

Cromwelliana

The Journal of

The
Cromwell Association



Series II

2010

No 7

The Cromwell Association

President:
Vice Presidents:

Professor PETER GAUNT, PhD, FRHistS
Rt Hon the LORD NASEBY, PC
Rt Hon FRANK DOBSON, MP
Professor JOHN MORRILL, DPhil, FBA, FRHistS
Professor IVAN ROOTS, MA, FSA, FRHistS
Professor BLAIR WORDEN, FBA
Dr STEPHEN K. ROBERTS, PhD, FSA, FRHistS
PAT BARNES
TREWIN COPPLESTONE, FRGS
Dr PATRICK LITTLE, PhD, FRHistS
Dr MAXINE FORSHAW, BSc, PhD
"Warwick House" 61 Valley Road, Henley on Thames,
Oxon, RG9 1RL
DAVID HALL, FCA
33 Cheyne Avenue, South Woodford, London,
E18 2DP

Chairman:
Honorary Secretary:

Honorary Treasurer:

THE CROMWELL ASSOCIATION was founded in 1937 by the late Rt Hon Isaac Foot and others to commemorate Oliver Cromwell, the great Puritan statesman, and to encourage the study of the history of his times, his achievements and influence. It is neither political nor sectarian, its aims being essentially historical. The Association is a registered charity (reg. no. 1132954), which seeks to advance its aims in a variety of ways, which have included:

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

Editor of *Cromwelliana*: JANE A. MILLS, MInstLM, LCGI, ACMI, FHA
Elmleigh 32 Weymouth Road, Frome, Somerset, BA11 1HH

Press Liaison Officer: JOHN GOLDSMITH, BA, AMA, Cambridgeshire Heritage,
Castle Court, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP

www.olivercromwell.org.

CROMWELLIANA 2010

Editor Jane A. Mills

CONTENTS

Editor's Note	2
Cromwell Day Address 2009 By Professor Peter Gaunt	3
The Upbringing of Richard Cromwell By Dr Jason Peacey	13
Richard and Henry: The Relationship between Richard Cromwell and his Younger Brother Henry By Professor Peter Gaunt	28
Richard Cromwell's Parliament By Dr David L Smith	46
'My Solitary Life' Richard Cromwell, 1659-1712 By Miranda Malins	61
Writing and Sources XIII: Richard Cromwell Speech By Professor Peter Gaunt	78
Cromwellian Britain XXIII: Cheshunt, Hertfordshire. By Jane A. Mills	84
Light Vanquishing Darknesse: An insight into the private life of the New Model Army By Dr Patrick Little	88
Obituary: Rt Hon Michael Foot, PC By Professor Ivan Roots	95
Select Bibliography of Publications By Dr Patrick Little	99
Book Reviews By Dr Patrick Little	101

ISBN 0-905729-22-6

To mark the 350th anniversary of Richard Cromwell's abdication in 1659 and self-imposed exile in 1660, a study day took place on Saturday 17th October 2009 at Huntingdon Library and Archives. This special Richard Cromwell edition contains the four papers that were presented on that day.

I must give special thanks to John Goldsmith for providing and granting permission to use the image of Richard Cromwell which appears on the front cover.

The signature on the back cover is taken from Richard's letter to General George Monck dated 18 April 1660.

This year saw the sad death of Michael Foot, one of our vice-presidents and third son of Isaac Foot our founder. Professor Ivan Roots kindly agreed to write an obituary which appears in this edition.

By Professor Peter Gaunt

The Association's annual Cromwell Day address, delivered beneath and in sunnier years in the very shadow of the greatest statue of Oliver Cromwell, usually and traditionally explores some aspect of Oliver's life, career and achievements. Very unusually, this year, the 350th anniversary of the fall of Protector Richard Cromwell and thus of the fall of the Protectoral regime, it has been felt appropriate that the address should focus not on Oliver but on his son and heir and successor as Lord Protector, Richard Cromwell, a figure who, as far as I am aware, is commemorated in no statues and who in death as in life has tended to be overshadowed by his illustrious father.

We know a lot about what Richard was doing exactly 351 years ago today, on 3 September 1658. He was in attendance at Whitehall during his father's final hours in this world, up to Oliver's death at around 3pm. Upon the Lord Protector's decease, the Protectoral council met for several hours and then in the evening first the Lord Chamberlain, then the President of the council and then the council members collectively attended upon Richard at Whitehall formally to tell him that they were satisfied that, as per the written constitution, before he died Oliver had nominated Richard as his successor and that he therefore was the new Lord Protector and head of state and was to be proclaimed as such. Richard responded with his first speech as Protector, in which he thanked the councillors for the support they had given his father, acknowledged his own inexperience and the enormity of the task ahead of him and stated that he looked to God as well as to the council for support, strength and guidance. Richard was proclaimed in London on the morning of 4 September, during the afternoon he met the lord mayor and aldermen of the city of London to receive their condolences and congratulations and to be offered the sword of the city and then, in the presence of the lord mayor and aldermen, the council members and assorted senior army officers, Richard took the oath of office as the new Lord Protector. His Protectoral government was launched swiftly, smoothly and apparently without opposition. A healthy and active man, just a few weeks short of his 32nd birthday upon taking power, and as such offering a stark contrast to the illnesses and unmistakable signs of ageing and physical decline which had marked Oliver's last years, Richard should have had a long Protectorate ahead of him.

We do not know precisely what Richard was doing 350 years ago today, on 3 September 1659, the first anniversary of his smooth succession to the

Protectorate. His time in the sun had been brief, barely eight months through to spring 1659, when he fell or more accurately faded from power. It is hard to discern a precise date on which Richard's Protectorate ended. On 22 April 1659 he was forced by the army officers and clearly against his will and preference to dissolve the Protectorate parliament which he had opened in January and whose cost-cutting, civilianising policies he had supported in the days and weeks before the bloodless military coup which forced it out. Thereafter, Richard's real power was at an end, though he then faded away in a long goodbye. Through to mid May he seems to have been kept under house arrest by the army in Whitehall while the officers decided on the new constitutional arrangements and on whether to leave Richard any vestige of power or office, though the recall of the Rump parliament and the re-establishment of republican rule at the end of the first week of May effectively closed off that route. On 25 May Richard wrote or at least signed a formal letter of resignation, placing himself under the power and protection of the Rump in the capacity of a private gentleman. Thereafter, it seems he was allowed somewhat more freedom and rather curiously was permitted for a time to continue using the Cockpit in Whitehall and the former Protectoral palace of Hampton Court, where he went hunting in early June. But sometime during the first half of July he seems to have given up or been forced out of the London Protectoral properties and he returned to Hursley in Hampshire, the home of his now ailing father-in-law Richard Maior and of his own wife Dorothy Cromwell *née* Maior. In some ways it marked a return home, for Richard and Dorothy had lived there in the early 1650s, during the first years of their marriage, and several of their children had been born there. During the early 1650s Richard had played an active role in Hampshire society, as a county JP and quite prominent in the administrative and social life of the county. His return home in summer 1659 was less happy, as he brooded over how and why the wheel of fortune had turned so dramatically against him, how it was that former allies and colleagues, even his uncle by marriage John Disbrowe and his brother-in-law Charles Fleetwood, had turned so decisively against him and had removed him from power. Richard's sense of bitterness, as well as his stoical resignation, shine through the letter he wrote from Hursley on 20 September 1659, replying to a courteous letter he had received earlier in the month from Admiral Edward Montagu:

My Lord, you have expressed a very greate respect to me in your letter...and I should be glad to returne the like to you, being in noe capacitye to doe any thing else. Besides, the times are such now

that it is prudence to be cautious even in them. It hath pleased God to change the face of things straingely to what they were when you left England, and it is my feare that many honourable and innocent persons suffer in it. How some particular persons can answer their consciences I know not. God is a righteous judge, and hath a plaine transcript of things, and will in his due time deale righteously with all men according to the works of their hands and the intentions of their hearts...¹

By spring 1660 Richard had gone from Hursley, too, embarking on a long exile on the continent more to elude his English creditors than to escape the restored Stuart monarchical regime.

So why had Richard's Protectorate been so brief and ostensibly unsuccessful? Why had he fallen from power so swiftly and been overthrown so easily? Historians have advanced many reasons, some of which, I suggest, do not stand up to scrutiny.

Was Richard a fool, a naive, empty-headed dunderhead? All the evidence is against this. He received a solid secondary education at Felsted School in Essex. As at that stage a younger son, he did not go on to attend university in his teens, but in the later 1640s, by which time the deaths of his elder brothers meant that he had become Oliver's eldest surviving son and heir, he was enrolled at and received at least some legal training at Lincoln's Inn in London. His personal and private letters, which survive in fair numbers from the mid 1650s onwards, reflect and reveal a thoughtful and intelligent figure, who wrote lucidly, effectively and often movingly, with good use of metaphors and similes. Even if we accept that most of his major state speeches as Protector were written for him, he presumably had some input into their thrust and contents, and contemporaries noted that he delivered these speeches effectively and confidently. More important, his recorded extempore responses and speeches as Protector, delivered when receiving visitors, diplomats and delegations bearing petitions and addresses, again reveal an intelligent and thoughtful figure, a clear intellect with a sound grasp of domestic and foreign policies.

Was Richard a nobody, a complete non-entity, with no experience of public life and so completely bereft and out of his depth when he succeeded his father? Again, such suggestions are inaccurate and unfounded. Richard's public profile and thus the range and depth of his experience of public life and office advanced in distinct stages – in the mid 1640s, when he became

Oliver's eldest surviving son and so his heir, from December 1653, as the son and personal though not necessarily political heir of the new head of state, and from summer 1657, when under the new constitution Oliver gained power to nominate his successor as Lord Protector and it became evident that he was grooming Richard to succeed him. So from the later 1640s Richard played a very active role in Hampshire's county administration, as a JP, on centrally-appointed committees, as Lord Warden of the New Forest and later as a strong supporter of Major-General Goffe in the mid 1650s and as a power-broker in the Protectoral parliamentary elections of 1654 and 1656. After very brief and slight military service in the later 1640s, he was appointed by his father in 1657 as colonel and thus commander of a New Model Army regiment. He was elected to and served as an active MP in the first and second Protectorate parliaments, while in 1657 he was elevated to the new nominated second parliamentary chamber, became a member of the Protectoral council and succeeded his father as Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Although his experience was undoubtedly limited in some areas and it would inevitably be a very steep learning curve to take on the responsibilities of the office of Lord Protector and head of state, Richard did have a substantial record of public office and public administration before autumn 1658.

Was Richard irredeemably lazy, a man who could not or would not apply himself to business in general and to the responsibilities and demands of the office of Lord Protector in particular? The case in favour of this view of Richard depends very heavily on the string of letters which his father wrote to his son as well as to his son's new father-in-law, Richard Maior, around the time of Richard's marriage to Dorothy Maior in 1649. In these, Oliver outspokenly criticised his son for exceeding his financial allowance and running up debts, and for paying too much attention to and spending too much time on worldly pleasures, faults which together Oliver termed 'idleness'. But these complaints smack of a rather fussy, perhaps over-protective and over-critical father, several of them written by Oliver when he was about to embark upon his Irish campaign and may therefore have been over-compensating for his imminent distance from his eldest son. Moreover, there is plenty of evidence to contradict the picture of Richard painted in this clutch of letters and instead to demonstrate that he could and did apply himself. He took seriously his responsibilities as a member of the Hampshire elite, active as a JP and in the administration of the county. His record of appointment to parliamentary committees and as a teller in formal divisions suggests that he was a fairly active MP in both the first and second

Protectorate parliaments. He was assiduous as Chancellor of Oxford, helping to force out the incumbent vice-chancellor of whom he disapproved. His attendance record as a member of the new second chamber during the brief second session of the second Protectorate parliament in the opening weeks of 1658 was exemplary, suggesting that Richard attended without fail. After he was added to the Protectoral council late in 1657, he again played an active part, attending around seventy per cent of council meetings down to his own elevation as Protector in September 1658. As Lord Protector, he was an active and engaged, discharging the duties of and playing a full role as head of state. Contemporary accounts of his actions and stance as Protector suggest that he was engaged and engaging, displaying charisma and fine inter-personal skills which surprised several observers. Contemporaries emphatically did not criticize him for abandoning the work of government, for absenting himself from Whitehall or, like James I, for leaving business to others while he went off hunting and pursuing other all-too-worldly pleasures.

Was Richard a man of weak religious faith, with no links to or sympathy for the godly cause? Certainly, it seems that Richard did not possess the overriding and very visible faith of his father, did not share Oliver's acute awareness of having been lifted by God from the darkness of a sinful life and picked out as the select instrument of His divine will, of having being raised out of the dust by God, and he did not view or express unfolding events with the intense religiosity of his father. It is probable, too, that Richard's religious outlook was more conservative than his father's, more sympathetic to a Presbyterian perspective. But his surviving letters do reflect a strong personal faith, an awareness of God's active involvement and presence in the world and its affairs, a sincere belief in the providences of the Lord, even and perhaps especially when they arrived unexpectedly, unhelpfully and as apparent rebukes, a belief which apparently gave him some comfort during and after his sudden fall from power in 1659. A handful of excerpts from Richard's surviving letters of the later 1650s will prove the point. Thus in June 1656 he wrote to his brother Henry that, in respect of his brother's governance of Ireland, 'my prayers shall runn for its eternall happynesse, and my requests to God shall be that God will make it an instrument in His quarrell, to defend His churche and people against there enimyes'.² In summer 1657, again writing to his brother, he commented on the new constitutional arrangements: 'I thank God I desire to be contented with what condition He shall please to keepe me in...Indeed, that is our glory that we can boaste in the salvation of God,

who hath been yesterday, is to-day and will be for ever unto us righteousnesse and peace (temporall and spirittuall) and to all those that live by faith for and upon Him'.³ In August 1658, during what proved the false dawn of Oliver's apparent recovery from severe and as it turned out fatal illness, Richard wrote that 'It is God that hath removed his more dreadfull illnesse to this more common, and it muste be His greate power to check and abandon illnesse. He by His dispossessing providence makēs His soveraignety good to Himselfe. We have had greate prayer and faith acted of late in our family, the Lord make it bennificiall unto us'.⁴ In despair in mid May 1659, overthrown by a coup led by his close relations and in effect under house arrest, Richard wrote that 'I shall not say in how sad a condition I and owre family, nay the nations are in, for it is better for me to throwe my selfe in the dust and crye before the Lord, my sins hath brought what is come to pase upon us...My confidence is in God and to Him wil I put my cause...I am in the duste with my mouth as to God...God will avenge innocency'.⁵ In his letter to Edward Montagu of September 1659, already quoted, Richard ascribed the late political changes to the will of God and comforted himself in the belief than in due time God would deal righteously with all men.

Was Richard a man of weak political beliefs, a man with no links to or sympathy for the secular aspects of the parliamentary cause, perhaps even a closet royalist? Again, it is probable that Richard was more cautious and more conservative than his father and, lacking his roots in the origins and fragile early years of the parliamentary cause, when it had to be fought for politically and militarily, he also lacked his father's obvious and very visible commitment to political change as well as to the religious and secular aspects of godly reformation. But Richard was a clear, strong and apparently sincere supporter of the Protectoral regime and its policies in parliament in 1654 and 1656-58 and in the council in 1657-58, he spoke out in support of the non-monarchical Protectoral regime and constitution after he succeeded his father and as Protector he acted firmly to counter royalist threats at home and abroad. There is no plausible and convincing evidence that, either before or after his father's death and his own elevation, Richard had active royalist links or clear royalist sympathies and it is noticeable that as Protector he did not promote former royalists or appoint them to his inner circle and to his council – those former royalists or members of royalist families who did win favour or held senior office under the Protectorate, such as Sir Charles Wolsey, George Monck and Lord Fauconberg, had all been advanced by Oliver, not Richard.

Did Richard receive poor advice as Protector from a weak and hopelessly divided council? It has recently been argued that from spring 1657, with the disputes over the proposed new constitution, the return to kingship and the offer of the crown, the Protectoral council became so deeply divided between civilian and military factions that it never again functioned properly as a united and efficient governmental body, that it lost power and influence, thus weakening if not crippling central government, and that not only did Richard inherit a hopelessly divided, neutered council in September 1658 but that those divisions worsened during his brief government. That there were deep conciliatory divisions over the kingship question in spring 1657 and that two years later there were senior army officers who sat in the council whose uncertainty about Richard led them to take the lead in deposing him is undeniable. But overall, both during the closing fifteen months of Oliver's Protectorate, following his re-inauguration, and during his son's Protectorate, the evidence indicates that the council continued to work as an effective and coherent body at the heart of central government, properly and conscientiously discharging the heavy burdens of Protectoral government. Richard added no new councillors during his Protectorate, so by 1658-59 all the members of his council were very experienced politicians and administrators.

Was Richard's government doomed to failure because of the dire financial position he inherited in September 1658? He certainly inherited a regime which was more than two and a half million pounds in the red and running an annual deficit in excess of a third of a million pounds. But early modern governments, in England as on the continent, were accustomed to struggling on through and despite heavy debts. The Protectorate's substantial debts and unenviable financial position undoubtedly worried John Thurloe and others, from time to time led to cost-cutting drives and caused the modification of some policies, but equally they certainly did not bring about the collapse of the regime or the negation of government. The Protectorate's active and successful foreign policy was maintained under Richard, the Protectoral army continuing to work with France against Spain in Flanders, while naval operations were stepped up, including the dispatch of a fleet to the Baltic in winter 1658-59 in an attempt to mediate between Denmark and Sweden and more importantly to protect Protectoral commercial interests in the region.

No, the real problem at the heart of Richard's Protectorate was the new

Protector's lack of standing in the army and the army's growing lack of confidence in him. Because Richard had no real military experience or pedigree when he became Protector, from the outset some senior army officers, both inside and outside the council, had misgivings and reservations about him and his policies. The limited record of the council debates and decisions on 3 September 1658 hint at some uncertainty, the order book stressing that at length the councillors decided without dissenting votes that Richard should be and was Lord Protector and they went out of their way to have that entered in the official conciliar record. Lieutenant-General Charles Fleetwood was then directed to inform the other army officers of this decision and to gain their signatures to the official document ordering the proclamation of Richard as Protector. The rather over-egged record of apparent support for Richard probably points to something very different, rather like the board of directors of a football club giving a vote of confidence to a manager in difficulties – a move which generally serves only to demonstrate that the manager is in fact losing the confidence of those around him and confirms that his days are numbered. Other contemporary accounts make clear that by the end of September 1658 many junior and some more senior army officers were questioning Richard's position, not directly challenging his tenure of the office of Lord Protector but suggesting that he should not hold supreme military command and that a senior and experienced army officer should be appointed as Lord General and commander-in-chief – the obvious candidate being Charles Fleetwood. Richard's firm stance during the autumn and winter, flattering the army, assuring the senior officers that he had their interests at heart, would consult them and would do all he could to see arrears of pay met, but that as per the written constitution he was unquestionably Lord General and commander-in-chief and would not relinquish that position, just about held the line for a time. However, his control over the army quickly crumbled in spring 1659 when he supported the moves of the civilian majority in the Protectorate parliament against the army's interests – disciplining selected officers, pondering large-scale disbandment, asserting parliament's power over the army and, with Richard's active support, ordering the general council of the officers to meet no more. In a show of force on 21 April regiments in and around London overwhelmingly obeyed and rallied to senior officers opposing parliament and critical of Richard rather than obeying the Protector, and on 22 April Richard felt compelled to bow to army pressure and dissolve parliament. The power struggle was over and Richard as well as his parliament had

emphatically lost.

Richard Cromwell and the Protectorate had fallen not because of any major character flaws in the young Protector, not because of stupidity or laziness or godlessness or royalism. He fell because he was obviously and overwhelmingly a civilian, with no real military background or standing, and because in spring 1659 he went too far in supporting the civilian parliament against the army. He lacked Oliver's military pedigree, the bedrock of military support dating back to Worcester and Dunbar, Preston, Naseby and Marston Moor, Winceby and Gainsborough, and he lacked the standing and secure foundations within the army to quell and to survive a military backlash. In going too far in supporting his parliament, in going too far too fast in an anti-military direction in spring 1659, it could be argued that Richard miscalculated and was at least in part, perhaps in large part, the author of his own destruction. Maybe he could have gone further in restraining or at least distancing himself from the more intemperate anti-military parliamentary manoeuvres, allowing himself longer to become known to and better trusted by the army. But the cards were stacked against him from the outset and both his lack of military pedigree and the suspicions of him in army circles, very evident by and from autumn 1658, would have been enormously difficult hurdles to overcome, even if Richard had played his weak hand rather more cleverly.

So as we gather today beneath the towering figure of Oliver Cromwell, we remember, perhaps with affection, perhaps with regret, the short and troubled Protectorate of his son, a difficult eight month interlude in Richard's long life of over 85 years. He was a conscientious, honest, pleasant and intelligent figure – even his opponents said that he was personally blameless and endearing – who made a decent fist of a political role which he did not actively seek and for which, in one key area, he had not been very well prepared. In laying the Cromwell Day wreath, which as the Association's new president I will have the honour to do in a few moments time, I will be remembering and honouring the great Oliver certainly, but on this Cromwell Day I will also be remembering and honouring his son, heir and successor, that meek knight, the gentle and virtuous Richard.

Notes.

1. C.H. Firth, ed., *The Clarke Papers* (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), IV, 297.
2. P. Gaunt, ed., *The Correspondence of Henry Cromwell, 1655-1659* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 138.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 300.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 401.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 515-17.

Peter Gaunt is professor of early modern history at the University of Chester. He was chairman of the Association from 1990 until 2009, when he succeeded Professor Barry Coward as president.

By Dr Jason Peacey

Some might argue that there is little point in devoting particular attention to Richard Cromwell, whose period in office as Lord Protector lasted a mere eight months. This dismissal of Richard would, however, be a mistake. This is partly because his life and career, both in and out of office, have been relatively neglected by serious scholarship, and it is a rather sad fact that, although a handful of books have been devoted to him, they are not all of the highest quality, and some of them are now rather dated.¹ Secondly, Richard was head of state during a crucial period, between the death of Oliver Cromwell in September 1658 and the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. This is an immensely complicated period, with governments coming and going with bewildering regularity, sometimes at the point of a soldier's sword. It might even be argued that Richard's period as head of state represents a crucial aspect of a period which has failed to receive adequate attention from historians, and which is sometimes glossed over rather quickly in books that effectively do little more than assume that the death of Oliver Cromwell made the Restoration inevitable, and that what happened between September 1658 and May 1660 was fairly inconsequential. Thirdly, Richard is also an extremely unusual head of state. He is one of only two rulers who governed under a written constitution, the constitutional settlement which emerged from the 'Humble Petition and Advice' of 1657, the replacement for the *Instrument of Government* which had established the protectorate in December 1653. Unlike his father, moreover, Richard is the only English head of state to *inherit* a written constitution which he had played no part in preparing. And Richard is, of course, a rarity in our history: a head of state who fell from power, lived to tell the tale, and returned to normal life.

Beyond these very sound reasons for taking him seriously, it is also possible to argue that Richard deserves attention because historians have tended to get him wrong. Too often, Richard is treated as if he was not really suited for the job of ruling the country; that he didn't really want the job, that Oliver did not take him particularly seriously, and that he was neither fit for public life, nor destined to assume the protectoral throne. We have been led to believe that he was weak and ineffectual, that he really longed to live quietly in the country, and even that he may secretly have been a royalist sympathiser. Hence the descriptions of him as 'the pretended protector', 'the meek knight', or 'Queen Dick'.² Such views may contain a kernel of truth – Richard probably did lack political ambition, and certainly lacked the

military experience and the flair for governance displayed by his younger brother, Henry – and they reflect the way in which he was perceived and portrayed by at least some contemporaries. Nevertheless, this simplistic picture of Richard needs to be challenged, and his life and career need to be reappraised.³ There is scope, in other words, for recognising his talents, as some who encountered him clearly did, for appreciating that he did a better job of dealing with the mess which he had inherited than has been assumed, and for acknowledging the way in which he was treated by men, including kinsmen, from whom he might have expected more support. Richard was more serious about his job than we have been led to believe, and a great deal better at it too. The aim of this piece, however, is to challenge the idea that Richard was not prepared for high office, by reconsidering his upbringing, and his relationship with his father, not least by resisting the temptation to read history ‘backwards’, and to judge earlier periods on the basis of what happened later.

I

The place to start a re-evaluation of Richard’s career is with the little that we know about his early life. While it is true that Richard Cromwell took little part in the civil wars, and that he was not destined to rule the land, these facts are not always properly understood. Firstly, Richard was born in October 1626, which meant that he was only sixteen when the battle of Edgehill was fought in 1642, and that he had still not reached maturity by the time that Oxford surrendered in May 1646. His lack of military experience, therefore, can hardly be considered noteworthy. Secondly, during the early years of his life, Richard was not heir to the Cromwell estate, but rather the third son, and the third son of a provincial squire of only dubious wealth. This meant that, thirdly, his education was exactly what one ought to expect: modest. Richard was educated at Felsted School, near Braintree in Essex, under the eye of his maternal grandfather, Sir James Bourchier. What is important about Felsted is the tone of the education that Richard would have received, which would almost certainly have been Puritan. This was the school of William Gouge, one of the greatest Puritan divines of the seventeenth century, and Richard’s headmaster, Martin Holbeach, was notably ‘godly’. A former pupil of the legendary Puritan, John Preston, he was also a client of Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, the grand patron of Puritans in the area, who later became a powerful parliamentarian grandee during the civil wars.⁴ Richard’s education was

entirely fitting for the younger son of a minor, if Puritanically inclined, gentleman.

