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Overseas Despatches will not appear in this edition due to circumstances beyond my control, but I hope we can resume this new section in 2006.

Three hundred and fifty years ago today, on Sunday 3 September 1654, this area around the Palace of Westminster was thronging with MPs, hundreds of newly elected Members who had gathered for the opening of the first Protectorate Parliament. In the course of the day many attended one or more services over the way in Westminster Abbey, where in the afternoon the Presbyterian minister Stephen Marshall preached a sermon springing from verses three and four of the twelfth chapter of the old testament book of Hosea. However, the abbey soon became very full 'by reason of the great concourse of people from the city of London' and many MPs instead worshipped at nearby St Margaret's; we know that Oliver Cromwell's two sons, Richard and Henry, both of them returned as MPs to this parliament, were amongst those who attended St Margaret's. The Lord Protector himself appears not to have attended any of these services and instead he arrived at Westminster 'privately' and by water later in the day. By that time the MPs had gathered in their chamber and had begun debating their choice of Speaker, though that debate was cut short without conclusion when the Members received a summons from the Protector to attend him in the Painted Chamber. There he occupied 'a very rich chair wrought and trimmed with gold, upon a place up 2 steps like a throne, with a table before it'. When the MPs — over 300 of them, we are told — entered Cromwell stood up, removed his hat and delivered a short speech. We possess only a summary of this 'most excellent but short' oration, in the course of which Cromwell counselled the MPs to foster 'the spirit of union' and expressed a hope that 'the work of the Lord might be effectually carried on, for the peace and tranquillity of all the saints in Sion'. But he said little more, noting that as it was a Sunday, the Lord's Day, it was not fit to conduct business. Instead, he urged the MPs to adjourn and to reassemble on the morrow, when he promised to address them more fully. Without further debate, the House duly adjourned at around 8 pm on that late summer's evening.

The meeting of the first Protectorate Parliament on 3 September 1654 — and surely it was no coincidence that the authors of the written constitution had pitched upon that date, the anniversary of the God-given victories of Dunbar and Worcester, for this meeting — in many ways marks a high point,
indeed perhaps the high point, of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate. After the failings of the Rump and the disastrous experiment of the Nominated Assembly, Cromwell and many of his colleagues, military and political, soldiers and civilians, believed that the Protectorate - the regime established in late 1653, comprising a permanent executive council and an assured succession of elected, single chamber parliaments, headed by a Lord Protector - had solved many of the problems which had plagued and wrecked the earlier republican governments and represented a solid, workable compromise, a regime which would provide stable and durable government, pursuing the ends of the Lord and of the army but also re-establishing more traditional and civilian forms. By the time the first parliament of the Protectorate assembled here in early September 1654 Cromwell's confidence in and optimism about the regime had grown and he could look to a body of solid achievements put in place through the work of Protector and council over the preceding nine months. Accordingly, when the Lord Protector returned here to address the MPs early on Monday 4 September, this time arriving in great state, travelling in procession in a rich coach drawn by six horses, preceded by a marshal and accompanied by his lifeguard, footmen and members and officials of the Protectoral household, plus assorted gentlemen and City dignitaries, he was in buoyant mood. The day began with another service and sermon at Westminster Abbey, with the Protector and MPs in attendance, after which Cromwell proceeded with even more ceremony, the mace, sword and purse of state accompanying him, to the Painted Chamber adjoining the old House of Lords, summoning the MPs to join him there to hear his opening speech. In so doing, he was reviving a medieval format, for it was from the Painted Chamber that successive monarchs of the later middle ages had opened their parliaments, a venue abandoned in the 1530s when Henry VIII began the practice, still in operation today, of summoning members of both Houses to the House of Lords to hear the royal speech opening a session of parliament. Cromwell's great speech of 4 September, of which we possess something approaching a verbatim text, reflected the confidence and optimism of the moment. While it lacked something of the millenarian fervour of the speech of the previous 4 July with which he had opened the Nominated Assembly, perhaps suggesting that exactly fourteen months on Cromwell was no longer so sure that the day of Christ was quite so imminent, the speech was still redolent with anticipation of God's presence and divine gifts. 'Gentlemen', he began,
ending the Anglo-Dutch war, as well as a string of diplomatic and commercial treaties concluded with continental powers.

Cromwell closed his great speech of 4 September by urging the MPs to build upon this firm foundation, to push ahead and complete this good work and so win God's grace and secure God's gifts. The work was not yet complete, he warned.

Truly, I thought it my duty to let you know that though God hath thus dealt with you, yet these are but entrances and doors of hope, wherein through the blessing of God you may enter into rest and peace. But you are not yet entered.

Cromwell explicitly referred in his concluding remarks to the Old Testament story of the Israelites. Like them, God's new chosen people, the English, had been led out of Egyptian (Stuart) bondage towards the land of Canaan, but because of 'unbelief, murmuring, repining and other temptations and sins' they were being held in the wilderness until they had purged themselves of their remaining sins and so won admission 'to the place of rest'. We are thus far through the mercy of God', Cromwell remarked.

A door of hope is open. And I may say this to you; if the Lord's blessing and His presence go along with the management of affairs at this meeting, you will be enabled to put the top-stone to this work and make the nation happy.

Drawing to a close, Cromwell urged the MPs onwards.

And therefore I wish that you may go forward and not backward, and that you may have the blessings of God upon your endeavours. It's one of the great ends of calling this parliament that the ship of the commonwealth may be brought into a safe harbour, which I assure you it will not well be without your counsel and advice. You have great works upon your hands.

The meeting of the first Protectorate Parliament three hundred and fifty years ago saw Cromwell at probably his most buoyant and confident of the entire Protectorate. His great speech of 4 September, pregnant with optimism, reflected his belief that the new government, his new government, was delivering results and doing God's work. One final push by this glorious parliament could, would, complete the task. In terms of apparent achievement and of a sense of tangible optimism evident not just in Cromwell but also in some of his conciliar colleagues and advisors, this moment, three hundred and fifty years ago, could be said to mark the apogee of the Protectorate.

Of course, the mood was quickly shattered as the warmth of summer gave way to something far chillier and bleaker, and if the meeting of the first Protectorate Parliament showed Cromwell at his exuberant best, it also cruelly exposed some of his blind spots and revealed many of his weaknesses. There are, for we Cromwellians, some uncomfortable echoes in Cromwell's opening speech of the naive optimism with which Charles I had opened some of his parliaments, apparently oblivious to the tide of criticism, questioning and attacks upon his government about to be unleashed within the chamber.

There is little evidence of pre-session planning in 1654 and such preparation as had been made was unrealistic and careless. Cromwell and his advisors were from the outset caught cold by the welter of heated republican criticism of the regime and they quickly lost control of the session. The very opening day of the session, exactly three hundred and fifty years ago, had revealed something of the inadequacy of Cromwell's preparations and a degree of mismanagement, for having returned from the afternoon services, the MPs were left sitting in the chamber for at least half an hour - some sources suggest nearer an hour - before Cromwell was ready to address them and they were summoned to the Painted Chamber for his brief Sunday speech. This allowed the Members to hold a rambling debate, with discussions leading from the lawfulness of meeting on a Sunday to the wider issues of the authority by which they had been called together and consideration of the legitimacy of the Instrument. The debate came round to the choice of a Speaker and at least five names were floated, including that of John Bradshaw, a leading opponent of the Protectorate. It was fortunate for the regime that no decision had been reached when Cromwell's colleague John Lambert arrived to summon members to the Lord Protector and that, despite cries of 'sit still' from a dozen or so opponents, the debate broke off and almost all the Members dutifully attended the Painted Chamber. Within the first minutes of the session, carelessness and poor planning had allowed opposition MPs to attack the regime and to plant dangerous ideas in the minds of their less experienced or undecided colleagues. It was not an auspicious start.
Although councillor MPs and others did respond to the republican onslaught on the regime and its constitution which was unleashed in the opening days of the session, deploying arguments in support of the Protectoral regime and suggesting limited concessions, it was too little too late and the Cromwellians were unable to regain control. Accordingly, barely a week into the session, on Tuesday 12 September, Cromwell was forced to intervene, employing troops temporarily to close the House. He berated MPs with a second and very much sharper speech, emphasising not the rights and freedom of parliament but rather the limitations and constitutional restrictions upon MPs' freedom of action, and he imposed a novel written test upon MPs, which they were required to sign before they could resume their seats. These developments smacked of desperation, an ad hoc intervention running against the letter and spirit of constitutional propriety. Cromwell's arguments on 12 September that parliament had to respect and adhere to the constitution under which it had assembled and that, because the elections had been held and the MPs returned under the terms of the Instrument of Government, its contents - or at least its principal provisions - were therefore inviolable, left many unconvinced and angry at the time and is a line which still attracts sharp criticism from historians. Even in the wake of this purge and the effective exclusion of around 80 MPs, a fifth or so of the House, the remainder of the session brought no positive results and the purged parliament proved a disappointment. The MPs completed no legislation, public or private, their attacks upon the anti-Trinitarian John Biddle seemed to prefigure an unwelcome and dangerous narrowing of religious liberty and the revised constitution on which they lavished so much time contained certain provisions - especially the clauses concerning religion and the future command and financing of the army - which were unacceptable to Cromwell and others. Accordingly, at the earliest opportunity and interpreting the existing constitution's five month minimum lifespan of a parliament as equalling twenty weeks, Cromwell angrily dissolved the parliament on 22 January 1655, killing off its still incomplete revised constitution and dismissing the MPs with a speech full of anger and condemnation - September's talk of doors of hope and of ships about to enter safe harbours had given way to imagery of weeds and nettles, briars and thorns, accompanying a dangerous mix of dissettlement, division, discontent and dissatisfaction.

Looking back ruefully at the end of the session, Cromwell recalled that the meeting of his first Protectorate Parliament had been 'the hopefulllest day that ever mine eyes saw, as to considerations of this world'. For Cromwell, this world was always less than half the story and his hopes of securing God's love and gifts, never seriously dimmed or were extinguished. The door of hope, about which Cromwell spoke three hundred and fifty years ago tomorrow as he opened his first Protectorate Parliament, was not slammed shut forever, but never again was it to appear so open and so accessible to Cromwell and to some of his colleagues. In many ways the meeting of the first Protectorate Parliament on 3 September 1654 was the apogee of the Protectorate and the high point of Cromwell's hopes and optimism as Protector, just as the failure of that parliament proved to be a turning point in the history and fortunes of Cromwell and his regime.

A note on sources.
This paper rests upon, and the quotations are drawn from, the newspapers of early September 1654 found in the British Library Thomason Tracts, the texts of the Protector's speeches of 4 and 12 September 1654 and 22 January 1655 found most accessibly in I.A. Roots (ed), Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (London, 1989) and Guibon Goddard's parliamentary diary for the opening days of the session found in volume one of J.T. Rutt (ed), Diary of Thomas Burton, Esq (4 vols, London, 1828).

Dr Peter Gaunt is Reader in History at University College Chester and is chairman of The Cromwell Association.
THE CIVIL WAR IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

By Professor Ian Beckett

I. Buckinghamshire and the Approach of War

In 1642 Buckinghamshire was primarily agricultural, its economy based largely on supplying London's food. There were, however, some industries with needle making at Long Crendon, lace making at Olney, Newport Pagnell and Aylesbury, and brick making around Brill and the Claydons. The most important industry was the manufacture of paper, mills having been established along the Colne and Wye. The population was probably in the region of 55,000 to 65,000.

Because of the London trade, the county was relatively prosperous compared with many others at a time of general trade depression, with some 200 gentry families, of whom approximately 40 or so were prominent. Many of this closely-knit group were related to one another. Sir Alexander Denton of Hillesden was the brother-in-law of Sir Edmund Vemey of Claydon and father-in-law to Sir William Drake's younger brother Francis from Amersham. Denton was also a cousin of Sir Peter Temple of Stowe. Richard Grenville of Wotton Underwood was son-in-law to Thomas Tyrell of Castlethorpe, Arthur Goodwin of Upper Winchendon a cousin to the Tyringhams and father-in-law of Philip, Lord Wharton. Bulstrode Whitelocke of Fawley was godson to Henry Bulstrode of Hedgerley. Many had shared a common education and most had served together as deputy lieutenants and justices.

The population outside the ranks of the gentry is rarely glimpsed. It can be said, however, that local society was largely secular. Visitations in the 1630s found a noticeably lax laity. There were Nonconformist conventicles at Long Crendon, Woburn, Sherrington and Wendover while Ivinghoe found a noticeably lax laity. There were also considerable pressures from below. As in resistance in Wycombe to attempts by the Privy Council and local justices, including Hampden, to fix grain prices in 1630 for the benefit of London consumers. There were also indications of popular opposition to the gentry in the parliamentary elections at both Marlow and Wycombe in 1640.

II. The Militia and the Crown

The Crown's determination to modernise the militia was a particular burden and one associated with George Villiers, the royal favourite, who was created lord lieutenant of Buckinghamshire on the death of Lord Ellesmere in 1616 and successively Earl, Marquis and Duke of Buckingham between 1617 and 1623. There had already been opposition to attempts to raise men for war with Spain and France with, for example, the deputy lieutenants complaining in 1625 that the 'multiplicite of payments in maneteyng of soldiers is very greevous fallinge out in these times of affliction and dearth'. Not surprisingly, therefore, this new 'exact militia' also ran into opposition at local level. The use to which the militia might be put to demonstrate wider discontent was illustrated by Hampden mustering the Buckinghamshire trained bands - that portion of the militia being called out for training - in Beaconsfield churchyard in October 1634 in defiance of the 1604 canons for the profanation of churches and churchyards.

None of the MPs returned in 1640 were particularly sympathetic to the Crown, highlighting the central problem of the monarchy, since it required the gentry's co-operation to facilitate government. In Buckinghamshire, cooperation was conspicuously absent with long standing opponents of the Crown. Goodwin followed his father in opposing the extension of royal power while Whitelocke's father had been imprisoned. The father of Sir Kenelm Digby of Gayhurst had been executed for his part in the gunpowder plot. From the beginning of Charles I's reign several Buckinghamshire gentry were prominent opponents of the Crown including Sir Miles Hobart of Marlow, Sir Edward Coke of Stoke Poges and Sir William Fleetwood of Great Missenden. Hampden's celebrated resistance to the 20s. assessed on his land at Stoke Mandeville for ship money in 1636 is well known. In fact, opposition was based far more on the manner in which successive sheriffs, Sir Peter Temple and Sir Alexander Denton, chose to assess liability rather than the principle of the tax itself, and the arrears on the first ship money writ demanding a county total of £4,500 amounted to only £188.1s.11d. by July 1636, the lowest in the country after Gloucestershire. But the second writ of 1636 for a further £4,500 brought far greater opposition with £2,985 outstanding in September 1637, placing Buckinghamshire at the head of the list of defaulting counties. In short, the Crown's policies alienated the gentry upon whose diligence tax collection and local government depended. Indeed, the Rector of Beaconsfield, Dr John Andrews remarked in 1635 that Buckinghamshire was a county 'where government is so slackly looked to, men of some little fortunes are persuaded they may say or do anything against the government or governors (whether ecclesiastical or laic) without control'.
THE CIVIL WAR IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

While generally sympathetic to issues of national defence and local law and order, local gentry placed the preservation of local harmony first. In the case of the lieutenancy, where much work fell on the relatively small number of deputies, normal functioning depended upon the degree of co-operation the deputies received. The spirit of co-operation had to reach the lowest levels of administration in the form of the parish constables and the whole pace of local government tended to be set according to local taste, albeit a self-interested localism. The Crown, however, did not recognise this reality and, generally, the relentless pace of enforced change put too great a strain on the stability of local communities with endless disputes on ship money and other assessments: individuals and parishes were set one against the other. Shipton Lee complained of its assessment as compared to that of Quainton and Bierton complained by comparison to Quarrordon. The process personified the government's insensitivity to localism so that, when even greater demands were made for the wars against the Scots in 1639-40, there was almost total opposition. The Commons established a committee in December 1640 to investigate complaints against the lieutenancy and militia assessments. Such impositions as coat and conduct money were condemned as vehemently as ship money in the Grand Remonstrance of November 1641. Prominent in the latter, Hampden was also involved in the subsequent militia bill that sought to wrest control of the force from the Crown.

Attitudes were hardened still further by Charles's over-reaction to the Commons challenge in attempting to arrest the 'Five Members' including Hampden on 4 January 1642. Buckinghamshire became the first county to petition parliament on Hampden's behalf with a reputed 5,000 'freeholders' accompanying the petition to Westminster on 11 January. On 14 January it was reported that a 1,000 horse had come up from Buckinghamshire to offer their services to parliament, while on 18 January it was also reported that the trained bands had been called out in the Chiltern Hundreds.

Events developed rapidly with the passing of parliament's militia ordinance in March. The constitutional validity of the ordinance, which passed control of the militia to lords lieutenant, was questionable but it won de facto recognition in Buckinghamshire with Lord Paget of Marlow, appointed as joint lord lieutenant with the Earl of Carnarvon of Wing in February 1641, proceeding to implement it. Paget reported on 23 May that about a quarter of the militia (150 men) had so far been mustered in the Chiltern Hundreds together with 160 volunteers, while a further 250 volunteers were expected to join the next muster. In June the parliamentary ordinance appealing for plate, money and horses was enthusiastically supported. The entire county was reputed to have given up to £30,000 to the parliamentary cause. On 14 June, however, all was thrown into confusion by Paget's sudden flight to join the King. A further muster had been fixed for 17 June. Hampden had already informed the House of Paget's flight and came down armed with authority for the 32 deputy lieutenants assembled at Aylesbury to collect money, levy and train the militia, provide a garrison for Aylesbury and form a commission.

At this point, choices were being made. I well remember being in a crowd watching a Sealed Knot re-enactment many years ago at which one small boy kept asking his increasingly exasperated mother what was the difference between Roundheads and Cavaliers. In the end, she snapped, 'They've all got round heads, but some wear hats.' In some ways, this might be regarded as particularly perceptive given the often-difficult choices with which some men were faced. Some of the confusion that existed with respect to men's choices is indicated by the fact that the King's own commission of array for the county, issued on 16 June and naming 19 adherents, included the names of four of the deputy lieutenants named for the parliamentary commission on the following day. In passing, it can be noted that since Paget subsequently implemented the commission of array for the King in Staffordshire he is unique in having presided over both the militia ordinance and the commission of array.

It was by no means easy for some individuals to make their choices in the summer of 1642. Of this, the agonised deliberations of Sir Edmund Verney and his son, Ralph, afford the clearest example. That Ralph chose to remain a supporter of Parliament while Sir Edmund and two other sons – Thomas and Edmund (Mun) – joined the King was painful to all, Mun writing to Ralph, 'Brother what I feared is proved true, which is your being against the King: give me leave to tell you in my opinion tis most unhandsomely done, and it greeves my hearte to thinke that my father already and I, who soe dearly love and esteeme you, should be bound inconsequence (because in duty to our King) to be your enemy'. Knight Marshal of England since 1625, Sir Edmund could not desert the King he had faithfully served even though it meant defending principles his conscience condemned. Sir Edmund famously remarked to Edward Hyde that 'I have eaten his bread, and served him nearly 30 years, and will not do so base a thing as to forsake him, and choose rather to lose my life (which I am sure I shall do) to preserve and defend those things which are against my conscience to preserve and defend'. A fourth son, Henry, serving as a soldier of fortune in
Europe, joined the Queen in Holland in February 1643 after weighing up which side would afford him greater advantage.

Another family split by war was the Chesters of Chicheley. Sir Anthony Chester and his brother John joined the King, while another brother, Henry, remained nominally attached to the parliamentary cause. Some of those who supported the parliamentary cause were far from ardent. Sir William Drake, for example, went abroad on a number of occasions: he was a complex and highly ambiguous figure. Sir Ralph Vernon also went abroad between 1643 and 1650. Others were entirely neutral, such as Richard Barringer of Iver. There were those who were prominent supporters of the Crown such as Camarvon, but many royalists such as Sir Thomas Ashfield of Chesham, a Catholic and a man of considerable wealth as a result of being patentee for coal for Newcastle, do not appear to have been active. Still others changed sides during the course of the war such as Edmund Waller of Hall Barn, who was implicated in a plot against London in 1643.

Between 17 and 24 June the Buckinghamshire trained bands assembled at Aylesbury with nearly 1,000 volunteers. Since some carried long bows, bills and crossbows, their effectiveness might be doubted. On 24 June they petitioned parliament for a new lord lieutenant and in response Philip, Lord Wharton of Wooburn Green was appointed. Wharton, however, did not appear at Aylesbury until early July. In the meantime, local recruiting had begun for regiments for parliament's new army. The best known, Hampden's 'Greencoats', was recruited from among his tenants and friends. Its officers included Sir Richard Ingoldsby of Lenborough and Thomas Tyrell, both of whom were to command it after Hampden's death. As with all regiments in the army, however, it soon lost its county identity. By January 1643 Hampden was finding recruits from as far afield as Ipswich.

Arthur Goodwin raised his own regiment of horse and also a troop on behalf of his son-in-law, Wharton. Wharton also raised his own regiment of foot though not in Bucks, the flight of which at Edgehill with Wharton supposedly taking refuge in a sawpit led to him ever afterwards being known as Saw Pit Wharton. Richard Grenville commanded a troop of harquebusiers in Goodwin's regiment and we know from his accounts that he spent £140 on equipping and horsing himself, that 'mounting' his officers and NCOs cost another £238 and the monthly pay of his troop amounted to £1,494.14s. Troopers, of course, received 2s. 6d. a day at a time when labourers could expect only between 4s. and 6s. a week. The regiment
Newport Pagnell plundered Sir Anthony Chester's house in the autumn of 1645.

Estates also suffered. Temple was said to have received no profits at all from his estates between 1642 and 1647 through taxation and free quartering of parliamentary troops. When Sir Ralph Verney moved abroad in 1643, he arranged the payment of protection money to both sides but this did not stop the temporary sequestration of the estate by the royalists or a considerably more prolonged parliamentary sequestration as Verney refused to take the Solemn League and Covenant. Only 20-30 per cent of normal income from the Verney estates was forthcoming between 1643 and 1647. Just as Verney was paying both sides so, too, was Sir Richard Pigott, accounts of his steward at Grendon Underwood showing payments to both Boarstall and Aylesbury in 1644/5. When parliamentarians came to Gayhurst looking for lead in June 1645, Lady Digby denied having any and roundly abused the soldiers, but a search 'ultimately produced seven or eight hundred weight from a heap of manure'.

Gentry lives were also lost. Camarvon was killed at Newbury in September 1643 and Hampden at Chalgrove on 18 June 1643, mortally wounded by a shot in the shoulder and not from the bursting of his own pistol in his hand as was claimed at one time. Sir John Digby was killed fighting for the King as was Sir Kenelm Digby's son and Sir Kenelm himself was imprisoned by parliament until August 1643 when he went overseas. Edward Tyringham was also killed in the King's service while his brother, the Rev. Anthony Tyringham, was seized near Stony Stratford by dragoons led by a Captain Pollard and carried off to Aylesbury. En route he was robbed three times and 'Tyringham 'pollarded' on the arm by the captain so that his arm had to be amputated. Even greater calamity befell the Verneys. Sir Edmund Verney, who had gone into battle without armour or buff coat, was killed at Edgehill in October 1642 while defending the Royal Standard, traditionally having his left hand cut off while still grasping the shaft. A ring given him by the King was returned to Claydon but the body was never found and, of course, one of the traditions is that his ghost was seen wandering the house looking for his missing hand. Mun was treacherously killed while unarmed and walking beside Oliver Cromwell after being given quarter at Drogheda in August 1649. Both Tom and Henry were prisoners at various times. While exiled, Sir Ralph lost two of his children while their mother, Mary, died shortly upon joining them abroad in 1650. Sir Edmund's daughter, Cary, lost her husband as well as her brother-in-law and was left pregnant and a widow at 18 years of age.

Sir Edmund's brother-in-law, Sir Alexander Denton, suffered equally. His house at Hillesden was garrisoned for the King in early 1644 when the depredations of its garrison led powerful forces to be brought against it under the command of Luke and Cromwell. The house fell on 4 March 1644 with Denton captured along with his sister and daughters and some of the Verney womenfolk. About 30 of the garrison were slaughtered after the house had surrendered and the women robbed of most of their clothing although their treatment was not quite as lurid as the royalist broadsheet, Mercurius Aulicus, depicted. The garrison commander, Colonel William Smith of Akeley, and Denton, whose wife and mother had both died just before the siege, were lodged in the Tower of London. Smith, who became Denton's son-in-law, managed to escape whereupon Susan Verney was arrested for aiding and abetting. Denton's sister subsequently married Captain Abercrombie of the besieging parliamentary forces but he was killed in the following year. Denton's son, John, was killed near Abingdon in August 1644 and he himself died of fever in the Tower in January 1645.

Parliamentary victory brought retribution. The fate of Sir John Pakington serves to illustrate much that happened to former royalists after the war. Pakington had his estates at Aylesbury seized in 1642 and he may have lost anything between £10,000 and £20,000 during the war. Having been captured at Worcester in 1651 when again in arms for the King, he was fined £13,395. Pakington's family had long been in dispute with Aylesbury's inhabitants over manorial rights and he was forced to make these over as well.

Ironically, gentry families who had backed parliament also found their influence diminished as a new elite emerged from the County Committee, which had evolved from the original commission of deputy lieutenant of 1642. With fewer candidates available, there was more social mobility on the part of minor gentry. In theory, the membership of the commission remained much the same throughout the war but, increasingly, as it adopted the nomenclature of 'County Committee' from January 1643 and appointed its own permanent officials, the work devolved upon a small radical clique.

In the course of one of his numerous disputes with the committee, Sir Samuel Luke, the Governor of Newport Pagnell, wrote in May 1645, 'Take away Mr. Lane's name and I am confident you would not have found any of them Committee men if Colonel Hampden or Colonel Goodwin had lived.' The committee had indeed fallen to a small group of no previous influence. The nucleus consisted of Henry Beke, William Russell, Christopher Henn,
John Deverell and Christopher Eggleton. Beke and Eggleton were respectively minor gentry from Haddenham and Grove. Russell had been a small farmer at Chalfont St. Giles, a location apparently used as a Quaker meeting house, while Deverell owned a small house and windmill at Swanbourne. Here was described in one royalist pamphlet as a butcher and he may well have followed this trade in Aylesbury. Some other figures associated with the committee included Thomas Scott, a former brewer turned Aylesbury attorney; John Lane, another lawyer and the brother of the MP for Wycombe in the Long Parliament; and Simon Mayne, Beke’s half-brother and a minor landowner at Dinton. Becoming MPs, both Mayne and Scott signed the King’s death warrant. Subsequently, Mayne died in the Tower in 1661 while Scott was executed.

The power wielded by this group was not confined to a monopoly of the committee. In the case of the militia, only Richard Grenville and Thomas Tyrell of the old elite remained available for county defence in the early months of the war with Tyrell then assuming command of Hampden’s regiment. Three of the committee had only been militia captains under Tyrell in 1642 (Eggleton, Deverell and Beke) while his former sergeant major, Thomas Theed, was also an occasional member of the committee by the time Tyrell returned to the county in 1644. The permanent commanders of the militia and forces at Aylesbury between 1643 and 1645 were Deverell, Robert Aldridge from Chalfont St. Giles, Thomas Shelbome, and the Horton paper manufacturer, Edmund Phipps, known to Mersurius Aulicus as the ‘rag man’, who had once been prosecuted by the justices including Hampden in the 1630s for various sharp business practises including running the mills seven days a week, pollution, throwing his employees on parish relief, and spreading plague in rags.

Shelbome’s rise was a classic example of wartime social mobility since according to Mersurius Aulicus he had previously been Hampden’s shepherd. Shelbome may not have been Hampden’s shepherd but even Luke described him as a pasture keeper ‘and one of the meaner rank of men’. Shelbome later commanded one half of Cromwell’s double regiment and died of ‘flux’ while serving in Ireland in 1651. In 1650 Deverell, Theed, Aldridge, and Eggleton were still militia officers under the command of George Fleetwood. Fleetwood was the son of Sir George Fleetwood of the Vache and had raised a troop of horse in 1643 at the age of only 21 rising to the rank of colonel within three years. Fleetwood, a sectarian and regicide, was elected for the county in 1645 and was also to become deputy for Buckinghamshire when the Major-Generals were appointed by Cromwell to run the country between 1655 and 1657. Unlike Mayne and Scott, Fleetwood’s sentence of death was commuted but he was imprisoned and ordered to be transported to Tangier in 1664, either dying there or possibly in North America in 1672. Another Buckinghamshire regicide was Adrian Scrope of Wormsley, who was also executed. By far the most fortunate of the Bucks regicides was Richard Ingoldsby, who threw his lot in with George Monk at an opportune time and somehow managed to persuade everyone that it was not really his signature on the King’s death warrant because Cromwell had held his hand and guided the pen. He ended up as a Knight of the Bath.

