OLIVER CROMWELL died on 3 September 1658. Not long before his death he had sent for the document in which he had named his successor, but it could not be found. On 30 August he had verbally nominated his elder son Richard to succeed him as Protector, and on 2 September he had repeated this nomination in the presence of some members of the Council. Whether or not Richard's nomination was contrived by Secretary of State John Thurloe, as some believed, the Council accepted it as fulfilling the requirements of the Humble Petition and Advice; and on 4 September Richard Cromwell was officially proclaimed Lord Protector, the proclamation being signed by army officers as well as council members.¹

Though by no means trained for his high office, either in terms of administrative skills or of military experience,² Richard at first made a good impression, and the many loyal addresses presented to him, including one from the "Armies in England, Scotland and Ireland", gave some testimony of popular approval. Thurloe, however, was full of forebodings, warning Henry Cromwell in Ireland that there were


some secret murmurings in the army, as if his highnes were not generall of the army, as his father was; and would looke upon him and the army as divided, and as if the conduct of the army should be elsewhere, and in other hands.\(^1\)

The "secret murmurings" were soon given open expression: a petition was circulated asking for the appointment of Lieutenant-General Fleetwood as Commander-in-Chief with the power to appoint all officers below field rank. Richard refused to surrender control; and the embers of discontent were fanned by leading officers like Disbrowe and Berry who were reported as having daily meetings with their juniors.\(^2\) From Scotland came Monck's advice to get rid of disaffected officers by combining every two regiments into one, but the plan was not adopted. A cardinal difficulty was that army pay was considerably in arrears, and the Council was divided on the need to summon a parliament to vote the necessary taxes, the military junta apparently preferring to raise money by extra-parliamentary means.\(^3\) Even the civilians had reservations: when, at the end of November, the summoning of parliament was at last decided on Thurloe confessed that his fears were greater than his hopes, for those who opposed the Protectorate were organizing with care and could be expected to appeal to the army intransigents; yet the "great necessities wee have for money, which cannot be supplied but by parliament" allowed no alternative.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Th[urloe] S[ta]te P[apers], ed. T. Birch (7 vols., 1742), vii. 374. On the other hand, Richard had the support not only of his brother Henry, Lord Deputy of Ireland, but also of George Monck, commander in Scotland, Edward Mountagu, who commanded the fleet, and Sir William Lockhart, the Governor of Dunkirk. Of the regimental commanders in England, Colonels Ingoldsby, Goffe, Whalley, Howard, and Richard's brother-in-law Viscount Fauconberg also supported him. Mountagu also had a regiment, but was away with the fleet in the Baltic from March to September 1659. Altogether there were nine regiments of horse and eight of foot in England.

\(^2\) Ibid. vii. 450.

\(^3\) Ibid. vii. 387; Davies, Restoration, p. 32. Richard's civilian supporters in Council "were rather followers than leaders"; he looked for advice outside the Council to his Chief Justice Oliver St. John and William Pierrepont, as well as Lords Broghill and Fauconberg, both former Royalists. Richard's relatives Disbrowe (uncle) and Fleetwood (brother-in-law) and their military associates took umbrage at this (ibid. pp. 29-32; Hause, op. cit. pp. 143-6).

The founding-constitution of the Protectorate, the Instrument of Government, had made substantial electoral changes, not only by redistributing seats and increasing the county franchise but also by providing for Scottish and Irish representation.\(^1\) However, the Council interpreted the clause in the more recent Humble Petition and Advice, "that the laws and statutes of the land be observed and kept" when parliaments were summoned,\(^2\) as implying a return to the ancient laws, thus negating the electoral reforms of the Instrument, at least as far as England was concerned; Scotland and Ireland, it was decided, were to be represented as under the Instrument—a decision which was likely to lead to controversy. Further conflict was bound to be caused by the new House of Lords or "Other" House which had excited great controversy in Oliver Cromwell's last parliament: it was to consist of the same persons who had been summoned by Oliver.