What should be noted, however, is that Oliver’s attitude towards Richard changed dramatically when the latter became his heir, in 1644, following the death of Oliver Cromwell junior, who had been to university, and who had joined the parliamentarian army.⁵ Thereafter Oliver Cromwell senior – who was by this stage growing in prominence, both as an MP and as a military figure – quite conventionally looked to the career development of his eldest surviving son, not least by means of a suitable marriage. Richard’s marriage, to the daughter of Richard Maior, a prominent and fairly wealthy Hampshire parliamentarian, took place in May 1649, and represents the first time that we can add some colour to his biography, and begin to explore his relationship with Oliver, although the letters written during the marriage negotiations are not unproblematic, and have not been well understood.⁶ Richard, who was described as being ‘civil, free, and open hearted’, spent much time in Hampshire in early 1649, and it became clear that he felt at home in this godly family, and that he became extremely fond of his future bride.⁷ This image of a serious and godly young man has generally been overlooked in favour of evidence which has been taken to reveal Oliver’s disappointed at his son’s character, and his lack of enthusiasm for public life. Oliver asked Maior to offer parental guidance to Richard, saying that ‘I wish he may be serious; the times require it’. In another letter Oliver wrote asked Maior to advise Richard; saying that while ‘I envy him not his contents’; nevertheless ‘I fear he should be swallowed up of them’. He continued: ‘I would have him mind and understand business, read a little history, study the mathematics and cosmography, these are good, with subordination to the things of God. Better than idleness, or mere outward worldly contents’. Oliver re-emphasised that his son needed wise counselling in other letters, adding that ‘he is in the dangerous time of his age, and it’s a very vain world’. Finally, Oliver expressed dismay that Richard had overspent his allowance, adding that ‘if pleasure and self-satisfaction be made the business of a man’s life, so much cost laid out upon it, so much time spent in it, as rather answers appetite than the will of God, or is comely before his saints, I scruple to feed this humour... I cannot think I do well to feed a voluptuous humour in my son, if he should make pleasure the business of his life, in a time when some precious saints are bleeding, and breathing out their last, for the safety of the rest’.⁸

Such comments seem to imply that Richard was insufficiently serious,

insufficiently godly, and something of a spoilt playboy. However, a more prosaic, but more plausible explanation is that these comments reflect the natural concerns of a father, and one whose military duties were taking him to an uncertain fate, and it is surely no coincidence that each of Oliver's missives was written on the eve of major army campaigns. Oliver can thus be considered to have been not so much berating Richard as expressing how he wanted him to be guided in the event of his own death. Moreover, Cromwell's tone in such letters is hard to detect. In one letter written during the marriage negotiations, for example, he characterised Richard Norton as 'idle Dick'. The nickname has stuck, but it was obviously inappropriate, since Norton was an extremely active parliamentarian commander and administrator, and a good friend.⁹ If at all appropriate, the nickname probably reflected Cromwell's frustration at the pace of negotiations in which Norton was participating, but it is also possible that Cromwell was poking fun at a friend by playing upon some of the wildly inaccurate accusations which had been made about him by political enemies.¹⁰ It seems that Cromwell, the stern Puritan, understood irony, and was making a joke, and as such it is possible that the comments about Richard also reveal more than a little playfulness.

II

Our next task is to reassess Oliver's expectations of his heir, and the reality of Richard's life after he reached maturity in the mid-1640s, and to demonstrate that Richard performed exactly in accordance with his father's wishes. This meant being a good deal more active in public service than has generally been recognised. Rather too much has been made of the comment made by Oliver about Richard in 1655 – that 'my desire was for him and his brother to have lived private lives in the country' – because this was not intended to mean retirement from public life, but rather life off the national political stage, and the life of a godly and active local magistrate, much like the 'constable' which Cromwell once claimed that he aspired to be.¹¹ Indeed, when he had recommended that Richard should read history, mathematics and cosmography, Cromwell had made explicit his understanding that these would make him 'fit for public services, for which a man is born'.¹²

In addition to misreading Oliver's words – which in any case implied that this was not the life that Richard was in fact leading – historians have also overlooked Richard's actions. It is necessary, in other words, to confront the

claims made by contemporaries, such as the suggestion made in October 1654 that he 'thinks of little but living privately and enjoying the ease and liberty conceded to him by his father', and the claims by later historians that he was a crypto-royalist, who even pleaded with his father to save the life of Charles I.¹³ The evidence, in transpires, does not substantiate such claims, although it is true that Richard flouted godly manners by sponsoring a horse-racing cup, and interceded on behalf of the family of the royalist rebel, John Penruddock.¹⁴ Beyond this, there is little more to the claims about Richard's royalism than wishful thinking on the part of contemporaries who recognised that he was not a carbon copy of his father, as well as hostility on the part of some later historians. Although Richard's Whitehall lodgings were often left vacant, and were eventually reassigned, and although he often remarked upon his 'private condition', and lack of political knowledge, protestations about his ignorance and poor letter-writing skills were probably a reflection of modesty rather than reality.¹⁵ Richard excluded political comment from correspondence with his brother for fear that letters would be intercepted, and other letters demonstrate a fairly subtle understanding of contemporary events, both at home and abroad.¹⁶

Moreover, the death of Richard's elder brother can actually be shown to have provoked a very obvious change in his career trajectory. Having missed out on university, he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in May 1647, with the assistance of the future secretary of state, John Thurloe.¹⁷ He was not called to the bar, although this was not uncommon for those who sought legal knowledge but not a professional career, and he was subsequently inducted into political and military life by being made captain of Sir Thomas Fairfax's lifeguard in the Autumn of 1647, and perhaps even by being elected as MP for Portsmouth in late 1648.¹⁸ Thereafter, he became an active servant of the republican regime, as a member of numerous local commissions in his native East Anglia and his adopted Hampshire.¹⁹ Such service in the region ensured that he was able to secure election to Parliament in 1654, as one of the knights of the shire for Hampshire, and he served in the Commons in a fairly active, although not vocal, capacity.²⁰ He was prominent enough to act as a 'teller' after one vote, indicating his support for the Instrument of Government, and his opposition to attempts to reform the provisions of the constitution.²¹ After 1646, in other words, Richard seems to have been required to act, and serve, like a member of the gentry elite, on both local and national stages, and the evidence suggests that he fulfilled this role perfectly well.

III

Having emerged from the ranks of the squirearchy in the late 1640s and early 1650s, Richard's career changed dramatically once again after the 1654 Parliament, when he began to play a much more visible public role. This indicates very clearly that Oliver wanted to bring him onto the national political stage, and such a change in the protector's attitude towards his son represented a direct response to new political circumstances. Cromwell appears to have been reacting to the constitutional debate which took place in October 1654 over the future form of the protectorate, which decided that future protectors should be elected, rather than hereditary, but which revealed that many prominent Cromwellians took a different view, recognising that constitutional logic suggested that Cromwell's successor was likely to be chosen by the protector-in-council, rather than by the Commons.²² It was now possible to envisage that Oliver would play a significant part in the nomination of his successor, and it is surely no coincidence that Richard began to play a much more important role in public affairs after the dissolution of the 1654 Parliament, and in the wake of such debates.

Inevitably, this meant playing a more significant role in Hampshire, not least as an assiduous warden of the New Forest, a role which had particular importance in terms of the supply of wood to the naval dockyard at Portsmouth.²³ Richard's correspondence on such matters offers a rare glimpse into his political views, which mixed conservatism with a willingness to accept that recent innovations could provide new precedents for administrative behaviour. He explained that 'it is better to sail in a known way which conducts for safety and easiness (though old), than to find out new rocks and sands, which will hazard the destruction of all', but he accepted that at least some of the 'actions in this last twenty years' did provide 'new precedents', which were 'more agreeable to the juncture of the times than former orders'.²⁴ More important than Richard's work as warden of New Forest was his zealous support for William Goffe, one of the Major Generals appointed in 1655, with particular responsibility for Hampshire. Upon his arrival in the region, Goffe immediately held discussions with both Richard Cromwell and his father-in-law, Richard Maior, who offered sage counsel based upon local knowledge.²⁵ Goffe saw in Richard Cromwell someone who was zealous for reform, not least in response to 'the wicked spirit of the magistrates', and this ensured that he played an influential role during elections for the 1656 Parliament, during which Goffe regarded him

as one of the county's most important power-brokers.²⁶ Richard certainly worked to ensure that Goffe was himself elected in Hampshire, and in the face of agitation by radical opponents of the protectorate, Goffe was happy to stress his reliance upon Richard's advice and assistance.²⁷

More important than such service in support of the regime in Hampshire was Richard's very obvious emergence as a political player on the national stage after the 1654 parliament. In March 1655, he and his brother, Henry, deputised for Oliver in inspecting the London militia, while in May it was suggested that he would be made deputy in Scotland, and in the following month rumours circulated that he was to be made Lord High Admiral and Lieutenant of the Tower of London.²⁸ It is no coincidence that these stories coincided with renewed interest in the question of hereditary rule in the summer of 1655, and although such appointments were not ultimately made, Richard was made chairman of a new Committee for Trade, and appointed to the committee charged with organising the collection for distressed Protestants in Piedmont.²⁹ Richard also maintained his high public profile by securing election to Parliament himself in 1656, opting to sit for Cambridge University even after proving to be the most popular candidate in Hampshire.³⁰ Once again, Richard was not a prominent figure in parliamentary debates, but he seems to have been quietly active on a range of committees.³¹ These reveal an interest in religion, and a Puritan outlook, which is at odds with his reputation, while at the same time revealing that he was an enemy of radical sectarians, not least the infamous Quaker, James Nayler, who he thought deserved to be hanged.³²

By the end of 1656, Richard was clearly considered by contemporaries to be a political grandee, although he adopted a lower profile due to illness, and due to the injuries which he sustained on the famous occasion when the staircase collapsed at the Banqueting House, as MPs gathered to hear one of Cromwell's speeches.³³ He was also absent from key debates in the House of Commons relating to the 'Humble Petition and Advice', and the offer of the crown to his father, although this too appears to have been the result of something other than disinterest. Indeed, his views on the issue seem fairly clear from a disparaging comment made in June 1657, regarding those 'whose design hath been for a long time laid to take root for the hindering [of] national advantages [and] settlement, where it might occasion difficulty to their getting into the saddle, respecting their own ambitious minds, and advantages before religion, peace, or what else may stand in their way'.³⁴ Richard evidently supported the Humble Petition and Advice, and perhaps

even the offer of the crown, and his withdrawal to the country during the kingship debates seems to have been the result of his more or less formal exclusion, no doubt on the grounds that he was rather too much of an interested party. In a letter to Henry Cromwell, written from Whitehall on 7 March, Richard explained that ‘there is a bar to my pen in state affairs’, adding that he had effectively been shut out of Commons debates for being ‘a wrangler’.³⁵

By examining the mid-1650s, therefore, it is possible to demonstrate that historians have stressed Richard’s inactivity only by paying insufficient attention to the evidence, which indicates that he became a figure of national standing, with clear areas of personal, political and religious interest. That this change in his career should have happened was entirely natural; as son and heir to the Lord Protector, there was little chance that his life would be unaffected by events in December 1653. What is really remarkable, however, is the strength of the correlation between the growing willingness to make the protectorate hereditary, and the more or less conscious enhancement of Richard’s status.

IV

In June 1657, Richard Cromwell made another important contribution to public life, by helping to organise his father’s second inauguration as protector, and this was particularly appropriate given that Oliver’s attitude towards him entered a new phase after the acceptance of the Humble Petition and Advice, albeit without the crown with which some had intended that it should be accompanied.³⁶ What was previously possible was now a certainty: that Oliver had the power to ‘appoint and declare’ his successor. Once again, in other words, novel political circumstances affected Oliver’s attitude towards Richard and his career.³⁷ Many contemporaries now recognised that Richard was ‘the first peer of the kingdom’, even if ‘no office or title be as yet bestowed upon him’, and Cromwell’s behaviour after June 1657 indicates that his rejection of the crown did not reflect any concerns regarding the ability of his offspring.³⁸

From the spring of 1657, according to Henry Cromwell’s, Richard was once again being considered for high office in Scotland. One newsletter from early March noted that he was to be appointed as general and commander in chief, with Monck as his deputy, and it seems that expectation of such a change caused sympathisers of the Scottish protesters – the more radical grouping, who had opposed the crowning of Charles II as king of Scotland

– to begin lobbying Richard.³⁹ Henry Cromwell seems to have approved of Richard’s appointment, although once again they came to nothing, due to Richard’s riding accident in August 1657, which at one stage was thought likely to result in permanent disability.⁴⁰ Even this did not dampen expectations that he would be appointed to a command in Scotland, however, and although he was appointed instead to the command of William Goffe’s regiment of horse, stories were still circulating in the spring of 1658 about his likely transfer north of the border, not least as part of plans to undermine Monck.⁴¹ What is also interesting about Richard’s riding accident, moreover, is that it sheds valuable light upon contemporary perceptions of his status. One commentator noted that news of the incident ‘was remarked as [being] strangely trysted with his father’s design of bringing him forth into the world’, while another drew attention to the fact that the accident to ‘Prince Richard’ occurred in the New Forest, ‘that fatal place to the sons of our princes’.⁴² At least some people, in other words, thought of Richard as a future head of state, an impression which may only have been confirmed by his appointment – as Oliver’s successor – to the chancellorship of Oxford University in July 1657.

The Oxford job was anything but a sinecure, and chancellors tended to play an extremely active role in the running of the university. Richard’s duties included supervision of discipline, presiding over elections, approving appointments and granting dispensations, as well as ceremonial functions such as the conferral of degrees and the opening of new buildings. Richard, who had evidently developed a keen interest in educational affairs, was determined to play his part actively, and he brought both ‘zeal’ and ‘seriousness’ to the job, to the surprise of some commentators.⁴³ Within weeks of his appointment, therefore, he began to intervene over new appointments, and in order to remove certain individuals from college fellowships.⁴⁴ He dealt personally with petitions from disgruntled and ambitious scholars, and he became active in some important developments within Oxford.⁴⁵ Not the least of these was helping to deal with factional tension between Independents such as Thomas Goodwin and John Owen (the vice-chancellor), and Presbyterians such as John Conant and John Wilkins. This religious balance, which seems to have been created deliberately by Oliver Cromwell, had caused bitter arguments between those who sought to implement Puritan reforms – such as the alteration of the academic dress-code, which was thought by some to involve popish relics – and those who sought to preserve traditions. Unlike his father, Richard seems to have sided very clearly with the Presbyterians, and he liaised fairly

closely with Wilkins from an early stage.⁴⁶ Indeed, there is a distinct and intriguing possibility that Richard helped to orchestrate the resignation of John Owen as vice-chancellor in October 1657, and the election of Conant as his replacement. At the very least, there are grounds for thinking that Richard would have welcomed this development; Owen had become increasingly critical of the Cromwellian regime, and of the drift towards a monarchical constitution, and Richard had already been involved in attempts to undermine his ability to implement radical reform of the university.⁴⁷ After Owen's departure, moreover, Richard provided valuable backing for Conant, helping to promote Conant's drive to protect the practice of civil law within the university, supporting the attempt to block plans for a new university at Durham, and bolstering those who opposed reform to the process of selling college fellowships.⁴⁸

In addition to this important and politically sensitive appointment, there is evidence of one final stage in Richard's political education after the adoption of the 'Humble Petition and Advice', which indicates that his father could have done little more to prepare his eldest son for protectoral office. Under the terms of the revised constitution, the protector was expected to nominate and summon a second parliamentary chamber, styled the 'other House', as well as to nominate new councillors to serve life terms, and it was in accordance with these new powers that Oliver took the final steps to bring his son onto the highest political stage. By late November 1657, reports indicated that Richard was living at St James's Palace, which heirs to the throne had customarily inhabited, and in the following month he was appointed to the protectoral council.⁴⁹ After taking his seat, moreover, Richard became an assiduous councillor in terms of both attendance and activity, and Thomas Clarges noted that he was 'very diligent', and that he was also 'much in the esteem of his highness'.⁵⁰ In addition, Richard also headed the list of those who were to be made Cromwellian peers, and he duly attended every single one of their meetings.⁵¹ Although Richard made a brief trip to the West Country in June 1658, for his health, he quickly returned to Whitehall, amid talk of another parliament, in which he would surely have played a prominent part.⁵² Indeed, as one of the regime's key grandees, contemporaries evidently raised little objection to the fact that he was honoured by having a new addition to the Cromwellian fleet named after him.⁵³ Some commentators even considered it likely that the protector had even greater plans for Richard, and reports circulated in early 1658 to the effect that 'the city-statesmen here begin to talk as if my lord Richard... is to be made king, and that very shortly, his father remaining still lord

Protector till the government be more and more settled'.⁵⁴ Royalists too thought that 'Cromwell intends to make his son Richard king, and to be himself protector of both king and kingdom, and general of all forces of England both by sea and land'.⁵⁵

V

Richard's accession to the protectoral throne in September 1658 was obviously not met with universal approval, and in Oxford the official who made the announcement was 'pelted by some junior scholars... with turnip and carrot tops'.⁵⁶ More significantly, there was clearly opposition, of a kind which Henry Cromwell had predicted, from men who considered themselves more worthy of the position. A royalist like Sir Edward Nicholas found it hard to believe that such men would 'tamely submit' to Richard, and felt it likely that Richard would be unable to control a new Parliament, given that even Oliver had found the Commons 'too hard for him'.⁵⁷ These seem like intelligent predictions, but derogatory views of Richard's talents and upbringing were far from universally held. Those who worked most closely with him, and who observed his behaviour at first hand, like Henry Lawrence, president of the council, told a different story about his ability and attitudes, and official propagandists wrote about the new protector in glowing terms.⁵⁸ Both sides in what was obviously a contemporary debate about Richard's virtues probably need to be treated with caution, and both may contain a germ of truth, as well as prejudice and wishful thinking. When Richard Cromwell's pre-protectoral career is assessed without the benefit of hindsight, and without retrospective reconstruction, it becomes apparent that many conventional arguments can no longer be upheld.

Firstly, there is little meaningful evidence that he was incapable of holding high office, or that he was disinclined to play an active part in public life, and there is little plausibility to claims that he was opposed to the commonwealth, or that he harboured royalist views. Richard emerges as modest, serious and hard-working, and as a zealous and godly supporter of the republic and the protectorate. He was probably inclined towards conservatism and moderation in both religion and politics, but he clearly did not want to undo all of the changes that had been introduced since 1640, and he was almost certainly a religious Presbyterian who was more consistently attached to 'healing and settling' than was his father. Secondly, it is implausible to argue that Oliver, recognising Richard's weakness, shielded him from national affairs, and failed to prepare him as head of

state. Richard's public career before September 1658 needs to be divided, however, into distinct phases, each of which involved an appreciation of his age, his status within the family, and his family's status, as well as of political and constitutional circumstances, and a fairly precise correlation can be observed between changes in familial and political circumstances and the roles which Oliver expected his son to perform. Each turning point in the history of the Cromwell family and of the commonwealth regimes was marked by a fairly dramatic change in Richard's responsibilities and public profile. What emerges is a more subtle picture of Oliver's attitude towards his eldest son, in terms of bringing him into public life, and in terms of (eventually) grooming him as a successor, as well as a more nuanced picture of Richard's attitudes and abilities before he reached the protectoral throne.

Notes.

1. R. W. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell* (1935); J. A. Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell* (Lampeter, 1994); J. R. Hammer, *Protector. A Life History of Richard Cromwell* (New York, 1997); E. M. Hause, *Tumbledown Dick: the Fall of the House of Cromwell* (New York, 1972).
2. S. Bethel, *A True and Impartial Narrative* (1659), 3; J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Court of England* (4 vols, London, 1840), iii. 160-1; A. Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*, ed. J. Gutch (2 vols, Oxford, 1792-6), ii. 694; *Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Time* (6 vols, London, 1833), i. 150-1; G. Bate, *The History of the Rise and Progress of the Civil Wars in England* (London, 1688), ii. 240-1; M. Guizot, *History of Richard Cromwell* (2 vols, London, 1856), i. 6.
3. J. Peacey, 'The protector humbled: Richard Cromwell and the constitution', in P. Little, ed., *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Woodbridge, 2007), 32-52.
4. M. Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell* (2 vols, Birmingham, 1787), i. 158; W. C. Abbott (ed.), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (4 vols, Harvard, 1937-47), i. 50-1, 85.
5. Another older brother, Robert, had died in 1639, probably while a student at Felsted, and probably while Richard was also studying there: Abbott, i. 49, 107, 194, 216, 279.
6. Abbott, i. 585, 589-92, ii. 8-9, 12-13, 21, 27-30, 40-1, 46-7, 52, 56-7, 61-2; B[ritish] L[ibrary], Add. 24861, fos. 17v, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27.
7. BL, Add. 24861, fo. 17; Abbott, ii. 12-13, 21, 52.
8. Abbott, ii. 95, 102-4, 159-60, 289, 330, 425-6.
9. Abbott, i. 585, 590-92, ii. 8, 236.
10. J. Peacey, 'Richard Norton' (draft History of Parliament Biography).
11. T. Birch (ed.), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe* (7 vols, 1742) [hereafter *TSP*], iii. 572.
12. Abbott, ii. 102-3.
13. *C[alendar of] S[tate] P[apers] V[enetian] 1653-4*, p. 275; Noble, *Memoirs*, 159-60; Jesse, *Mémoirs*, iii. 153-4.
14. Hampshire RO, W/E6/2, unfol.; Wiltshire RO, 332/265/16, 17, 39, 50.
15. *C[alendar of] S[tate] P[apers] D[omestic] 1654*, p. 401; BL, Lansdowne 821, fos. 38, 64, 58, 109, 160; BL, Lansdowne 822, fos. 128, 130, 136, 144, 162; BL, Lansdowne 823, fos. 21, 39, 81, 85.
16. BL, Lansdowne 822, fo. 140; BL, Lansdowne 823, fos. 21, 81.
17. Lincoln's Inn Library, Admission Book 7, fo. 67.
18. C. H. Firth and G. Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army* (2 vols, Oxford, 1940), p. 48; *C[ommons] J[ournals]*, vi. 80.
19. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* (3 vols, Oxford, 1911), ii. 130-9; *CJ*, vi. 241, 367; *CSPD 1651*, p. 151; *CSPD 1653-4*, pp. 217, 287, 296; *CSPD 1655*, pp. 222, 349-50.
20. *CJ*, vii. 366, 368, 370, 371, 374, 380, 387, 407, 419.
21. *CJ*, vii. 391.
22. J. T. Rutt (ed.), *The Diary of Thomas Burton* (4 vols, 1828) [hereafter *Burton Diary*], i. li, liii-lviii; *TSP*, ii. 681-2, 684, 685.
23. *CSPD 1655-6*, pp. 544, 548; *CSPD 1656-7*, pp. 392, 521, 557; Bodl[elian Library], MS Rawl. A.328, p. 33; T[he] N[ational] A[rchives], ADM 2/1729, fos. 48v, 209; TNA, ADM 2/1730, fos. 51, 56.
24. BL, RP 2573(i).
25. *TSP*, iv. 229, 238, 363.
26. *TSP*, iv. 764, v. 215.
27. *TSP*, v. 329, 396-7.
28. *Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655-1656*, ed. M. Roberts (Camden Society, 4th series, 36, 1988), pp. 72, 80; C. H. Firth and F. Henderson (eds), *The Clarke Papers* (5 vols, 1891-2005), iii. 43; *TSP*, iii. 538.
29. *Weekly Intelligencer*, 2 (21-28 Aug. 1655), pp. 6-7; *Swedish Diplomats*, p. 200; *CSPD 1655-6*, pp. 1, 100; *TSP*, iv. 177; *Mercurius Politicus*, 282 (1-8 Nov. 1655), pp. 5738-40.
30. *TSP*, v. 329.
31. *CJ*, vii. 424-82; *Burton Diary*, i. 84, 95, 215.
32. *CJ*, vii. 426, 493; *Burton Diary*, i. 126.