That the ‘meaner sort’ might seek to profit from the weakness of the gentry was perhaps inevitable. Thus the poorer inhabitants of Aylesbury petitioned to have a share in the redistribution of Pakington’s lands. Petitions were also presented to parliament in July 1645 and May 1646 opposing the continuing payment of tithes. In 1647 Sir Ralph Verney was expressing concern that enclosures at Brill would be pulled down under the influence of Levellers and, indeed, there was an enclosure riot at Brill in 1649. Levellers were certainly active in the county with two celebrated pamphlets emanating from them in March 1649 – Light Shining in Buckinghamshire and More Light Shining in Buckinghamshire. Both exploited grievances against tithes and enclosures and Levellers also inspired a com riot against the corporation in Wycombe. There were Digger colonies at Colnbrook and Iver and the Diggers may have been involved in an even more radical pamphlet in May 1649, the proposals of which were adopted by a Leveller meeting in Aylesbury, A Declaration from the Well Affected in the County of Bucks.

Radicals sought to make capital out of resentment not only against traditional impositions such as tithes but also out of disillusionment with the excesses of both sides. The demands of war could place an often intolerable additional burden on a society already faced with the failure on average of every fourth harvest as well as other endemic disasters such as disease, malnutrition, flood and fire. Prices were relatively stable and harvests reasonably good in the early 1640s but thereafter 10 harvests failed in 15 years reinforcing the war’s dislocation of trade and employment caused by a war in which the crops, horses and other livestock of farmers and husbandmen were a continual target for the soldiery, forced labour and free quarter deprived villagers of the ability to pay rents, and the administration of local justice, poor relief and charitable institutions frequently collapsed.
III. The War and the Local Community

There were few major movements of armies through the county during the war, principally the passage of the parliamentary army northwards en route to Edgehill in the summer of 1642, the passage of the Earl of Essex’s army in the spring of 1643 en route to the relief of Gloucester, the passage of the King’s army through Buckingham in June 1644 en route for the battle of Cropredy Bridge, and the passage of Sir Thomas Fairfax and the New Model Army through Stony Stratford en route for the battle of Naseby in June 1645. Much of the considerable and unwelcome attention Bucks did receive, however, derived from its very position. Pre-war the county had been one of the main purveyors of food to the capital and it lay across the main routes from London to east, west and north. Luke described the route to the north through Stony Stratford as ‘the greatest road in the Kingdom’. When the royalists seized Newport Pagnell on 16 October 1643 it was widely recognised that they had cut the lines of communication into London and were now able ‘to intercept all cattle and other provender that shall come out of all the adjacent counties to London, hoping thereby to cut off all victual from this city, and so to starve it’. In the event, serious misunderstanding led to the royalist abandonment of Newport Pagnell on 28 October, enabling the parliamentary forces to garrison the town for the remainder of the war. Its Governor until June 1645, of course, was Sir Samuel Luke, Scoutmaster General to the Earl of Essex but no longer thought to be the model for Samuel Butler’s Hudibras. The royalist garrison established at Greenlands similarly threatened to disrupt the Thames river traffic into London.

Aylesbury was also an important strategic position. Indeed, after the capture of Oxford by Arthur Goodwin on 12 September 1642, Lord Saye and Sele abandoned the city in preference for holding Aylesbury. The subsequent unforeseen occupation of Oxford by the King and his court made Aylesbury’s position even more important as a counterpoint. Royalists made a number of unsuccessful attempts to bribe the Aylesbury garrison into surrender while Oxford’s outer ring of fortifications and garrisons impinged on Buckinghamshire. The royalists fortified Brill in late 1642, repulsing an attack by Goodwin in January 1643. In April 1643 the Brill garrison was withdrawn to Reading but new garrisons were established at Hillesden and Boarstall in February 1644. The Hillesden garrison beat off one attack in February but, as already indicated, the small garrison of only 263 men was overwhelmed by the almost 2,000 men brought against it by Cromwell and Luke in March, Cromwell and Luke traditionally spending

the night before the attack at the Camp Barn in Steeple Claydon. One suspects Luke and Cromwell themselves probably stayed in the manor house since it was owned by another Buckinghamshire regicide and a long-standing opponent of the Crown, Thomas Chaloner, who was to go into exile at the Restoration. Boarstall was briefly abandoned in April 1644 but retaken by royalist forces in June and was then held until its surrender on 10 June 1646. Indeed, it was only the imminent fall of Oxford itself that finally persuaded Sir William Campion to seek terms after an eight-week siege.

The existence of these royalist and parliamentarian garrisons meant the county was a constant battleground with raid and counter-raid, the occupation of territory being regarded as significant in terms of raising the cash and other provisions required to sustain the respective war efforts. In the case of the parliamentarians, those parliamentarians who had so readily opposed the Crown’s pre-war financial demands were now forced through sheer necessity to impose new taxes far exceeding Charles’s efforts. The concept of ‘loans’ was replaced in February 1643 by a weekly tax, assessing Bucks at £420 per week. In May 1643, parliament introduced the ‘fifth and twentieth’, by which those with an income of over £10 were liable to contribute one fifth of the annual value of their land and one twentieth of the annual value of their goods. In September 1643 came the ‘excise’, a tax on commodities. Income was also expected from sequestrations of royalist property.

The problem was that the amounts raised frequently fell far short of expectations. In June 1647 a monthly tax was substituted for the weekly assessment but, two years later, attempts were still being made to collect arrears on weekly tax. The maintenance of the garrisons at Aylesbury and Newport Pagnell swallowed virtually all the County Committee’s total income. Between July 1644 and February 1646, for example, garrisons and local forces took £28,288 out of the total income of £36,833 while salaries and allowances of the committee’s officials claimed another £1,133, leaving only £7,472 for all other purposes.

Financial demands were not the only impositions for Aylesbury and Newport Pagnell also required food, fodder and other material support. At first Luke appears to have ensured proper payment for food at Newport Pagnell but, by February 1645, Luke was reporting that ‘we have been forced to eat up the inhabitants in these three hundreds that they neither have horsemeat for any, or com for themselves to sow’. It was also customary for garrisons to order in local labourers to work on fortifications,
Luke for example calling in 600 labourers to work on repairing the damage done the fortifications by excessive winter rain in early 1645.

Not unexpectedly the presence of garrisons also implied a certain amount of immorality, Luke complaining in March 1645 that 'here women can be delivered of children without knowing men and men and women can take one another's words and lie together and insist it not to be adultery'. At other times there was disease, Cromwell's eldest son, also Oliver, being one victim at Newport Pagnell in March 1645. A young John Bunyan was also a member of the garrison. Luke's garrison was supposedly maintained by a monthly sum of £4,000 raised from the 'Associated' counties of Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Northamptonshire, Suffolk, Essex, Norfolk, and the three hundreds of Newport. Few attempted to meet their obligations and pay was frequently in arrears, increasing tensions between soldiers and civilians. In February 1645 it was reported of Newport Pagnell that soldiers were laying three to a bed and in one company two men 'had but one pair of breeches between them so that when one was up, the other must upon necessity be in his bed'. In April one petition addressed Luke by troopers at Cosgrove indicated that 'we may have just cause to fear that the people may rise and cut our throats if any enemy approaches from whom they may expect some relief from such oppression.... Having so long been deceived by fair promises which is probably as great oppression to the country as Pharaoh's demanding full tale of brick without allowance of straw'. Precisely the same situation obtained at Aylesbury. In March 1644 Parliament had to borrow £3,000 from the Haberdashers Company in order to pay the garrison sufficient of its arrears for it to consent to march to the relief of Gloucester. By May 1644 the regiment of the governor, Colonel Henry Marten, was so lacking in pay that it was feared it would disband itself and the town was reported to be in 'great disorder'. Both towns had to be placed under martial law in January 1646 because of disorderly soldiers. Parliament agreed to disband the Aylesbury garrison on 11 July 1646 and Newport Pagnell on 6 August although its fortifications had still not been slighted by May 1648 and the ordnance was not removed until 1649.

If the depredations of parliamentary garrisons were not enough the county also suffered from the visitations of other parliamentary forces. The forces of the Eastern Association were widely recognised as being particularly oppressive and the practice of free quarter became widespread while Luke remarked of the New Model Army in March 1645 that 'I think these new modellers knead all their dough with ale, for I never saw so many drinking

in my life in so short a time'. Royalist activities merely compounded the miseries of parliamentary excesses. The King levied a weekly rate of £1,200 on the county and appointed Sir John Tyringham as sheriff in 1642 but there was little systematic collection. Thus, in June 1644 the King's army paused at Buckingham for three days to hold assizes and levy contributions. It was only with the establishment of garrisons at Hillesden, Boarstall and Greenlands that more permanent contributions were attempted. By May 1646 the Committee of Both Kingdoms could declare that, although small, the Boarstall garrison 'hath yet much infested the country, both by levying contribution and plunder, wherein they have been more than ordinarily active'.

Most royalist activity, however, took the form of raids. In November 1642, one raid on Aylesbury was magnified into a great battle by a parliamentary broadsheet Good and Joyfull Nesses out of Buckinghamshire, which claimed that 1,500 men under Sir William Balfour had defeated 10,000 men under Prince Rupert. The broadsheet is the only evidence and Rupert was at Abingdon on the day in question. In the following month royalist forces circled the town but found its defences too strong. In March 1643 some 6,000 royals again circled the town and Carnarvon plundered Wendover carrying off animals, com, ploughs and plough horses. In June 1643 some £3,000 worth of goods was carried off from Wycombe. In April 1644 Wendover and Wycombe were again plundered and the raids continued to the end of the war, two regiments being stationed at Wycombe in October 1645 to prevent royalist interference with the parliamentary elections. All in all, there was comparatively little to choose between sides. One of Luke's agents reported in 1645 of Buckinghamshire that a man 'may travel into those parts & see a 1000 acres & never a herd of cattle on it'. Similarly, John Taylor's lecture to the people addressed to the farmers of Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire in 1644 captured the prevailing situation well:

• Your crests are fallen down, and now your journeys to the market towne, are not to sell your pease, your oats, your wheates, but of nine horses stole from you 'tintreat, but one to be restored, and this you doe, to a buffed captain, or perhaps unto, his surly corporal.

IV. The Revival of the County Community

By 1647 the country had reached near anarchy with army unrest culminating in its march on London in August. It was, in fact, at Wycombe
that parliamentary commissioners received a formal request that army representatives be appointed for the negotiations of the soldiers' demands. Buckinghamshire, however, was not directly involved in either the sporadic Second Civil War in 1648 or the Third Civil War of 1650-51 though the county witnessed the passage of Cromwell, and of the royalist and Scottish prisoners after the battle of Worcester. Suitable precautions were taken at the time of Pennudock's rising in 1655 with a number of arrests in the county. In August 1659 Sir George Booth, disguised as a woman, was apprehended by 'some country people' at Newport Pagnell after the failure of his conspiracy against the Protectorate.

The period of the Protectorate, however, if lacking more dramatic events as far as Buckinghamshire was concerned, was marked by a steady revival of the fortunes of the older elite. In February 1650 sequestration was centralised in London and the County Committee lost a substantial part of its revenue. The Major Generals appointed in August 1655 in the aftermath of Pennudock's rising also centralised much authority in their own hands as well as imposing yet more taxation in the form of the decimation tax on delinquents and papists and petty restrictions. Sir Ralph Verney, for example, was compelled to give security for the conduct of himself and his servants though he could produce a certificate from the Buckinghamshire Committee that there were no charges pending against him and that he had voluntarily contributed to the parliamentary cause. Neither this nor two petitions to Cromwell made any difference and in July 1656 the decimation was confirmed. As Verney wrote to Lady Gawdy, he went to meet Fleetwood 'with soe little hopes of good successe, that were not Alisbery soe very neare to Claydon, I should scarce goe thether about it, unlesse it

was to give an opportunity to the Major Generall & Commissioners to make their injustice shine more clearly, which you may guesse to bee a needlesse errand being most men are already fully satisfied in that point'. The unpopularity of direct military rule was reflected in Buckinghamshire in the elections in 1656, which resulted in the return of six opponents of the government. The new parliament proved so hostile to the Major Generals that they were dispensed with in 1657, leaving the way open for many older families to reassert themselves over the County Committee.

That committee itself had been weakened by the deaths of some original members. Russell died in 1651 and Beke in 1654 although they were replaced by their sons. Henning, Deverell and Aldridge were still active in March 1660 but shortly either sought accommodation with the reviving tides of conservatism and or simply disappeared from sight. A growth in

the county's prosperity after 1650 also contributed to the revival of gentry estates. The Drakes began buying land anew in 1648, Sir Ralph Verney began to rebuild at Claydon in January 1653, and the fortunes of both the Temple and Grenville estates revived with the assistance of higher prices due to bad harvests. Henry Chester re-emerged as sheriff in 1658 and, together with Sir Richard Temple, met General Monck in January 1660 to urge a free parliament on the latter's passage through the county.

That parliament saw the election of such noted royalists or formerly excluded parliamentarians as Sir William Bowyer, William Tytingham, Sir Richard Temple, John Dormer and Thomas Tyrell. Bucks was among the first counties to petition for a free parliament and send congratulations to Charles II in May 1660. By 1661, the older elite had substantially reasserted itself over those who had always lacked social authority in the county.

In superficial ways, Buckinghamshire had not been deeply affected by war and its aftermath. Between 20 and 40 clergymen appear to have been removed from their stipends during the whole period, but the county's justices appear to have functioned relatively normally after 1645. The county had certainly returned by 1660 to an approximation of that description of it by Sergeant Nehemiah Wharton of Holles's Redcoats in August 1642 as 'the sweetest county that I ever saw'. A few echoes lingered, the hermit John Bigg at Dinton, Simon Mayne's former servant, being popularly supposed to be the King's executioner and another parliamentary veteran, the hermit Roger Crab of Chesham, becoming known as the Mad Hatter though there was a later nineteenth-century inspiration for Lewis Carroll's invention. A number of royalist veterans lived long on county pensions, the last, William Leaver only dying in 1718 at the age of 102. Yet, it would be wrong to imply that all had been forgotten. War left a lasting legacy in the hostility towards a standing army and in the fear of social disorder. Mary, Lady Verney articulated the views of many when finding yet more troops at Claydon in August 1647: 'God send us well quit of them.'

Professor Ian Beckett BA PhD FRHistS is Professor of History, University College, Northampton, Chairman of the Army Records Society and Secretary to the Trustees of the Bucks Military Museum Trust. His publication record is extensive and includes a well-known history of Buckinghamshire. His edition for the Record Society of the Buckinghamshire \textit{Posse Comitatus of 1798} is one of the most used volumes in the series. Ian is a Vice President of the John Hampden Society.
JOHN HAMPDEN: THE RISE FROM OBSCURITY 1594 – 1636

By Roy Bailey

When I was given the title for this talk today I was somewhat surprised. I wondered if there had been some confusion and that it should really have read ‘Oliver Cromwell – The Rise from Obscurity’. Compared with the family of his cousin John Hampden, the future Lord Protector’s background was much less impressive. His great-grandfather was an unknown Welsh yeoman – Richard Williams – who came to the court of Henry VII in the previous century and adopted the name of his maternal uncle Thomas Cromwell, Henry VIII’s great minister. Although Oliver’s grandfather Sir Henry Cromwell owned Hinchinbrooke and Ramsey Abbey, Oliver’s father was a younger son, and Oliver inherited very little in the way of property and was therefore little known outside East Anglia. In a speech to Parliament in 1654 he said, ‘I was by birth a gentleman, living neither in any considerable height, nor yet in obscurity.’ So if ‘obscurity’ is the wrong word to describe Oliver Cromwell’s background, how much less so is it for his cousin.

The Hampdens had owned land in Buckinghamshire since before the Norman Conquest and had somehow held on to it afterwards. Within a hundred years of the Conquest Robert de Hampden was knighted, and from then on it was a story of service to the Crown and acquisition of land through inheritance and marriage. Many of the Hampdens were sheriffs not only of Buckinghamshire but also Bedfordshire; Members of Parliament; and Royal courtiers. Sir Edmund Hampden became an Esquire of the Body and Privy Councillor to Henry VII; Sir John Hampden ‘of the Hill’ as he was known, was one of the Queen’s attendants at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520 and he later commanded a Royal ship, The Saviour. His daughter Sybil, an ancestress of William Penn of Pennsylvania, was nurse to the future Edward VI. Griffith Hampden was an MP, served as High Sheriff of Buckinghamshire, and entertained Queen Elizabeth I in lavish style at Great Hampden. There is a story, almost certainly apocryphal, that he had the avenue known as ‘The Queen’s Gap’ cut through the beechwoods overnight to improve the Queen’s view.

So by the time Griffith’s grandson John was born in 1594, the Hampdens had long been established as a powerful and influential family in the Chilterns and surrounding areas. They owned manors not only in Buckinghamshire, but also in Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Bedfordshire, Essex and Hampshire, and there is a doggerel rhyme, which suggests that one of

the Hampdens lost some of this land by quarrelling with the Black Prince over a game of tennis.

Tring, Wing and Ivinghoe
Hampden of Hampden did forego
For striking of the Prince a blow
And glad was he to escape it so

There is no evidence that this quarrel ever took place or that the Hampdens owned these manors, but even such a loss would hardly have diminished their wealth. John was later estimated to have an annual income of at least £1,500 – an enormous sum, putting him in the multi-millionaire class by today’s standards. If the rhyme has some basis in fact, it indicates the status of the Hampdens.

All this huge inheritance became John’s at the age of three, when his father William died, and he and his brother Richard were raised by their mother Elizabeth, who was the sister of Oliver Cromwell’s father. Shrewdly she secured the wardship of her son for the sum of £800, thereby avoiding the revenues of the estate going to the Crown. Elizabeth sent John to Lord Williams’s Grammar School in Thame, where according to Anthony a Wood, ‘the Hampdens while young had been mostly bred in the said school in Thame and had sojourned either with the Vicar or the Master’.

The Master was a much-respected scholar, Richard Bourchier, who ensured that his pupils had a firm grounding in the disciplines that they would need in later life. Up at 5 am for prayers and breakfast, then lessons in Greek, Latin and Hebrew, Bible readings and oratory, before finishing at 5 pm with more prayers. On Sundays the boys attended morning and evening services at the nearby parish church and were required to discuss the subjects of the sermons on Monday morning.

In 1609, when he was fifteen, Hampden left the Grammar School and entered Magdalen College in Oxford. It was either here or at Thame that he met his lifelong friend Arthur Goodwin of Lower Winchendon. Together they wrote verses for Luctus Posthumus, a collection to mark the death of Henry, Prince of Wales, in 1612, and a year later some more verse for Lucius Palatini, which celebrated the marriage of Henry’s sister Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine. From University Hampden went to the Inner Temple to study law, a common practice for such landed gentlemen. He would be destined for a lifetime of administering the wide estates, which he owned,
and therefore legal training was essential. Only two miles from the Inner Temple was the Palace of Westminster, where the Law Courts sat, and we can imagine this young man walking along the river to Westminster Hall and witnessing the practical application of the law he was studying, and which would play such an important part in his life. He may well have visited St Stephen's Chapel, where the House of Commons sat, and acquired the ambition to be a member, like so many of his forebears.

Hampden was at the Inner Temple for two years, from 1613 to 1615, and, having reached maturity, probably took over the management of his estates. His mother appeared still to have her finger very much in the pie, because in 1620 she wrote to Anthony Knyvet, 'If ever my son will seek for his honour, tell him now to come, for here is multitudes of lords a making... I am ambitious of my son's honour, which I wish were now conferred upon him, that he might not come after so many new creations.'

John Hampden was not interested in this. Perhaps he was aware of the debased court of King James I and wanted nothing to do with it; perhaps he was aware that political power would shift to the House of Commons; or perhaps he was far too happy with his new wife. He had married Elizabeth Symeon of Pyrton on Midsummer Day 1619 and the couple settled down at Hampden House. Two years later he entered Parliament as Member for Grampound in Cornwall.

Hampden entered Parliament at what was probably one of the most significant periods in its history. It had already been in existence for over 300 years, and had mostly been viewed by the various monarchs as a convenient way of persuading the populace to finance the Crown and of ratifying Royal decisions. It could be called or dissolved at the whim of the Sovereign, so there were long periods when no Parliament was in session. Queen Elizabeth I knew how to manage her Parliaments, mainly because they were composed largely of Protestant gentlemen who loved her as their Sovereign, so there were long periods when no Parliament was in session. Hampton's share was assessed at £13. 6s. 8d, and one of his neighbouring MPs wrote, 'I do think Mr John Hampden to be £13. 6s. 8d and his mother £10 a harder rate than I find on any other.' Hampden appealed and the assessment was reduced to £10, but the business could hardly have endeared the King to him.

Although Hampden had been an MP for only a few months, he had served his apprenticeship, sitting on a number of committees and learning the way in which the House did business. Of equal importance, he had come to know and respect such individuals as Sir Edward Coke, John Pym and Sir John Eliot. He had also witnessed the behaviour of the new Stuart monarchy at first hand. It is doubtful if he was impressed.

Another Parliament was called in 1624, but Hampden did not sit in this one initially. He withdrew from Grampound and promoted a scheme to re-enfranchise three Buckinghamshire boroughs – Amersham, Marlow and Wendover. It is an indication of Hampden's wealth and status that he employed a lawyer, William Hakewill, to carry out all the legal work and submit the petition to Parliament. King James objected to having any more MPs from radical Buckinghamshire, but the writs were issued and Hampden became MP for Wendover.

James died the following year, and was succeeded by his son Charles. It was said that, had his brother Henry become King, Charles would have been Archbishop of Canterbury. He was certainly a great exponent of the Church of England, and it was his efforts to restore some of the dignity and ceremony to the Church, as well as his foreign policy and his marriage to a French Catholic, that caused many Protestants to believe that he was leading England back into the fold of Rome. More so than his father, Charles also interfered in finance and trade by granting monopolies on such essentials as salt and soap.

So when his first Parliament assembled in June 1625, the seeds of dispute were there. Both Houses were composed largely of gentlemen and peers who had become wealthy by acquiring monastic lands at the Dissolution of the Monasteries. They were determined to enjoy that wealth, and they believed that they had a right to be consulted on how much should be allocated to the Crown and how it should be spent. When the House of Commons voted far less in subsidies than the King expected, he issued a demand to each county for a compulsory loan. John Hampden's share was assessed at £13. 6s. 8d, and one of his neighbouring MPs wrote, 'I do think Mr John Hampden to be £13. 6s. 8d and his mother £10 a harder rate than I find on any other.' Hampden appealed and the assessment was reduced to £10, but the business could hardly have endeared the King to him.

The leadership of the House now devolved upon Sir John Eliot, and he started proceedings to impeach the King's favourite, the Duke of
Buckingham, for his corruption and incompetence as Lord Admiral. Eliot asked Hampden to list the possible charges against the Duke, which he did, but before the impeachment could proceed the King again dissolved Parliament. Still short of money, Charles tried to raise a large sum by means of a forced loan. John Hampden was one of those who refused to pay, and was summoned before the Privy Council, where he is said to have answered, 'I would be content to lend as well as others, but I fear to draw upon myself that curse in Magna Carta which is to be read twice a year to those who infringe it.'

Like so much of Hampden's life, this is based on hearsay or later reports. It is said that he was imprisoned in the Gatehouse or in Hampshire throughout 1627, but it may be that he was confused with his cousin Sir Edmund Hampden, who was imprisoned together with Sir John Eliot. In any event, such activities on the part of the King could only have reinforced Hampden's opposition to such arbitrary government.

Charles's third Parliament assembled in 1628, all the seventy-six prisoners having been released. Many of Hampden's closest colleagues and relations were among the new members, including a certain Oliver Cromwell from Huntingdon. Eliot was again the leading light, and if Hampden had been released with him, they had obviously learned to like and respect each other. Hampden served on fifteen committees in this Parliament, eight of them concerning religion. He earned a high reputation among his colleagues as a manager of business and a negotiator, rather than an orator. He was a good listener.

It was this Parliament that passed the famous Petition of Right, that cornerstone of English liberty, which made illegal:

- Levying of any tax or charge without the consent of parliament.
- Imprisonment of any citizen on the King's word alone.
- Billeting of soldiers without payment in peacetime.

Following this, the Commons voted the King a grant of £350,000, but he wanted more, and decided that the Petition of Right did not cover the ancient tax of tunnage and poundage. The House launched a counter attack against the Royal customs officers, in which Hampden made his first recorded speech. Charles also appointed William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury and encouraged him to re-introduce elaborate ceremonial into the Church of England. The opposition, led by Eliot, decided on a protest against those who made Popish or Arminian innovations in religion on one hand, and against those who advised the illegal taking or paying of tunnage and poundage. The Speaker, who was a King's man, refused to allow any speeches, but Denzil Holles and Benjamin Valentine held him down in his chair, with Holles roaring, 'God's wounds. You shall sit till we please to rise!' The protest was read out, and the House dissolved. It was not to meet again for eleven years.

Within days nine members of the House were imprisoned in the Tower. Hampden was not among them, but Eliot was, and so began a correspondence between them which is both illuminating and moving. Fifteen letters from Eliot to Hampden, and nine from Hampden to Eliot survive. Their deep regard for each other shines out in their writings, which, despite the dire circumstances, abound with good humour. In one letter Hampden wrote:

Sir, I write indeed rather to let you know that you are frequent in my thoughts than for any business that at the moment requires it; and if those thoughts can contrive anything that might conduce to my friend's service, I should entertain them with much affection.

When Eliot wrote to say that the Lieutenant of the Tower had been appointed as an emissary to Brussels, Hampden replied good-humouredly, 'You were far enough above my emulation before; but, breathing now the same air with an ambassador, you are out of all aim'. Hampden also kept a fatherly eye on Eliot's two sons while they were at Oxford University, and frequently entertained them at Great Hampden.

The conditions of his imprisonment affected Eliot's health, and he steadfastly refused to submit to the King. Eventually, in November 1632 he died and even then Charles would not let his body be taken back to Port Huntingdon. Eliot was again the leading light, and if Hampden had been released with him, they had obviously learned to like and respect each other. Hampden served on fifteen committees in this Parliament, eight of them concerning religion. He earned a high reputation among his colleagues as a manager of business and a negotiator, rather than an orator. He was a good listener.

It was this Parliament that passed the famous Petition of Right, that cornerstone of English liberty, which made illegal:

- Levying of any tax or charge without the consent of parliament.
- Imprisonment of any citizen on the King's word alone.
- Billeting of soldiers without payment in peacetime.

Following this, the Commons voted the King a grant of £350,000, but he wanted more, and decided that the Petition of Right did not cover the ancient tax of tunnage and poundage. The House launched a counter attack against the Royal customs officers, in which Hampden made his first recorded speech. Charles also appointed William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury and encouraged him to re-introduce elaborate ceremonial into the Church of England. The opposition, led by Eliot, decided on a protest against those who made Popish or Arminian innovations in religion on one hand, and against those who advised the illegal taking or paying of tunnage and poundage. The Speaker, who was a King's man, refused to allow any speeches, but Denzil Holles and Benjamin Valentine held him down in his chair, with Holles roaring, 'God's wounds. You shall sit till we please to rise!' The protest was read out, and the House dissolved. It was not to meet again for eleven years.

Within days nine members of the House were imprisoned in the Tower. Hampden was not among them, but Eliot was, and so began a correspondence between them which is both illuminating and moving. Fifteen letters from Eliot to Hampden, and nine from Hampden to Eliot survive. Their deep regard for each other shines out in their writings, which, despite the dire circumstances, abound with good humour. In one letter Hampden wrote:

Sir, I write indeed rather to let you know that you are frequent in my thoughts than for any business that at the moment requires it; and if those thoughts can contrive anything that might conduce to my friend's service, I should entertain them with much affection.

When Eliot wrote to say that the Lieutenant of the Tower had been appointed as an emissary to Brussels, Hampden replied good-humouredly, 'You were far enough above my emulation before; but, breathing now the same air with an ambassador, you are out of all aim'. Hampden also kept a fatherly eye on Eliot's two sons while they were at Oxford University, and frequently entertained them at Great Hampden.

The conditions of his imprisonment affected Eliot's health, and he steadfastly refused to submit to the King. Eventually, in November 1632 he died and even then Charles would not let his body be taken back to Port Huntingdon. Eliot was again the leading light, and if Hampden had been released with him, they had obviously learned to like and respect each other. Hampden served on fifteen committees in this Parliament, eight of them concerning religion. He earned a high reputation among his colleagues as a manager of business and a negotiator, rather than an orator. He was a good listener.
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he had interests in two colonial enterprises in the New World – the Massachusetts Bay Company and the Providence Company, and he probably owned some land in Connecticut. All these shareholders were Puritans and opponents of the King when in Parliament, and so under the guise of shareholders' meetings, what was, in effect, the Parliamentary opposition met at places like Broughton Castle, where there was a turret room impervious to eavesdroppers – The Room That Hath No Ears. Matters other than the Americas were certainly discussed.

Sadly, in 1634, Hampden's beloved wife Elizabeth died. That theirs had been a love match is evident from the epitaph he composed for her memorial in Great Hampden church, and he obviously felt her loss very deeply.

So here we have this able and talented man, deprived of his wife and companion, deprived of his work in Parliament, kicking his heels in the Chilterns, with little to occupy him. True, he had the Hampden estates to run, but I imagine that by now he had got that down to a fine art. True, he had his work as a JP, such as seeing to the maintenance of highways and bridges, and regulating the sale of corn in the market towns, but was this enough? There is a story that at this time he and Cromwell decided to emigrate to America, and were actually waiting on the dockside in London when they were prevented by an order of the King. It seems unlikely that Hampden would abandon his estates and responsibilities in this way, especially as his son was still a minor. It is possible that after the loss of his wife he may have decided to make a visit to the New World to get away for a while. If the emigration story is true, the King made a grave tactical error!

