11. NOTEBOOK XXXI

4 January–29 September 1659[1]

Introduction

The year 1659 was a particularly turbulent one in the political life of the country. After more than usually acrimonious elections[2] Richard Cromwell's first and only parliament assembled on 27 January. It lasted less than three months and was brought down finally, amid increasingly strident appeals for a return to the principles of the 'Good Old Cause',[3] by the combined efforts of a minority group of republican MPs (the 'commonwealthsmen') and the 'Wallingford House' group, leaders of the army based in England.[4] As well as several new written accounts of the Parliament's collapse, there are records of two conversations with messengers from London, one bearing a letter from Richard Cromwell's brother-in-law, the Earl Fauconberg, and the other from Richard himself.[5]

There is no indication of the content of Fauconberg's letter, but it is possible that he was sounding Monck out to see whether he would join the royalist cause. In December 1658 Charles Stuart had already considered approaching Monck and was shortly to do so again. A letter of 8 July 1659 from Sir John Grenville to Edward Hyde which refers to 'the late correspondence' between Monck and Fauconberg may indeed be a reference to the meeting described here.[6] If, as seems

[1] Worc. MS XXXI.

[2] P. 277; R. Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658–1667* (Oxford, 1985), p. 28.

[3] P. 282.

[4] For the complex groupings and political manoeuvres in Richard's parliament see A.H. Woolrych, 'The Good Old Cause and the fall of the Protectorate', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 13 (1957), pp. 133–161; I. Roots, 'The tactics of the Commonwealthsmen in Richard Cromwell's parliament', in D. Pennington and K. Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries* (Oxford, 1982 edn), pp. 283–309; D. Hirst, 'Concord and discord in Richard Cromwell's House of Commons', *English Historical Review*, 103 (1988), pp. 339–358.

[5] Pp. 285–288, 290–293.

[6] A. Bryant (ed.), *The Letters Speeches and Declarations of King Charles II* (London, 1935), p. 65; *CClarSP*, IV, pp. 263, 268. Grenville's letter makes it clear that Monck's brother was to visit Fauconbridge before paying a visit to Monck in Scotland.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

likely, the letter did contain some kind of royalist overture, it is clear that – as during the summer of 1658 – Monck did not respond to it.[7]

Clarke's brief record of his own conversation with a personal messenger from Richard Cromwell to Monck answers questions about whether or not Richard attempted to contact Monck in Scotland.[8] We learn that Richard's motives were not to ask Monck for military assistance; to the contrary, he did not 'desire any to answer another for him further than might consist with the peace of the nations' and was now 'resolved to sit still and look on'.[9] Monck had already made up his mind that he could not adhere to Richard, but must endorse the new regime.[10] A few days after receiving Richard's messenger he sent a warm letter of support to Charles Fleetwood and the other grandees at Wallingford House.[11]

For two volatile weeks between Richard's downfall on 22 April and 7 May, when the General Council of the Army recalled the remaining members of the Rump to act as a Parliament, the country was in the hands of the army. It was to remain a pivotal force in English politics for the remainder of 1659, although increasingly the armies in Scotland and Ireland would distance themselves from the policies and actions of the Wallingford House group.

Tension and difficulties continued on all sides under the new regime.[12] Senior army officers increasingly resented the restrictive measures imposed by the Rump and as the quarrel worsened there was talk in army circles of placing the government again in the hands of a single person, and even of reinstating Richard Cromwell.[13]

Early in the year we are given the curious story of Richard's dealings with two Quakers arrested for passing themselves off as members of the watch.[14] The Protector's light-hearted dismissal of the incident and his decision to order their release, in spite of the widespread alarm currently surrounding all Quaker activities,[15] are in keeping with his Privy Council's lenient response to an appeal on the behalf of imprisoned Quakers in the preceding September. Nevertheless, only

[7] Pp. 268–270.
[8] Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 40.
[9] Pp. 292–293.
[10] P. 292.
[11] *TSP*, VII, pp. 669–670.
[12] See, for example, pp. 295, 296, 298–300, 307, 309.
[13] Pp. 297, 298–300, 305–307, 308, 309.
[14] P. 280.
[15] There were, for example, large numbers of Quakers meeting in London and even in Westminster itself around this time; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 26.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

a month after the incident described here some 144 Quakers were still held in custody around the country.[16]

By mid-June the Protectorate was at an end and Richard had become a public laughing-stock.[17]

News from [T.C.], London, 4 January 1659[18]

fo. [5]r

3 queries proposed to be debated on by the members of the insuing Parliament or at least [talked] on to be done: 1. whether or no that the authority of the late Parliament wherein the petition of advice and present government was [settled] are sufficient for the establishment of the government; 2. whether or no that the late Protector's will for declaring his successor be valid or no; 3. whether that it is fit for the Members sent from the ~~Parliament~~ Scotland[19] and Ireland should be fit to sit with those that are the free-born people of England in Parliament, being not allowed by their constitutions.

Memorandum, [Dalkeith], [11 January 1659]

fo. [9]v

Hague 11/21 January 1658/9

A letter [attached] from Master Downing wherein are the great preparations in Holland for the Sound.[20]

[16] G. Davies, *The Restoration of Charles II 1658–1660* (San Marino, 1955), pp. 27–28; Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 36–37.

[17] P. 301.

[18] Apparently the postscript to a newsletter (in longhand) from 'T.C.' (possibly Thomas Clarges).

[19] 'Scotland' superimposed on 'Parliament'.

[20] There is no surviving copy of Downing's letter among Clarke's papers. Clarke must have intended to copy it into his notebook and, following his usual practice, entered this memorandum under the date on which the letter was written. Downing enlarged upon the information in a further letter to Monck dated 21/31 January 1659; *CP*, III, p. 175. His intelligence formed the basis of the report on the current situation with regard to the Sound which John Thurloe presented to the Commons on 21 February 1659; *CJ*, VII, p. 606; Burton, *Diary*, III, pp. 376–403, esp. p. 380; *TSP*, VII, pp. 619–620.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newsletter from Francis Childe, Exeter, 15 January 1659

fo. [13]^{r}

We are in these parts most terrible enemies to an army man and not one of them should be chosen if we have all other interest. Some[21] a gallant [beat too as] the crows, jackdaws, and magpies play together.[22] *Colonel Robert Rolles & Sir John Northcott are our Shire Knights, & Mr Richard Forde of London & Major Gibbons our 2 Burgesses. The first was hang'd att the Exchange by his wooden image*, and the other a [fiery] Sir John.[23]

Francis Childe

News from J.R., Westminster, 27 January 1659[24]

fo. 17^{r}

Itt is a Commonwealthes interest doth oppose them but if you will have my opinion (and I think I take a right measure of men) *there will bee two to one for confirming of the present Settlement by a protector & two Houses against a Standing Commonwealth Councill (for Standing Pooles doe Corrupt) . . .*'.

News from Thomas Morgan, 3 February 1659[25]

fo. 23^{r}

By Lettres from Flanders itt is informed that it was the Lord Lockharts pleasure to command five Companies of Colonel Lillingtons Regiment from their winter quarters at Amiens in order to the Strengthening of Dunkirke <(although in myself's judgment it will much [. . .] them that some men desire an army in a garrison)>[26] *which was obeyed . . . .*[27]

T.M.

Thomas Morgan

[21] Blank.

[22] Three main groups contested the elections – supporters of the Protectorate, republicans, and crypto-royalists. There were many irregularities in the elections; G. Davies, 'The election of Richard Cromwell's Parliament', *English Historical Review*, 63 (1948), pp. 488–501.

[23] The two Members returned for Exeter were Thomas Bampfield and Major Gibbons; *Publick Intelligencer*, 161 (24–31 Jan. 1659), p. 180.

[24] This newsletter, probably from John Rushworth, is printed in *CP*, III, p. 176. This single shorthand phrase joins what are given there as paras 2 and 3.

[25] Printed in full in *ibid.*, pp. 179–180, where the writer is identified as 'G.M.' (p. 180n).

[26] Interlined.

[27] The document then continues in longhand.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newsletter from G.M., London, 15 February 1659[28]

fo. 31v

Sir Arthur Hesilrige upon the passing of the vote for the recognition of his Highness made a [~~...~~] speech to the effect following:

Master Speaker,

Now you have passed this vote I have but one word to say as an old Briton and an English knight. You have at one blow given away our liberties and set up a family that we must maintain at a vast charge. Here is a [structure] of brick to be made but where is the straw? It is such a burthen that the people [~~cannot~~] will not be able to bear. My motion is that the House may adjourn and go to prayers to seek deliverance from these burthens.[29]

The 14 instant a Committee of Officers were appointed to draw uppe some Heads to bee framed into a Petition & presented to the parliament in the name of the Army. His Highnesse was lately with the Officers att the Lord Fleetwoods and admonished them to bee prudent & carefull in the Draught of this intended Petition, which itt's well hop't will bee carefully observ'd.[30]

G.M.

A Member of Parliament answered Sir Arthur Haslerig that he wondered not that Sir Arthur Haslerig should be so much troubled at the alteration of the government from a commonwealth, but if he had got 8,000*l* a year by it as well as he, <~~8,000*l* per annum~~>[31] he thought he should be unwilling to part with it.

A Member of Parliament that mourned for his late Highness speaking in the House, he that replied to him, called him the gentleman of the long robe.[32]

There being one Master Freeman[33] that urging in the House that they should [establish] my Lord Protector who had an army that would back him, my Lord Fairfax moved he might be brought to the bar that should mention such things in the House and accordingly he was called to the bar.

