Cromwell a na

The Cromwell Association

1982-83

The Cromwell Association

President: Professor IVAN ROOTS M.A., F.S.A.

Vice-Presidents: THE LORD CARADON OF ST CLEER
Mr MAURICE ASHLEY, C.B.E., B.A., D.Phil.
LADY (DINGLE) FOOT
Dr E.S. DE BEER, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., Mr G. G. LILBURN, B.A.

Chairman: Mr TREWIN COPPLESTONE

Council

Major R. D. BATTCOCK, The Rev. D. A. GREEVES, M.A.,
Miss J. S. HENDERSON, Mr JOHN LANGFORD, Mrs K. A. ROBINSON,
The Rev. R. S. PAUL, M.A., D.Phil., Miss P. BARNES, Mr L. VERITY,
Mr G. NEWPORT-TINGLEY

Hon. Secretary: Miss H. PLATT, B.A.
Combe Lodge, Ringley Park Avenue, Reigate, Surrey.

Hon. Treasurer: Mr G. WOOLLARD,
Chalk Farm, Bottisham, Cambridge.

Hon. Editor of Cromwelliana
Professor IVAN ROOTS M.A., F.S.A.

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION WAS founded in 1935 by the late R. Hon. Isaac Foot and others to commemorate Oliver Cromwell, the great Puritan statesman, and to encourage the study of the history of his times, his achievements and influence. It is neither political nor sectarian, its aims being essentially historical. The Association seeks to advance its aims in a variety of ways which have included:

(a) the erection of commemorative tablest (e.g. at Naseby, Dunbar, Worcester, Preston etc.). (From time to time appeals are made for funds to pay for projects of this sort);
(b) helping to establish the Cromwell Museum in the Old Grammar School at Huntingdon;
(c) holding two annual meetings, one the now traditional Memorial Service by the Statue outside the Houses of Parliament; the other a business meeting at which the Council presents a report on its year's work for discussion by members. At both meetings an Address is given by a distinguished Cromwellian;
(d) producing an annual publication *Cromwelliana* which is free to members;
(e) awarding an annual prize for an essay on a Cromwellian theme;
(f) maintaining a small reference library for the use of members;
(g) supporting the formation of local groups of paid-up members of the Association meeting for study or social purposes;
(h) acting as a 'lobby' at both national and local levels whenever aspects or items of our Cromwellian heritage appear to be endangered.

All enquires about the Library should be addressed to Cromwell Association (Library), c/o Trewin Coppleston (Books) Ltd., 101 - 109, Ladbrok Grove, London W.11.

Printed in Great Britain by
The Printing Unit of the University of Exeter

CROMWELL'S DAY

The Address by Lord Caradon at the Annual Commemoration Service, 3 September 1981.

We come once a year on Cromwell's Day to pay respect to the memory of one of the greatest of Englishmen. And I wish most warmly to thank the Cromwell Association for again making the arrangements for the annual ceremony.

I am myself personally and specially very glad to be here again particularly because my father was a most devoted admirer of Oliver Cromwell. He taught me as a boy to remember Cromwell's Day. He never passed this way going to the House of Commons without raising his hat in respect to the statue of the Lord Protector—and I dutifully do the same on my way to the House of Lords. My father used to say that one can judge an Englishman today by the test of which side he would have fought for in the Civil War.

In preparation for today I have been reading again the fascinating life story of Oliver Cromwell. As I did so I asked myself what quality amongst all the great man's characteristics was outstanding. I want to suggest to you that his dominating quality was his sense of urgency. Both as a commander of cavalry in battle and as a national leader in times of confusion and peril he may have sometimes hesitated in deciding, but when he acted he acted swiftly, surely, confidently, eagerly. All the more surprising since for most of his life he had no military training or experience and no position of wealth and power beyond being a modest Member of Parliament for Cambridge. But in the last fifteen years of his life he rose to become a brilliantly successful general and an outstanding national leader who changed the history of his country and spread its influence to Europe and beyond. Remember the scene at Marston Moor when the two great armies came into line facing each other. It was already late afternoon, and it was assumed that the battle would not be joined till the next morning. Prince Rupert commanding the Royalist army went to his supper. But Cromwell gave the order to charge. By night-fall it was all over. Cromwell's devastating charge had won the day. So it was throughout the revolutionary years of Cromwell's ascendancy. He acted with a driving sense of urgency.

A salutary lesson for us all today. The evil of delay does so much dreadful damage at home and abroad—especially, for instance, in Arabia and in Africa and in America. We badly need Cromwell's sense of urgency. My favourite quotation indeed, from Oliver

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION

S T O P P R E S S !

Date of Annual General Meeting 1985 SATURDAY, APRIL 23rd.

in St. Mary's Church Hall, Putney (where the plaque commemorating the Putney Debates, erected by the Cromwell Association, can be viewed)

H. PLATT

Cromwell is:

> Get up what volunteers you can. Hasten your horses. You must act lively. Do it without distraction. Neglect no means.

Good advice for the leaders of the world today. 'Hasten your horses. You must act lively.' Attack, as Oliver Cromwell did, the evil of delay.

'THE DEVIL CANNOT MATCH HIM': THE IMAGE OF CROMWELL IN RESTORATION DRAMA

Roger Howell, Jnr.

That Cromwell's reputation was blackened at the Restoration is well-known. The fulminations of Heath and others, who invented a consistent if imaginary picture of a diabolical Cromwell, formed the staple of the immediate post-Restoration view of the Lord Protector. Less noticed, however, has been the treatment accorded Cromwell by dramatists and pamphleteers writing in dramatic form.[1] Given that theatrical writers of the Restoration period employed political and contemporary references with a free hand and that a number of partisan pamphleteers chose to express their satirical points in dramatic form, it is hardly surprising to find that a diabolical Cromwell also stalked the Restoration stage. Few if any of the 'plays' in question—a number of them were clearly never intended for actual performance but circulated rather in printed form—were lasting literary monuments. On the other hand, their treatment of Cromwell is both an indication of immediate post-Restoration opinion and a formative influence on the development of the longer-term popular image of Cromwell. An examination of five such plays (two from 1660 and one each from 1661, 1663, and 1668) provides an instructive view of this sort of political use of the Restoration stage.

Cromwell's Conspiracy (1660) predictably shows that with the revival of the theatre at the Restoration plays of a political nature took a strong stand in favour of the monarchy. Controversy exists over whether or not this play was ever produced,[2] but the fact that an important song from the play ('How happy's the Pris'ner that conquers his Fate') was given a contemporary musical setting still extant seems substantial evidence that it was indeed performed.[3] The authorship of the play remains problematic, but it is possible that the song was Alexander Brome's, who perhaps wrote the play, too.

The song may, anyway, be taken as indicative of the tone of the play. Even its context is prejudicial to Cromwell, for it is sung in a scene in which Cromwell succumbs to the charms of Lady Lambert, while the song itself is a spirited rejoicing at the restoration of the King, full of the Englishman's pride in his regained liberties. The play itself is an ambitious piece in five acts, tracing the history of the state from Cromwell's seizure of power until Monck's arrival in London. In some key ways these two characters are constructed as foils to each other, Cromwell as the emboidment of evil ambition, Monck as a true and glorious cavalier.

Cromwell's character is made clear from the very beginning, in the Prologue where he is compared to tyrants of antiquity such as Marius and Sulla:[4]

> Here's one out-does them all, Cromwell by name,
> A man of mean extraction, yet whose Fame
> Hath equall'd soaring Caesars; if he spake
> The well-built Pillars of three Kingdoms shake.
> By Treachery and Guile the Crown he gain'd,
> And by the Blood of Loyalists he stain'd
> The Land; no man of any sort was free,
> Whether of Clergy or of Laity;
> Nobles or Commons, all was one to him:
> His Maxim was either I'll sink or swim.
> Long thus he domineer'd, at last he fell;
> Despairing dy'd a Sacrifice for Hell.

Even those associated with Cromwell in the play comment negatively on him, Hugh Peters, for example, is portrayed as comparing Cromwell to Richard III.[5] The familiar embroiderings on Cromwell's youth make their appearance:[6]

> Another fit of heaviness possest me
> After that I had acted *Tactus* part
> At Cambridge when I stumbled on a Crown
> Scepter and Robes, which ever since that time
> Hath put such high ambitious thoughts into me
> As onely death can quench. . . .

Overweening ambition and hypocrisy, those often repeated charges against the Lord Protector, are stressed. To Colonel Pride he comments

I must confesse this [i.e., becoming Protector] was
The utmost of my aimes, my chief desire;
Although as yet, the simple people think
I don't aspire to any top of Greatnesse,
But they're mistaken, let them not suppose
That I have taken so much pains for nothing.

In the end, in a scene somewhat reminiscent of *Macbeth*, Cromwell is portrayed as burdened by his guilt; a servant tells the attending physician that he has often observed cromwell walking in his chambers, talking to himself of 'Wars and Plots, / Of close Contrivances, of Treacheries / And Murders of Kings,' while Cromwell himself exclaims: [8]

I cannot any longer patient be.
Furies do now torment me, and already
I do begin to feel I cannot live;
Horrors and strange amazements seize upon me,
And now the blood that I have caus'd to flow
From several bodies, appears all at once
And threatens for to drown me.

The image of Cromwell in *The Tragical Actors*, written also in 1660, is less well developed, but the picture is essentially the same. Ambition to dominate the country is shown as the mainspring of Cromwell's character. Referring to the King, Cromwell comments, 'I must have him rid out of my way, he must be degraded of his kingship, else how can I be a Protector?' [9] Elsewhere, in conversation with Bradshaw, Cromwell is portrayed as a cynic as well as an ambitious hypocrite: 'The business I have to report to you is very great, . . . for it tends much to the ruine of the K-, the destraction of these Nations, and my honour through to the dishonour of God.' [10] *The Tragical Actors* does add one significant dimension to the image of Cromwell, namely the idea that he was bent on the destruction of the existing social order through the elevation of the lowly-born to positions of power. To one group he is made to comment, 'Assure yourselves if all the antient Nobility and Gentry be extinct, I'll make you all gentlemen, nay not only in name but in Estates also.' [11] And when it comes to procuring witnesses for the court to try the King, the fictional Cromwell is portrayed as relying on the 'many-headed monster' for his support: 'Tush, cannot I hire fellows to swear; if that be all, I can have store, for I have spoke to 30 Coblers, Taylors, Barbers, and such mecannick fellows.' [12]

Hells Higher Court of Justice (1661), like *The Tragical Actors*,

is a pamphlet in play form, not intended to be acted, taking the popular form of a conversation in the underworld. The central exchanges are between the ghosts of Cromwell, the King of Sweden, Mazarin, and Machiavelli on the theme of whose villainy was the most substantial. The arguments are crude and repetitive, the outcome predictable. While the King of Sweden caused many to die in foreign wars as a result of his own ambition, Cromwell not only caused many to be slain, but he treacherously seduced them away from their natural allegiances and obligations: [13]

But I made Subjects Rebels, I drew men
To fight against their King, their Oathes, their Lawes,
Their Liberties, and their Religion too.
Nay so far had I them seduced that if
The powers above had been within their reach
They would in person have opposed the Deity.

To Mazarin, Cromwell pointedly argues, 'Even you yourself / Then sued to me for Peace'. [14] Judging the claims of the other three, Machiavelli's ghost gives the prize for iniquity to the Lord Protector: [15]

Yet Cromwell beares the bell away for hee
In wickedness is cheifest of the three
And when hereafter men will name a villaine
Soaked in all mischeifes call him by his name.
If you here [*sic*] of a man under the skies
Has acted all deceits and told all lies
Has killed his Soveraign and inslaved the people
Destroid the Church and pulled down the steeple
Acted impieties beyond Lucifer
Let him be stil'd by his name Oliver.

And to make the point even more forceful, Pluto himself confesses that Cromwell is 'that Prodigy of men, that Divell / Worse, worse then thousand times than I myself' and wonders whether Hell will be able to find fit torments for such a villain. [16]

While *Hells Higher Court of Justice* was intended to blacken the Protector's reputation, it does, perhaps unintentionally, contain another note which foreshadows the paradoxical portrayal of Cromwell by Clarendon as 'a brave, bad man'. For all the evil done, Cromwell did assert the authority of England in the world; the United Provinces, France, Spain, and other states were made to stand in awe of England's might in the Cromwellian period. If the route to power

was illegitimate, the exercise of that power was substantial and, as Cromwell's ghost boasts, 'rais'd me / To such a height as made me, deservedly, / The envy and the terror of all Princes, / Even from the Artick to the Antartick Pole.'[17]

The Unfortunate Usurper (1663) is another anonymous but avowedly political composition. It represents a different genre of attack on Cromwell, the attempt to blacken him through analogy.[18] The plot concerns the evil doings of Andronicus, whose character and actions parallel the image of Cromwell, for he is ambitious, false to his friends, ruthless, and hypocritical, masking all his evil intentions under a cloak of seeming piety. The point is made most forcefully in the play by Theodorus, a religious patriarch, who says of Andronicus:[19]

'Tis strange I should be so mistaken
In a man, or rather that any should
Be such a grand Impostour and deceiver
Of all the world, as to imagine
He shall unpunisht go for his usurping
Tyranny and foul Hypocrisie:
How did it lately seem as if
He were made up of Sanctity,
And wore Religion in his looks,
Though now it does appear by 's actions
He's nothing less: 'tis in his reign
A capital offence to be thought pious.