And then, in 1635, occurred the event that was to propel John Hampden into the national limelight. Ship Money! This was an ancient tax on the coastal counties to provide ships in times of national emergency. Charles had tried to impose it in 1628 but it proved so unpopular that he abandoned it. In any case, Parliament was sitting then, and he probably thought he could get the money by more conventional means. Now that he had no Parliament (and no intention of calling one if he could help it) he was advised in 1634 to try again. And it worked! There was grumbling, but because the tax was something hallowed by precedent, everyone paid up.

So the following year the writ was extended to all counties, and provoked a storm of protest. Such a tax was in clear contravention of the Petition of Right, and there was no national emergency. Buckinghamshire was required to provide a fully equipped ship of 450 tons with provisions for six months, or £4,500 in money. One can imagine how disappointed Charles would have been if he had got the ship, since it was the money he was after! In the event, he got no ship and only about half the money, so the next year he issued a third Ship Money writ. Many refused to pay, including John Hampden. Lord Saye and Sele tried to get the King to prosecute him, but instead the King settled on Hampden, probably because he was a quiet, inoffensive commoner whereas Saye and Sele was a noisy and aggressive peer. Another tactical error!

Hampden had obviously been assessed on all his lands, and I do not have the total amount, but the important assessment was the twenty shillings on his Stoke Mandeville property. As Edmund Burke was later to say, 'Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr Hampden's fortune? Not but the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave.' And that was the point. Irrespective of the amount, the tax was illegal. Furthermore, Hampden was objecting on behalf of his tenants, many of whom were farmers and smallholders who could not afford to be mulcted by the Crown at will. In Great Kimble church is a copy of the roll listing the freeholders who met there to affirm their opposition. Hampden's name is at the top, with the twenty shillings charge against his name, but there are many others with much smaller amounts. He was fighting for them.

So in February 1637 a writ was issued against Hampden requiring him to show cause why he had not paid the 20 shillings assessment. When the case commenced in the Court of Exchequer Chamber in the autumn, Hampden's counsel Oliver St. John addressed the judges for three days, after which the Solicitor General responded for another three days. Robert Holbourne then spoke on Hampden's behalf for another four days, after which the Attorney General summed up. There is no record of how long he spoke, but the twelve judges then adjourned until the Hilary term of 1638, when their verdict would be given.

This case became nationally famous. The law fascinated Englishmen of the seventeenth century, and they were always ready to resort to it, so there was enormous interest in the proceedings. Hampden's name was on everyone's lips. In his History of the Great Rebellion, the Royalist Clarendon wrote of Hampden at the trial:
Before this he was rather of reputation in his own country (meaning Buckinghamshire) than of public discourse or fame in the kingdom, but then he grew the argument of all tongues, every man enquiring who it was that durst at his own charge support the liberty and property of the kingdom, and rescue his country from being made a prey to the court.

And he added that Hampden's carriage throughout that agitation was with that rare temper and modesty that they who watched him narrowly to find some advantage against his person, to make him less resolute in his cause, were compelled to give him a just testimony. And the judgement that was given against him infinitely more advanced him than the service for which it was given.

That judgement, when it was finally delivered in June 1638, was 7-5 in favour of the King, but it was a Pyrrhic victory. Clarendon wrote that the decision 'left no man anything he could call his own'. Resistance to the tax increased, and in 1639 no one in Buckinghamshire appears to have paid anything. Within two years the King was forced to call Parliament again. Clarendon wrote of Hampden,

When this parliament began, the eyes of all men were fixed on him as their Patria pater, and the pilot that must steer their vessel through the tempest and rocks which threatened it. And I am persuaded his power and interest at that time was greater to do good or hurt than any man's in the kingdom, or any man of his rank hath had in any time; for his reputation for honesty was universal, and his affections seemed so publicly guided that no corrupt or private ends could bias them.

In 1640 Hampden occupied the same position as that of his descendant Winston Churchill exactly three centuries later. And it is, of course, from Patria pater that we get the word Patriot, by which name John Hampden has been known ever since.

What of the character of this remarkable man? We in the John Hampden Society who admire Hampden tend to look upon him as a flawless character who embodies all the virtues and none of the faults. In his biography of Hampden, Professor John Adair writes that 'he seems to have inherited a good nature, so that people found him easy and pleasant in conversation. He carried himself well in society and attracted people into friendship with him.' Professor Adair also writes of Hampden's 'flowing courtesy to all men.' The Royalist Sir Philip Warwick said of Hampden, 'He was certainly a person of the greatest abilities of any of that party. He had a great knowledge both on Scholarship and in the Law', while Clarendon believed that he had 'the most absolute faculties to govern the people of any man I ever saw.'

But whatever his qualities, Hampden was no plaster saint. There is a story about a quarrel he is supposed to have had with another landowner over a bridge for which they were jointly responsible for the maintenance. Apparently, Hampden stood on his side of the boundary shaking his stick in rage at his opponent. I like that; it makes my hero somehow more human.

And what would have happened if John Hampden had not been mortally wounded at Chalgrove? My wife Annabel has a rather simplistic answer when the subject crops up and someone asks, 'Who was John Hampden?' She replies, 'If he had lived, he would have been Oliver Cromwell'!

I cannot say I totally agree with this. John Pym, who was the leader in Parliament, died in late 1643, so Hampden may well have given up all military involvement and taken on Pym's mantle. They had, after all, worked closely together before the Civil War, and Hampden was not a natural soldier. In view of the respect and admiration in which Cromwell held his cousin, Hampden may have been able to restrain Cromwell's support and encouragement of the religious Independents within the Army, and been better able to negotiate with the King. In such a case, I do not believe Charles would have been executed.

Dr Paul Hooper thinks differently, and believes that Hampden never forgave the King for Eliot's death. In a recent article he wrote that, at the time of the passing of the Grand Remonstrance, it is said that Hampden remarked, 'The King must put himself and his family entirely into our hands.' I think the operative phrase here is, 'it is said'. Like so much concerning John Hampden, there is no firm evidence, just hearsay. In any case, such a statement does not necessarily signify a desire to execute the King. I prefer to think of Hampden's fair-minded behaviour during the Act of Attainder against the Earl of Strafford, when he insisted that the Earl's counsel be heard, and then abstained from the vote. To me, Hampden
John Hampden's life was not really a rise from obscurity, more a case of the hour producing the man.

Roy Bailey was a founder member of the John Hampden Society and has served as Secretary and Vice-Chairman. Roy writes occasionally on beer, brewing and pubs and runs a company making Berkshire cider. After National Service in Germany and Cyprus with the 1st Bn The Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light Infantry, Roy joined the film industry as a cameraman. Latterly, he ran his own production company before retiring.

Present-day politicians, and present-day political controversy, are not well informed about history. This is a modern development. In the seventeenth century, the century of John Hampden and Oliver Cromwell, political thinking was largely historical thinking. Constitutional rights and wrongs were determined by appeals to precedent and to ancient practice. Political conduct was explained, or recommended, on the basis of historical experience: of the wisdom accumulated by previous generations, and of the detection of parallels with behaviour in past societies — classical, biblical, medieval, Renaissance. It is hard to say when it was that politics ceased, for better or worse, to be so backward-looking, but at least until around 1900 public political consciousness was steeped in history and was extensively shaped and supported by citations of it.

Today's political audience sees the past as a foreign country, where 'they do things differently'. Our sense of historical relativism distances the past from us. But at least until the Romantic movement, and perhaps well beyond it, people were more conscious of the similarities between the past and the present than of the differences. History, which today we are told never repeats itself, was thought to repeat itself all the time: never exactly, of course, but the differences were regarded as local variations of time and place which should not obscure the permanent features of human behaviour. The past was thus a storehouse, or database, of examples which could be applied or compared to the present, and which politicians and political observers ignored at their peril.

It was also full of heroes. Today we are told that people need role models. Mostly those models are present-day ones. The role models of earlier times belonged mainly to the past. A large part of political education consisted in the identification, the study, and the celebration of the great and virtuous men of the past, whose example was held up for inspiration and emulation. And if there were heroes there were also villains, whose example, by the same token, should be deterrents from present-day evil.

No event of English history has so mesmerised posterity as the civil wars of the mid-seventeenth century. No episode has been more frequently invoked for contemporary purposes. Tories and Whigs (and then Tories and Liberals, and even Tories and Socialists) have sometimes seen themselves, sometimes been portrayed by their enemies, as the heirs of the Cavaliers.
and Roundheads. Anglicans and Nonconformists have seen themselves, or each other, as the heirs of the civil war Churchmen and Puritans.

Of those who, in the civil war, sat in parliament and fought in battles, two names have drawn more attention from posterity than any others: Oliver Cromwell and John Hampden. To their importance in their own time we can add the importance of their afterlives (afterlives in this world rather than in the next world, a subject on which we are short of evidence, though in Cromwell's case there has been plenty of confident speculation, by both the friends and the enemies of his memory, about the destination of his soul). Today's historians of the civil war have little time for afterlives. Those historians see themselves as varnish-strippers, who get to the plain truth, which the passions and distortions of posterity have hidden. Yet the imaginative hold that posthumous reputations have exerted has its own lessons. I shall therefore look at the posthumous reputations — until around 1900, when the past was losing its capacity to inflame the present — of Hampden and Cromwell, and see what we can learn by comparing them.¹

But first I must enter a caveat, standing as I do near Buckinghamshire soil, among people who know a great deal more about the county's history than I do. I will be talking mainly about national reputations, not about local ones. Up to a certain point, the local standing of local heroes is likely to show us the national pattern in microcosm. But it is also likely to have a life of its own; and the surviving reminders of the vitality of Hampden's local reputation are legion. Today his name is, I think, much better known within Buckinghamshire than outside it: a pattern that is not paralleled, at least on any comparable scale, in Cromwell's reputation in and around the Fens.

Much more has been written about Cromwell's national reputation than about Hampden's, and its outline is by now, I hope, fairly clear.² At the cost of considerable, but defensible, simplification, we can, in the modern manner, call Cromwell's reputation a game of two halves. In the later seventeenth and through the eighteenth century he is predominantly a villain: in the nineteenth century he becomes a hero. For more than a century after the Restoration, the civil wars lay in the public memory as a nightmare. Constitutional breakdown, social disruption, regicide, military rule, sectarian anarchy, were hideous recollections. There were plenty of people who thought that the Long Parliament had been right to challenge Charles I through constitutional means, and some (though not so many) who thought it had had no alternative but to go to war with him. But the aftermath of the war, which brought Cromwell to the fore, was another matter. He had been — it was said — the instrument, not of constitutional liberty, but of military despotism. And his faith, as seen by the age of reason and by the Enlightenment — the faith which had sacrificed constitutional propriety to fundamentalist belief and had justified military rule with the sanction of divine approval — was now viewed as a terrible fanaticism. Royalist and Tory writers portrayed Cromwell as a monster or demon, and few Whigs writers dared, even when they wanted to, to come to his defence.

Indeed he incurred at least as much hatred on the Whig as on the Tory side. To constitutionalist-minded Whigs, the defenders of the ancient constitution and of the liberties, which, they believed the Stuarts had invaded, Cromwell was an embarrassment. They preferred to remember the Revolution of 1688, the cautious, aristocratic, bloodless revolution that had preserved the institutions of church and state and adapted them to the needs of liberty: the sort of revolution, they thought, at which John Hampden had aimed. But there were other Whigs — radicals and republicans — to whom Cromwell was something much worse than an embarrassment. These were the people, a small but articulate minority — and a minority active in the writing of history — who dared to justify, or at least half-justify, the revolution of 1649: the abolition of monarchy and the House of Lords, and the introduction of the republic. To them, the Revolution of 1688 had not gone nearly far enough. They looked back to the Commonwealth regime of 1649-53, which Cromwell's military coup had destroyed. That had been England's lost republican moment. From Slingby Bethel in the later seventeenth century to Catharine Macaulay in the later eighteenth, Cromwell was the man to whose personal ambition, and to whose usurpation of power in becoming Lord Protector at the end of 1653, republican virtue and principle had been sacrificed.

So — in modern terms — right and left united against his memory and made him, until well into the nineteenth century, a public ogre. But historical reputations are never quite so simple. Let me therefore qualify the picture. First, while no one justified the means by which, or the motives with which, Cromwell had risen to power, there was a widespread acknowledgement — sometimes even among Tories, though never among republicans — that he had put it to some good uses. If there is a single theme that dominates political language from the late seventeenth century to the late eighteenth, it is corruption. In the seventeenth century the executive had tried to rule without parliaments. Having lost that battle, it now sought, through the placemen supplied by an expanded civil service, to dominate and tame them. Previously the legislature, and the people it represented, had been...
threatened by arbitrary or absolute rule: now it was being emasculated — it was claimed — by venal rule. So was England’s power abroad. Especially at times of diplomatic or military weakness or humiliation — under Walpole; in the early stages of the Seven Years War; in the war for America — the new oligarchy was reviled as much for its failures on that front as for its corruption at home. In comparison the rule of Cromwell, however wicked in origin and intention, seemed to have had its virtues. It became a stick with which to beat modern rulers. On slender evidence, historians insisted on the incorruptibility, and on the consequent dynamism, of the Protectorate: on its immunity to bribery, and on the regime’s respect for the independence and quality of the judiciary. This record, even anti­republicans admitted, put both the early and the later Stuarts to shame. So, still more did the achievements of Cromwell’s army and navy, before which Continental monarchs, who were so scornful of the England of the Stuarts, trembled. Thus Cromwell, the man who wickedly deprived England of its lawful king, had also been the sort of king — rather like the ideal patriot king for whom opponents of the eighteenth-century oligarchy sighed — that England needed now.

Secondly, there were those who remembered the toleration and protection that Cromwell had given to Puritan religious groups: groups, which, after the Restoration, had returned to the experience of persecution and proscription. Though the Toleration Act of 1689 restored their freedom of worship, it did not restore their civil rights, which were returned only in the nineteenth century. In the later seventeenth and through the eighteen­century, Dissent or Nonconformity, on the whole, kept its political head down. The memory of its political ascendancy in the mid-seventeenth­century was an embarrassment to a body, which was anxious to earn toleration by proving its political reliability and respectability. Even so, whispers of Nonconformist gratitude to Cromwell’s memory can be heard.

If the whispers are only occasional, that may be because, here as elsewhere, the evidence is by its nature distorted. Historical evidence is what survives of what people wrote down. But what people write — or at any rate what they publish — may be different from what they say. Few writers and few publishers dared to espouse Cromwell’s political and religious radicalism. The overwhelming body of published material was hostile to him. Yet why, after all, was it necessary to keep attacking him? From the later seventeenth century to the early nineteen­century we find writers who, even as they vilified him, acknowledged that he had admirers: admirers whose sentiments the attacks on him were written to counter.

Nonetheless, the current of opinion ran with anti-Cromwellianism. It has never died. Readers of the letter­pages of our national newspapers will notice that for many people he remains an ogre (though he often appears, too, in more favourable guise, as a champion of ‘parliamentary democracy’ — no mean feat for a man whose troops four times broke up parliaments and to whom, as to the rest of his generation, the word ‘democracy’ would have been anathema). But the demonic view of Cromwell has become, at least within the lettered world, a minority one. From the early nineteenth century the villain became, slowly but surely, the hero. By the century’s end, the time when the statue to him was erected at Westminster, he was widely described as the greatest of all Englishmen, even as the greatest man, or at least one of the greatest men, in the history of the world. Larger than life when portrayed as a villain, he was no less so when represented as a hero.

Why did the villain become the hero? A number of forces were at work. The first is the product of the Napoleonic wars and of the Industrial Revolution, those massive challenges to national resolve and unity, which seemed to call for a new kind of political leadership. Eighteenth­century heroes were preservers of the status quo, which, in politics, meant defenders of liberty against the encroachments of prerogative or innovation. Nineteenth-century heroes were men of action and initiation, who mastered and directed great movements of society and politics: the kind of hero celebrated in the 1840s by Thomas Carlyle, whose edition of Cromwell’s letters and speeches had massive sales and created a new literary base for Cromwellianism.

Secondly there was the rise of popular and working-class radicalism, and of the movements for parliamentary and social reform. Eighteenth­century heroes had come from the nobility and the substantial gentry. Cromwell had been derided for his relatively low social status, especially for his family’s brewing of beer. But in the nineteenth century he became the champion of the middling and lower orders, and the devotee of radical and liberal debating societies and Mechanics Institutes. It is hard for us now to recapture the passions which his name aroused. In 1852 the Watlington Mutual Improvement Society, after a debate which lasted seven winter evenings and which produced, according to the local newspaper, speeches of ‘great research, power and eloquence’, resolved that ‘a better Christian’ than Cromwell, ‘a more noble-minded spirit, a greater warrior, a more constant man has scarcely ever appeared on the face of the earth’.5 (We don’t know what amendments were put before the motion was carried.) Cromwell came to represent the Other England, the downtrodden part of
the nation: a part less reverential towards constitutional forms and niceties. His readiness to smash the Long Parliament by force in 1653, which had shocked earlier generations of Whigs, now thrilled radicals who saw, in the Long Parliament, a mirror of the oppressive, unreformed parliaments of their own time. With the New Model Army he had swept aside the feeble peace-party generals and politicians on his own side, who clung to aristocratic notions of chivalry and honour. The aristocracy of England, explained the lecturer Edmund Clarke to the Manchester Mechanics Institute in 1846, "have always regarded" Cromwell as their chief enemy, for he "infused the loftiest energy in the common people, and showed that there was a soul in the plebeian, and a might in his arm, before which the aristocrat and his retainer were as dry twigs before the blast." In the eighteenth century the great merit of the Self-Denying Ordinance of 1645, the measure that made the creation of the New Model Army possible, was that it had been a 'corruption bill', a means to stop MPs holding lucrative offices, which curbed their independence. In the nineteenth century the great merit of the ordinance was to have purged 'titled incapables' from the parliamentary command.

Popular radicalism was the major force in the Cromwellianism of the first half of the nineteenth century. In the second half it partly merged with, and was partly subordinated to, a second force: Nonconformity. As, in the struggle between church and chapel, Nonconformity grew in numbers and confidence, it shed the political deference and timidity that had characterised it since the Restoration, and learned to rejoice in the memory of its political ascendancy in the civil wars. In 1873 the Dissenting magazine The Congregationalist called for an end to two centuries of humiliating subordination to secular Whig leaders, and looked behind them 'to those sublime days when our forefathers held sway in England. If we have served under Somers, Walpole, Fox, Grey and Russell, we have reigned with Cromwell.'

Thirdly there is a change in the climate of political thought, which made not only Cromwell himself, but the whole parliamentary cause, easier to defend. The divine right of kings was dead. Toryism had become a thoroughly parliamentary creed. There was plenty of nostalgia for the chivalry of civil-war royalists, and among high-church Anglicans there was much admiration for the regime of Archbishop Laud. But Charles I's political programme found ever fewer defenders. Besides - once England had got over the hump of the 1840s, with its hardships and revolutionary dangers - the horrors of the regicide, an event now two centuries or more in the past, lost its power to horrify. By the end of the century, Cromwell, among lettered people anyway, had lost most of his power to horrify too. He even found admirers - selective admirers - among Tories and imperialists, who came to think of him as the founder of the British Empire.

John Hampden has probably never been loved, and surely never been hated, with the intensity that Cromwell has aroused. He has been the respectable face of the Roundhead cause, while Cromwell - to the pleasure of some, the contempt of others - has been the unrespectable one. At the coronation of George V, a handsome statue of Hampden, bearing an inscription of studied loyalty, was erected in Aylesbury. It was the same king who vetoed a proposal by Winston Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty, to name a battleship after Cromwell. Far less is known about Hampden's reputation than about Cromwell's. A very useful book by Peter Karsten, Patriot-Heroes in England and America, published in 1978, and undeservedly little known, has a great deal of valuable information, but the subject, which for Karsten is part of a larger one, has never been confronted head-on. Let us see what we can make of it. If Cromwell's great century is the nineteenth, Hampden's great era begins in the middle of the eighteenth century and ends in the middle of the nineteenth. Thereafter, as Cromwell's standing soars, Hampden's declines.

In the material from which the reputations of Cromwell and Hampden were built, there are five conspicuous contrasts. First, Hampden's life was cut short. There are those who have speculated about what would have happened if either man had lived longer. A number of Cromwell's admirers have maintained that, if he had survived ten years longer, the Puritan Revolution would have endured and England would have been spared the reaction of the Restoration. But at least Cromwell lived long enough, not merely to see parliament win the war, but to shape the aftermath. Hampden's conduct in the wake of a parliamentary victory has to be a matter of speculation.

Secondly, Cromwell's life and mind bequeathed a much fuller documentary record than Hampden's. His personality, if not necessarily better understood than Hampden's, is better known. His speeches, though not brought together until the 1840s, were known from his own century. More of his letters survived, and in the main they came sooner into the public domain. Where evidence is wanting, imagination steps in. Hampden has been the more easily idealised of the two men: the more easily turned into a plaster-saint. Cromwell's admirers have delighted to quote words and cite
incidents that illustrate his qualities and give individuality and particularity to his character. Hampden’s admirers have resorted more frequently to adjectival phrasing. He often seems, in their accounts, less an individual than a type, on to whose personality there have been projected stock perceptions of gentility or valour or resolution.

There is, of course, one vivid portrait of Hampden’s personality by a contemporary: the one which appears in the History of the Rebellion by Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon, written in the later 1640s, revised under Charles II, and published in 1702. It is a mixed portrait. On the one hand there is Clarendon’s awed tribute to the range and depth of Hampden’s abilities, to his civility and affability and courage. On the other there are the craft, the subtlety, the cunning, the dissimulation, features that until 1642 took people in – Hyde, we are left to infer, among them – and that made Hampden so dangerous an enemy to the institutions of church and state. Hampden’s admirers had an easy solution to this challenge. They attributed Clarendon’s criticisms to sour grapes: to resentment at Hampden’s success with Cromwell, whose fame lies as a maker of events and as an imposer of discipline, to his civility and affability and courage.

In 

Hampden is famous above all for two episodes: for the ship money trial, which demonstrated the connection of liberty both with property and with parliamentary consent; and then for his role as one of the five members of the Commons whom Charles I disastrously tried to arrest in January 1642. In both those episodes he is, at least as his admirers have represented him, a victim or martyr – or, in the second instance, an intended one. In both instances he defies power. He does not occupy it. Here is the third contrast with Cromwell, whose fame lies as a maker of events and as an imposer of his will. Of course, those two episodes are only the most celebrated moments of Hampden’s career. Elsewhere we see him on the offensive, as a shaper of policy, as a manager of men in parliament, and as a brave soldier. Yet it was on these fonts that Hampden was vulnerable to detraction, and it was here that Tory critics aimed their fire. Fewer writers have criticised his stand over ship money; and though some Tories have found means of disparaging or mocking it, none of them has vilified it – or him. In Clarendon’s account, after all, ship money, and the behaviour of the judges who supported it, are grave errors. In the mid-eighteenth century David Hume teased Whiggish historians who idolised Hampden’s conduct in the early 1640s, which, in Hume’s account, were presented as seditious and as animated by ambition. But Hume is unqualified in his praise of ‘the heroism of Hampden’s conduct’ over ship money, a tax that, at least since the Revolutionary settlement of 1689, had been hard to defend. Hume – who had his Whig as well as his Tory side – associated Hampden’s stand with ‘the care of all English patriots to guard against the first encroachments of the Crown’ and with ‘the existence, at this day, of English liberty’.

Fourthly, ship money was a secular issue, not a religious one. It did have implications for Puritans, because a Crown, which could tax at will, would be able to promote Laudianism at will. But the basis of objection to it was legal and constitutional, not biblical or spiritual. This suited Hampden’s eighteenth-century admirers, who were glad to distance him from the fanaticism, or ‘enthusiasm’, with which civil war Puritanism was commonly charged. Fortunately the evidence of Hampden’s Puritanism supplied by his letters – and it is anyway not substantial evidence – had yet to come to light. Cromwell’s Puritanism, by contrast with Hampden’s, was inescapable.

Finally, there is a class difference. It is now argued that Hampden’s wealth and status have been exaggerated, and that until the ship money trial he had only limited standing in his county. But eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century admirers followed the account of his neighbour and fellow-statesman Bulstrode Whitelocke, who described him not only as ‘of an ancient family’, which he obviously was, but ‘of a great estate’. With status went the accoutrements of gentility and courtesy. Thus in 1757 Biographia Britannica contrasted Hampden’s ‘smoothness and complaisance’ with Cromwell’s ‘roughness and unpolishedness’.

From the Restoration to the early nineteenth century, Hampden’s gentility, and his stand on a secular and legal issue, worked as finely in his favour as the opposite characteristics worked against Cromwell’s. In the nineteenth century, on both issues, the tide would turn in Cromwell’s favour; but that was in the future. In 1680, during the exclusion crisis, when the prospect that ‘[16]41’ would ‘come again’ seemed imminent, a minister was arrested and brought to the bar of the House of Commons for traducing Hampden’s name – not something that could conceivably have happened to a maligener of Cromwell. Under the early Hanoverians it would have been unimaginable for Cromwell to be eulogised alongside Hampden in James Thompson’s poetry, where Hampden ‘stemmed the torrent of a downward age/ To slavery prone’. It would have been unimaginable for Cromwell to appear, as Hampden does, in the Temple of Worthies in the gardens of
Stowe, where the inscription tells us that Hampden 'with great courage and consummate abilities...began a noble opposition to the arbitrary court, in defence of the liberties of his country, supported them in parliament, and died for them in the field.' The eighteenth-century Hampden was the friend of liberty and the enemy of power. Not until, in the nineteenth century, power could seem an instrument of liberty could Cromwell acquire libertarian credentials. Thomas Gray's 'Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard', probably written in the later 1740s, does place Cromwell alongside 'some village Hampden' or 'mute inglorious Milton', but only on terms that recall Cromwell's 'guilt' for 'his country's blood'. In a draft of the poem the place, which the final version gives to Cromwell, is occupied by Caesar, the eliminator of his country's liberty, while Hampden and Milton are prefigured by Cato and Cicero, the champions of that freedom.\textsuperscript{11}

Clarendon did Hampden's character one great favour – a greater one than he can have known. 'His reputation for honesty', he wrote, 'was universal, and his affections seemed so publicly guided that no corrupt or private ends could bias them.' As usual, Clarendon praises only Hampden's 'reputation' – only what his attributes 'seemed'. We are left to wonder about the reality. Hampden's admirers bypassed that qualification. A Cavalier description of a Roundhead as incorruptible was a sure ticket to eighteenth-century admiration. Clarendon had also – again in a sceptical tone from which eighteenth-century readers detached it – described Hampden as a 'patriot'. In the eighteenth century, a patriot was one whose independence of mind, and whose defence of liberty, were inexorable and incorruptible. So Hampden duly became, what he is in the title of today's event, the 'patriot'. In the nineteenth century the word patriot would change its meaning. The term came to signify not (or not so much) a friend to liberty but a supporter of one's country against its external enemies – usually a supporter right or wrong. The nineteenth-century Cromwell was a patriot; but in the eighteenth century the palm of patriotism went to Hampden. The contemporary hero of eighteenth-century patriotism, for a time, was the elder Pitt, who rose, or appeared to rise, above faction. A cartoon of 1757 shows Pitt in confrontational dialogue with the wicked Cromwell, who is portrayed as a tempter. 'It's foolish to be honest', Cromwell advises him. 'Ancient traitor, I defy thee', comes the reply. But eleven years later Pitt had lost his patriot credentials. Now another cartoon lauded Hampden and other seventeenth-century patriots, but showed the apostate Pitt 'well mounted' on a broomstick inscribed 'Oliver Cromwell'.\textsuperscript{12}

Hampden's patriot credentials were well established by the middle of the eighteenth century. But it is in the 1760s and 1770s that his fame takes off. There were two reasons for this. First, there was the accession of George III, which toppled the Whig ascendency that had prevailed under George I and George II. George III's appointment, as his leading adviser, of the Earl of Bute, who was descended from England's Stuart kings and who seemed bent on reviving their policies, gave a new edge to memories of the civil war. Secondly there was the conflict in America. On both sides of the Atlantic the Sugar and Stamp Acts, and the principle 'no taxation without representation', prompted comparisons with ship money, and the record of Hampden's trial was widely published. The feelings of the colonies, observed that champion of the American cause Edmund Burke, 'were formerly those of Great Britain. Thens were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden.' Burke went on, in words that have often been remembered, 'Would twenty shillings have ruined Mr Hampden? No, but the payment of half that sum, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave.'\textsuperscript{13} In the United States, Hampden has had a celebrity and esteem as great as in England, though there was some falling off once America had gained its independence; and, as in England, there was a conspicuous decline from the mid-nineteenth-century.\textsuperscript{14}

On both sides of the Atlantic, the eighteenth-century Hampden found an intimate ally. His worshipers habitually associated him with the republican Algernon Sidney, a victim, like him, of the Stuart judiciary. Sidney fought for parliament in the civil war until he was badly wounded at Marston Moor, and he was one of the rulers of the republican regime of 1649-53. But it was as an opponent of Charles II that he won posthumous fame, partly for his Discourses on Government, which became a Whig political textbook, and partly for his death on the scaffold in 1683 on the trumped-up of treason that was shamelessly endorsed by Judge Jeffreys. It may be that the link between the two heroes was first made by James Thompson, who in 1730 inserted them into a new version of his poem The Seasons.\textsuperscript{15} But it is not until 1753 that we first meet the slogan 'The cause for which Hampden bled in the field and Sidney on the scaffold.' From the 1760s the slogan is everywhere. It gave a historical pedigree to present constitutional struggles, and it indicated a continuity between the issues of the 1630s and those of the 1680s – and thus between the two revolutions (the civil war and 1688) which they provoked. But the words were usefully vague, and they answered to many different perceptions, some moderate, some radical, of what the cause had involved. Its users were not always well informed.
Sometimes they got the two men the wrong way round, Sidney dying on the field and Hampden on the scaffold. In 1828 Macaulay - who was himself ready, as a Whig candidate for parliament, to appeal to the memory of Sidney's 'cause' in an election address - acknowledged that 'the cause for which Hampden bled on the field and Sidney on the scaffold is enthusiastically toasted by many an honest radical who would be puzzled to explain the difference between ship-money and the Habeas Corpus Act.'