[28] Probably from Gilbert Mabbott.

[29] The vote was passed on 14 February. There is no confirmation in Burton's *Diary* of the speeches quoted in this newsletter. Hesilrige's verbosity and filibustering tactics are described in Roots, 'Tactics of the Commonwealthsmen in Richard Cromwell's parliament', esp. pp. 306–309.

[30] This paragraph is printed in *CP*, III, p. 182.

[31] Interlined.

[32] For the reputed bias of the 'gentlemen of the long robe' towards Richard Cromwell, see Burton, *Diary*, III, p. 32n.

[33] Edward Freeman, MP for Leominster.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from London, 17 February 1659

fo. [32]v

Master Neville questioned in the House for atheism, his denying the Scriptures etc.[34]

The 2 main things now in debate are the negative voice and militia.

News from G.D., The Hague, 18 February 1659[35]

fo. [33]v

Since the writing hereof is the post arrived from England and the whole town is full of nothing but talk of the confusions at London in the Parliament and presaging what the consequences thereof should be, to the disrepute of your affairs, discouraging your friends and heating your enemies.[36]

News from [G.M.], [London], 19 February 1659[37]

fo. 34v

The names of those appointed by the Parliament as a committee for receiving the whole [accounts] of the present revenue of England, Scotland and Ireland and of the whole forces by sea and land belonging to this Commonwealth, and who are impowered to call before them any person for making out the true revenue and condition of the armies and of the shipping at home and abroad, before which committee the Muster-Master General is appointed to predicate muster rolls of the whole commission officers, together with the particular number and strength of the regiments:

Sir Henry Vane	*Colonel Thompson*
Sir John Carter	*Joseph Jackson*
Mr Peter Middleton	*Mr Scott*
Colonel Birch	*Lambert Godfrey*

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 296–305. Neville was acquitted; *CClarSP*, IV, p. 152.

[35] Postscript to a letter from 'G.D.', probably George Downing.

[36] i.e. the Royalists, who were hoping that divisions within Parliament and with the army would provide an opportunity for another attempt to restore the monarchy.

[37] Postscript to a newsletter from 'G.M.', probably Gilbert Mabbott.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mr Scawen *Mr Biddolph*
Mr Bampfeild *Major Generall Browne*[38]

Which 12, or any five of them, are to meet the 18th instant by 2 of the clock in the afternoon and so forth, every sitting day until they be able and furnished to make a secret[39] report to the Parliament of the above trust.

News from W.R., Westminster, 21 February 1659[40]

fo. [36]r

It is observable that in the debate about the Other House[41] there was a dissent between the protectoral party among themselfs whether they should have the old lords or those new ones lately named. During all which debate the commonwealth's party sat still and said nothing, but left them to dispute it among themselfs.[42]

Newsletter from [London], 1 March 1659

fo. 40r

Some few days since a Quaker constable being upon the watch in London, he and his watchmen met with 2 troopers going the round, whom they disarmed and sent to prison, whereon the constable being questioned before his Highness came with his hat on his head and being demanded wherefore he committed the trooper, he made this defence, to wit:

Thou Richard Cromwell, thou master, thank thy servant Robert Tichborne for this.[43] For thy servant Robert Tichborne set thy servants

[38] This list corresponds with that in *CJ*, VII, p. 605, but not that given by Burton (*Diary*, III, p. 311), which provides only ten names, and includes John Lambert.

[39] Presumably 'secret' is used in its seventeenth-century sense of confidential or non-public. The report was presented to the House on 7 April; for its text see *CJ*, VII, pp. 627–631.

[40] Postscript to a newsletter, probably from William Ross.

[41] The debate began on 19 February 1659; *ibid.*, p. 605.

[42] All this is confirmed by Burton, *Diary*, III, pp. 349–369. The debate was continued on 22 February (*ibid.*, pp. 403–424), and the Commons finally voted in favour of transacting business with the Other House on 8 March 1659; *CJ*, VII, p. 611.

[43] The regicide Robert Tichborne, at this time colonel of the yellow regiment of the London trained bands, was a staunch supporter of both Oliver and Richard Cromwell (*DNB*, 'Tichborne').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

to watch upon the high gates of the city about the 10th hour or 1st watch of the night and <lo [besides]>[44] about the 12th hour or 2nd watch of the night there appeared to thy servants, 2 sons of men on horseback, and thy servants ~~asked who are~~ said unto them, who are you?And they answered and said, We are the watch. And thy servants <said>,[45] Nay, but we are the watch. And it came to pass that they resisted, so thy servants fell upon them and smote them hip and thigh[46] and took them and bound them and cast them into prison, at which his Highness particularly laughed at and dismissed them, giving the authority to be discharged.[47]

Newsletter from Westminster, 17 March 1659[48]

fo. [54]r

Our affairs [above] at Westminster are very perplexed. God only can disintangle them to whom it is our duty seriously to commend them, there never being such a time of hazard upon all accounts. *You will heare how the Chaire has sent one Speaker sick & another has left itt by death, Sir Lislebone Longe who died yesterday, Mr Bampfeild is now in itt* to whom I wish better success. *Yesterday Colonel Overton was released & his imprisonment voted illegall & unjust, & Major General Boteler was before the House for some actions in the Major Generall-shippe which was referr'd. Doctor Hewett's lady has petitioned the House for the Murther (as shee termes itt) of her husband, & is to have an hearing on Wednesday sennight. The Scotch Members sitting was in debate this day.* Master Weaver this day told the Speaker that they had suffered the Scotch gentlemen to sit in the House only to see [. . .], and now they expected to continue. By this you may see the strain of the rest, he being as moderate as any.[49]

[44] Interlined.
[45] Interlined.
[46] Judges, XV. 8.
[47] I have discussed Richard's response to this case above (pp. 275–276).
[48] As shorthand and longhand are interspersed, I have reproduced this newsletter in full.
[49] Although Burton, who arrived in the House after this debate had started, records a speech by the staunchly republican John Weaver on this day, it does not contain these phrases; Burton, *Diary*, IV, pp. 164–165. The debate on the right of the Scottish MPs to sit in the House (of which Weaver was one of the instigators) ran from 11–21 March; *ibid.*, p. 76; *CJ*, VII, pp. 613–616. On the day on which the resolution was passed, 21 March, Weaver was one of those sent by the House to visit the dying former Speaker Challenor Chute at his home in the country; *ibid.*, p. 615.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from [London], 24 March 1659[50]

fo. 61r

After the vote was passed for the [sitting] of the Scotch and Irish Members,[51] Master Sadler told the Speaker in his speech that what was once made in an epitaph upon the earl of Strafford he might invert else. It was

Here lies vile[52] and valiant dust
Huddled up twixt fit and just.

and might now say

The Scotch commissioners here must sit
Huddled up twixt just and fit.

Newsletter from Robert Lilburne, 29 March 1659[53]

fo. 65r

All things here look with a sadder countenance at present than they have done these many years. Many give the good old cause for lost, but our God is still the same and I hope will not leave us in this [wilderness] condition. It is said here that there will be a general meeting of officers, but at this distance I must not tell you when.[54] I think my great fear is the designs for *Ch[arles] St[uart]* under other vizards.

R. L.[55]

Robert Lilburne

[50] Possibly the postscript to a newsletter from J.C.

[51] The vote for retaining Irish members in the House was passed on 23 March 1659, two days after the lengthy debates on the rights of Scottish MPs to sit; *CJ*, VII, p. 619.

[52] The original, quoted in Burton's *Diary* (IV, pp. 156, 227), and taken from the 'Epitaph on the Earle of Strafford' by John Cleveland (*Poems by J.C. with Additions* (London, 1651), p. 47), reads 'wise' for 'vile'.

[53] Robert Lilburne, now governor of York, had been elected MP for New Malton in Richard's Parliament but lost the seat on 7 March; *CJ*, VII, p. 611.

[54] Presumably Lilburne is referring here to the meeting of the General Council of Officers which Richard Cromwell was persuaded to allow to go ahead on 2 April 1659; A. Woolrych, Introduction to *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, VII, revised edn (New Haven and London, 1980), p. 62.

[55] These initials are written in shorthand rather than the longhand characters by which Clarke usually identified correspondents.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from [G.M.], 29 March 1659[56]

fo. 68v

The marquis of Argyle[57] made a long speech in the House concerning religion and against sectaries and 5th Monarchy-men, which was [freely] answered by Sir Henry Vane.

Upon the vote for transacting with the Other House, a motion being made that one[58] Grove, a member of the Commons, should carry up the vote to the Other House, Master Sadler stood up and said he had spoken once before upon that business[59] but had now one word to add, that when the children of Israel were delivered out of Egypt they returned again to [. . .] worshipped Baal and set up a grove.[60]

News from [London], [8] April 1659

fo. [75]r

There was much debate in Parliament about passing this declaration[61] for the fast [as] things debated were, 1st because that liberty in religion is therein laid down as a ground of humiliation, 2. the imposing the fast upon all sorts.[62]

News from G.M., London, 14 April, 1659[63]

fo. 80v

The Newes concerning the Agreement betweene France & Spaine continues. An Expresse was sent from hence on Tuesday last into France to know the Certainty therof & to Returne with all Speede.