In case the audience should miss intended parallels, a demon is conjured up at the end to foretell the future and to prophesy 'what many years hence shall be / Acted on England's Stage'.[20] The prophecy develops into an attack both on Cromwell and on the Presbyterians, who are seen as the breeders of 'Chaos / And Confusion in the Kingdom'. Cromwell will be, the demon asserts, 'an Idol of his [i.e., the Presbyterian's] setting up',[21] and the Protector's career a parallel of that sorry tale already told of Andronicus:

He (like Andronicus) will not stick to murder
His lawful sovereign, and make
Great Charles' wain give place unto
His Brewer's Dray; He'l be
The greatest Hypocrite the Sun e're
Shin'd on, and pretend he stears
His Course by th' Compass of Religion,
When he intends to sail to th' fortunate
Island of a prosperous wickedness. . . .

At length he (that like Nero) rais'd so
Many storms i' th' Kingdom shall (like him)
In a storm be hurried away;
His tyranny shall cause so many sighs
In England, that all the breath
(Exhaled in 'um) shall unite, and make
A Whirle-wind to waft him over Styx to Hell
And (when he's landed there) to blow fire
The more to torture him.

Though they did crop up occasionally later, these sorts of attacks on Cromwell and his followers, popular and common at the time of the Restoration, appear to have begun to pall after 1665. Perhaps the last significant play in the immediate post-1660 period to make a political parallel of this kind about the Commonwealth was Edward Howard's *The Usurper* (1668). The unflattering view of Cromwell contained in it appears to have elicited an enthusiastic response from Charles II, for he saw two performances of it in 1668 in the space of five days.[23] As was the case with *The Unfortunate Usurper*, the Cromwellian characters appear in thinly disguised parallels, the central character Damocles representing Cromwell, Hugo de Petra being Hugh Peters, and so forth. If the actual plot of the play bears little resemblance to the outward features of Cromwellian England (Damocles, for example, is overthrown after murdering his son), the message about Cromwell's character is nonetheless clear and hostile. Once again, ambition, hypocrisy, and the gift of dissimulation are stressed. While others refer to his 'never satisfyed Ambition', Damocles himself confesses, 'He that Aspires must know no Conscience. / I see 'tis easier to be great then good: / Some Trees thrives best whose Roots are warm'd in Blood.'[24] At the same time, he is shown as wholly contemptuous of those beneath him: 'The People! Hang the shabbed multitude.[25] And that contempt is extended to the representative institutions of the nation:[26]

The Senate then a lazy lump of Power,
With forcked Heads threatn'd to sit heavy
Upon my heart: But I found ways to purge
And bleeding to Remove 'em, and constrain'd
The dull Remains to humble their proud necks
For me to walk on.

Such propaganda productions are of marginal literary value at best. On the other hand, they provide useful insight into the making of the Cromwellian image. Almost unreservedly hostile, they stress ambition, hypocrisy, dissimulation, and tyrannical behaviour as the

hallmarks of the Lord Protector. The only point at which the black picture is lightened at all is the awareness that Cromwellian foreign policy had made England a force in the world, a point most clearly put in *Hells Higher Court of Justice*, but also present in Howard's *The Usurper*, where de Petra tells Damocles that the people who speak favourably of him 'say you are / A brave villain: In conduct fortunate and full / Of courage.[27] Through much of the criticism runs the feeling that there was something diabolical about Cromwell. The immediate post-Restoration image of Cromwell was so overwhelmingly black that only such an explanation could justify a character so uncompromisingly wicked; as de Petra comments in an aside, 'the Devil cannot match him.'[28] In the 1660s, it was a view from which few would have dissented.

NOTES

1. One of the few attempts to do so is A. Nicoll, 'Political Plays of the Restoration', *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 16 (1921), pp. 224-42.

2. A. Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama 1660-1700* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 348 states that it was not intended to be acted; J. P. Cutts, 'Cromwell's Conspiracy 1660', *Notes & Queries*, vol. 202 (1957), pp. 534-8 argues the case for production.

3. The setting is in B.L. Add. Mss. 29396, fols. 74 v - 75. See Cutts, 'Cromwell's Conspiracy', pp. 535 ff.

4. *Cromwell's Conspiracy: a tragy-comedy relating to our latter times* (London, (1660), sig. A 2v.

5. Ibid., p. 4 6. Ibid., pp. 13-14. 7. Ibid., p. 14. 8. Ibid., sig. E 2v—3.

9. *The Tragical Actors or the Martyrdome of the late King Charles* (London, 1660), p. 2. 10. Ibid., p. 7. 11. Ibid., p. 5. 12. Ibid., p. 6.

13. *Hells Higher Court of Justice or the Triall of the three politick ghosts* (London, 1661), sig. C 3. 14. Ibid., sig. C 4v. 15. Ibid., sig. C 4v—D 1. 16. Ibid., sig. D 2v. 17. Ibid., sig. B 3V.

18. The technique was common and not confined to the stage. Cf. T. Hoy, *Agathocles: The Sicilian Usurper* (London, 1683) and R. Perrinchief, *The Syracusan Tyrant . . . with some reflexions on our modern usurpers* (London, 1661).

19. *The Unfortunate Usurper: A Tragedy* (London, 1663), pp. 52-3. 20. Ibid., p. 61. 21. Ibid., pp. 62, 64. 22. Ibid., p. 64.

23. 3 and 7 December, 1668; Nicoll, *History of Restoration Drama*, p. 306.

24. E. Howard, *The Usurper* (London, 1668), pp. 13, 24. The pagination is irregular; I have followed that of the original text. 25. Ibid., p. 32. 26. Ibid., p. 48. 27. Ibid., p. 34. 28. Ibid., p. 11.

ON READING THAT ON 25 MARCH 1960 THE HEAD OF OLIVER CROMWELL WAS SECRETLY BURIED IN SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, WHERE HE HAD STUDIED, 1616-17

Raymond Tong

'The mind is the man,' Cromwell once said.
Yet where there is no mind there is no man;
when the brain is absent, subject becomes object.
The head of a corpse that has been buried
then dug up contains nothing of the mind.
Although a sad reminder of the living man,
it is only blackened bone and emptiness.

The main achievements of Cromwell's powerful mind
are now a part of the fabric of this nation.
Yet when his head was bequeathed to Sidney Sussex
three centuries after the barbarous hanging
of his disinterred corpse, it was solemnly
but secretly buried in the ante-chapel,
like an object of shame or an ominous force.

There was nothing to fear. It was only blackened bone and emptiness,
bone and emptiness, a pitiful relic
of the College's most illustrious student.
Instead of secrecy, all the church bells
in England should have been proudly ringing,
and in Cambridge a statue should have been unveiled
of a truly great and inspired Englishman.

CROMWELL AND THE RESTORATION: 'A PERSISTENT GRIN'

The Address given at the Annual General Meeting at Bolsover on 24 April 1982 by Dr Barry Coward.

For those like myself who are admirers of Oliver and who are sympathetic to many aspects of the Good Old Cause I have not, on the face of it, chosen a very pleasant topic. The most obvious feature of the years immediately after the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in May 1660 was a violent reaction against Cromwell and the Good Old Cause. Oliver's body was exhumed (along with the remains of Henry Ireton and John Bradshaw) and 'their odious carcasses' (as someone called them at the time) were dragged on open hurdles

to Tyburn, where they were hung up and then taken down by the hangman, beheaded and slung into a pit at Tyburn. Their heads were stuck on poles and displayed outside Westminster Hall. Not only were Oliver's remains treated so shamelessly: his reputation also was pilloried and blackened. He was portrayed as Tyranoprocrit, the tyrant, and Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, which poked fun at Cromwell and Cromwellians as the essence of hypocrisy and narrow-mindedness, became a best-seller. William Winstanley's *The Loyal Martyrology*, (1662) typically lambasted Cromwell as

> the English Monster, the Center of Mischief, a shame to the British Chronicle, a pattern of Tyranny, Murther and Hypocrisie, whose bloody Tyranny will quite drown the name of Nero, Caligula, Domitian, [who] having at last attained the height of his Ambition, for Five years space . . . wallowed in the blood of many Gallant and Heroick Persons.

So great was this hostility in the early 1660s that it threatened to sweep away all the changes that had been brought about by successive parliamentary and republican regimes in the 1640s and 1650s. So powerful a force was it that one cannot ignore it. It is important that friends of Oliver ought at least to understand why he was so hated, even if they do not share that sentiment. In the first part of this talk I intend to look at some manifestations of this negative reaction to the Good Old Cause in the early 1660s, not principally in the Cavalier Parliament (which are fairly well-known) but in the localities, in provincial England, (which have received much less attention from historians).

But the more one reads about this period the more one realises that this negative reaction to Cromwellian rule was not by any means the only important one. When one looks more closely one realises that the unity and reconciliation of the nation as it stood and cheered the returning Charles Stuart were more apparent than real. It becomes clear that the deep gulf in English society which had opened up during the Civil War and after did not close up in 1660, and that alongside violent hatred there was a more ambivalent, less hostile attitude to what had happened in the Interregnum. Less easy to detect than the strident voices full of hate, it was still there. So, as well as looking at the negative reaction to Cromwell in the early 1660s, I intend to talk also about a more positive response to Cromwell from people who were clearly not willing to see all the achievements of the previous twenty years swept away, and I would emphasise that in this they were partly successful. 'The Great Rebellion', in the words of the President of this Association, 'willy nilly had

permanent consequences. Like some kind of many-lived Cheshire cat it left a persistent grin behind'.[1]

However, when one first looks at the early 1660s this 'persistent grin' is not very evident. Everywhere it is anti-Cromwellianism that is most apparent. 'I stood in the Strand and beheld it, and bless'd God', wrote John Evelyn about Charles Stuart's entry into London. 'And all this was don without one drop of bloud shed, and by that very army which rebell'd against him': but (Evelyn went on, showing that even Oliver's enemies shared his belief in Providence) 'it was the Lord's doing,—for such a restauration was never mention'd in any history antient or modern, since the returne of the Jews from the Babylonish Captivity; nor so joyful a day and so bright ever seene in this nation, this hapning when to expect or effect it was past all human policy'.[2] The provinces followed London's lead. Everywhere there were bonfires, some burning effigies of Cromwell. Loyal addresses to the king were drafted and presented. In Susses the joyful gentry even distributed claret to the loyal countrymen[3] (an incident which with recent political developments in mind prompts the speculation whether claret has always been associated with politically reactionary movements!).

It is not difficult to explain the euphoric mood of militant conservatism prevalent among the English propertied classes in 1660. It was rooted in their bitterness at the way the moderate events of 1640-41 had got out of control and escalated into civil war, army revolts, regicide and political revolution. What is more these events had threatened even to release the 'many-headed monster' of social revolution. For many the high taxation of the 1640s and 1650s—assessments, loans, sequestrations, decimation taxes—had obscured the memories of (or perhaps had come to be seen to be worse than) the fiscal measures—forced loans, ship money and so on—of the 1620s and 1630s. Moreover, the rule of the county committees of the 1640s and of the major-generals of the mid-1650s came to be seen as more arbitrary and more heavy-handed interference by central government in local affairs than anything attempted by the conciliar government of Charles I or the religious innovations of Archbishop Laud in the 1630s. In this climate Cromwell's commitment to reform of the Church, of the law and of education came to be seen, not as moderate and sensible (which it was) but as the first moves towards turning the world upside down. The duke of Newcastle illustrates this well. In a treatise written in 1660 he advised making savage educational cuts. (I resist the temptation to make a further allusion

to present-day events, but you may hear echoes of recent pronouncements from the D.E.S.). 'The Bible in English under weaver's and chambermaid's arms hath done us much harm', he wrote.

> That which made it one way is the universities. Abounds with too many scholars. Therefore, if every college had but half the number, they would be better fed and and as well taught.

He went on to argue that only enough educational facilities were needed to provide learned clerics, lawyers and government officials. Ordinary men and women do not need education,

> for else they run out to idle and unnecessary people that become a factious burthen to the Commonwealth. For when most was unlettered, it was much a better world both for peace and war.[4]

The way in which Cromwell's consistent commitment to moderate reform came to be identified with extremism is most clearly illustrated by the issue of church reform. One of the most striking contrasts between the period before 1640 and that after 1660 is the changed attitudes of many propertied landed gentlemen to this issue. From at least the 1580s to the early 1640s many had given their patronage to schemes to reform the church, to so-called 'puritan' reforms. By 1640-41 some (after the experience of Laudian bishops) could countenance the abolition of episcopacy. However, the late 1640s and early 1650s marked the end of that commitment. Most propertied gentlemen, unlike Cromwell—and here is one of the crucial peculiarities of Oliver which set him apart from his social equals—began to step back from church reform and they returned to the episcopal fold. Church reform (like the army) became a symbol of the political revolution that had taken place and the social revolution that it was thought had been about to take place. In 1660 it became a widespread political slogan that Dissent from the established church equalled sedition.