With the reign of George III we enter a new era of radical popular politics, which begins with the travails of John Wilkes, whose experiences invited comparison with Hampden's and Sidney's. The writers and agitators among the new radicals took the two seventeenth-century figures to their hearts. John Thelwall named his sons John Hampden Thelwall and Algernon Sidney Thelwall. In 1795 Henry Yorke recalled 'the fate of the British patriots,' Hampden and Sidney above all, 'who perished in the last century.' Writers adopted the pseudonym 'Hampden' in demanding universal suffrage and the end of the rotten boroughs. During the Tory ascendancy of and after the Napoleonic wars the radicals equated modern oppressions - the Seditious Meetings Act, the Treasonable Practices Act, prosecutions for seditious libel - with those which Hampden had challenged. It took some boldness to invoke Hampden's and Sidney's names, for the excesses of the French Revolution, which damaged the Whigs by association and placed them on the defensive, restricted their scope for historical parallels.

In 1808 the Whig writer Francis Jaffray lamented that it had become 'unfashionable and, we are afraid, not very popular to talk of the tyranny of the Crown,' for fear that it might give rise spirits to invoke Hampden's 'name for seditious libel,' for the excesses of the French Revolution, which damaged the Whigs by association and placed them on the defensive, restricted their scope for historical parallels.

Sometimes they got the two men the wrong way round, Sidney dying on the field and Hampden on the scaffold. In 1828 Macaulay - who was himself ready, as a Whig candidate for parliament, to appeal to the memory of Sidney's 'cause' in an election address - acknowledged that 'the cause for which Hampden bled on the field and Sidney on the scaffold is enthusiastically toasted by many an honest radical who would be puzzled to explain the difference between ship-money and the Habeas Corpus Act.'

With the reign of George III we enter a new era of radical popular politics, which begins with the travails of John Wilkes, whose experiences invited comparison with Hampden's and Sidney's. The writers and agitators among the new radicals took the two seventeenth-century figures to their hearts. John Thelwall named his sons John Hampden Thelwall and Algernon Sidney Thelwall. In 1795 Henry Yorke recalled 'the fate of the British patriots,' Hampden and Sidney above all, 'who perished in the last century.' Writers adopted the pseudonym 'Hampden' in demanding universal suffrage and the end of the rotten boroughs. During the Tory ascendancy of and after the Napoleonic wars the radicals equated modern oppressions - the Seditious Meetings Act, the Treasonable Practices Act, prosecutions for seditious libel - with those which Hampden had challenged. It took some boldness to invoke Hampden's and Sidney's names, for the excesses of the French Revolution, which damaged the Whigs by association and placed them on the defensive, restricted their scope for historical parallels.

In 1808 the Whig writer Francis Jaffray lamented that it had become 'unfashionable and, we are afraid, not very popular to talk of the tyranny of the Crown,' for fear that it might give rise spirits to invoke Hampden's 'name for seditious libel,' for the excesses of the French Revolution, which damaged the Whigs by association and placed them on the defensive, restricted their scope for historical parallels.

Inevitably the Romantic movement was drawn to Hampden, as to Sidney. Byron joined the Hampden Club. Shelley's interest was keener still, especially in the years after Waterloo. He began a play called 'Charles the First', with Hampden as its hero. Around the same time, in 1817, the year in which a secret committee of the House of Commons reported that the Hampden Clubs were plotting revolution, Shelley and Thomas Love Peacock considered refusing to pay taxes, which they judged 'illegally imposed'. Shelley's wife, Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, in reporting this fact to Leigh Hunt, explained that the two men aspired to be Hampden's 'successors'. A few months later Mary, her husband, and her father the writer William Godwin travelled to Great Hampden to pay their respects to the monument.

The episode casts light on a passage, a perhaps rather contrived digression, in Mary's novel *Frankenstein*, published in 1818, where the protagonist, on his melancholy visit to Britain, journeys from Oxford to visit 'the tomb of the illustrious Hampden', and the field on which the illustrious patriot fell. 'For a moment my soul was elevated from its debasing and miserable fears, to contemplate the divine ideas of liberty and self-sacrifice, of which these sights were the monuments and the memorancers.' For the Romantics looked to Hampden as an emblem not only of resistance to tyranny but of the possibilities of human fulfilment. In 1812 Shelley's own 'blood boiled to think that Sidney's and Hampden's blood was wasted', a tragedy he blamed on men whose aim was 'to arrest the perfectibility of human nature'. Shelley's father-in-law Godwin, who thought Hampden 'one of the most extraordinary men in the records of mankind', believed that he had aspired to raise the minds of men 'to all that is excellent of which their nature was capable'. Godwin, whose approach at once points back to eighteenth-century attitudes and anticipates Victorian ones, found the 'crown' of Hampden's character in that imperviousness to 'corruption', which Clarendon had acknowledged.

Those words come from Godwin's four-volume *History of the Commonwealth*, published in 1828, the most authoritative account of the Puritan Revolution yet to have appeared. Three years later, as the movement for parliamentary reform neared its climax, Hampden's historical standing received further boosts, with the publication first of the biography by the radical politician George Lord Nugent (the younger brother of the Duke of Buckingham at Stowe), and then of Macaulay's long and enthusiastic and influential review of the book. In his youth Macaulay had been caught up in the Hampdenite mood of the years after the Napoleonic wars. In 1817 he
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called on 'Freedom' to continue to 'pour the holy ray/ Which soothed the
gloom of Sidney's parting day,[and]/ O'er Hampden's life its beams of glory
poured'.25 Despite his scepticism about the phrase that linked Hampden
with Sidney, Macaulay's admiration for Hampden was profound. The great
work of Macaulay's maturity, of course, would be his history of the
Revolution of 1688. But the earlier Macaulay had been drawn more to the
first of the seventeenth-century revolutions, that of 1640-60. Indeed from
the early nineteenth century we find the first revolution gaining in public
esteem at the expense of the second. Radical disapproval of the aristocratic
cautions and self-interestedness of 1688 intensified in the late eighteenth and
early nineteenth centuries. It was shared by Shelley, who blamed the wasting
of Hampden and Sidney's blood on the leaders of 1688. But more moderate
writers were also learning to prefer the earlier revolution, even if they
regretted that it had got out of control. Alongside Macaulay there was John
Forster, whose own eulogy of Hampden appeared among his studies of the
heroic statesmen of the early stages of the Long Parliament. The twenty or
thirty years after the Napoleonic wars are the era when historical
condemnations of the tyranny of Charles I were at their most vigorous and
intense. Forster pronounced that the personal rule of the 1630s, that
calculated attempt 'to trample into the dust...the laws and liberties of
England', had been 'the most vexatious and intolerable tyranny that ever
tortured body and soul at one'; and that only 'the gallantest fight for liberty
that had ever been fought by any nation in the world' had thwarted it.

At this stage, Hampden still held the upper hand over Cromwell. To
Forster, Cromwell was the vile usurper who betrayed the virtuous cause of
Hampden and his allies. Godwin's account was similar, though his
treatment of Cromwell was more nuanced. Macaulay reflected that
Hampden, had he only lived, would have been uniquely equipped to guide
and restrain the revolution and to prevent its descent, under Cromwell, into
military despotism and radical folly.26 For 'in Hampden, and in Hampden
alone, were united all the qualities which...were necessary to save the state,
the valour and energy of Cromwell, the discernment and eloquence of
Vane, the humanity and moderation of Manchester, the stern integrity of
Hale, the ardent public spirit of Sidney. Others might possess the qualities
which were necessary to save the popular party in the crisis of danger; he
alone had the power and the inclination to restrain its excesses in the hour
of triumph. Others could conquer; he alone could reconcile.' After
Hampden's death 'England missed the sobriety, the self-command, the
perfect soundness of judgement, the perfect rectitude of intention, to which

Other nineteenth-century writers, too, would portray Hampden as
England's lost leader. For although admiration for Hampden's resistance to
ship money persisted, the nineteenth century was at least as interested in his
powers of initiative and management and leadership. What the nineteenth
century emphasised, from Godwin and Macaulay to S.R. Gardiner, was
Hampden's unflinching sense of duty, his tireless readiness, at whatever
cost to personal interest or convenience, to meet the public need, from
which he would not 'shrink'.28 The eighteenth century had praised his
superiority to power and his resistance to its inducements: the nineteenth
emphasised his responsible use of it. There was also, in that era of high
parliamentary self-consciousness, a new stress on Hampden as a great
parliamentarian,29 as well as a perplexingly unfounded conviction that he
had been an 'exquisite orator'.30 Parliament honoured him, alone of the
parliamentarian soldiers, with a statue in St Stephen's Hall in the newly built
Palace of Westminster. Cromwell, despite popular protest, was denied one,
and had to wait until 1899 for the statue that in any case stands outside, not
within or even on the exterior walls of, the building.

Yet by the 1840s Cromwell's stature had come to rival Hampden's: not,
indeed, among MPs or within the Establishment, but among a wider public.
Not everyone, admittedly, felt the need to choose between the two men:
some emphasised that they had been allies as well as kinsmen, and
remembered what the parliamentary cause had owed to both. But to
Thomas Carlyle, the worshipper of Cromwell and the most influential
historian of the civil wars of his age, the reverence for Hampden was an
affront.31 Though in his youth Carlyle had held conventional Whiggish
sentiments about the civil wars, revering Hampden and despising Cromwell,
his tune had changed. He admitted that Hampden and his allies had had
their uses, even their virtues. Yet they now seemed to him to embody all
that he despised about the smug, godless parliamentary rule of the
nineteenth century, with its addiction to empty forms, to constitutional
neceties, to the falsities of oratory. Hampden and his fellow parliamentary
leaders were 'smooth-shaven respectabilities', who lacked the authenticity
and the spiritual depths of the 'rugged outcast' Cromwell. Resistance to ship
money, in any case, was to Carlyle a symbol of a deadening materialism, for
'a just man will have better cause than money to revolt'. Carlyle admitted
that Hampden had had, as the eighteenth century (which Carlyle loathed)
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had insisted, an 'unspotted' character. But where was the fire, the elemental engagement with the heart of the universe that Carlyle divined in Cromwell? Carlyle mocked Hampden's 'purerst linen' and contrasted it with Cromwell's indifference to clothing. And he compared Cromwell's thick, tremulous lips, those emblems of Oliver's greatness of soul, with Hampden's 'close thin lips', which reflected littleness of spirit.

Carlyle's preference for Cromwell colours his commentary on the one episode where we can confidently place Cromwell and Hampden in each other's company: the conversation recalled by Cromwell when, on 13 April 1657, he addressed parliament during the negotiations over parliament's offer of the Crown. Cromwell told MPs that - apparently in the wake of the Battle of Edgehill - he had proposed to Hampden, as the only means of beating the royalists, the formation of new regiments, which would be filled not with the 'tapsters' and 'base and mean fellows' on whom the Roundheads were relying but on God-fearing men of spirit. In Cromwell's account, Hampden replied 'that I [Cromwell] talked a good notion, but an impracticable one'. Hampden's admirers had tended to pass rapidly over this evidence, which, though it revealed Cromwell's respect for Hampden's memory, also showed Hampden to have faltered where Cromwell decisively acted. Carlyle rejoiced in it. So did other Victorian admirers of Cromwell, who read - or misread - his speech as evidence of lower-class sympathies. By the mid-nineteenth century Hampden's appeal to lower-class audiences had shrunk. In the earlier stages of radical and populist politics he had crossed the social divide, as had Algernon Sidney, with whose name his was so widely linked. But by the early nineteenth century, when working-class radicalism was developing its own momentum, Sidney (the son of an earl) had come to seem too aristocratic a figure to sustain a popular appeal. Hampden, whose great deed, after all, had been a defence of property rights, became vulnerable on the same front. The link made of Hampden's name to Sidney's came to smack of comfortable parliamentary Whiggism. Admirers of both men agreed that they were 'gentlemen', free from vulgarity and demagogism. That attribute became less and less of an advantage. In 1833, with the Whigs back in power after the Reform Act, Richard Carlile, a shoemaker's son and devotee of Thomas Paine, called for an end to the 'Whiggish' toasting of "Hampden that died in the field, and ... Sidney on the scaffold". That was all very well in its day, but that day has gone by, not again to return." This was an extreme view. The names of Hampden and Sidney remained dear to many Chartists and republicans of the 1840s. But by the 1850s the two men had come to seem too gentle and conventional to rouse fervent support.

The appeal that Hampden did retain in the later Victorian era was of two kinds. By comparison with Cromwell's it was muted, but it nonetheless has a story to tell. First, he became a Puritan, albeit one of a moderate and respectable kind. Macaulay acknowledged his Puritanism but distanced him from Puritan austerity and fanaticism: it was his achievement, Macaulay explained, to combine 'the morals of a Puritan' with 'the manners of an accomplished courtier'. Gradually, over the nineteenth century, a figure who had been praised for his secular and constitutional virtues was claimed to have had religious ones. For if the eighteenth century had been horrified by seventeenth-century Puritanism, the nineteenth century rediscovered it. Its attraction reached beyond the constituency of militant Nonconformity, which saw civil war Puritanism as its forebear. It met that Victorian taste, which extended to many people who could not subscribe to Puritan doctrine, for a religion of moral earnestness; here Macaulay, by equating Hampden's Puritanism with morality rather than with theology, had pointed the way. A range of Puritan heroes was assembled for Victorian (and sometimes Edwardian) taste: Cromwell, the writers Milton and Bunyan, the divines Thomas Goodwin and John Howe, the statesmen Hampden and the younger Vane. In the northern industrial towns and cities, that heartland of political Liberalism and of Nonconformity, statues (or sometimes stained-glass windows) of leading Puritans were put up in civic buildings and chapels. Hampden is often there, and often stands alongside Cromwell, as he does in the writings of such historians of Puritanism as Peter Bayne, W.B. Selbie, A.M. Fairburn and John Brown. If you go into the chapel of Mansfield College in Oxford, that Nonconformist foundation, you will see, among the range of stained-windows put up in 1908, Cromwell flanked by Vane and Hampden, with Milton and two Puritan divines below. But it is Cromwell who occupies the centre. Hampden has become his subordinate.

Secondly, Hampden became again, what he had been in the eighteenth century, an enemy of state power. In the eighteenth century that image had caught the spirit of the age. Now it caught only a diminishing spirit of protest. Hampden's stand against ship money appealed to local gentry, Tory and Anglican, who resented the state's intrusion into local affairs. In 1876 a critic of the 'despotic' London School Board, who signed himself 'John Hampden, ratepayer', described the ideal of providing state education for all as 'oppressive taxation' and compared the School Board to Charles I's
THE VERDICTS OF POSTERITY

Court of Star Chamber. 'Were he alive now', Hampden would have denounced 'this unconstitutional demand'. Two years earlier, in a similar spirit, an Oxford don urged Englishmen to embrace 'with reverence' the Hampdens', that 'moderate party of all ages', and 'recoil from the picturesque attractions of a strong government, whether of absolute monarchy'—i.e. like that of Charles I—'or military despotism'—like that of Cromwell. But the power of the state had come to stay. By the 1890s Hampden's stand against ship money was being questioned by proponents of a strong British navy.37

By then, too, we see the first signs of the decline of Nonconformity, that other surviving prop of Hampden's reputation. The same decline removed a principal base of the cult of Cromwell. We have watched the two men inspiring different and often conflicting emotions. Since the early twentieth century neither of them has aroused feelings on a remotely comparable scale. Short of a revolution in the way our society thinks about its past, I doubt if they ever will again.
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NEW EVIDENCE ON CROMWELL AND PRIDE'S PURGE, OR A RED HERRING?
by Dr Patrick Little

The enigmatic qualities of Oliver Cromwell are nowhere more apparent than in the events surrounding Pride’s Purge – the New Model Army’s direct intervention at Westminster on 6 December 1648, which resulted in the exclusion of many moderate or Presbyterian MPs from the Commons, and prevented a last-minute accommodation with Charles I. Traditionally, the Purge has been seen as the first step towards the ‘English Revolution’. With a Commons comprised of radicals, the rejection of the authority of the king, his trial before the commissioners of justice and his execution less than two months later seemed to follow an inexorable path. Inevitability of this process has been questioned in a recent collection of articles, but its starting point – for revisionists as well as for traditional historians – remains Pride’s Purge. And the central conundrum of the Purge is the apparent absence of the most influential officer in the New Model Army, Oliver Cromwell.

For much of the autumn of 1648 Cromwell had been in the north of England, commanding the troops who suppressed the pockets of resistance left behind after the chaotic retreat of the Duke of Hamilton’s army, defeated at Preston on 17 August. With the siege of Pontefract dragging on, Sir Thomas Fairfax ordered Cromwell to return to the army’s headquarters at Windsor, in a letter dated 28 November. Eight days later, on the evening of 6 December, Cromwell publicly entered London (which the army had occupied four days before), arriving only hours after the Purge of Parliament had ended. According to the best-known source for this episode, the memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Cromwell greeted news of the Purge with surprise, and ‘declared he had not been acquainted with this design; yet since it was done, he was glad of it, and would endeavour to maintain it’. Other contemporaries confirm Ludlow’s version of events. The writer of Mercatorius Elecetius, in his account of 6 December, comments that ‘King Noll came this afternoone to London, and in the evening to Whitehall’; and in his own gloss on the purge, Marchmont Nedham commented: ‘when all was said and done, in came Nol. Cromwell to Towne at night, as if he (poore man) had no hand in the Busines’.

Cromwell’s delay in coming south has caused immense problems for historians, who are suspicious that it took him eight days to reach London from Yorkshire, and incredulous that he did not know that the army
officers intended a political coup at Westminster. David Underdown, in his definitive study of the period, *Pride’s Purge*, has pieced together Cromwell’s itinerary in late November and early December. Fairfax’s orders were sent north on 28 November, and ‘A fast-riding courier could have brought the order to Pontefract within forty-eight hours. Cromwell could therefore have left by the 30th, and have been in London by Saturday, 2 December: this indeed, is what people at Windsor expected.’ Cromwell is known to have left for Nottingham on 1 December, ‘But he then took five days to cover roughly 135 miles from Nottingham to London’. The length of the delay involved leads Underdown to conclude that Cromwell was ‘a reluctant accomplice of the revolution’. Other historians have followed Underdown’s account of Cromwell’s movements, but added their own analysis of his motives. Barry Coward sets out the possible options, concluding that the delay could either show Cromwell’s ‘political guile’ or his ‘genuine indecision’ when faced with a political powder keg. For Peter Gaunt, ‘His behaviour during this crucial period suggests a man still undecided, an accomplice after the fact, rather than a committed supporter of the army’s coup’. Colin Davies comes closest to taking Ludlow at face value: Cromwell ‘accepted what had happened but to what extent he had been consulted beforehand it is now impossible to say’. John Adamson is more robust in voicing suspicions that the delay in coming south was ‘almost certainly deliberate’, and he concludes that Cromwell ‘wholly approved of the army’s actions, yet saw a political advantage in distancing himself from direct involvement’. John Morrill is also sceptical, placing the leisurely march south among those other convenient episodes in Cromwell’s career, ‘in which his denials of foreknowledge and responsibility strain credulity’. Morrill’s list includes Cromwell’s exemption from the Self-Denying Ordinance, his claim of lack of involvement in the seizure of the king in June 1647 and in the escape of the king to the Isle of Wight later in the same year.

In each of these cases – and more – Cromwell was the beneficiary of initiatives of which he pleads ignorance. The frustrating thing is that his guilt cannot be conclusively established in any of them. Can there be so much smoke without fire?

The debate on Cromwell’s movements, and therefore his motives, turns on the truth of contemporary accounts that the general first arrived in London on the evening of 6 December. Blair Worden has exposed Ludlow’s
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...
been appended to ensure that a quorum was reached. This was clearly not the case in the Eastern Association warrant of 2 December 1648, however, as other surviving warrants from the same period include as few as four signatures, and five was the norm, so six was a superabundance. But it is more than likely that Cromwell was encouraged to sign the warrant later because of his special interest in its business, which concerned garrisons in his own local area. This would explain why his signature appears on the warrant for the payment of the garrisons, but is absent from the other surviving Eastern Association warrant of 2 December, which deals with humdrum printing costs. The hypothesis that Cromwell signed the warrant later is supported by the position of the signature on the warrant. It was usual for signatories to begin in a column down the right hand side of the page, followed by further columns to the left. On the 2 December warrant this would place Mildmay and Cromwell last – a suggestion confirmed by the way in which Mildmay’s signature runs over that of Wauton in the right hand column. So it appears that Mildmay signed later than the others; and that the final signatory was Oliver Cromwell. The receipts appended to the warrant, recording when the money was paid to the individuals concerned by the treasurer of the committee, show that the first payment was made on 15 December. So Cromwell had definitely approved the warrant by the middle of the month, but the irregular practice of committees means that we cannot be confident that he signed it before his public entrance to London on the evening of 6 December.

It is tempting to speculate that Cromwell entered London privately on 2 December, met his friends at the committee (and presumably at the army headquarters as well), but waited four days before making his very public entry on 6 December, once Pride’s Purge had been completed. But such speculation runs too far ahead of the evidence, and (as some will no doubt argue) takes us beyond the realms of probability. Ludlow and other contemporaries explicitly state that Cromwell did not arrive in London until the evening of 6 December, and this is the view of later historians – whether that of specialists of the later 1640s or biographers of Cromwell himself. In any case, how could someone as well known as ‘King Noll’ enter London incognito, and then lie low for four days? With doubts about the dating of the signature on the warrant unresolved, it would perhaps be safer to assume that Cromwell was not in London on 2 December 1648, but was plodding slowly south at the head of his troops.
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PRO, SP 28/251, unfol.:

Die Sabt 2° Decembr 1648

Att the Committee of Lords & Commons for the Eastern Association

Whereas there are divers Arrears still due and unpaid by the several counties of the Eastern Association upon ye Ordinances of the third of September 1645 and 6th of August 1646 for maintenance of ye late Garrisons there, wch by reason of the late and present distempers cannot as yet be brought in for satisfaccon of divers debts formerly ordered by several warrants of this committee to be paid out of those Arrears to the several Officers undemanded for pay owing to them and to some of their companies for their services in some of the said Garrisons; And whereas the sume of sowe hundred pounds disposeable by warrant of this committee was received by yow from ye Comrs of Excise for one halfe yeares Interest due the first of Septembr last for the Tenn thousand pounds payable to this committee by Ordinance of Parliament of the 22th of february last for reimbursement of monies formerly advanced and lent by the said counties for ye use of the three Regiments of horse lately imploied under ye severall Comands of Major Le Hunt, Major Gibb, and Major Haynes in Reducing of Newarke, over and above the Twenty thousand pounds payable out of the Excise by another Ordinance of the said 22th of february last; And for as much as this committee upon serious consideracon had thereupon doe now thinke fitt and soe order, that the severall Officers under menconed shall now receive respectively, the summes hereafter expressed (for wch they have long attended to their great prudence) out of ye said Interest money for supply of their and some of their companies pressing necessities; And that the committees of the said counties may reimburse themselves out of their said Arrears such proportion of the said Interest money as shall appeare to this committee to be due to them upon their Accompts. These are therefore to will and require yow out of the said sowe hundred pounds, or soe much thereof as yet remaynes in yer hands undisposed off forthwith to pay unto Captaine Richard Moyse fiftie pounds, Captaine francis ffrench fiftie pounds, Captaine Symon West fiftie pounds, and to Captaine Peter Speakerd fiftie six pounds fifteene shillings & six pence in pte of the Arrears of pay owde[j] to them and their several companies for their services in ye Garrison of Lynn Regis; And likewise to Captaine John Smith sixtie pounds, And to Ensigne Mathew Malory ffortie
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pounds in parte of the Arreares of pay due to them for their services in the late Garrison of Newport Pagnell, and to John Dudley Mr Gunner in the late Garrison of Cambridge seaven pounds twelve shillings and six pence; And this together with the respective Acquittances of the said severall Officers, or their Assignes shall be for yor soe doeing yor full and sufficient warrant and discharge.

Miles Corbett
W Heveningham
Hen Mildmay Valentine Wauton
To Mr Hen: Broade
O Cromwell John Lowry
Treasurer

Notes
4. Mercureus Pragmaticus no. 36/37 (5-12 Dec. 1648), Sig. CCC3v; see also The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer no. 289 (5-12 Dec. 1648), p. 1180.
7. Ibid.
13. The National Archives (Public Record Office) [hereafter PRO], SP 28/25 1, unfol.: Eastern Association warrant, 2 Dec. 1648. The warrant was first discovered by my colleague at the History of Parliament, Dr David Scott, who (despite his misgivings) kindly allowed me to make his discovery public.

14. Corbett, Wauton and Mildmay all became regicides; Heveningham was a commissioner at the king's trial and was present when sentence was passed, although he did not sign the death warrant; Lowry, an old friend of Cromwell, was selected as a judge, but declined to sit. Needless to say, none of the five was purged on 6 December. See Underdown, Pride's Purge, 371, 376, 379, 380, 389. I am grateful to Dr Andrew Barclay for discussion of the affiliations of these men.
16. PRO, SP 28/251, unfol.
17. PRO, SP 28/25 1, unfol. This warrant is out of chronological order in the bundle. I am grateful to Dr Barclay for drawing it to my attention.

Dr Patrick Little is a Research Fellow at the History of Parliament. He is the author of a number of published articles on Irish politics and society in the Mid-Seventeenth Century.
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OLIVER CROMWELL: LORD PROTECTOR IN ALL BUT IMAGE?

By Jonathan FitzGibbon

I am ready to serve not as a king, but as a constable. For truly I have as before God thought it often, that I could not tell what my business was, nor what I was in the place I stood, save [by] comparing it with a good constable to keep the peace of the parish.1

When Oliver Cromwell made this remark to a parliamentary committee on 13 April 1657 he was wrangling with the most difficult decision of his life. Cromwell was clearly uneasy with the title and office of king and defined what he saw as his task as Lord Protector differently from that of an early modern monarch. He was not a supreme power who governed over all; he was a constable, watching and chastising his nation when he felt it stepped out of line. Yet, despite the fact that Cromwell refused the crown in May 1657 some, like Roy Sherwood, feel that Cromwell was purely a ‘king in all but name’.2 The Protectorate regime was merely a relapse into old ways of monarchical government after the brief aberration of pseudo-republicanism attempted from 1649 to 1653. It is the purpose of this essay to question such assumptions and to try and reassert the argument, as Professor Coward has put forward, that ‘the Protectorate did not mark a conservative drift back to the restoration of the monarchy’.3 The problem is that the symbols and iconography of the regime, the way in which it was presented to the public, was heavily steeped in monarchical forms. The ‘imagery’ of the king and monarchy were always strong during the Protectorate; there is no denying that. Yet, it is possible to get too caught up in such images and to draw conclusions from them to ‘prove’ that Cromwell was merely a king under a different title. Consequently, the actual machinery of government and the nature of the office of ‘Lord Protector’ in reality have been largely ignored amidst the noise and colourful displays of what are seen as ‘regal’ celebrations and ceremonies. However, people should not believe all that they see. Behind the pomp and glamour of monarchical symbolism lay a system very different from what could be described as an early Stuart monarchy. Imagery was an effective tool of propaganda for the Protectorate regime to gain popularity with the conservative majority of the populace. As Cromwell himself admitted ‘people do love what they know’ and it was monarchy that Englishmen knew best.4 What mattered during the Protectorate was not the fact that it was brought about by a minority, but the degree of acceptance accorded it by the rest of the population.5 If, as Scott would suggest, the regicide was a declaration of war upon English

political history then the only way to help smooth over the cracks which had emerged as a result of such actions was an appeal to precedent and ‘known ways’.6 The appeal of monarchy is highlighted in the debates of April 1657 over the title of king. As Sir Charles Wolseley argued ‘the law knows not a Protector ... this nation hath ever been a lover of monarchy, and of monarchy under the title of king’.7 With such yearnings for more ‘traditional’ ways of government it is no surprise that the Protectorate government should adopt a number of measures that gave the semblance of monarchical rule. Yet, at the same time, it should also be remembered that for Cromwell and his associates such displays were probably more for show and reassurance, a means to pacify the conservatives, than a statement of the reality of Cromwellian rule. When Cromwell called the title of king ‘a feather in a hat’ to the army officers on 27 February 1657 he was making a statement, which had more implications than just stating the unnecessary extravagance of such a title.8 The ‘feather in a hat’ is symbolic of the decorative use of monarchy in the Protectorate regime as a whole. It was an elaborate decoration, which shielded the more novel activities of the regime. The image of king was merely for show to distant onlookers while underneath the iconography lay more fundamental changes, which actually took the Protectorate away from such imagery. When one examines the way the regime presented itself from 1653 to 1658 one should not merely believe such displays at face value especially after the agreement under the Humble Petition and Advice. Otherwise one may be led to inaccurate conclusions of the regime, the very conclusions the regime wanted its conservative followers to believe, the idea that ‘the office of King had been transmitted to another name and with apparent ease’ and that in effect it was simply a case of ‘business as usual’.9

The problem with arguments which place Cromwell as the ‘king in all but name’, is that they rely far too much on this imagery of the regime. Sharpe concedes that to establish the authority of the new regime, ‘the language and image of a republic had to be instilled and the language and imagery of monarchy erased’.10 Such thinking may be highly inaccurate if the opposite is inferred and instead of seeing the image of the king battling against the Protectorate regime actually look at it as a help, not a hindrance. It was a way in which a system, which was novel in reality, could win some support because of its very claims of tradition through imagery. History could not be easily dismissed in seventeenth century England where a gentleman’s education, lands and family as well as the nation’s major institutions were all defined by it.11 The image of Charles I was still strong and lived in the popular imagination. As Sharpe argues, there was scarcely a country house
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in which some image of the king or court did not hang. Thirty five editions of Eikon Basilike (The Image of the King) were published within a year of Charles I's execution with its emotive imagery of the executed king on the frontispiece. With the strength of royal iconography it is unsurprising that the Cromwellian Protectorate should use such a wealth of propaganda to its own cause. Sharpe comments on the fact that the years 1653-58 marked a shift to a more regal style on seals and coins - 'a decision which may tell us as much about the hold of a royal image as about the preferences of Cromwell himself'. Indeed, it was probably not the case that Cromwell, and those around him, favoured monarchical forms but that the regime had the foresight to harness the immense political capital from using them as a tool to buy conservative support and mask changes in government which may otherwise have been unacceptable.