Major-General Boteler's business was debated in the House. He carries it very high which, if [he/it] persists in, the House will go

[56] Probably the postscript to a newsletter from G.M., (Gilbert Mabbott?).
[57] Argyle was MP for Aberdeenshire in Richard's parliament.
[58] Blank.
[59] Sadler's earlier remarks were recorded by Thomas Burton; Burton, *Diary*, IV, p. 279.
[60] I Kings, XVI. 31–33.
[61] Clarke added this note to a longhand transcription of the draft declaration; Worc. MS XXXI, fos 73r–[75]r), for which see also *CJ*, VII, pp. 623–624.
[62] Thomas Burton's lengthy account of this debate (*Diary*, IV, pp. 300–345) is discussed in Hirst 'Concord and discord in Richard Cromwell's House of Commons', pp. 339–358.
[63] Postscript to the letter printed in *CP*, III, pp. 189–190, most probably from Gilbert Mabbott.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

near to deprive him of being capable hereafter of any trust, civil or military.[64]

Yesterday Mr Challenor Chute late Speaker in the Commons died.

Newsletter from A.J., [London], 19 April 1659[65]

fo. 84v

The inclosed votes came uppe to the House with Mr Stephen's this Morning & tooke uppe our House in Debate till 2 of the Clock whether wee should now take them into Consideration or delay it till after the Declaration of the fast was passed and the Malignants by proclamation removed from London. It was carryed by one voyce to consider them to morrow morning, and indeed their will be much debate upon them.[66] I pray the Lord God to dispel this cloud and to prevent the breaches and divisions which threateneth us so sadly.

fo. 85r

Wee heare alsoe the Officers are to meete alsoe amongst themselves to morrow morning. The Lord send a spirit of soberness and unity and amity both on the House and on the officers that their adversaries make not advantage of any mistakes and jealousies may arise amongst them.[67]

A.J.

The Lord Disbrowe and the Protector had very high words about the officers going from London.

[64] For this debate see *CJ*, VII, pp. 636–637; Burton, *Diary*, IV, pp. 403–412; *TSP*, VII, p. 653. The action of the Commons in prosecuting Boteler for offences against royalists caused offence and alarm in army circles; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 36.

[65] Almost certainly from Archibald Johnston of Wariston, who attended the Other House on that day; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the House of Lord*, IV NS (London, 1908), p. 563. I have reproduced the entire document, in which longhand alternates with shorthand.

[66] *Ibid*, pp. 562–563. The resolutions concerned the prohibition of unauthorized meetings of the General Council of Officers, and other restrictive measures to be imposed upon the army. A longhand copy of them precedes this letter – presumably taken from the enclosure referred to in line 1; Worc. MS XXXI, fo. 84r–v; *CJ*, VII, p. 641; *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England. . . .*, 24 vols (London, 1751–1762), XXI, p. 348.

[67] On 18 April the House of Commons had prohibited meetings of the General Council of Officers held without the express permission of the Protector and of Parliament. They had also voted that every officer, on pain of dismissal, must sign a declaration against the forcible coercion of Parliament; *CJ*, VII, p. 1. The proposed meeting to be held on the 20th did not take place; Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 37. On 18 April, before the measure could be passed, Richard disbanded the General Council and ordered the officers to return to their regiments.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Colonel Ashfield told the Protector that he had surprized them <to [order] them to their charges so suddenly>.[68] His Highness answered that he could not be surprised that had not been with his regiment for 2 years.[69]

The militia troops sent for by the Lord Fleetwood to London.

Newsletter from London, 23 April 1659[70]

fo. 87v

Major-General Browne offered to raise 40,000 men for the securing and guarding of his Highness and Parliament, and he would see whether the army would oppose them, and he would have them ready in 24 hours' time. Some of the regiments of the army are also [there on].[71]

Some letters say that the Protector has lost both himself and friends.

The design laid by the commonwealthsmen in Parliament because they could not carry it against the Protector's establishment, and Sir Henry Vane and Sir Arthur Hesilrige met in council with the Lord Fleetwood and Lord Disbrowe, and there it was agreed that Fleetwood should be General of the Army, but the Parliament to grant commissions, the Long Parliament being to be returned though they [are/were] divided [two and two]. One insisted that he should grant commissions, the other considers not.[72]

It is said that the Lord Broghill persuaded his Highness to sign the commission for dissolution of the Parliament.[73]

[68] Interlined. The position of this insertion is not indicated in the original.

[69] A similar version of this exchange is quoted in Davies, *Restoration*, p. 81.

[70] Although it is just possible that this newsletter is a postscript to the immediately preceding letter, identified in shorthand as coming from Thomas Fitch (Appendix A below, p. 370) and printed in *CP*, III, p. 193, I have treated it as a separate document.

[71] Browne, already a royalist supporter (*CClar.SP*, IV, pp. 176, 178), would be involved in the royalist rising later that summer and promoted the restoration of Charles II in 1660 (*OxDNB* 'Sir Richard Browne'). Other offers of military backing to Richard at this time are described by J.A. Butler, *A Biography of Richard Cromwell*, (Lewiston, NY, 1994), p. 117.

[72] This meeting considerably antedates previously recorded contacts between the army leaders and the republican MPs. Hitherto it has been supposed that the officers procrastinated until early May before contacting. Hesilrige and Vane; Davies, *Restoration*, p. 88; Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 39–40.

[73] Although it is usually believed that Richard yielded immediately to pressure from the army officers, this report may be authentic. Broghill, who left for Ireland on 29 April (according to Ludlow to get Henry Cromwell's support) was one of Richard's closest advisers; *TSP*, VII, p. 665; Ludlow, *Memoirs*, II, p. 61. Bulstrode Whitelocke, who was among those who advised Richard on this matter, recorded that Broghill was also consulted and that 'most were for the dissolving of the parliament' (Whitelock, *Memorials*, IV, p. 343), while Ludlow (*Memoirs*, II, p. 69) wrote that Richard had 'taken a little time to consider of it'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some debate amongst the officers that those that were put out of their commands by Oliver late Protector, or the Richard Protector without a court martial might be restored to their commands.

John Swinton,[74] [London], to [George Monck], 23 April 1659

fo. 88r

My Lord

It will appear to your Lordship from the inclosed declaration what is become of the Parliament.[75] I know your Lordship has an account from better hands what the late transactions have been these 2 or 3 days past. I have been so great a stranger to the particular managements of things as I dare not upon hearsay undertake to give your Lordship a particular account of them, only suppose the account I gave your Lordship some weeks ago doth by this time appear not to have been altogether groundless. We do now seem to be launched again into the depth. Where we shall land can hardly be foreseen. We are mighty still at present and things have been carried with a [structure] of [calmness] which considering the present juncture of affairs is no small happiness, for in such courses [confusion] above all things is to be diverted.

J.S.

John Swinton

William Ross, [London], to [George Monck], 23 April 1659

fo. 88r

May it please your Lordship

Since my last there hath nothing proceeded in the House butt a vote of Adjournement which past yesterday in the forenoone, whereby the House is adjourned till Munday next butt I suppose the Adjournement may prove longer because of the inclosed whereunto I shall not add anything but commit you and your affairs to the directing of the Almighty, wishing heartily that He may furnish your Lordship with direction in these difficult times that you may be

[74] MP for Berwickshire in Richard's parliament.

[75] Probably [Richard Cromwell], *By the Lord Protector. A Proclamation About Dissolving the Parliament* (London, 1659). Clarke's copy, perhaps that referred to here, survives at Worcester College.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

able to distinguish and know your friends from others, and that all of us may lament for our sins and provocations which justly occasioned these symptoms of the Lord's rath thus threatened against us and these poor nations whose condition requires the prayers of all honest men. As for particulars I offer them to the relation of the more intelligent.[76]

William Ross

Newsletter from [London], 23 April 1659

fo. 88r

Upon the Thursday night as Colonel Ingoldsby's troop came marching to Whitehall, Captain [Merriman][77] meets them and asks the Captain-Lieutenant <[. . .]>[78] who he was for. He answered, for the Protector, and he said he was for the good old cause and the Commonwealth, and then dismissed him and then addressed himself to the troop and cried, Gentlemen all you that are for the good old cause and Commonwealth follow me and march to Whitehall according to my Lord Fleetwood's orders. The like was done by a lieutenant of the same regiment to Major Duckett who was marching upon the Lord Protector's orders to Whitehall[79] and Major[80] did the like and carried away 5 companies of Colonel Goffe's regiment who was marching by the Lord Protector's orders to Whitehall, telling them that he had something to do with them as [well did he] and desired all those that were for the good old cause to follow him.

Sir Charles [Wolseley][81] and Captain John Garner governour of Dunottar Castle died this week at London.

Newsletter from [London], 25 April 1659

fo. [90]r

This day being Monday, the time to which the House of Commons had adjourned themselfs, Sir Arthur Hesilrige went through Westminster Hall, and going up to the lobby to go into the House found the door shut and guarded with soldiers, and demanding entrance he was

[76] 'Intelligent' in the sense of being well-informed.
[77] Probably Capt. John Merriman of Col Ingoldsby's regiment.
[78] Interlined.
[79] Blank.
[80] Blank.
[81] The shorthand is somewhat unclear but appears to read 'Wolseley'. If so, this is an unfounded rumour. Wolseley, a member of Richard's Council, did not die until 1714 (*OxDNB*). Gardiner had been cashiered in May 1654; F&D, II, p. 538.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

denied by some of the soldiers, whereupon he told them he came to do his duty to his country, to sit in Parliament, but they told him that they had orders that he must not enter. Whereupon he said, then, soldiers, you will have no Parliament, and they said no. To which he replied, then you must expect no money, and so went down. Sir Henry Vane was coming up the stairs with him but, hearing he was repulsed, went no further.