It was not only the opponents of the Protectorate who conspired to return candidates satisfactory to themselves. The Venetian ambassador noted that Richard himself was approaching county dignitaries with that end in view. Of course the most active agent was his Secretary of State; yet, when Thurloe was accused of being responsible for securing the election of four-score members, he assured the House of Commons that he knew "not of three members thus chosen". Less discreet in his statements was Henry Howard, later sixth Duke of Norfolk, who was reported as boasting that he had sent twenty-four members to the Commons: a committee was appointed to examine his alleged misdemeanours but never reported back. Proof that there was competition for seats lies in the fact that at


\(^2\) Ibid. p. 452. The Council may have hoped that the old boroughs would prove more amenable to control than the counties (Ludlow, op. cit. ii. 48; Bordeaux to Mazarin, 23 December 1658, Guizot, op. cit. i. 274). In fact, notable opponents of the Protectorate like Vane, Scot, Ludlow, Weaver, and Neville successfully contested borough elections.
least eighteen candidates stood for more than one constituency. There were, however, no organized parties; and even Thurloe, after hearing the results, admitted that there was "soe great a mixture in the house of commons, that noe man knowes which way the major part will enclyne". In fact events were to prove that a majority of members favoured the continuance of the Protectorate, but a Protectorate controlled and limited by law.¹

Of the 558 members of Richard Cromwell's House of Commons which met on 27 January 1659, rather less than half had previous parliamentary experience.² Perhaps thirty-four had served as original members of the Long Parliament and another sixty or so were recruited to that parliament, while at least twenty-five were chosen for the Nominated Parliament; but most of those with previous experience had served in one or other of Oliver Cromwell's protectoral parliaments. The oldest serving members, Sir Walter Earle,³ John Wylde, former Chief Baron of the Exchequer, John Trenchard, Sir John Trevor, and Colonel Robert Wallop harked back to the stormy days of 1621 when the Commons, to vindicate their rights and privileges, asserted their claim to freedom of speech, only to have their Protestation struck from the Journal by James I's own hand. Earle, Wylde, and Wallop sat in all Charles I's parliaments, while several others—William Purefoy (like Wallop later to sit in judgement on his sovereign), Colonel Thomas Hatcher, Sir Robert Goodwin, Sir Anthony Irby, and Sir Thomas Wroth are also likely to have seen the presentation to Charles of the


² By my count 262 for sure. The brief analysis by E. L. Klotz and G. Davies, "Membership of Richard Cromwell's Parliament", Huntington Library Quarterly, vi (2) (February 1943), 199-20, may mislead the unwary, for it is based on 287 members listed in the defective official returns, just over half the total membership. I have collated the unofficial returns given in the Thornason Tracts, E. 1836 (4), pp. 58-70, with those in Old Parliamentary History, xxi. 246-62. Numbers can only be approximate.

³ Earle actually sat in the Addled Parliament of 1614.
Petition of Right. Some of the old hands of the Long Parliament complained of the extreme youthfulness of Richard’s assembly, the regicide Thomas Chaloner even wondering whether some were old enough legally to take an oath.¹ No doubt he had his eye on young men like Thomas Meres, only in his twenty-fourth year, who sat in the Commons until 1710, and Edward Hungerford, who was to be a member of most parliaments until 1702.

The social standing of the 1659 parliament may be gauged from a crude analysis of its composition. The elected representatives included a marquis (Argyll), two earls (Tweeddale and Linlithgow), a viscount (Falkland), two barons (Fairfax and Aungier), as well as some fifty-nine baronets and knights. Notable English judges were elected—John Bradshaw, the Chief Justice of Cheshire, who had presided at Charles I’s trial; Matthew Hale, chairman of the 1652 law committee (Hale refused the renewal of his judge’s commission by Richard Cromwell); besides several future judges, including Thomas Street, who was to give the only dissenting opinion against the king when James II’s use of the dispensing power was tested in Godden v. Hales, 1686. There was the usual hard core of lawyers ("Court lawyers 72 certain"), a sprinkling of merchants (like Slingsby Bethel, who "never broke the Sabbath but for gain"), author of The World’s Mistake in Oliver Cromwell, Richard Hutchinson, Vane’s successor as Treasurer of the Navy, and the one-eyed Thomas Boone), half-a-dozen medical men (including Dr. Thomas Clarges, Monck’s brother-in-law, and Oliver Cromwell’s physician Dr. John Bathurst), and a huge array (at least a hundred) of men bearing military rank. Among the soldiers were grandees like "Black Tom" Fairfax, who had commanded the New Model and was now probably sitting in parliament for the first time,³ come to London to sue pardon for