The use of monarchical imagery was apparent in nearly all the ways the Protectorate regime expressed itself to the public. From his first investiture on the 16 December 1653 this theme was apparent. The proclamation on this date of 'His Highness Oliver Cromwell Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland', clearly appealed to contemporary political (monarchical) discourse. The Second investiture on 26 June 1657 was even more steeped in the images of kingship. Clarendon commented on the fact that 'Westminster Hall was prepared and adorned as sumptuously as it could be for a day of coronation'. The sceptre and robes were used as was the Coronation Chair on which all English sovereigns had been enthroned since Edward II in 1308; indeed all that was missing was the crown and the anointing. Another occasion when the government presented itself to the public was at Cromwell's funeral on 23 November 1658. Sharpe points out how 'the effigy, looking for all like the icon of a medieval king', was placed on a hearse and, 'vested with royal robes, a sceptre in one hand, a crown on the other and a crown on the head'. The funeral itself was modelled in almost every detail on that of King James I. One debate in parliament over the investiture ceremony of 1657 led one MP to say 'You are making his Highness a great Prince, a King indeed, so far as he is Protector. Ceremonies signify much of the substance in such cases, as a shell preserves the kernel or a casket a jewel'. Yet this was the purpose of these ceremonies - even if the crown were missing the association of monarchical forms with the Protectorate regime lived on. Although such displays gave the image of a 'casket' it did not necessarily mean that inside the box was a complimentary jewel or a fervent monarchical system. When the writer of the Unparalled Monarchs wrote of

Cromwell that 'he is king and will not put on a crown', it is likely that this was as much a compliment to the success of the regime's propaganda as its failure actually to break free from monarchical forms in terms of the physical machinery of government.

The fact of the matter is that for all the imagery, which may link Cromwell to the office of King, he was, in reality, a Lord Protector with a role substantially different from that of an early modern monarch. Cromwell's office as Lord Protector rested on written constitutions - such a restraint on his powers has been ignored by many. It should be remembered that the title of king itself had little or no restraints on it prior to 1641 and that such a move towards a clearly defined constitution represents something which was significantly different from the type of monarchical rule known under James or Charles. Much is made of the fact that the two constitutions presented to Cromwell in 1653 and 1657 respectively were fundamentally monarchical in tone. Sherwood points out how the Instrument of Government was based on the abortive proposals put to Charles I in 1647 and that the draft version presented to Cromwell in 1653 probably contained the title of King before Cromwell refused. Also the Humble Petition and Advice is similarly seen as a shift to 'known ways'. Yet it seems difficult actually to come to the conclusion that a written document which restrained the power of the monarch and clearly defined certain workings of the government in the form of a constitution was a return to something which was inherent in the traditions of English government. Even Magna Carta in 1215 was only a three month experiment and the similar restraining proposals which were placed on Charles I in 1641 and 1642 caused serious discord among parliamentarians because of their 'novel' nature. The ruler of England could hardly be said to have had serious constitutional restraints on them prior to 1641 - indeed Pym's concern to safeguard such restraints was one of the reasons for Civil War in the first place. Therefore even if Cromwell had accepted the title of 'King' in 1657 under the Humble Petition and Advice he would not have been a King in the early-seventeenth-century sense of the word. The fact that Cromwell as Lord Protector did have such restraints placed on him and ruled under adherence to such principles therefore marks a significant change, which can hardly be seen as a relapse into monarchism in any traditional sense. Unlike an early modern monarch Cromwell was not unfettered in the extent of his ability to make decisions on policy like James and Charles had been. Cromwell himself professed that 'by the government, I can do nothing but in ordination with the Council'. Even if this statement is taken as a bit of an exaggeration, many of the limits placed on
the Protector by the rules of the constitution did make consensual government a fact of the Protectorate in a way which was foreign to the office of a King. The powers given to the Council in the Instrument were considerable. Article three stated that the Lord Protector was to 'govern by the advice of the council'. Although Kings had had Privy Councils the nature of their tasks had never been laid down in the way that the Council of State was defined alongside the office of Protector and the giving of advice was not the only way the Council helped run the nation. Indeed, because Cromwell was the visible leader of the regime with most of the pomp and trappings of a king the extent to which the Council was actually running the show behind the scenes is often overlooked.26 The utility of the Council is demonstrated most starkly in the period from December 1653 to September 1654. In this time Cromwell was only present at 39 out of 202 council meetings yet in the space of just eight months the Council was able to discuss 200 draft ordinances of which 80 became law.27 Cromwell could, in theory, veto Council legislation yet in practice he almost always passed the Council's ordinances despite only being present at 40% of all Council meetings during the period 1653 to 1658.28 The Council also had powers of its own which were not dependent on the Lord Protector. Article thirty-two of the Instrument allowed the Council to pick the Protector's successor.29 The Council could examine and exclude MPs from parliament. Indeed, as Gaunt points out, the barring of 100 MPs from parliament in September 1656 was not the act of Cromwell, 'the Council was empowered to do this, the Council had examined and excluded MPs, the Council had taken care to exclude no-one unfairly and made no mention of the Protector in any way'.30 Furthermore it should not be assumed that Cromwell merely ignored the Council and treated it as a fig-leaf for the naked use of absolute powers. Cromwell himself suggested in the Additional Petition of 26 June 1657 that the Protector should require the Council's consent before making appointments to senior officers of state.31 Nor should it be thought that the Council was merely a body of sycophants all to willing to do whatever Cromwell told them. The debates Cromwell had with the Council over the readmission of the Jews was all too stark a reminder to Cromwell that consensual government would not always uphold his own views on how the nation should be run. Unlike a 'King', Cromwell had to rule in accordance to a constitution and this stipulated rule with a Council which took many of the decisions which had formerly been part of the 'royal prerogative' such as legislating on religious matters with the formation of the 'Triers and Ejectors' as well as making decisions over foreign warfare as demonstrated in the Dutch wars. The existence of the Council of State is therefore one
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argument, which counters the belief that Cromwell was merely an early modern monarch with a different title.

Hamard makes it clear that 'the Instrument gave parliament a role little better than it had under the king and certainly less powerful than that which the Rump had enjoyed'.32 Yet parliament had a set of defined rules which had never been effectively exercised under previous monarchs.33 Article seven of the Instrument said parliament was to meet every three years, article eight stated that each parliament had to last five months and article eleven said parliament was to be called at the allotted time even without Protector's consent.34 All these clauses were a serious attack on the rights of a 'King'; it removed the tool of dissolution and creation of parliament at the will of a monarch and instead made parliament self-sufficient. The First Protectorate Parliament had been problematic for Cromwell yet he still stuck to the rule of the Instrument by allowing it to sit for the allotted five months (even if his interpretation of 'months' was the relatively shorter 'lunar' month). It was Cromwell's attitude towards parliament as a 'good constable' which ultimately created him so many problems as it ensured that parliaments, unlike under James and Charles, were not managed to the extent which they had previously been. This allowed malcontents like the Commonwealthsmen Hasellig and Bradshaw to make their views felt. The exclusion of MPs from parliament in 1656 was not Cromwell's own choosing but was the action of his Council - when they were chosen you garbled them, kept out and put in whom you pleased by the Instrument, and I am sworn to make good all you do, right or wrong'.35 Such actions prove that Cromwell under the constitutions did not have the same sort of direct management of parliament that early modern monarchs before him had. Cromwell alone could not dissolve parliament, exclude MPs or, because of the lack of management, direct parliamentary debate; all these traits, which Cromwell lacked, had been the features of Kingship in relation to parliaments. It is probably because the Lord Protector lacked the coercive powers of a King in relation to the parliaments that new powers had to be granted as an expedient. The Protector had a veto of twenty days over legislation which was seen to be contrary to the constitution. The rising power of parliament was also recognised when Cromwell made the suggestion for an upper chamber to act as a balance on the Commons like the House of Lords had previously done. Such restraints on parliament were necessary due to the fact that there was no longer any person exercising 'Kingly' powers over the parliaments and thus legislation was needed to keep parliament in check, such as the power of the Council to
 excluded MPs and the veto on certain legislation.

Furthermore the debates on the Humble Petition and Advice in 1657 led parliament to discuss constitutional matters, which would have rarely been allowed under previous monarchs. Indeed the document itself originated from parliament and thus had a legitimacy about it which was favourable to Cromwell and his love of parliaments.36 The debates on the paper itself brought Cromwell as Lord Protector and a commission of parliament together to discuss matters of the constitution in a more open way than had been allowed previously. Cromwell had much to think about over the new constitution, especially the offer of the crown it contained, and asked parliament on 8 April 1657, 'howbeit, your title and name you give to this paper makes me think you intended advice...The liberty I ask is to vent my own doubts, and mine own fears, and mine own scruples.'37 Cromwell used his time with the parliamentary commission as a sort of fact-finding mission in order to gauge the reasons why parliament wanted the crown to become part of the new constitution. All the time he points out that he values any constitution which is agreed on by the parliament, as on 20 April 1657 when he told the parliamentary committee 'I promise you, I shall think whatever is done without the authority of parliament in order to settlement will not be very honest...I hope we shall come to know one another's minds, and shall agree to that that shall be to the glory of God, and the good of these nations'.38 The dialogue Cromwell opened with these MPs helped him to formulate his own arguments for declining the crown as well as allowing a vent for his own grievances on the constitution. On 21 April 1657 he presented some of the problems he found; many of his grievances were sensible, often requiring grey areas to be made clearer such as the fifth article that said that the Lord Protector was to decide on the members of the upper house but made no allowance for subsequent removals or the replacement of dead members.39 Yet the fact is that Cromwell was working with parliament in the formulation of this constitution and actively promoting its involvement in helping to deal with any problems he had with it. In this way the Lord Protector was using the parliament as a way to make his own feelings felt as well as allowing MPs to criticise the Instrument and the title of Lord Protector, which was different from the monarchs of early seventeenth century England who had been very wary of allowing any debate in parliament which encroached on their own position. Far from flouting parliamentary government Cromwell arguably made it wider reaching than it had ever been under what had been the norm under a
1641 and this meant that the sects were free to operate. Because of the loose framework of the Cromwellian church sects of separatists were allowed to proliferate which mocked the idea of a comprehensive church. It is true that even after the Reformation the Church of England had never been completely united and there had always been some dissenters from the orthodox view. However, Cromwell as Lord Protector did not actually identify himself with one particular strain of Protestantism which was fortified under a common liturgy and ecclesiastical policy. Instead the definitions remained woolly and vague, which meant that unlike an early modern monarch, Cromwell as Lord Protector lost the use of religious unity as a form of legitimacy for his rule.

Behind this lack of religious unity is also another fundamental shift from one of the chief characteristics of early modern monarchs. Whereas traditional monarchs claimed legitimacy for their powers by referring to the 'Divine Right' of Kings, Cromwell couched his legitimacy in terms of Providentialism. As Barnard points out, Cromwell believed that God had given clear signs that the time had arrived to spread godly regeneration, and that he had been singled out as the vital player in that process. Cromwell's belief in Providentialism is fundamental to an understanding of his mind: he believed that, just as God had delivered the Israelites from slavery in Egypt and Babylon, so now God had chosen him to lead a new chosen people towards the new Jerusalem. It was this belief in Providence which justified many of Cromwell's actions both before and during the Protectorate. When Cromwell saw the obstructionism of the Rump as God's wrath he lamented 'we all forget God and God will forget us, and render us up to confusion', and it is likely that such feelings led to the dissolution of the parliament on 20 April 1653. As Worden points out, Providentialism could often devalue political planning. Cromwell conceived his expedition to Hispaniola in 1654 because 'providence seemed to lead us hither', and when the Western Design failed the year after the principal effect on Cromwell was to read this as God's displeasure and pursue even further godly reformation through the Major Generals. Cromwell could not 'tempt' providence by inertia. It is significant also that most of the major political decisions of the period were taken as a result of prayer meetings. Furthermore, Cromwell couched his rise to fame in similar terms of providence. Cromwell pointed out to the parliamentary committee on 20 April 1657 that 'I have not desired, I have no title to, the government of these nations, but what was taken up in a case of necessity, and temporary, to supply the present emergency'. His rise to the office of Lord Protector was through the expediency of situations which had been created through the workings of God and once in office, Cromwell explained on 21 April 1657, 'I have through the providence of God endeavoured to discharge a poor duty, having had, as I conceive, a clear call to the station I have acted in, in all these affairs; and I believe very many are sufficiently satisfied in that'. Cromwell claimed legitimacy as Lord Protector because of his belief in Providence not Divine Right. This is a significant difference as Divine Right was the belief that the King was God's lieutenant on earth and as such all actions were only answerable to God. Providence, on the other hand, gave God more of a guiding hand in the office of Lord Protector. A King held his office by birthright; on the other hand, Providence could be used both to raise somebody to power, as in the case of Cromwell, and to bring him down as in the case of Charles I. Indeed, providential thinking and Kingship became incommensurable. As Cromwell explained on 13 April 1657, 'truly the providence of God has laid this title aside providentially...God has seemed providentially not only to strike at the family but at the name'. Belief in providence for legitimacy also meant that the agency of the Lord Protector was constrained by events and their interpretation. Policy tended to be more reactionary than innovatory because each action had to be justified by the will of God. Thus the Major Generals were the necessary result of the Western Design. The freedom of actions of a King merely because it was accepted that God was on the King's side was not applicable to Cromwell; instead there is always a sense that the Lord Protector has to prove himself and legitimise his actions before God.

Barnard argues that the effects of a Cromwellian Protectorate were similar to, though generally worse than, those of a Stuart monarchy. High taxes, centralisation and arbitrary rule were all the order of the day. Yet, even if such a grim image of the Protectorate is accepted and the effects of Stuart monarchy were the same as the Protectorate, the means were very different. It must be remembered that on 8 May 1657 Cromwell declined the crown offered him. Cromwell was never a King in the early modern sense; this was only the illusion which the propaganda of the regime wished to convey. Behind the imagery were many aspects of the actual machinery of the Protectorate government which meant that it functioned significantly differently from those of an early Stuart King. Decision-making was much more the preserve of a body of men in the Council of State than the Lord Protector alone. Parliament was given a role which was much more clearly defined and arguably more powerful because of the lack of a king to rule over it. The Church was highly diverse compared to what had been known
under monarchs who had claimed to be the head of a unified state religion. More significantly Cromwell carried out his office as Lord Protector not as King. He served his country as a constable fortified by the belief in God's Providence not Divine Right. It was when signs of God's displeasure manifested themselves that Cromwell saw it fit to act. Cromwell was not a 'King in all but name'; the only way in which this interpretation can be substantiated is by believing in the myths which the regime around Cromwell was trying to give to the people of England who had lamented at the execution of Charles I and the diversion from 'known ways' from 1649 to 1653. Images can always be misleading and in the case of Cromwell and the Protectorate it is time that one stopped believing the imagery and start looking more deeply at the actual workings of the regime itself. Underneath this gloss it should be stated that Cromwell was a Lord Protector in all but image not a King in all but name.
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By Professor Ann Hughes

In January 1654, at Whitehall, men and women flocked to hear the startling visions of a shipwright's daughter from Stepney. Anna Trapnel had fallen into a trance while she was attending the Council of State's examination of the Fifth Monarchist preacher Vavasour Powell. The trances continued for some eleven or twelve days with visions of God, Relating to the Governors, Army, Churches, Ministry, Universities, and the whole Nation, Uttered in prayers and spiritual songs, by an inspiration extraordinary, and full of wonder — and attracted much attention, both sympathetic and hostile.1

In the most vivid vision Trapnel saw:

great darkness in the earth and a marvellous dust like a thick smoke ascending upward from the earth; and I beheld at a little distance a great company of cattle, some like bulls, and others like oxen, and so lesser, their faces and heads like men, having each of them a horn on either side their heads. For the foremost his countenance was perfectly like unto Oliver Cromwell's; and on a sudden there was a great shout of those that followed him, he being singled out alone, and the foremost; and he looking back, they bowed unto him, and suddenly gave a shout, and leaped up from the earth with a great kind of joy that he was their supreme. And immediately they prompting him and fawning upon him, he run at me, and as he was near with his horn to my breast, an arm and a hand clasped round, a voice said, "I will be thy safety." He run at many precious saints that stood in the way of him, that looked boldly in his face; he gave them many pushes, scratching them with his horn, and driving them into several houses; he ran still along, till at length there was a great silence, and suddenly there broke forth in the earth great fury coming from the clouds, and they presently were scattered, and their horns broken, and they tumbled into graves. With that I broke forth, and sang praise, and the Lord said, "Mark that scripture, Three horns shall arise, a fourth shall come out different from the former, which shall come out different from the former, which shall be more terror to the saints than the others that went before".2

NOT GIDEON OF OLD: ANNA TRAPNEL AND OLIVER CROMWELL
Anna Trapnel, who delivered this uncompromising denunciation of the new Protector, was the most notorious female prophet of the 1650s. She was born in Poplar in Stepney and despite relatively modest circumstances 'trained up to my book and writing'. Since the age of fourteen she had 'been very eager to hear and pray, though in a very formall manner' but the preaching of Hugh Peters awakened her, in a very disturbing fashion, to the limitations of her faith. She gained much comfort from 1642 through the preaching and pastoral care of the radical Independent John Simpson, but throughout the 1640s and 1650s periods of spiritual torment and temptation were interspersed with dramatic visions and a sense of Christ's love. The death of her mother was one turning point: 'The Saints told me when I mourned for the loss of my tender mother, that Christ would be more tender, and would be all to me in the loss of earthly comforts; and he was more to me then they told me, he was double comfort, and a Comforter that hath tarried and abided with me, and will abide with me for ever'.

In June 1646, a great 'distemper of body' confined Trapnel to bed, where she had 'such Visions of the External God, that tongue is not able to express; the Raptures were so great, that I was not sensible of a body, whether in the body or out of the body God knows'. God urged Trapnel to communicate her visions 'he sweetly informed me, and told me for the future how I should speak to the Saints'. She became increasingly well known within London's gathered congregations - Henry Jessy's and William Greenhill's (in Stepney), as well as Simpson's. This remarkable woman has become better known also to scholars; literary scholars in particular have analysed her writings as an example of how women might speak in public despite their subordinate position. Trapnel's specific political impact has perhaps not yet been sufficiently recognised. As James Holstun has stressed, Trapnel was 'one of the most important public political women to emerge from the sectarian ferment of seventeenth-century England and New England'. An account of her attacks on Cromwell during the first year of the Protectorate, and of the reactions of the authorities, will illustrate more directly her political role.

Anna Trapnel's prophetic outbursts of January 1654 emerged within the 'Fifth Monarchist' movement, a fluid grouping of radical preachers and lay people, mostly from Congregationalist and Baptist churches, who looked forward with particular urgency to the second coming of Christ, when he would rule this world with his Saints for a thousand years. The unbroken series of victories by parliament's army, and the overthrow of the Stuart monarchy intensified expectations that these were the last days when God was doing marvellous things with and for his people. Trapnel's pastor, John Simpson, ministered to a congregation at All Hallows the Great in London, one of the most important centres of the movement. Thus Trapnel felt that God was telling her:

that the time was not yet far off ere he would pour out his spirit upon his Children, and take away that skin of formality that hath lain so long upon their sights, and that drowsiness or sleepiness of spirit that hath seized upon them, and baptize them with the holy Spirit which should break forth as fire among them so that they shall be filled with the Song of the Lamb, and they shall behold their King of Salem, which is King of peace riding on his white horse of Triumph, Conquering and to Conquer; The Saints shall overcome by the Lamb.

The Fifth Monarchists' political programme was inspired by the prophecies of Daniel. In Daniel's dream (Daniel 8.3, 17-18), he saw four great beasts rising from the sea: 'These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.' After the fall of the last earthly monarchies, 'the Saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.' Many took the prophecies of Daniel and the Book of Revelation seriously as guides to what was happening in mid-seventeenth century England. The four monarchies were traditionally interpreted as Babylon, Assyria, Greece and Rome, and the regicide for many radical parliamentarians was the final episode ushering in the rule of the Saints, under no king but Jesus. 'We are not soldiers of fortune, we are not merely the servants of men; we have not only proclaimed Jesus Christ, the King of Saints, to be our King by profession, but desire to submit to him upon his own terms', declared the English Army as it marched to Scotland in August 1650. The distinctive Fifth Monarchist position was that it was necessary to work actively to bring about the rule of the Saints, when many other parliamentarians preferred to wait on the Lord.

Trapnel's visions on public affairs, according to the accounts given in 1654, follow a common 'Fifth Monarchist' pattern of enthusiastic support for parliament and its army as instruments of God's purposes, gradually giving way to a haunting and bitter sense of betrayal. She insisted on her own zeal for the cause:
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I lived with my Mother till shee dyed, which was about twenty years, then I kept house with the means my Mother left me, and paid taxes towards maintaining of the Army then in the field; and this I did not grudgingly, but freely and willingly; I sold my Plate and Rings, and gave the mony to the Publick use.9

In the summer of 1647 when the Army marched on London to discipline the Presbyters in parliament, Trapnel foresaw 'in a vision the army coming in Southwark-way' and:

The Lord told her, "that out of the mouthes of babes and sucklings" he would perfect his praise. After which she had many Visions and Revelations touching the Government of the Nation, the Parl., Amy, and Ministry, and having fasted nine days, nothing coming within her lips, she had a most strange Vision of horns.

In this earlier vision of horns, the first horn represented the Bishops, 'broken in two and thrown aside'; the second 'more white, had joined to it an head' also broken in pieces; the third with scales upon it like a fist she saw broken and scattered, that not as much as any bit of it was left'. The fourth horn, short and colourful was 'different from the three other, because great swelling words and great offers of kindness should go forth to all people from it, like unto that of Absalom' who deceived people into withdrawing from 'honest David'.10 The meaning of this is obscure and some scepticism about visions recounted after the event may be permitted, but the overthrow of the monarchy and the Long Parliament are presumably implied.

Trapnel's positive view of the army and its leaders continued into the 1650s. When Trapnel was 'dissatisfied' with the war against the godly Scots in 1650, she 'sought the Lord' on it and was reassured that God 'had raised up a Gideon, bringing that of Judges 7 to me, to prove Oliver Cromwell, then Lord-General, was as that Gideon, going before Israel, blowing the trumpet of courage and valour, the rest with him sounding forth their courage also; and that as sure as the enemy fell when Gideon and his army blew their trumpets, so surely should the Scots throughout Scotland be routed...this I saw both by vision, and faith, and prayer and praises, that God had appointed me that great things should be done'. In further visions, Trapnel foretold the victory at Dunbar and continued to believe that the English army and its leader were like 'that old Gideon and his company'. She rejoiced again when Major General Harrison and 'Gideon' threw out the Rump parliament.11 Trapnel's retrospective optimism is paralleled in the 1653 writings of Fifth Monarchist preachers. John Rogers greeted Cromwell in similar terms on the dissolution of the Rump, appealing to him as a Moses, a Joshua or a Gideon to choose 'men fearing God' to carry on the government. 'For as at first Israel had no government but God...So now the change is to go back again from Kings to Parliaments, from Parliaments to Generals, until we have Governours as at the beginning (Isaiah 1.26) and till Christ come'.12 John Spittlehouse, another Fifth Monarchist preacher, hailed Cromwell as Moses at the summoning of the Barebones parliament, and urged the members themselves 'to accomplish the grand design of your professed Lord and Master Jesus Christ, in these Overtuming, Overtuming, Overtuming days...That to the utmost of your power you will endeavour the erection of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ'.13

The evocation of Gideon in addresses to Cromwell in the early 1650s was especially effective, as he was clearly one of the Old Testament exemplars that Oliver himself identified with. Although Gideon was from a poor family, 'the least in my father's house', he was appointed by the Lord to deliver Israel from the Midianites, and destroyed the idolatrous altar of Baal to restore true religion [Judges 6.12-13, 25]. After Gideon and his small band of 300 Israelites had triumphed [Judges 7], he was offered the crown: 'Then the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son also; for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian. And Gideon said unto them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you' [Judges 8.22-23].