News from [London], 26 April 1659[82]

fo. 91v

[godly][83] new lords

Lord Fleetwood
Lord Disbrow
Lord Barkestead
Lord Cooper
Lord Hughson
Lord Sydenham
Colonel Lilburne
Colonel Ashfeild
Major General Kelsey
Colonel Clarke
Lord Berry

Newsletter from London, 29 April 1659

fo. 95v

The Treaty betwixt the 2 Crownes of France & Spaine is asserted by Letters to divers Merchants though nott fully owned by Politicus.[84] *A Decemvirate must sitt at Whitehall under the Notion of a Committee* whereof the Lord Bradshaw and Sir Henry Vane they say must be 2. The Fifth Monarchy men are now very active for the Kingdom of Christ and [here is a very choice] at this present, but we cannot discern who may probably produce the

[82] It is just possible that this is the postscript to the letter of 26 April from John Thurloe which is printed in *CP*, III, p. 195. Thurloe is identified in shorthand as the sender of that letter; Appendix A, p. 370.

[83] In a small sample of three words it is impossible to be sure which of several possible equivalents, for example the figure 9, is intended here. The outline most closely resembles that for 'godly', but is not quite typical.

[84] Marchamont Nedham (dismissed on 13 May 1659) was still the editor of the official newsbook *Mercurius Politicus*; Davies, *Restoration*, p. 3n.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

[least] good out of that heap of [evil]. The Lord Protector, 'tis likely, will be laid aside, and Fleetwood is already addressed unto by the title of Excellency. Ambition it seems will acknowledge no kindred, or any former favours put a lasting obligation upon thankless spirits. Many here stand at a gaze and wonder when the Israelites can be able to settle, in regard they have no basis to bottom on but the pretence of the good old cause, and the removal of the old Parliament. Here is talk of a new Lieutenant of the Tower, but little can be resolved on till Monck, Mountagu, and the Lord Henry declare themselfs.[85]

Major Babington suspend[ed] and Colonel Grosvenor confined to his chambers, who it seems were active against the officers in their late actings.[86]

Sir James MacDowall to Colonels Syler and Lytcott, 30 April 1659

fo. 96r

London, last April

Much Honoured

I understand from Master Clarke that he has been interceding with you for offering Francis [Steer/Steel/Stell] in his place, and with all desired me to consent unto it. He seems to undertake much for his faithfulness wherefore knowing he would be very unwilling that any person unworthy or unfaithful should be owned by you, I am very apt to have charitable thoughts of Master [Steer/Steel/Stell] as being no wise known to me but by report, and therefore if you think fit to [confer] or restore him I shall be satisfied. This being all for present, I am

your most humble servant

James MacDowall[87]

For the much honoured Colonel Syler
and Colonel Lydcott[88] at Leith

[85] Just over one month later Col John Barkstead was arrested and on 10 June 1659 was replaced as Lieutenant of the Tower by 'Haslerigge's creature', Col Thomas Fitch; *Mercurius Politicus*, 570 (2–9 June 1659) p. [496]; Whitelock, *Memorials*, IV, p. 351.

[86] See Davies, *Restoration*, p. 86.

[87] Sir James MacDowall of Garthland was MP for Wigtonshire in Richard's parliament. By July 1659 he was at Leith; Worc. MS LI, fo. 82r–v. See also Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland*, esp. p. 288n.

[88] i.e. Col Leonard Lytcott.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from G.M., [London], 30 April 1659[89]

fo. 96[v]

Captain Elsmore putt out of imployment about the business of Mistress Green, by whom it is said he had 2 children etc.[90]

Colonel Lilburne, Colonel Hacker, Colonel Salmon and Colonel Ashfield for the returning of the Long Parliament, Fleetwood and Desbrowe said to be against it.

Conversation with Major Goodrick, 2 May 1659

fo. [97][v]

Discourse with Major Goodrick[91]

That he came away from London the day after the dissolving of the Parliament, that Sir Arthur Hesilrige, Sir Henry Vane and others of the commonwealth party did in several speeches in the House exclaim against the proceedings of the officers in [drawing up] a force to Whitehall to inforce the Lord Protector, and so to dissolve the Parliament. And that the Lord Fairfax was much of the same mind, and that the Lord Lambert spoke most moderately of the business but at last concluded that it was not to be excused.

That being at the meeting of the officers when Lieutenant-Colonel Moss brought in the paper from the late Lord Pride's regiment he asked who stood next him [when] the common soldiers [. . .] for the good old cause for that most of them are cavaliers and for Charles Stuart's party, that thereupon Major Farley overhearing them was ready to draw upon him.[92]

[89] Postscript to a newsletter, probably from Gilbert Mabbott; the letter and first few words of this excerpt are found in *CP*, III, p. 196.

[90] Elsmore was to be arrested for his involvement in the abortive Royalist uprisings planned for the beginning of the following August; *ibid.*, IV, p. 37; *Publick Intelligencer*, 188 (1–8 Aug. 1659), pp. 629–630.

[91] Presumably Maj. William Goodrick, a staunch supporter of Richard Cromwell, who had served in Cromwell's Scottish campaign of 1650–1651 and had remained there under Monck. He would therefore have been known to both Monck and Clarke; Worc. MS XXXI, fo. [12][r]; Ludlow, *Memoirs*, II, pp. 61–62; F&D, I, pp. 256, 259–260, 263; C.A. Goodricke, *History of the Goodricke Family* (London, 1885), p. 47. The conversation recorded here apparently took place between Goodrick and Monck, Clarke himself also being present. Monck may well by this time have already learnt of the fall of the Parliament by a letter from Charles Fleetwood dated 23 April 1659; *L-P*, pp. 115–116.

[92] The 'paper' was probably *To His Excellency the Lord Fleetwood, and the General Council of Officers: The humble Address of the Inferiour Officers and Souldiers of the Late Lord Pride's Regiment* (London, 1659), written and printed on 7 or 8 April; Burton, *Diary*, IV, pp. 388–389n. It appears that there had been a meeting of officers on the same day. The General Council

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

That he could never observe there was above 40 voices in the House of Commons for the old Commonwealth's way and that when the commonwealthsmen saw that the young gentlemen of estates would not accept of the new [~~....~~] in expectation to bring in the old peers they would not go any further in that business but left it, but all the while before they got them to joyn with them.

That only himself and the Lord Chancellor Disbrowe were of the negatives in the business of Portman's or Colonel Overton['s] imprisonment by the late Protector to be illegal and [unjust] being he was General and that it might question all commands of soldiers.[93]

That they intend to have a committee of inspections to put a black mark upon all those that are not of some gathered church.

That upon the occasion of the [. . .] of officers of the Lord Lambert, Colonel Sanders, Colonel Okey etc., he said that his major should be removed as well as he.[94] And when I spoke of their regiments coming in he said he could not tell whether it would be my Lord Falconbridge's and my Lord Lambert's and that it may be they might think of [Colonel] Lilburne to command in Scotland in case they should remove the Lord General and then he would let the Scots beat him out of the castle as he did formerly.[95]

That he could not tell what would be the occasion of the dissolving of this late Parliament unless it were the questioning of some men about the act for the propagation of the gospel in south Wales. Also upon the pretence of raising money for that had gained estates of 500*l* a year out of nothing.

That ~~the Parliament might have raised~~ there was 150,000*l* in the hands of the excise men about London which the Parliament were in a way of getting in and now he thought they would not [give] 20,000*l*.

fo. [98]r

That he could never observe any of the commonwealthsmen in the House to speak anything against the choice of the present Protector but that Sir Arthur Hesilrige himself said in a speech that he was a person without gall and without guile.[96]

had sent a petition to Richard on the 6th which was referred by him to both Houses on the 8th. Both Moss and Farley were supporters of the commonwealth faction; Farley was major in Goffe's regiment at this time, while Moss had assumed command of Col Pride's regiment sometime after Pride died in October 1658; Davies, *Restoration*, p. 74; F&D, I, pp. 333, 371.

[93] For these debates see Burton's *Diary*, III, pp. 494–498; IV, pp. 150–161.

[94] Goodrick had served in Lambert's regiment; F&D, I, p. 259.

[95] Lilburne acted as commander-in-chief in Scotland from March 1653 to April 1654 (*SS*, p. 38).

[96] Burton, *Diary*, III, pp. 104, 112.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Major Goodrick came with a letter from the Lord Fauconbridge to the Lord General that he shall give credence unto him and that what he should ingage he would make good with his life.[97]

His Lordship answered him that his Highness having dissolved the Parliament he could not adhere to him, declaring that himself and most of the officers here are for returning the old <Long>[98] Parliament and to keep things in peace.[99]

He said that when the vote came for the proclaiming of <papists and>[100] cavaliers to remove from London or 20 miles off that there was not one negative voice, whereas in former Parliaments there had been some debates that they might have their freedoms as well as others, being that they had paid for it and were brought into the same capacity with others.[101]

Memorandum, 7 May 1659

fo. 104v

This day Master Underwood, one of the gentlemen belonging to his Highness, came with a letter from his Highness to General Monck at Dalkeith.[102] The purport was to give him a brief account of affairs and to advice [*sic*] him that[103] would not desire any to answer another for him further than might consist with the peace of the nations.[104]

Upon discourse with Master Underwood, I find that his Highness condescended to these and the commission for dissolving the late Parliament upon the importunity of the Lord Fleetwood, Lord Disbrowe etc., who told him that it was the advice of his father's best friends and that it should not be any prejudice to him, that otherwise all would be lost, that thereupon his Highness chose rather to adhere to the army, his father's old friends, then the Parliament and

[97] I have discussed the possible contents of Fauconberg's letter in my introduction to this chapter, pp. 274–275.

