Court whenever the Protector did. There was also a privy cellar and the posts of butler to his Highness and to her Highness.

Other sub-departments of the protectoral household included a spicery, a wine cellar, a great beer cellar with a complement of ale-brewers, a slaughterhouse, a scullery and a woodyard. There were also porters and a cooper as well as servants of the officers of the household such as waiters at the Comptroller's and Cofferer's tables and the Comptroller's butler.

The household below stairs was the only department of the protectoral court for which money was specifically assigned and from which payments were made. Initially £16,000 a quarter was allocated for the maintenance of the household below stairs out of a total annual sum of £100,000 a year settled on the Protector in April 1654 to cover his household and other, unspecified, expenses. Later the full £100,000 was allotted for the upkeep of the household, which by this time included the maintenance of the protectoral palaces. By settling on the ruler a set sum of money expressly for the maintenance of the household the protectoral government had broken with tradition. Hitherto the monarch had been expected to "live of his own", that is he had to maintain not only the household but also every aspect of the government out of his revenue. This arrangement was reintroduced at the Restoration and the concept of a civil list, exclusive of the cost of maintaining all aspects of government including the civil service, as was the case at the time of the Protectorate, did not re-emerge until the reign of George III more than a century later.

Royal households below stairs were generally speaking headed by a Lord Steward assisted by, in order of precedence, a Treasurer, a Comptroller, a Cofferer and a Master of the Household. With the exception of the Master of the Household, whose principal concern was the behaviour of the court servants, these officers, together with two Clerks of Greencloth and two Clerk Comptrollers, constituted what was known as the board of greencloth which scrutinized the expenditure of the household and arranged for the purchase of supplies. The Lord Steward's attendance at board meetings was generally confined to the more important occasions at which times he always presided.

For most of Oliver's reign the protectoral household was run solely by two Stewards, John Maidstone and Nathaniel Waterhouse, who worked as it were in double harness, although Maidstone was the senior of the two. And then in late 1657 the household was given a hierarchical structure resembling, but not closely, that which had existed in former times. Out of this emerged the posts of Comptroller and Cofferer. The offices of Treasurer and Master of the Household were not revived. Also, the rank of Steward to the Protector, which fell wholly to Waterhouse, was an inferior one to both that of the Comptroller, which was given to Colonel Philip Jones, and Cofferer, to which John Maidstone was promoted. The board of greencloth was also reconstituted at this time and with it the posts of Clerk of the Greencloth and Clerk Comptroller.

We now come to the third court department, the chamber, or household above stairs. As I said earlier, this particular aspect of the protectoral aulic arrangements does not appear to have functioned in the normal way. To begin with, although the office of Lord Chamberlain seems to have been in existence since at least 1655 we do not know to what extent he exercised his role in the traditional sense of head of the chamber department and principal court officer. This is because, unlike the other two court departments, the household and the stables, the chamber was never defined nor for that matter was the expression ever used. And while many individuals and sub-departments which could have constituted a chamber department were in being during the Protectorate there were certain anomalies which would seem to stand in the way of their existence as a corporate entity. In fact these anomalies effectively divide into two distinct groupings the departments and offices which would have gone to make up a chamber department.

There were those specifically constituted for the service, enjoyment or glorification of the Lord Protector. Into this category can be placed his Highness's Gentlemen of the Household, the Gentlemen or Grooms of the Bedchamber, and the protectoral bodyguard. The 29 Gentlemen of the Household, who were either lieutenant-colonels or majors, would have performed various duties about the Protector's private apartments, including those of ushers in the presence chamber, as their royal predecessors had done. Royal Gentlemen and Grooms of the Bedchamber were at this time expected to dress the monarch in accordance with an elaborately prescribed and singularly tedious ritual — a practice which, seemingly, lasted well into the eighteenth century. That Oliver would have submitted himself to such a regime is, of course, extremely hard to believe. What is more likely is that the Protector's bedchamber staff merely performed the normal functions expected of a valet or body servant.