Fifth Monarchists thus expected Gideon to establish the rule of the Saints, not to accept personal power as the 'single person' under the Instrument of Government. Their sense of betrayal in the winter of 1653/4 was made more acute by their belief that Cromwell and the army shared their assumptions. The Instrument of Government was an apostasy from the army's 1650 vow to have no king but Jesus.14 Although modern scholarship has demonstrated that Cromwell was not following a Fifth Monarchist programme when he and the Army Council summoned the nominated or 'Barebones' parliament, his language at its meeting gave some plausibility to the hopes of Trapnel and her associates. They surely noted Cromwell's enthusiastic welcome for the assembly on 4 July 1653, and ignored the hesitations and qualifications now stressed by historians. Cromwell declared
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‘Why truly you are called by God to rule with him, and for him, and you are called to be faithful with the Saints’. But he also remarked that members should show ‘such a spirit as Moses and Paul had’, which was not just ‘for the believers among the people of God, but for the whole people’. When he said that ‘this way may be the door to usher in things that God hath promised and prophesised of’, we can be sure that Fifth Monarchists disregarded the ‘may’.15

Thus Trapnel’s visions of 1654 are, as Hilary Hinds explains, ‘a condemnation of, and a lament for, Cromwell and the army, and their betrayal of the godly cause’.16 As the ‘new representative’ (the Barebones parliament) was breaking up Trapnel received a vision of ‘the deadness of Gideon’s spirit to the work of the Lord, showing me that he was laid aside as to any great matters, the Lord having finished the greatest business that he would employ him in’.17 Much of the Fifth Monarch condemnation of Cromwell was couched in the terms of Daniel’s vision of the beasts and the horns in Daniel chapter, echoed in the account of the beast with seven heads and ten horns in the equally millenarian Book of Revelation [13:1-7]. These texts were the inspiration for Trapnel’s outbursts described at the start of this essay, and were used more directly by leading male Fifth Monarchist preachers. Daniel’s fourth beast, more dreadful and terrible than the others, had ten horns at first and then another ‘little horn’ appeared with eyes and a mouth like a man’s and ‘before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots’. This ‘same horn made war with the Saints and prevailed against them’, but presaged also the coming of the kingdom of God [Daniel 7:7-8, 21, 24-26]. The little horn had previously been taken to be Charles I, but the text was now applied to the fallen Gideon. In December 1653 the leading Fifth Monarchist Christopher Feake preached on the little horn. In January he and John Simpson were imprisoned and Vavasour Powell was arrested and examined by the Council on 10 January, providing the occasion for Trapnel’s dramatic intervention.18

At Whitehall Trapnel continued to denounce the Protector’s backsliding: ‘Must thy servant that is now upon the throne, must he die and go out like a candle?...Oh that he might hearken to a praying people, rather than to a wicked council, rather than to a politic crew about him! Father that he might, Lord God, come out of those fetters and chains.’ She urged Cromwell to listen to God through Anna Trapnel: ‘Let thy handmaid entreat thee to persuade him, For thy persuasions are more than the persuasions of all the great doctors and rabbis: that are about him’. Repentance was urgent as ‘the kingdom of the Lord Jesus is at hand, all the monarchies of this world are going down the hill’.19 Trapnel broke frequently into doggerel verse, addressed to the powerful of the world, to the soldiers, the merchants and the established clergy, as well as to the Protector. All must recognise there should be no king but Jesus:

It is better to side with him
Which is a king for ever,
Than to the earthly kings below
Whom pale death soon shall sever.20

Gideon’s apostasy had broad implications, for Trapnel’s vision of the Fifth Monarchy combined the spiritual elitism of the rule of the Saints with a more egalitarian stress on social reform. In one of her later Whitehall visions Trapnel declared

If he were not (speaking of the Lord Cromwell) backslidden, he would be ashamed of his great pomp, and revenue, whereas the poor are ready to starve, and art thou providing great palaces? Oh this was not Gideon of old, oh why dost thou come to rear up the pillars, the stones which are laid aside? Tell him, Lord, thou art come down to have a controversy with him; oh sin will bring a dark smoke unto thy judgement...Oh but know, the Lord is the great redeemer in Israel, and he is risen now, and will break all yokes [Isaiah 68:6] as fast as they can put them on.21

It would be a mistake – one Cromwell himself did not make – to see the Fifth Monarchy movement as an eccentrical fringe and its female prophet as hysterical or deluded. Fifth Monarchists were a serious potential threat to the Protectorate and could hope for significant support precisely because the breach of December 1653 was a painful and intimate one, amongst parliamentarians who believed they had aspirations in common. Supporters of the Protectorate – and of course Oliver himself – shared many of the assumptions and hopes of the more militant Saints. Most fundamentally they shared the belief that the Scriptures offered a living guide to God’s purposes for England and the godly. Cromwell’s condemnation of Fifth Monarchy was thus more equivocal than his denunciations of Levellers or heretics. In his first speech to the Protecorate parliament of 1654 Cromwell denounced the errors that arose in these ‘latter times’ – ‘a departing from the faith’ and recourse to the ‘doctrines of devils’. But amongst ‘spiritual evils’ there was a more ‘refined’ error, held by ‘many honest people, whose hearts are sincere, and the evil that hath deceived
them is the mistaken notion of the Fifth Monarch'. Cromwell shared the hope 'that Jesus Christ will have a time to set up his reign in our hearts', although this was a rather different matter from the overall social and political transformation the Fifth Monarchists were actively promoting. So the Protector denounced those who sought to achieve a general transformation by force: 'But for men to entitle themselves on this principle, that they are the only men to rule kingdoms over nations, and give laws to people; to determine of property and liberty, and everything else upon such a pretence as this is, truly, they had need give clear manifestations of God's presence with them, before wise men will receive or submit to their conclusions'. Those who moved from 'notions' to 'practices' were to be dealt with by the magistrate.22

Shared assumptions meant that prophecy, including female prophecy, worked as a public discourse because people believed, or were at least willing entertain a belief, that God might speak directly to his people through unlikely human instruments. Hence the Army Council paused in its deliberations in December 1649, to give time to the visions of the Abingdon woman Elizabeth Poole opposing the execution of the king.23 As Philip Baker and John Morrill have written of Cromwell, 'His political theory derived exclusively from his understanding of God's willingness to work with and through a variety of forms as recorded in the Old Testament'. God's providence and the Cromwellian appeal to necessity were 'linked aspects of God's immanence and engagement with the affairs of men'.24 Cromwell, like Trapnel, rejected 'formal' religious worship, and Cromwell, like Trapnel, found comparisons with Gideon convincing.25 Where God was at work so directly in this world, it seemed entirely natural that God would speak directly through weak human instruments; indeed in these traumatic, exhilarating times of overturning, it might well be that God would choose unlikely methods to convey his messages to humanity. As the prophet Joel had foreseen: God would 'pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And also upon the servants and upon the handmaidens in those days will I pour out my spirit' [Joel 2.29-30]. Trapnel drew attention to this verse in her autobiographical tract, A Legacy for Saints as validation for her own prophetic career, and she consistently presented herself as God's handmaid.26 Trapnel was 'a weak worthless creature, a babe in Christ, which makes his power the more manifest'.27

Like Poole, but unlike Sarah Wight (a young visionary of the 1640s) who focused on spiritual advice, Trapnel presented her prophetic role as an overtly public and political one. God had promised:

for that she had been faithful in a little, she should be made an instrument of much more; for particular soules shall not only have benefit by her, but the Universality of Saints shall have discoveries of God through her.28

She cited another important scripture explaining that six weeks before the battle of Dunbar:

I told them how I prayed against this publick-spirituedness; and how the Lord silenced me, from those words in 1 Corinthians. 1.27, 28, But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things that are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea and things that are not, to bring to naught things that are.29

As an emblematic figure within the Fifth Monarchy movement, Trapnel's political importance was acknowledged by friends, foes and neutrals alike. The chamber near Whitehall where she uttered her prophecies became 'a newsworthy site for meeting, discoursing, note taking, and controversy'.30 Amongst the crowds in attendance were many former Barebones members such as Colonel Robert Bennett, and other army figures such as Colonel Sydenham and Colonel Bingham who agreed with her about the deadness of Gideon's spirit.31 Trapnel's fame spread through newsbook reports as well as direct contact. Most newsbooks were open-minded on the authenticity of Trapnel's trances and they gave a more muted account of her criticisms of the regime than was to be found in her own pamphlets. Several Proceedings of State Affairs described the visions of 'Hannah whom some call a Prophetesse'. It claimed 'many hundreds do daily come to see and hear hear...some say that what she doth she doth is by a mighty inspiration, others say they suppose her to be of a troubled mind'. Her trances were described in an even-handed fashion, and she was reported as hoping, 'for the Lord Protector, that God would keep him close to himselfe, as he hath hitherto'. According to this version Trapnel also advised, 'That the people of God may not (as some of them have done) revile and scandalise the Lord Protector behinde his back', but should speak
'faithfully and plainly' with him in private, hardly her own techniques. She condemned peace with the Dutch and uttered conventional denunciations of sin and profaneness, ladies' 'Powderings' and witchcraft.32

The journalist Marchamont Nedham reported to Cromwell on the political impact of Trapnel and other Fifth Monarchists in early February 1654. He was predictably sceptical about the legitimacy of Trapnel's divine inspiration, but he had no doubt she was a political threat. The Fifth Monarchists, in some disarray since the arrest of Peake and Simpson, had a 'two-fold design' for the prophetess Hannah who had 'played her part' at Whitehall. The first was to print her 'discourses and hymns which are desperate against your person, family, children, friends and the government'; the second to send her all over England 'to proclaim them viva voce'. Trapnel was 'much visited, and does a world of mischief in London and would do in the country. The vulgar dote on vain prophecies'.33 Nedham's predictions were fulfilled firstly with the publication of A Cry of the Stone, the account of Trapnel's background and Whitehall visions, and then with Trapnel's departure for a preaching tour of the West Country.

In Cornwall Trapnel was 'a local sensation', not necessarily with the 'vulgar' but within zealous godly networks. She was sheltered by Captain Langdon and Major Bawden who had been members of the Barebones parliament, and who offered sureties for her appearance when she was summoned before Quarter Sessions.34 Trapnel's reputation had gone before her and she was repeatedly asked to expound her vision of the horns. She 'discoursed' through the night, 'with a young Minister, his name is Mr Paul, he came out of the west to see me, having heard such various reports of me, for the book had given a report before I came here.'35 The newsbook reports of Trapnel's Cornwall journey were more alarmist and more hostile than the accounts of her Whitehall visions. Nedham's Mercurius Politicus was probably the source for other newsbooks. All agreed there were 'two convincing Reasons against her Spirit; the one is, that it withdraws from Ordinances, and the other is, that it is non-sensical'. They reported the action taken against her at the Sessions and regretted that decisive measures had not been used after her trances at Whitehall: 'it might have prevented the staggering of many a spirit in Cornwall'. All were reminded of 'the old story of Elizabeth Barton, the holy maid of Kent (as she was called) in the dazes of Henry 8 who was made use of by certain fanatick Popish Priests by fained Miracles and Trances, to raise admiration in the multitude, and

foment seditious humors against the Government, for which she had in the end her reward'.36 The most forthright version stressed that Trapnel's purpose was to 'alienate the heart of the people from the present Government', and rendered Barton's 'reward' more directly to its readers: for her sedition, 'she and her accomplices were all executed'.37

It can be misleading to write straightforwardly of Anna Trapnel's trances or of her political impact. The words in her tracts come often at second-hand, narrated by a 'relator', as much as from her own first-person accounts. Many of the visions, prayers and songs in The Cry of a Stone were published 'as by a very slow hand could be taken for eight days' while on the fourteenth day of January the relator offered 'some short account of some things she uttered...as the relator could take them in some scattered expressions'.38 Trapnel's later autobiographical tract A Legacy for Saints was also published indirectly in the summer of 1654, by leading members of the All Hallows congregation.39

More profound difficulties arise from the fact that Trapnel's influence arose not from her determined expression of her own opinions, but from the belief that she was transmitting God's words. Indeed God's choice of weak women as his instruments underlined their stereotypically feminine weakness and passivity as it stressed his own power. Trapnel was a 'weak, worthless creature', 'a poor inferior' while her associate Sarah Wight was 'an Empty Nothing Creature'.40 Furthermore the credibility of Trapnel as a female prophet depended on her being somehow detached from her own body, which was worked upon by God. In her early trances Trapnel was in a state of physical collapse, confined to bed and in a fortnight in the 1640s she only took 'small beer & a little juice of cherries, or conserve of currants, I took a little sometimes for cooling of me, I did so bum in my throat and stomack'.41 She was asked by spectators in Whitehall 'what frame of spirit was upon her? Was it a 'spirit of faith' which inspired her to speak, or something more, a 'vision wrapping up your outward senses in trances'? She answered that she had no self-consciousness at all: 'I neither saw, nor heard, nor perceived the noise and distractions of the people, but was as one that heard only the voice of God sounding forth unto me'.42 On Trapnel's journey to Cornwall, 'though I rode through towns, I minded not any speakings of creatures; for indeed I was not capable of outward sayings or doings, nor of the rating of the Coach those two days'.43 She remained unconscious even when the Cornish magistrates and their followers shouted that she was 'A witch, a witch', pinched her nose and pulled her pillow from under her. In Trapnel's visions her female body is
insensible and deprived of food. It is permeable and passive, on display as evidence for God's power and the authenticity of her words, but not under her own control.44

But we miss much of Trapnel's singular impact if we stress only female passivity and indirectness. The main text of The Cry of a Stone opens with the defiant assertion, 'I am Anna Trapnel', and, despite her protests that all was due to God, Trapnel's writings have a very distinctive personal voice, of a defiant, committed and independent activist, proud of herself and proud of her impact.Trapnel cooperates with God in entering her trances: 'I was desirous to be out of the body, I longed to be dissolved';45 and she glosses or explains her visions for hearers and readers, another indication that Anna Trapnel did not see herself simply as God's passive instrument. The contradictory or dual nature of Anna Trapnel's prophetic enterprise - as God's passive instrument and as an assertive member of radical political movement - is well illustrated at her appearance before the Cornish Quarter Sessions. Trapnel was 'no whit afraid or thoughtful, for I had cast my care upon the Lord, which I was persuaded would speak for me.' The Lord indeed told her to say 'not guilty', for he 'knew I was not guilty of such an indictment'. She concluded 'in all that was said by me, I was nothing, the Lord put all in my mouth, and told me what I should say'. But Trapnel could also speak for herself, valuing her independence as a single woman. When the Justices asked her why she had come to Cornwall when she had 'no lands, not livings, nor acquaintance' there, she replied, 'I am a single person, and why may I not be with my friends anywhere...why may not I go where I please, if the Lord so will?'46 Trapnel's modest but real economic independence, and her revered place within the Fifth Monarchy movement, reinforced her assurance that she was God's instrument and made her an imposing public figure.

This public activity inevitably aroused controversy and hostility. Women's speaking in public was always liable to condemnation and Trapnel's extreme political stance increased her vulnerability. It was a commonplace that in the last days error multiplied as well as glorious truth, and during her first trances Simpson himself was careful to encourage Trapnel's self-examination to ensure she was not deluded. In Cornwall some came to hear her out of 'good will' but others aimed 'to catch my words so as to reproach me'. Women's inappropriate public speech laid them open to accusations of scolding or even witchcraft. In Cornwall Trapnel was denounced as a 'witch, deluder, Imposter', and was examined by a 'witch-trying woman'. On the other hand, the authorities feared she 'stirred and provoked the people to Rebellion against powers'. Trapnel compared her sufferings to a passive Christ who 'went as a sheep, dumb before the shearsers' and to Paul who met with wild beasts as Ephesus, as Trapnel was assaulted by 'unreasonable men [who] roared upon me.'47 Trapnel herself shared, at least in part, an unease about female speech. The Cornish JPs 'were in a hurry and confusion and sometimes would speak all together, and I was going to say, "What, are you like women, all speakers and no hearers?". But, significantly, she thought better of this dismissive remark.48

Trapnel's dramatic public interventions had been provoked by the Protectorate's assault on the Fifth Monarchist preachers, Simpson, Feake and Powell. Nonetheless, as Holstun insists, we do not have to assume that she was a pawn of the male leaders, or that she was 'using' the movement as a way of achieving a female presence in a male dominated world.49 Rather she was an integral part of the movement. Trapnel's description of her spiritual torments, her awakening and ultimate assurance owed much to London congregations and preachers, particularly Simpson. The autobiographical passages of The Cry of a Stone following the assertive, 'I am Anna Trapnel' continued:

I have walked in fellowship with the church-meeting at Allhallows (whereof Mr John Simpson is a member) for the space of about four years; I am well known to him and that whole society, also to Mr Greenhill, preacher at Stepney, and most of that society, to Mr Henry Jessey, and most of his society, to Mr Venning, preacher at Olaves in Southwark, and most of his society, to Mr Knollys, and most of his society, who have knowledge of me, and of my conversation. If any desire to be satisfied of it, they can give testimony of me, and of my walking in times past.50

Trapnel's journey to Cornwall was framed within accounts of the tribulations of the movement and its imprisoned leaders. She visited Feake and Simpson in Windsor Castle at the outset of her journey and was able to inform the godly in the west country how they did.51 Her Legacy for Saints concluded with a series of letters sent to Simpson's congregation of All Hallows, and from her prison to the prison at Windsor Castle where her 'dear brothers' lay: 'its no small joy to me, the hearing your Faith, Courage and Stedfast unshaken frame of Spirit which you abide in'.52 Trapnel's appeals to the solidarity of the Fifth Monarchists were paralleled by references to her in the movement's manifestoes: an appeal for the release of prisoners, for example, urged: 'Let out the Lords prisoners M. Feak, M.
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Simpson, Hannah Trapnel now in Bridewell for Christ'. Trapnel's A Legacy for Saints, was, as we have seen, published for the good of the Saints by leaders of the All Hallows congregation.

Trapnel's visions attracted scepticism and mockery, but more commonly in 1654 she was seen as a dangerous threat to the new regime. The newsbooks regretted the leniency of the magistrates following the Whitehall visions, and the Cornwall magistrates certainly did not hesitate, summoning Trapnel to answer charges of vagrancy, organising unlawful meetings and speaking against the government. Throughout her visit, Trapnel and her friends were watched by the authorities 'as if we were treacherous to the State'. The magistrates questioned Trapnel on her past as well as her actions in the west country. They asked her to acknowledge her book (presumably The Cry of a Stone) but she refused to answer; 'then they caused the Vision which mentions the horns; and Cows, and Oxen, to be read, and asked me what I would say to that? was that mine? I said as before, I would not answer them touching the book.' On 7 April 1654 the Council ordered that Trapnel be apprehended and sent up to London; by the end of April she was in custody at Plymouth where her military gaoler awaited a suitable ship for her carriage to London. She remained there for five weeks where the minister George Hughes was 'very bitter against me', denouncing her as an imposter and her book as nonsense. On 2 June the Council finally ordered her imprisonment in Bridewell; this prison, used for vagrants and prostitutes, was presumably chosen as a deliberate insult. A final indignity was that she was sent up to London in a coach with some partridge eggs from Guernsey, a present for 'the great man at White Hall'.

Bridewell did not dampen her spirit or lessen her fame, despite the matron accusing her of being one of 'a company of ranting Sluts'. The Bridewell authorities sought advice on how to deal with the 'many disorders by great numbers resorting dayly to Hanna Trapnell'; Anna herself was made 'weak and sickly' by the crowds, but was nonetheless able to issue a 'defiance to all reproachful, scandalous, base, horrid, defaming speeches, which have been vented by Rulers, Clergy, and theirAuditors, and published in scurrilous Pamphlets up and down in Cities and Countries, against Anna Trapnell, later Prisoner in Bridewell for the Testimony of Jesus the Lord'. She urged the godly not to give their love to the Protector 'more than to another, nor so much as to old King Charles' for they should love 'King Jesus'. When that king came there 'shall be no mockers, nor deniers to scoffe at the fifth Monarchy'.

Trapnel was released in July 1654 while in another trance: 'I came not into a capable frame...when I spoke that night, my friends said, do you know you are set at liberty, you sang as if you had known; I said, the Lord hath given it me...so you told us today in your singing, said my friends'. Trapnel's impact was tied closely to the dilemmas of the early Protectorate and references to her are infrequent after 1654. Late in 1655 newsbooks reported that Trapnel had returned to Cornwall, with three young companions to visit the Fifth Monarchist prisoner John Carew. When an 'honest trooper' challenged them in the name of the Protector, they retorted: 'The Lord Protector we own not; thou art of the Army of the Beast'. Two years later, Trapnel entered another period of intermittent, bed-ridden trances, reported in doggerel verse in two lengthy, inaccessible and now rare tracts, very different from the topical pamphlets of 1654. Although she is now often discussed alongside Quaker women visionaries, Trapnel had a very precise sense of her own, predestinarian faith and some of her prophecies were denunciations of the Quakers:

Now then friends treasure up these notes, Lay them up in your breast, That you may know the difference Between false visions and the best.

As Cromwell considered accepting a literal crown, Trapnel's hostility to the Protector intensified:

Spirit and Voice hath made a League, Against Cromwell and his Crown The which I am confident the Lord Will ere long so strike down.

Although Anna Trapnel outlived Oliver Cromwell she never regained the impact of the winter and spring of 1654. Shared scriptural language and common assumptions about God's purposes for England ensured Fifth Monarchists gained a hearing from godly men and women who by no means supported the full Fifth Monarchist programme of action. But these shared assumptions meant that many with Fifth Monarchist sympathies were themselves willing to give the Protectorate the benefit of the doubt. Trapnel herself might be scathing: 'Because the pastors of churches some of them do own thee, will the Lord therefore own thee? Oh no, the Lord will own such only who are true in heart, and in his sight' but others amongst the
leadership were more equivocal. The prominent Barebones radical Robert Bennett welcomed Trapnel in Exeter on her way to Cornwall, yet he had also declared to Cromwell that 'God hath placed your Highness over us'. Two of the ministers closest to Trapnel ultimately came to terms with the Protectorate. Henry Jessy was certainly a Fifth Monarchist sympathiser in 1653-4, but he ended up as one of Cromwell's 'Triers', a supervisor of the public ministry. John Simpson was arrested and imprisoned repeatedly between 1654 and 1656 but then renounced Fifth Monarchist activism and gained some protection from the Protector and Council when the Presbyterian minister of Botolphs, Aldgate, sought to bar Simpson from exercising his long-established lectureship there. This provoked a bitter split in Simpson's All Hallows congregation, with the more radical breakaway led by John Proud and Caleb Ingold, the men who had taken Trapnel's Legacy for Saints to the press. It was presumably this trauma that prompted Trapnel's renewed, and steadfast visions of 1657-9.

Paradoxes will always remain in any account of Anna Trapnel. She was 'a poor silly Creature in whom the Lord is seen', insensible, 'out of body', a mere instrument of God. Yet she was also a self-assured political activist, confident in her public stance and a genuine threat to the precarious and controversial new Protectorate regime. When writing from Plymouth to her church at All Hallows in 1654 she insisted that she was merely an 'unworthy sister', yet in fact she was giving them stern advice to stand firm while their pastor Simpson was in prison and was happy to boast that through free grace she had visions and a 'constant intimate familiarity with God'. Despite the opposition of those who 'cry up the fourth Monarchy' Trapnel remained confident that 'their horn growth blunt pointed' and determined 'while I have tongue and breath I shall go forth for the fifth Monarchy'.
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THE PROTECTOR AND THE PREACHER: OLIVER CROMWELL AND VAVASOR POWELL, REVISITED.

By Barbara Coulton

The best-known confrontation between Cromwell and Powell occurred in December 1653, albeit at a distance, Powell being in the pulpit at Blackfriars. The preacher is reported as saying: 'Let us go home and pray, and say Lord wilt Thou have Oliver Cromwell or Jesus Christ to reign over us?' A good sound bite, but this evidence is in fact third-hand, the final hand being that of Marchamont Nedham, journalist and government propagandist. It was not the first time that Cromwell had been mocked for his aspirations – royalists had accused 'King Noll' of ambition; in January 1648 the newspaper Mercurius Pragmaticus described 'King Cromwell' as walking 'like Moses among the seventy': 'He is become as absolute as the Grand Signior and though heretofore he took up arms against all superstition, yet now he is content to be idolized and worshiped as supreme over the States and Lord Paramount of the faction.' The editor was Marchamont Nedham.1 Clearly, the case of Nedham will have to be considered; but first we should see how our main protagonists arrived at the situation which brought confrontation in December 1653.

Cromwell's 'inner certainty of a specific call from God' is said (by John Morrill) to have come to him by 1638: 'It was to dominate the rest of his life.' But (as J.C. Davis argues) there is no evidence determining the ' vexed question of Cromwell's religious identity.' Another historian (Anthony Fletcher) directs our attention to Cromwell's speeches to his parliaments as a source of enlightenment about the programme of evangellisation and moral reform: 'to assess the extent of his achievement and the obstacles he failed to overcome.'2 Cromwell's progress is well-known, after the relative obscurity of his first forty years in East Anglia. At the other side of England the Welsh-born preacher Vavasor Powell (1617-70) spent his formative years in the south Shropshire district around Clun, of which parish his great-uncle was vicar from 1596 to 1637. Erasmus Powell was one of a circle of godly, Cambridge-educated ministers in the Church of England, placed there by two godly patrons, Richard More and Humphrey Walcot (also a Cambridge man). In the 1630s the group came up against Laudian oppression. More also translated, for his own satisfaction and not for publication, an influential work in Latin: Joseph Mede's Clavis Apocalypsis. One of Mede's students, an associate of John Milton, was a young clergyman, Richard Heath, appointed to a chapelry of Clun in 1635.3 So, by his early twenties Vavasor Powell had experienced godly religion, Laudian
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oppression, and (presumably) millenarian ideas of an intellectual nature.

Other influences were added. It was most likely in Shropshire that Powell met the ejected Welsh clergyman Walter Cradock who was at Llanfairwaterdine, where Powell taught school, in the late 1630s. Cradock’s fervent preaching style and his dedication to bringing the gospel to Wales evidently inspired the younger man. Another influence may have come from an associate of Cradock, Henry Jessey, pastor of a gathered church in London. The gathered church was sustained by the deeply held conviction that the act of entering a congregation of visible saints was to enter Christ’s “Kingdom” not in a metaphorical but in a literal sense. When Cradock moved into Wales (in 1639) to help William Wroth establish an independent church at Llanfaches in Monmouthshire Jessey travelled from London to help. In the words of Jessey’s anonymous biographer the Llanfaches congregation became “like Antioch the Mother Church in that Gentile Country”. Vavasor Powell was now active as a preacher in the same area. Another time, being in Brecknockshire, at an honest man’s house, I preached to several persons that were then together.” Taking a text from Ezekiel (34:16: I will seek that which was lost...) he preached: “though the little flock of Christ be despised and dispersed, yet shall they be gathered, prized, preserved.” He was evidently ‘gathering’ a congregation in Jessey’s style. For this activity he was arrested and bound over; he was accused of drawing away the king’s subjects and of speaking that_...

Powell devoted himself to religion. He was over two years in London, preaching, then for over two years he served a meeting in Dartford; he wrote The Scriptures Comment in English for those ‘little ones’; this was translated ‘for the good of Wales’. Powell also pleaded that his ‘dear and soule-hungring Countrey-men’ should have ‘godly able Welsh Ministers’. In September 1646 Powell received his certificate to preach, signed by the eighteen members of the Committee of Ministers; they included Thomas Froyssell of Clun, then preaching in London, and Stephen Marshall, to whom Powell explained his doubts about ordination, even on the Presbyterian model, as not being the eldership of which Timothy spoke (first epistle). Powell supported gathered congregations. Now in his thirtieth year, Powell was approved by the committee: ‘Mr Vavasor Powell is a man of a Religious and blameless conversation, and of able gifts for the work of the Ministry...he being now called, and desired to exercise his Gifts in his own Country of Wales, he also having the Language thereof.’ Powell’s commitment to the puritan cause led him into military activity and into the public sphere of politics. In the summer of 1646 he was present at the siege of Oxford and may have heard the radical preacher William Dell address the soldiers, quoting Isaiah 54:11-17: ‘O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted, behold...No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper.’ The army had not yet intervened decisively in politics but Dell urged that their mission was to help establish ‘the truly Christian and spiritual church’. In 1648 there was open insurrection in south Wales, ‘triggered by the attempt to disband the supernumerary forces’, Austin Woolrych also points to resurgent royalism and dislike of the post-war religious settlement as factors in the Second Civil War. Cromwell took a force into south Wales in May; Chepstow and Tenby castles surrendered but Pembroke held out until July. There was also trouble in north Wales where Thomas Mytton was besieging a last royalist stronghold. Powell volunteered to serve there, ‘charging at Beaumaris in Anglesey where he had a wound in the head’; he also lost the use of two fingers. He was, this account says, well known to General Mytton, Colonel John Jones and other officers. He was then in the north ‘when the Scots came’. Powell would later write of himself as one of those who joined with parliament and the army with no other design against the king and his party, save as they were enemies to our Lord Christ, his kingdom and people, hinderers of his work, and oppressors of the nation.

In the first year of the Commonwealth, 1649, our horizon must extend westward, to include Ireland where rebellion had to be dealt with. First Cromwell had to subdue fortified towns on the eastern and southern coasts; he had with him his chaplain Hugh Peters, described by Geraint Jenkins as leader of ‘a highly influential core of zealous Puritan preachers and military commanders...who had sedulously pressed the case for full-scale evangelisation in Wales.’ The proximity of Ireland and Wales, and the common strength of royalism and Catholicism, would be particularly evident to Peters and Cromwell, crossing from the one shore to the other. Insight into Cromwell’s religious policy is given in his response to the governor of Ross on 19 October: ‘I meddle not with any man’s conscience. But if by liberty of conscience you mean the liberty to exercise the Mass...that will not be allowed of.’ In January 1649/50 he replied to declarations made by prelates and clergy assembled at Clonmacnoise; the
ecclesiological sections of Cromwell's *Declaration* were probably drafted by one of his chaplains, but his own voice may be detected elsewhere. He accused the prelates and clergy of provoking a massacre of the English and of deceiving and seducing the Irish people. 'This principle, that people are for Kings and Churches, and Saints for the Pope and Churchmen (as you call them) begins to be exploded...to let them know what they are to trust from me, is the principle end of this my Declaration. That if I be not able to do good upon them, which I most desire...I shall have comfort in this, that I have freed my own soul from the guilt of the evil that shall ensue.' After arguing that the mass was not legal under English law (Cromwell saw the Irish as rebels) he concludes: 'there may be found another means than massacring, destruction and banishment; to wit the Word of God, which is able to convert...together with humanity, good life, equal and honest dealing with men of different opinion, which we desire to exercise towards this poor people'.

The poor people of Wales had long been a concern of Protestant preachers and politicians; at the time when Cromwell was in Ireland provision was being planned for England's neighbour. It was not just a matter of combating ignorance and Catholicism but of safeguarding against royalism and foreign intervention. In July 1649 Colonel Thomas Harrison, a supporter of Cromwell and a religious radical, was appointed to command in south Wales; he was also to head the commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales; the relevant act was passed on 22 February, to come into effect on 25 March 1650. The first three commissioners named were military men: Colonels Harrison, Philip Jones and John Jones; there are then listed numerous gentry not only from Wales but also from Shropshire. Any five or more of them were to have authority to deal with complaints against unsatisfactory clergy, to examine witnesses, to eject clergy. 'And to the end that godly and painful men, of able gifts and knowledge for the work of the Ministry [sic], and of approved conversation for Piety, may be imploied to preach the Gospel', the Commissioners were able to appoint persons recommended by ministers, including Cradock and Powell. During the process of preparation of the bill a parliamentary committee was appointed to give reasons for setting a day of public humiliation and fasting; Powell was asked to preach before parliament; Colonel Thomas Harrison was asked formally to thank Powell for his sermon and to request that he print it.

In *Christ exalted above all creatures by God his father* Powell exhorted the 'Worthy Rulers (of our Israel)' to walk humbly and to give God due glory.

There is much citing of Paul (including Hebrews, then attributed to him). Some things were disputable, such as 'Whether Christ shall come and reign in his owne Person and humane Nature upon the earth'. As to the Saints:

Its true, that faith, tears, prayers etc. are the best weapons, and with these the Saints do chiefly warre. But yet it is true, that the Saints may lawfully fight, for wee read that they have a two edged sword in their hands, as well as high prays of God in their mouths...