THE UPBRINGING OF RICHARD CROMWELL

33. BL, Add. 78678, fo. 171; *Burton Diary*, i. 284.
34. BL, Lansdowne 822, fo. 100.
35. BL, Lansdowne 821, fo. 324.
36. *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675*, ed. R. Spalding (Oxford, 1979), p. 471; *Burton Diary*, ii. 513, 515.
37. *CSPV 1655-6*, p. 284.
38. Aberdeen University Library, MS 2538/1, fo. 34.
39. Bodl. MS Tanner 52, fo. 197v; National Library of Scotland, Wodrow folio xxvi, fo. 146.
40. TSP, vi. 482; *CSPD 1657-8*, p. 84; *CSPV 1657-9*, p. 110.
41. *CSPV 1657-9*, pp. 170, 179; *CCSP*, iv. 17, 32; *CSPD 1657-8*, pp. 335, 338; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 132, 145; BL, Add. 78195, fo. 87v.
42. *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston. Volume 3, 1655-1660*, ed. J. D. Ogilvie (Edinburgh, 1940), pp. 96-7; *CSPD 1657-8*, p. 87.
43. J. Butler, 'Richard Cromwell and Oxford, 1657-1660', *Cromwelliana* (1982-3), p. 21.
44. BL, Lansdowne 822, fo. 166; BL, Lansdowne 823, fo. 85.
45. *CSPD 1657-8*, p. 86; Butler, 'Richard Cromwell and Oxford', pp. 214-15.
46. B. Worden, 'Cromwellian Oxford', in N. Tyacke, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford. Volume 4: Seventeenth Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 737-8, 747; *CSPD 1657-8*, pp. 215, 349; *Mercurius Politicus*, 373 (23-30 July 1657), pp. 7955-6; *CSPD 1658-9*, p. 352; *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow*, ed. C. H. Firth (2 vols, Oxford, 1894), ii. 61.
47. Worden, 'Cromwellian Oxford', p. 746; Butler, 'Richard Cromwell and Oxford', p. 21; *Burton Diary*, ii. 63-4; *CJ*, vii. 482a.
48. *CSPD 1657-8*, p. 272; Worden, 'Cromwellian Oxford', p. 747-8; *CSPD 1657-8*, pp. 260, 278; *CJ*, vii. 476-7, 482; *Burton Diary*, i. 353-4.
49. TNA, PRO 31/3/101, fos. 437, 496; *CSPD 1657-8*, pp. 206, 208, 210; *Clarke Papers*, iii. 129; *CSPV 1657-9*, pp. 154-5.
50. *CSPD 1657-8*, p. 239; TNA, SP 25/78, pp. 328, 331; *Clarke Papers*, v. 271.
51. TSP, vi. 668; *HMC House of Lords*, new series, iv (London, 1908), pp. 503-24.
52. *Mercurius Politicus*, 423 (1-8 July 1658), pp. 664-5; BL,
53. *Mercurius Politicus*, 417 (20-27 May 1658), sig. Yyy4v; *CSPV 1657-9*, p. 209.
54. R. Vaughan, *The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell* (2 vols, London, 1838), ii. 436.

THE UPBRINGING OF RICHARD CROMWELL

55. BL, Add. 78195, fo. 77.
56. Wood, *University of Oxford*, ii. 685.
57. BL, Add. 78195, fos. 139, 141, 145v.
58. Northamptonshire RO, IC 3367; *Publick Intelligencer*, 141 (30 Aug.-6 Sept. 1658, E756/14), pp. 795-6.

Dr Jason Peacey is Senior Lecturer in History at University College London. He is the editor of *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (2001), co-editor of *Parliament at Work* (2002), and editor of *The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800* (2007). He is also the author of *Politicians and Pamphleteers. Propaganda in the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (2004), and recent articles include 'Cromwellian England: a propaganda state?', *History*, 91.2 (2006), and 'The Protector humbled: Richard Cromwell and the constitution', in P. Little, ed., *The Cromwellian Protectorate, 1653-9* (Boydell, 2007).

RICHARD AND HENRY:
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RICHARD CROMWELL AND HIS
YOUNGER BROTHER HENRY

By Professor Peter Gaunt

Deare brother,

That I doe not oftener write unto you will, notwithstanding my private condition, bare an excuse; for indeed though I much love and honour you, yet writing to my unskilfull hand is very irksome, and could my affections talke some other way, I should not care for appearing in this. I could almost notwithstanding forbidd it when I consider the ardent affections I have for you, there being a beleife in me of community with you, and that forreine distances cannot hinder the opperation of love in good dispositions, nor the many waters betwix England and Ireland squench that beate which admitts of noe winter of snow or froist in that breast where it dwelleth...

After further expressions of brotherly love, the writer reports that the recipient's father-in-law was sending over to him some cattle from England and goes on:

I could not doe lesse...then to make some expression of a brother (though poore, it being in dogs, compannions they have been for princes). I ded with very great chearfullnesse lay hold of the opportunity to present to the kennell (now I suppose on there marche to you) eight couple of beagles, the wholl stock of that kinde I had...

Rapidly running out of space on the paper, having nearly filled the whole sheet, the writer concludes:

...fearing I shall not leave roome to tender my respects, with my wife's, to your selfe and deare consorte, I shall desire that wee may be knownen to you and how much I am, deare brother,

Your most affectionate brother and servant,
R Cromwell¹

This is a doubly important letter: firstly, because it is probably the earliest extant letter written by Richard Cromwell, from the mid 1640s the eldest surviving son and heir of Oliver Cromwell and in 1658 his successor as

RICHARD AND HENRY

Lord Protector and head of state; and secondly, because it is one of the fullest and most eloquent expressions of the love and respect which existed between Richard and the recipient of this letter, his younger brother Henry Cromwell, who at this time – the letter is dated 27 November 1655 – was based in Dublin and was serving as commander of the English army in Ireland and in effect as the Protector's governor of Ireland.

We have already heard much about Richard Cromwell's background and upbringing this morning and will hear more about his political career and later life this afternoon.² His brother Henry may be less familiar and it is therefore worth spending just a little time outlining his life and career. Henry was born in January 1628 and so was around fifteen months younger than Richard. He was probably educated at Felsted school in Essex and, like Richard, he does not appear to have entered or attended a university. Almost certainly too young to have seen action during the main civil war of 1642-46, by autumn 1647 he was serving in Thomas Harrison's New Model horse regiment and so campaigned in northern England during the second civil war of 1648, including almost certainly fighting at the battle of Preston in August 1648. By the end of 1649 Henry had been promoted to colonel and given command of a newly-raised horse regiment, with which from early 1650 he campaigned in southern Ireland under first his father, Oliver Cromwell, and then successively his brothers-in-law Henry Ireton and Charles Fleetwood. He returned to England in winter 1652-53 and in May 1653 he married at Kensington Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Sir Francis Russell, an old friend and comrade-in-arms of his father Oliver. He represented Ireland in the Nominated Assembly of 1653 and was quite active and prominent in that parliament. In spring 1654 he was sent by his father on a brief mission back to Ireland, to report on the political and religious views of the English administrators and officers there. He was back in England by summer 1654 and was elected to the first Protectorate parliament as MP for Cambridge University. The parliamentary records again suggest that he was a fairly active Member. At the end of 1654 the Protector and Protectoral council added Henry to the existing Irish council and appointed him commander-in-chief of the English army in Ireland. He did not cross to Ireland until summer 1655, settling with his wife and growing family – in the end they had seven children, all but one of whom survived into adulthood – in official residences in Dublin. For the next four years, until spring 1659, Henry was chief administrator and in effect governor of Ireland for the Protectoral regime, as well as commander-in-chief of the army there, never once leaving Irish shores. Not until autumn

1657, however, was Henry formally appointed as Lord Deputy of Ireland in succession to his brother-in-law Charles Fleetwood, who had returned to London in late summer 1655; a year later, in November 1658, the new Protector, his elder brother Richard, promoted him to become Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Henry was left in limbo in Dublin after the collapse of his brother's Protectorate in spring 1659. After several weeks of uncertainty, exploring his options, Henry decided to go quietly, in mid June 1659 tendering his resignation to the restored Rump and shortly after returning with his family to England. He briefed the Rump's council about Irish affairs and then retired to his in-laws' estate at Chippenham in Cambridgeshire. Neither the restored Rump nor the returning Stuart regime troubled him – after all, he had played no part in the main civil war or the regicide and had resigned all political and military offices in spring 1659 – though Henry took care to mobilize friends and to present his case favourably to the new royal regime. He retained some lands in Ireland but never returned there and instead spent his last years living quietly at Spinney Abbey in Wicken, a Cambridgeshire property which he acquired soon after his return to England. He died there, reportedly of the stone, in March 1674, aged just 46, and lies beneath a marble slab in Wicken church.

So what do we know about the relationship between Henry and his more famous and better known elder brother Richard? And, particularly in terms of their public lives and public careers from the late 1640s to the end of the 1650s, how do the two compare? What similarities and differences can we discern when we examine the lives and careers of these two Cromwell siblings and how did they intertwine or interconnect, converge or diverge?

Firstly, at the outset we must recognize and thereafter keep in mind that there are considerable differences in the nature, quality and quantity of the surviving source material, particularly personal source material, written by or about the two brothers. As governor of Ireland from summer 1655 to spring 1659, Henry signed a large number of formal letters of state and other official documents, most of them impersonal papers written for him; they survive in large numbers, either amidst the state papers in the National Archives in London or for a time in the Irish state archives in Dublin, and although most of the latter were sadly destroyed in 1922, transcripts or calendars of much of this material were published in nineteenth-century collections of Irish historical documents. As head of state of Britain from September 1658 until spring 1659, Richard Cromwell signed a large number of formal letters of state and other official documents, most of them

impersonal papers written for him, and also delivered a small number of speeches, again probably in the main written for him; they survive in huge numbers, mainly amidst the state papers in the National Archives in London, though some were officially printed and published at the time, so their texts can also be found in the newspapers and other pamphlets of 1658-59. However, this sort of material, plentiful as it is, tells us very little about the characters and personal thoughts and feelings of the two men – they give us few insights into the essence of Henry or Richard. For this, we need to look for records of their personal or spontaneous utterances, for personal diaries, journals or commonplace books kept and written by the two and above all for surviving personal correspondence.

For a diary, journal or commonplace book of Henry or Richard we search in vain. We have some record of off-the-cuff remarks and apparently spontaneous and unprepared, unscripted short speeches made by Richard during his Protectorate, particularly when he received flattering addresses from various towns and counties in autumn 1658, but they are not terribly revealing. Richard's bigger and more official speeches, to meetings of the army officers in autumn 1658 and to his parliament when he opened it in January 1659, might offer greater insights into Richard's character and approach to government, though we have the problem that premeditated speeches of this ilk may well have been in part or in whole written and prepared for Richard by others – Secretary of State John Thurloe is often suggested as the author of Richard's speeches to the army officers of October and November 1658. For Henry, we do not even possess records of state or public speeches during his years in Ireland; indeed, considering that for nearly four years he was governor of Ireland and the regime's leading officer, politician and statesman there, it is remarkable that he seems to have made very few public speeches and that we have such scanty record of other utterances and informal speeches or oral pronouncements made by Henry.³

In the main, therefore, it is the surviving personal correspondence, that is the extant non-official letters which Richard and Henry wrote, which give historians and biographers the greatest and most valuable insights into the two men. And here historians have to grapple with a major problem and a great discrepancy in the quantity and quality of the surviving source material. From 1655 to 1659 there survive dozens – scores – of letters written by Henry to various correspondents in Ireland, Scotland and especially England, to John Thurloe in the main, but also to Lords Broghill

and Fauconberg, to his brother-in-law Fleetwood, to his father and brother as Protectors and to others, relating his actions and policies in Ireland, his hopes and fears, his ambitions and goals, and thus giving us detailed and rich insights into his thoughts and outlook. In contrast, there survive only a scattering of personal, non-official letters written by Richard between late 1655 and the eve of his departure for the continent in 1660. So although Richard rose to greater heights than his brother and held a far more elevated office and he is certainly now better known and more fully studied – there have been a handful of full length biographies and political studies of Richard over the past thirty years, while Henry has had no full length biography since R.W. Ramsey's volume *Henry Cromwell* appeared in 1933⁴ – we have potentially a far sharper and deeper insight into Henry than into Richard, for there survives vastly more personal material written by Henry than by Richard or, indeed, by all Henry's siblings put together.

Secondly, as attested by Richard's letter to Henry of November 1655, quoted at length at the outset, there seems to have been a strong bond of love and mutual support between the two brothers. The bond does not appear to have been weakened by the fact that they spent much of their adult lives and public careers apart and, in fact, could have spent remarkably little time together once their childhood and adolescence were over. In 1648 Henry was on campaign in northern England, while Richard was based in London and Hampshire. From 1650 to 1653 Henry was on campaign in Ireland, while his brother and his new family were living in Hampshire. From summer 1655 until spring 1659 Henry was serving in Ireland, while Richard divided his time between Hampshire and London. In spring 1660 Richard departed for semi-voluntary exile on the continent, while his brother remained living in quiet retirement in Cambridgeshire, and Richard never saw his younger brother again, returning to England only long after Henry's death. So from the time the two brothers entered adulthood in the later 1640s, when Richard turned 20 and his brother was in his late teens, there was limited opportunity for direct and personal contact: perhaps during 1649, though Richard married in the course of the year and thereafter spent most of his time with his new wife and father-in-law in Hampshire; perhaps from spring 1653 to summer 1655, though Richard and his family were generally living in Hampshire over this period, while Henry and his new wife were living with his in-laws in Cambridgeshire, but the two probably used the London lodgings they had been assigned in Whitehall from time to time and from late summer 1654 to early 1655 they both sat in the first Protectorate parliament; and perhaps on occasion in 1659-60, when

the two brothers were both in England, though Richard again seems to have been based in Hampshire and his younger brother nearly one hundred miles away in Cambridgeshire.

Despite or perhaps because of this physical separation, the surviving correspondence of the mid and later 1650s points to a strong and continuing personal bond of mutual love and support between the two brothers and a desire to span the miles which physically separated them. Thus in January 1656 Richard told Henry that 'As nature hath linked us soe near, soe shall the grace of God tye our affections with cords of true love that cannot be broken'.⁵ A few months later, in June 1656, he apologized to Henry for his slight tardiness in congratulating Henry on the birth of his son, but he was confident that there would be no need to apologize at length, for 'the neare relations of brothers will cutt offe that, especially betwixt yourselfe and me'.⁶ A year later, in summer 1657, Richard thanked Henry for the kind reply he had sent to his earlier letters, commenting self-deprecatingly that 'It must be your goodness that can give them soe great an advantadge, not that there is or can be any thinge worthy in my penn. I hope I shall never want a sense of your kindnesse to me', adding that 'we are born in our relations to help one another'.⁷ In June 1658 Richard noted Henry's effusive letter of thanks for a gelding which he had sent his younger brother in Ireland, commenting that 'You set soe over a vallew upon common respects, that indeed I know not how to appeare in any thing'.⁸ In July 1658, just a few weeks before he succeeded his father as Protector, Richard told Henry that, on his recent semi-official trip to Bath and the west country, he had yearned to continue westwards and so visit Henry in Ireland: 'Had I been my owne when att the Bathe I thincke I should not have returned without vissitinge you; for I can assure [you] my affections often employes there sailes for Ireland, but oure bodyes are too heavy for our soules...'.⁹

After Richard became Lord Protector, the boot was on the other foot and it was Henry who began expressing in his surviving letters a strong desire to return to England to see his elder brother. Henry's letters of autumn 1658, addressed both directly to Richard and to intermediaries such as John Thurloe and Lord Fauconberg, are full of requests that he be given permission to leave Ireland and to spend some time in England, at least in part so that he could advise and support Richard in his new role. But despite promises from Richard and Thurloe that these requests would receive a swift and sympathetic hearing, it is fairly clear that the military clique in

general and several senior officers in particular opposed and successfully delayed and stymied Henry's intended visit – they clearly did not want him on hand in London to help, support and strengthen Richard's position, though it should be noted that some senior politicians who supported Richard and the Protectorate also thought that Henry should stay in Ireland, feeling that he would be both safer and better placed to support the Protectoral regime from his Irish power base.¹⁰ In the end, Henry did not return to England until after the fall of the Protectorate. At that point, Henry's surviving correspondence dries up and he largely disappears from view, though the handful of surviving letters by Richard of summer and autumn 1659 and the various accounts of Richard's movements and actions in the weeks and months after his fall from power give no indication that the brothers met at this time. Although Henry passed through London very briefly in early July 1659, before retiring to Cambridgeshire, it may be that the brothers never saw each other again after Henry left to take up his Irish posting in summer 1655.

Thirdly, it is clear that Richard and Henry held slightly different positions and thus a different status within the Cromwell family. Richard and Henry had both been brought up as younger sons but, following the death of Oliver junior in 1644, Richard became the eldest surviving son and thus heir of a man who was now a rising and important army officer, a man of growing political stature and a man whose social status, property and wealth rose and grew rapidly during the 1640s. Accordingly, Oliver Cromwell was very closely involved in the arrangements for Richard Cromwell's marriage in the late 1640s, initially objecting to demands and offers made by the family of Richard's prospective bride, the Maijors of Hursley in Hampshire, and delaying the conclusion of those negotiations and the resulting marriage for almost a year. Accordingly, too, as now the eldest surviving son and heir, by the late 1640s Richard was carving out or being pushed into an elite social role, appointed a JP for Hampshire, sitting on various county committees, during the 1650s being appointed Lord Warden of the New Forest and also taking a lesser but significant role in local affairs in the Fenlands. In contrast, as a younger son, Henry's path was rather different. He married rather later than his elder brother and, although he too married into an established landed family, there is no sign among the surviving letters and papers that Oliver fussed over and interfered in Henry's matrimonial affairs in the way he certainly had done over Richard's. While in the 1650s Richard became an established member of the Hampshire county elite and played a significant role in the political, administrative, social and

wider life of Hampshire, Henry does not seem to have carved out such an elevated niche or such a prominent role in Cambridgeshire life and society after he took up residence and married life there.

From December 1653, both brothers were sons of the new head of state and both were accorded rather more respect and attention, often referred to as 'lord' and assigned apartments at Whitehall. But neither was looked upon as Oliver Cromwell's political heir at this stage – after all, the Instrument of Government established an elective not an hereditary Protectorship, and neither Henry nor Richard was seen as a likely candidate to be elected or selected by the council as Oliver's successor upon his death. Not until the new constitution of summer 1657 was inaugurated, giving Oliver the power and obligation to nominate and so appoint his successor, did eyes really turn to his two surviving sons and they soon focused upon Richard. Oliver's deliberate and clear promotion of his elder son and heir in 1657-58, appointing him colonel of an army regiment, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, a Protectoral councilor and a member of the new second parliamentary chamber, all clearly and strongly suggest that from summer 1657 onwards Oliver planned and intended that, as his eldest surviving son, Richard should succeed him as Lord Protector. Although Henry was promoted to be Lord Deputy of Ireland in autumn 1657, there is no indication that Oliver was seriously contemplating nominating him as his successor as Protector – the hereditary principle was probably strongly embedded in Oliver's thinking and overrode other considerations – even though some modern historians, with the benefit of hindsight, have speculated that Henry might have been better prepared for, and so able to make a better fist of, the role of Lord Protector and head of state than was Richard.

Yet fourthly, despite Richard's role as eldest surviving son and heir and eventual successor as Lord Protector, it was his younger brother Henry whose career took off first and who in the late 1640s and for much of the 1650s played a weightier and more substantial role on the national stage than his elder brother. During the late 1640s – perhaps in 1647 – Richard may very briefly have held a largely honorific military position, for according to some reports he was, presumably briefly, attached to the lifeguard of Lord General Sir Thomas Fairfax. However, there is no evidence that he saw any real military action or fighting, by the time of his marriage negotiations in 1648-49 he seems to have been firmly a civilian and during the early and mid 1650s he never claimed, used or was referred to by any

military rank or title. There is every sign that down to his formal appointment by his father as colonel and commander of a cavalry regiment in 1657, Richard was primarily or wholly and solely a civilian and possessed no real military experience or standing. Conversely, there is strong evidence that in 1648 Henry Cromwell was a regular, serving junior officer in a New Model regiment which saw extensive action and fighting in northern England, that from 1650 he was an active colonel and regimental commander and that over the following years he saw extensive, varied and substantial military action as he campaigned in southern and western Ireland.

In political life as in the military, it was the younger brother Henry not the elder brother Richard who first played a significant role in national affairs. In spring 1653 Henry was named as one of the members for Ireland in the Nominated Assembly and he played an active role in that body; Richard, in contrast, was not a member of the Nominated Assembly. According to some though not all accounts of the event, on 16 December 1653 Henry accompanied his father at his inauguration as Lord Protector; all accounts agree that Richard was not present and had no role. In February 1654 Henry certainly accompanied Oliver to the grand dinner where he was entertained by the city of London as the new head of state; again, Richard was not there and had no role. Not until summer 1654 did Richard first play a clear and well documented role in national politics – the occasional suggestions by historians that he became a member of the Rump sometime in 1649 seem to rest upon thin and shaky evidence, and in their published accounts neither David Underdown nor Blair Worden show Richard as ever being a member of the Rump.¹¹ Not until 1654 did Richard gain parliamentary experience, returned to the first Protectorate parliament where he sat alongside his brother as fellow MPs. And despite his deliberate promotion by his father from summer 1657 onwards, Richard clearly lacked the extensive political and administrative as well as military experience and power which Henry gained and exercised as governor of and military commander-in-chief in Ireland from summer 1655 onwards.

In the end, of course, Richard's office and powers as Lord Protector from September 1658 to spring 1659 exceeded and eclipsed those of his younger brother, albeit briefly, unhappily and unsuccessfully, but it is suggestive that down to the late 1650s it was the younger not the elder brother whose public career had been longer, far more substantial and glittering and had taken him much higher up the greasy pole.

Fifthly, how do the political views, opinions and outlooks of the two brothers compare? There is an obvious problem here, for not only does there survive just a small number of personal and potentially revealing letters written by Richard Cromwell but also many of those extant letters were written to his brother in Ireland over the period 1655-59. We know that Richard was being very guarded about what he said and the views he expressed in those letters, as he was well aware that correspondence between England and Ireland could easily go astray or be intercepted and read by others – in a letter to Henry of March 1657 Richard noted that ‘Those things that might be whispered ought not to be committed to paper, and therefore it is my greate unhapynesse that there should be alwayes such a distance and difficulty of coming to each other. Though there is a barre to my penn in state affaires, yet I know noe law against brotherly affection...’¹² So while Richard’s political views often appear rather thin, his political outlook sometimes shallow and his political analysis occasionally weak or simplistic, this may not fairly and accurately reflect Richard’s political grasp. In his surviving correspondence Henry, in contrast, generally comes across as well informed about political developments in both Dublin and London, as very interested in affairs of national administration and government, attuned to the nuances and potentials of state affairs and possessing clear views of his own which, despite the uncertainties of the postal service, he was happy to put in writing and so share.

Thus, for example, Richard expressed few political opinions about one of the key issues of his father’s Protectorship, the possibility of reviving kingship and granting Oliver the crown, and we search both his surviving correspondence of late winter and spring 1657 and his contributions to parliamentary debates of the time in vain for clear expressions of his views and stance on this key development. Indeed, from his rather thin and opaque surviving comments of this period it is not even clear whether he favoured or opposed the revival of kingship. In his letter to Henry of early March 1657 – the letter, already quoted, which opens with his comment about being unable to commit to paper some sensitive political matters – Richard revealed that he found the kingship controversy unpleasant, writing about the ‘spatteringe dirte which is throwen aboute here’ in ‘this peevious world’ and implied that he found the issue so distasteful and the parliamentary debates so uncomfortable that he had voluntarily withdrawn from the House and returned to Hursley.¹³ Henry, in contrast, clearly went out of his way to keep himself abreast of these developments, even though he was hundreds of miles distant from Whitehall and Westminster, and he

was not shy in offering clear and fairly sophisticated analyses of the issue, expounding his views in a series of detailed letters addressed to his father and to Secretary Thurloe between March and early June 1657. While he welcomed the new parliamentary constitution and felt that it was an improvement on the old Instrument of Government of December 1653, he was uneasy about the new title and also felt that supporters of the new constitution were making a mistake in focusing so much on the title of the head of state and attempting to force the Protector to accept all or reject all, thus imperiling many of the improvements found in other aspects of the proposed new constitution and, more broadly, threatening the smooth running of the parliament and regime.¹⁴ Indeed, it is noticeable that it was Henry, the younger son, who wrote to his father offering clear advice – ‘titles and names are of little moment’,¹⁵ he told Oliver in late April – and whose letter survives amongst the papers preserved by Secretary Thurloe. Richard, who seems to have been back in Hursley at the time and so would also have needed to give his advice in writing, appears not to have done so – or, at least, no letter of his on this matter, either to Oliver or to Thurloe, was preserved and has survived.

Overall, in political terms both brothers probably shared a broadly conservative outlook, more apt to pursue the healing and settling agenda set out by their father than Oliver’s radical, reformist goals. Thus in Ireland Henry restored many aspects of traditional civilian government, including the central law courts run by civilian judges, local commissions of the peace and civilian urban government under reissued town charters, he attempted to stimulate the Irish economy and to enhance educational facilities in Ireland and he chose not to enforce fines imposed upon many Irish Protestants.¹⁶ It is not so easy to discern Richard’s political goals, for while his brother effectively ran Ireland for four years, his own period in power, as Protector and head of state, was much briefer, in effect less than eight months. But during that brief period Richard maintained the structure and personnel of government inherited from his father and during the autumn he sought to win over those, both inside and outside the army, who had doubts about his regime by stressing how, as rightful successor, he was continuing his father’s regime and policies and how he stood by the existing constitution, pledging himself to adhere to its provisions; although he tried to woo the army by promising to do all he could to see military arrears of pay met, he did not attempt to win military or wider support by committing himself to major new policies or radical fresh initiatives. In his speech opening his Protectorate parliament in January 1659 he spoke of his desire

to preserve the peace, laws and liberties of the nation and to ensure the sound administration of justice, again favouring a conservative agenda of making the existing system work better rather than a radical agenda offering a new direction. Toward the end of this parliament, in spring 1659, Richard showed himself sympathetic to moves which would have further stressed the civilian nature of the regime, trimmed governmental costs and given the regime a more traditional appearance.