[98] Interlined.

[99] Hitherto there has been no evidence to suggest that Monck knew about the imminent collapse of the Protectorate until the day after this conversation, 3 May; Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland*, p. 240.

[100] Interlined.

[101] *CJ*, VII, p. 642.

[102] This was not the first time that Underwood, a gentleman of the bedchamber to both Richard and Oliver Cromwell, had been employed by Richard as a trusted personal messenger; Sherwood, *Court of Oliver Cromwell*, pp. 70–72.

[103] The word 'he' is omitted but clearly intended.

[104] Some three and a half lines left blank here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

all the new friends in the several parts of the nation which had made addresses to him.

That now he was resolved to sit still and look on.

Marginal annotation [7] May 1659[105]

fo. 107^{v}

. . . They have passed a Declaration to set forth the reasons of their Convening, and to assert the Government of the Nation to be in a free State and Commonwealth and have ordered Letters to be sent to all their Members that are qualifyed to invite them to attend the service of the house . . . .

<Like a [warren] of witches amongst the [. . .] supreme [. . .] so [. . .] is the single [person].>[106]

Army officers in Scotland to the General Council of Officers, London, 9 May 1659[107]

fo. 106^{r}

Answer of the Lord General's, Colonel Talbot's and Colonel Wilkes' regiments to the letter from his Excellency the Lord Fleetwood and the Council of the Officers at Wallingford House dated 3rd May 1659.

Right Honourable and Worthy Friends

Yours of
the 3rd instant with the inclosed papers directed to Colonel Wilkes to be communicated to the Lord General's his own and Colonel Talbot's regiments was sent unto us by the right honourable[108] the Lord General Monck with his desire to be communicated as directed, which was performed accordingly. By which together with your actions have evidenced the[109] sense of the late declining state of the good old cause and of the reviving it now seems to have in your spirits with your

[105] The longhand newsletter to which this poorly written marginal note is attached, probably from Thomas Clarges, begins with a report of the reinstatement by the army of the Rump Parliament. I have reproduced only the sentence to which it refers.

[106] Marginated.

[107] This letter is printed in *Mercurius Politicus*, 568 (19–26 May 1659), pp. 461–462, where its date is given as 10 May. It pre-dates the letter from Monck to Fleetwood which is printed in *TSP*, VII, pp. 669–670. The letter from the General Council of Officers to which it is a reply is printed in *CP*, IV, pp. 4–6.

[108] *Mercurius Politicus*, 568, p. 461, omits 'the right honourable'.

[109] *Ibid.* reads 'your' for 'the'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

declared resolutions to pursue it in which our hearts are mutually knit unto you as to those who of necessity and love to your country (as we hope) and not novelty or faction have ingaged to expose your all and the whole army to jeopardy for the recovery of that almost lost cause which had many seals of divine presence with it of old, when it was witnessed unto by much blood and the expense of much treasure, but sithence[110] near wholly involved into a particular, and not (as intended) the interest of the publike. And that you have appeared at this season when no ways[111] else was left for the securing the interest of that cause and[112] good people of these nations from utter ruin. Whereby (we trust) you have frustrated the plots of the common enemy and their accomplices.[113] How ever they are reputed as friends or have laid their designs, is esteemed a mercy. All which have wrought the like sense in us in some measure as in you and ingaged us to inquire what have been the causes the nations in all their intended settlements have met with such disappointments in their counsels and actions at home and abroad as by the loss of that presence formerly found in both has for some years past been sadly experienced. And now having taken notice of your prudent and friendly advice to lay these proceedings[114] to heart and to indeavour love and union amongst ourselfs towards you which[115] brotherly counsel we accept with thankfulness, and resolve by the assistance of God to be found unanimously practical therein, desiring that you with us will really prosecute those things you have now once more declared for. And that you go on to improve the opportunity now in your hands, that so the nations and the good interest thereof may be secured upon that foundation of Parliamentary government which you and we have avowed so often to stand for. And as an expedient for the effecting thereof we humbly advise that the Long Parliament dissolved the[116] 20th of April 1653 be readmitted to assemble and exercise their legal authority as the probable way left after all our wanderings for the establishing of truth and peace in this Commonwealth to us and our posterity, with all just rights and privileges in matters essential to our well-being as men and Christians, and that God may direct and prosper you in all your good undertakings shall be the prayers of

your loving friends[117] and fellow soldiers

[110] *Ibid.*, 'since'.
[111] *Ibid.*, 'way'.
[112] *Ibid.* inserts 'the'.
[113] *Ibid.*, 'Complices'.
[114] *Ibid.*, p. 462 reads 'providences' for 'proceedings'.
[115] *Ibid.* reads 'that with' for 'which'.
[116] *Ibid.* omits 'the'.
[117] *Ibid.* reads 'Your humble and faithful Servants and fellow Soldiers'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from G.M., [London], 12 May 1659[118]

fo. 119r

Sir George Booth, Colonel Rossiter, Mr Prynne, Members of the old parliament attempted to goe into the House butt were Turn'd back by Adjutant Generall Allen.[119] Divers of the old Protector's ministers prayed that God would return the banished.

News from G.D., The Hague, 13 May 1659[120]

fo. 121v

If I had a [charger] I could let you know that our common enemy is now might and main at work. I pray God we may enough apprehend it.

News from G.M., Westminster, 17 May 1659[121]

fo. 122v

The Councill of State was yesterday perfected – consisting of 31 – 21 whereof were of the House & ten out of itt, and amongst others my Lord Warston is nominated a Councellour. Swinton was in competition with him and some say Argyle, but the old man carried it.[122]

News from T.C., [London], 19 May 1659[123]

fo. 124r

A petition on foot by some troopers for the increase of their pay from 2*s* 6*d* a day to be presented to the Parliament, which occasioned the Parliament to sit till 12 a clock at night to debate about some way for payment of the arrears in the army.[124]

[118] Postscript to a longhand newsletter from G.M. (probably Gilbert Mabbott).
[119] See Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 43–44.
[120] Postscript to a longhand letter from G.D., probably George Downing.
[121] Postscript to a longhand letter, probably from Gilbert Mabbott.
[122] Wariston claimed that he had tried to have the marquis of Argyle elected as the member for Scotland; J.D. Ogilvie (ed.), *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston 1655–1660*, III (Scottish History Society, 3rd ser., XXXIV, 1940), p. 113.
[123] Postscript to a longhand newsletter, probably from Thomas Clarges.
[124] *CJ*, VII, pp. 658–661.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newsletter from [London], 2 June 1659

fo. [135]v

There are jealousies in the house of the high, their speaking of Sir Henry Vane, Sir Arthur Hesilrige [are] grown already to that heighth as reported that what is moved by them is looked on as an opposing and so opposed, at best suspected, in the army. The Lord Lambert's growing greatness narrowly observed by Fleetwood[125] and Disbrowe, and those jealousies heated by bringing in Sir Henry Vane's eldest son to be a cornet in the army and the [new/now] intended alliance twixt him and Lord Lambert's daughter. But whether there be any certain grounds for this last I cannot aver. The army it self is in no good posture as having seen too much of their own strenth and by too busy hands, a little over much concerning themselfs with what is [beyond] their [sphere] but they have not been of late overprudently managed in the judgement of some, which gives them [new/now] occasion to be extravagant. The reins of discipline has been so much slacked that they have got the bit between their teeth and thereby become not so easily guided. The form of civil government is as hotly and highly debated amongst them in several juntos as by whom it should properly belong to debate those things, so that what the result of these debates may be God only knows. Under the act of indemnity some of them have offered unto the House several exceptions wherein they have appeared very partial, which much impairs the spirit of their justice and at the best brings matters to this unhappy issue, that if what they offer be accepted the world will look on the Parliament as acting under a force.[126] If [in reason rejected] it may lessen the good understanding that may be betwixt them and the Parliament. For all men are apt naturally to magnify their own results and to be angry with those that joyn not issue with them therein. This city more highly malignant than ever, the Presbyterian ministers neither prudent nor discreet, nor as some say good Christians, and they may in time see it and sorrow for it, though at present not taken notice of. Colonel Lockhart is expected this night from Dunkirk.[127] 3 commissioners for Ireland are also coming. The Dutch press us to a peace, in order

[125] Parliament appointed Fleetwood commander-in-chief of the army on 7 June 1659, (*ibid.*, p. 674).

[126] After passing its first and second readings on 23 May the act of indemnity was finally passed, after many postponements and delays, on 12 July 1659; Davies, *Restoration*, pp. 112–113; *CJ*, VII, p. 714.

[127] On 27 May the Council of State had acceded to Lockhart's request of 17 May that he might return to London on condition that he did so immediately; *TSP*, VII, p. 671; *CSPD 1658–1659*, p. 359; his arrival was widely reported, for example by *Mercurius Politicus*, 570 (2–9 June 1659), pp. 487–488.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

whereunto Lord Whitelocke, Colonel Sidney and Colonel Berry are appointed plenipotentiaries to go to the Sound to meet with the Dutch ambassadour and so determine on all things there, the treaty betwixt France and Spain being equally dangerous to Holland as Portugal.[128] And who knows but that they are both agreed that the French shall not assist the Portugal against Spain, or Spain the Provinces against France, which perhaps makes the Dutch crave our alliance. But be it what it will, it's hoped we shall not reject it if it be to be had upon good terms. Yesterday the earl of [. . .] petition was read and laid aside, and perhaps he will stir no more in it.