As if to confirm that sentiment, right on cue between 1661 and 1663 came a rash of incidents—Venner's Rising in London, the Derwentdale Plot in Durham, a couple of planned rebellions in York and Leeds—incidents which were blown up by the authorities out of all proportion to their minor importance and to the small number of people involved in them. They provided the justification for the passage by Parliament in the early 1660s of a series of laws which amounted to a savage code of repression, intolerance and bigotry, often misnamed 'the Clarendon Code'. The main driving force behind the legislation was not, in fact, the Chancellor but the Anglican

gentry. The preambles to the statutes reflect the deep hatred of Dissent held by many and also the widespread belief that the Church of England was the only bulwark which stood between them and the overthrow of the established hierarchical structure of government and society.

The legislation of Cavalier Parliament is, of course interesting. It attempted to create a regime of religious and political apartheid. But if you concentrate only on the speeches and the legislation you see only the tip of a huge submerged iceberg of gentry abhorrence of Dissent and Cromwellianism. To appreciate the real force of the reaction of the 1660s one has got to switch attention to provincial England—which historians of Restoration England (unlike those writing about the period before 1660) have been remarkably loath to do.[5] When you do look there you find that local gentlemen were suppressing conventicles and ejecting dissenting church ministers *before* the Cavalier Parliament was elected, let alone sitting. In counties as far apart as Shropshire and Sussex, Staffordshire and Devon, Nottinghamshire and Northumberland, Cheshire and Middlesex, in the autumn of 1660 ministers who refused to read the Prayer Book were being hauled before the Assizes and Quarter Sessions[6]. The inescapable conclusion is that the Church was being restored from below without any direction from Westminster. As always the best illustration of the mood is the words of a contemporary, in this case those of a Nottinghamshire J.P., Peniston Whalley, on 22 April 1661 spoken to the Grand Jury at the Quarter Sessions. 'There cannot be', he said,

> a more acceptable piece of service done to his Majesty . . . than putting the statute about the Common Prayer in execution, for the opposers being a generation of men that seldom or never believe well of any, especially of Kings . . . it may be presumed that they doubt much of the Royal performance, which indeed they cannot be of till trial: and how can they have that, till they be prevented, and lie under the punishment of the law, the remitting of which will make them love the King, by which in time they may prove good subjects—but that is scarce to be hoped for because next to a miracle.[7]

In this spirit the gentlemen of England restored the Church.[8] At the same time they themselves were restored to the militia commissions issued in March 1660 and the new commissions of the peace of March and July 1660. And they also began to purge the towns of Dissenters. In Lancashire the eighth earl of Derby, for example, urged his fellow magnates to follow the extreme principle that 'all such as ever had been against the King & had given noe testimony of theire loyalty

before his Majesty's happy restoration should notwithstanding they be willing to subscribe, & take the othes appointed by the [Corporation] Act be turned out'.[9] The earl's family, of course, had suffered badly in the 1640s and 1650s for their loyalty to Charles I. The earl's mother—the famous Lady of Lathom, the scourge of parliamentarians in 1644, a woman who had castigated the royalist governor of the Isle of Man for not torturing and executing parliamentary prisoners and who had once chastised her husband, the seventh Earl of Derby, for his timidity by saying that if he did not fight she would take off his breeches and put them on herself and go to war—no doubt fuelled her son's vindictiveness and helped to account for his role in one of the most extreme cases of royalist revenge in the 1650s, perpetrated against William Christian, the leader of those who had opposed the Derbys in their Kingdom on the Isle of Man, and who had seized the island for the Commonwealth in 1651. Christian returned in 1662, convinced he was safe because Parliament had passed an Act of Indemnity pardoning all but a few ex-republicans. Yet the earl of Derby in November 1662 had an indictment of treason drawn up against him, a Manx court sentenced him to death and early in January 1663 he was executed by a firing squad.[10]

Sentiments that led to such acts of vindictiveness and persecution in the 1660s were long-lived. Even in the 1700s Tory political propaganda was redolent of the history of the 1640s and 1650s called in to buttress the political slogan that the 'Church (was) in Danger'. The case of Dr Sacheverell in 1710 (62 years after Cromwell's death) brings home the persistence of the bitterness left by the Republic. His trial in 1710 demonstrated the wide support for him: mobs even took to the London streets on his behalf. Here is a flavour of his views. 'Presbytery and republicanism go hand in hand', he thundered in a sermon he delivered in 1702.

> They are but the same disorderly levelling principles in the two branches of our state, equally implacable enemies to monarchy and episcopacy. . . . It may be remembered that they were the same hands that were guilty of regicide and sacrilege.

Dissenters (he went on) are those 'whom nothing but . . . the sequestration of our estates and revenue can satisfy'.[11]

Important though all this is, as I said at the beginning, when you begin to look more deeply into the history of the early years of the Restoration other themes beside a stark reaction to Cromwell become

apparent. The often-emphasised unity of 1660 in favour of the Stuarts is revealed as being more apparent than real. Few, of course, were willing to stand out against the type of sentiments I have been talking about so far, though there were some brave souls who did. (In October 1662) Richard Harper, a labourer of Dutton in Cheshire, was brought before the Cheshire General Sessions for allegedly saying:

> I have been a Roundhead and I will be a Roundhead all the days of my life and unless the King mind his manners we will have the other bout with him.

On the same occasion another labourer, Henry Weaver of Wettenhall, was said to have

> ever declared himself against the king . . . he would fight against him but never for him . . . (he) did wish his knife in the King's belly.

Two yeomen, John Pennington of Aston and Edward Shernerdine of Kennerley, were charged with hoping

> the young King's head would come to the block as well as his father . . . there never was such great taxes laid upon the country as now there was, and that there never would be peace and quietness till they did as they did in Germany and that is to rise and cut the throats of all the gentry of England, wherin he said he will be as ready as any man . . . they hate the name of a gentleman to this day.[12]

These are obviously extreme and untypical sentiments in the 1660s. Yet there is evidence that others also did not fully share in the reactionary mood. Samuel Pepys is a good example. He confided to the privacy of his diary a lack of sympathy for Butler's *Hudibras*. He tries two or three times in vain to read it to see why it was so popular. Later in 1667 he reflects a growing admiration for Cromwell's achievements, mainly in foreign affairs in contrast to the ignominious diplomacy of Charles II. In February 1667 Pepys recorded, 'at dinner we talked of Cromwell, all saying he was a brave fellow and did owe his crowne he got to himself as any man that got one'. A few months later, after the Medway disaster, he wrote:

> Everybody doth nowadays reflect upon Oliver and commend him, so brave things he did and made all the neighbouring princes fear him.

And in August 1667 Pepys read a book on Cromwell, which was 'to his honour as a soldier and politician, though as a rebell, the first of that kind that I ever saw, and it is well done'.[13]

The problem for the historian is that little of this sympathy for Cromwell was allowed to appear in print. It was expressed only in diaries or in letters written by foreign ambassadors, one of whom reported in 1669 that people

cannot refrain from odiously comparing the present government with the late one of Cromwell, magnifying the power of the fleets, the alliances, and the reputation of their nation, in those times, with many other reflections of like nature.[14]

How one would like to have had details of these lost 'reflections'.

However, if the historian lacks much explicit evidence of pro-Cromwellianism there are implicit indications of the existence of attitudes other than those of die-hard Cavaliers. One is the fact that for some people conversion to the idea of the restoration of the monarchy came very late in the day. Professors Underdown and Woolrych have demonstrated the partial success of the Cromwellian regime in attracting back into official life those who had withdrawn from it during the Commonwealth period.[15] Despite the major-generals experiment they began to reappear on commissions of the peace and on assessment commissions. The Humble Petition and Advice received a lot of support, and Anthony Fletcher in his excellent book on Sussex writes of the 'widespread but grudging acceptance of the Cromwellian regime in the last months of Oliver's life, particularly among the greater magnates'[16]. My point quite simply is that many people collaborated with the republican regime in the 1650s. They did so from a variety of motives, ranging from the pragmatic consideration that the republic was a guarantee of political stability after the uncertainties of events between 1646 and 1649 to the recognition that the republic gave the lie to the long-held belief that political anarchy was the inevitable consequence of religious toleration. For such people the converstion to restoration came about only because of the escalating anarchy of the winter of 1659-60. Anthony Ashley Cooper (later 1st earl of Shaftesbury), according to his biographer, Professor Haley, only 'began to anticipate a return of the monarchy towards the end of 1659' and only did so then because he saw it as the sole way of securing truly parliamentary government. When Ashley Cooper and his Royalist neighbours, the Strangeways, knelt before the king in 1660 to present a loyal address from Dorset, Professor Haley comments that 'between the attitudes of the Cavaliers and Ashley Cooper there lay a whole world of difference'.[17]

The Cheshire rebellion in August 1659 led by Sir George Booth, not only illustrates the lack of enthusiasm for the Stuarts at that time—the rebellion was the only part of a planned nation-wide rising to get off the ground and it failed dismally—but it indicates

the different attitudes to the idea of restoration.[18] Booth had been an M.P. and a J.P. in Cheshire in the 1650s and had not helped the Stuart cause in 1648, 1651 or 1655. Even in 1659 he did not declare openly for the king, but was probably aiming to secure enough power to impose stringent conditions on Charles Stuart when he was restored. In this aim he was clearly at odds with his fellow rebel, the Anglican loyalist, the eighth earl of Derby. The earl and his supporters had none of Booth's hesitation about proclaiming Charles as king without any conditions.

What makes Restoration politics so interesting is that these differences, which were rooted in contrasting attitudes to what had happened in the 1640s and 1650s, continued after 1660. The consequence was to leave behind the Cromwellian 'persistent grin' I have referred to. It ensured that the anti-Cromwellian reaction was not totally successful. What, then was that 'persistent grin', the Cromwellian legacy to the future? It is possible to argue that part of it was a fundamental alteration in the constitutional structure of this country. I am not convinced that this is so.[19] All the major attempts to salvage the constitutional gains of the English Revolution and to shackle effectively the king's power failed in 1660. In that year a group of Presbyterian peers led by the earls of Manchester and Northumberland and Lord Wharton tried desperately to impose the limitations which had been agreed on by the parliamentary commissioners negotiating with Charles I at Newport in the Isle of Wight in 1648. In 1660 this group was reported to have resolved that 'they should immediately send propositions to the King . . . and so engage his Majesty . . . before the new Parliament meet', otherwise it would be too late, because 'the King will have many friends in it, and the whole country [will be] violent for him'.[20] And so it proved. True, the Cavalier Parliament was not so violently Royalist that it abandoned all the gains of the 1640s. Yet significantly the attempts during that decade to tie the hands of the monarch in two key respects were abandoned in 1660, namely the claim Parliament had made in the 1640s to appoint the King's ministers and to control the army. Charles II, in fact, was given a position of great potential in 1660. The Cromwellian legacy to the development of this country after 1660 was clearly not constitutional monarchy.

For me the 'persistent grin' that remained after Cromwell's death was a deep-seated and important change in the country's religious character.

The bigoted attempt to impose religious uniformity in the 1660s

was less successful than might appear. From the admittedly limited work that has yet been done on provincial England after the Restoration it becomes clear that the penal legislation of the 1660s was not always fully enforced. Sir William Bowyer, a Buckinghamshire J.P., lamented that, although suppression of conventicles

> may with ease be done in the country, where the gentry live and the people have a dependence on them . . . but in corporations it will never be carried through by the magistrates or inhabitants, their livelihood consisting altogether in trade, and this depending one upon another, that when any of these shall appear to act in the least measure, their trade shall decline, and . . . their credit with it. [21]

In towns as far apart as Chester, Bristol, Yarmouth, Rye, Lewes and East Grinstead the result was the survival of the Puritan tradition that had blossomed in the 1640s and 1650s.[22] Nor did it die out in rural England. The need for a second Conventicle Act in 1670 underlines the fact that the earlier legislation was not always fully implemented. This was certainly true where there was a powerful individual who was sympathetic to Protestant Dissent, like Lord Townshend, who had been sympathetic to Prebyterianism in the 1650s and who as Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk from 1661 to 1676 prevented any wholesale persecution of Dissenters.[23] Or like Lord Wharton, who afforded protection in his household in Buckinghamshire to a great number of dissenting ministers.[24] Moreover, Dr Ian Green (who has recently published a detailed work on the quarter sessions records of the early Restoration period) shows that south-eastern counties, like Kent, Hertfordshire and Surrey, had very few outbreaks of persecution.[25]

Ironically (in a sense) those working to moderate the persecuting zeal of militant Anglicans had allies in Charles II and Clarendon, both of whom were decidedly more tolerant of Dissent than most M.P.s. Adam Martindale, a Lancashire Presbyterian, in his autobiography credits both king and minister with intervening to protect him from the vengeance of Charles, earl of Derby.[26] Indeed Charles II and Earl Charles were at loggerheads over a number of issues in the 1660s, including the Christian case I mentioned earlier. When king and privy council heard about Christian's trial and the verdict they ordered a stay of execution. After Christian's death the earl and six of his Manx officers were called before the privy council to account for their actions. All the earl's excuses were brushed aside, he was censured, two of Christian's judges were imprisoned and arrangements were made to compensate

Christian's family.[27]

Not only did Derby's policy of revenge get him into trouble with Charles II. Clearly some people in Lancashire and Cheshire were also not sympathetic to his zealous persecution. This was the beginning of a period of great division in the north-west as families like the Booths (Lords Delamere and later earls of Macclesfield) became increasingly identified with the Whig cause and the eighth and ninth earls of Derby slid into the Tory camp. There is little doubt that these later controversies were rooted in the events of the 1650s.