¹ Burton, iii. 76.
³ Dryden, Absalom and Achitophel.
⁴ His election to the Long Parliament was declared valid in February 1649, but he probably did not take his seat (D. Brunton and D. H. Pennington, Members of the Long Parliament (1954), p. 231 n.).
the escapades of his new son-in-law the Duke of Buckingham; and proud, ambitious John Lambert, malcontent, but with no programme save for his own advancement. The Wallingford House group of officers—the followers of Fleetwood, Disbrowe, Sydenham, Berry—was not strongly represented; its strength lay outside the House rather than in it. Variety was added to the Commons by the presence of the poet Andrew Marvell, eulogist of both Charles I and Oliver Cromwell, Milton’s assistant as Secretary for Foreign Tongues; the historian John Rushworth who, Aubrey tells us, later lost his memory through much drinking of brandy; John Sadler, Master of Magdalene; Edward Bysshe, Garter King-of-Arms; and Dr. William Petty, Professor of Anatomy, Professor of Music, political economist, and land-surveyor.

The Court party in the Commons—the loose group of those supporting the Protectorate (as Hugh Trevor-Roper says in a different context, “The officials, the lawyers, the Protectoral family and clients, the government financiers—all who had an interest in the stability of government”¹) was led, or should have been led,² by Secretary of State John Thurloe and the official lawyers—Sir Edmund Prideaux (Attorney-General), Sir William Ellis (Solicitor-General), John Maynard, Evan Seys, Nicholas Lechmere, Francis and Nathaniel Bacon—supported by office-holders like John Trevor, the future Secretary of State, described by Ludlow as “a leading man of the Court-party”, Martin Noell, tax-farmer, Deputy Postmaster-General, but above all, as Ashley says, “the outstanding financier of the Cromwellian period”, John Stone, Teller of the Exchequer and Excise Appeals Commissioner, George Payler, Navy Commissioner, William Jessop, Clerk of the Council, John Upton (related by marriage to Thurloe), Commissioner of the Customs, Griffith Bodwrda and Nicholas Pedley, Commissioners of the Wine Office, Richard Sherwyn, Secretary to the Treasury Commissioners, and Edward Dendy, Sergeant-at-Arms to the Council, who was to be attainted at the Restoration for having served as cryer to the high court of

² In fact, leadership was lacking.
justice at the King's trial. Besides these officials the Court party could expect support from the Irish and Scottish representatives, who were regarded largely as government nominees. The thirty Irish members included Lord Aungier, the regicide Major-General Sir Hardress Waller, Sir Charles Coote, Lord President of Connaught, Colonel Sir Henry Ingoldsby, brother of Richard Cromwell's resolute supporter Dick Ingoldsby, the Surveyor-General Vincent Gookin, Sir Anthony Morgan, soon to be one of the original members of the Royal Society, as well as Sir Theophilus Jones, Governor of Dublin, and the orientalist Dr. Dudley Loftus. The Scottish contingent, only twenty-one in number when parliament met on 27 January, though reinforced later, included the regicide Colonel Adrian Scroop, one of the Council of State for Scotland, who in his student days had led a riot at Lincoln's Inn, Samuel Disbrowe, Scottish Chancellor and Keeper of the Great Seal, Judge Swinton of Swinton, Dr. William Stayne, an old friend of Oliver Cromwell, Colonel George Lockhart, Advocate to Oliver Cromwell, John Thompson, Auditor-General, as well as the Marquis of Argyll whom Monck did not expect to "doe his highness's interest any good".

Whatever the voting strength and personal abilities of the Protectoral supporters, they were scarcely equal to the obstructionist tactics employed with great skill and persistence by the republican minority who had learnt their political craft in the Long Parliament and especially the Rump, that hard-working and self-seeking body which had governed England from December 1648 until its forcible expulsion at Oliver Cromwell's hands in April 1653.3


2 TSP, vii. 584. Argyll, who had placed the crown on Charles II's head at Scone, was executed for treason at the Restoration.