Sixthly, how do the religious beliefs, practices and outlooks of the two brothers compare? It must be admitted at the outset that much remains obscure about the personal faiths and religious practices of both brothers. For example, we know very little about precisely how or where they worshipped and exactly which form of church service Henry followed in Dublin during his years as governor of Ireland and Richard followed in Hursley and London before and during his Protectorate. What is apparent from the correspondence of both brothers, in Richard’s case also confirmed by his speeches as Protector, is that their own lives and experiences did not lead them to see and interpret or at least openly to express events and issues with the very intense religiosity of their father. Richard and Henry seem not to have shared Oliver’s overwhelming sense of having been raised out of the dust by the Lord and in their letters they make no allusion to having shared the sort of conversion experience which their father underwent while they were still children. On the other hand, their letters contain plenty of references to God and the will of the Lord – in all but their most mundane letters of business and recommendation, God is referred to – and both brothers seem to have shared a strong and sincere personal faith and to have believed in God’s providences, placing their fate and futures in the hands of God and, especially in times of uncertainty or misfortune, seeking strength or solace in submitting themselves to the divine will. Thus in December 1658 Henry reported that ‘I see now I have no other remedy but to trust myself upon the good providence of God’ and in May 1659 he wrote that he was ‘in a waiting frame to see what God would command...I wish we had been mindful enough and prepared for such dispensations as the Lord may have for us’,¹⁷ while in a letter of September 1659, written to a former colleague and Protectoral councillor, Richard noted that ‘It hath pleased God to change the face of things straingly...God is a righteous judge, and hath a plaine transcript of things, and will in his due time deale righteously will all men according to the works of their hands and the intentions of their hearts’.¹⁸

Upon his arrival in Ireland in 1655, Henry quickly embarked upon a long and dour but eventually successful campaign of clamping down on the activities of the Baptists in the English army and garrisons and towns in Ireland, reversing and removing many of the liberties and privileges which they had gained under his predecessor, Charles Fleetwood, and in 1656 he also moved quickly to ensure that Quakers would not gain a hold within military or civilian circles in Ireland. However, in both cases Henry repeatedly insisted that he did not oppose these faiths *per se* and indeed that he strongly supported the regime's well-established policy of guaranteeing liberty of conscience to all Protestant groups; instead, he stressed that he was taking such a firm line because Baptism had become a cover and front for insubordination within the army and for political disaffection towards the Protectoral regime, as well as slightly later moving to nip Quakerism in the bud for fears that it could in this sense become the new Baptism. Perhaps we come closer to discerning Henry's own religious views and faith by examining the type of churchman and church organization he favoured in Ireland. During his years in Ireland Henry appointed and promoted a wide range of Protestant ministers, but typically he seems to have come to favour Presbyterians rather more than Independents and in 1658-59, when – in consultation with a group of selected ministers – he came up with a blueprint for the future organization of the Protestant church in Ireland, he strongly supported a Presbyterian form of structure in preference to a more purely Independent-style arrangement.¹⁹ We also get a good insight into Henry's own religious preferences from a surviving diary which reveals that, while living in retirement in Cambridgeshire after the Restoration, Henry retained a personal chaplain who favoured a preaching style of ministry, who employed the prayer book 'as little as possible' and who supported the personal piety of Henry and his wife, though in 1665 Henry felt compelled to dismiss this chaplain when the authorities began to enquire into the type of minister he was maintaining.²⁰

As in political outlook and approach, so in religion, it is not as easy to discern Richard's views, for he had less than eight months in power, compared to Henry's four years in charge of Ireland during which he could and did implement secular and religious policies there. In December 1656 Richard reportedly took a very hard line against the prominent Quaker James Nayler, who had over-enthusiastically ridden into Bristol accompanied by adulterous female followers, he claimed merely commemorating Christ's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, though his critics, Richard amongst them it seems, bitterly condemned this as horrid

blasphemy. The parliamentary diarist Thomas Burton recorded that over dinner on 12 December, at the time the second Protectorate parliament was debating Nayler's guilt and the savagery of appropriate punishments, Richard 'was very clear in passing his judgment that Nayler deserves to be hanged... He, for his part, was clear that Nayler ought to die'.²¹ However, Burton's extensive account of the parliamentary debates themselves does not show any speech or other contribution by Richard and there is no evidence that he ever expressed these or similar views in the House. A satirical and hostile pamphlet of 1657-58 claimed that Richard was no friend of the Protestant sects and implied that he was personally rather lax in praying and preaching, but it is far from clear whether there was any truth in this attack or whether it rested on any firm evidence.²² As Chancellor of Oxford University Richard seems to have favoured Presbyterians²³ and as Protector he indicating that he wished to continue the religious policies and the type of church he had inherited from his father, though in practice his brief Protectorate was not marked by any clear church policies or religious initiatives. There is no evidence that, once he had returned to England late in his life, Richard did anything other than conform to the established Church of England, both before and after the passing of the Toleration Act.

Seventhly, how do the two brothers compare and contrast in terms of their personal lives, their health and their wealth? Both married fairly young – Richard at 22 and Henry at 25 – to daughters of solid, county, landowning families and both seem to have enjoyed a happy married life with a clutch of children who survived into adulthood. Oliver Cromwell was clearly worried about Richard around the time of his wedding and during his early married life, criticizing him for spending too much time on leisure activities, overrunning his financial allowance and running up debts. Even if, as has already been suggested, much of this reflects the concerns of a rather fussy though absentee father, by the end of the 1650s Richard does seem to have been mired in debt and the need to escape his creditors was probably one of the reasons behind his departure for the continent and his prolonged absence from England – and also, noticeably, from his wife and children, as there seems never to have been any real thought that they join him during his long self-imposed exile. Oliver never expressed any similar misgivings about Henry's lifestyle, though he did apparently hesitate for some time before dispatching his younger son to Ireland in the mid 1650s and shortly after he sent a senior officer to Ireland to report back to him on Henry's handling of Irish business.²⁴ As a husband and father, Henry's financial affairs seem to have been in good order, he acquired land and property in

both England and Ireland during the 1650s and he survived the Restoration without major financial problems.

On the other hand, Henry does seem to have been rather thin-skinned, given to self-doubt and uncertainty, to an exaggerated sense of his own inadequacy, to periods of gloomy despondency and to repeated apprehensions that he was being criticized behind his back in London and was not being supported by his father and by senior members of the Protectoral government. From his letters, he comes across as a natural worrier. Henry had only just arrived in Ireland when his predecessor and brother-in-law Fleetwood noted his ‘melancholy thoughts’, several times during his first year in Ireland he wailed about his own ‘youthe and inabilitie’ and ‘howe evilly I am requited for my kindness’, and on several occasions in 1655-56 he either announced his intention to resign or actually wrote and submitted letters of resignation – ‘Truly sir, according to the apprehension I have of the present state of thinges, I cannot judge it good either for the publique or myself to be longer here. I knowe not howe things are managed, but sure I am, my enemyes...insult, my friends droope, myself thereby rendered contemptible, and altogether uncapable of doeing further service’ – though every time his father and Secretary Thurloe smoothed his ruffled feathers and sought to reassure him and Henry stayed in place.²⁵ In contrast, Richard comes across as more balanced, placid and controlled and, apart from a brief period of impotent rage in May 1659, when he was under house arrest, uncertain about his own fate and stunned at seeing apparent friends and close family members turn against and betray him,²⁶ his correspondence generally suggests a spirit of equanimity, a calm response to the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. As Protector, Richard was aware of his youth and inexperience but, rather than fussing about them as his brother tended to do, sought to turn them to his advantage, making modest and self-deprecating speeches and calling upon his councillor and the army officers to help and advise him. Moreover, by the late 1650s Henry’s letters were littered with references to physical ill-health, to persistent and apparently serious colds and coughs, possibly exaggerated as part of his pleas to be allowed to leave Ireland and to return to England and to London during his brother’s Protectorate, but apparently with a basis in truth, for other correspondents of the time noted Henry’s ill-health and indisposition.²⁷ Although his health seems to have improved somewhat back in England during the 1660s, he died in 1674, aged just 46. Richard, in contrast, had a much longer life and generally enjoyed robust

good health, for example making a swift and full recovery from the potentially very dangerous injury of fracturing his thigh bone during the 1650s. Not until he was well into his seventies do we begin to get reports of noticeable physical decline. He outlived his younger brother by nearly four decades and died in his 86th year.

Eighthly and lastly, the manner and nature of the brothers’ departure from public life and public office in spring 1659 was remarkably similar. Both went quietly and neither brother really put up much of a fight. Richard was probably incapable of doing so once it became clear that most of the army regiments in and around London were loyal to Disbrowe and Fleetwood, not to him, but he neither gave a real lead to nor attempted to mobilize the armies in Scotland, Ireland or Flanders or the fleet. Henry Cromwell, too, seems to have hesitated and for several weeks to have been inactive in Dublin before deciding to go quietly and without active resistance. The brothers’ formal letters of resignation are also remarkably similar, but perhaps this is no co-incidence, as Richard wrote or at least signed his on 25 May and its text was quickly made widely available, so it is quite possible that Henry had read his brother’s letter and used it as a model when he wrote his own rather longer letter of resignation dated 15 June. Both stressed that they respected and would ‘acquiesce’ – they both employed this word – in the new government of the restored Rump, both expressed their love of the commonwealth and a desire for the maintenance of peace and order and both emphasized that they willingly submitted to the providence of the Lord.²⁸

For both the brothers, the end was very sudden. At just 31 Henry’s political and military careers were over. At 33 Richard moved in a few weeks from being head of state and commander-in-chief of the armed forces to being an embarrassing nobody, with well over half of century of exile and retired life ahead of him. So much, so young, so far to fall – the brothers were very much alike in that. Competent and able as they both were, intelligent, capable of personal charm, with good interpersonal skills, their rapid rise and very elevated positions were surely due to others factors, primarily that they were their father’s sons. Would Henry have been given command of a regiment at 22 and been appointed commander of the forces in Ireland and chief administrator and governor of Ireland at 27 were he not Oliver’s son? Would Richard have been appointed commander of a regiment, a Protectoral councilor, a member of the new parliamentary second chamber and Chancellor of Oxford University at 31, still less become head of state a

few weeks before his 32nd birthday, were he not Oliver's eldest son? The answer to both questions is surely a resounding 'no'. Both men rose so high, only to fall from grace so dramatically, because they were the surviving sons of Lord General and Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell. For them both, that was the motor and well-spring of their triumphs and considerable personal achievements, but also perhaps of their disappointments and personal tragedies.

Notes.

1. P. Gaunt, ed., *The Correspondence of Henry Cromwell, 1655-1659* (Cambridge, 2007), pp.75-76.
2. This paper was delivered as part of the Richard Cromwell Study Day held at Huntingdon in October 2009. It was the second of four lectures delivered in the course of the day.
3. Clearly, he did occasionally deliver speeches as chief administrator of Ireland, but we generally have little or no record of what he said. For example, we possess only a brief summary of Henry's speech on the future structure of the Protestant religion in Ireland with which he opened a convention of ministers held in Dublin in spring 1658, see British Library, Lansdowne Ms 1228, f. 13.
4. Recent full-length studies of Richard include E.M. Hause, *Tumble Down Dick. The Fall of the House of Cromwell* (New York, 1972), J.A. Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell, 1626-1712. The Second Protector* (Lampeter, 1994), and J.R. Hammer, *Protector. A Life History of Richard Cromwell* (New York, 1997), plus substantial chapters by J. Peacey in P. Little, ed., *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Woodbridge, 2007) and P. Little, ed., *Oliver Cromwell, New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2008). Both Richard and Henry do, of course, receive quite substantial new biographies by P. Gaunt in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004). Unless otherwise indicated in footnotes, the general assessments of Richard and Henry found in this article rest upon my 2004 biographies of the two brothers.
5. Gaunt, *The Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, p. 89.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 138.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 300.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 376.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 395.
10. All this is made clear by, and is taken from, the correspondence of autumn 1658 to spring 1659 printed in T. Birch, ed., *A Collection of the*

- State Papers of John Thurloe, Esquire* (7 vols, London, 1742), volume VII.
11. D. Underdown, *Pride's Purge* (Oxford, 1971) and A.B. Worden, *The Rump Parliament* (Cambridge, 1974).
 12. Gaunt, *Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, pp. 220-21.
 13. *Ibid.*, p. 221.
 14. Birch, *Thurloe State Papers*, VI, 93-94, 182-83, 222-23, 330.
 15. *Ibid.*, VI, 222-23.
 16. For assessments of Henry Cromwell's government in Ireland see also T. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland* (2nd edn, Oxford, 2000) and Gaunt, *Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, introductory chapter.
 17. Birch, *Thurloe State Papers*, VII, 579, 674.
 18. C.H. Firth, ed., *The Clarke Papers* (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), IV, 297.
 19. For assessments of Henry Cromwell's religious and church policies in Ireland see also Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, especially chapters 5 and 6, and Gaunt, *Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, introductory chapter.
 20. M. Storey, ed., *Two East Anglian Diaries* (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 97-103.
 21. J.T. Rutt, ed., *The Diary of Thomas Burton* (4 vols, London, 1828), I, 126.
 22. G. Wharton, *A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament (So Called)* (London, 1658), p. 1.
 23. Indeed, the Presbyterian leanings of Richard emerged quite strongly in the course of this Study Day, both in some of the other lectures and during the question and answer/discussion session which concluded the event.
 24. Gaunt, *Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, p. 23.
 25. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-24; Birch, *Thurloe State Papers*, III, 697, IV, 74, 327-28, V, 177.
 26. Evident from Richard's letters to Henry of 12 and 17 May 1659, in Gaunt, *Correspondence of Henry Cromwell*, pp. 515-17.
 27. Again, see the letters of Henry and of others of autumn 1658 to spring 1659 found in Birch, *Thurloe State Papers*, VII.
 28. For Richard's letter, see *His late Highness's Letter to the Parliament of England* (London, 1659), single sheet broadsheet; for Henry's letter, see Birch, *Thurloe State Papers*, VII, 683.

By Dr David L. Smith

Richard Cromwell was Lord Protector for less than nine months, and his only Parliament consisted of a single session lasting under three months. Although Richard had been a member of both the first and second Protectorate Parliaments, he lacked his father's extended parliamentary experience. Nevertheless, Richard's relations with his Parliament deserve close examination. This talk will explore why Richard called a Parliament, his relationship with that Parliament, and the reasons why it ultimately failed.¹

During the autumn of 1658, Richard's council was divided over whether or not a Parliament should be called, and if so on what franchise. According to the French ambassador, Bordeaux, in mid-September there was 'talk of a Parliament being called', although it was 'a very general opinion that the Parliament will not be assembled just yet, for fear lest, under the shadow of that body, factions might be formed which would not venture to show themselves at any other time'.² By early October, 'more positive statements' were 'afloat' 'in reference to the assembling of a Parliament', but 'the principal matter in debate' was 'how to regulate the form of the elections'. Richard and the council eventually decided informally on 29 November to summon a Parliament for January 1659, and this decision was formally confirmed on 3 December.³ Thurloe told Henry Cromwell that a Parliament was 'always usual at the beginning of every prince's reign', and that the main reasons for the decision were 'the great necessities we have for money, which cannot be supplied but by Parliament'; 'the good opinion the people in general now have of his highness'; and 'other reasons, which are more fit to be told your excellency by word of mouth, than by this way'.⁴

Richard and his Council decided to revert to the franchise and distribution of seats as they had been in 1640. According to one Royalist observer, this reversion 'to the old laws' was 'much opposed by divers of the grandees of the council and army'.⁵ It may be that a reversion to the old franchise, which reduced the number of county seats from 236 to 78 at a stroke, was motivated partly by a wish to prevent such large numbers of troublesome county members from being returned. There may also have been a feeling that such a restoration of old established procedures would be more likely to generate support for the regime than persisting with the new arrangements associated with the controversial elections of 1654 and 1656.⁶ Clive Holmes has suggested recently that the government's relatively limited efforts to

manage the elections or to secure the return of members sympathetic to it might suggest that this was not the only consideration, and that there may have been other reasons for the decision.⁷ First, a return to a Parliament composed along traditional lines was consistent with the rumours that had circulated in the spring and summer of 1658 about Oliver Cromwell's possible plans for calling another Parliament.⁸ For example, as early as 19 February 1658, James Waynwright had thought it likely there would be 'a Parliament once within nine months, called and constituted according to the ancient rights of the nation in the late King's time ... The ancient boroughs and cities their ancient number'.⁹ Second, the council may have wished not to grant continued legitimacy to the electoral arrangements embodied in the Instrument of Government given that the Humble Petition and Advice had now in other respects superseded the Instrument. This would be consistent with the 'meticulous concern for proper form' that appears to have characterised the government's approach to these elections.¹⁰

There was considerable competition to secure election, and the commonwealthsmen actively co-ordinated their efforts to win as many seats as possible. Around twenty members who had been excluded from the second Protectorate Parliament in 1656 returned to the House. Thurloe told Henry Cromwell that 'great strivings there will be to get in, and the commonwealthsmen have their daily meetings, disputing what kind of commonwealth they shall have, taking it for granted, they may pick and choose'.¹¹ When the results came in, Thurloe wrote that 'there is so great a mixture in the House of Commons, that no man knows which way the major part will incline'.¹² A Royalist agent predicted that 'there never met any Parliament in England so full of animosities as this will do', while the Venetian Resident, Giavarina, thought that 'it would not be remarkable if such a heterogeneous mixture had a bitter taste'.¹³ Others, however, felt that the position looked rather more encouraging for the government than initially anticipated. Bordeaux reported that 'the party of those who are discontented with the government will probably be numerically the weakest'.¹⁴

Richard's opening speech to the new Parliament on 27 January 1659 was generally well received. One contemporary wrote that he 'spoke to both Houses with such a grace and presence, and with such oratory and steadiness, without the least interruption and so pertinently to the present occasion, as it was beyond all expectation'; while another reported that 'it was very taking, and much approved of by most of the members, which

they signified by their general hummings of him whilst he was speaking.¹⁵ Richard's words offer some insight into his view of Parliament and what he hoped it might achieve. He had, he declared, 'thought it for the public good to call a Parliament of the three nations'. He believed it to be 'agreeable not only to my trust, but to my principles, to govern these nations by the advice of my two Houses of Parliament'. He quoted approvingly from the Humble Petition and Advice that 'Parliaments are the great council of the Chief Magistrate, in whose advice both he and these nations may be most safe and happy'.¹⁶ He assured members that he had 'that esteem of them', and that just as he had 'made it the first act of [his] government to call [them] together', so he would let them 'see the value' he placed upon them by the answers he would 'return to the advice' they gave him 'for the good of these nations'. He insisted that he had 'nothing in my design, but the maintenance of the peace, laws, liberties, both civil and Christian, of these nations; which I shall always make the measure and rule of my government, and be ready to spend my life for'. After briefly addressing issues of foreign policy, religion and legal reform,¹⁷ he closed with a characteristic plea to members to 'maintain and conserve love and unity among yourselves, that therein you may be the pattern of the nation, ... and to this let us all add our utmost endeavours for the making this an happy Parliament'.¹⁸ Like Richard's other recorded speeches, the tone was very temperate and irenic, a far cry from his father's impassioned and uncompromising calls for radical action.

Bills for the recognition of Richard as Lord Protector were initiated shortly afterwards in both Houses, but neither came to fruition. In the Other House, a bill 'for recognizing his Highness the Lord Protector and disclaiming the title of Charles Stuart' received its first reading on 31 January and its second the following day.¹⁹ It was then committed, and the committees recommended that the recognition of Richard and the disclaiming of Charles Stuart's title should be enacted by two separate bills.²⁰ The amended bill for Richard's recognition then passed its third reading on 5 February, but nothing further was heard of it.²¹ In the Commons, meanwhile, Thurloe introduced a bill for 'an Act of Recognition of his Highness' right and title to be Protector and Chief Magistrate of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging': this received its first reading on 1 February and its second on 7 February.²² It was then debated on 8-12 and 14-18 February.²³ On 14 February, the House voted to retain the word 'recognise'; with the commonwealthsmen Hesilrige and Neville as tellers for the minority who

sought its deletion, but it was agreed to drop the word 'undoubted' from the bill. The Commons also resolved that 'before this bill be committed, this House do declare such additional clauses to be part of the bill, as may bound the power of the chief magistrate; and fully secure the rights and privileges of Parliament, and the liberties and rights of the people'.²⁴ The House considered the additional clauses on 17 and 18 February, but on the second day voted not to 'proceed to determine the power of the negative voice in the chief magistrate, in the passing of laws, before the constitution of the Parliament, as to two Houses, be first resolved on'.²⁵ As a result, the House then turned its attention to the knotty problem of the nature and title of the Other House, and the bill for the recognition of Richard's title as Lord Protector disappeared from view for the rest of the Parliament.

Although there is apparently no surviving evidence of the debates in the Other House, extensive records exist of proceedings in the Commons that enable us to reconstruct something of how members perceived Richard and his title as Lord Protector. The initial reaction to the bill for recognition at its first reading on 1 February did not seem particularly hostile. Later that day, Thomas Clarges told Henry Cromwell: 'I hope it will be the happiest Parliament that ever sat in England ... Some few made sharp reflections on the bill, but the spirit of the House was so much for it, that by this day's action, I perceive, things will go fairly on'. However, he added more cautiously: 'on Monday next there will be a tough debate upon the second reading of the recognition; but there is no danger'.²⁶ Exactly a week later, as the debate got under way, he wrote: 'I perceive a great (I think I may say, the greatest) sense of the House is with [the recognition]; but those that oppose, are able speakers, which makes the considerations long before they come to a question'. Clarges did 'not observe any, that can object any thing against his Highness's person; those that have been sharp, and have seemed to doubt of his due nomination to the succession, but yet concluded to approve it'. 'Others', he noted, 'have glanced at the establishing a commonwealth to consist of a single person, a senate, and the people; but nothing of this kind has been gratefully received'.²⁷

Certainly members were fulsome in their personal tributes to Richard, and stressed his goodness, honesty and integrity. Such positive views co-existed with a wide variety of different political and constitutional positions. Many members emphasised their deep personal loyalty, including swordsmen such as Lambert, who reportedly stated that 'we are all for this honourable person that is now in the power'. The Attorney-General, Sir Edmond

Prideaux, echoed him: 'I find no man give just exception against the man... I hear of none to remove him, nor in competition with him.'²⁸ Many Presbyterian members spoke in a similar vein, although they sometimes suggested the need for tighter definition of protectoral powers. John Bulkeley, for example, 'would trust him more than any man... I take him not to be a person ambitious of power, but to rule with the love of his people, not to grasp at greatness.'²⁹ Richard Knightley apparently echoed him: 'It is some happiness that the single person is of good disposition, free from guile; but he is but a man. I have heard the judges say, that the Chief Magistrate, man or woman, must be bound; law must not cease.'³⁰ Such warnings indicated the persistence of the anxieties about sweeping protectoral powers that some Presbyterians had expressed in the first two Protectorate Parliaments.

It is important to notice that encomia of the new Lord Protector were in no way the exclusive preserve of courtiers or Presbyterians. Commonwealthsmen were anxious to stress their lack of personal animus towards him. Hesilrige, for instance, reportedly declared: 'I never knew any guile or gall in him. I honour the person.' Henry Neville likewise moved 'to declare the Protector to be Chief Magistrate' on the grounds that 'he is the fittest person of any man in England'.³¹ Other commonwealthsmen, while echoing such plaudits, regretted the vagueness of the Humble Petition and Advice and urged the need to define the Protector's powers more clearly. Thus Thomas Scott: 'I would not hazard a hair of his present Highness's head. Yet I would trust no man with more power than what is good for him and for the people... If you think of a single person, I would have him sooner than any man alive.'³² Such concerns notwithstanding, the chorus of praise for Richard was remarkable, and even a political maverick of possible Royalist sympathies like Robert Reynolds joined in: 'I heard not one man against the single person: against *the* single person there is not one exception. Not any other man in this nation would pass so clearly... I would venture my life rather than he should be in danger.'³³

Such apparent goodwill towards Richard suggests that the third Protectorate Parliament was not doomed to failure from the outset. Indeed, by late February the situation looked more promising for Richard and his allies than it had done a few weeks earlier. Bordeaux reported that 'before the meeting of Parliament', everyone, 'even the most enlightened ministers of state', suspected that 'the Protector was threatened with an alliance between the disaffected officers of the army and the republican members, and that these

two parties, acting together, would be capable of effecting a change in the government'. Since then, however, 'the Protector's party gained strength in Parliament'. The main danger, Bordeaux observed shrewdly, was that 'the public belief that the Protector has failed in regaining the adherence of the leaders of the army, without putting himself entirely in their hands, [might] yet alienate from him the support of many'.³⁴ Nevertheless, by the end of March, after the Parliament had sat for a couple of months, Richard had gained significant measures from it, although not as many as he would ideally have liked. He had secured a resolution recognising his title as Lord Protector (although the bill to that effect languished), the recognition of the Other House, and an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the Scottish and Irish members of the Commons. Sir Richard Browne thought that the 'admission of the Scotch and Irish to sit and have voice in Parliament seems to manifest the prevalence of the Court party (as they call it) over the republican, and by the accession of those voices not a little to fortify Cromwell in all future deliberations and debates'.³⁵ The disposal of the fleet was also left in the Protector's hands rather than in those of a committee.³⁶ However, a bill to settle certain taxes on the Protector for life was defeated by a resolution on 1 April.³⁷ This was another manifestation not so much of hostility towards Richard or the Protectorate as of a reluctance to give him too much financial independence, at any rate until his powers were defined more specifically.

Despite these disputes and tensions, the Parliament did not seem to be on the verge of collapse at the end of March, and events appeared to be moving in Richard's favour. Giavarina wrote on 24 March that 'there is good reason to look for a happy issue in conformity with the wishes of the Protector because it is noteworthy that notwithstanding the disputes and delays his party prevails at every decision', and as late as 8 April he reported that 'in spite of the numerous difficulties raised by opponents everything has proceeded in accordance with the Protector's desires'.³⁸ That same day, a Royalist agent observed that 'Cromwell's party is abundantly the more powerful, and that what they want in reason they supply in number, and will by that advantage in a short time (without the ... interposition of some accident) work all things to their own will'.³⁹ The Parliament's subsequent disintegration – culminating in its dissolution on 22 April – was remarkably rapid and was due primarily to the intervention of the army.