But I will not push too far ahead into the post-Restoration period. All that I want to emphasise is that 1660 was not a new beginning. The blackboard was not wiped clean in 1660 by the anti-Cromwellian reaction. The great rifts in English society opened up in the 1650s did not close in 1660. There was only a modicum of the Cromwellian type 'healing and settling' spirit abroad in 1660. Instead the rifts grew wider. The political struggles between Whigs and Tories which rent the political structure of the country between the 1670s and the 1720s were one manifestation of this. Another (and I think much more important) legacy of Cromwellian England was the religious divide between Anglicans and Dissenters, between Church and Chapel. The 1650s had been a freer time for the expression of ideas and religious beliefs than any previous period. 1660 ensured that the Cromwellian dream of religious toleration would not become a reality for a long time, but could not extinguish it entirely. Such was its strength and the sympathy for it in the 1660s that even the harsh bigoted climate of the period was not able to kill off completely the fruits of surely the most appealing of Oliver Cromwell's achievements.

NOTES

1. Ivan Roots, *The Great Rebellion 1642-60* (1966), p. 257.
2. H. B. Wheatley, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* (2 vols., 1906), ii, p. 113.
3. Anthony Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-60* (1975), p. 320.
4. Extracts in Joan Thirsk, ed., *The Restoration* (1976), pp. 170-1.
5. There are as yet no county studies of the Restoration period to match those on English localities before 1660 by, for example, T. G. Barnes (Somerset), Alan Everitt (Suffolk and Kent), John Morrill (Cheshire), Anthony Fletcher (Sussex) and Peter Clark (Kent).
6. R. S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement. 1649-62.* (1951), p. 201.
7. Ibid., p. 202.

7. Ibid., p. 202.
8. Ian Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-63* (1978), chapter 9.
9. P.R.O., SP29/61/45.
10. William Harrison, ed., *Illiam Dhone and the Manx Rebellion 1651.* Manx Society, xxvi (Douglas 1877), pp. 1-2, 4-40; P.R.O., SP29/448/119, *The Earl of Derby's Case Stated for the Vindication of the Proceedings . . . Against William Christian.*
11. Quoted in J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles 1689-1720* (1977), p. 93. For the extraordinary events surrounding Sacheverell's trial see G. Holmes, *The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell* (1973) and 'The Sacheverell riots', *Past and Present*, no. 72 (1976).
12. Quoted in Howard Hudson, *Cheshire 1660-1780:* (Chester 1978), p. 2.
13. Robert Latham and William Matthews, eds., *The Diary of Samuel Pepys* (1974), iii, p. 294; iv, p. 35, viii, pp. 50, 332, 382.
14. Ibid., vii, p. 392 note.
15. David Underdown, 'Settlement in the counties 1653-58' and Austin Woolrych, 'Last quests for a settlement 1657-60' in G. E. Aylmer, ed., *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement 1646-60* (1972).
16. Fletcher, *Sussex*, p. 314.
17. K. H. D. Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (1968), pp. 138-9.
18. There are two good accounts, J. R. Jones, 'Booth's Rising of 1659', *Bulletin of of John Ryland's Library*, xxxix (1957) and R. N. Dore, 'The Cheshire Rising of 1659', *Lancs. and Cheshire Antiquarian Soc.*, lxix (1959).
19. I have argued this in *The Stuart Age. 1603-1714* (1980), especially pp. 246-7, 291-302, 412-16, 458-9.
20. D. R. Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England 1661-89* (New Brunswick, 1969), p. 7.
21. Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (1978), pp. 245-6.
22. Ibid., Chapter 3. Another good example is Coventry, where between 1660 and 1689 over 40% of the mayors were Dissenters, J. J. Hurwich. '"A fanatick town": the political influence of Dissenters in Coventry 1660-72', *Midland History*, iv, (1977), pp. 15-48.
23. R. M. Dunn, ed., *The Norfolk Lieutenancy Journal 1660-76* (Norfolk Record Society, xlv, 1977), p. 10.
24. G. F. T. Jones, *Saw-Pit Wharton.* (Sydney 1967), pp. 212-13.
25. Green, *Re-establishment of the Church*, passim.
26. Richard Parkinson, ed., *The Autobiography of Adam Martindale*, Chetham Society, 1st series, iv (1845), p. 153.
27. P.R.O., SP 29/67/33; SP 29/448/119; SP 29/78/92; PC2/56 fols. 361, 365, 433, 441, 470-1, 481, 490-1, 496-8, 505, 509, 623, 661, 665-6; PC2/57 fols. 2, 29.

RICHARD CROMWELL AND OXFORD 1657—1660

John Butler

Richard Cromwell was installed with great ceremony as Chancellor of Oxford on 29 July 1657. He remained in office until April 1660, when his letter of resignation was read out in a session of Convocation. Richard had demonstrated an unexpected interest in education, and during his term showed a zeal and a seriousness of purpose not not usually associated with his name. His tenure of the Chancellorship, moreover, had been seen by some of the more progressive members of the university as holding out the hope of a less ideologically stulfifying atmosphere there. Unfortunately, the hope had scarcely manifested itself before it was extinguished by the collapse of the Protectorate and the eventual return of Charles II, whose government brought back many characters from the 1640's and their corresponding adherence to the old system.

Since Oliver Cromwell's assumption of the legislative power in 1653, Oxford had been governed largely through a commission set up by its Chancellor, who happened to be the Protector. Cromwell retained the position of Chancellor, but by 1657 was beginning to feel the strain which had been imposed on him by attempting to control hostile Parliaments, and he felt that it was time to give up his office of Chancellor. As the factions both within the commission itself, and in Oxford in general, were becoming more and more divisive, Cromwell saw a need for someone who could take the time to mediate among them and yet remain loyal to the Protectorate. Richard Cromwell, as we shall see, had contacts in the academic world, and although he had attended neither Oxford nor Cambridge, he had served as Member of Parliament for the University of Cambridge. Cromwell therefore nominated Richard as the next Chancellor, and for a few days Richard found himself in the anomalous position of being Chancellor of Oxford and Member for Cambridge at the same time.

To give readers some idea of the situation which prevailed in Cromwellian Oxford, it will be necessary to give a brief account of the history of the city after 27 April 1647, when Oxford ceased to be England's temporary royal capital. It was on this date that Charles I slipped away in the early hours of the morning and started on his journey north. Fairfax's troops, who were beseiging Oxford, did not actually enter the city until 24 June. On the same day the Lord General gave his word that Oxford's rights and charters would

remain inviolate. Learned and cultivated, if politically naive, Fairfax no doubt gave his guarantee in good faith, but the university authorities must have felt anger and betrayal when they learned that a parliamentary commission had been set up and was on its way to Oxford. There is no evidence that Fairfax knew anything of this or bore any responsibility for it, yet the cloud grew more threatening by an order that until the commission arrived no appointments could be made by the university and no elections were to be held. And when the commission did arrive, this order was still applied as long as it was in Oxford.

Parliament, it seemed, well understood the value of extending as much control as it could over the universities. Hobbes's remarks on this subject in his conclusion to *Leviathan* are very pertinent here:

> For seeing the Universities are the Fountains of Civill, and Morall Doctrine, from whence the Preachers, and the Gentry, drawing such water as they find, use to sprinkle the same (both from the Pulpit, and in their Conversation) upon the People, there ought certainly to be great care taken, to have it pure, both from the Venime of Heathen Politicians, and from the Incantation of Deceiving Spirits.

As Oxford had been loyal to both Charles I and the Established Church, it was natural for Parliament in 1647 to be thinking about making the university pure. Yet at the same time it was prepared to acknowledge that the whole structure could not be simply destroyed at one blow. The gentry and the preachers were to remain at Oxford, but their robes had changed, and at times it was difficult to distinguish one from the other. This was not to say, however, that some repression did not descend on Oxford, but it was largely confined to the first years of parliamentary ascendancy. However, one could argue that the continued presence of all manner of preachers and their attempts to sprinkle their particular doctrines on the people at the university also constituted in itself a form of repression. In fact, Oxford suffered far less under Parliaments and Protectors than it did under kings such as James I, who liked to be regarded as a kind of eternal Vice-Chancellor, or under the changes imposed by the Laudian clergy in the 1630s and 1640s. Furthermore, many of the proposed changes were enlightened in nature, though most of them failed to outlive their creators, and those which had not been irretrievably absorbed into the rules and statutes were soon discarded after 1660.

The preliminary step towards parliamentary interference, then, was the setting up of a commission which would have the power of

Visitors. Preceding even their arrival, six Presbyterian ministers descended upon the city and university, for the Presbyterians were at that time the most powerful of the many groups in Parliament, and no doubt considered that if they did not get to Oxford first, the 'Deceiving Spirits' would. Fortunately for Oxford, one of this group was Edward Reynolds, a 'gentle, eloquent, scrupulous and fair-minded man' who himself would later hold the position of Vice-Chancellor. Reynolds persuaded the preachers and the Visitors to act with extreme caution, knowing very well that Oxford would resent and resist anything which looked like an imfringement upon its ideas of academic independence. Yet feelings in Oxford were more divided than would normally have been expected in a bastion of royalist sympathy. The Heads of Oriel, Lincoln and Queen's Colleges, for example, quickly compounded with the Visitors; on the opposing side were Samuel Fell, the Vice-Chancellor, and Gilbert Sheldon, a future Archbishop of Canterbury.

Trouble began in Oxford even before Reynolds and his fellow Presbyterians arrived. It came in the form of a mob of Independent preachers, determined to get equal time to air their views, which they did with a vengeance. These included Hugh Peter and the shoe-maker-cum-colonel John Hewson, and a rivalry sprang up between them and the more orthodox Presbyterians. It might have provided some amusement for the students in the form of running theological battles, but it was not hardly conducive to the purpose of the parliamentary position and its spokesmen. Reynolds and the others could do little to stop it, however, and what had started as almost a joke soon became an internecine squabble fused by personal animonsities and doctrinal fanaticism such as Oxford had rarely experienced. The position of the Independents is well-expressed by one of the most reasonable preachers, William Dell, who was Fairfax's private chaplain and who had married Bridget Cromwell, Richard's sister, to Henry Ireton in Oxford the same year (1647):

> It is one of the grossest errors that ever reigned under Antichrist to affirm that universities are the fountain of the ministers of the Gospel.

If peace was supposed to bring men together after the defeat of the common enemy, the religious men from London showed a remarkable propensity for falling out with one another now that their enemy was out of sight and out of mind.

When the Visitors arrived, they claimed royal authority, since the King was the only person able to authorise a Visitation, and Charles I

had, of course not yet been deposed. This specious claim met with the contempt it deserved, but the university was unable to prevent the appointment as its Chancellor of Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke. Pembroke was, to put it kindly, 'a stooge'; he was notorious for his dissolute habits and had curried favour with Parliament by changing sides when he incurred the dislike of Queen Henrietta Maria. This great intellectual had received his degree from the sycophants of New College at the age of nine. At his inauguration as Chancellor he made a suitable speech of thanks when he was presented with a Bible. 'I love the Bible,' Pembroke declared diplomatically. 'though I seldom use it,' he added thoughtfully. Samuel Fell, who retained the position of Vice-Chancellor, loathed Pembroke, and their dislike of one another led to public quarrels and, on one occasion, even blows. Fell's first action as Chairman of Convocation was to declare Oxford loyal to the Established Church, and he refused utterly to speak with or even see the Visitors. After this, there was a noticeable lack of co-operation on the part of other university officials; Registrar, Bedels and Clerk all found obstacles to prevent them carrying out their duties, and the Proctors announced that they could not acknowledge a visitation which had not been authorised by the King.

The Visitors, at this point, saw that they had little choice but to retaliate. Pembroke dismissed Fell, who was expelled from his deanery and only saved from a huge fine by the intervention of John Selden. Selden's task was not made easier by Mrs. Fell, who staged a sit-down protest and had to be evicted by Parliamentary soldiers. In April 1648 a similar fate befell Gilbert Sheldon upon his refusal to leave All Souls College, though as troops led him away a great demonstration was made in his favour by students.