3 On the Rump see Blair Worden, The Rump Parliament 1648-1653 (Cambridge, 1974). However unscrupulously members may have behaved in their individual capacities, Worden argues (p. 102) "it is hard to think of a major policy decision in which the Rump's concept of the public interest was sacrificed to private ends".
Among the surviving leaders of the Rump were Sir Arthur Hesilrige, one of the five members of the Commons whom Charles I had vainly sought to arrest in January 1642, Thomas Scot, who preceded Thurloe as Director of Intelligence and was to succeed him in that post, and the younger Sir Henry Vane, after Pym’s death one of the leaders of the Commons, to whose efficient administration the successful rebuilding of the fleet must largely be attributed. These and other Rumpers had been outraged when Cromwell put an end to their sitting. Hesilrige and Scot had carried their opposition to Cromwell into the 1654 parliament; but, failing to sign the Recognition, they were refused admittance to the House. Elected again in 1656 they and many others were again denied entry, the Instrument of Government having given the Council the right to scrutinize election returns. The rejected members published a Remonstrance, the first two names on the list being those of Hesilrige and Scot. However, the Humble Petition and Advice restored to the Commons the right to judge the eligibility of its own members, and back came Cromwell’s antagonists when Parliament re-assembled in January 1658. “I shall heartily take the oath” [to be true and faithful to the Lord Protector], declared Hesilrige. “I will be faithful to my Lord Protector’s person. I will murder no man.” As Oliver Cromwell’s ablest supporters had been elevated to the “Other” House, the newcomers immediately took control of the Commons: so much so that the French ambassador reported “il était devenu le Parlement de Haslerig”. Sir Henry Vane, together with Oliver St. John, had sustained the Independent cause in Parliament while Oliver Cromwell was defending it in the field. In 1653, however, Vane had been accused by Cromwell of seeking to perpetuate the rule of the Rump and retired into private life after its summary dissolution, declining the offer of a seat in the Nominated Parliament. Although the reign of the saints might be about to begin, said Vane, he preferred to take his share of it in Heaven. In May 1656 he published a tract entitled A Healing Question.

1 Of these three, who had been schoolfellows at Westminster, Hesilrige was to die in the Tower after the Restoration, Scot on the gallows at Charing Cross, and Vane by the axe on Tower Hill.
This was regarded as seditious; and when he refused to give security to do nothing to the prejudice of the government and pointed out that the publication of his pamphlet had been licensed, he was imprisoned for some months in Carisbrook Castle. More constructive than Hesilrige, more politically sophisticated, Vane was ready to accept a constitution which guaranteed liberty of conscience and gave authority to the friends of liberty—those who had contributed “either their counsels, their purses, their bodily paines, or their affections and prayers” to the cause. The Protectorate hardly fulfilled this role.¹

Allied with these Rumpers—indeed very much of their party—were Henry Neville and Thomas Chaloner, boon companions of Harry Marten (that “legislative Priapus”) in the Long Parliament and associates of James Harrington in his Rota Club: such men looked to the Venetian republic as an ideal; and that great Commonwealthsman (and regicide) Edmund Ludlow, the “thick-skulled officer of horse” who had rendered good service in Ireland, grievously offended by Cromwell’s dissolution of the Rump, was also an inflexible opponent of the Protectorate: he was to serve as a link between the anti-Cromwellians within the House and the army malcontents outside it. To these may be added Thomas St. Nicholas, John Weaver, Adam Baynes (Lambert’s wealthy protégé), and disgruntled military men like Colonels Okey and Alured who in 1654 had given expression to their dissatisfaction by petitioning against the Instrument of Government and been cashiered for their pains, as well as Major-General William Packer (permitted to sit in Richard’s Parliament until the disputed election for Hertford was decided against him) who, together with five of his captains, all Baptists, had been stripped of his commissions by Oliver Cromwell in February 1658 for his refusal to accept the increasingly conservative tendency of the Protectorate. Sympathizing with the officers cashiered or imprisoned by Oliver Cromwell was a

militant group of junior officers outside the House led by Colonels Richard Ashfield, John Mason, Richard Moss, and Robert Lilburne, "mainly sectarian, if not millenarian" in religion; and, as the French ambassador pointed out, "the subalterns inclining to a more Republican constitution than their chiefs are desirous to establish". Well might Colonel Gorges exclaim: "Those that are for Commonwealth, are but to lead us into confusion."¹

Between the Commonwealthsmen and the Cromwellians were the crypto-Royalists or men who would become Royalists, the moderate Presbyterians who also looked to the restoration of monarchy but on conditions, and the many undecided neutrals and trimmers ("47 true patriots of liberty, 23 of them highly exasperated at the present government, 24 of meeker spirits", estimated a Royalist correspondent).² Among those who were afterwards rewarded with high honours by the restored monarch were Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, elevated to the peerage in 1661 and created Earl of Shaftesbury in 1672; Sir Horatio Townshend, created baron in 1662 and viscount in 1682; Arthur Annesley, created Earl of Anglesey in 1661; Lord Aungier, later Earl of Longford in the Irish peerage; Sir George Booth, the leader of the unsuccessful rising in the autumn of 1659, created Baron Delamere; and Sir Charles Coote, rewarded for helping to secure Ireland for Charles II with the earldom of Mountrath.³ Many of the members of Richard Cromwell's House of Commons were later to be knighted by a grateful