The Common Council of London attended the House this day with an address.[129] Their (16) keep good correspondence with Sir Henry Vane and Lord Lambert, old friends, as well as Lord Fleetwood and Disbrowe. Captain Smith's business will breed some debate though he has many very good friends seriously ingaged for him. Colonel Whetham not yet returned from Portsmouth or there settled. Nothing done in Scotch business towards settlement of that nation [and/no] [we/true] wonder seeing so little is yet done towards settlement of ourselfs in England and charity begins at home. Tomorrow is the 1st day of the term, and the courts of Westminster not yet settled.

News from G.M., [London], 11 June 1659[130]

fo. 142^{v}

Colonel Talbot had been outed had it not been for my Lord General's letter to the Speaker[131] which kept in him and some other officers in Scotland, though 2 of the captains of my Lord General's regiment of horse were accused as tipplers particularly Captain Johnston, as was mentioned in my Lord Lambert's letter.[132]

[128] *Ibid.*, pp. 485–486, reports that the commissioners had not yet been appointed by 4 June, two days after this letter was written. Whitelocke excused himself, and the three who were appointed were Sidney, Honeywood, and Thomas Boone; Whitelock, *Memorials*, IV, pp. 351–352; *CJ*, VII, pp. 677, 695, 700. The treaty between France and Spain would be signed on 28 October 1659.

[129] *Mercurius Politicus*, 569 (26 May–2 June 1659), p. 485.

[130] Postscript to the newsletter, most probably from Gilbert Mabbott, printed in *CP*, IV, pp. 19–20.

[131] For Monck's letter to the Speaker see *ibid.*, pp. 16–17. It was not until 27 September 1659 that the composition of Talbot's regiment was finally approved; *CJ*, VII, p. 787.

[132] On the changes made to Monck's regiment at this time see F&D, II, pp. 539–540.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from [Neason], London, 14 June 1659[133]

fo. 144r

I received a letter written with your own hand dated the 7th of June instant subscribed by a person whom I much honour and render my humble thanks to him for his good acceptance of that mentioned in your letter. I will not take the boldness to write to him. You may if you please communicate what followeth unto him but to none else, and then dispose the letter to the fire for these times are jealous, and though a man give a plain narrative of matter of fact yet offence may be taken though none intended. Besides many of that person's letters have been opened at Theobalds at the post house there which made me at that time though upon a great and sudden change forbear to give you a brief account of affairs, but since I perceive by your letter it will be acceptable, take in good part this insuing narrative:

As soon as the Army had obtayned his last Highness' consent That noe Officer should be putt out of his Command butt by a Councill of Warre They then fell uppon matter of agitation a Parliament sitting which in few dayes after produced a Representacion from the Army to to [*sic*] *his Highnesse subscribed by many that never read itt & others that* did not know of your action in it. *Itt was communicated to the parliament & did hold forth to the World* that they were resolved to pluck out of places of trust etc. a *phrase practically knowne in the Army by pulling of Members formerly out, soe that from that time the Parliament concluded the Army will bee att the old Trade againe.*[134] *Butt to wipe the shame off themselves they pressed one night till 3 of the Clock in the Morning soe hard uppon the Protector that att last hee was constrayned to signe a Commission to dissolve the Parliament much against his minde, for that hee as well as the Nation knew they were a Parliament of as gallant Spiritts to preserve the Rights, Liberties, and properties of the people, as ever satt in Parliament yett the House of Commons, hearing the commission was come to dissolve them, & Troopes of Horse brought before both Houses which they looked uppon as a force uppon them as had bin that night before uppon the Protector and being exceedingly dissatisfied with some Grand Lords of the other House Members of the Army who procured that Commission to dissolve the Parliament they did scorne to owne their Lordshippe, though sent for, butt in a great fury adjourned till Munday following on which day the Commons came againe, butt a Company of Red-Coates* commonly called the keepers

[133] The longhand portions of this newsletter which appear in *CP*, IV, pp. 20–22, are interspersed throughout with shorthand and I have reproduced it in its entirety. From the first paragraph it appears to be addressed to an intermediary acting for Monck, possibly Clarke himself.

[134] Sir Charles Firth (*ibid.*, p. 20n) noted that 'in the Army's petition they speak of "plucking the wicked out of their places"' (quoting from *OPH*, XXI, p. 338).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the liberties of England *were placed att the Parliament doore, and would nott lett the Members goe in, and now the Word was given through the Army by the Grandees of the Army before mentioned. That they should stand to the Good Old Cause, and the Good Peticion & Advice, which had setled 1,500,000li. per annum to maintaine the Army, and to limitt a Single Person in nature of a duke of Venice. Butt these Army Grandees who had thus forced the Protector and dissolved a Gallant Parliament were Trapanned, and that deservedly by the Inferiour Officers of the Army, who kept their Councill apart att St James's, with whom the Churches did att that time Confederate, and Swayed downe the Designe of those Grandees, & cryed uppe the Setting up of a Governement in nature of an Oligarchy of 70 wise/good*

fo. 144v

good men, which was backed by Colonel Titchborne (now nott so famous as then), and from divers of the Congregated Churches; butt the Cry was great against itt, as a thinge the people of England would nott bee bound by, soe att last the Churches were wrought over (by the persuasion as it is thought of Sir Henry Vane on whom they chiefly depend) *to restore the Longe Parliament which tooke Effect, and they mett accordingly* and are labouring hard for a being in order to a wellbeing, but they have a hard game to play, taking upon them a debt by taking upon them to be a Parliament of 2,400,000*l* yet should be inforced to lay a great tax upon the 3 nations when people are already so sufficiently discontented besides the press being at liberty without comptrol. *Desperate Bookes and other thinges are writt & published* exclaiming against the Parliament and their proceedings and [possessing] the people that this nation can never be settled in a firm peace till some of the old family be restored, as Master Prynne and others have publicly owned, *who have stated another Good old Cause as hee calls itt* upon the royal account contrary to the good old cause stated by the army *and these thinges are suffered to goe abroad without Question.*[135] *Itt is nott fitt for a private pen to reprove a Parliament otherwise one might with Submission say. They suffer by such permission.* That which adds to the greatest discontent of the army is that *about 160 Officers, Colonells, Lieutenant Colonells, Majors, Captains, Lieutenants, Cornetts, Ensignes, & Quartermasters are putt out of their Commands without hearing, without charge, without Tryall* and those (7) of the army who are imployed upon that unacceptable service are under that secrecy that they must not let a man know whether he is in or out till another comes in his place and be appointed of and put in and the Parliament is kept blindfold therein, not knowing who they put out

[135] A month earlier *The Faithfull Scout* had reported that 'Mr Prin hath declared some dislike against the present Government, terming the Good Cause, to be an Instant Cause, and the Government of King, Lords and Commons, to be the Good Old Cause'; *Faithfull Scout*, 3 (6–13 May 1659), p. 241.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

so that this unexamined way of proceedings gives high and mighty discontent.[136] *The Parliament have Setled Commissioners for the management of the businesse of the Navy* but General Mountagu is not named in the act for that business, so it is supposed he is not intended to be confirmed to be a commander at sea and his regiment at land is disposed of to another who is still in the Sound. *Noe newes from Ireland butt that Commissioners are going thither to command that Nation, & a lettre is to bee sent on purpose for the Lord Harry to come over* in what posture he [is turns but] not certainly here. *Wee take itt for granted That the peace is concluded betweene Spaine & France*. My Lord Fairfax sits neither at the Parliament house nor at the Council. The letter he lately received from your friend in Scotland he communicated to some Members to observe your friend's desire therein, but I believe same course will be taken with them in Scotland as here in England when they think fit to fall upon business, for the letter to the Parliament concerning the 3 regiments therein marched did not procure an answer suitable to the request. In brief there is an evil councillor called necessity <(which of necessity)>[137] some say should be made use of at this time which lords all over all rule and order.

14 June 1659, London

[Neason][138]

News from G.M., [London], 16 June 1659[139]

fo. [144a]r

It is observable that the greatest countenancers of the petitioners against tithes and those who brought them into the House is Sir Henry Blunt who is reputed to arrest one that said that the Kingdom was only meant [to consider people in [two/zeal]].[140]

Lieutenant-General Ludlow

[136] For the seven commissioners for the nomination of officers appointed by Parliament on 12 May see below, p. 306.

[137] Interlined.

[138] Unfortunately this important signature is blurred in the original. It may in any case, in view of the cryptic tone of the letter, be a *nom de guerre*.

[139] Postscript to a longhand newsletter, probably from Gilbert Mabbott.

[140] Blunt was one of those who presented such a petition from the county of Hertfordshire on 21 June 1659; *CJ*, VII, p. 690.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

William Cary, [London], to [William Clarke], 22 June 1659

fo. [146]v

It is a great shame that his Highness should be so much abused, for openly in the streets do women cry his Highness' picture which is in this manner, an owl in a fowl's coat sitting on a horse.[141]

W.C.