Mistrust of Richard steadily grew among the senior army officers, especially among those whom Ludlow referred to as the 'Wallingford House, or army-

party', notably Fleetwood, Disbrowe, Sydenham, Kelsey and Berry.⁴⁰ Their view of Richard was not improved when, probably in March, a cornet in Richard Ingoldsby's regiment was summoned before Richard for insubordination, and denounced his major as ungodly. Richard allegedly responded: 'Go thy way, Dick Ingoldsby, thou canst neither preach nor pray, but I will believe thee before I believe twenty of them'. This incident appears to have reinforced the fears of leading army officers that Richard's religious sympathies were less in tune with theirs than his father's had been. Around the end of March, Richard, possibly in an attempt to mollify the army leaders, apparently consented to a request from Fleetwood and Disbrowe that a General council of officers be convened.⁴¹ It was a fateful step, for when the army council met at Wallingford House on 2 April, it authorised the drafting of a 'humble representation and petition' to the Protector. Whitelocke later commented that 'this was the beginning of Richard's fall': he observed that it was 'set on foot by' Fleetwood and Disbrowe, and that 'the Parliament disputed about the other house, but took no course to provide money, but exasperated the army, and all those named of the other house'.⁴² Indeed, the army council's representation contained a barely concealed threat towards the Houses when it spoke of 'plucking the wicked out of their places, wheresoever they may be discovered'.⁴³

Although, according to *Mercurius Politicus*, Richard publicly received the representation 'with a very great affection and respect to the whole body of officers which presented it', in private he allegedly ordered Fleetwood to suppress it.⁴⁴ He yielded under pressure, however, and forwarded the representation to both Houses of Parliament on 8 April.⁴⁵ If the representation showed the army leaders' growing antagonism towards Richard and Parliament on various issues ranging from the payment of arrears to the promotion of the 'good old cause', the Commons' response revealed both a lack of empathy with the officers and a reluctance to treat their grievances with any degree of urgency. For a full ten days, they continued to discuss a range of matters including the public revenue (especially the excise), certain disputed elections, two Quaker papers, and complaints against Major-General Boteler. Only on 18 April did they belatedly turn to consider the army's representation.⁴⁶

Ironically, the debate in the Commons that day helped to bring the two Houses closer together, for most of those who spoke advocated conferring with the Other House about how best to proceed. Among those most

deeply hostile to the army's meetings were members as diverse as the crypto-Royalist Viscount Falkland, the Presbyterian John Swinfen, the Presbyterian-turned-courtier John Maynard, and the Solicitor-General, William Ellis.⁴⁷ The commonwealthsmen tended to take a more sympathetic line: Hesilridge, for example, 'would have you also to court them, by providing them pay ... Go upon that which will draw the affections of the army after you'.⁴⁸ Yet such sympathy was predicated on an insistence that any concessions to the army should not be detrimental to Parliament's authority. Likewise, it is telling that according to Burton, Scott not only said that 'there is a "good old cause"'. If their meetings be to manage that, I shall not be against them', but also added the crucial qualification: 'while their counsels are in subordination to you'.⁴⁹ After lengthy debate, the Commons passed two resolutions that Whitelocke thought 'distasteful to the army':⁵⁰ first, 'that, during the sitting of the Parliament, there shall be no General council or meeting of the officers of the army without the direction, leave, and authority of his Highness the Lord Protector, and both Houses of Parliament'; and second, 'that no person shall have or continue any command or trust in any of the armies or navies of England, Scotland or Ireland...who shall refuse to subscribe, that he will not disturb or interrupt the free meetings in Parliament of any the members of either House of Parliament, or their freedom in their debates and counsels'. The Commons then resolved to seek 'the concurrence of the Other House...to these votes'. Only after passing these resolutions did the House then agree to consider, the following day, 'how the arrears of the armies and navies may be speedily satisfied'.⁵¹

The army's representation had also been forwarded on 8 April to the Other House which, possibly swayed by the presence of such senior officers as Sydenham, Whalley, Fleetwood, Berry and Goffe, acted with greater despatch than the Commons and resolved to consider the matter on Monday, 11 April.⁵² That day, they referred the matter to a committee (which included all these grandees as well as Disbrowe), and ordered them to report the following day. The committee found it impossible to report within the time available, and the item was postponed and then disappeared from view until the Commons' two resolutions of 18 April were brought to the Other House the next day.⁵³ According to Thomas Clarges, 'the other house was in a great consternation upon receipt of the Commons' resolutions, 'and were so high, as many moved to lay them aside, and it was carried but by one voice in the contrary, which I somewhat admire; for without doubt, if they disagree with us in these, a further transaction may be

doubtful'.⁵⁴ The House voted to set aside all other business and to consider the Commons' resolutions the next day. This they did throughout 20 April, without reaching a conclusion; further discussion was then deferred until 22 April to allow for consideration of amendments to a bill for 'securing the nation against the common enemy', but the debate was never resumed before the Parliament was dissolved that day.⁵⁵

It was ironic, given the government's protracted efforts to secure the recognition of the Other House, that Richard did not wait for that House to come to a view: indeed, John Barwick thought that the second chamber was 'another clog upon him' and had 'encouraged the army to their late interposition into the affairs of state'.⁵⁶ Instead, on 18 April Richard immediately informed the officers of the Commons' resolutions, forbade them from holding further meetings, and ordered them to return to their respective posts. Disbrowe 'attempted to justify what had passed at their meetings', but Richard insisted that they repair to their commands, whereupon they 'withdrew without replying'.⁵⁷ When the officers failed to disperse, Richard summoned Fleetwood to Whitehall, 'but the messenger returned without an answer'; instead, Fleetwood ordered a rendezvous of the army at St James's for 21 April, whereupon Richard ordered a counter-rendezvous for the same time at Whitehall.⁵⁸ Meanwhile, on the morning of 21 April, the Commons began to debate the settling of the armed forces as a militia, possibly under Parliament's control, which was precisely what the army most feared.⁵⁹ According to Ludlow, at about noon that day Disbrowe came to Richard at Whitehall and told him that 'if he would dissolve his Parliament, the officers would take care of him; but that, if he refused so to do, they would do it without him, and leave him to shift for himself'.⁶⁰

It soon became clear on 21 April that virtually all the regiments in London were attending Fleetwood's rendezvous rather than Richard's, and the latter was left 'a general without an army'.⁶¹ That evening Disbrowe led a deputation of about a dozen officers to Richard to repeat the demand for Parliament's dissolution.⁶² Bordeaux had written the previous day, with characteristic insight, that Richard 'will yield to the wishes of the [army] leaders, and will prefer this to placing himself in the hands of the Parliament, which is composed of men of no solidity, who would desert him at a pinch, and some of whom are on his side only so long as they believe it to be consistent with the design of restoring the king'.⁶³ Bordeaux was proved correct. Whitelocke recorded that, faced with the army's demand, Richard conferred with Broghill, Fiennes, Thurloe, Wolsey and himself.

'Most of them were for it', Whitelocke wrote, although he claimed that he himself was not, 'and wished a little longer permission of their sitting, especially now they had begun to consider of raising money, whereby they would engage the soldiery.' 'Most were for the dissolving of the Parliament', and 'it [was] said that the Lord Broghill persuaded his Highness to sign the commission for dissolution of the Parliament'.⁶⁴ This was delivered to the Houses the following morning.⁶⁵ The Other House promptly obeyed, but the Commons initially tried to resist and locked their doors. Faced with the threat of military force, however, they adjourned: the army then barred entry to the House and the members dispersed.⁶⁶

The Parliament's dissolution was the latest in a series of army interventions that sought either to dissolve a Parliament or to manipulate its membership, following those of August 1647, December 1648, April 1653 and September 1654. The fundamental problem remained the lack of understanding between the army leadership and many ordinary members of Parliament. This manifested itself in contrasting political and religious priorities, and different conceptions of the 'good old cause'. Whereas under Oliver Cromwell, a military Lord Protector excited the suspicion of many within Parliament, under his son a civilian, pro-Presbyterian Lord Protector excited the suspicion of many within the army. Both Cromwells tried in different ways to straddle two essentially incompatible worlds, yet their attempts to do so often tended to destabilise parliamentary proceedings between 1653 and 1659. This did not mean that the Parliaments were unable to function effectively or productively, but it did represent an inherent source of weakness that had potentially disastrous consequences if the 'single person and Parliament' failed to govern harmoniously together.

It was indicative of the deep dilemma facing Richard that on 21 April 1659 he conferred with his closest advisers, all of whom were civilians, and then capitulated to the army's demand that Parliament be dissolved. He thus ended up gaining the worst of both worlds. Many courtiers lamented the passing of the Parliament and felt that he had sold out to the army, yet in spite of that the army leaders still did not see him as one of their own. John Maidstone, steward and cofferer of the protectoral household, wrote that the army always 'reflected on [Richard] as a person true to the civil interest, and not fixed to them'.⁶⁷ Although technically Richard remained Lord Protector for about another four weeks, his powers in effect came to an end with the dissolution of the third Protectorate Parliament. Thereafter, he was 'little better than a prisoner' at Whitehall, left in a 'state of abandonment'

and 'a melancholy posture'.⁶⁸ On 7 May the army secured the return of the Rump Parliament and with it the Commonwealth; then, on 19 May, the Rump elected a new council, and a few days later demanded Richard's resignation.⁶⁹ It was, perhaps, the betrayal of his brother-in-law Fleetwood and his uncle Disbrowe that hurt Richard most deeply. Of them he wrote: 'they tripped up my heels before I knew them, for though they were relations, yet they forsook me ... They are pitiful creatures. God will avenge innocence'.⁷⁰

The proceedings of the third Protectorate Parliament nevertheless suggest that Richard's efforts to build political support were not doomed to fail. Despite the evident difficulties of the session, by March 1659 events were steadily moving in Richard's direction until the decisive army intervention in April-May proved fatal first to the Parliament and then to the Protectorate itself. That intervention reflected long-term anxieties among the army officers that can only have been exacerbated by Richard's civilian background and Presbyterian leanings. Yet the actual coup, led by Fleetwood and Disbrowe, took place suddenly and for essentially short-term reasons. It reflected army fears that Richard was gaining too firm a hold on the Parliament, and that he was guiding it in directions that would ultimately prove prejudicial to the army's aims and interests. Richard's misfortune was thus that he fell foul of the army before he had had sufficient time to construct a secure parliamentary base. His own benign character and attitudes could well have enabled him to become an effective leader of a broad and moderate coalition, within which a large number of Presbyterian members were playing a more supportive and co-operative role than they had in the first two Protectorate Parliaments. However, not for the first time during the English Revolution, the army intervened before developments in Parliament had been able to proceed further, and thereby helped to turn events in a radically different direction that would ultimately lead to the restoration of Charles II.

Notes

1. For fuller discussions of this subject, see Patrick Little and David L. Smith, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge, 2007), chapter 7; and Jason Peacey, 'The Protector Humbled: Richard Cromwell and the Constitution', in Patrick Little, ed., *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (2007), pp. 32-52.
2. F.G.P. Guizot, *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II*,

trans. A.R. Scoble (2 vols., 1856), I, 234, 238. In these notes, place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.

3. Thomas Birch, ed., *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.*, (7 vols., 1742) [hereafter TSP], VII, 541. It appears, however, that the formal council decision to summon Parliament for 27 January 1659 was only taken on 3 December 1658: The National Archives (Public Record Office) [hereafter TNA], PRO 31/17/33, p. 243. See also Bodleian Library [hereafter Bodl.], MS Clarendon 59, fos. 273r, 278v-279r; Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 270-1; Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (4 vols., Oxford, 1853), IV, 338.
4. TSP, VII, 541. Cf. *Calendar of State Papers Venetian* [hereafter CSPV], 1657-9, 261.
5. Bodl., MS Clarendon 59, fo. 279r.
6. Cf. Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1985), p. 27.
7. Clive Holmes, 'John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal, and the last months of the Cromwellian Protectorate', *English Historical Review*, 122 (2007), 918-36.
8. Cf. C.H. Firth, *The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656-1658* (2 vols., 1909), II, 271-80.
9. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Sixth Report* (1877-8), p. 442.
10. Holmes, 'John Lisle, Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal', 921-9.
11. TSP, VII, 541.
12. TSP, VII, 594.
13. Bodl., MS Clarendon 59, fo. 409r; CSPV, 1657-9, 288.
14. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 287. One of Ormond's informants likewise wrote that 'the republican party ... are as yet judged much the weaker': Bodl., MS Clarendon 60, fo. 61r.
15. C.H. Firth and Frances Henderson, eds., *The Clarke Papers* (5 vols., Camden Society, 2nd series, 49, 1891; 54, 1894; 61 [recte 60], 1899; 62, 1901; 5th series, 27, 2005), III, 176.
16. This was derived from article 2 of the Humble Petition, which stated that Parliament is 'your great council, in whose affection and advice yourself and this people will be most safe and happy': S.R. Gardiner, ed., *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (3rd edition, Oxford, 1906), p. 449.
17. These sections of Richard's speech are analysed more fully in Little and Smith, *Parliaments and Politics*, pp. 191, 216, 259.
18. [Richard Cromwell,] *The Speech of His Highness the Lord Protector, made to*

- both Houses of Parliament at their first meeting on Thursday the 27th of January 1658/[9] (1658/[9]), pp. 4-5, 9.*
19. HMC, *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1699–1702* (1908), pp. 529-30; *Clarke Papers*, III, 176.
 20. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords, 1699-1702*, p. 531.
 21. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords, 1699-1702*, p. 533.
 22. *Journals of the House of Commons* [hereafter *CJ*], VII, 596, 601; *Clarke Papers*, III, 176; J.T. Rutt, ed., *Diary of Thomas Burton, Esq.* (4 vols., 1828) [hereafter Burton], II, 25-6; British Library [hereafter BL], Add. MS 5138 (diary of Guybon Goddard), pp. 114-15, 122-3; Bodl., MS Clarendon 60, fo. 83r; W.A.H. Schilling, ‘The Parliamentary Diary of Sir John Gell, 5 February - 21 March 1659’ (MA thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1961), p. 25; C.H. Firth, ed., *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow* (2 vols., Oxford, 1894), II, 54. For the draft Act, see TNA, SP 18/201/1; and *TSP*, VII, 603-4.
 23. *CJ*, VII, 601-5; Burton, III, 118-94, 204-32, 256-87, 289-95, 316-45; BL, Add. MS 5138, pp. 123-95; Schilling, pp. 25-90; *Clarke Papers*, III, 181; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 339-40.
 24. *CJ*, VII, 603; Burton, III, 284-7; BL, Add. MS 5138, p. 176; Schilling, p. 80; BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fos. 219r, 223r-v; *Clarke Papers*, III, 181; *TSP*, VII, 617; Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 303-4; *CSPV*, 1657-9, 293.
 25. *CJ*, VII, 605; Burton, III, 345; *TSP*, VII, 619; BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fo. 229r.
 26. *TSP*, VII, 605. Bordeaux also noted the lack of opposition at the bill’s first reading although, like Clarges, he went on to observe that it would ‘shortly call forth all forms of discontent’: Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 299-300.
 27. *TSP*, VII, 609.
 28. Burton, III, 132, 161, 232; BL, Add. MS 5138, p. 150.
 29. Burton, III, 146. Cf. Schilling, p. 43.
 30. Burton, III, 262. Cf. BL, Add. MS 5138, p. 176; and Schilling, p. 71.
 31. Burton, III, 134. Cf. Schilling, pp. 39-40.
 32. Burton, III, 112.
 33. Burton, III, 211. Cf. Schilling, pp. 54-7.
 34. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 314-17.
 35. G.F. Warner, ed., *The Nicholas Papers* (4 vols., Camden Society, 2nd series, 40, 1886; 50, 1893; 57, 1897; 3rd series, 31, 1920), IV, 87.
 36. Burton, III, 493; BL, Add. MS 5138, p. 245; Schilling, p. 122; *CJ*, VII, 607; *TSP*, VII, 626.

37. Burton, IV, 327. Cf. Derbyshire Record Office, MS D258/10/9/2 (diary of Sir John Gell), fo. 13v.
38. *CSPV*, 1659-61, 1, 6.
39. Bodl., MS Clarendon 60, fo. 307r.
40. Ludlow, II, 61-2.
41. Ludlow, II, 65-6.
42. Ruth Spalding, ed., *The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675* (British Academy, Records of Social and Economic History, new series, 13, Oxford, 1990), p. 511. The same passage also appears in Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 341-2. The full text of ‘the humble representation and petition of the General council of the officers of the armies of England, Scotland and Ireland’ is printed in *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England* (24 vols., 1751-61), XXI, 340-5.
43. Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England, XXI, 344. See also *Nicholas Papers*, IV, 101-2; *CSPV*, 1659-61, 6-7.
44. *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 561 (31 March-7 April 1659), p. 352; *State Papers collected by Edward, Earl of Clarendon* (3 vols., Oxford, 1757), III, 451-2.
45. Burton, IV, 379; *CJ*, VII, 632.
46. Burton, IV, 380-448; *CJ*, VII, 632-41; Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 362; BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fo. 293r.
47. Burton, IV, 449, 451, 452, 459.
48. Burton, IV, 450.
49. Burton, IV, 454.
50. Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 512; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 342.
51. *CJ*, VII, 641. See also BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fo. 297r; *TSP*, VII, 657-8, 662.
52. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords, 1699-1702*, pp. 557-8.
53. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords, 1699-1702*, pp. 558-63.
54. *TSP*, VII, 658.
55. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords, 1699-1702*, pp. 564-7.
56. *TSP*, VII, 662.
57. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 364. See also *TSP*, VII, 658; BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fos. 299r-v, 301r-302r.
58. Ludlow, II, 68-9. See also *CSPV*, 1659-61, 10-12.
59. Burton, IV, 472-81.
60. Ludlow, II, 69. See also Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 366; *Nicholas Papers*, IV, 124-5.
61. Ludlow, II, 69. See also *Clarke Papers*, III, 193-4.
62. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 370.

63. Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 367.
64. Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 512; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 343; *Clarke Papers*, V, 285.
65. Whitelocke, *Diary*, p. 512; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 343. See also Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 371; Burton, IV, 482-3; Ludlow, II, 70-1; *CSPV*, 1659-61, 13-14; BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fo. 304r; Patrick Little, *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 168.
66. HMC, *MSS of the House of Lords*, 1699-1702, pp. 566-7; Burton, IV, 482-3; *CJ*, VII, 644; Ludlow, II, 70-1; *Clarke Papers*, IV, 20-1; *Nicholas Papers*, IV, 116-18; Bodl., MS Clarendon 60, fo. 432r-v.
67. TSP, I, 767.
68. Bodl., MS Clarendon 60, fo. 456r; Guizot, *Richard Cromwell*, I, 385; *Nicholas Papers*, IV, 122. See also *CSPV*, 1659-61, 16-18.
69. Ludlow, II, 77-85; Whitelocke, *Diary*, pp. 513-16; Whitelocke, *Memorials*, IV, 343-50; C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, eds., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (3 vols., 1911), II, 1272-6.
70. BL, Lansdowne MS 823, fo. 370r. See also *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1658-9, p. 336.

David L. Smith is Fellow and Director of Studies in History at Selwyn College, Cambridge. His books include *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649* (Cambridge, 1994), *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603-1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford, 1998), *The Stuart Parliaments, 1603-1689* (1999), and, with Patrick Little, *Parliaments and Politics during the Cromwellian Protectorate* (Cambridge, 2007). He has also co-edited several collections of essays, including most recently, with Jason McElligott, *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge, 2007), and *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010).

By Miranda Malins

Pub quizmasters up and down the country delight in tricky historical questions designed to ensnare their most confident contestants. A particular favourite goes like this: who, they ask, was England's longest-lived head of state? The correct answer, which is almost never given, is Richard Cromwell. Richard may only have been head of state for eight months but he lived for eighty-six years, longer than Queen Victoria or George III. Fifty-three of these years occurred after Richard ceased to be the Lord Protector and yet this half-century of his life is hardly ever studied. The vast majority of historians, even historians who specialise in this period, know next to nothing about Richard's life after 1659, as this was, to all intents and purposes, his exit from the main stage. If one does continue to watch the man quietly retreating into the wings, and even if one follows him there, he quickly gives us the slip. It is difficult to piece together much of Richard's later life as he plots a frustratingly shadowy course through the Restoration years. He lived, in effect, fifty-three years of reclusive retirement, barely rippling the tense self-conscious calm imposed by his Stuart successors.

However, it is not my intention to render my talk redundant before I even begin: Richard's is not an entirely lost cause. Moreover we must remember that nothing inflames the historian more than an elusive biographical subject. The historian pursuing the second Protector does have a smattering of sources to help them. Principal among these are the existing correspondence between Richard and members of his family, the accounts of those he lodged with, some memoirs of his contemporaries and the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*. Aided thus the inquisitor can begin to assemble pieces of Richard's life and to learn more about our most private head of state and the ages he witnessed. In this talk I will give an account of Richard life after the collapse of the Protectorate before considering what conclusions we can draw from such an examination.

I

Richard Cromwell's position upon his resignation of the Protectorship in May 1659 did not at first seem to be too dire. The Rump agreed to pay his debts and provide him with a pension and he took his time leaving the State Apartments, retiring to his country estate of Hursley in Hampshire in July 1659. A year later, however, his debts were still unsettled and he wrote to George Monck for help explaining that his ‘present exigencies’ had caused

him 'for some tyme of late to retire into hiding-places to avoid arrest for debts contracted upon the publiq account'.¹ As Richard was not to face prosecution under the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion at the Restoration, it seems likely that it was largely fear of his creditors that finally drove him into voluntary exile in July 1660. Leaving his pregnant wife Dorothy and his children Oliver, Elizabeth and Anne behind, he sailed for France.

Richard would not return to England for approximately twenty years, and it is this period of his life that is most veiled in mystery. Reports of his activities occasionally reached the political classes at home. Samuel Pepys recorded on 13 October 1664 that Jeremiah White, a former chaplain of the Cromwells, had told him in conversation 'that Richard is and hath long been in France and is now going into Italy.' White further admitted that he corresponded with Richard and forwarded his money on to him. Apparently Richard had 'been in some straits in the beginning' but was 'relieved by his friends.' In public he 'goes by another name but do not disguise himself, nor deny himself to any man that challenges him.'² On 8 April 1666 Pepys came by another fragment of information, this time from Mrs Hunt, a relation of the Cromwell family, who told him: 'The Protector lives in France and spends about £500 per annum'.³

Many in Restoration England shared Pepys' lively interest in what he called 'the old matters of the Protector and his family' and Richard's presence continued to be felt in men's thoughts and plans.⁴ The *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* reports on meetings between Colonel Ingleby, the Earl of Derby and others who designed to reinstate Richard 'whom they hold as the undoubted heir to the Government of these nations'. They expressed great hopes of his leading an invasion in the summer of 1666.⁵ It is impossible to know whether Richard was aware of, or indeed involved in any such plans. However, the government was sufficiently concerned about Richard's popularity to list him among fourteen people who they wished to hand themselves over for questioning in March 1666.⁶ Soldiers were sent to search Hursley for any sign of the erstwhile Protector and, in so doing, they uncovered another clue to Richard's life abroad. This was a letter which one of Richard's daughters had hidden in her dress addressed to 'Mistress Browne', instructing her

to go to our Merchant Mr. Nicholas Skinner in Nicholas Lane, London & desire him to return you such a sum or sums of money as you should put into his hands and

retain it for M. de Bastille's use into the hands of Mons. Estienne Margas at Paris... Should Mr. Skinner be out of the way you need only enclose Mons. Bastille's letter in a blank paper to Mons. Margas.⁷

It seems likely that this letter outlines how the Cromwell family smuggled money to Richard and offers further proof that he was then living in Paris.