¹ Trevor-Roper, op. cit. p. 105; Gardiner, op. cit. iii. 52, 58; David Underdown, "Cromwell and the officers, February 1658", EHR, lxxxviii (January 1968), 101-7; Woolrych, Milton, pp. 11-12; Guizot, Richard Cromwell, i. 317; Burton, iii. 157.

² CSP, iii. 440. Royalists were forbidden under heavy penalties to vote or sit, but, as Davies points out in his survey of the election (loc. cit. p. 491), "no official was made responsible for seeing that a candidate or elector was duly qualified".

³ For Ashley Cooper's equivocal role throughout this period see K. H. D. Haley, The First Earl of Shaftesbury (Oxford, 1968), ch. 6-7. See Burton, iv. 286-7, for a reference to a long temporizing speech he made on 28 March until the House was "fuller of those of his party".

⁴ If Sir John Grenville, the future Earl of Bath, was a member (Mary Coate, Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum (Oxford, 1933), p. 300), he did not speak in the House nor was he nominated to any of its committees.
sovereign: Thomas Clarges, who acted as Monck’s go-between in the negotiations with Charles; William Morice, another of Monck’s kinsmen, who was to urge Monck to re-admit the secluded members in February 1660; John Trevor, who succeeded Morice as Secretary of State in 1668; the great Cromwellian financier Martin Noell; wealthy Sir William Wheeler who was given a baronetcy; John Fagge of Sussex whose parliamentary career extended from his recruitment to the Long Parliament until 1701, created a baronet in 1660 although he had been named as a commissioner for Charles I’s trial; the unpopular George Downing (after whom Downing Street was named), who procured the arrest in 1662 of the regicides Okey, Barkstead, and Corbet; Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of the King’s Bench in 1671; Sir Thomas Barnardiston of Suffolk, created a baronet, as were John Howe of Gloucestershire and Robert Jenkinson of Oxfordshire, as well as William Wray, described by Evelyn as “a good drinking Gent:”; Thomas Meres, M.P. for Lincoln 1659-1710; Edward Hungerford, founder of Hungerford Market on the site of which Charing Cross station was built; Richard Knightley, John Hampden’s son-in-law but a member of the council which arranged Charles’s recall; Anthony Shirley of Sussex; Thomas Higgons of Malmesbury, diplomat and author; choleric, intemperate Edward Baynton, created a Knight of the Bath at the coronation in 1661; Sir Richard Temple, also made Knight of the Bath as a coronation honour; Edward Thurland, friend of John Evelyn and Jeremy Taylor, who was made a Baron of the Exchequer in 1673; Edward Turner or Turnor, Speaker of the House of Commons in 1661 and Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in 1670; Job Charlton, also a judge, dismissed by James II but made a baronet; William Petty, statistician and one of the founders of the Royal Society; Thomas Street, M.P. for Worcester 1659-81, knighted and made a judge in 1681; Nicholas Lechmere, who had to wait until 1689 for his knighthood and judgeship; Colonel Redman, commander of the Irish brigade in England, knighted for the staunch support he gave to Monck; Colonel George Lockhart of Scotland; Major-General Richard Browne, Lord Mayor of London in 1660; Richard
Ingoldsby, pardoned for his share in Charles I's death, and created a Knight of the Bath in 1661; his brother Sir Henry, like Sir William Windham of Somerset created a baronet by both Oliver Cromwell and Charles II; Edward Bysshe, Garter King-of-Arms, knighted and appointed Clarenceux King-of-Arms in 1661; and of course Serjeant Maynard, whose political career was to span the Short and Long parliaments, Cromwellian parliaments (save those of 1653 and 1654), Convention, Cavalier and Exclusion parliaments, James II’s parliament and, crowning glory, the Convention Parliament of 1688-9.