Pembroke's administration ended with his unlamented death in January 1650. In the same year the Cromwellian connexion with Oxford began, for Parliament offered the Chancellorship to its victorious general, Oliver Cromwell. He accepted, and as Vice-Chancellor secured the appointment of John Owen, his chaplain. Under Cromwell and Owen, the power of the Vice-Chancellor increased by leaps and bounds, and Owen, an austere disciplinarian, began to become unpopular. He himself served on two Boards of Visitors while he was Vice-Chancellor, and was also elected Member of Parliament for Oxford, although this was disallowed. Owen fuelled his unpopularity by interfering in such seemingly trivial matters as the wearing of gowns and other academic distinctions, and he was

vehemently opposed to singing, dancing and celebrating of any kind. He moreover, became increasingly dissatisfied with the quasi-regal nature of the Protectorate, and grew proportionately apart from Cromwell and his family. Richard Cromwell, writing to his brother Henry in March 1657, noted that Owen had been appalled by the idea of the creation of a new upper House:

> I heare that ye Howse hath made them selves the Comons, by voting another Howse, they are affraid of tytles, the feather in the cap is allowed to none but such Gallants that wait upon Ladyes. R. Riche, my Lady ffrancis Gallant flyes with his plumes in Whitehall [Richard is referring to his sister Frances, who was being courted by Robert Rich, the grandson of the Earl of Warwick—author's note]. Dr. Owen hath been very angry, & went in great haste out of London. . . .

Owen's final break with the Protector and his family would not come until after Richard had become Chancellor.

If John Owen had objections about university pomp and regalia, or indeed about the Cromwells, he concealed them all for Richard's installation. We read how 'the Heads of Houses in scarlet, and Proctors, and a great number of Masters of Arts' went with Owen 'in their formalities' to escort Richard from his lodgings to the ceremony. Owen then made a grandiloquent Latin oration to which Richard replied in a short, gracious speech, in which he 'declared his good acceptance of the honour done him by the University,' and promised to look after Oxford's interests. He was then created Master of Arts by the University, 'to which the whole Convocation gave their *placet* or consent,' a tactful gesture which had not been accorded to their Member of Parliament by Cambridge. The day's round of feasting, music and celebrating then started, with 'banquets prepared in several rooms for the entertainment of that learned body' which was now headed by Richard Cromwell.

Shortly after Richard succeeded, the position of Vice-Chancellor came up for renewal before Convocation. Richard did not submit the name of John Owen. At the beginning of 1657, a Petition had been presented to the Protector which begged him completely to eschew all royal trappings and to steer his course more along the lines of the parliamentary governments which had preceded the Protectorate. John Owen's name headed the list of signatories. Cromwell, who had refused the Crown already, sensed in this an attempt by the Independents to advocate a return to what came to be known as 'the Good old Cause'. Owen, moreover, had enjoyed the support of those Independents who were already at Oxford, and

and when the Protector had appointed the Commission he had seen an opportunity to make Oxford into a centre for Independent educators and their systems. It was at the zenith of Owen's power that Richard Cromwell became Chancellor, and there was no reason why Owen should not have expected to retain his very powerful and influential position under Richard, whose inexperience it was felt could easily be harnessed to the cause of right thinking.

Cromwell had chosen the Commission carefully. He had made sure that its members were distinguished academically as well as theologically. In addition to Dr. Owen, he had appointed his personal physician, Dr. Jonathan Goddard, and Dr. Peter French, a Canon of Christ Church who had married the Protector's sister Robina Cromwell, the Independent divine Thomas Goodwin and Dr. John Wilkins, the newly-appointed and very able Warden of Wadham College. Of these Goodwin was a strong supporter of Owen, while Goddard, French and Wilkins were what whould now be termed 'progressive'. French died in 1655, and there were no serious clashes until the next year, when Owen, angered by Convocation's refusal to approve some of his recommendations, invoked his authority as Visitor, and was able to persuade the other Board members to support him. It now appeared as if the battle which had been in the offing for some years would now break out into the open.

The first salvo was fired by John Wilkins, who by marrying Robina French within a few months of her first husband's death was now, a member of the ruling family of England, and had the ear of both Protector and Chancellor. Owen was alarmed, as royalist sources gleefully noted: 'Dr. Wilkins is like to prove [a] man of men . . . having lately married the Protector's sister.' The anonymous observer also noted that 'this troubles Dr. Owen and others of the grandees,' by whom he no doubt meant Independents in both Oxford and London. William Pope, in his biography of Seth Ward, praised Wilkins for moderation: 'Dr. Wilkins, Dr. Goddard, and perhaps 2 or 3 more, whom I need not name, used their constant endeavour to oppose the fury, and moderate the heats of the fiery, giddy party, and to advance the interest of learning. . . .'

Wilkins's marriage naturally brought him into contact with Richard, to whom he remained a loyal friend until his own untimely death in 1672. Wilkins, as John Aubrey testified, was a man of considerable charm and great ability:

> He was no great read man, but one of much and deep thinking, and of a working head, and a prudent man as well as ingenious. . . . He was a lusty, strong-grown, well-set, broad-shouldered person, cheerful and hospitable.

Wilkins was, in short, the sort of person whom Richard Cromwell always found congenial. When Richard became Chancellor, it was thought that, as a young man, he might make some changes in the austere regime of Owen, and perhaps seek to end the sectarian strife amongst the men who governed the University. His connexion with John Wilkins made this more likely, and Richard's appointment of John Conant as the new Vice-Chancellor went some way towards confirming this expectation. Conant was a popular Vice-Chancellor, and although personally rather ascetic, does not seem to have inflicted his beliefs on others, at least not in university administration. Owen, in the end, made his own dismissal easier for Richard by voicing what sounded like republican sentiments and associating with disaffected army officers. When Richard became Protector, Owen often attended meetings at Wallingford House, and became a close friend of its incumbent, Charles Fleetwood.

At the basis of the Owen controversy lay the genuine interest which the Cromwells had in educational matters. Much of what follows on this subject is conjectural, as there are no documents concerning its effect on Richard Cromwell, but his friendship with Wilkins and his father's acquaintance with progressive educators of the time must have brought Richard into contact with some of the men and ideas mentioned here. The Protector certainly knew William Dell, who was an associate of the continental educators Samuel Hartlib and John Dury, who in turn were disciples of Comenius. Dell believed strongly, that the universities should not have a monopoly on religious teaching, and was prepared to extend this line to secular learning as well:

> . . . all who want human learning must also want divinity; and then how shall plain poor people, who live in lawful callings and have not leisure to attain human learning, how shall they do to be saved?

Dell saw education as a way of improving society in ways other than divine, and considered that minds, however humble, needed it as much as others, for education was not a luxury devised for enjoyment by the idle rich. Both Hartlib and Dury had settled in England during the reign of Charles I, having received invitations from Parliament. Remarkable as these invitations might have been, they were eclipsed by one extended to Comenius himself, who duly arrived in 1642.

Cromwell may also have established some contact with other continental educators through the agency of his Latin Secretary, John Milton, whose wide acquaintance in Europe is well-documented. What was even more important for the matter at hand is that Hartlib himself said that Richard Cromwell had plans for 'countenancing and advancing of universal learning in due time,'—a tantalising observation which at least proves that there was personal contact between Richard and the great educator.

John Wilkins visited London frequently and was often to be seen in Richard Cromwell's company and at his table. It is not known whether they conversed about Comenius's doctrine of Pansophism, in which all knowledge was synthesised and built into a system which could be assimilated by all segments of human society to its general good. Wilkins almost certainly had some influence in Richard's nomination of Conant rather than Owen as Vice-Chancellor, and had been instructing him in his new duties, providing him with copies of letters written by former Chancellors so that he could study their style. Wilkins probably introduced Richard to those members of the university with whom he would have to have dealings, and no doubt told him of their loyalties or lack of them. The expulsion of the Independents from their power in Oxford was initiated by the appointment of Richard, whose dismissal of Owen, whether through Wilkin's advice or not, facilitated the promotion of learning in a more disinterested manner.

Richard's office was, of course, partly ceremonial. Yet if the Chancellorship had been a mere sinecure, it seems unlikely that the Protector would have relinquished it and yet taken so much trouble to see that its functions were carried out. Richard's duties consisted of the overall supervision of discipline, presiding over elections, approving appointments and granting dispensations to students. In cases of the latter, reports came in from tutors, the Vice-Chancellor and possibly students themselves, and he had to attend to them regularly. There are several letters granting dispensations written from both Hursley and Whitehall, including one which attempts to issue blanket dispensations, because Richard had too much other work to do at the time. He was expected to have a thorough grasp of the system which he headed, and he had also to perform ceremonial duties such as conferring degrees and opening new buildings.

The Chancellor could grant dispensations for students to be excused from attendance at lectures and disputes for a given number of terms and yet still receive their degrees. Reasons for dispensations could

be of a financial nature, or perhaps health problems and family matters. There is no evidence that Richard ever refused a request for a dispensation. In some cases they made a great deal of difference to a man's career. For example, Richard granted one on 9 February 1659 to Thomas Hyde, which enabled him to graduate as M.A. Hyde eventually became, Bodleian Librarian, then Laudian Professor of Arabic, and finally Regius Professor of Hebrew. The fact that he had been granted a degree by an illicit administration seems to have made little difference to his rise to eminence. The letter granting Hyde his dispensation, moreover, is one of the few signed 'RICHARD P'.

Since his father's coming to power, Richard had received a growing number of petitions from people seeking work or asking for money. The number increased even more when he became Chancellor of Oxford. One interesting example was Robert Whitehall, who asked Richard if he could write to his brother Henry, now Lord Deputy of Ireland, and obtain him a position. Whitehall, according to Anthony [a] Wood, had 'cringed to the Visitors' and became a Fellow of Merton in 1647. Notwithstanding this, he seems to have been expelled in the next year, and only reinstated in 1652 by Oliver Cromwell himself. He then trained as a doctor, a B.Med. being conferred on him by Richard Cromwell in 1657. Whitehall made sure of his acceptance in the new order at Oxford by composing a long poem in honour of Richard's election as Chancellor. He must have been a marvellous diplomat, as his two referees when he made his request to Richard were Drs. Owen and Wilkins! Henry Cromwell did manage to find employment for Whitehall as a schoolmaster in Ireland, but he resigned his post in 1660 and traded his mortar-board for a wine-glass by becoming one of the boon-companions of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. An amusing verse-letter from Whitehall to Rochester survives, in which he advises the earl to hang his portrait, which accompanied the letter, in the toilet. 'Hang it or burn it, choose you which,' Whitehall cheerfully wrote. Anthony Wood's harsh judgment of Whitehall as 'a useless Fellow of Merton' contrasts with Richard Cromwell's own assessment of him as 'a person worthy of favour.'

Another notable controversy of Richard's Chancellorship was the proposed elevation of Durham College to university status. This was not a novel situation; in 1640 Charles I had received a petition from Manchester, and he had, earlier in his reign, granted university charters to York, Stamford and Northampton. However, under

pressure from those who said they knew best—the dons of Oxford and Cambridge—Charles revoked the latter two, and the petition from Manchester was not accepted. Durham, however, had rather better luck with the Parliamentary government, and the proposal was supported by Oliver Cromwell, who presented it to Parliament himself in 1651. As the land which the College proposed for the erection of new buildings had been expropriated from the Laudian clergy, Parliament looked very favourably upon Durham. Cromwell's involvement was an outcome of his friendship with Dell and the Comenian group, and Samuel Hartlib was appointed to the committee which was to determine the curriculum of the proposed new university. That Parliament did not grant a charter at this time, was probably the effect of political crises in the 1650's rather than of any opposition to the plan.

When Richard succeeded his father as Chancellor of Oxford. Durham re-opened negotiations with the Protector, who seems once more to have reacted favourably. The issue did not come to a head, however, until after John Owen had left Oxford, and John Conant had succeeded him. Conant was adamantly opposed to the creation of any new universities, and lent his support to a joint Petition of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge against Durham. This Petition was to be presented not to the Protector, but to Richard Cromwell, on 13 April 1658.

Why Conant and Convocation decided to to this remains a puzzle; Oliver Cromwell was in favour of expanding education, and so, if we may believe Hartlib, was Richard. If Richard had known Conant's position on Durham, or had Wilkins made him aware of it, it might be assumed that Richard would have nominated a more progressive Vice-Chancellor. In the absence of any real evidence, one must assume that Richard made the appointment on the grounds that Conant would relax Owen's administrative strictures while still preserving efficiency, and that this was more important than his own support for new universities.