Investigators also apprehended Dorothy Cromwell's servant William Mumford who gave evidence in defence of Richard. His description of Richard's life paints a dreary picture. Mumford told how he had been to London to plead for Richard's removal from the proclamation opining that a return to England would be disastrous for Richard whose debts 'would ruin him'. Mumford continued stating that Richard had no contact 'with any fanatiques, nor with the King of France, nor States of Holland' and that he was, on the advice of Dr Wilkins, considering moving to Spain or Italy. Richard, he said, only wrote to him and Dorothy and 'had no English, Scotch nor Irish in his company.' He had 'no intelligence with intenders against the King and conceives himself bound to discover conspirators against government'. Moreover, Mumford 'had heard Richard pray in private to God to make the King a nursing father to his people.' As for leisure, Richard was tutored in the sciences and his 'whole diversion' was 'drawing landscapes and reading books.' These sound pleasant occupations but the isolation Richard endured in exile is clear. As Mumford put it, with some irony, Richard was 'not 6d. the better for being the son of the pretended Protector'.⁸

These answers must have satisfied the court as Richard's name was dropped from the proclamation, much to the undoubted relief of himself and his family. Nevertheless, the investigation may have frightened Richard into moving from France as the Earl of Clarendon relates an intriguing story in his *History of the Rebellion* which places Richard in Penzenas en route to Geneva in the latter part of the 1660s. There Richard, using the pseudonym of Mr Clarke, was apparently introduced to the Governor of Languedoc the prince of Conti. Unfortunately the prince, encountering an Englishman, saw fit to unburden himself of his opinions on the government of that sorry country. Oliver Cromwell, he maintained, was 'a brave fellow, [who] had great parts, and great courage, and was worthy to command' although, at the same time, the regicide had shown him 'a traitor and a villain.' The Protector's son and successor, however, received harsher treatment. In

Conti's opinion 'he was the basest fellow alive', a 'coxcomb, coquin, poltroon'. Richard, always a mild and sensible man, replied that on the contrary, the younger Protector had 'been betrayed by those he most trusted' before changing the subject. We can only imagine his feelings repressed throughout the remainder of the meeting, and also Conti's on learning the true identity of his English guest two days later.⁹

II

During these long years Richard's main source of comfort would have been his correspondence with those he had left behind in England. The earliest letters we have date from 1675-6, when Richard's wife Dorothy was seriously ill. He wrote to Elizabeth saying 'I would write unto your mother but I know not how: for I feare her weakness'.¹⁰ On hearing from his steward Edward Rayner that Dorothy's illness had worsened, Richard's next letter to his daughter pulses with his frustration and desperation: 'what is it that the Lord will doe with us? Oh that he would spare, that he would looke upon a poore afflicted family. I know not the present strength of your deare mother I am persuaded she is very weake my great greife & sorrow.' Richard had not seen his wife for fifteen years and he rails: 'I am unable to help, what can such a poore creature direct?' All he can do is suggest some powders and sweets she might take and pray that 'the Lord direct the good Lord step in in this our great perplexity.' Unable to speak to his wife, he directs Elizabeth: 'Pray imbrace thy mother for me', 'I doe love her, she is deare to me. Desire her to keep up her spirits beg her to be cheerfull. A good mother & a loving wife – her name is a sweet ointment, her soule is precious'.¹¹ It can only be hoped that Elizabeth read these words to Dorothy before she died shortly afterwards in January 1676.

This was a deeply unhappy time for the Cromwell family. Richard's brother Henry had died in 1674 and with his wife's death, Richard's world altered entirely. His providential instinct made him believe God was punishing his family: 'The Lord hath given us the wound & it is he that must heal us, our sins brought the stroake'. However, he retained his faith that repentance, faith, prayer and vigour would save them yet: 'let us repent & humble & turn unto the Lord whoe is infinte in mercy & hath said the rodd shall not alwayes be upon the back of the righteous'.¹² This sense of unity in adversity, of strength in shared grief brought him and his daughter Elizabeth much closer – her letter on Dorothy's death, Richard wrote, 'gives my oppressed soul a little ease & my troubled mind some space of quietness' –

and she became his chief correspondent henceforth.¹³ Thinking of his children gave Richard much comfort in his isolation. He conveyed this to Elizabeth:

my hopes are in thee & in my greatest troubles
deprivements of dearest & nearest relations, in my
solitary life, when I have looked about and cast my
thoughts upon my children, praises & thanksgivings to
the God of my choicest mercies have so... flowed that
my whole soul hath been refreshed.¹⁴

But it must have been difficult for Richard to imagine his children after fifteen years' absence. In this time Oliver, Anne and Elizabeth had quite grown up. Oliver had taken over the estate of Hursley on the death of his mother and the two older sisters lived with him there. As for Dorothy, the youngest, Richard had never seen her, which perhaps explains why he appears to have written to her less than to her older sisters. She was now an adult and in 1680 had married a Mr Mortimer.

This was the family picture in 1680-1 when Richard finally returned to England. He found much altered; all of his immediate family were dead except his sisters Frances Rich and Mary Fauconberg and virtually all of his closest friends and political supporters from the days of his Protectorate were gone also. In public life Charles II had lost much of his Restoration popularity and the 'Popish plot' had stirred up hatred and paranoia. So why did Richard return into this hostile environment at this juncture? It is hard to say. Perhaps he felt that enough time had passed for him to be relatively safe from government attention. If this was the case, however, it did not mean that he came out into the open. As Richard's biographer R. W. Ramsey concluded: 'Twenty years of exile had accustomed him to secrecy and an obscurity from which he had no wish to emerge, nor was it safe for him to do so'.¹⁵ As a result Richard spent the rest of his life living in lodgings, under an assumed name and he only began to visit Hursley many years later, staying with tenants on the estate incognito.

Despite his return to England he did not see his daughters – afraid no doubt of discovery – but he does seem to have met his son Oliver several times. The location of his first residence is unknown, but some of his continued letters to his family still exist. In these his sense of isolation persists: 'I hope my distemper is turning', he wrote 'it hath been very sharpe, & a solitary time with me'.¹⁶ His troubles increased when his daughter Dorothy fell ill a

year into her marriage. Once again he sought to interpret the will of God:

Our troubles rather increase than diminishe, we are in the fyer the L(d) purge us of all drosse. Truly Chyld there is cause of great wresting w(th) the L(d) for our strength is not great, the weight is heavy, oure waye is rugged, and the night is very dearke. yet let us put o(r) trust in the L(d) comit thy wayes unto the L(d) and he shall bring it to passe.¹⁷

Sadly Dorothy died on 14 May 1681, but her husband remained a loyal friend to Richard for the rest of his life, even calling his son by his third wife years later Cromwell Mortimer and making Richard his godfather.¹⁸

III

In 1683 a new and more concrete phase of Richard's life began when he moved in as a paying lodger to the house of the merchants Thomas and Rachel Pengelly in East Finchley, Middlesex. He remained with the Pengellys for the rest of his life, moving with Rachel to Cheshunt, Hertfordshire to live with her relatives on the death of her husband. Richard formed a strong attachment to them and their son Tom who he supported in his education and later in his legal career. Rachel Pengelly's accounts, which still exist, provide insights into Richard's lifestyle, which seems to have been quite comfortable, maintained by his income from Hursley. They tell of Richard's fondness for tea, wine, sherry, brandy and preserves. We know of his enjoyment of potted meats from a letter to Elizabeth in which he thanked and complimented her for the potted ‘Hayre venneson’ that she sent him. Richard also seems to have smoked a pipe occasionally and to have kept dogs, presumably for hunting, for which he ordered off-cuts of meat. The accounts similarly show that, despite his decline in station, Richard kept pride in his appearance. There are entries for silver buttons, doeskin gloves, periwigs and an expensive sword as well as spectacles, which he began to use around this time. Richard also cultivated an interest in home remedies that caused the most odd order in the account book – ‘herbs and woodlice for your diet drink’.¹⁹ Richard, or Mr Clarke as he continued to be known, kept himself to East Finchley for the most part but he gradually began to visit London, Westminster and Peckham. He originally hired a horse for these journeys before eventually buying one and this period also saw him acquire a manservant, Robert Deagle, known as ‘Black Robert’ for his dark complexion.²⁰

Rumours of Richard's return to England must have gained ground during these years as suspicion again began to attach itself to him. In 1683 he was suspected of involvement in the Rye House Plot and the arm of the state reached uncomfortably close to him when Rachel Pengelly's brother-in-law was questioned. Charles II himself ordered Sir Nicholas Butler to ‘have Mr. Richard Cromwell, the late pretended Protector, brought before him [the King] in order to be examined’.²¹ Their search proved fruitless however, the former Protector evasive as ever.

This hostile climate also caused Richard concerns about his son Oliver, a more open target. Oliver was certainly attracting attention: the commission investigating the Rye House Plot was informed that ‘Mr Cromwell, son of Richard Cromwell, who usually goes by the name of Mr. Cranbourne, was so vain as to endeavour to make a party for himself or his father in the city’ and it was ‘believed the said Mr. Cromwell and Mr. Ireton, the son of the Lieut-Gen. Ireton, would assist in the intended assassination of the King and the Duke of York’.²² Thus was the lingering fear of the Good Old Cause transferred from father to son, the name Cromwell or Ireton alone a sufficient reason for mistrust.

Richard was evidently concerned lest Oliver draw too much attention to himself. He warned Oliver through Elizabeth not to buy pistols: ‘pray let him be dissuaded from such a ffancy, the day will not beare it.’²³ Richard was again anxious in 1690 when his son attempted to enter politics, standing as a candidate for Lymington. He won the seat but was disbarred from taking it up by the parliamentary commission. Richard shared Oliver’s outrage at this, commenting on the parliament that

it pleaseth our King very well: he loves not to see the Presbyterian to prick up his eares, & the Comonwealthsman hangs them down. The Lord appears to be breaking & pounding together all must be melted downe & then looke for somewhat, what thinck yee of the Kingdom of Christ. Pray do not call me fanaticke why all our world are mad. And is it not a strange sight to see a sober man in a mad world.²⁴

Despite Richard’s disapproval of the parliament, he disagreed with Oliver’s decision to appeal the ruling, fearing the publicity it would entail. ‘It is not too late for him to take advice’ Richard wrote ‘whether the nature of the thing will allow to be dropte & soe prevent a public stain’.²⁵ His son, he felt

'hath prodigiously opened the mouths of o(r) Enemys to his & his ffamily's derision.'²⁶

Echoing his own father's dissatisfaction with him in early years, Richard also worried about Oliver's personal life. He disapproved of his son's friends such as the 'young Lockharts' despite the fact that they were the sons of Richard's old friend the arch-Cromwellian Ambassador William Lockhart: 'Is this a day to be careless, when everyone is throwing at us' he asked Elizabeth.²⁷ Treating her as head of the family in his absence, Richard wrote to her of his concerns about her brother and asked her to help guide him. Chief among his worries was Oliver's bad management of the estate of Hursley and his dim marriage prospects. In January 1689 he wrote to Elizabeth of Oliver's 'duty bo'th to God & his ffamuly'.²⁸ To Elizabeth's mind, Oliver's handling of his financial affairs proved an obstacle to settling down: 'Could he accomodate his mony matter a littel I don't doubt but that he would go briskly on'.²⁹

Oliver did not, however, 'go briskly on' and despite a few initial negotiations for a bride he remained a bachelor much to Richard's sadness. Elizabeth, meanwhile, clearly felt the weight of her responsibilities, and missed the assurance of a father's presence. She entreated of Richard

Is there noe hopes Dearest S(r) that the turns made of late by the Wheel of Providence may lead you from your Cell & Hermits life that your famely may be made happy by your presence... I hope it will not be long ere you will give me leave to wait on you.³⁰

Richard continued, however, to be concerned to the point of paranoia of discovery and constantly postponed their meeting

nothing in this world could be more pleasing to me then to enjoy the company of my children' he wrote 'but lett me act as Fa[ther]: not to doe that w(ch) shall be prejudicial I think my removal should be with advice, & I am ready to imbrace it, though I have found no incouradgement.³¹

It was not until 1693 that Richard finally saw his daughters in person. He was now living in Cheshunt and seems to have relaxed a great deal in his fears for his security. Perhaps we may explain this by the departure of James II in the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Richard must have felt very personally connected to both Charles and James as the sons of his father's nemesis and his direct rivals for sovereignty. It would have been surprising had he not felt the coming of William of Orange and Mary, a new generation from beyond the sea, to bring some slight relief. Consequently, there are more reports of his movements. An antiquary some decades later recorded that

Mr [Richard] Cromwell while he lived at Cheshunt was not a recluse, but he made visits and excursions to his friends, not only from what I have learned from Dr. Watts and another gentleman now living, but from what Mr. Cromwell, his great-nephew, told me, that he remembered his dining at Westminster with his uncle Richard Cromwell, the Rev. Mr. Jeremiah White who had been chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, and Mr. William Penn, the famous Quaker and Proprietary of Pennsylvania.³²

According to other sources, Richard 'attended divine worship regularly every Sunday' and 'he was well-esteemed in the neighbourhood about him'.³³ We also learn of Richard's visiting a coffee-house in Chelsea and attending Baptist meetings in Romsey.³⁴ Richard also entered into the negotiations for his daughter Anne's marriage to Dr Thomas Gibson which took place in 1698. The match pleased Richard who, upon visiting them in Hatton Garden in London, reported to Elizabeth: 'the more I looke upon the relation between your Sister and M(r) Gibson the more I see of God. without flattery let me say they are a worthy couple'.³⁵ This was one of many visits that Richard made to the Gibsons, and he even began to visit Oliver and Elizabeth at Hursley again, even, in 1701 staying for a whole summer.

This spell of happiness was not to last however. Trouble first reared its head in the form of a bitter argument between Oliver and Elizabeth over the management of the estate. Elizabeth disapproved of Oliver's drinking and whoring with his cousin Henry Cromwell and also of his having borrowed money against the surety of Hursley. Oliver, who resented her interfering,

told her to leave and she did, staying with the Gibsons in London. Eventually, after many months, and with Richard's help the pair was reconciled and Elizabeth returned to Hursley in March 1705. Tragically, however, Oliver died nine months later at the age of forty-nine.³⁶

This disaster affected the family in a variety of unfortunate ways, not least by plunging them into a legal wrangle over the estate, the intentions of Oliver's will being far from clear. Both Richard and Elizabeth advanced competing claims to take over Hursley and different members of the family supported each against the other. The process was a long and debilitating one and the fragile family, which had overcome so much already, almost broke under the strain. Richard felt deeply hurt and angry. As he wrote to Elizabeth:

To trouble & tare me aboute my Estate is a feeling to the flesh, but I have spirrit as well as flesh I will sooner be abused then my companions at Hursl'y Hampton Co(t) & in many dangers in my hiding pilgimaging removals: whoe dare to break that knot of love & faithfulness which time hath of soe many years experienced. I tell you againe & againe what I doe its for youe more than for myselfe, doe not think I flatter of eulogue I am for your Brothers will.³⁷

Such was his dedication to the case Richard finally began to use his own name in proceedings, abandoning the pseudonyms of Cranbourne, Cranberry and Clarke, among others, which he had relied upon for the last forty-five years. His perseverance paid off and in December 1706 a judgement was reached in his favour. Perversely, he decided not to take up residence at Hursley, but he took over management of its affairs and succeeded in balancing the accounts and helping several relations in the process.

Happily, and despite their protracted dispute, Richard and his daughters patched up their differences once the ruling had been given. They even returned to their old correspondence and much in the same manner. Richard's last years were therefore peaceful ones. Rachel Pengelly looked after him in his final illness in 1712 sending reports to her son Tom of 'Our Gentleman' – the affectionate term with which she always referred to Richard. After a period of stomach pains and general deterioration he died on 13 July 1712, quite peacefully, having said shortly beforehand: 'Live in

love, I am going to the God of Love.'³⁸ Richard left Hursley to his sister Mary Fauconberg who did not long survive him. His direct line would die out with Elizabeth's death in 1731.

V

So, what does a closer look at Richard's later life contribute to today's assessment of the second Protector? In answer to this I would like to offer you two contrasting views, contrasts which I hope we will discuss afterwards.

The first view is the more traditional one, and it applies, I think, to Richard's outward persona and his treatment by members of the general public. For many historians, including Ramsey, Richard was 'a patient exile in the years that followed, and at last, an old gentleman living in a desired obscurity, contented with simple pleasures and acts of kindness'.³⁹ Aspects of this description ring true. Richard certainly sought seclusion, yet was indeed a generous man to the small intimate circle which surrounded him, paying for his landlady's son to go to the Bar and helping his brother Henry's children. 'Those who knew him well in the latter part of his life', according to the eighteenth-century historian Daniel Neal, 'have assured me, that he was a perfect gentleman in his behaviour, well acquainted with public affairs, of great gravity and real piety; but so very modest, that he would not be distinguished or known by any name but the feigned one of Mr. Clarke.' Richard was certainly modest; his friend William Tongue reporting that he 'was not very free to speak of his former elevation'.⁴⁰ When, very occasionally, he did speak of it, he did it with a wry sense of humour. Several sources tell of his keeping the many loyal addresses he received from his subjects on becoming Protector in a small green trunk.⁴¹ There, he joked, he kept 'the lives and fortunes of all the good people of England'.⁴²

Underneath his humour one can see that these testimonies clearly meant a great deal to him. His friend Walter Garret related how Richard had told him that he was once addressed as much as any prince had ever been and that he meant to give the documents to the Bodleian Library 'on purpose to be preserved to show the temper of this nation and the readiness of its greatest members to compliment people on purpose for the secular interest'.⁴³

There is always, with Richard, a bizarreness to his situation that anecdotes like these reveal. Just as he was unsure how to treat his past – to hide it and

forget it, to be proud of it, to joke about it – so the public did not know how to react to him either. We must remember that there was no precedent for Richard's condition as a former sovereign, living freely and privately in his erstwhile kingdom. Previously kings or queens who had been deposed – we think of Lady Jane Grey, Richard II or Richard III for example – had died in battle, been imprisoned or executed. Yet Richard just went back to being plain Mr Cromwell, or Clarke or Cranbourne, living out the life of a country gentleman. As such he must have been a fascinating exhibit for his former subjects, a specimen, a curio.

Pepys was not alone in his curiosity about the Cromwell family. The name lived on, often cited in plots and conspiracies, and continuing, for some at least, to inspire affection and nostalgia. Thus Andrew Marvell's poems, republished at his death in 1678 remained popular, among them his *A Poem upon the Death of His Late Highness the Lord Protector* which includes the lines

And Richard yet, where his great parent led,
Beats on the rugged track: He virtue dead
Revives, and by his milder beam assures;
And yet how much of them his grief obscures.

He, as his father, long was kept from sight
In private, to be viewed by better light;
But opened once, what splendour does he throw?
A Cromwell in an hour a prince will grow.

Those lines must have resonated uncomfortably in the turbulence of the exclusion crisis.

Both the Protectors were often held up as comparisons to Charles II with whom they provided stark contrast. Thus a report on the Rye House Plot records a merchant Mr Terry claiming in 1683 that 'Mr Cromwell had more wit and right to reign than the King'.⁴⁴ Pepys records conversations in 1667 during which the spectre of Oliver Lord Protector was used as a yardstick for King Charles' failings:

It is strange how everybody doth nowadays reflect upon Oliver and commend him, so brave things he did and made all the neighbour princes fear him; while here a prince, come in with all the love and prayers and good liking of his people, hath lost all so soon, that it is a

miracle what way a man could devise to lose so much in so little time.⁴⁵

The aged Richard seems to have commanded an affectionate respect. The chronicler Mark Noble tells an anecdote, 'communicated by a most learned and honourable friend' in which Richard, when in court over the Hursley dispute, was honoured by the judge who ordered a chair and refreshments for him. Queen Ann herself is reputed to have commended the judge for proper attention shown to one who had once been a sovereign.⁴⁶ This story may have as much of myth as matter to it but it suggests the Cromwell family might have achieved a certain acceptance at last.

The general sense we get from this cheerful picture of the aged Richard, content with his lot and remembered fondly by the public, is that he was not perceived as a threat. Instead, as Bishop Burnet beautifully put it: 'As he was innocent of all the evil his father had done so there was no prejudice laid against him. Upon his advancement to the protectorship, the city of London, and almost all the counties of England, sent him addresses of congratulation, but when he found the times too boisterous he readily withdrew, and became a private man; and as he had done no hurt to anybody, so nobody ever studied to hurt him. A rare instance of the instability of human greatness; and of the security of innocence!'⁴⁷

VI

This has been the traditional view of the older Richard Cromwell advanced by historians. But I would like to offer an additional or perhaps alternative reading of events, a reading that corresponds more closely to the revised picture of Richard Cromwell that we have been constructing today. Our previous speakers have argued that Richard was a rather more potent Protector than hitherto thought and I believe a study of his later life suggests this. First, in the case of his treatment by the government and secondly in what we can reconstruct of his private feelings.

The records of the Restoration show that the government kept Richard in its mind's eye. He was summoned and investigated and his name often surfaces in official reports linked with those of known conspirators. It is an inescapable conclusion that Richard's life and that of his son's were blighted by their name. Richard felt compelled to live in exile for twenty years and even after that, to live incognito until well into the eighteenth century. He may have relaxed somewhat on the expulsion of James II but even this

event did not expunge the Cromwell legacy. We see this in William of Orange's decision to refuse Oliver's offer to raise troops for him to fight against James II in 1689. The name Cromwell still carried with it an implicit, emotive and visceral threat that made it too dangerous to be given power or publicity. In this and in his barring from Parliament Oliver's life was just as frustrated as his father's, and though this was in part due to inherited Cromwell family flaws, it was also because of the hindrance which his name posed.

The government was also aware that Richard retained a place in the hearts and minds of a significant number of the people. Some of these were prosecuted for such views as those expressed by Richard Abbott addressing the northern assize circuit on 20 May 1660: 'If I had but one bat in my belly, I would give it to keep the King out, for Cromwell ruled better than ever the King will'.⁴⁸ The likelihood of his restoration may have been slim, but Richard continued to pose a symbolic threat to the Stuart regime that was painfully aware that he had in his time been a popular ruler and a focal point for many disparate groups. If nothing else, their fear of his name evidences that.

To return finally to Richard himself – our unlikely hero – it seems to me that our fleeting windows into his later life reveal a man for whom frustration, bitterness and sadness formed the undercurrent of his feelings. This, I believe, was precisely because he knew that he had had great power in his grasp but it had slipped from him. He felt grievously hurt by the betrayal of his relations Fleetwood and Desborough whom he blamed for the collapse of the Protectoral world. He wrote to Henry that 'they tripped up my heeles before I knew them, for though they were relations, yet they forsooke me... They are pitiful creatures. God will avenge inocency'.⁴⁹ It is clear from his later letters, furthermore, that he was a far from patient exile, frustrated in his isolation. His relationship with his children also suffered enormously from their separation and the later disputes between them suggest the latent tensions within the family.

Throughout his troubles, Richard looked to God for guidance and, at times, it appears to be only his belief in the workings of providence that enabled him to deal with the heartache he faced. It seems to have been a rather less effective tool, however, in relieving Richard's disillusionment with the state of the world in general. In many ways Richard was a relic from a past age who had outlived himself as well as all of his contemporaries. His letters

convey this world-weariness, for instance his comments on Edmund Ludlow's treatment by Parliament in 1691:

I cannot digest the Par: usadge of Ludlow I believe we cannot parrallell a time of greater roguery & dissimulation & treachery as what we are in, & the time we are coming into is to be feared will be worse & worse.⁵⁰

Ludlow had never been a friend to Richard, but perhaps he felt some sense of communion with him as a man from his own era, a man who had suffered at the Restoration and ever since, as he had.

Richard like many former Cromwellians struggled to understand God's purpose for their country after 1660. They shared an underlying sadness for the future they had lost and it is this wistfulness that pervades Richard's later years. This is best shown in his visit to John Howe who had been chaplain to both him and his father when the cleric lay on his deathbed. It was reported that 'there was a great deal of serious discourse between them. Tears were freely shed on both sides, and the parting was very solemn'.⁵¹ The two men knew that they were the last lingering whisper of the Cromwellian dream, a dream that had long-since shattered.

The lesson Richard had been forced to learn through all this, and more painfully than any of his contemporaries, was the price of unsuccessful engagement with the great doings of the world. He had never been an ambitious man by inclination, and his brief time in the spotlight scarred him. The conclusion which Richard himself drew at the end of his strange life was this: 'our World is to be lamented, the day is only happy or rather favourable to them that have least to doe in it'.⁵²

Notes

1. J.A. Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell, 1626-1712, The Second Protector* (New York, 1994), p. 142.
2. R. Latham and W. Matthews (eds.), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys 1660-1669*, (London, 1976), Vol V 1664, p. 296.
3. *Ibid.*, Vol VII 1666, p. 94.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1665-6*, p. 281.
6. R. W. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell Protector of England* (London, 1935), p. 124.

7. *Ibid.* p. 131.
8. *CSPD, 1665-6*, p. 299.
9. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols (Oxford, 1888), Vol IV, p. 17; Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 148.
10. A.S. Burn (ed.), 'Correspondence of Richard Cromwell', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 13 (1898), p. 93.
11. *Ibid.* p. 94.
12. *Ibid.* p. 95.
13. *Ibid.* p. 94.
14. *Ibid.* p. 95.
15. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 139.
16. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 95.
17. *Ibid.* p. 96.
18. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 155.
19. British Library Add MSS 32456; Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 96.
20. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell*, pp. 142-5; Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 156.
21. *CSPD, July 1 to September 30 1683*, p. 33.
22. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 159.
23. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 96.
24. *Ibid.* p. 104.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.* p. 105.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.* p. 101.
29. *Ibid.* p. 103.
30. *Ibid.* p. 106.
31. *Ibid.* p. 99.
32. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 169.
33. Dr. Gibbons quoted in Rev. Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral-House of Cromwell*, 2 vols (London, 1787), Vol I, p. 183; Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, pp. 169-170.
34. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 167.
35. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 115.
36. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 174.
37. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 122.
38. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 224; Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 180.
39. Ramsey, *Richard Cromwell*, preface.
40. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 170.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 82.
42. Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House*, Vol I, p. 180.
43. Butler, *Richard Cromwell*, p. 82.
44. *CSPD, July 1 to September 30 1683*, p. 444.
45. Latham & Matthews, *Diary*, Vol VIII 1667, p. 332.
46. Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral House*, Vol I, pp. 174-5.
47. G. Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of his own time* (Dublin, 1724-34), pp. 82-3.
48. T. Harris, *Restoration* (London, 2005), pp. 48-9.
49. P. Gaunt (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Cromwell, 1655-1659: from the British Library Lansdowne Manuscripts*, (London, 2007), pp. 516-7.
50. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 108.
51. E. Calamy, *Memoirs of the life of the late rev. Mr. John Howe* (London, 1724), p. 226.
52. Burn, 'Correspondence', p. 114

Miranda Malins of Magdalene College Cambridge is in the final stages of writing her PhD which has the working title of 'Monarchy Asserted: Cromwellian kingship and its advocates, 1657-1670'. Her research focuses on the group of so-called conservative Cromwellians who spearheaded the campaign to offer the crown to Cromwell in 1657, tracing their political fortunes and personal attitudes into the Restoration years. She has been working with David Smith since her final year as an undergraduate at Cambridge, first on a dissertation on the parliamentarian officer and Governor of the Isle of Wight Colonel Robert Hammond and his involvement in the Revolution of 1648-9, and then on an MPhil thesis examining the importance of the Royal Independents in the Interregnum and their continuing influence on Cromwell. She has spoken at several conferences and seminars in the last few years but this is her first published article.