Some of these men had been secluded from the Long Parliament, prevented from taking their seats by Colonel Pride in December 1648. These secluded members were scornful of the outraged feelings of the Rumpers: as they were not slow to point out in debate they had suffered similar treatment at the hands of those who now cried “Outrage!” In general the parliamentary tactics of these men and their fellow Presbyterians were to support the Protectorate lest the Commonwealth be restored: Arthur Annesley, John Bulkeley, John Maynard, Hugh Boscawen, and Edward Rossiter all acted as tellers for the Court party when crucial issues were at stake (though Annesley opposed the continued sitting of the Irish members, preferring a separate legislature). Indeed Richard’s parliamentary strength “came largely from the Presbyterian ranks”. The position of the Royalists was more difficult. Divided on the question of recognizing Richard as Protector, they seem to have gained greater cohesion in opposing the motion to transact business with the new House of Lords. Hyde remarked that “our friends in the House do not make a clear judgment of the Parties and so oft mistake their votes”. The tactics of the Commonwealthsmen were to delay the business of the House by every subterfuge allowed by parliamentary procedure so that the soldiers, their arrears unpaid, might become restive and throw in their lot with them. Moreover, by dragging out the debates by filibustering, by tedious recriminations, by chasing every hare that was put up, “time was gained”, says Ludlow, “to infuse good principles into divers young gentlemen”—the inexperienced members who constituted more than half the House. Step by step they fought a
rearguard action, aiming to thwart parliamentary recognition of the Protectorate, seeking to limit the Protector's powers, venting their spleen on the "Other" House, endeavouring to reduce the majority against them by trying to exclude first the lawyers ("The justice of the nation is abused by putting off the assizes") and then the members for Scotland and Ireland ("I make a question whether they think themselves well represented by persons chosen from hence, that never saw Scotland, but in a map").

Discussion centred on a bill known as the Act of Recognition. Instead of assuming the validity of Richard Cromwell's title—after all it was by his authority that the Parliament sat—Thurloe mistakenly sought parliamentary approval of it. Hesilrige seized the opportunity to give the House a history lesson extolling the virtues of the Rump:

At the end of four years, scarce a sight to be seen that we had had a war. Trade flourished; the City of London grew rich; we were the most potent by sea that ever was known in England. Our Navy and Armies were never better.

As for the Petition and Advice on which Richard based his authority, the Parliament which passed it

was a forced Parliament, because some of us were forced out; an imperfect Parliament, a lame Parliament, so much dismembered . . . What was done in the last Parliament is not a sufficient foundation to bring peace and settlement to this nation.

Hesilrige concluded his lengthy reminiscences by insisting that any recognition of the Protector had to be preceded by a definition

---

of his powers: first "consider of foundation stones". When Richard's supporters urged that he should immediately be declared the lawful Chief Magistrate while the rest of the bill was debated the Commonwealthsmen wanted to know whether recognition implied acceptance of a House of Lords and "whether the militia, negative voice, and an uncontrolable power, shall go along with it". On these matters the debate then turned. Progress was so slow that Speaker Chute lamented: "We are indeed in a wood, a wilderness, a labyrinth"; and perhaps because of the long sittings and the unusually difficult nature of their task both he and his temporary successor Sir Lislebone Long were dead by the middle of April. (Members complained of the severity of the third Speaker, Thomas Bampfield, who behaved "like a Busby amongst so many school-boys"). By that time the Commons had succeeded in passing a number of resolutions on constitutional matters: they had resolved (by 191 to 168) to recognize and declare Richard to be Lord Protector and Chief Magistrate, but his powers had still to be defined; they had resolved (the Noes yielded) that Scottish members should continue to sit during the existing Parliament, and (by 156 to 106) that Irish members should continue to sit; and they had agreed (by 198 to 125) to transact business with the "Other" House as a House of Parliament, though saving the rights of peers who had been faithful to the parliamentary cause. Much of their remaining time was devoted to considering the manner of transacting business with the "Other" House.¹

Meanwhile the armed forces waited in vain for their arrears of pay. It was not until 7 April that the House of Commons was informed of the state of the national finances. The annual revenue of England, Scotland, and Ireland was £1,868,717 while expenditure amounted to £2,201,540, showing a deficit of about £330,000. In addition there were the debts inherited from Oliver Cromwell's regime, and the arrears due to the armed forces. On 16 April the total debt was estimated at £2,222,000 by year-end. An attempt was made to hasten the payments due to the Exchequer by the excise farmers, but little else was done

to satisfy the soldiers and much to scandalize them. One of the main arguments against the new House of Lords was that it consisted largely of military officers:

There are nineteen regiments of horse and foot, and divers garrisons, besides the Tower of London, all in that House; and a great part of the fleet besides.