The protectoral bodyguard or "his Highness's Guard of Halberdiers" was instituted quite early on in the Protectorate and their function was to provide Oliver with bodily protection by standing guard in and around the protectoral apartments and by furnishing the Protector with an escort whenever he left his palaces or attended state functions, the first recorded instance of which was on the occasion of the state opening of the first protectorate Parliament on September 4th, 1654 when the household guard "in his Highness's livery" marched at the side of Oliver's coach as it carried the Protector from the palace of Whitehall to Westminster. The guard was captained by one of the Protector's Privy Councillors, Walter Strickland and it was a protectoral version of the King's Bodyguard of the Yeomen of the Guard. In fact, on one occasion at least the words "Yeoman of his Highness's Guard" were used in a document during the Protectorate to describe one of Cromwell's household guards. The term Yeomen of the Guard was used at least twice in the post-protectorate Commonwealth period to describe what were then ex-members of the defunct protectoral bodyguard.

The other category of chamber offices and sub-departments includes those that were in being before the Protectorate was established as departments of state serving the pre-protectorate Commonwealth in a functional capacity, while at the same time giving some slight ceremonial expression to the corporate existence of the English republic. These strictly state functions were continued after the establishment of the Protectorate, even though these departments were no longer designated as belonging to the state but to his Highness the Lord Protector, to whom their first duty now lay and whose livery some of their servants now wore. Two departments that come into this category were the wardrobe and the barges. The state's wardrobe, as it was called during the pre-protectorate Commonwealth, was responsible under its Keeper, Clement Kinnersley, sometime Yeoman of Charles I's removing wardrobe, for supplying furniture for the Parliament House, departments of state, government dignitaries, the entertainment of representatives of foreign powers, and the Commonwealth's own ambassadors who were loaned furniture and plate whenever they went abroad. Kinnersley continued to provide this service as well as furnishing the Protector with wardrobe stuff in his role as Keeper of his Highness's wardrobe. Likewise what were known as the State's Watermen in the pre-protectorate Commonwealth days had been used to convey state and foreign dignitaries up and down the Thames which at this time was the capital's main transport artery. And these functions continued after the establishment of the Protectorate when the primary occupation of the Watermen was "to attend his Highness's barge". One of the first recorded instances of Oliver's use of the protectoral barge was in January 1655 when he travelled the half mile between Whitehall and the Palace of Westminster in it to dissolve the first Parliament of his rule. The choice of river transport for such a short journey may have been prompted either by the possibility of assassination, which would have been much easier to effect in the narrow, congested streets of the metropolis than on the River Thames, or by the need to overawe a Parliament, about to be dissolved much against its will, which the stately arrival at Westminster in a ceremonial barge would, one imagines, have been accomplished more readily than in a coach. The badges worn by the Watermen, and also the Master of the Barges and his assistant, from the summer of 1657 onwards, were representations of the protectoral arms which had first appeared on the Great Seal of the

Commonwealth in 1655, having been approved by the Council on March 6th of that year. In addition to the badge were the letters 'O' and 'P', for Oliver Protector, one of which letter was positioned on the left and the other on the right side of the upper half of the arms, just as the letters 'C' and 'R' had appeared with the royal arms on the coats of Charles I's Watermen.

So we see that certain of the sub-departments in what would normally be regarded as the chamber department were both state servants and personal servants of the Protector at the same time. And what jurisdiction the protectoral Lord Chamberlain exercised over these and those other sub-departments whose services were entirely personal to the Lord Protector is unknown. But from the little evidence that we have it would seem that for most of the period of its existence the post of protectoral Lord Chamberlain was mainly either honorific or ceremonial.

There were other ways besides form and structure in which the protectoral court differed from a royal court. During the Protectorate there was no movement from court office, especially those of the first rank, to a high position in the administration as was the custom in royal courts. Quite the reverse, in fact, because the offices of the first rank in the protectoral court, such as the Lord Chamberlain, the Comptroller of the Household and the Captain of the protectoral bodyguard were occupied by, and were a means of conferring further dignity upon, men who were already politically powerful. So that these posts could be said to have been filled from above rather than from below. In the case of the mastership of the horse, this was probably given to John Claypole as a necessary means of elevating a man who, although a political nonentity, was after all the husband of Cromwell's favourite daughter.

But why was it deemed necessary to surround Cromwell with a court of almost royal magnificence? Surely, it could be said, a simple household to cater for his domestic needs would have been all that was required. One answer to this question is contained in the final paragraph of my forthcoming book on the court of Oliver Cromwell, and from which I would, if I may, like to quote:

'As Lord Protector Cromwell would of necessity have needed to surround himself with a degree of aulic splendour. After all, was he not the outward and visible symbol of the nation and the might which it possessed under him? Majesty like histrionic ability is surely an essential ingredient of a man's power to influence his times...'

And I am sure there is no one here who has any doubts about Cromwell's power to influence *his* times.