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XIII:
LORD PROTECTOR RICHARD CROMWELL'S SPEECH OPENING
HIS PROTECTORATE PARLIAMENT, JANUARY 1659.

By Professor Peter Gaunt

As Lord Protector, Richard Cromwell summoned and worked with a single Protectorate parliament, called by Protector and council in autumn 1658 – principally though not solely in the hope that it would vote additional money to pay off some of the Protectorate's heavy debts, especially the arrears of military pay – and formally opened by Richard on 27 January 1659. Accompanied by his councillors, some senior army officers and selected courtiers and household officials, Richard travelled to Westminster by water and, with many Members of both Houses, attended divine service in Westminster Abbey, which finished at around 1 pm, before returning to the palace of Westminster to deliver his opening speech. The speech was given in the Lords House, at that time being used by Members of the unelected second chamber created in 1657, to which Members of the House of Commons were summoned in order to hear the Protector's words, though by no means all of them attended – a great many declined on political grounds, staying seated in the Commons House in order to signify their opposition to and refusal to recognise the unelected second chamber and, in some cases, the Protectoral regime as a whole. Richard made no further speeches in or to this parliament in the course of its often troubled twelve-week session and it was abruptly dissolved in April by a written order rather than in person, so he gave no dissolution speech at its close. Thus this is the only formal speech which Richard delivered to the two Houses of his Protectorate parliament.

Contemporaries reported that Richard's speech lasted around fifteen minutes, that it was delivered confidently and crisply – unexpectedly so, some noted – and that its contents were thought to be clear and pertinent and were generally well received. Thus accounts speak of Richard's 'grace and presence' and his 'oratory and steadiness' in delivering his text, of the 'very handsome speech', a 'very sober and full discourse', and of the way in which the speech fitted 'so pertinently to the present occasion, as it was beyond all expectation', 'sound and effective, with great eloquence and point'.¹ We do not know who wrote the speech or, more precisely, how much of it emanated from or was written by Richard himself and how much from and by his key advisers, such as Secretary of State John Thurloe. Equally, the surviving accounts of events on 27 January do not make entirely clear whether Richard merely read from a prepared script word for

WRITINGS AND SOURCES XIII

word from beginning to end or whether in any sections he spoke from notes or extemporised. The printed text which has come down to us and which is reproduced below may have been polished a little for publication, but the contents closely reflect the thrust and main points of the speech as delivered on 27 January and as noted by several contemporaries and its length, too, seems about right for a speech which lasted around fifteen minutes, again as noted by several contemporaries in their accounts of the events of 27 January. Thus it is probably fair to conclude that the text as published soon after and as it has come down to us is close to the speech actually delivered by Richard when he opened this parliament. It is a clear and focused text and gives the impression of having been carefully prepared. It is certainly much shorter than and very different from the huge, sometimes rambling but also often very emotive and moving texts of Oliver Cromwell's largely extemporised speeches to his Protectorate parliaments as they were recorded and have come down to us.

Standing up and courteously removing his hat, Richard opened his speech by noting the unexpected and God-given continuation of peace at home, despite all the recent changes and the threats of lurking enemies, and by praising the work and legacy of his late father in maintaining peace at home and honour abroad. He told his audience that he had summoned the parliament, conforming not only with the written constitution but also with his own principles and preferences, in order that it give him good counsel and advice and so help maintain peace, law and liberty. Turning to specific policies and issues, Richard stressed that peace at home was threatened by a range of internal and external dangers and enemies, including the great arrears into which army pay had fallen – here came an explicit call to Members of the House of Commons to provide extra funds – as well as the continuing war with Spain and the uncertain and worrying position in the Sound, that is the narrow sea passage between Sweden and Denmark at the mouth of the Baltic, where several other European states were seeking to intervene in the conflict between the Swedes and the Danes to further their own interests, thus imperilling English naval and commercial interests in the region. Indicating that he would leave it to his Lord Keeper, Nathaniel Fiennes, to speak at greater length on this and other issues, Richard closed his own speech by drawing attention to three specific areas – the need to heal religious divisions, to advance reformation and to support the Protestant cause abroad.

The text reproduced below is taken from a nine-page pamphlet 'published

by his Highness special command' and produced by the government printers, Henry Halls and John Field, within a week of the speech being delivered – George Thomason dated his copy 2 February.² In this transcription, the original spelling has been retained, but the use of upper and lower case has been rendered consistent with modern practice and the punctuation has been lightly revised.

The speech of his Highness the Lord Protector, made to both Houses of parliament at their first meeting, on Thursday the 27th of January 1658 [i.e. 1659]

My lords and gentlemen,

I believe there are scarce any of you here who expected some moneths since to have seen this great assembly at this time, in this place, in peace, considering the great and unexpected change which it hath pleased the all-disposing hand of God to make in the midst of us. I can assure you that if things had been according to our own fears and the hopes of our enemies, it had not been thus with us. And therefore it will become both you and me in the first place as to reverence and adore the great God, possessor of heaven and earth, in whose hands our breath is and whose are all our ways, because of His judgements; so to acknowledge Him in His goodness to these lands, in that He hath not added sorrow to sorrow and made the period of his late Highness his life and that of the nation's peace to have been in one day.

Peace was one of the blessings of my father's government; a mercy after so long a civil war and, in the midst of so great division which that war bred, is not usually afforded by God unto a people in so great a measure.

The cause of God and these nations which he was ingaged in met in all the parts of it, as you well know, with many enemies and great opposition. The archers, privily and openly, sorely grieved him and shot at him, yet his bow abode in strength and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob.

As to himself, he died full of days, spent in great and sore travail; yet his eyes were not waxed dim, neither was his natural strength abated; as it was said of Moses, he was serviceable even to the last.

As to these nations, he left them in great honor abroad and in full peace at home; all England, Scotland and Ireland dwelling safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree, from Dan even to Beersheba.

He is gone to rest and we are entred into his labors; and if the Lord hath still a blessing for these lands (as I trust He hath) as our peace hath been lengthned out to this day, so shall we go on to reap the fruit and gather the harvest of what his late Highness hath sown and laid the foundation of.

For my own part, being by the providence of God and the disposition of the law my father's successor and bearing that place in the government that I do, I thought it for the publique good to call a parliament of the three nations, now united and conjoined together into one commonwealth under one government.

It is agreeable not only to my trust but to my principles to govern these nations by the advice of my two Houses of parliament; I finde it asserted in the Humble Petition and Advice, which is the corner-stone of this building, and that which I shall adhere to, 'that parliaments are the great counsel of the chief magistrate, in whose advice both he and these nations may be most safe and happy'. I can assure you I have that esteem of them; and as I have made it the first act of my government to call you together, so I shall further let you see the value I have of you by the answers that I shall return to the advice that shall be given me by you, for the good of these nations.

You are come up from your several countreys as the heads of your tribes and with hearts (I perswade myself) to consult together their good; I can say I meet you with the same desires, having nothing in my design but the maintenance of the peace, laws, liberties, both civil and Christian, of these nations; which I shall always make the measure and rule of my government and be ready to spend my life for.

We have summoned you up at this time to let you know the state of our affairs and to have your advice in them; and I believe a parliament was never summoned upon a more important occasion.

It is true, as I have told you, we are through the goodness of God at this time in peace; but it is not thus with us because we have no enemies; there are enough both within us and without us, who would soon put an end to our peace, were it in their powers or should it at any time come into their powers.

It will be becoming your wisdoms to consider of the securing of our peace against those who, we all know, are and ever will be our implacable enemies; what the means of doing this are, I shall refer unto you.

This I can assure you, that the armies of England, Scotland and Ireland are true and faithful to the peace and good interest of these nations and it will be found so and that they are a consisting body and useful for any good ends; and if they were not the best army in the world, you would have heard of inconveniences by reason of the great arrear of pay which is now due unto them, whereby some of them are reduced to great necessities. For you shall have a particular account of their arrears and I doubt not but consideration will be had thereupon in some speedy and effectual way. And this being matter of money, I recommend it particularly to the House of Commons.

You have, you know, a war with Spain, carried on by the advice of parliament. He is an old enemy and a potent one, and therefore it will be necessary both for the honour and safety of these nations that that war be vigorously prosecuted.

Furthermore, the constitution of affairs in all our neighbor countreys and round about us (as well friends as enemies) are very considerable and calls upon us to be upon our guard both at land and sea and to be in a posture able to maintain and conserve our own state and interest.

Great and powerful fleets are preparing to be set forth into these seas and considerable armies of several nations and kings are now disputing for the mastery of the Sound with the adjacent islands and countreys; among which is the [Holy] Roman Emperor, with other popish states; I need not tell you of what consequence these things are to this state.

We have already interposed in these affairs, in such manner as we found it necessary for the interest of England; and matters are yet in such a condition in those parts that this state may, with the assistance of God, provide that their differences may not prejudice us.

The other things that are to be said I shall refer to my Lord Keeper Fiennes and close up what I have to say with onely adding two or three particulars to what I have already said.

And first, I recommend to your care the people of God in these nations, with their concernments. The more they are divided among themselves, the greater prudence should be used to cement them.

Secondly, the good and necessary work of reformation, both in manners

and in the administration of justice, that profaneness may be discountenanced and suppressed and that righteousness and justice may be executed in the land.

Thirdly, I recommend unto you the Protestant cause abroad, which seems at this time to be in some danger, having great and powerful enemies and very few friends; and I hope and believe that the old English zeal to that cause is still among us.

Lastly, my lords and you gentlemen of the House of Commons, that you will in all your debates maintain and conserve the love and unity among yourselves that therein you may be the pattern of the nation, who have sent you up in peace and with their prayers, that the spirit of wisdom and peace may be among you; and this shall also be my prayer for you; and to this let us all add our utmost endeavors for the making this an happy parliament.

Finis

Notes.

1. C.H. Firth, ed., *The Clarke Papers* (4 vols, London, 1891-1901), III, 176; J.T. Rutt, ed., *The Diary of Thomas Burton* (4 vols, London, 1828), III, 2, 7; A.B. Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice*, XXXI, 1657-59 (London, 1931), p. 288.
2. British Library, Thomason Tract E968 (1).

By Jane A Mills

Cheshunt is located in the Lea Valley close to the River Lea and the A10 (Great Cambridge Road). It has its origins in a small fortified settlement on the east side of Ermine Street, the road built by the Romans leading from London to York. In the Domesday Book its name also gives a clue to its origins, it is known as *Cestrehunt* which is derived from the Latin *castrum* meaning fort. Its original location is probably where St Mary's church is situated at Churchgate.¹

Richard Cromwell left England in July 1660 because of his creditors; he had considerable debts both personal and Protectorate. Parliament had failed to pay his debts (Richard claimed he spent £29,000 on behalf of the state) and a pension as promised when he resigned as Protector in 1659. He decided to go into exile alone, leaving his pregnant wife Dorothy and his three children to maintain their home at Hursley in Hampshire. He spent the next twenty years in disguise, living in France, Italy and Switzerland, secretly corresponding with family and friends under the assumed name of John Clarke.²

While in exile he received the sad news of the death of his brother Henry in 1674; and two years later the illness and death of his wife Dorothy in 1676. On his return in 1680-1 his hopeless situation was made even worse when his youngest daughter, whom he had never met died on 14 May 1681 having been married only a short time.³

On his return to England he continued to remain in disguise and live in lodgings. He lived with the Pengelly family in East Finchley, and when Thomas Pengelly died in 1700, Richard stayed with his widow and went to live with her family at Cheshunt. His relationship with his children was not an easy one. He had not been there for their formative years, and they had many disagreements over his son's lifestyle, political aspirations and the management of the Hursley estate. The latter ended in a bitter court case between Elizabeth and he father. His final six years were happier and he was reconciled with his daughters.⁴

In Cheshunt on the 13 July 1712 Oliver Cromwell's last son died and his body was buried in the chancel of All Saints Church, Hursley. Richard's last remaining daughter, Elizabeth died in 1731 and she is also buried in Hursley.⁵

During Tudor times the manors of Cheshunt became a popular hunting ground for Royalty possibly due to its closeness to London. In 1548 Henry VIII's daughter Elizabeth (age 15) left her then home in Hanworth near Hampton Court to join the household of Sir Anthony Denny at the manor of Cheshunt Nunnery. It was in 1536 that Sir Anthony had been granted the priory of the nuns of St Mary de Swetmannescrafte. Elizabeth was very close to her stepmother Queen Catherine Parr who treated her as her own daughter. This bond continued after Catherine's marriage to Sir Thomas Seymour (Baron Seymour of Sudeley and Jane Seymour's brother), even though her relationship with Sir Thomas had become a cause for concern. The Queen's reasons for sending Elizabeth away from her household are probably a mixture of jealousy as well as concern for the young girl's reputation, as they remained friends.⁶

It was here that a future Royal Palace was to be built. In 1564 Sir William Cecil came into possession of the manor of Theobalds and started building his great house over the next 21 years. Cecil was Elizabeth's chief minister and became Lord Burghley in 1571. The Queen stayed at Theobalds on several occasions and used it as a Royal residence receiving visiting foreign dignitaries and ambassadors. On his death it passed to his son Robert Cecil (created Earl of Salisbury in 1605), and it was here on 3 May 1603 that Elizabeth's Privy Council welcomed her successor, James I, on his journey from Scotland. Cecil entertained the King and his entourage over the next four days during which time the King made twenty-eight knights. James visited the house on various occasions before finally exchanging with Robert Cecil, the manor of Theobalds and its surrounding manors for Hatfield and other properties on 22 May 1607. Over the next ten years further land in the surrounding area was purchased and work was started on enlarging the property.⁷ It was James's favourite palace where he spent a great deal of his time, it was here that he died on Sunday 27 March 1625 and where at its gates, the Knight Marshall proclaimed Charles the new king.⁸

In February 1642 Charles I was presented with Parliament's last petition concerning the Militia Bill, and later on 3 March, he left Theobalds for Royston and the start of his journey to Nottingham, to raise his Standard on 22 August, the ceremonial start to the Civil War.⁹

After the execution of Charles, Theobalds' future was in the hands of the Parliamentary trustees who were organising the sale of Crown land, they decided it should be excepted, but then on reconsideration it was decided it

should be sold. In 1650 commissioners were sent to survey the property, their decision was that the Palace was in excellent condition and exclusive of the park, it was worth £200 per annum. Though if it was demolished the materials would be worth £8275 11s. The park was surrounded by a brick wall of some ten miles containing 2,508 acres which together with various buildings was valued at £1545 15s 4d per annum. The 15,608 trees' timber was worth £7,259 13s 2d. It was a foregone conclusion that Theobalds was worth more demolished to a Parliament desperate for money. The Almshouse and Chapel were left untouched, though demolition took place on most of the buildings and park walls.¹⁰

After the Restoration the manor was granted to the Duke of Albemarle by Charles II. In 1695 the manor was separated from the park and house; the manor was then sold in 1736 to Mrs Letitia Thornhill on her death it passed to Sir Robert Thornhill's granddaughters. One of the granddaughters was Sarah Gatton who married Oliver Cromwell's great grandson Richard, a Lincoln's Inn lawyer. Together they had six children who either died young or unmarried. When their daughters Elizabeth and Letitia died the property then passed to their cousin Oliver Cromwell, the son of Richard's brother Thomas. Oliver was also a lawyer of Gray's Inn and sadly the only male descendant of his great great grandfather. Oliver died in 1821 and is buried in St Mary's churchyard Cheshunt.¹¹

Notes

1. W. Page (ed.), *A History of the County of Hertford*, vol 3 (1912; Victoria County History), 441-458.
2. A. Fraser, *Cromwell Our Chief of Men*, 1973, Weidenfeld & Nicolson), 686-7.; C.P. Hill, *Who's Who in Stuart Britain*, (1988, Shepheard-Walwyn), 216-8.
3. P. Gaunt, *The Cromwellian Gazetteer*, (1987. Sutton), 86-88, 238-9
4. *Ibid.*, 76, 86-8; D. Lysons, *The Environs of London Volume 4: Counties of Herts, Essex & Kent* (1796).
5. Gaunt, *Gazetteer*, 76, 238-9.
6. A. Fraser, *The Six Wives of Henry VIII* (1992, Weidenfeld & Nicolson), 404-5. C.R.N. Routh, *Who's Who in Tudor England*, (1990, Shepheard-Walwyn), 50-1, 193-206., Page, *Hertford*, 441-458.
7. Lysons, *Environs*; Page, *Hertford*, 441-458.
8. P. Gregg, *King Charles I*, (1981, Dent), 110-111.
9. The Militia Bill was issued by Parliament as an ordinance as it lacked

Royal consent and was adopted by both Houses on 5 March. S.R. Gardiner (ed.), *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660* (1906, Oxford), 245-247; A. Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (1991, Macmillan), 175.

10. Lysons, *Environs of London*,
11. Gaunt, *Gazetteer*, 86-8, 238-9., Lysons, *Environs*; Page, *Hertford*, 441-458.

Jane A. Mills is the editor of *Cromwelliana* and a Fellow of The Historical Association. She is the editor of a forthcoming book about Oliver Cromwell.

By Dr Patrick Little

In an earlier edition of *Cromwelliana*,¹ I discussed the surviving sources for Cromwell's sense of humour, and tried to put them into the context of humour in the seventeenth century as a whole. One issue proved particularly opaque: what role had humour in the camp culture of the New Model Army? This is not the only aspect of the New Model that is obscure. We know a fair amount about the material aspects of life on campaign, the clothing and equipment, the food and drink provided, the problems of finding quarters on the march; but the ways in which soldiers interacted, the pastimes they were able to pursue, their religiosity, the kinds of jokes and stories and songs that were shared beside the campfire: these cannot easily be recovered. With this assumption in mind, I was interested to come across a pamphlet, published in October 1650 by a captain of Colonel Okey's famous regiment of dragoons, one Francis Freeman, which provides a glimpse of this lost world.²

Francis Freeman, originally a tanner from Marlborough in Wiltshire, probably served in the local parliamentarian forces in the west country during the first civil war, and was a captain by July 1646, when he conducted the siege of Dunster Castle in Somerset.³ Freeman was commissioned captain in Okey's dragoons in 1647, and presumably served with the regiment in south Wales during the second civil war of 1648, perhaps fighting at the battle of St Fagans and the siege of Pembroke before marching north to the siege of Pontefract in Yorkshire – the latter two actions being conducted by Oliver Cromwell. He was not one of the captains destined for Ireland in 1649, and he may have served against the Leveller mutineers in the spring and summer of that year, before going north with the army marching against the Scots in the summer of 1650.⁴ By this time it was already clear that Freeman was becoming something of a problem in the regiment. Okey, a fairly conservative Independent, was deeply unhappy at Freeman's more experimental views. Freeman said that he had tried all kinds of religion, but none had suited him, telling Okey that he 'had been a Papist, Protestant, Presbyterian, Antinomian, Independent, Anabaptist, Seeker etc, but I gave God thanks I had passed through them all'.⁵ Whatever Freeman's claims to religious non-affiliation, it is clear that Okey feared he had moved on a further step, to become a fully-fledged 'Ranter' – a member of a sect famed for its sexual license. From Okey's point of view, Freeman was particularly dangerous as he was intent on

proselytising his fellow officers; he was certainly a popular man in the regiment, and commanded a loyalty from his men that Okey found threatening. As Okey is supposed to have said in an earlier confrontation with Freeman and his confederates, 'he would root us out of his regiment, or else we should root out him'.⁶ It was when Freeman's troop was quartered at Whaley Bridge in Derbyshire in the summer of 1650 that matters came to a head, and Okey moved to cashier his troublesome subordinate. Okey was at pains to emphasise that his actions were morally as well as religiously guided, and this is why the extract below is so valuable, as it deals not with theology but with less common themes such as bawdy music, practical jokes and laughter, and even hints at the dangers of officers becoming too close to their men, upsetting the hierarchy, and discipline, of the whole regiment.

As a preliminary, the detail perhaps requires a little explanation. Of the three 'bawdy songs' that Okey alleged Freeman was singing, two can be identified with some certainty. 'New Oysters' was a simple canon, sung in unison, originally published in Ravenscroft's *Pammelia*,⁷ and the original version, at least, appears innocuous enough. Based on London street cries (a popular subject for songs of the period) it repeats the lines 'New oysters... have you any wood to cleave?... what kitchen stuff have you maids?'. Whether there was a 'soldier's version' of this, akin to the obscene takes on popular and religious songs which emerged from twentieth-century conflicts, is anyone's guess. 'There dwells a pretty maid whose name was Siss', as published in Hilton's *Catch that Catch Can*,⁸ is far less innocent, being based on crude double-entendre:

Here dwells a pretty Mayd, whose name is Sis,
you may come in and kisse
Her hole, her hole, her whole estate is seventeen pence a yeare,
Yet you may kisse, you may kisse, you may kisse her,
if you come but neare.

Sung as a catch (or round) this would no doubt be hilarious after a few quarts of ale, but it hardly ranks as the worst of its kind, and many rhymes and songs of the seventeenth century truly plumb the depths of bad taste even from a twenty-first century perspective.⁹ The worst of the three, for Okey, was 'I met with Joan of Kent', but this apparently has not survived. At first sight the title suggests that this a historical song about 'Joan of Kent' – the 'Fair Maid of Kent' who married the Black Prince in the fourteenth

century, or possibly a religious song about 'Joan of Kent', burnt by Queen Mary in 1550; but from the context it is plain that this was another smutty song, singled out by Okey as 'a grief to all godly Christians', and Freeman himself admitted that it was indeed 'bawdy'. Against this must be put Freeman's claim that he sung all three songs 'not thinking any hurt at all', and the fact that his host's wife merely thought them 'merry songs'.

Various other minor points can be made. Concerning the musical side, it is clear that all ranks enjoyed listening and performing, and Freeman prided himself on being 'musical' and able to 'sing my part'.¹⁰ This music-making could even involve the civilians they were quartered with, and overall Freeman's account provides a fascinating snapshot of the New Model at its ease. It is also interesting that Freeman had a favourite in his troop, a former lieutenant named Roger Daniel, whom he called 'my Buckingham', in a joking reference to Charles I and his favourite, George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham. Freeman is very free in admitting their friendship and in using the nickname, despite its royalist (even homosexual?) overtones. This may be yet another example of playful inversion to comic effect, similar to Cromwell's nickname for the industrious Richard Norton in 1649 – 'Idle Dick'.¹¹ Freeman also uses the intimate form 'thou' when speaking to Daniel, although interestingly Daniel uses the more formal 'you', acknowledging the boundaries of this friendship between unequals. Finally, Freeman has one or two things to say of the hypocrisy of Okey, whose own sense of humour is thus recorded for posterity. Oddly, Okey's practical joking resembles that of Cromwell himself, with flinging of cushions and very physical jests, sometimes at the expense of others.¹² Having said that, there was much more good humour in Cromwell's jokes, and he was far more at ease with his subordinates than the volatile and touchy Okey, who had already acquired a reputation for being 'either all honey, or all ----'. (It does not need much imagination to supply the missing word.) Perhaps Okey's prickliness was merely the result of the blatant insubordination of Freeman and his friends. As an officer from another regiment exclaimed, on hearing of the case, 'Oh, was there any officer in the army that ever gave such language to his colonel?'¹³

The end of the story is easily recounted. Francis Freeman's case was brought before Cromwell himself, when he was stationed at Alnwick in Northumberland, on 17 July 1650. Cromwell's ruling, that the captain should resign his commission rather than face court martial, hints that he was did not think any real crime had been committed by Freeman; but it

also made sure that Okey would not be humiliated by being forced to retain him, or by having such absurd evidence brought out in open court. Cromwell needed to treat such cases shrewdly to make sure the army was disciplined and united for the coming campaign. In the case of Okey's dragoons, he seems to have succeeded: within a few weeks the regiment was in Scotland, playing its part in the great victory at Dunbar.