It was dangerous to allow them to share legislative power. And, although it was urged that the very fact that they were soldiers proved their faithfulness, expressions were used in debate which could not but breed resentment. Doubt was also cast on the legality of the Rump’s actions by a member who argued that the Scottish Union was invalid as having been made “by the fag end of the Long Parliament”, and these same words were used by another member in hot altercation with Sir Arthur Hesilrige. As parliamentary diarist Thomas Burton noted:

This was presently noised abroad, and very ill resented by the army. I doubt it may breed ill blood; for every man that acted, begins to say, “What did I do in that fag-end of a Parliament, and how shall I be indemnified but by my sword? We will not give the cause away.” Never did two words work such an alteration in one day in the face of affairs. Query, the consequence? if not appeased.1

Far from appeasing the soldiers, the Commons intensified their resentment by impeaching Major-General Boteler or Butler for actions which he claimed had been performed by order of Oliver Cromwell. This was to touch the army on a very tender spot. A further cause of alarm was the declaration for a fast issued by the Commons, in which civil magistrates were reminded of their duty to prevent the spread of damnable heresies. Vane regarded this as an “imposition upon consciences”; and the Commonwealthsmen were reported to be fomenting discord in the army by warning the soldiers that religious toleration was now threatened.2

1 Burton, iv. 11-13, 17, 209, 221-3; CJ, vii. 628-31, 634.
So was built up "the confederated Triumvirate of Republicans, Sectaries and Soldiers" which was to bring down the Protectorate. There had been early hints of an alliance between the Rumpers and the sectaries. In February a petition signed by thousands of London citizens was presented "To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England" by three prominent Baptists led by Samuel Moyer, who had been one of the leading radicals in the Nominated Parliament, "Commonwealths men, Levellers, 5th monarchs attending". The petitioners were obviously familiar to the Rumpers and their friends: one after another Neville, Weaver, Baynes, Vane, Scot, Okey, Lambert, Alured invited the Commons to welcome the "honest, old faces"; and no wonder, for it was the same petition which they themselves had promoted during Oliver Cromwell's last parliament, leading to its summary dissolution. It appealed to the republicans by demanding a restoration of the Commonwealth form of government, with Parliament enjoying untrammelled legislative power and control of the revenue; to the sectaries by demanding freedom for tender consciences; to the soldiers by demanding that none should be cashiered without court-martial. Save for the Royalists, it provided a rallying-point for all enemies of the Protectorate. However, the Court party in the House stood firm; and the petitioners, receiving a dusty answer, retired "scarce well satisfied". An unexpectedly firm stand was also taken by Richard Cromwell that same month when a section of the army, covertly led by Lambert, sought to present a petition in similar terms. Going in person to Wallingford House, Richard threatened "extreme measures" against the officers and persuaded Fleetwood and Disbrowe to repudiate the project. He was, however, unable to control the press: as Austin Woolrych has shown, pamphlet after pamphlet appeared at this

1 William Prynne, The Re-publicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause... Anatomized, 13 May 1659, cit. Woolrych, Milton, p. 19. Prynne considered that Richard's reliance on the "antient nobility, gentry, lawyers, and presbyterians" served to alienate the soldiers and their commanders.

2 Burton, iii. 152-5, 288-96; Davies, Restoration, pp. 57-59; Woolrych, Milton, pp. 20-21; Firth, Last Years, ii. 30-34; L. F. Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men... (1911), pp. 173-4.

3 Guizot, Richard Cromwell, i. 304, 306-8; CSP, iii. 425-6; TSP, vii. 615-16.
time, many of them millenarian in tone, denouncing the Protectorate and demanding a return to what they called the "good old cause".\footnote{See Woolrych's article "The Good Old Cause and the Fall of the Protectorate", Cambridge Historical Journal, xiii (2) (1957), 133-61. He notes that several of these pamphlets were printed by Livewell Chapman, a publisher indirectly associated with Vane; Vane's responsibility for some of the pamphlets is discussed by Violet Rowe, Sir Henry Vane the Younger (1970), pp. 217-18.} In mid-March a further opportunity was presented to the dissident factions in the Commons. A petition was presented on behalf of Major-General Robert Overton, who had been imprisoned by Oliver Cromwell for subverting his Scottish command; the warrant committing Overton did not show the cause of his imprisonment, and the republicans were soon at fever pitch urging his immediate release, while Vane proposed that he should be given reparation as well. It was left to Hesilrige to point the moral: it all stemmed from the arbitrary power of the single person—"Experience tells us it is time to bound the single person."\footnote{Burton, iv. 150-61. The House ordered that Overton should be discharged without paying any fees.}