BOOK NEWS AND REVIEWS

Maurice Ashley. The English Civil War: a concise history with 169 illustrations. Thames and Hudson. £3.50.

Here is a concise history of the Civil War in 178 pages: who could possibly achieve any effective history of the Civil War in that space? Maurice Ashley has achieved it and, as a fellow worker in the same field, I feel the deepest admiration with just a touch of envy. Dr. Ashley's leading figures stand out as recognisable characters, he pin-points the critical moments and he never forgets the confused and crowded human scene, yet he has

room for lucid and original analysis and for judicious discussion of the opposing interpretations of modern scholars.

His opening chapter on "Long-term Causes" is a masterly dissection of the conflicting points of view put forward on high authority in the last thirty years. This often ferocious controversy has led to research which has piled up a mass of new knowledge useful to us all. But what does it all lead to? It leads essentially to a much fuller picture of the English Seventeenth century. But the research doesn't conclusively prove any of the theories. Dr. Ashley is respectful towards good scholarship and one never hears the grinding of any personal axe. But he is not convinced by any of them. He holds to the belief that history is affected, at least at times, by fortuitous developments: the wrong King at the wrong moment. "The genesis of the revolution is therefore not to be discerned in any class struggle, not even in the "loss of grip" of the aristocracy. The man who lost his grip was King Charles I." Dr. Ashley firmly re-states, with full understanding of the most recent research, that the causes of the war were essentially political and religious, not social or economic.

Most historians have their own bees buzzing in their own bonnets. While wholly agreeing, I would have added that the religious causes were intensified by the King's disastrous pro-Spanish foreign policy, and that Charles was regarded by Parliament as having betrayed not only the Protestant Church but the Protestant Cause in Europe. But this is a merely personal footnote, not in any way a criticism of his admirable full and sane summary of the causes of the Civil War.

Dr. Ashley's account and analysis of the fighting is equally sane and objective. He has the courage to attack that sacred cow of an idea, for which there is no contemporary evidence, that Charles I planned a three-pronged attack on London in the campaigns of 1643. Even in the more sophisticated campaigning of the Thirty Years War one does not find grand strategy of this kind. They couldn't do it: their communications and logistics were not up to it. Chance, muddle and improvisation were far more generally the normal order of things.

In his excellent bibliography, designed to tempt beginners into further reading, I was glad to see that he warned readers of Clarendon's "dislike of military men" which vitiates much of what he has to say about the active conduct of the war.

This is an outstandingly good, and up-to-date introduction to the study of the English Civil War. Strongly recommended to all beginners, it has also much to interest and inspire the old hands, myself included.

C. V. WEDGWOOD

THE LAST OF THE ASTROLOGERS (Mr. William Lilly's History of his Life and Times). ed. K. M. Briggs. The Folklore Society. University College, London. 1974. — £3.00.

Although well enough known to specialist students of the period, Lilly's 'Life and Times' has not been readily available to the general reader. Dr. Briggs' splendidly edited text now enables us to travel back in time and look at the Stuart age through the eyes of an observer both shrewd and naive. Born in Leicestershire in 1602 of a yeoman family, Lilly was educated by a strict Puritan, John Brinsley. At sixteen, like many another of his age, the boy was 'troubled in (his) dreams concerning Salvation and

Damnation'. Although an apt scholar, the family fortunes did not allow him to go to the University. Instead, in 1620, a place was found for him as a servant in a tradesman's family in London. In this employment he nursed his mistress through a terminal sickness and was rewarded with a pension. He learnt to play the 'base-viol', frequented the bowling greens and began to dabble in the occult by means of which, together with three advantageous marriages, he rose to a comfortable position in society. His first astrological pamphlet appeared in 1644 and the series continued into the Restoration period. He managed to keep a finely balanced political position being, in his own words, 'engaged Body and Soul in the cause of Parliament, but still with much Affection unto His Majesty's Person and unto Monarchy.' Dr. Briggs aptly describes Lilly as having 'his ears to a good many keyholes'. Just how many, and whose, is hard to tell. Was he a spy? And if so, for whom? Was he the man who betrayed the King's plan to escape from Carisbrooke? We find him at the siege of Colchester, prophesying, on astrological grounds, success to the Parliamentary forces, whilst, inside the walls his pupil Humphreys was doing the same for Sir Charles Lucas.