The Petition which Richard received is a formidably-long document in a closely-spaced and crabbed hand. It contains all the reasons against granting Durham a charter that the representatives of established education had at their disposal. The claim was made that Durham could only muster a faculty of six professors, whom the petitioners considered underqualified. Yet one was Robert Wood, a Fellow of Lincoln College and the inventor, amongst other things, of a system of decimal coinage. If Durham became a university,

the petitioners went on, it would mean that every other town with a college could be eligible to make similar application, and learned men would be scattered about the country, which would not augur well for the future of education, which was defined as 'the advancement of learning and religion'. Dell's objection that the existing universities were only for the rich was met with the argument that this simply was not true; they drew their scholars from all walks of life and from all over the civilised world. It was certainly true that Erasmus had resided in Cambridge during the previous century, but whether a poor Englishman who wished to acquire higher learning would be invited to Cambridge or anywhere else was an open question, for which Dell, at least, had a negative answer. They then cited Germany as an example of a country where learning had been allowed to become too diffuse; whether they remembered that Hartlib and Dury both came from Elbing in East Prussia is a point worth considering. Quoting Charles I's decision about Stamford and Northampton, the petitioners turned specifically to religion, and pointed out that if there arose learned divines independent of the jurisdiction of Oxford and Cambridge, they might sprinkle down upon the people doctrines detrimental to God, law and order. Cicero's useful tag, 'quot homines, tot sententiae', applied here, in the sense that once the Oxford and Cambridge hold on education had been weakened, there would indeed be as many opinions around as there were men to state them.

It would have been very difficult for Richard Cromwell, or, indeed, for the Protector, to have gone against the expressed wish of the two universities. The political situation was hardly a favourable one, and the Protectorate needed all the support it could get, or at least it could do without yet another centre of opposition to its policies. Still, it is surprising that Richard did nothing about Durham in view of what the Cromwells were supposed to have thought about education. The explanation probably lies in wider issues. There is little doubt that Richard had no vested interest in the conservatism of the universities, but he was perhaps advised by either the Protector or Wilkins to let the matter rest. Durham would not receive a charter for another two hundred years, and Richard, in his recommendation of Conant for another term as Vice-Chancellor, cited his 'great care, fidelity and uprightness', in the administration of the university of Oxford.

After September 1658 Richard's correspondence with Oxford drops quite dramatically, for as Protector he had little time to attend

to the university. He did, however, retain the position of Chancellor until April 1660, although after May 1659 the records of Convocation do not refer to him at all by name. On 18 April 1660, Richard wrote a moving letter of resignation to Convocation, in which he expressed much regret at not having had time to do more for them, concluding:

> I shall always retain a hearty sense of my former obligations to you in your free election of me to the office of your Chancellor: and it is no small trouble to my thoughts when I consider how little serviceable I have been to you in that relation. . . . I shall always retain my affection and esteem for you, with my prayers for your continual prosperity, that amidst the many examples of the instability and revolutions of human affairs, you may still abide flourishing and fruitful.

There was a sad aftermath to Richard's connexion with Oxford. At a meeting of Convocation on 25 January 1666, a document was drawn up which can still be read, pasted upside-down in the minutes of the meeting. It condemns, in execrable Latin, all the acts of Chancellors 'durante tyrannide Parliamentaria', and goes on 'Philippo Comites Pembrochiae, Olivario et Richardo Cromwellys (*sic*) nomine sese hic veditantibus, concluding 'ista omnia praedicta . . . censurae subjecimus et damnamus'. Signed by, amongst others, the new Vice-Chancellor, John Fell, and Sir Kenelm Digby, this petty Latin diatribe was not worthy of the esteem in which the University of Oxford liked to believe itself held.

THE LIFE OF MAJOR GENERAL JOHN LAMBERT (1619 - 1684)

A Lecture given at Kirkby Malham Parish Church on 16 May 1981 by D. Blanchard Good

General John Lambert, commonly called the 'Lord Lambert', probably from his role as Lord Chamberlain at the inauguration of the Protector and his membership of the Protectorate Council of State, was born at Calton Hall, in the parish of Kirkby Malham, on 7 September 1619. He is said by Bulstrode Whitelocke to have studied the law at one of the Inns of Court, though he never practised the profession.

At the very commencement of the struggle between Charles I and the Parliament he directed the siege of Skipton Castle; and in 1643 we find him holding the rank of colonel, and commanding, in conjunction with Colonel Meldrum, a sally from the besieged town of Hull. In January 1644 he was with Sir Thomas Fairfax at the battle of Nantwich; and on the 5 March 1644, in command of a regiment

of dragoons, he defeated Colonel Bellasis at Bradford, pursued him to Selby, and near Kirklees gained another victory. He then joined Lord (Ferdinando) Fairfax at the siege of York. At the battle of Marston Moor, 2 July 1644, Sir Thomas Fairfax and Colonel Lambert commanded the right wing of the Parliamentary army. On 14 October 1644, Lambert took many prisoners after a flight at Plumpton, near Knaresborough, and in November captured Knaresborough itself. In February 1645 he defeated a Royalist party at Keighley. In 1646 he took part in the sieges of Dartmouth, Oxford and Newark. On 17 April 1647, with the First Civil War over in England, the Earl of Warwick addressed about 200 officers in the church at Saffron Walden, urging them to encourage their men to volunteer for service in Ireland. Lambert, as spokesman for his brother-officers, replied by asking what security there was for the payment of arrears and indemnity for past acts. The Parliamentary commissioners could reply only that no provision had been made for the settling of claims of the soldiers. But, even so, Fairfax assured the Commission that he would express a wish that the officers should volunteer for Ireland. In June 1647, General Ireton, Colonels Lambert, Rich, Desborough, and Sir Hardress Waller were nominated as commissioners on the part of the army to prepare Heads of Proposals for the settlement of the peace of the Kingdom but all the negotiations failed. In August 1647, Lambert was appointed major-general of the five northern counties, and though he possessed unlimited power of jurisdiction, he is said by Clarendon, Whitelocke, and others, to have used it 'with great wisdom and justice'.

In the Second Civil War of 1648 Lambert fought many minor battles and was Cromwell at the battle of Preston, where he defeated the Duke of Hamilton and Sir Marmaduke Langdale. March 1649 found him at Knottingley. In the same year he joined Lord Fairfax, Major-General Skippon, Overton, and Desborough in striving along with Cromwell to save the life of King Charles I.

On 25 June 1650, Major-General Lambert was appointed second in command of the army. On 29 June he left London, marched to Scotland, joined Cromwell, and fought at the battle of Dunbar (3 September); and afterwards took Edinburgh, Leith and Burntisland. On 11 August 1651, he was at Settle, in Craven, with five regiments of Horse.

On 28 August 1651, he assisted at the capture of the city of Worcester; and on 9 September the Rump Parliament resolved 'that lands of inheritance in Scotland, to the yearly value of one

thousand pounds sterling, be settled upon Major Lambert and his heirs, for his great and eminent services for this Commonwealth'. Lambert was sent to Edinburgh to endeavour to make a final settlement of affairs between England and Scotland, and in 1652 he was appointed by Parliament Lord Deputy of Ireland; but on some curtailment of the powers allotted to him he relinquished the appointment.

In 1653, Lambert was nominated one of the M.Ps for the West Riding of Yorkshire. On 16 December 1653, Major-General Lambert, in the name of the army and of the three nations, 'after adverting to the dissolution of the late Parliament and the exigency of the times, did, in the name of the army and of the three nations, desire the Lord General Cromwell' to accept the protectorship upon the terms proposed in the Instrument of Government, which was read aloud, and the oath was administered to Cromwell, which he took and signed. After which Lambert, kneeling, presented to him a sword in a scabbard, representing the civil sword, which putting off his own he accepted. At the opening of the Parliament, General Lambert sat in the coach with the Lord Protector Cromwell and his son Henry, where the usual ceremonies at the opening of a Parliament were observed, and on alighting General Lambert carried the Sword of State. Whether from this circumstance of acting as Lord Chamberlain, or from having been appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, is not clear, but on his appointment to the Council of State, where he is first named, and after the opening of this Parliament, both in the *Journals* and elsewhere, and in the directions of letters to him, etc, he is always called the Lord Lambert.

On 19 October 1954, in a Committee of the Whole House upon the Act of Settlement, Lord Lambert, in a long speech, advocated that it was necessary to make the office of Protector hereditary; but on a division, to the great surprise of the Lord Protector and his friends, 200 members voted for election, and only sixty for heredity succession. Cromwell shortly afterwards—though not for the above reason—dissolved the Parliament (January 1655). In September 1656, Lambert was again elected as one of the members for the West Riding, and at the opening of the Parliament he was named on all the public committees. Although he had been the principal means of raising Cromwell to the Protectorate, he showed himself entirely opposed to the Protector being declared King. Cromwell finding that his own relatives, Fleetwood, Desborough, and others were also opposed, felt compelled to give the matter no more thought and on 8 May 1657, formally renounced the idea, though he accepted the

rest of the Humble Petition and Advice.

From this time Cromwell considered Lord Lambert with some reserve, and soon after deprived him of all his offices and employments; he thus lost his seat in the Council, the Lord Wardenship of the Cinque Ports, and other places about the Court, a regiment of cavalry and another of foot, the pay of Major-General in the army, and the pay attendant on that rank in the five northern counties. That Cromwell took no joy in this action is clear from the fact that he settled upon Lambert the sum of £2,000 a year. Lambert retired to his house at Wimbledon, where he devoted his time to the cultivation of flowers. Cromwell soon after dissolved Parliament (February 1658) and did not live long enough to summon another, as he died on 3 September 1658.

That the estrangement between Lambert and Cromwell arose from more than one reason would seem to be true, but without a doubt Lambert's refusal to take the oath prescribed under the new constitution which he had opposed added fuel to the fire. Lambert is reported to have stated 'I am not for any kind of oaths . . . this oath will go down freely with all that are not scrupulous about an oath, yet to upright men who love truth it has no point'. All others had taken the oath and Lambert's objection left Cromwell in a very difficult position. If he took no action there were those who would think privilege was being extended to Lambert. Cromwell sent for Lambert and in the presence of Fleetwood and Desborough spoke as follows: 'that the division and opposition gave great advantage to the enemies of this State, who were only waiting for opportunities and openings to renew the war and rekindle the flames that were burnt out, and that therefore he ought to obey'. Lambert replied 'that no one has been more ready than he to expose his life and estate for the good of the nation, and that he did not understand that sort of speech. He though it covered some mystery which he would not venture to interpret, unless it were that Cromwell wished to dismiss him and take his commission from him. If that was what he wanted, he had only to send one of the meanest of his fellows and it should be promptly delivered up'. To these words Cromwell made no reply, but changed the subject and soon after Lambert took his leave.

On 13 July 1657 Cromwell sent this letter to Lambert:

> Sir,—I have sent this bearer, Mr William Jessop, to you for your commission as Major General, as also your other commissions, to whom I desire you to deliver them enclosed and sealed in a paper.
>
> Your sincer and ever loving friend
> Oliver P.

Following Oliver's death, Richard Cromwell succeeded, and a Parliament was called for 7 January 1659. Elected as member for Pontefract, under the title of John Lord Lambert, he was again named upon all the public committees, and was as active and resolute as ever in defence of the constitution—the Instrument of Government—which he had taken so much trouble to establish. .

In 1659 Richard dissolved both Council and Parliament, and soon after resigned the Protectorship. A conspiracy and insurrection of the old loyalists being discovered in Cheshire, Lord Lambert was appointed by the restored Long Parliament to take command of the army to put it down, and in the battle near Northwich, on 16 August, entirely routed and defeated Sir George Booth and the insurgents, and quelled the insurrection. The Parliament for this service resolved 'that a jewel of one thousand pounds' value, with a letter of thanks be presented to the Lord Lambert, as a mark of favour for this signal service'. In September he left Cheshire, and retired to his seat in Craven.

In November 1659, General Monck appeared with his army on the border with Scotland, and Lambert was deputed to meet him, and would have fought him at Newcastle; but, against his advice, a treaty was projected between Monck and the Council of State, which in the event led to the restoration of the Stuarts to the throne. Lambert returned to London, and was by Monck's intrigues committed a prisoner to the Tower; from whence he contrived to escape, but was seized at Daventry by Colonel Ingoldsby. Bishop Burnet in his *History of his own Times* relates an anecdote which he says he had of Ingoldsby: when Lambert was taken, the people were in crowds applauding the success of his capture. 'This reminds me', said Lambert, with great good humour, 'of what Cromwell once said to us both near this very place, as we were going with a body of officers after our troops, marching into Scotland in the year 1650, the people as now shouting and wishing us success. I observed to Cromwell, 'I was glad to see we had the nation on our side'. Cromwell answered, 'Do not trust to that; for these very people would shout as much if you and I were going to be hanged'.

Lambert was elected Member for Ripon in two Parliaments in 1660 but was not allowed to take his seat. He had not been concerned in the trial or execution of King Charles I, but he was in spite of efforts made by the House of Commons, kept in close confinement in the Channel Islands. He was conveyed to the Island of Guernsey in October 1660, and confined in Castle Cornet. On 17 February 1661,

a licence was granted to Mrs Lambert, with her three children and three maid-servants, to go to Guernsey and remain with her husband.

In April 1662, Lambert was, with Sir Henry Vane, brought to England and tried in June 1662; and on the 25th July a warrant was issued to Lord Hatton, the governor of the Island of Guernsey, to take into his custody 'the person of John Lambert, commonly called Colonel Lambert, and keep him a close prisoner as a condemned traytor until further orders'. On 18 November the following directions were given from the king to Lord Hatton to 'give such liberty and indulgence to Colonel John Lambert within the precints of the island as will consist with security of his person'.