It was desirable that all remnants of 'Paganisme, Popery and Superstitious' be removed; places consecrated by bishops 'and still adored by the ignorant and superstitious' should be declared to have no inherent holiness in them. Powell also dealt with objections to 'meane men' being exalted; he cited as precedents Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Jephtha, Saul, David, 'and many others'. Were they not 'mean men, and not trained up or educated either for Civil or Military employments'? (This of course could apply to Powell himself.) He also praised 'that blessed, plaine, and ancient way of preaching', in the days of the apostles and during the early years of the church. Most congregations of saints supported parliament, Powell said: this was a sign of God's approval. He asked the members to have regard for the poor and oppressed, to administer justice, and 'to be tender also to some tender consciences'. This was a not uncommon theme of preachers. Powell declared:

Christ begins to take his great power, and to reign, and now the Judgement is set, and power put into the hands of the Saints, and one of the ten Hornes is cut off, and never to be put on againe...

This apocalyptic symbolism (from Rev. 13:1) was common currency among independent preachers: the ten horns of the beast represented kingdoms, which were agents of Antichrist. It was to be used again on 1 August 1650 in the army's declaration at Musselburgh: the Scots had crowned and were supporting Charles Stuart; God gave his verdict in Cromwell's victory at Dunbar on 3 September.

The symbolism of Hellenistic Jewish apocalypses, such as the pseudonymous Book of Daniel, 'largely derived from ancient myths' (as Norman Cohn shows). Jesus, who drew on this tradition, was 'obsessed with the coming of the kingdom and the elimination of the forces that obstruct it.' He seems to have expected a transformed earth; the primitive church 'saw itself as the congregation of the last days'. The influential

In *Christ exalted above all creatures by God his father* Powell exhorted the 'Worthy Rulers (of our Israel)' to walk humbly and to give God due glory.
apocalypse written for Jewish Christians, the Book of Revelation developed the ancient symbolism (of the beasts) and the belief in a millennium, heralding or following the Second Coming of Christ. In his study of seventeenth-century Congregationalists, Geoffrey Nuttall draws comparisons with first-century Christians; the later millenarianism 'seems more shocking'. 'It is easier to write off "Fifth-Monarchism" as an insignificant byway attracting...cracked-brained enthusiasts'; but 'the pathway leading to millenarian convictions was trodden by very many, especially between 1640 and 1660, not in England alone'.17 The language of apocalypses would provide ammunition for opponents of millenarian preachers.

At this point we should re-introduce Marchamont Nedham. His royalist adherence had landed him in prison; at Newgate, on 1 August 1649, he penned *Certain Considerations Tendered in all humility, to an Honorable Member of the Counsell of State*. He used his skill to present himself as 'persecuted' by 'whisperers, Informers etc.' whereas he desired to contribute to 'the Weale and Peace of the Nation'. The tumcoat was welcomed by the new regime; he was rewarded for his services (£50 and a promised salary of £100 as editor of a new official weekly, *Mercurius Politicus*). The regime had acquired one of the best propagandists available. In the spring of 1650 Nedham published *The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated*. He uses Biblical and classical instances; his work seems clever but specious, argued from expediency rather than conviction. But he became the associate friend of both Milton and Nedham 'placed them in an insignifιcant byway attracting...cracked-brained enthusiasts'; but <the Herald or follower of John Milton (dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and one of Cromwell's chaplains) had preached to parliament on "The Advantage of the Kingdome of Christ in the Shaking of the Kingdomes of this world": "There are great and mighty works in hand in this nation, Tyrants are punished, the jaws of Oppressours are broken, bloody revengefull persecutors disappointed, and we hope, Governours set
up, that may be just, ruling in the fear of the Lord’. A year later he again preached ‘Concerning the Kingdom of Christ’, the tone is now moderate: ‘The coming in of the kingdom of Christ, shall not be by the Arm of flesh, nor shall it be the product of the strife and contentions of men which are in the world: it is not to be done by might or power, but by the spirit of the Lord of Hosts’. The London preacher John Rogers wrote to Cromwell on 25 April 1653 from his study at Thomas the Apostle: ‘this is the day to be much observed, the rather for that in the revolution of times the changes will run their round out, and then the Lord will come to reign.’ He offered advice on the new parliament, recommending a Sanhedrin of men who feared God and loved truth and justice; they must govern as the servants of Christ. The letter was published that summer in a work already composed (in Dublin in 1651-2), Bethshemesh.23

Cromwell and the Council of Officers published their declaration on 23 April: they had been led by Providence and necessity to act as they had done; they relied upon the Lord. A provisional administration was set up, as a Council of State; in order to proceed with reforms the next assembly would have to be nominated, but a ‘Sanhedrin’ of seventy would not be adequate, so the number was doubled. Some members were nominated by preachers, including Vavasor Powell in Wales. A naval victory over the Dutch on 2-4 June was seen as a sign of God’s mercy, and of the gathering of his people. Cromwell himself, addressing the Assembly at its opening in July 1653, struck a millenarian, if ambiguous, note: ‘Truly God hath called you to this work...it may be truly said, that there never was a supreme authority...in such a way of owning God and being owned by him; this was ‘a day of the power of Christ’. One member of the assembly was Thomas Baker of Sweeney Hall in north Shropshire where Powell was often heard to pray and preach ‘four hours together’ to many people.24

The Nominated Assembly was short-lived: on 12 December 1653 a majority of members resigned their power to Cromwell; others were forcibly removed from the House. Despite the achievements of the Assembly conservative opinion feared social disorder, exemplified by the threat to abolish tithes and adowsons. Nor was the Assembly likely to bring about the reforms desired by Cromwell and his supporters. ‘It is likely that, for many of those who engineered the fall of Barebone’s Parliament and its replacement by the Protectorate, a concern to safeguard liberty of religious conscience was as important as a concern to safeguard property.25

A written constitution was adopted by the Council of Officers and presented to the Lord General; Cromwell refused the title of king but accepted that of Lord Protector; the new regime was inaugurated on 16 December. The oath taken by Cromwell that day spoke of the necessity of taking ‘some speedy Course...for the Settlement of these Nations’, the need to ‘secure Property’, and to ‘answer those great Ends of Religion and Liberty’, he promised, ‘in the Presence of God’, to observe the constitution, and to seek peace, justice and law.26

Cromwell had assumed the role of rule by ‘a supreme Single Person’ (as Christopher Feake described it). For two years meetings had taken place at Allhallows the Great, Thames Street, where preachers like Feake advocated the advancement of Christ’s kingdom. Barebone’s Parliament had given hope for this cause; its resignation, and Cromwell’s advancement, created dismay and anger. Within days of the Protector’s inauguration Feake and Vavasor Powell were preaching against Cromwell, in the pulpit of Blackfriars. Secretary of State John Thurloe intercepted a letter written to Daniel Lloyd at Wrexham on 22 December 1653: ‘Dear Friends, Mr. Powell and Mr. Feake having spoken somewhat largely in their thoughts of this present change, were yesterday taken into custody...Major-general Harrison...had his commission taken from him.’ Thurloe, a lawyer of Lincoln’s Inn, was in charge of intelligence. Marchamont Nedham compiled his report of the sermons given at Blackfriars on Monday evening 19 December 1653; it is one of the most frequently cited texts concerning this event, appearing as it does in full in the Calendar of State Papers Domestic. Nedham relayed the information but it came from another source. In March, Cromwell received a letter referring to Powell’s sermons: ‘I made bold...to take notes thereof, which were presented to your highness’. The writer was Alexander Griffith, Powell’s enemy. After a lengthy account of Feake’s discourse ‘concerning the little horn in Daniel vii’, the reporter turned to Powell: ‘he took occasion to inveigh bitterly against the great commanders; he applied Daniel’s prophecies ‘in a most pernicious manner’; he asserted that Christ was now setting up a fifth monarchy and would destroy all antichristian churches and clergy. ‘Upon the latter he was copious’ (as presumably were the apparently verbatim notes). Powell is said to have preached ‘in a very furious manner’, with ‘many strange ejaculations’ – one of these being the question whether the congregation would have Cromwell or Jesus as king.27

The sermon does indeed sound militant and threatening, but many phrases injected by the reporters help to create this effect. Now that we are aware that Griffith was the note-taker and Nedham the intermediary we may…
wonder what the actual sermon was like; was the report spiced up to show Powell as seditious? (Or even to reflect obliquely on Cromwell?) We do have comments by Feake: 'the man, whom the people call his Highness, and their Lord Protector' examined Feake in the Council Chamber with Thurloe present. He said that he had not applied the prophecies directly to Cromwell (looking him steadfastly in the face) because he had thought that Cromwell would not persecute the Saints. He argued that if he was against government then so was Cromwell who had 'pulled down' prelatical, Presbyterian and parliamentary government. Powell was also arrested but we have no details of his meeting with Cromwell. Both preachers were set free but after more preaching were again arrested; Feake was now imprisoned for a longer period (nineteen months at the time of his writing this account at Windsor) after being questioned on matters 'which some of their Purseavants or sneaking Spies had brought unto them. It put me in Mind of persecuting Prelates.' On 7 January 1654 followers of Powell attended him at Whitehall where he was summoned before the Council; Anna Trapnel was among them, 'who waiting in a little room near the Council, where was a fire, for Mr Powells coming forth, then with a purpose to return home. She was beyond and besides her thoughts...being seized upon by the Lord'. She embarked upon an eleven-day trance, singing her prophecies; there were numerous visitors but we do not know that Powell was among them. He was not imprisoned and was preaching again on 9 January at Christ Church at the Monday evening meeting. This occasion was witnessed by Powell's friend William Erbery, preacher at that church. Erbery believed in a spiritual coming of 'the kingdom within'. On the day of the meeting at Christ Church he composed a short tract, An Olive-Leaf, arguing against Powell's interpretation; he also posed the question whether ministers should 'meddle with Civill Government, seeing [Christ's] Kingdom is not of this World?' Two passing comments in the text may be retrieved: that since Blackfriars 'the face of blackness hath lately appeared on your Fellowships: some have lookt (though I do not) on your actions as Jesuitical'; and: 'As for my dear Countreyman Mr Powels preaching, I could not but cleave to his peaceable spint at the end of his Sermon [at Christ Church], persuading his brethren to meddle no more with Civill matters, but to speak of Spiritual glories.' Again information was passed to the Council, which issued a warrant for Powell's arrest, but nevertheless he was allowed to return to Wales.

Should we deduce from Erbery's account that Powell had felt his usual remorse after rashness, as described by his first biographer? 'It is true, under all the Worth and Excellency spoken of, you'll find him also, a man of like passions with his Brethren, and not without his Infirmities...The natural infirmity that he much groaned under, and complained of, was, passion and rashnesse, and which he would, when overtaken with, make haste out of, and with due acknowledgements for his evil therein, return speedily in a sweet frame and temper again.' Interestingly, a similar comment was made about Cromwell by his steward John Maidstone: 'His temper exceeding fery, as I have known, but the flame of it kept downe, for the most part, or soon allayed with those moral endowments he had. He was naturally compassionate'. Or was the Griffith-Nedham report distorted?

An interested observer in London was, of course, Alexander Griffith; his own view of events was expressed in a short preface to the work he now undertook, an anonymous and scurrilous attack on Powell:

We found out the s[e]cret of some part of his Doctrin in Wales, and here in London more bitterness of his Seditions, for which he was 3 times committed to the custody of the Messengers attending His Highness Council, and being thence with great clemency released, he became as wild as Actaeon...

Griffith continued to receive reports from Wales where, he said, Powell was 'as busie and violent...as ever he was here, against this present Government'. Powell's followers in Wales set about defending their Teacher, comparing Griffith to the viper which bit Paul and was cast into the fire (Acts, 28: 3-6). They drew up a defence because 'the faith given to the Saints...is to be contended for, and the cause of Zion not to be pleaded by holding our peace.' The authors were gentlemen, some lawyers, who dealt with certain false charges by procuring signed statements from witnesses (elders and deacons of Powell's congregations); some in Radnorshire had known him from his youth. So, the defence ran, the unnamed author (Griffith) 'suffers his absurdities to be discovered'. Powell preached indefatigably and was no 'fruitless itinerant'. On the subject of Christ's personal reign, they explained that Powell had cited learned books, including Mede's, but as hearers of the preacher they declared that he never made that opinion 'the subject of one whole sermon among us'; indeed, he seldom, and then sparingly, touched on it. They also pointed out that Powell had spoken and acted on behalf of parliament and had done military service at Beaumaris and in the north 'when the Scots came'. As for his attacks on the Protectorate: 'It is no new thing for Gods people to be charged with Seditio and Rebellion against Authority', but Powell had
be prophet Kindes, and encouraging such called by God to rule with him and for him’. He also spoke ‘concerning the wills you do prefer Christ’s will or your own wills ... to administer justice, to be tender to tender consciences, and to examine their own minds: ‘whether you do prefer Christ’s will or your own wills... Aske what is the will of God, and then what reason you have to obey it...’[say] as Paul, Lord what wilt thou have me to do?’ In July 1653 Cromwell had addressed the Nominated Assembly: ‘Truly God hath called you to this work... you are called by God to rule with him and for him’. He also spoke concerning the propaganda of the Gospel, and encouraging such Ministers and such a

Ministry as be faithful in the land...men that have truly received the spirit for such a use’. Cromwell had also mentioned ‘the case of Wales’ (the attempt to establish a preaching ministry there): ‘what discountenance that business of the poor people of God there had, who had watchings over them, men like so many wolves ready to catch the lamb as soon as it was brought out into the world... I think it was as perfect a trial of the spirits as anything, it being known to many of us that God kindles a seed there, indeed hardly to be paralleled since the primitive times.’ Powell could give a first-hand account of that. Cromwell may have explained something of the political necessities, such as the need to implement reforms, and the nature of his government.

One recorded contemporary view was expressed privately by Roger Williams, the minister of Providence, Rhode Island, who had been in London during 1652-4 and who knew Cromwell, Peters and others at the centre of affairs. Back at home, he wrote in July 1654 to John Winthrop, junior:

all the people of God in England, formerly called Puritanus Anglicus, of late Round heads, now the Sectarians... are now in the Saddle, and at the Helm... Some cheere up their spirits with the Impossibilitie of another Fall or Turn, so doth Major General Harrison and Mr Feake and Mr Jo. Simson now in Winsor castle for preaching against this last change and against the Protector as an Usurper Rich. 3. etc... Major G. Harrison was the 2nd in the Nation of late when the Lord [Gen] and him selfe joind against the former long Parliament and dissolved them: but now... he was Confin’d by the Protector and Councell within 5 mile of his Fathers house in Staffordshire.

Williams judged Harrison ‘a very gallant most deserving heavenly man, but most high flowne for the Kingdome of the Saints and the 5th Monarchie now risen, and their Sun never to set againe.’ Other ‘at the helm’, such as Henry Vane, ‘are not so full of that Faith of Miracles but still imagine changes and Persecutions’ and the very laughter of the Witnesses before that glorious morning so much desired of a Worldly Kingdom, if ever such a Kingdom (as literally it is by so many expounded) be to arise in this present World and Dispensation.’

Powell was welcomed back by his Welsh congregations but enemies continued to work against him. One report in February 1654 referred to his
'heretical' doctrines and his discontent: 'saying that men are more for power then Christ'; he preached, it was said, 'with much violence and vehemencie'. In April he and thirteen others were indicted in Montgomeryshire for signing a petition; the content and the outcome are not known. We do know of certain discontents. Powell did not approve of the new national system of appointing ministers to livings financed by tithes; he had refused such a living in 1647. Others were discontented too, such as the publishers of Cromwell's speech to Barebone's Parliament, given in July 1653; the pamphlet, issued without authority in October 1654, was meant to point up the contrast between Cromwell's statements in 1653 and those made to the first Protectorate parliament on 4 September 1654. In November 1654 Colonels Alured, Okey and Saunders presented a petition expressing concern at the Protector's power: they had engaged (in 1647) to fight against tyranny and for frequent, freely elected parliaments; with the new power a future Protector might use the army to destroy parliament, making void 'all provisions for liberty of conscience or freedom'. The colonels were arrested. In his speech to the first Protectorate parliament in September 1654 Cromwell condemned 'levelling principles' and 'the evil' of 'the mistaken notion of the Fifth Monarchy.' But that parliament also failed to effect the looked-for reforms, as Cromwell reproached members when he dismissed them on 22 January 1654/5: 'I think it my duty, - to tell you, that it is not for the profit of these nations, nor fit for the common and public good, for you to continue here any longer.' In January 1655 Cromwell wrote in a letter of his disappointment at setbacks and opposition, of 'the burden of my condition'. Peter Gaunt writes of the 'false dawn' of the Protectorate as troubles loomed in 1655.

In the spring of that year Powell showed his loyalty to the Commonwealth by gathering a force, in and around Wrexham, against a royalist rising in north Wales, leading the van and the pursuit, with the capture of over a hundred prisoners whom he took to Powis Castle. But he was not a supporter of the Protectorate, nor of the authoritarian rule of the major-generals, established during 1655. These men were sent into the provinces not only to ensure the security of the protectoral regime and to take over local government, but also to put into operation a programme of moral and godly reform. 'As staunch puritans, a strong commitment to the concept of the godly society was at the very core of their collective religious vision'. The major-general in charge of Wales and the border counties, James berry, told Powell that he had come with confidence 'in this worke, as sent of God'. We have Powell's response to the new regime in the autumn of 1655. 'Divers Christians' in mid-Wales, Powell's congregation and members of other churches, dissatisfied with the Protectorate, met for several days; a great rain was beating into the room when they asked for a sign: 'and before the Prayer was ended, the Lord shut up the windows of Heaven, and the Sun did shine gloriously'. We do not have to rely on hostile second-hand reports for the actual testimony they drew up since we have the published text. The testimony is prefaced by a letter to Cromwell, strongly condemnation of the 'sudden, strange and unexpected alteration of government', which disabled him from fulfilling 'the good things covenanted for'. A reference to the recent failure at Hispaniola was 'God's signal withdrawing from you his designs.' (This failure troubled Cromwell too.) In contrast, the paper quotes from the soldiers' declaration at Musselburgh in August 1650, asserting that the monarchy of Charles I was 'one of the ten horns of the beast spoken of, Rev. xvii. ver. 13, 14, 15', and that the army were called forth by the Lord to destroy Antichrist and deliver his church and people. This would also have been a reminder to Cromwell of his role then and his victory at Dunbar. In fact, Powell's paper addresses him not as Protector but as Lord General, a significant detail. The writers speak as 'as Christians, having a right to the things of Christ, and as...men, having a right to our native privileges'. Their objections are itemised: there are parallels to the Israelites after their deliverance from Egypt, when they forgot God; the blessed cause has been laid aside; the unwarrantable change of government undermines the foundation of the commonwealth; many servants of God are in prison without knowing their accusers; taxes are being raised without consent of parliament; honours, profits, benefits, tithes are maintained and sons, servants, friends and favourites are exalted; an unreasonable number of officers receive their pay, and are maintained in pomp and luxury, out of the penury of poor peasants and tenants. Lastly, they declared from their hearts and souls, that those of them that had any hand in acting against the late king and his party did so because they were enemies of Christ, his kingdom and his people: they never intended setting up another person or unrighteous power. There were over three hundred signatures and the paper was taken to Cromwell in person by a Captain Richard Price, as testimony against Cromwell's 'Apostacy in that evil day', as a supporter later avouched. Certain radicals were imprisoned: Thomas Harrison, John Rogers and Christopher Peake were in Carisbrooke Castle in 1655. Arise Evans,
visionary (and unbalanced) Welsh prophet, regarded Feake, Powell and Rogers as ‘demigods’ of the radical independents. John Simpson was removed from St Botolph’s in July 1655 but continued to preach in London; he and Cornet Wentworth Day read out A Word for God to a large meeting at Allhallows in December 1655; Day was arrested.44 Not surprisingly, Powell was an object of suspicion to John Thrudoe who wrote to Henry Cromwell in Ireland that Powell and his party would ‘call up again the old parliament’, bringing things to ‘trouble and confusion’. But the preacher had a strong defender in Major-General James Berry. While at Worcester Berry sent to Montgomeryshire where Powell had been arrested at a day of fasting and prayer and imprisoned on account of his Word for God. On 12 November 1655 Berry wrote to his friend the Protector who was concerned at a possible design ‘to put things into distraction’.

I had sent for [Powell] to understand the truth of things. He told me that truly it was far from him or any of his friends to design any such thing...their ends in it were...First to see if it would please God thereby to work upon your heart...secondly if not soe then to discharge their duetyes by publishing their dissatisfactions.

Powell promised not to meddle ‘with anything of difference’; Berry gave him permission to preach at Worcester (‘where he preached very honestly and soberly 4 sermons in 4 churches and had many hearers’). After their discussion Berry invited Powell to dinner. On 1 December, in a letter to Thrudoe, Berry recommended ‘a little more understanding’ of ‘our British zeale’. Writing from Welshpool on December 28 he informed the Secretary: ‘I have had a long and sober discourse with Mr. Powell...we parted friendly’. A letter from Shrewsbury on 5 January expressed Berry’s conviction ‘that people will not be wrought up to any comotion...they are an affectionate tender-spirited people that want judgment’.45 Berry’s assurances were underlined that same month by a counter-petition to Powell’s ‘unseemly Paper’, reassuring Cromwell that the generality of the saints in south Wales supported him. The authors acknowledged the mercies brought to them: protection of the saints, liberty of the gospel, rights of the people; ‘we cannot see if some, who are so earnestly set against this Government...had their wills, how these mercies can be preserved to us.’ Some 750 signatories, distant from ‘publique affairs’, included Walter Cradock.46

Another response to Powell’s pamphlet was Plain Dealing or the unmasking of the opposers of the present government and governors. In answer of several things affirmed by Mr Vavasor Powell and others...; written by Samuel Richardson, it was published in London in January 1655/6 and distributed by the government; the writer asserted that Cromwell aimed at the general good of the nation, ‘and just liberty of every man’; the government rewarded him for his service. Blair Worden writes that Marchamont Nedham ‘daringly recalled’ his earlier criticism of the Protector: ‘Though he did not now name Cromwell, Cromwell remains the intended target of Nedham’s allusions to ambitious generals who had destroyed public liberty in classical antiquity’. In 1656 such criticism was published in The Excellency of a Free State, ‘one of three major anti-Cromwellian publications of 1656’, the others being A Healing Question Propounded, by Henry Vane, and Oceana by James Harrington.47 Powell was not alone, therefore, in his criticism of the Protectorate, but he was far from the centre of things. There is nothing to suggest sedition but Powell’s fervent preaching and the enthusiasm of his followers alarmed the authorities in Wales: in June 1656 the sheriff of Montgomery, Sir Richard Pryce, wrote to his father-in-law, Commissioner Bulstrode Whitelocke, asking what he should do about ‘tumultuous assemblies’. Pryce arrested Powell but soon released him. In London there were meetings of ‘real’ Fifth Monarchists, led by Thomas Venner who had returned from New England in 1651. His plotting appears to have begun in 1655; Thomas Harrison refused to take part; a planned rising in 1656-7 was condemned by Harrison and John Rogers. Venner was in prison from April 1657 until 1659. ‘Venner’s lasting notoriety sprang from his second rising, shortly after the Restoration’.48

Powell outlived Cromwell by twelve years; he was in prison at the Restoration, but he continued to write. The first of his prison books, written at a time when the Prayer Book was being revised, was a direct challenge to the regime; it was dedicated to the Lords and Commons in Parliament. In Common-prayer-book no divine service he argued from Scripture and early church history that imposed liturgies (‘stinted liturgies’) were unlawful, unnecessary, popish: ‘The Scriptures themselves are a sufficient Directory and Rubrick to the Church of God’. His arguments against a national church followed an established puritan line, from separatists to independents.49 The next book, The Bird in the Cage, Chirping, was addressed to his ‘Beloved Brethren’ in Wales, but would reach a wider public. Powell recalled his ministry (echoing Paul’s second epistle to the Corinthians, 11:26-9): ‘labouring day and night, in perils often, and many waies: meeting and encountering with great difficulties, but most of all with self­discouragements and weaknesses’. He encouraged his brethren to ‘Search the Scriptures and give attendance to reading, and be steadfast in those
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truths, which you have been taught'. The magistrates of the fourth monarchy were to be obeyed (as in the apostles' time) 'in all lawful things'; but not if they commanded anything contrary to the word of God. Millenarian hopes were subdued: 'Withall expecting the destruction of Antichrist, the Restauration of the Jews, the Coming, Kingdom, and Raign of Christ'. Meanwhile: 'It is a great piece of prudence in an evil time to be silent', but in some cases it was right to make a stand: 'as when the Persecution is general; or when a man hath a special boldness given to him to suffer'. 'The Lord now shakes his visible Church, as a Tree is shaken, that the rotten fruit may fall off.' Most of Powell's last decade was spent in prison; he died there (in Caronne House, Lambeth) in October 1670.30

This paper suggests that the report on Vavasor Powell's London sermons in December-January 1653-4 should be revisited, taking into consideration the source of the information against him and other evidence, not usually adduced. The term 'Fifth Monarchist' should also be refined: as used in the seventeenth century it was meant to denigrate, an example of naming and smearing of the order of heretic, atheist, anabaptist, puritan, Leveller. The Millenarian aspect of the preaching should be seen in a wider perspective. Given this approach, we may see both Powell and Cromwell in a clearer light. The person who has suffered most from the adoption of seventeenth-century propaganda into twentieth-century historiography is Powell. It has been possible, from the English point of view, to dismiss him as a Welsh firebrand. (Welsh historians favour the image of an apostle.) A more balanced view was available at the time, from those who knew and were not hostile to Powell; James Berry is notable as the representative of the regime which Powell was denouncing. An attempt to assess Cromwell's response to Powell has to be circumstantial. A better understanding of events from December 1653 until 1655, involving Powell, helps us to evaluate his published criticism of the Protectorate at the end of the latter year. This fits into the larger subject of the Protectorate, from its false dawn to its midpoint; both Powell and Cromwell were disappointed in their hopes for a godly kingdom on earth, although they both presumably held to their personal faith.
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AUSTIN HERBERT WOOLRYCH (1918-2004)

Austin Herbert Woolrych died of a heart attack while on holiday at Lanzarote on 14 September 2004. He was 86 and since the death of Christopher Hill was the benign doyen of historians of the Age of Cromwell. Born on 18 May 1918, he was a bright dayboy at Westminster School, but family circumstances precluded entry to university. At seventeen he started work at Harrods. During his time there he acquired a taste for music, travel and literature. It was a cultivated young man who enlisted in the army in 1939, soon to be commissioned in the Royal Tank Corps. In command of three tanks at El Alamein, he was wounded and transferred to a variety of postings in Palestine and back home. Frequently ill, he never expected, he said, to reach his mid-eighties, much less to do so in good health. He had married Muriel in 1941. (They were devoted and he nursed her tenderly through a long illness until her death in 1991, which hit him hard).

The war over, he had no thought of a future at Harrods, nor did a regular army career appeal to him. He was rescued by the generous further education scheme for ex-service people. He got a place at Pembroke College, Oxford, (his grandfather's alma mater), hoping to read English, for which he was well prepared. But Pembroke, the smallest college in Oxford, lacked an English tutor. He took it, a wise and lucky decision. The immediate post-war ex-service pupils were surely the best generation ever - responsive, enthusiastic, and keen to get back and to get on. Hard working, they worked their tutors hard. Austin was one of them. He got a First, of course. Earlier reading in seventeenth-century literature edged him into its historical context. His special field was already set. Abandoning the notion of school teaching, he started a B.Litt., but concerned for possible shortages in the academic job-market, accepted an assistant-lectureship at Leeds, historical context. His special field was already set. Abandoning the notion of school teaching, he started a B.Litt., but concerned for possible shortages in the academic job-market, accepted an assistant-lectureship at Leeds, where he spent fifteen formative years becoming an inspiring teacher and supervisor. While there he turned into a northerner, too, walking the Dales, Lanzarote on 14 September 2004. He was 86 and since the death of Christopher Hill was the benign doyen of historians of the Age of Cromwell. Born on 18 May 1918, he was a bright dayboy at Westminster School, but family circumstances precluded entry to university. At seventeen he started work at Harrods. During his time there he acquired a taste for music, travel and literature. It was a cultivated young man who enlisted in the army in 1939, soon to be commissioned in the Royal Tank Corps. In command of three tanks at El Alamein, he was wounded and transferred to a variety of postings in Palestine and back home. Frequently ill, he never expected, he said, to reach his mid-eighties, much less to do so in good health. He had married Muriel in 1941. (They were devoted and he nursed her tenderly through a long illness until her death in 1991, which hit him hard).

The war over, he had no thought of a future at Harrods, nor did a regular army career appeal to him. He was rescued by the generous further education scheme for ex-service people. He got a place at Pembroke College, Oxford, (his grandfather's alma mater), hoping to read English, for which he was well prepared. But Pembroke, the smallest college in Oxford, lacked an English tutor. He took it, a wise and lucky decision. The immediate post-war ex-service pupils were surely the best generation ever - responsive, enthusiastic, and keen to get back and to get on. Hard working, they worked their tutors hard. Austin was one of them. He got a First, of course. Earlier reading in seventeenth-century literature edged him into its historical context. His special field was already set. Abandoning the notion of school teaching, he started a B.Litt., but concerned for possible shortages in the academic job-market, accepted an assistant-lectureship at Leeds, where he spent fifteen formative years becoming an inspiring teacher and supervisor. While there he turned into a northerner, too, walking the Dales, Lakeland and the Pennines. This period produced his first two books - short but pregnant. Battles of the English Civil War (1961) drew on his own experience of what field fighting was like, but it was also very much military history with the politics left in. Cromwell (1964) began a continuing evaluation of the dominant figure of the mid-century.