Lilly was skilful enough to earn the commendation of both Charles and Oliver Cromwell. He survived legal indictments, the venom of rivals and the suspicions of the Presbyterians. At the Restoration he was taken into custody and interrogated 'concerning the Person who cut off the King's head'. Lilly cited Oliver's secretary, Robert Spavin, as his source for believing the executioner to have been George Joyce, of Holmby House fame. Lilly survived this and like vicissitudes as when he was suspected of fore-knowledge of the Great Fire. Lilly turned the charge into a testimonial to his abilities as prophet. From 1665 until his death in 1684 he lived at Horsham as a gentleman and physician. He is buried there, his friend Elias Ashmole assisting at the funeral.

Lilly's little book is an invaluable document of the shadier side of life at a time when great affairs were in hand both in Church and State. Spy, trickster no doubt, but also a sceptical student of his chosen science, Lilly is a fine example of the third oldest profession (monarchy is said to be the second), that of 'Cunning Man' and an apt reminder should any still be needed, that few men of the seventeenth century fitted in any way at all those popular stereotypes of Roundhead and Cavalier. ALAN SMITH

'*BOSTON POLITICS and the SEA 1652 - 1674*', another paperback in the 'History of Boston' Series written by member A. A. Garner, 24a Warwick Avenue, Grimsby, South Humberside, is now available from him at £1.20 per copy, or can be borrowed from the Association Library. It has many interesting illustrations.

Following *Cromwelliana's* now established procedure of carrying extracts from less well known or not easily available works on Cromwell it has been decided that one of the earliest genuine biographies ever written of Cromwell should be the subject of this year's issue. This is the fairly well known, but not easily available, *The Perfect Politician or a full view of the Life and Actions (Military and Civil) of O. Cromwell*, said to be attributed to the booksellers who handled it, Henry Fletcher and William Raybould. It was first published in 1660 and therefore written before many of the myths surrounding Cromwell had had chance to solidify and before Cromwell became in popular imagination the all-purpose agent of events in the British Isles between 1642 and 1658. The book ran to four editions in all. There was a German version, published in Nuremberg in 1663, and two further

English editions, one published in 1680, from which the passages quoted below are taken, and the other in 1681.

The Perfect Politician is divided into six chapters entitled "His Actions in the Wars of England", "His Wars in Ireland", "His wars in Scotland", "His Actions in the Protectorship", "His Character" and "A Catalogue of Honours conferred on several persons, by Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, in the time of his Government". And it is addressed "To the people of England". "The ensuing history", writes the author, "properly belongeth to you, in double respect: First, because it was your blood and treasure that raised the subject of this discourse to supremacy. Then secondly, your backs bore the burden of his greatness. Therefore it is fit that once again you look back and view, with a full aspect, this gentleman, general, politician and Protector".

Although this work is said to contain the best version of Cromwell's early life, this particular aspect of Cromwell, nevertheless, receives rather meagre treatment, which could be said to add to its credibility. It forms, in fact, the first few pages of the first chapter devoted to "His Actions in the Wars of England".

Of Cromwell's social origin and the first two decades of his existence the book merely says:

It is very well known that he was of honourable extraction and had suitable education. He was born at Huntingdon on April 25th in the year 1599 and bred up in the famous University of Cambridge in Sidney College. Whilst he was a student there wanted not présages of his future greatness. Neither was he then so much addicted to speculation, as to action, as was observed by his tutor. After a good proficiency in the University he came to London where he betook himself to the study of law in Lincoln's Inn, that nothing might be wanting to make him a complete Gentleman, and a good Commonwealth's man.

Slightly more is divulged about the next twenty years of Cromwell's life, a shortened version of which is as follows:

From thence [Lincoln's Inn] he returned home again, where his father, Mr. Robert Cromwell (third son of Sir Henry Cromwell), had been dead some while before. There for some time he spent his life not altogether free from the wildness and follies incident to youthful age, to the wasting of some part of that small estate his father had left him. but growing to years of greater discretion and solidity he became as remarkable for his sobriety and religiousness, as before for his vanity.

By this great change he gained much repute, especially among the Puritans, that when the necessities of those times compelled the late King to call that Parliament in the year 1640 (truly surnamed *The Long*) he was elected by the town of Cambridge to serve as a member therein.

And now God being displeased with England for the abuse of a long-continued peace, and the blessings thereof, and determining to punish the inhabitants thereof for the same, he sent an evil spirit of division betwixt the King and that Parliament ... [which] ... soon brake forth into the flame of open hostility.