Hesilrige's opportunity came at the end of March when the Fleetwood/Disbrowe group made overtures to his party through the medium of Ludlow. Ludlow roundly blamed the generals for England's misfortunes "in that they had advanced a single person over us"; reconciliation was still possible if they would assist in the restoration of the Commonwealth, "which had cost the nation so much blood to establish". Although this was probably much farther than the senior officers wished to go, they were soon to experience unremitting pressure from their juniors.\footnote{Ludlow, op. cit. ii. 63-65.}

On 2 April, at a general council of officers held at Wallingford House, it was decided to frame the army's grievances in the form of a petition. Commonwealthsmen like Robert Lilburne and Richard Ashfield (whom the Protector had recently antagonized) dominated the drafting committee; and out of their labours emerged the Humble Representation and Petition which was presented to Richard Cromwell on 6 April.\footnote{For the Humble Representation and Petition see Old Parliamentary History, xxii. 340-5. There are good accounts of the fall of the Protectorate in Davies, Restoration, ch. 5; Woolrych, Milton, ch. 4; and Ivan Roots, The Great Rebellion, 1642-1660 (1966), ch. 25.} It demanded the
maintenance of the "good old cause" for which so much blood and treasure had been spent, and emphasized the extremities to which the army had been reduced for want of pay; it pointed out that the long promised reformation of law and manners was still awaited, and urged that "good and well-affected" persons might freely repair to their places of worship. However fair its professions it was couched, wrote Annesley, in such "cantzing equivocating language, whereof the sword was like to be interpreter, that the sting was easily visible through the honey".

The general council continued to meet; and (ominous sign) the whole of 13 April was given over to prayer and preaching. The Commons did not take official cognisance of these meetings until 18 April, when a very excited House resolved by 163 to 87 (Hugh Boscawen and Edward Rossiter acting as tellers for the majority, Thomas Chaloner and Henry Neville for the minority) that no general council of officers should meet without the consent of the Protector and both Houses of Parliament; moreover no person should hold a command in any of the armed forces unless he had undertaken not to disturb the parliamentary debates. Taking heart from this Richard, that same afternoon, declared the general council dissolved and ordered the officers to repair to their commands. Disbrowe and some of his fellow-officers received the orders with open derision. On 21 April, when Fleetwood called a general rendezvous of the army at St James's and Richard ordered a counter-rendezvous at Whitehall, the failure of the soldiers to heed the Protector's summons made it apparent that the army was in control. Lord Falkland had earlier warned the Commons:

You have been a long time talking of three estates. There is a fourth which, if not well looked to, will turn us all out of doors.

The prophecy was not long in fulfilment. The army leaders demanded the dissolution of Parliament. Yielding to their threats Richard signed the necessary commission, and on 22 April 1659 Parliament was dissolved.¹

If Fleetwood and Disbrowe intended to maintain Richard as a figurehead while exercising real power themselves, they reckoned without their junior officers and the former leaders of the Rump. Faced with a ground-swell of discontent which found free expression in a flood of pamphlets, the army grandees rode with the tide by restoring the Rump on 7 May. The membership of the Committee of Safety it appointed is significant: Fleetwood, Hesilrige, Vane, Ludlow, Sydenham, Salwey, John Jones, Lambert, Disbrowe, Berry, and Scot—the Commonwealthsmen, self-appointed custodians of the "good old cause", had certainly come into their own. Clearly the Protectorate was over, as Richard soon acknowledged. And so, in Bishop Burnet’s words,

> without any struggle he withdrew, and became a private man. And as he had done hurt to nobody, so nobody did ever study to hurt him; by a rare instance both of the instability of human greatness and of the security of innocence.\(^2\)

The Rump lived less tranquilly: ousted by Lambert in October 1659, restored despite its unpopularity in December, it was powerless to prevent the re-admission of the secluded members in February 1660—a move which obviously foreshadowed the restoration of the monarchy.