On 3 December 1667, the petition of Mrs Lambert that her husband and herself might take a house for themselves and family of ten children to live in was considered. Leave was given, Lambert passing his word, or giving security, to remain a true prisoner.

This licence seems to have been revoked, and in February 1667, Colonel Lambert appears to have been in bad health, and leave was given to his daughters Frances and Mary to visit their father. Mary had married Charles Hatton, son of Lord Hatton, the Governor of Guernesey, who petitioned the king on the subject, and stated that the match was made entirely without his knowledge, and claimed that becoming aware of it more than a year afterwards he turned his son out of doors, and never gave him a penny.

Until recently it has been believed that Lambert died in Guernsey, but in 1667 he was, in fact, removed to St. Nicholas Island, known today as 'Drake's Island', in Plymouth Sound, at the entrance to the Hamoaze.

A visit to Lambert on 22 August 1683 is recorded by Samuel Pepys, on sailing from Plymouth for Tangier, where he had been commissioned to superintend the English evacuation. Under 22 August he writes 'In the afternoon came to anchor in Plymouth Sound. . . . After seeing the Citadel . . . I slipped aside and went alone by our barge to Mount Edgecombe, where I visited my Lady and child . . . and in the evening took leave and we went to St. Nicholas Island to visit my Lord Lambert'. Lambert died the following year in March, on Easter Day. Yonge, the Plymouth diarist, states that he was buried in the Parish Church of St. Andrew's or its precincts, though examination of mural tablets and gravestones has failed to locate the spot. However the Register of St. Andrew's Church, Plymouth does contain the burial record.

1864, March 28th, John Lambert, Esq'e

The autobiography of Dr George Clarke also mentions Lambert's death, and suggests the cause. In 1684, he 'was sent to a Court Martial at Plymouth. . . . Whilst there I went to see St. Nicholas Island, that lies over against the Citadel. They told us that Major-General Lambert, who had been prisoner there many years, died there—I think the March before. He always loved gardening and took a delight during his confinement to work in a small garden he had made there, whilst so engaged he took a cold and this brought his end.'

So ended the life of one, who sought the freedom of his fellows, and who gave of himself to this end. His reward it would seem was poor indeed, but he was a worthy son of this Nation of the County of Yorkshire. We who come after honour his name and give thanks to God for his life and works.

During his long exile Lambert apparently never put pen to paper on his thoughts on any subject—a misfortune for literature and history. But fortunately sufficient is known of 'Honest John Lambert' from his own recorded words and deeds and the testimony of others to enable a safe judgment to be passed upon him as an Englishman of the finest type, and an ardent patriot who both in war and in peace gave whole-hearted devotion to the public weal as he saw it. Of high moral stature—though he fell short of greatness,—he stood out among his contemporaries, by the admission of friend and foe alike, as a man of distinguished gifts, wide culture, large mind and engaging personality. He loved chivalry, truth and honour, freedom, and courtesy, and was ever honoured for his worthiness. Fearless in sword play, he was frank, deliberate, and discreet in council. He was ambitious, yet neither served nor sought selfish ends. Proud without arrogance, and fully conscious of his own value, he never stooped to familiarity or suffered it from others—yet suavity and geniality were allowed to be among his strongest arguments in political controversy. In personal intercourse he upheld decorum, in public life dignity and forbearance. His was a character much like that of Oliver Cromwell's, which emphatically hung together, in all its parts thus contributing to a harmonious and gracious whole. He had faults, since he was intensely human, but they lie lightly on his memory.

LAMBERT MEMORIAL CHAPEL

Rather more than a year ago the Yorkshire Group was approached by the Vicar of Kirkby Malham near Skipton. In his Parish Major General John Lambert was born, and baptised and married in the church there. Originally a Lambert family chapel existed within the church and still remaining on a wall there are two tablets in memory of John Lambert's son.

Following the removal of the nineteenth-century organ it will be possible to restore the chapel as a memorial to General Lambert, provided a sum of around £1500 can be raised. The Yorkshire Group was asked if it could help both practically and financially. An appeal letter has been sent out to many Cromwell Association members throughout the country and through this it is hoped that the necessary finance will be forthcoming permitting an early start on the restoration.

This might take up to two years but the chapel, when completed will be re-consecrated.

Anyone wishing to support this appeal and who has not already received a letter is asked kindly to send a donation to Mr. D. F. Varley, 5 Lascelles Road, Harrogate HG2 OLA, making cheques payable to 'Lambert Memorial Chapel Fund'. At a later date it is hoped to advise all members of the re-consecration date.

RE-ENACTMENT SOCIETIES: AN INSIDE VIEW

Keith R. Knight

All too often, the Re-enactment Societies are described as 'just grown men playing soldiers'. The comment is so dismissive that it obscures a great deal of their activities and their potential value. The object of this article is to show how re-enactment societies are organised, explain their own 'history' and some of the benefits that they can offer to both the historian and the public at large.

Re-enactment or mock battles have been used for military training and for 'entertainment' throughout history. Many generals have used them to accustom their troops to battle or for weapon-training, C. H. Firth, in his *Cromwell's Army* mentions a May Day fight put on at Blackheath to entertain the country people and so 'prevent so much sin'. The Victorians also enjoyed the spectacular recreation

of their own glories by staging spectacular mock battles on the many arenas of London, and their taste for the Gothic inspired a mock medieval tournament at Eglinton Castle that Disrael recorded in his novel *Endymion*.

The modern re-enactment movement started in the 1950s in the United States. Drawing on their own historical experiences, the Americans were able to portray the U.S. Civil War and American War of Independence. Contemporuneously in England, a small band of medieval enthusiasts was touring shows and fairs with somewhat theatrical recreation. The late 1960s saw the real start of re-enactment in Britain when a group of historians developed the Sealed Knot out of a fancy-dress party. As the movement grew, other societies were formed to recreate the age of the Romans, the Vikings, the Napoleonic Wars and so on. But at first the re-enactment societies owed more to the theatre than to history; then in the mid 1970's a new attitude evolved, with participants trying to reproduce the uniforms and drill of the period as accurately as possible. With this in mind let us look at a particular society—the Roundhead Association, of which the author is himself a member. As part of the English Civil War Society, the Roundhead Association aims to portray an army of the period 1642-1660, its main work is to produce 'musters' throughout Britain during the summer months. Where possible these are staged on the actual sites of battles or sieges as re-enactments, but more often they are presented as 'entertainments' showing the tactics and drill in a mock battle. They are staged in association with a sponsor, and are primarily fund-raising or advertising events. Since the Roundhead Association was formed in 1974 many thousands of pounds have been raised in this way. As well as charity work the Roundhead Association stages 'campaigns' and practical history events. The public are excluded from the former, and the society experiences, almost at first-hand, the conditions that would have been faced by an army in the field. A practical history weekend is essentially a civilian experience—a country house is taken over and re-staffed with 'servants' and 'family', allowing the public to see the past living again. This is an idea which has been taken up by several organisations, most notably the National Trust. One particularly successful week-long event was at Littlecote House, near Hungerford in July 1980, when the outstanding feature was the opportunity to use and examine the collection of equipment from Col. Alexander Popham's Regiment. Practical history events are particulary valuable as they both educate and fire the imagination of

the spectator. It is possible to see household implements, weapons and armour in use, and actually handle them rather than merely to look at them locked away in a museum. (I must add that many items of our equipment are, in fact, faithful reproductions.)

Our larger musters can only offer a general history of the Civil War to the public but they represent a great deal of detailed research into the period. Several thousand spectators may attend, the majority coming out of curiosity, expecting to see a 'Merrie England' populated with cavaliers dripping with lace and ostrich plumes. The society may disappoint many as it aims to offer a well-researched lesson in history rather than to perpetuate the myths that have built up over the years regarding the character of the Roundheads and Cavaliers.

It would be foolish, of course, to suggest that we can ever hope to achieve total historical accuracy. Our main problem, as in the seventeenth century itself, is finance—for example, the expense of transporting our equipment is high and our largest piece of field artillery costs some £200 to bring to a muster. In addition to expenditure on explosives, there is a need for the constant maintenance of such a potentially lethal piece of equipment. Most of the equipment used by members is brought or made by themselves; uniforms, muskets, apostle bandollers, together with transport and camping equipment are all financed by individuals, though several regiments have their own methods of borrowing and lending the more expensive items.

Actual costumes of the soldiers have survived the years, but our research, based on woodcuts, pictures and descriptions, leads us to believe that we give an accurate representation. Our musters test the construction and practicability of uniforms and equipment and provide a useful addition to more conventional methods of research. I should point out that an army of the period would have looked much shabbier than its modern counterpart—poor dyestuffs, low quality materials coupled with constant wear on campaigns would mean the quick disintegration of uniforms.

With weaponry we have to make a number of compromises but we are fortunate in that a great many guns, pikes and armour have survived. Pikes were made of ash, but modern methods of farming have led to the destruction of woodlands and copses. Metal pike-heads are not used by the Roundhead Association. Our guns are subject to the stringent firearms restrictions of modern times and we are prevented from using pistols on our battlefields. The craft

of the armourer has been almost lost, except among the antique restoration trade, but our members have relearned this and other crafts. One armourer is now employed full-time producing quality armour to high standards of historical accuracy. As a guide, a good suit of pikeman's armour, back, breast and tassets with gorget, costs at the time of writing £50. One area that remains a problem is with the helmets—a metal morion costs £30 and anything cheaper will look incorrect. But it is too expensive for many members and glass-fibre and modern plastics are used to produce realistic substitutes at £12 each; one advantage is that a mould can be taken from an original helmet.

The Roundhead Association has some 1000 members, and our sister society the King's Army is of a similar size. People join for many different reasons; the 'romantic' element of becoming a roundhead or royalist does play a part, but the societies, also, have a strong social side to their activities. In all, there are 12 infantry regiments, a cavalry troop, artillery train and 'civilians' within the Roundhead Association. Each regiment has between 50 and 100 members. The need to show tactical movements in the limited space available for musters, does impose a restriction on the size of our regiments. On several occasions, especially when filming for documentaries or television, we can combine regiments to give a more accurate representation of a civil war unit.

In October 1980, the Roundhead Association formed up as a company for the London Parade. The company was equipped and clothed to represent a company of the Red Regiment of the London Trained Bands, and marched through St James's Park and down Whitehall to lay a wreath at the statue of Cromwell, in remembrance of the commanders of the Civil War. It was an important event for the society—to put ourselves in public view and to show how historically accurate a re-enactment society can be. We hoped that by providing such a demonstration there would be an end to the disparaging remarks and the media treatment that have held us back in the past. As an example, one newspaper printed a photograph of a 'Roundhead and his Lady' on motorbike, all very fine for the readers of tabloid newspapers, but a total misrepresentation of the character and real worth of the event.

I would ask you as historians to conside the London March as a watershed in the development of the Roundhead Association's role as a re-enactment army. We can provide a great deal of practical knowledge and would be pleased to help anyone in many aspects of

the English Civil War. Conversely, we are grateful for any help in creating a more accurate representation.

To sum up, the Roundhead Association fulfills a number of functions. Most important it is a means of raising funds and creating publicity for charity. Secondly, it offers an entertaining history lesson for spectators. Thirdly, it provides an outlet for members' researches into history. Finally it is a social activity which combines a range of hobbies for the whole family—from camping to music and from visiting country-houses to shooting.

I hope this article has provided a glimpse of the potential of the Roundhead Association, and shown there is, indeed, much more to re-enactment than 'Just grown men playing at soldiers'.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND ARTICLES

(Published in 1981 and 1982 and likely to be of interest to readers of Cromwelliana)

Barnard, T., *The English Republic 1649-1660* (Longmans 1982)

Barker, F. (ed), *1642: Literature and Power in the 17th Century* (University of Essex 1981).

Clark, Peter, *Country Towns in Pre-Industrial England* (Leicester U.P. 1981).

Coates, W. H. et al (eds), *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament, 3 January to 5 March 1642* (Yale U.P. 1982).

Cope, E. S., *The Life of a Public Man: Edward 1st Baron Montagu of Boughton 1562-1644* (American Philosophical Society, 1981).

Fletcher, Anthony, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Arnold 1981).

Gentles, I.m., Shiels, W. J., *Confiscation and Restoration: the Archbishopric Estates and the Civil War* (Univ. of York, Borthwich Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers lix).

Greaves, R. L. and Zaller, R. (eds), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol I A-F (Harvester Press 1982).

Gregg, Pauline, *King Charles I* (Dent 1981)

Gruenfelder, J. K., *Influence in Early Stuart Elections 1604-1640* (Ohio State U.P. 1981).

Hutton, Ronald, *The Royalist War Effort 1642-46* (Longmans 1981).

Katz, D. S., *Philo-Semitism and the Re-Admission of the Jews to England 1603-1655* (Oxford U.P. 1982).

Kussmaul, Ann, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge U.P. 1981).

Lindley, Keith, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution* (Heinemann 1982).