No sooner had the drum and trumpet summoned the nation to arms than Cromwell was alarmed, who neglecting the softness of a sedentary,

betook himself to a martial employment. And having commission for that purpose immediately raised a troop of horse for the Parliament among his neighbours at his own charge, in listing of whom he picked out such only as he judged to be stout and resolute.

This chapter on Cromwell's actions in the wars of England concludes with:

And now the army was wholly at the devotion of Cromwell, and the agitators (by his advice) remonstrate to the Parliament that all persons of whatever quality and condition (not excepting the King) that had been guilty of the blood spilt in the late war, should be brought to justice and condign punishment.

Related in the chapter "His Wars in Scotland" is the account of Cromwell being fired at and missed by a Scotch soldier:

The Scots drew forth on the west side of Edinburgh between the River Leith and the Sea, to the number of two or three thousand horse. Conceiving the army intended to possess a pass over the said river . . . the Lord General [Cromwell] . . . drew forth a forlorn to engage them, himself in person leading, to show the Scots his readiness to fight them. Approaching near to their body one that knew the Lord General fired a carbine at him but timorously, which he [Cromwell] seeing, called out and proclaimed that if he had been one of his soldiers he would have been cashiered for firing at that distance. But the truth is, these daring actions in generals favour more of valour than discretion. Bullets distinguish not betwixt the meanest private soldier and the most puissant general, if he came in their way. Hence it was that the people would not suffer David to go out in person.

The penultimate chapter of *The Perfect Politician*, devoted to "His Character", begins with:

We find him [Cromwell] in the beginning of England's distractions a most active instrument to carry on the cause for King and Parliament. This claim holding water, and proving prosperous, he then became the main stickler for liberty of conscience without any limitation. This toleration became his masterpiece in politics, for it procured him a party that stuck close in all cases of necessity. These libertines, in general being divided into several particular fractions (as Independents, Anabaptists, Socinians, Millenarists, Antisabbatarians, Ranters, Quakers, Seekers and God knows how many more) did all of them serve as steps to mount our Protector to the highest pitch of preferment. After he had made use of all that could augment his interest then humility condescended to look through his fingers at a crown. But constantly waiving the airy title of King, he rather chose to accept the substantial power of Protector.

This character assessment ends with this telling appraisal of Cromwell's genius:

To take him in the whole, he was a man better fitted to make a prince of than the people was to receive him. This we see sufficiently in the management of the government to his death. But afterwards the sudden disaster which befell his posterity was so extraordinary that it cannot be imputed to anything else but the hand of God.

R. E. SHERWOOD

THE JUDGES OF CHARLES I

The number of Judges who attended the Trial of Charles I never exceeded 75. Some attended only a few times, others attended regularly. The 59 who signed the Death Warrant were regular in attendance, and some were more prominent than others. They might be termed the Managers of the Trial. Cornelius Holland played a leading part in drawing up the charges against the King; while John Lisle, an eminent lawyer, did the same in drawing up the sentence. Yet neither Holland nor Lisle signed the Death Warrant. The advice of Dr Isaac Dorislaus, a Dutch jurist, was sought frequently during the Trial. In addition to the Judges there were two Clerks of the Court, John Phelps of Salisbury and Andrew Broughton of Maidstone, Kent; also two officers in charge of the soldiers—Daniel Axtel and Francis Hacker.

The Judges can be divided into three groups — first, those who were country gentlemen or the sons of country gentlemen. This was by far the largest section. From the data available many had received a University education and also a legal training at one of the Inns of court. Oxford produced a larger number of Judges than Cambridge; Henry Ireton and Edmund Ludlow were at Trinity College, Oxford; Henry Marten and William Saye were at University College. At Cambridge, Peterhouse was attended by John Hutchinson and Anthony Millington. John Bradshaw, John Cook, and also Henry Marten, all three Republicans, attended Grays' Inn.

The second group included traders and merchants of London and other cities and towns. John Barksted, goldsmith; Robert Tichborne, linen draper, and Gregory Clement, who had amassed wealth in trade with Spain, were all Londoners; while Thomas Harrison was son of a wealthy grazier of Newcastle, Staffs; John Blakiston was a mercer of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and William Cawley, the son of a brewer of Chichester, Sussex.