In 1963 Woolrych was appointed to the chair of History at the new (Robbins-expansion) University of Lancaster, and was soon deeply involved in framing its institutional structure and easing the emergence of its peculiar...
ethos. The syllabus he devised has been described as less adventurous than those developing at about the same time in York and Sussex, but some might think it none the worse for that. The departmental staff he enlisted was a distinguished one – including the social historian Harold Perkins, Martin Blinkhorn, and later Geoffrey Holmes and Michael Mullett. Essential university business in a formative period delayed somewhat the appearance of his first substantial work – the long, searching Historical Introduction to the seventh volume (1974) of the Yale edition of Milton's prose works, tackling the unexpected revival of the Rump in 1659 and its demise in 1660. His general line on the collapse of the Good Old Cause into a mish-mash of divergences has been followed by later historians, though some revision has lately been suggested by Ruth E. Mayers in her *1659: the Crisis of the Commonwealth* (2004).

In 1982 *From Commonwealth to Protectorate* provided an incisive analytical narrative of a vital year, pivoted on the Nominated Assembly of 1653, from which Austin decisively cut away the sneering nickname of Barebones. To complete a trilogy he went back to 1647, *inter alia* putting the Putney Debates – not, he was convinced, held in the church there – into a context less of radicalism than of the internal politics of the Arny Council at the time when Cromwell was showing signs of becoming Milton's chief (for a time at least) of men, *Soldiers and Statesmen 1647-1648*.

The central concerns of these major works prompted the title of the *festschrift* presented to him on his eightieth birthday (1998) – *Soldiers, Writers and Statesmen of the English Revolution*, which included articles by admiring former students and researchers whose theses he had expertly examined. This substantial volume includes an evocative personal appreciation of the man himself by Lesley le Claire and a photographic portrait – the neat military moustache and a hint of humour in the direct gaze presenting Austin Woolrych to the life.

All along Austin had been publishing articles, conference papers – delivered in five continents, very congenial to his love of travel – and reviews. (His first review was of *The Committee at Stratford* (1957), edited by Donald Pennington and myself. It was generous). A Historical Association pamphlet on *Penruddock's Rising* (1955) is the standard work, while *England without a King, 1649-60*, (1983) offers a distillation of a whole decade on the guise of an introduction. In 1985 he made with me a couple of audiotapecs discussing Oliver Cromwell (who else?), the General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century (a fruitful error?) and the Thirty Years War.
The city of St Albans is situated 23 miles northwest of London on the banks of the River Ver.

Evidence of human activity in this area dates back to the Palaeolithic, worked flints from this period and from the Mesolithic, around 6000 BC, suggest that the people were transient hunters. Neolithic farmers were the first permanent settlers, artefacts from the Neolithic and the Bronze Age have been found, but it is only with the arrival of the Celts that the continuous record of the development of the city really begins.

Celts migrating from the continent gradually settled the area, initially at Wheathampstead to the north-east, but later moving to Prae Wood on the western edge of present St Albans. Evidence of earthworks is still visible at both sites. The dominant Celts in Hertfordshire were the Belgic Catuvellauni tribe. Following initial opposition, under their leader Cassiuvellaunus, to the invasion of Julius Caesar in 54 BC, negotiations led to peace. The Belgae subsequently started to barter with the Romans and, as trade grew, they then became the first British tribe to mint coins.

Romanisation increased after the invasion of 43 AD and the Belgic settlement was superseded by the development of a Roman town between Prae Wood and the River Ver. This first town, which was mainly timber-structured, was burnt down during the 61 AD Iceni uprising led by Boudicca and little is known about it. The town, Verulamium, was rebuilt, again of timber but with additional flint and brick. By AD 79, it included a forum, dedicated to the governor Agricola, and a basilica. One corner of this is outlined on the ground next to the Museum. Houses, shops, temples and a theatre were also constructed. The town became pre-eminent in England with municipium status and is one of the best examples of Roman town planning remaining in Britain. The Verulamium Museum contains an outstanding collection of Roman finds, including mosaics and painted wall plaster, and various structures including the theatre, hypocaust and a section of Roman wall can be seen nearby.

St Albans was martyred under the Romans, probably during the 3rd century, on the hill above the River Ver. The present-day town developed around this spot following the foundation and establishment of what is now the

Cathedral and Abbey Church. The high altar supposedly marks the site of St Alban's martyrdom. The original foundation around 793 appears to have been a double monastery with Benedictine monks and nuns. Founded by King Offa of Mercia, little is known from the Saxon era. It was revitalised about 969 and remained a double monastery until 1140 when the nuns moved to nearby Sopwell. It became a very wealthy Abbey with numerous dependencies. The Abbey church was re-built in the 11th century incorporating brick and tile recycled from the ruins of Verulamium and further construction and alterations have been carried out into the 20th century.

Most of the buildings of the Abbey complex were demolished after the Dissolution but the great gateway (c. 1360), a focus for attack during the 1381 Peasants` Revolt, forms part of St Albans School. John Ball, one of the leaders of the Revolt, was executed in St Albans. The townsperson purchased the Abbey church as their parish church after the Dissolution and in 1877 it became a cathedral known as "The Cathedral and Abbey Church of St Alban".

St Albans was the site of two battles during the 15th century in the conflict between the Houses of York and Lancaster now known as the "Wars of the Roses". The first took place in the town on 22 May 1455. The Lancastrians were beaten and many of their nobles, including the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Clifford, were killed. The second battle was fought on 17 February 1461 and this time resulted in a win for the Lancastrians. When the battle was over the Lancastrian soldiers plundered the Abbey and the town.

Throughout the Civil War, two centuries later, the Parliamentary army held St Albans. Early grievances during the Long Parliament arose over ship money. In 1640 people from St Albans and Watford petitioned against the High Sheriff of Hertfordshire, Thomas Coningsby, for levying ship money too rigorously. One of the MPs representing St Albans was Sir John Jennings of Holywell House who, during the course of the Long Parliament, was succeeded by his son, Richard. Holywell House was later owned by Sarah Jennings who became Duchess of Marlborough, favourite of Queen Anne. The house was demolished in the 19th century when Holywell Hill was widened.

In 1641 separate proclamations were issued by King and by Parliament. William Newe, the Mayor of St Albans made the wrong decision and read
the proclamation issued by the King. As a consequence he was imprisoned in the Fleet. He was eventually released and was again Mayor in 1649.1

As war started to appear inevitable, St Albans became a recruiting centre for the Parliamentarians. Albam Cox undertook to train horsemen and John Marsh foot soldiers. Colonel Cox lived in the manor house of Newland Squillers and was a friend of Cromwell who, tradition relates, often stayed with him. The Marlborough Almshouses erected by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough in 1736 now occupy this site. In 1654 Albam Cox was sent to Parliament as the member representing the borough of St Albans and he died in 1665.

The townspeople were required to provide quarter for the Army. Many were concerned about the discipline of the troops in the town. For example, by the outbreak of the war, Gorhambury Park situated to the west of St Albans was rented by Sir Thomas Meautys to Lady Sussex and her elderly, second husband. She corresponded frequently with the Verney family and her letters illustrate her unease as war looked increasingly likely. Two letters from January 1642 [modernised spelling] read

These distracted times put us all in great disorder, but I hope we shall not be killed...3

We have been at our devotions today, and there was something read from your Parliament to have all the trained bands in a readiness. They are all in great fear at St Albans, and every house they say have brought arms and guns to defend them. I hope I shall be safe here, though I have neither...3

In June 1642 she was concerned for her possessions

I am loathe to eat in pewter yet, but truly I have put up most of my plate, and say it is sold.4

Troops passed through St Albans in October 1642, early in the Civil War, because it was on the Parliamentarian route between London and Edgehill. The Earl of Essex arrived in the town on 5 November 1642, after the battle, and established his headquarters. On 9 November, Lady Sussex, travelling home to Gorhambury from London, expressed thanks for her good fortune in meeting no soldiers.5 Worried about looting, she wrote to the Earl begging for safeguards for Gorhambury. An order of protection was duly signed by the Earl. This obviously did not convince her because letters written later in the month to Sir Ralph Verney report that she was barricading her doors and walling up some of her remaining valuables in one of the turrets. Lady Sussex was later nicknamed the 'Peeress of the Protectorate' because the Earl of Warwick and the Earl of Manchester became her third and fourth husbands.6

Gorhambury Park had been built in 1563 for Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal to Elizabeth I. Elizabeth visited on three occasions in 1570, 1573 and 1577. It then passed to his son Sir Francis Bacon, 1st Baron Verulam and Viscount St Alban, until his death in 1626. A statue of Sir Francis Bacon is in St Michael's Church. Sir Harbottle Grimston purchased the park in 1652. He became Speaker of the Convention Parliament of 1660. The Tudor house was demolished when a new house was built in the late 18th century and only its ruins remain.

Soldiers were frequently stationed in St Albans throughout the war and it was often the site of the Parliamentarian headquarters. The Earl of Essex fortified the town with trenches and earthworks in 1643. The main sites of these defences were near St Peter's and St Stephen's churches.

Although it does not appear that she was ever directly affected at Gorhambury, Lady Sussex was right to be wary of problems with military discipline. For example, in December 1643 several hundred soldiers mutinied and threatened to pillage the town on a market day if they remained unpaid. The Earl of Essex managed to quell the insurrection. In the spring of 1645 unruly recruits engaged in violence throughout Hertfordshire and twelve appeared before the Justices of St Albans. Two were condemned to death.7

Fighting broke out in the town on 14 January 1643. Sir Thomas Coningsby, the High Sheriff, arrived in St Albans from South Mimms and attempted to read a royal proclamation. Coningsby had ridden into Market Place on market day accompanied by his supporters. While the proclamation was being read, Cromwell and his troops appeared from the junction of Holywell Hill and High Street. A skirmish took place in the gateway and yard of the Great Red Lion. Cromwell prevailed and Coningsby was arrested and sent as a prisoner to Ely House in Holborn, London.8

The Earls of Essex and Manchester resigned their commissions on 2 April 1645 pre-empting the passing of the Self-Denying Ordinance, which
occurred the next day. Sir Thomas Fairfax lost no time in taking over the leadership of the army and on Easter Day, 6 April 1645, he was in St Albans reviewing the army. Fairfax was again in the town in June 1647 and so was the King.

Charles I passed through St Albans on at least two occasions. The first occurred after his escape from Oxford in April 1646. He rode in disguise from Hillingdon through St Albans and stopped for the night at nearby Wheathampstead. He then continued his journey to meet the Scots. Handed over by the Scots to representatives of Parliament in January 1647, Charles was again in St Albans with the Parliamentary Army on 24 June. This followed his removal from Holmby House by Cornet Joyce into the New Model Army's control earlier in the month. By the 26/27 June the King had been moved to Hatfield House to the east of St Albans. Here the 2nd Earl of Salisbury treated him with courtesy although he was not a supporter of Charles, having decided for Parliament. Hatfield House was built for Robert Cecil, first Earl of Salisbury, the second son of Lord Burghley although it was not completed until 1612, the year of his death. It is considered to be one of the finest Jacobean houses in England.

The King remained with the New Model Army in the Hertfordshire area for several weeks. During this period rancour between Parliament and the Army grew. Parliament had ordered the Army to disband but without payment of arrears. The General Council of the Army declared it would not disband until its grievances had been met. The fact that the Army now had the King gave them additional power in bargaining with the Parliament at Westminster. As messages sent from Westminster proved unsatisfactory, the Army moved closer to London threatening the capital.

On 13 June a deputation of London's citizens was sent to Fairfax's Headquarters in St Albans to meet the soldiers. Two days later the Council of the Army sent The Declaration of the Army demanding the purging of the House. It was followed by another demand from St Albans for the expulsion of 11 members considered hostile to the Army's interests. On 24 June this demand was repeated and the next day the Army left St Albans for Uxbridge. On 26 June the 11 members withdrew. On 3 July, some of the Army's demands having been met, it withdrew to Reading.

The Army was back in St Albans later in the month. As a result of riots in London, both Speakers, eight peers and 57 Independent members sought Fairfax's protection in St Albans on 29 July because they considered
especially Roman. The St Albans City Museum has collections from medieval and later periods and the Kingsbury Watermill Museum displays milling machinery in a mainly 16th century building. The ruins of Verulamium are particularly noteworthy, as is the Cathedral and Abbey Church. The late 14th century great gateway and the early 15th century clock tower are also of interest. The tower probably contained a clock from the date of its construction (1403-12) but was also a bell tower used to signal curfew. Medieval construction survives in buildings in Market Place, French Row and George Street, adjacent to the clock tower. Many of St Albans array of public houses also have origins prior to the 17th century reflecting its history as a crossing point for major highways and the need to provide food and drink and accommodation for travellers. Gorhambury Park is open to visitors on Thursday afternoons throughout the summer and Hatfield House opens every day except Mondays.

Present day visitors to the city will find that St Albans is easily reached via the M1/M10, the M25 and the AIM or by either of its two railway stations.

Notes
15. Entry in D.N.B.

Dr. Judith D. Hutchinson joined The Cromwell Association in 1991, has been a member of the Council since 2001 and has recently become the Honorary Secretary.
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There is no modern biography of Thomas Rainborowe, one of the most colourful characters thrown up by the English Revolution. Whitney Jones is therefore to be congratulated on making this foray from his main area of scholarly expertise, the Tudor period, to fill this historiographical hole. Jones rightly decides not to use any of the many variants spellings of his subject's name (Rainborough, Rainsborough, Rainsborow, Rainesborough, Raynborough are only some of these) on the sensible grounds that that Thomas consistently called himself Rainborowe. Jones has also rightly chosen as the centrepieces of his book the two episodes for which Rainborowe is most well known, his intervention on the radical side in the debate on the franchise in the assembly council at Putney on 29 October 1647 and his assassination at Doncaster in October 1648. In chapter 5 he assiduously documents the context of the famous debate at Putney at which Rainborowe challenged Henry Ireton's opposition to granting the right to vote to anyone who did not possess property. Rainborowe's response is still powerful and thrilling: 'For really I think that the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live, as the greatest he; and therefore truly sir, I think it is clear, that every man that is to live under a government ought first by his own consent to put himself under a government.' Chapter 8 is the most thorough investigation ever attempted of the evidence of the murky events surrounding the murder of Rainborowe, avoiding the crude imaginings of conspiracy theorists, some of whom have seen the hand of Rainborowe's enemies cut short by death, a 'fellow traveller' or a man 'for whom Leveller ideas seem to have been a passing fancy'. Readers might justifiably ask 'but what does Professor Jones think; has he given them the material to come up with answers of their own.'


This is an illustrated edition of a book first published in 2000. The new edition includes 137 interesting black and white illustrations, as well as alphabetically arranged short entries on people, places, and battles of the English Civil War, as well as definitions of things like taxes introduced in this period (e.g. 'excise'), military equipment (e.g. 'drake'), radical groups (e.g. 'Ranters'), beliefs (e.g. 'millenarianism'), and so on. Inevitably one or two errors have crept into he text. In the introduction (p. 16) the date of the battle of Edgehill is wrongly given as 1643, although the battle is correctly dated at 1642 in the entry on Edgehill (p. 82). In the entry on Thomas Rainborowe (for whom Bennett, unlike Whitney Jones, adopts the variant spellings of Rain(s)borough and Rainborow) the Putney Debates are said to have taken place in 1648 (p. 206), although the correct date of 1647...
Dunbar are
As for the battle re-creations and expositions are now best achieved via multi-media presentations or computer-aided technology.

As for the text itself, its description and analysis of what happened at Dunbar are lucid and informative. As with all books with a focus on a particular military incident, the driving force carrying the text along is a strong narrative of events, which is accurate and thoughtful. So decisive and overwhelming was the success of the English army at Dunbar that it is easy to overlook the disadvantages of terrain faced by Cromwell. This book advances the view that the victory was the improbable consequence of what was intended initially as a breakout, a plan not to impose a crushing defeat on the covenanted Scots but an attempt by the English commanders to create an exit strategy southwards. This is a plausible interpretation of the evidence, and provides an extra strand of interest to the volume.

The wider politics of Dunbar are complex. The battle can only be understood in the context of the 'British civil wars', the 'wars of the three kingdoms' that embroiled all the kingdoms of the Stuarts. Unsurprisingly perhaps, given the military history emphasis, the political context that Stuart Reid provides is not detailed or sophisticated. The author makes much of differences between English and Scots views of kingship, as an explanation of the start of the troubles in 1638 (a fair point), but also as an explanation for Dunbar: 'the curious inability of Oliver Cromwell and the English government to appreciate that the Scots' view of kingship was fundamentally different from their own' (p. 7). Setting aside the obvious point that Cromwell was acting on behalf of a government that had explicitly repudiated monarchy of any kind, it is hard to see how the Scots campaign of 1650-1 can be attributed to a 'misunderstanding'. Stuart Reid misses the fact that the Charles Stuart proclaimed as King Charles II by the Scots in October 1649 was proclaimed as kung not only of Scotland, but of republican England and Ireland as well. The idea that this fiat could simply be ignored by the council of state of the Rump Parliament is scarcely tenable. Serious readers of Dunbar would do well to have alongside them one of the range of books on the politics of this inter-kingdom dimension, such as David Scott, Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49 (Palgrave, 2004).

Malcolm Atkin's account of civil war Evesham is more modest in its scope and presentation, but it is a reliable and lively guide nevertheless. As might be expected from an author who is a professional archaeologist, there are fresh glimpses of the civil war remains in Evesham. The main focus of the book is the battle by Edward Massie, then governor of Gloucester, on Evesham on 26 May 1645, but there is also much on developments on either side of that crisis in the civil war history of the borough. Atkin uses not only local sources, such as the borough records, to illuminate his subject, but also exploits documents in The National Archives and the British Library's Thomason Tracts to very good effect. More than Stuart Coward


These two books, one on a crucial full-scale battle, the other on the assault on, and capture of, a Worcestershire town with minimal casualties, provide serviceable military history narratives. Dunbar is an exhaustive study of one of the most celebrated of civil war battles. The first of Cromwell's lucky day battles, fought on 3 September, contributed much to Oliver's own providentialist interpretation of the destiny of the English. Stuart Reid's study is one of a series of Osprey volumes entitled 'Campaign', in which accounts of key battles are set in context, and in which overall strategy, immediate tactics and personal experiences in the heat of the battles themselves are given full treatment. There are many accounts of this battle readily available in print in one form or another. Books on civil war battles, biographies of Oliver Cromwell as well for that matter, are plentiful: readily available in print in one form or another. Books on civil war battles themselves are given full treatment. There are many accounts of this battle
Reid, Malcolm Atkin seems uncomfortable with political and religious history. Readers of this book will look in vain for any analysis of what the civil war was about, or what differences of outlook there might have been between men on the same side. Perhaps that is a better policy than providing a cursory sketch. Occasionally there are lapses: the celebrated writer and minister Richard Baxter stayed at nearby Rous Leach Court in 1647 not in 1646. He stayed there because it was a private retreat where he could recover his health, not while he was a serving military chaplain, and it was never a parliamentarian garrison (p. 29). A curious feature is that although there is a list of the abbreviations used in the footnotes, those that refer to published books are not given in full, so that for example readers are left to work out for themselves that EBR, 'Evesham Borough Records', refers to a Worcestershire Historical Society volume of that title. But these minor matters apart, this is a useful summary of civil war activity in a small town.

Stephen K. Roberts

Dr Peter Gaunt, Oliver Cromwell, (The British Library Historical Lives Series, South Sea Internal Press, July 2004) 144 pages, ppx, £12.95

Why another biography of Oliver Cromwell? Should you be intimidated by, or just avoiding the plethora of biographies on the man, Peter Gaunt has produced a compelling little gem in this prestigious series, which will change your mind. Dr Gaunt's critical enthusiasm and authoritative command of his subject are obvious in the concise, flowing text, many original illustrations, photographs and uncluttered layout, which carry the attention to the last page. This book will be useful to the generality of readers, whether as an introduction, a refresher, a reference source, or just a pleasurable good read. The contents are divided into five chronological chapters, tracing Cromwell's modest but respectable beginnings, his steady rise in the Army and Parliament, including his personal and religious development which illuminated his latent talents as a commander and statesman, to his eventual governance of the four kingdoms. The author helpfully summarizes the chapter theme in the top right hand corner of each chapter title page and avoids the obvious 'hero or villain' approach giving us instead his insights and balanced assessment of this complex man: a 'warts and all' portrait of which Oliver would have approved. This is an unconventional compact biography capturing the soul and spirit of the man. The right format, the right price and the right book.

Michael Byrd


The novel starts with one of the main characters Patience Madden recalling the events, which took place in a remote West-Country village during the Civil War of 1645. We are then transported back to 1645 and observe the events unfolding over the period of April to the following January (each chapter is a month). At the end of each chapter we then return to 1692 and the confession of Patience which she is giving to the judges in Salem.

Julie Heam started her career as a journalist and after working abroad returned to England. Her background of research has obviously been an asset to her new career as a writer. The Merrybegot (her second book), includes Prince Charles and a solution to his reluctance to leave the West Country and flee abroad for safety; Matthew Hopkins, the Witch-Finder General and liberal sprinkling of folklore, superstitions, fairies and, piskies. The book is aimed at young adults who if they have read Harry Potter books will probably like the adapted traditional Wiccan magic spells and the herbal remedies from Culpeper's Complete Herbal. I found the book informative and a very interesting read.

Jane A. Mills

Margaret Griffin, Regulating Religion and Morality in the King's Armies, 1639-1646 (Brill, 2004), pp. xxxii + 249; Patrick Little, Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland (Boydell, 2004), pp. xvi + 270; Ruth E. Mayers, 1659: The Crisis of the Commonwealth (Boydell, 2004), pp. xii + 306.

These three volumes, currently available only in hardback, represent the first substantial monographs by these historians. All three tackle specialised topics, though all three carry wider implications and broader resonances.

Margaret Griffin focuses on the English printed military orders issued by, or under the authority of, Charles I between 1639 and 1646. She offers close analysis of the clauses and sections within those regulations governing religion and morality in the king's armies, exploring contents, tone and objectives and assessing the policies and philosophies which underpinned them. This, then, is a study of royal/royalist intention and opinion, and there is only very limited discussion of the actual application of these regulations in the field or of religious and moral practices within the king's armies and garrisons. The author explores only printed regulations covering
the king's English and Welsh armies and she recounts in detail how she has established reasonably clear dates and publication sequences for them. Thus this volume is built around an examination of three sets of orders issued during the Bishops' Wars of 1639-40 and around half a dozen sets issued (and often reissued) between the opening weeks of the principal civil war in autumn 1642 and (for the king) the dark days of winter 1645-46, with that war all-but lost. Some were issued as orders, proclamations and injunctions by the king himself, whereas others appeared in the name of other senior commanders — Arundel, Northumberland and Holland in 1639-40 and Newcastle in 1642. Accordingly, the author also seeks to reconstruct the extent of the king's personal authorship and the degree to which they directly (or indirectly) reflected the king's own will and policy preferences, concluding that 'they can, with caution, serve as a guide to the authentic voice of the King' (p. 184). In charting the changing approaches to and coverage of issues such as requirements for soldiers to attend religious services, the nature and composition of those services, the role of chaplains and a whole litany of regulations against sin, blasphemy, fornication, 'dissolute lasciviousness', 'unnatural abuses', gaming, drunkenness, theft, rape, murder, the mistreatment of women and children and so on, the author brings out both trends and variations over this seven year period and also the drift of royal policies and ideas from which they sprang. For example, she charts a growing emphasis in the instructions of the period 1642-45/46 on the need to take Holy Communion, on catechising, on reverence and decency in religious practice, on veneration of the sacraments and holy utensils, reflecting, she argues, the personal religious stance of Charles I and his clear preference for quasi-Catholic, non-reformed elements of religious practice which he expressed with renewed vigour during the civil war years. Taken as a whole, she concludes, the religious and moral clauses of the 1639-46 regulations show a clear sharpening of religious and moral values, from a somewhat relaxed and watered-down line taken in the instructions of 1640 to something far fuller and stronger in Charles's regulations of 1643 onwards, thus revealing a restatement and 'a recreation of the royal/episcopal tradition of the Caroline Church' (p. 212).

Patrick Little has written an outstanding study of Roger Boyle, Baron Broghill and, after the Restoration, first Earl of Orrery (1621-79), younger son of the first Earl of Cork, the wealthiest English planter in early Stuart Ireland. Broghill's public career began and ended in Ireland, in the 1640s fighting for the Protestant cause in Munster and after the Restoration serving as president of that province. However, although the main strands of those phases of his career are sketched out here — his up-bringing 'under his father's thumb' (p. 31) and then his own emergence as a leading 'Irish Independent' in the mid and later 1640s and as a champion of the Protestant interest in Ireland, his return to royal favour in the wake of a Restoration he was initially reluctant to see and then his closing years in office and in retirement back in his native Munster during the 1660s and 1670s — this fine study focuses on the period in between, from the beginning of Oliver Cromwell's Irish campaign in summer 1649 through to 1657 and on to the Restoration. Under the heading 'The Rise and Fall of the Cromwellian Union', four central and thoroughly-researched chapters re-examine Broghill's major roles in Ireland, Scotland and England during the interregnum, in the process assessing Broghill as a soldier, administrator and politician, exploring his relationship with the Cromwells, Oliver, Henry and Richard, and examining his 'British' outlook. The author argues persuasively that Broghill's principal interests lay in Ireland, in cementing his own and his family's position there and in preserving and advancing the cause of the established Protestants in the face of threats from the Irish Catholics and from sometimes hostile or unhelpful parliamentary regimes in London and Dublin. In the process, Broghill came to ally with and to receive strong support from the Cromwellians, especially Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector from December 1653 and Henry Cromwell as chief administrator of Ireland from summer 1655. In return, Broghill served the Protector as chief administrator of Scotland in 1655-56 — where he sought, with mixed fortunes, to advance moderate and inclusive policies and so create a broadly-based civilian Protectorate there — and as leader of the established 'old' Irish Protestants both in Ireland itself and in the Protectorate parliaments in London, especially the second Protectorate Parliament; Dr Little marshals surviving evidence to argue that in the long first session of 1656-57 Broghill built and led a 'broad alliance of Irish and Scots, Presbyterians, country gentlemen and courtiers' (p. 159), a coalition opposed to the army and militarised rule and strongly supporting the new constitution in general and kingship in particular in the hope that they would bring a stronger and more secure civilian settlement. But the heady days of spring 1657 were ended by Cromwell's rejection of the crown, triggering Broghill's semi-retirement to Ireland, and although he returned to London, to parliament and to a degree of power during the closing weeks of Richard Cromwell's Protectorate, this marked a brief 'Indian summer of Broghill's relationship with the Cromwellian state' (p. 167). With the collapse of the Protectorate and the return of military rule Broghill became a rather reluctant and lukewarm royalist, and the author shows how he began rebuilding bridges with the Stuarts in the hope — largely fulfilled — of preserving his own position and the position of the old Protestants of Ireland in the event of Charles II's return. Dr Little rounds off this clear and convincing study by placing Broghill more firmly in context through
analysis of his family, his financial affairs and his faith. In a brief concluding chapter, Broghill is portrayed as a survivor, a consummate politician, an astute figure who could shape or wait upon events and turn them to his desired ends. Those ends, the author suggests, were consistent and coherent, namely to safeguard and secure the position of the established Protestants in Ireland, and his political, religious, parliamentary and ‘British’ programmes were all focused on that overriding goal.

While Patrick Little has sought to counter hostile interpretations of Broghill as a Machiavellian, a man to whom self-preservation and prudence always won out over principle or consistency, Ruth E. Mayers has set out to paint a kindlier and more positive image of the restored republican regime of 1659 and to counter the traditional images of anarchy and chaos which surround the rule of the Rump between May and October 1659. In this closely argued volume, which draws upon extensive new research, the restored Rump is portrayed as a reasonably effective and efficient regime which usefully began the process of tackling the problems it inherited, setting out sound and sensible policies and succeeding for a time in winning civilian and military support. Having laid out the case against the Rump and explored the condescending opinions of contemporaries and recent historians alike, the author analyses the Rump’s policies and record thematically, exploring in turn the ‘diligence and dedication’ (p. 44) of the MPs and their record of working together and with the army, their actions in ensuring security at home, financial restructuring, their handling of the City of London, the English and Welsh provinces and Scotland and Ireland, foreign policy and the ways in which the Rump sought to portray itself and to project its vision and aspirations. Although there is no disguising or denying the crisis and collapse of autumn and winter 1659, surveyed here in the closing chapters, Dr Mayers concludes that 1659 saw a renaissance of English republicanism, a period of confident radical thought, which found expression through the work and achievements of the restored Rump, offering ‘tantalising clues to what might have been: a unified British republic, religiously tolerant, politically based on the solidarity of the “well-affected” constituency, incorporating the best of their different ideas, and closely allied with the United Provinces’ (p. 273). But the key phrase here is ‘what might have been’. In practice, the restored Rump had neither the time nor the solid foundations upon which it could firmly re-establish itself and instead a renewed breach with the army led not only to its expulsion but also, Dr Mayers concedes, to the desolation of republicanism and to the disintegration of this form of non-monarchical government.

Peter Gaunt
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