William Cary

Satirical pamphlet, [28] June 1659[142]

fo. 159v

Several resolves prepared by the commanding junto to pass the House

Resolved

That the Warr with Spaine bee continued in regard it multiplies the number of beggars in the Nation, and consequently wee shall have good souldiers cheape to advance the work of reformation being it was[143] received as an orthodox tradition that broken merchants make excellent sword men.

<Resolved>[144] that since we can produce no more wise men then what is in[145] Parliament and Council of State or[146] no other militia than 4,000 horse and foot in London that all the rest of the nation be declared carnal and guilty of sequestrations.[147]

<Resolved>[148] that since the present militia are so accustomed to unhouse parliaments, we establish a country militia under pretence

[141] William Clarke's unique copy of this print showing Richard Cromwell, now in Worcester College library, was reproduced as the frontispiece to *CP*, III. See also Sheila O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England 1550–1850* (London, 1999), pp. 122, 168 and colour plate III. I am very grateful to Kate Colleran and Sheila O'Connell for discussions about the print.

[142] This is a copy of the anonymous satirical pamphlet *Several Resolves prepared by the Commanding Junto to pass the House*, provisionally dated by Thomason to 14 June 1659; Fortescue, II, p. 241. There is no copy of the printed version at Worcester College. See Hutton, *Restoration*, pp. 48, 307n.

[143] *Several Resolves. . . .*, 'is'.

[144] Marginated.

[145] *Ibid.* inserts 'the'.

[146] *Ibid.*, 'nor'.

[147] *Ibid.* omits the final 's'.

[148] Marginated.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

of suppressing the cavaliers and shuffle them out or force them upon some desperate outlandish design and so their arrears shall be paid by their ruin.

Resolved that in regard those water Christians of the fleet are a kind of giddy headed fellows and possibly for want of pay may be apt to return to the obedience of Charles Stuart, that there be forthwith an order made to pay them out of the excise and customs[149] of the Jamaica commodities and in the interim that Lawson be presently sent to divide the navy and shave[150] them off their pay with Parson Peters' old cheats.

Resolved that whereas[151] whimsy buzzes in the brains[152] of the officers it be adjudged the sense of the private soldiery though they never be consulted with in the business.

Resolved that all such officers as can pretend to be gentlemen be turned off in regard they may retain some dregs of the old English honour and liberty which is destructive to the present work.

Resolved that the army (except that in Scotland and Ireland and in the fleet at sea) for their good and faithful service to the good old cause be rewarded with the House's livery *vizt* blue coats and that that mark of the beast and abomination of the land[153] their old red coats with black buttons of the gift of the late tyrant be taken off and hung up by the Scots colours in Westminster Hall in token of victory and in the 1st year of[154] restoration of[155] liberty.

Resolved that the soldiers be new shoed at the Commonwealth's charges[156] and that my lord Hewson, that experienced artificer be intrusted with the sale of their old commodities to the end the Commonwealth may not be defrauded or deceived and that the money arising from the sale of them do go towards the satisfaction of their arrears.

fo. 160r

Resolved that if the army do not unhouse, molest or disturb us that we assume our former authority and make them our slaves to fight our battles as formerly while we injoy the fat of the land, for it is a

[149] *Ibid.*, p. 4, 'custom'.
[150] *Ibid.*, 'stave'.
[151] *Ibid.*, 'whatsoever'.
[152] Indistinguishable from 'veins' in Clarke's shorthand, but confirmed by the printed version.
[153] *Ibid.*, 'lord'.
[154] *Ibid.* inserts 'the'.
[155] *Ibid.* inserts 'our'.
[156] *Ibid.*, 'charge'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

great grief of heart to us and a quenching of the spirit to be awed as servants that formerly ruled as princes.

Resolved that if the city will once more give down their milk for the promoting of the good old cause (which in the heat of their zeal they so[157] extolled, set up, preached, prayed and fought for, though to their great loss and repentance) that Master Peters (after [our/his][158] long and illegal divorce made betwixt them and us by the late tyrant Oliver) do again marry and unite us the Parliament of England and the city, that the wedding be kept in[159] Guildhall, that a banquet be provided at the Commonwealth's charge and that all committee men, sequestrators and excise men, informers, and our[160] self-seeking saints of the race of Judas (our good and faithful servants) be there and assisting[161] us in the carrying on of that great work.

Resolved that there be a restraint upon presbytery as well as popery and prelacy because it some what resembles Christianity.

Resolved that there be a collection of the several addresses to the late tyrant and his son and placed amongst Tredeskin's monsters[162] to perpetuate the infamy of all the powers both ecclesiastick and civil and military[163] that have governed England these[164] 5 years.

Resolved that Master William Prynne (provided he will forbear to set his and our sins before us) be restored to his seat[165] in the House and[166] to his recordership of the city of Bath.

Resolved that Henry Cromwell, Lord Lieutenant[167] of Ireland and son of the late tyrant, do continue his absolute power and command until the House can take it from him and dispose of it other ways.[168]

Resolved that the late Lord Protector's[169] relations or kindred that did any ways[170] act against his interest in the promotion of the good old cause be rewarded and to that purpose Sir[171] Whimsy Mildmay

[157] *Ibid.*, p. 5 inserts 'highly'.
[158] Replaced in *ibid.* by 'this'.
[159] *Ibid.* inserts 'the'.
[160] *Ibid.* reads 'other' for 'our'.
[161] *Ibid.*, 'assist'.
[162] A reference to John Tradescant (1608–1662), traveller, collector, and gardener, for whom see *OxDNB*.
[163] *Several Resolves. . . .*, p. 6, 'ecclesiastical, civil and military'.
[164] *Ibid.*, 'this'.
[165] *Ibid.* reads 'do sit' for 'be restored to his seat'.
[166] *Ibid.* inserts 'return'.
[167] *Ibid.* reads 'Lord Deputy' for 'Lord Lieutenant'.
[168] *Ibid.* reads 'otherwise' for 'other ways'.
[169] *Ibid.* omits 'Lord'.
[170] *Ibid.*, 'way'.
[171] *Ibid.* reads 'Mr' for 'Sir'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the bauble keeper is to consult with the remains of Archee for such a distinguishable habit as may be suitable to their merit.

Resolved that when the city marshall and the sheriffs' beagles go a whore-hunting they pass over the seraglio[172] of Henry Marten and Master Scot, our fellow members, as two qualified nunneries to cool the concupiscence of the saints.

fo. 160^{v}

Resolved that the 5,000*l* which the city appointed for feasting his late highness and new house of peers be distributed in Bedlam and Bridewell as most[173] indigent fools and knaves.

Resolved that money[174] addresses be voted neither fast or loose.

Resolved that if their Catholike and Christian majesties shall[175] after this general peace enterprise a croysada and begin with England as the most[176] adjacent infidels that Master Manton (the Presbyterian) who is so large a benefactor of the devils be appointed to excommunicate them as malignants and enemies to tender consciences.

Resolved that the tyrant's design in helping the Swede our fellow labourer in all[177] villainous oppression be still supported with the expence of English blood and treasure.

Resolved that there be no support or[178] supplies sent to the poor English soldiers at Jamaica that are rotting there until they send a considerable parcel of pineapples, *Tartufolij*,[179] eringoes,[180] to fortify the decayed concupiscence of the decayed lecheries.[181]

Resolved that the House[182] take it into their consideration whether our present government may not be thought like that of the Romans under Nero and Heliogabulus when Henry[183] Neville sometime an eminent bardash[184] in Italy is now so great a favourite to[185] the state.

[172] *Ibid.*, 'seraglios'.
[173] *Ibid.* substitutes 'at more' for 'as most'.
[174] *Ibid.* reads 'Monck's addresses'.
[175] *Ibid.*, p. 7 places 'shall' after 'general peace'.
[176] *Ibid.* inserts 'near'.
[177] *Ibid.* omits 'all'.
[178] *Ibid.* reads 'sort of' for 'support or'.
[179] From the Italian 'tartuffo', truffle, implying concealment or hypocrisy (*OED*). *Several Resolves* . . . , p. 7 reads 'Gartuffoli and'.
[180] Eryngo, the candied root of the sea-holly, once used as a sweetmeat and regarded as an aphrodisiac (*OED*).
[181] *Ibid.*, 'of the famous state lechers'.
[182] *Ibid.* adds 'do'.
[183] *Ibid.* reads 'Harry Neville'.
[184] *Ibid.*, 'Burdash'.
[185] *Ibid.* reads 'of' for 'to'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Resolved that these resolves[186] be forthwith printed that the nation may see the glorious result of all their blood and treasure that has been spent since they betrayed their liberties to their slaves.

Advertisement to the soldiery:

Take notice that there is no way left in this hard[187] dispensation of tyranny to the whole nation of England to represent their grievances both[188] with the hazard of their lives to throw them about in a clandestine way and the tyrants fearing that these discoveries[189] in the end may cause[190] the generous thoughts of forlorn English souls amongst you (having[191] imitation of Mehomet who forbade all sort of learning lest the wickedness of his law should be found out) made an act that you should[192] not pry into those papers that display the groans of their afflicted country and intend to continue you still the instruments of their lusts which how glorious it is to have the infamous titles of executioners and hangmen of your fellow brethren I leave to the [worst][193] of you all to judge.