The third group of Judges were those of humble origin such as Thomas Pride, said to have been a drayman; John Hewson of Westminster reputed to be a shoemaker; and John Okey, a chandler. All had been able soldiers in the Parliamentary Army. Three of the Judges were sons of Anglican clergy — William Goffe, son of the Rector of Stanmer, Sussex, John Blakiston, son of the Rector of Sedgfield, County Durham; and Nicholas Love, whose father was a Canon of Winchester and Warden of Winchester College. Some of the Judges cared for their less fortunate neighbours; William Cawley founded almshouses at Chichester, Thomas Chaloner of Steeple Claydon, Bucks., founded and endowed a school; Colonel Hutchinson was on a Committee to relieve unemployment and distress in Nottinghamshire.

Broadly speaking, the Judges fell into two groups at the Trial — those activated by political, or by religious motives. The first group claimed that Charles had broken the contract between King and People and referred to cases in Greece and Republican Rome where Rulers had been called to account. English examples were also cited — i.e. deposition of Edward II and Richard II. Bradshaw and Cook quoted the axiom of a medieval English lawyer that a King is not above the law. The second group basing charges on religious grounds, followed the Old Testament and the Prophets and held the Army to be the instrument of God to avenge the nation and bring to account an evil ruler. Oliver Cromwell and William Goffe believed Charles to be guilty of the Nation's blood.

These two groups combined to bring about the King's Trial and substantiated their charges by evidence. The control of the armed forces was the main stumbling block to a settlement; the religious question might have been settled, as when the Anglican clergy proposed a modified Episcopacy at a conference in 1645, with toleration for Nonconformists, and Ireton's offer of a religious settlement on similar lines in 'The Heads of the Proposals' in 1647.

But Charles I's political outlook was summed up in the words uttered before his death: 'As for the People having a share in government, that does not pertain to them'.

At the Restoration ten Judges were excluded from the Act of Oblivion; Thomas Harrison, John Jones, Thomas Scot, John Barksted, John Lisle, Cornelius Holland, William Saye — the last three the brains or managers of the Trial — with John Cook, Solicitor for the Commonwealth, Andrew Broughton, a Clerk of the Court, and Daniel Axtel, Sergeant of Arms. Holland, Saye, Broughton and Lisle escaped abroad, though Lisle was murdered in 1664. Adrian Scrope was later included in the death roll — a breach of faith. Barksted, Okey and Corbet were meanly betrayed by the Dutch, brought back to England and executed. Sixteen others escaped abroad, mainly to New England and Switzerland, and twenty two died before the Restoration. John Hutchinson was included in the Pardon but was arrested and died a prisoner in 1664, whilst nineteen others were imprisoned. Francis Hacker, the Rev. Hugh Peters and John Carew were executed.

Thus those who took part in the Trial of Charles I and consequently suffered imprisonment, exile or death, may be regarded as martyrs in the struggle for civil and religious freedom.

S. J. P. THOMAS

NOTES and NEWS

ANNUAL SERVICE—September 3rd. This year the Service will be held in St. Giles' Church, Cripplegate, London, E.C. (see enclosed Notice) by kind permission of the Rector, the Rev. E. L. Rogers, a member of the Association, who will conduct the Service. Cromwell's Green, Westminster, is still inaccessible, and according to the Ministry of the Environment, will not be back to normal until 1977.

IRETON MEMORIAL PLAQUE: Some donations have been received towards this project for which the Hon. Treasurer is most grateful (more would be welcome!). Plans are now in hand to place a plaque on Ireton House, Attenborough, reliably reputed to be Henry Ireton's birthplace, and to hold an unveiling ceremony there, the date for which has yet to be arranged. Members interested in attending such a ceremony at Attenborough should please advise the Hon. Secretary who will then let them know precise details when arrangements are finalised.

WEST COUNTRY BRANCH. The Rev. Ernest Bacon, now living near Bristol, has offered to explore the possibility of forming a west country group of the Association. Interested members in that area should contact him at 2 The Homes, Langford Road Langford, Bristol, or the Hon. Secretary, Miss H. Platt, for further details. Incidentally, Mr. Bacon is the author of several books, including '*Great Serenities—Poems of Life and Faith*', a copy of which is now in the Association Library. One poem, '*Kimble Church*' alludes to John Hampden and Cromwellian times.

FOR SALE. Four Parliamentary newspapers from the year 1643; copies of '*CERTAIN INFORMATION*' complete, in excellent condition and quite rare. Members interested in buying these at £18 per copy should contact member L. TIMMINS, 10 Brindle Road, Yew Tree Estate, Walsall, WS5 4EH