* * * * *

Extract from *Light Vanquishing Darknesse*, by Captain Francis Freeman, 'a late member of the army', printed in London in October 1650. (pp. 18-21, spelling modernised and punctuation amended)

The next rendezvous we had was at Whaley Bridge, where my colonel gave me another fierce charge at the head of his regiment. He told me that I was a base scandalous fellow, and I had sung bawdy songs upon my march, which was a grief to all godly Christians that heard me, and he named one of the songs, which was this, 'I met with Joan of Kent, etc'. I shall therefore give you a true and perfect relation both of the manner and also the occasion of my singing, that you may the better see upon what slight occasions he would take advantage against me. I had a soldier in my troop whose name was Roger Daniel, who was formerly a lieutenant in the state's service - a man whom I loved very well, insomuch as I called him my 'Buckingham', my 'Favourite', etc.; who came to my quarters one morning (whilst I quartered at Morley near Derby) and told me that he had excellent music at his quarters, and invited me to come that night to hear it. I asked him, what music was it? He told me it was gallant music but did not tell me what instruments they were, neither did I at present take any more notice of what he had said, nor never thought of his invitation till after supper; but then (it coming into my mind, I being musical myself, and it is well known can sing my part) I went up to his quarters, where I found them at supper; the people of the house bid me welcome, and as soon as they had supped, [p. 19] my Buckingham (as I called him) rose from the table and went to a press-cupboard, where he took out a fife-recorder and a cittern,¹⁴ and delivered the recorder to the old man and the cittern to the young man his son, and they played half a dozen lessons very well in consort, insomuch that I thought they could sing prick-song, therefore I desired to know of them whether they could or not. They answered no, but they had some delight to play upon those foolish instruments (as they called them), and so played three or four lessons more and laid them aside. Now it came to pass,

as I sat by them in a chair taking a pipe of tobacco, one Ralph Dennis, another soldier of mine that quartered there, having a very good voice, sung a tune as he walked in the room. 'Ralph', said I, 'thou hast a very good voice, and so hath Graves (which is another one of my soldiers), I care not if I have you two to quarter near me, that I may teach you to sing your song'. 'Captain', said my Buckingham, 'will you not teach me?'. 'Why, thou hast no good voice', said I. 'Yea, but I have a good voice, and I do not think but I shall learn to sing my part as soon as either of them'. 'Dost thou think thou canst?', said I, 'That shall be tried'; and so began to sing this old song, 'New Oysters', etc. And after I had sung it once or twice over, I set them in their parts and showed them their time, and stroke time for them with my hand, and found them very tractable, for after twice or thrice singing over they sung their parts and kept their time very well, insomuch as I conceived the two men of the house who played music before were much taken with it, and liked our music very well. Then I sung six or seven songs and catches by myself, whereof one of them was this that my colonel hath laid to my charge, 'I met with Joan of Kent', etc. And this was another, 'There dwells a pretty maid, her name is Sis', etc. And these are the two songs that go under the notion of bawdy songs, which I appeal to all those that know what they are, and what the music is. And truly for my part I sung but merely for the music's sake, not thinking any hurt at all. Neither had I indeed any evil thoughts in my heart in singing any of those songs, which my conscience can bear me witness, and it is that which must either accuse me or excuse me. But now I shall show you how it came to pass that my colonel should have notice given him, of my singing these old songs.

[p.20] Now the woman of the house, where we had the music, after I was gone, she told my Buckingham that I was a merry man. 'Yea', said he, 'and I think he hath as much cause as any man I know' and withal spake something concerning my enjoyments, but she said but little more to him. But about fourteen days after, she went to Derby Market, and having a brother that was a shopkeeper there, she spake to something to him concerning my mirth, and that I had sung many merry songs at her house. Now you shall see how her brother wrought notably upon this news (having heard before how my colonel had painted me forth to Colonel Barton, and himself with colours of his own making, and with his own pencil too, though it were unknown to them), he presently made Colonel Barton acquainted with what his sister had told him concerning these old songs which I had sung, who sent for the woman and took her examination touching the matter, and drew a very formal charge against me, and sent it

to my colonel as if I had committed some notorious crime, and as if he himself had been guilty of no fault at all. I shall be glad if his own conscience can acquit him from being guilty of much blood that of late hath been spilt. And as for Colonel Okey, I have seen him and others fling cushions about the house, at each others heads, and this hath been well taken, and not so much as spoken of. Nay, once I saw him set a drunken man (which is far worse than anything he hath against me) upon a board in the middle of a room, to see whether he could go the length of the board and not tread beside it; and hath made sport with him half an hour together, in his drunkenness, and yet such things are as these are must pass as well done in him, and he himself think well of it too; when as an old song for the music's sake cannot pass from me without a charge against me, and it must be accounted a notorious crime in me, although there was no harm at all in it. But howsoever, this verifies the old proverb, 'that one man may better steal a horse than another man look over the hedge'. Besides, I have seen him sometimes merry with his officers, and sometimes again not an officer durst scarce speak to him; and this verifies an expression, that one used of him in my hearing, that 'he is either all honey, or all ----'. And truly, I have not had a good word from him, in eight months together, neither could I ever [p. 21] say, or do, anything in all this time, that would please him.

Notes.

1. 'Oliver Cromwell's sense of humour', *Cromwelliana*, series II, no. 4 (2007).
2. This pamphlet has been cited before, and quoted extensively, notably in C.H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army* (1966 edn.), 305-8; Percy A. Scholes, *The Puritans and Music in England and New England* (1934), 147; H.G. Tibbutt, 'Colonel John Okey, 1606-1662', *Bedfordshire Historical Record Society* xxxv (1954), 50-6. To my knowledge it has not been reproduced in the last fifty years.
3. Some of the details of Freeman's early career can be gleaned from attempts to settle his arrears in April 1650 (The National Archives, E 121/1/1, no. 37), and he was almost certainly the Captain Francis Freeman whose exchange with Colonel Francis Wyndham was published as *VIII Problems Propounded to the Cavaliers* (6 July 1646). I am grateful to Tim Wales for discussions of this point.
4. For his military career 1647-50 see C.H. Firth and G. Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army* (2 vols., Oxford, 1940), i. 293-7.
5. Tibbutt, 'Okey', 50.

6. Tibbutt, 'Okey', 51.
7. Thomas Ravenscroft, *Pammelia* (1609 edn), song no. 5.
8. John Hilton, *Catch that Catch Can* (1652), 63.
9. For some interesting comments on catches see Michael Burden, *Purcell Remembered* (1995), 24-31. For the broader context see Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: popular fiction and its readership in seventeenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1981), chapter 7. For a selection of such songs, including some of the more salacious, see Lucie Skeaping (ed.), *Broadsides Ballads: songs from the streets, taverns, theatres and countryside of 17th-century England* (2005).
10. Music was not in itself frowned upon, even by the most puritanical: see Patrick Little, 'Music at the Court of King Oliver', *The Court Historian*, xii (2007).
11. See Little, 'Humour', 77-8.
12. Little, 'Humour', 73-4, 80-1.
13. Francis Freeman, *Light Vanquishing Darknesse* (1650), 23.
14. A cittern is a stringed instrument, similar to a lute.

Dr Patrick Little is a Senior Research Fellow at the History of Parliament in London, and Chairman of The Cromwell Association.

By Professor Ivan Roots

Michael Foot died on 3 March 2010 at his home in Hampstead. In his 97th year though lame, half-blind, hard of hearing, he was still a vital force. Born on 23 July 1913, he was third son of Isaac Foot, a prominent Plymouth lawyer, a staunch Methodist, sometime a Liberal M.P. and mayor of the city. Isaac collected books to the point of bibliomania. In them he traced the origins of his nonconformity to the mid-seventeenth century amid the upheavals of the Civil Wars and Interregnum. Oliver Cromwell fascinated him. So he founded the Cromwell Association. His large family was brought up in a veritable living museum of Cromwelliana – a cornucopia of portraits, busts, prints and artefacts. Isaac himself is reputed to have judged a man by the side he would have taken at Marston Moor. Proud of their connexion with the Association, both Michael and his brother Hugh, Lord Caradon, the open-minded colonial administrator, would in time become vice-presidents.

At Leighton Park School Quaker values reinforced Michael's Methodism. He went on to Wadham College, Oxford, reading Classics, and, active as a Liberal in student politics, in 1933 became President of the Union. Then, caught up in the heady international politics of the late Thirties and of the War years and in pursuit of a journalistic career, he moved into the Labour Party, winning Devonport in the Attlee landslide of 1945, a seat he would retain until 1960. At Westminster he found instant friendship with diverse and eager groups on the left of the party, like himself fresh to parliamentary institutions, and eager to deploy them. In his maiden speech he boldly praised Oliver Cromwell, reference to whom would always come easily. His first Question was to enquire when an alabaster bust of the Lord Protector removed for safety during the war would be reinstated. In a wider sphere of activity he became a founding and constant member of CND. The death of Aneurin Bevan, close friend and mentor, brought him in 1960 to Ebbw Vale (later Blaenau Gwent) where he remained a popular constituency M.P. until retirement in 1996. Consistently he promoted a conviction that socialism – the objective he set for the Labour party – would come only through a democratic process pursued in parliament. For a long time he was diffident about taking office, feeling it would inhibit his independence, but eventually he accepted the secretaryship of state for labour under Harold Wilson. As Lord President of the Council he eschewed traditional 'uniform' of that eminent office, and went on to prove an articulate Leader of the House for Prime Minister James Callaghan. Surprisingly elected to head Labour in

1983, he took his party into electoral defeat on a radical 'Old Labour' programme described by a colleague as 'the longest suicide note in history'. Ironically, this cynic was in the event returned on the same manifesto. But Labour would be out of power until 1997.

Members of the Cromwell Association – like the Levellers – are 'a heterogenous lot', most will already have their own 'take' on Michael Foot's politics. I will leave them to pursue it through their own labyrinthine sources. It has seemed to me that coverage of this unique politician in most of the early obituaries appearing in the main daily newspapers and periodicals was generally fair. That could not last. Of course, the dead cannot be libelled but in truth they often are. What they really are unable to do is to sue for libel. So forget about 'de mortuis' within a few days the knives were out. The accusation that Foot had been some sort of Soviet agent – a libel he had fought successfully in court against the Murdoch press some years before – was sanctimoniously churned out again in a major broadsheet, opening up the Net to the restless fingers of holy 'patriots'. Soon *Private Eye* would dismiss him as 'this ludicrous politician'. Wrong. Rather, Michael Foot was often unfairly ridiculed. When he turned up at the 1983 Remembrance Day Service at the Cenotaph wearing what was gleefully called a 'donkey jacket', it was taken as an insult to the veterans lining up for the march past – not a word about the fact that many of them on that dank day were similarly clad. (This green coat – I believe real donkeys are dark blue – from Harrod's has become an icon. It hangs presently in the Michael Foot archive at the People's History Museum in Manchester). Nihilistic Kenny Everett at a Tory election rally in 1983 called for Moscow to be bombed and Michael Foot's walking stick to be kicked from under him. Wild laughter. No matter that the lame leg was a long-term consequence of a serious car accident.

Like Oliver Cromwell, Michael Foot was a commander of words, both oral and in print. Whenever he spoke there an emptying House of Commons somehow would begin to fill up. His delivery was *sui generis*. Chronic asthma had given him a speech impediment of which, like Aneurin Bevan and Christopher Hill with their stammer, he made a rhetorical advantage. He was witty, generous and sometimes startling in vocabulary, apt in literary and historical reference, not least, of course, to Oliver Cromwell and his excitable times. Speaking from few or no notes, like Oliver he composed on his feet, with always a touch of immediacy, something novel, even to himself, flowing into his mind. In 1995 he gave the Association's Cromwell

Day address at Westminster. Sadly no text or notes of it (written or taped), have been found. I am reminded of the Lord Protector's important introductory speech of 25 January 1658 jointly to the two Houses of Parliament newly created by the Humble Petition and Advice. The Commons asked for it to be printed, but Oliver had to confess that he could not remember four lines of the thoughts that had come spontaneously into his heart. Much of the speech had in fact been taken down by shorthand writers, standing nearby, but only a summary of it seems to have survived. (It may be that a member present in 1995 may have notes or recollections of Michael Foot's Address, the Editor of *Cromwelliana* will, I imagine welcome information).

Michael Foot was a polemicist, a journalist and the prolific author of biographical and thematic books. *Aneurin Bevan* (2 vols., 1962, 1973), is his most substantial biography. Certainly most of his other books have biographical content but their thrust is thematic, examining the ideas, sentiments and inner tensions of his protagonists within the context of their times. They are a diverse lot: Swift, Byron, Hazlitt, Wells. There are also collections of essays upon radicals, reformers, losers, loners – a gallery of remarkable individuals wrestled by an individual as remarkable. Much of this work will endure.

And yet Michael Foot might count himself a failure. Parliamentary socialism is as far off as ever. In 1649 the House of Lords was abolished overnight as 'useless and dangerous'. In 1660 it came back, restored even before the monarchy itself. Three hundred years later Michael Foot would have had it thrown out, root and branch, again. Meanwhile he resisted diverse governments' schemes to reform its powers and composition, judging, quite correctly that the sort of improvements any government envisaged would make the House more useful to itself and so more dangerous to the supremacy of the Commons. Peers have increased rapidly in number while their qualifications are intermittently being tinkered with under the fluid terms of the lingering Parliament Act of 1911. Nuclear disarmament, so dear to Michael's heart and head, is talked about incessantly while those who have the bombs intend to keep them to deter those who are reluctant to be deterred. Meanwhile his beloved Plymouth Argyll, whose colours draped his coffin, have yet to make the Premier League, and indeed are slipping even further down the tables. Sad, sad, sad. A record of failure, then, but a life lived to the full and dedicated to the common weal. Michael Foot may have moved away from the religious and Liberal values of his father and like

many Cromwellians was drawn to the Levellers and other radicals of the English Revolution. But we find that somehow once a Cromwellian means always a Cromwellian. 350 years ago Oliver's remains were dragged out of Westminster Abbey, hung up with ignominy at Tyburn and then flung for oblivion into an unmarked pit. Michael Foot's life might serve to demonstrate the utter futility of that gesture.

By Dr Patrick Little

I. BOOKS.

- J. Cope, *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion* (Boydell, Woodbridge, 2009).
 P.R. Hill and J.M. Watkinson (eds.), *Major Saunderson's War: The Diary of a Parliamentary Cavalry Officer in the English Civil War* (Stroud, 2008).
 S.B. Jennings, 'These Uncertain Tymes': Newark and the Civilian Experience of the Civil Wars, 1640-1660 (Notts Co. Council, 2009).
 J. Lyttleton and C. Rynne (eds.), *Plantation Ireland: Settlement and Material Culture, c.1550-c.1700* (Dublin, 2009).
 P. Major (ed.), *Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath* (2010).
 S. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010).
 J. Schofield, *Cromwell to Cromwell: Reformation to Civil War* (The History Press, 2009).
 M. Wanklyn, *The Warrior Generals: Winning the British Civil Wars* (Yale, 2010).
 J. Whitehead, *Cavalier and Roundhead Spies: Intelligence in the Civil War and Commonwealth* (Pen and Sword, 2009).

II. ARTICLES.

- W.J. Bullman, 'The Practice of Politics: the English Civil War and the "Resolution" of Henrietta Maria and Charles I', *Past and Present* 206 (2010).
 A. Craven, "For the better uniting of this nation": the 1649 Oath of Engagemennt and the people of Lancashire', *Historical Research* 83 (2010).
 S. Cunniffe and T. Wyke, 'The Curse of Cromwell: Warrington's Statue of Oliver Cromwell', *Northern History* 46 (2009).
 D.D. Debe, 'The Fifth Earl of Clanricarde and the founding of the Confederate Catholic government, 1641-3', *Irish Historical Studies* 36 (2009).
 S. Ede-Borrett, 'Some notes on the raising and origins of Colonel John Okey's regiment of dragoons, March to June 1645', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 87 (2009).
 A. Graham, 'Finance, Localism, and Military Representation in the army of the Earl of Essex', *Historical Journal* 52 (2009).
 P. Little, 'Uncovering a Protectoral Stud: horses and horse-breeding at the court of Oliver Cromwell, 1653-8', *Historical Research* 83 (2010).
 J. Morrill, 'How Oliver Cromwell Thought', in J. Morrow and J. Scott (eds.), *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political Ideas and Culture, 1600-1900* (Exeter, 2008).
 J. Morrill, 'Putting Words into Cromwell's Mouth', *BBC History Magazine* 11, no. 2 (Feb. 2010).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

- S. Mortimer, 'Re-evaluating Socinianism and Arminianism in Seventeenth-century Europe', *Historical Journal* 52 (2009).
- E. Murphy, 'Atrocities at Sea and the treatment of prisoners of war by the parliamentarian navy in Ireland, 1641-1649', *Historical Journal* 53 (2010).
- M. Nevitt, 'The Insults of Defeat: Royalist responses to Sir William Davenant's *Gondibert* (1651)', *The Seventeenth Century* 24 (2009).
- S.K. Roberts, 'The Reputation and Authority of the Speaker and the Speakership of the House of Commons, 1640-60', in P. Seaward (ed.), *Speakers and the Speakership (Parliamentary History special edition, 2010)*
- L.A.M. Stewart, 'English Funding of the Scottish Armies in England and Ireland, 1640-1648', *Historical Journal* 52 (2009).
- E. Vallence, 'Rebels, Radicals and (Lukewarm) Republicans in Early Modern England', *English Historical Review* 124 (2009).
- E. Vernon and P. Baker, 'What was the first Agreement of the People?', *Historical Journal* 53 (2010).

BOOK REVIEWS

Malcolm Wanklyn, *The Warrior Generals: Winning the British Civil Wars, 1642-1652* (Yale University Press, May 2010), xviii +312 pp. £25.

In recent years there have been a number of books on the military history of the civil wars, and they have tended either to focus on individual generals or to plod through the well-known narrative. In this book Malcolm Wanklyn takes a different approach, looking at generalship: how the commanders of armies performed not only on the battlefield but also on campaign, and how they were able to exploit successes both militarily and politically.

After an initial chapter setting out the problem, the book follows a chronological pattern, moving from the early campaigns of 1642-3, to parliament's failure to seize opportunities and the king's successes during the summer and autumn of 1643 and the spring of 1644, and the deadlock that followed Marston Moor. After a discussion of Naseby and the collapse of the royalist cause in 1645-6, Wanklyn reviews the Irish and Scottish wars of the 1640s, the brief second civil war of 1648, and the 'British Wars' of conquest in Ireland and then Scotland from 1649, culminating in Cromwell's final victory at Worcester in 1651. Along the way, we are treated to in-depth analysis of generals of all sides. The earl of Essex, despite being 'sloth and gluttony personified' (p. 14) comes out of it surprisingly well. Although not a battle-winner, at Edgehill (1642) and 1st Newbury (1643) he managed to save his army from defeat, and under fire displayed remarkable 'fortitude and unflappability' (p. 233). Essex's rival, Sir William Waller, may have had a good reputation among contemporaries, but here he is portrayed as a good strategist who was a weak commander on the field. On the king's side, Sir Ralph Hopton is condemned, controversially, as the king's 'worst' commander, whose victories were often down to his subordinates or to the mistakes of his opponents. Wanklyn is also harsh in his treatment of Prince Rupert, whose record as an army commander was 'disappointing' (p.232) even though his performance as a cavalry commander was second to none. Rupert's insistence on leading cavalry charges in person – even when commander-in-chief – meant that he failed completely when it came to what modern military men describe as 'command and control'. Of the other famous generals, Sir Thomas Fairfax also gets short shrift, as a man who was good in battle but unable to exploit his victories. Outside the English theatre, the marquess of Montrose is praised as a 'consummate performer' on the battlefield, who was never in a position to make any of his victories decisive, while in Ireland Owen Roe

O'Neill is dismissed as having 'a truly mediocre record' of only one victory in eight years of war (p. 180).

And what of Oliver Cromwell? Here we are presented with a career of two halves. His early engagements are underplayed, and his activities in battle are contrasted with his unhelpful attack on the earl of Manchester at the end of 1644, when he spread 'lies and half-truths' against his superior, and may even have 'deliberately set out to ensure that the autumn campaign was inconclusive by doing just enough to avoid defeat' (p. 125). It is argued that political and religious in-fighting were as important to Cromwell as securing victory, and he feared that victory at the wrong time might give his enemies in parliament the whip-hand in any peace treaty with the king. Wanklyn suggests that Cromwell's inactivity at Second Newbury (1644) contributed to the failure to defeat the royalists, and again hints at 'a hidden agenda' (p. 135). At Marston Moor, Cromwell gets a better write-up, as his role as a cavalry commander played an important part in securing victory, and his involvement at Naseby is seen as decisive (with Fairfax's role being played down). Although the chaotic battle of Preston in 1648 was largely outside anyone's control, Cromwell showed great 'political generalship' (p. 203) in following up his victory with a policy of dividing and ruling the Scottish factions. The Irish campaign of 1649-50 is seen as another low-point in Cromwell's career, as he was forced to fight bloody sieges instead of a decisive battle, but when pitched against the Scots, Cromwell suddenly emerges as the most impressive of all the generals of this period. Dunbar in 1650 was 'Cromwell's victory' (p. 220), even though (oddly) John Lambert's skirmish at Inverkeithing is seen as 'more decisive than Dunbar' (p. 222). The battle of Worcester in 1651 is portrayed as Cromwell's crowning glory, and 'as at Dunbar it is impossible to fault his leadership' (p. 226). Cromwell thus wins the laurels as 'the most successful army general by far', although Wanklyn is surely right to qualify this by pointing out that, unlike his colleagues in the first civil war, Cromwell was largely able to avoid political interference in his military decisions and (from 1649, if not before) he was provided with the resources to wage war decisively.

Although this book is strongly argued and a compelling read, it is not without its faults. Wanklyn's handling of England – and especially the first civil war – is far more assured than his treatment of Scotland and Ireland. The latter, in particular, is given short shrift, and the discussion of its generals appears to derive mostly from the opinions of others. And whether the use of the term 'Irishes', rather than 'Irishmen' or simply 'Irish',

would be acceptable in modern-day Ireland, I wonder! When it comes to England, Wanklyn includes rather too much detail of minor campaigns in the first civil war, and although this is an inevitable consequence of trying to explain an atomised conflict, where events of varying degrees of importance were happening all over the country, the result can be confusing. Conversely, in maintaining a punchy narrative, there are occasional lapses into slang ('new kid on the block' (p. 80), 'unfit for purpose' (p. 103), 'fall-guy' (p. 180), 'the elephant in the room' (p. 191), for example) which begin to jar after a while. One puzzling usage, which occurs numerous times, is the description of a brigade or similar unit under a particular commander, as a 'Force' – hence 'Balfour Force' (p. 29), 'Waller Force' (p. 135), 'Cromwell Force' (p. 154). Why not 'Balfour's force', etc? These are minor quibbles in what is a handsome volume with no typographical errors, complemented by excellent maps and useful illustrative plates. We need more of this sort of book to breathe life back into the military history of the period, and I have high hopes that Malcolm Wanklyn's robust and controversial opinions will do much to re-kindle the debate.

Stuart B. Jennings, '*These Uncertain Tymes: Newark and the civilian experience of the Civil Wars, 1640-1660*' (Nottingham County Council, 2009). ISBN 978-0-902751-62-0. £6.95 [copies available from Nottingham CC: www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk]

In this interesting study of the garrison town of Newark, Stuart Jennings has provided us with an important piece of the jigsaw that is the local dimension of the civil wars. Using the unusually rich surviving sources – borough minutes, poor relief records, churchwardens' accounts, and even a set of royalist military accounts and an eye-witness report – Jennings reconstructs what life was like in a key royalist outpost, besieged no less than three times during the first civil war. Yet this is not primarily a military history of the town, rather an attempt to understand the experience of the ordinary townspeople. The results of civil war and military occupation could be devastating. Many houses were pulled down as defences were rebuilt and extended; the town became crowded with soldiers and refugees; and typhus and the plague had killed perhaps 30% of the population by 1646. What is striking is the effort made by the town authorities to maintain business as usual, both during the war and afterwards. Newark was not an inherently royalist place, but nor did it welcome the successive parliamentarian and Cromwellian regimes after 1646, and at times cooperation was mixed with quiet exasperation. The Restoration – and in particular the return of the

BOOK REVIEWS

Anglican church - was generally welcomed, but one wonders whether this was a reaction to earlier instability and uncertainty, rather than a measure of true enthusiasm for Charles II.

The Newark that emerges from this book is not only a fascinating case-study in local history, it also connects with other better-known pieces of the jigsaw: notably Lucy Hutchinson's life of her husband, John, parliamentarian governor of nearby Nottingham. It also links together neatly with Cromwell's campaigns in neighbouring Lincolnshire – for example, it was the Newark forces under Colonel Cavendish that Oliver defeated at Gainsborough in 1643. It is a pity that some of these connections were not made more explicitly in the book. Also, although the research is impressive, the style is sometimes a bit dry. A few fleshed-out examples of prominent townspeople and their families, and how they coped with the various crises experienced by the town, would have helped to bring out the human aspect of the story. These are minor points, however, and both scholars and enthusiasts will gain much from this modestly-priced book.

Dr Patrick Little

The Cromwell Museum,
Grammar School Walk,
Huntingdon.
Tel (01480) 375830.

The Cromwell Museum is in the former Huntingdon Grammar School where Cromwell received his early education. The museum, which is fully accredited by The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council is run by Cambridgeshire County Council, and has a wide-ranging collection which illustrates the life and legacy of Oliver Cromwell. In addition to the permanent collection the museum has a programme of changing temporary exhibitions and activities.

The museum is open all year everyday Tuesday – Sunday, admission is free.

For information:

Website: www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/cromwell

Telephone: 01480 375830

Email: cromwellmuseum@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

Oliver Cromwell's House,
29 St Mary's Street, Ely.
Tel (01353) 662062.

April - October
Open every day 10am-4pm

November – March
Open Sunday-Friday 11am-3pm
Saturday 10am-4pm

Admission charge.
For discount please show The Cromwell Association membership card.

CROMWELLIANA

Published by The Cromwell Association, a registered charity, this annual journal of Civil War and Cromwellian studies contains articles, book reviews, a bibliography and other comments, contributions and papers. Further copies of this and previous editions may be obtained from the Honorary Secretary (at the address on the inside front cover), who can supply details of prices and availability. Alternatively details are available on our web-site: www.olivercromwell.org.

ISBN 0-905729-22-6

A large, stylized signature of the word "Cromwell" in cursive script, written in black ink on a white background. The signature is fluid and expressive, with varying line thicknesses and ink saturation.