[News] from [London], [28 June] 1659

fo. 161r

Alterations *in Col: Saunder's Regt*[194]

Captain Hope is out and Captain Izod has his troop.[195]
Captain Wright out and Captain Pretty to have his troop.
Captain Dendy out and Cornet Hacker to be captain-lieutenant.
Lieutenant Franks, lieutenant to Captain Hope, is out and one Captain [Digby/Diggory Barton] is for his place.
Lieutenant Brightman is out [to] Captain Coulson and one Captain Hodgson to have his place.
Cornet Davis, Captain Hope's cornet and Cornet Morton, Quartermaster Pinegar and Quartermaster [Paul] are out, but of

[186] *Ibid.* reads 'Acts' for 'resolves'.
[187] *Ibid.*, p. 8 reads 'sad' for 'hard'.
[188] *Ibid.* reads 'but' for 'both'.
[189] *Ibid.* reads 'discoverers' for 'discoveries'.
[190] *Ibid.*, 'rouze up' for 'cause'.
[191] *Ibid.* reads 'have in'.
[192] *Ibid.* reads 'shall' for 'should'.
[193] *Ibid.* 'meanest'.
[194] The changes in this regiment are summarized in F&D, I, p. 288.
[195] The committee for the nomination of officers had appointed Hope but he may have resigned his commission to be replaced by Thomas Izod; *ibid.*, p. 288.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

these there is Captain Hope, Lieutenant Brightman, Cornet [Davis] and Cornet Morton and Quartermaster [Paul] are provided for in other regiments, the rest totally out. Barton is moved for to be major.[196]

Newsletter from [London], [29 June] 1659

fo. 161r

The Committee for Nomination of Officers

[acknowledging] the 7 wise men

Lord Fleetwood	*Sir Arthur Heslerigge*
Lord Lambert	*Sir Henry Vane*
Major General Disbrow	*Colonel Algernoun Sydney*
Colonel James Berry	

News from G.M., [London], 7 July 1659[197]

fo. [166]r

Colonel Smyth late Governor of Hull to have Colonel Fitches Regiment.

Colonel Daniel the 6th instant out of his regiment. Lieutenant-Colonel Pearson to have the regiment and Major Holmes said to be his lieutenant-colonel.[198]

The plenipotentiaries are gone for the Sound. The Lord Lockhart made extraordinary Ambassadour to goe to Bayonne.

The Citty Militia setled.

A new design about a single person.[199]

[196] This was Nathaniel Barton; *CJ*, VII, p. 723.

[197] Postscript to a newsletter, probably from Gilbert Mabbott.

[198] In fact Holmes was appointed to Sawrey's regiment, while it was Clement Keane who became lieutenant-colonel of Pearson's regiment; F&D, II, pp. 479, 494.

[199] For a similar report, see below, p. 309. Around this time one of Hyde's informants reported, 'The Army is divided, some for the Parliament, and some for themselves and a single person, they say for Lambert'; *CClarSP*, IV, p. 286. In April the soldiers' demands had included 'A Comanwealth and noe single person'; *CP*, III, p. 213.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

News from G.M., [London], 14 July 1659[200]

fo. 170r

The act for the militia of London yesterday passed.[201] All is stable yet great jealousies amongst great persons.[202] A few days will shew the end. Their great militia is raising which gives some cause of fear to the army and great burthen and discontent to the country.[203] Our affairs in Denmark stands pretty well. English and Swedes lie before Copenhagen, the Hollanders in the Belt.

A. Johnston [of Wariston], [London], to George Monck, 14 July 1659[204]

fo. 170r

My Lord

There is such throng of business that with very great difficulty I got your letters read and answered by the Council, the intelligences cometh so thick of the designs of the malignants to rise in many places at once upon expectation or assurance of Charles Stuart and what he can do to be with them.[205] The Council are very diligent to use all means of prevention. We are are [*sic*] sending Major-General Disbrowe to the west. The Forest of Dean, Coventry and Chester[206] are places designed by the adversaries. The Council have taken[207] the roll of all those who have given bond to the Lieutenant of the Tower[208]

[200] Postscript to a newsletter, probably from Gilbert Mabbott.

[201] *CJ*, VII, p. 716.

[202] 'Our present affayres are very odd, the grandees and commonwealthsmen striving for superiority', wrote an unknown correspondent in an intercepted letter of 22 July 1659; *TSP*, VII, p. 704.

[203] *CSPD 1659–1660*, pp. 15–16, 24.

[204] Much of this letter is printed (from another copy, now apparently lost) in *L-P*, p. 118. Variations have been noted as footnotes. Its tone is markedly different from another written by Johnston to Monck on the same date by order of the Council of State; Worc. MS LI, fo. 78r.

[205] See also the intercepted letter of 22 July 1659 in *TSP*, VII, p. 704. On 14 July 1659 the Council of State instructed Johnston and Col James Berry to prepare a letter to Monck ordering him to secure the paroles of 'dangerous persons', i.e. royalists who had been bound over to keep the peace; Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 179, p. 177r; *CSPD 1659–1660*, p. 27. For more evidence of Johnston's concerns about such rumours at this time, see Wariston, *Diary*, III, pp. 124–125.

[206] *L-P*, p. 118 reads 'Chichester'.

[207] *Ibid.* reads 'will take'.

[208] Col Thomas Fitch, appointed Lieutenant of the Tower on 10 June 1659; *CP*, IV, p. 19.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and demand personal assurance of them. They desire that you do the like in Scotland and Lieutenant-General Ludlow in Ireland.[209] All excepted persons are to go out of London either tomorrow or be under hazard of execution. The business anent[210] sending commissioners in Scotland will be taken into consideration with the act of union and grace.[211] They have laid on me this night to despatch a packet to the Lord Lockhart and so I must cut short but shall rest

your Lordship's humble servant

A. Johnston

14 July

Your Lordship will do well to look to MacNaughton and some other highlanders who are speaking strange language as some writes.[212]

News from [London], [15] July 1659

fo. [171]r

Persons like to be put out of *Colonel Michells late Regiment now Major Generall Overtons.*[213]

Newsletter from [London], 19 July 1659

fo. [171]v

Yesterday Lieutenant Generall Ludlow went for Ireland. It's whispered that the Parliament will adjourn the next week. *The king of Spaine hath drawne out his Army butt Dunkirke is in noe Danger.*

[209] See *CSPD 1659–1660*, p. 27. After this sentence *L-P*, p. 118 inserts, 'Mr Reynolds did give me the enclosed ticket to be sent to you'.

[210] 'Anent', Scots, meaning 'concerning, about'; M. Robinson (ed.), *Concise Scots Dictionary*, (Aberdeen, 1985). See Sir Charles Firth's comment, *CP*, III, p. 189n.

[211] Johnston records that he 'spak freely' to Fleetwood about sending commissioners to Scotland two days after writing this letter; Wariston, *Diary*, III, p. 125. The next sentence is omitted in *L-P*, p. 118. Bulstrode Whitelocke was very much involved in measures to resuscitate the act for union with Scotland; Whitelock, *Memorials*, IV, pp. 349, 355, 362.

[212] *L-P*, p. 118, reads 'write'.

[213] There follows in longhand a list of the affected officers. When changes were made to Overton's regiment on 27 July, the name of only one of these, Lt Laverock, appears as having been retained in the regiment. Mitchell himself took over Thomas Fitch's regiment in Scotland; *CSPD 1659–1660*, pp. 31, 45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press

There has been a great debate in the Parliament about a Member of Parliament <Major Harley>[214] who gave out that the Lord Fleetwood should send for the late Protector to come to London and that he would set him up again into his place and dissolve the Parliament, and the Lord Fleetwood being examined about it said that he had sent to one of the brothers, but not about any such business.[215] Yet it's said that [Disbrowe] said openly that they would set up the Protector again so that there is great divisions about the business.

Memorandum, [Dalkeith], 5 August 1659

fo. 178r

This day there came an express from Captain John Mason from Carlisle informing that there was a rising in Lancashire and that there were 500 marched with colours who, being met by our scouts and asked who they were for, fired at them.[216]

News from [London], 29 September 1659

fo. 225v

Sir Arthur Hesilrige and the Lord Lambert reconciled.[217]

The Lord Howard committed close prisoner to the Tower.[218]

Charles Stuart to be assisted both by France and Spain to marry Cardinal Mazarin his niece and in case he recover his kingdom to declare himself Catholike, to see the king of France *incognito* before he goes to Brussels.[219]

[214] Marginated.

[215] Word of this incident was sent to Monck three days later by another correspondent; *CP*, IV, pp. 24–25.

[216] Capt. Mason was deputy governor of Carlisle, and is not to be confused with the colonel of the same name. He appears to have been responsible for establishing post stages in the area; *CSPD 1659–1660*, p. 94. The express and its enclosures are to be found in *CP*, IV, p. 31 (where its sender is tentatively identified as John Mayer), and pp. 32–33 (Col West to [Col Birch]).

[217] On the deteriorating relations between Hesilrige and Lambert, see *CClarSP*, IV, p. 294; Davies, *Restoration*, pp. 146, 148. See also Hutton, *Restoration*, p. 65.

[218] On 21 September 1659 Col Charles Howard was ordered to be sent to the Tower for high treason; *CSPD 1659–1660*, pp. 217–218.

[219] Earlier in the month the Venetian resident in London had reported to the Doge and Senate that 'The government has been disturbed and alarmed by a report . . . of negotiations for a marriage between the king of Scotland and a niece of Cardinal Mazarini and that French and Spanish forces will assist his Majesty to return to his country. This is much discussed at Whitehall'; *CSPV 1659–1661*, p. 71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096011630500076X Published online by Cambridge University Press