Lloyd-Jones, H. et al (eds), *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H. R. Trevor-Roper* (Duckworth 1981) (contains relevant articles by K. Sharpe, B. Worden, D. S. Katz and T. Barnard).

Lockyer, Roger, *Buckingham: the Life and Career of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (Longmans 1981).

MacDonald, W. W., *The Making of an English Revolutionary: The Early Parliamentary Career of John Pym* (Associated University Presses Inc. 1982).

McGrath, Patrick, *Bristol and the Civil War* (Bristol Historical Association 1981).

Munsche, P. B., *Gentlemen and Poachers: the English Game Laws*, 1671-1831 (Cambridge U. P. 1981).

Newman, P., *The Battle of Marston Moor 1644* (Antony Bird 1981).

Parry, Graham, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court 1603-42* (Manchester U.P. 1982).

Pennington, D. and Thomas, K. (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in 17th-century History presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford U.P. 1982—paperback edn.).

Pounds, N. J. G. (ed), *The Parliamentary Survey of the Duchy of Cornwall, Pt I (Austell Prior-Saltash)* (Devon and Cornwall Record Soc. NS. xxv 1982).

Quintrell, B. W. (ed), *Proceedings of the Lancashire Justices of the Peace at the Sheriff's Table during Assizes Week 1578-1694* (Pubs. of Record Soc. of Lancashire and Cheshire cxxi 1981).

Roots, Ivan (ed), *'Into Another Mould': Aspects of the Interregnum* ('Exeter Studies in History' No 3, The University of Exeter 1981).

Schreiber, R. E., *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton, 1589-1635* (Royal Historical Soc., Studies in History).

Spufford, M., *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in 17th Century England* (Methuen, 1981).

Thirsk, Joan, *The Changing Regional Structure of English Agriculture in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Macmillan 1982).

Woolrych, Austin, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford U.P. 1982).

Wormald, J., *Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1470-1625* (Arnold 1981).

Wrightson, Keith, *English Society 1580-1680* (Hutchinson 1982).

Allison, A. F., 'Who was John Brerely?', *Recusant History*, xvi (1982), 17-41.

Casada, J. A., 'Dorset Politics in the Puritan Revolution', *Southern History*, iv (1982).

Clifford, C. A., 'Ship Money in Hampshire: Collection and Collapse', *Southern History*, iv (1982).

Crawford, Patricia, 'Attitudes to Menstruation in Seventeenth Century England', *Past and Present*, xci (1981), 47-73.

Fallon, R. T., 'Milton in the Anarchy 1659-60', *Studies in English Literature, xxi* (1981), 123-43.

Farrow, G. W. E., 'The Rising of the Staffordshire Militia in 1659', *Journ. Soc. Army Hist. Res.*, lviii (1980), 247-52.

Greaves, R. L., 'The Tangled Careers of Two Stuart Radicals: Henry and Robert Danvers', *Baptist Q.*, xxix (1981), 32-45.

Guy, J. A., 'Origins of the Petition of Right Re-considered', *Historical Journal*, xxv (1982), 289-312.

Hamilton, C. L., 'The Earl of Bridgewater and the English Civil War' *Canadian J. Hist.*, xv (1980-81), 357-69.

Hawkins, M. J., 'Wardship, Royalist Delinquency and Too Many Children: the Portmans in the Seventeenth Century', *Southern History*, iv (1982).

Hibbard, C., 'The Contribution of 1639', *Recusant History*, xvi (1982), 42-60.

Hill, Christopher, 'Parliament and People in Seventeenth Century England', *Past and Present*, xcii (1981), 100-124.

Hughes, Ann, 'Militancy and Localism: Warwickshire Politics and Westminster Politics, 1643-1647', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th series, xxxi (1981), 51-68.

Hutton, R., 'The Structure of the Royalist Party 1642-46', *Historical Journal*, xxiv (1981), 553-569.

Hutton, R., 'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion', *English Historical Review*, xcvii (1982).

Jenkins, J. P., 'The "Old Leaven": the Welsh Roundheads after 1660', *Historical Journal*, xxiv (1981), 807-823.

Jones, E., 'The Welsh in London in the 17th and 18th Centuries', *Welsh History Review*, x (1981), pp 461-475.

Jones, J. Gwynfor, 'Sir John Wynn of Gwydir and his Tenants: the Dolwyddelan Llysfaen Disputes', *Welsh History* Review, xi (1982), 1-30.

Lake, Peter, 'The Collection of Ship Money in Cheshire during the Sixteen-Thirties: A Case Study of Relations between Central and Local Government', *Northern History*, xvii (1981), 44-71.

Loomie, A. J., 'Alonso de Cardenas and the Long Parliament, 1640-48', *English Historical Review*, xcvii (1982), 289-307.

McIntosh, A. W., 'The Number of the English Regicides', *History*, lxvii (1982), 195-216.

Mather, Jean, 'The Civil War Sheriff: His Person and Office', *Albion*, xiii (1981), 242-61.

Mosler, D. F., 'The "Other Civil War": Internecine Politics in the Warwickshire County Committees 1642-59', *Midland History*, vii (1981), 58-71.

Park, K. and Daston, J. J., 'Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in France and England', *Past and Present*, xcii (1981), pp 20-54 (Much on the 17th century).

Porter, Stephen, 'Farm Transport in Huntingdonshire 1610-1749', *Jnl. of Transport History*, 3rd series, iii (1982), 35-45.

Rabb, T. K., 'The Role of the Commons', *Past and Present*, xcii (1981), 55-78; Hirst, Derek, 'The Place of Principle', ibid., 79-99 (separate essays but jointly entitled 'Revisionism Revised: Two Perspectives on Early Stuart Parliamentary History').

Roberts, Stephen K., Jury Vetting in the Seventeenth Century', *History Today*, February 1982.

Rollinson, David, 'Property, Ideology and Popular Culture in a Gloucestershire Village', *Past and Present*, xciii (1981), 70-97.

Sprunger, K. L., 'English and Dutch Sabbatarianism and the Development of Puritan Social Theology 1600-1660', *Church History*, li (1982), 289-307.

Spufford, Margaret, 'Portraits of Society: Popular Literature in the Seventeenth Century', *History Today*, February 1982.

Trevor-Roper, H. R., 'Prince Rupert, 1619-82', *History Today*, March 1982.

Underdown, David, 'The Problem of Popular Allegiance in the English Civil War', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th series, xxxi (1981), 70-94.

Wanklyn, M. D. G. and Young, P., 'A King in Search of Soldiers: Charles I in 1642', *Historical Journal*, xxiv (1981), pp 147-154.

Weinzierl, M., 'Parliament and Army in England, 1659: Constitutional Thought and Struggle for Control', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, ii (1982), 47-55.

S. K. Roberts

BOOKS RECEIVED

Scots Armies of the Civil War 1639-1651 by Stuart Reid, with illustrations by Hawk Norton. 50p. (The Partisan Press, 1982). A paperback production which is packed with information and thoughful comment on military forces which made the Civil War something more than an English episode but 'the war of the three kingdoms'. Of mainly military interest it also has much to offer on many other aspects of the period.

I. R.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 1982

The Annual General Meeting of the Association was held on Saturday 25 April 1982 in the Meeting Room of the Bolsover Public Library.

Present: Professor Ivan Roots, President; Mr Trewin Copplestone, Chairman; the Hon. Treasurer, Mr Geoffrey Woollard, the Hon. Secretary, Miss H. Platt and 39 members.

The Chairman welcomed the members present and congratulated the Midland Group, particularly their Hon. Secretary, Miss Pat Barnes, on the first-class arrangements they had made for the Meeting. He also thanked Mr D. B. Good and the Yorkshire Group for the splendid exhibition of Cromwelliana they had mounted in the Meeting Room.

Mr Copplestone then vacated the Chair in favour of the President, Professor Ivan Roots, who heartily endorsed Mr Copplestone's remarks regarding the venue for the Meeting with the surrounding Cromwellian relics. He was glad to see such a good turn out of members. Professor Roots noted that a rival group had managed to appear on TV in January, commemorating the execution of Charles I. He thought the Cromwell Association should make some effort to be televised, too. There was still much to discover about Cromwell, but there was no doubt that he appealed to many types of people. Professor Roots said he was extremely glad to introduce Dr Barry Coward, lecturer at Birkbeck College, London and author of *The Stuart Era*, in Longman's 'History of England series.

Dr Coward then gave a most interesting lecture on 'Cromwell and the Restoration'—a Persistent Grin' (the text of which appears in *Cromwelliana*). It was much appreciated by members present. The members thanked Dr Coward for his light and yet learned address, illuminating as it did the persistence of the Cromwellian era.

MINUTES of the last Annual Meeting (25 April 1981) already circulated to members, were approved with no matters arising there from, save an important alteration to the note on the Yorkshire Groups visit to the Church at Kirkby Mallom where it had been stated that the Vicar had asked for contributions towards the repair of the Church Organ in the Lambert Chapel, whereas the need was in fact for help in the restoration of the whole Chapel.

Chairman's Report

In presenting the Chairman's Report (already circulated) Mr Copplestone reported with special regret the death of Mr Philip Thomas, a member of very long standing and enthusiasm and Hon. Treasurer of the Association for a number of years. As reported, Mr Copplestone said he was glad to see the strength of the local groups and the likelihood of more being formed in the different areas where members in that locality could come together socially. Mr Howard McKenzie said the report of his resignation from the Council as 'temporary' was erroneous; it was permanent and should be so recorded. This correction was noted.

Treasurer's Report

Mr Geoffrey Woollard, Hon. Treasurer, then presented the Accounts for the year from 1 April 1981 to 31 March 1982, which showed Income for the year as £1325.84 and Expenditure as £917.17, an excess of income over expenditure of £408.67. This was not, however, as rosy a picture as it looked because a large donation had been received from Mr Gavin Lilburn in memory of his wife. Members' subscription which were the main source of income had increased only slightly during the year. Mr Newport-Tinley suggested that the heading for subscriptions and donations should be shown separately in the Accounts in future. Mr D. B. Good complained that the Accounts had not been audited before the Annual Meeting was asked to adopt them. After Mr Woollard had pointed out that there was not time for the audit between the end of the financial year (31 March) and the Annual Meeting (24 April) it was agreed to accept the Accounts as they stood but to change the running of the financial year so that it ran from 1 January to 31 December, the next Accounts to run from April - December 1982, i.e. 9 months only. It was proposed by the Hon. Treasurer, seconded by Mr. Langford, that the Accounts as presented be accepted and this was carried.

General Discussion

In opening the discussion Professor Roots reminded members present that Cromwell had assumed authority as a healer and settler and had urged those who disagreed with him at one point to 'think it possible that they might be mistaken' in their attitude. He hoped this would be uppermost in members' minds as they discussed the

question that had taken up so much of their time at recent Annual Meetings, namely the advantages and disadvantages of a written constitution for the Association. There were two contrasting points of view and to meet the case it had been agreed at the last Annual Meeting to produce papers outlining the advantages and disadvantages and to send these out to every member of the Association with a referendum to which they could put their vote after weighing the pros and cons as presented in the papers circulated. The two papers were now before the meeting and were intended to reflect both sides fairly. They did not reflect personalities but sincerely held beliefs on either side. Mr Hepworth asked who would count the voting papers as they came in. The President kindly agreed to do this.

Mr Woollard said 8 weeks must be allowed to give Overseas members time to receive the papers and further 8 weeks for their return. Mr Good objected to the clause in the 'Disadvantages' paper which said the setting up of a written constitution would prove costly. Mr Newport-Tinley suggested that the alteration of the word 'would' to 'could' might meet this objection. Mr Verity commented that as to applying for charity status, he understood that the Charity Commissioners insisted on 'acts of charity' by those granted it. Mr Mullard thought the two statements should be submitted to members to vote on as they stood, leaving those voting to judge. Mrs Newport-Tinley felt that the wrangling at the Meeting was uncomfortable and she thought each side was anxious to get the matter settled. She suggested it would be well if each of the two papers was signed. Mr Goodman agreed. The President suggested that the papers might be revised and presented at the next Annual Meeting; but Mr Rycroft and Major Battcock both urged that the papers, which had been carefully thought out by their authors, should be sent out shortly for members to vote on, and the result known by the next Annual Meeting. Mr Newport-Tinley proposed as a conciliatory measure that each side might be given time to put a gloss on its paper as commentary. Mrs Robinson saw no reason for amendments or glosses on the papers now before them. The facts were at the disposal of members to make up their own minds as to what they felt was best for the running of the Association, but Mr Newport-Tinley again stressed the need to assuage bad feelings and proposed that amendments to the two papers should be agreed upon, say 200 words additional to the present wording, provided they were returned within six weeks in time to go out with

the voting paper. This was agreed by the meeting.

The President closed the discussion by saying that both sides had the good of the Association at heart and all wanted to go forward on a proper footing with unity of purpose.

A very sincere vote of thanks was accorded Professor Roots for taking the Chair so ably and agreeably, regarding the circumstances in which he had been called to it.