

some of Darwin's ideas.

Another more recent theory was the renewed belief in catastrophism. As the name suggests, this theory asserted that life forms stay the same until huge catastrophes kill off the dominant life forms, clearing the way for new organisms. Much evidence has become known that demonstrates how just such a catastrophe occurred sixty-five million years ago when a comet struck the Earth, massively changing the environment and killing off the dinosaurs.

A third challenge came from geneticists. As more was learned about genetic mechanisms, geneticists have discovered a lot of "junk" in DNA strands: long chains of amino acids that served no apparent function. Also, genes are unpredictable, disappearing from one generation and reappearing much later.¹⁵ Thus, one possible explanation for trait continuity could be some process of natural selection at a molecular level. However, more evidence pointed to the theory proposed by Japanese biologist Dr. Motoo Kimura that genes do not experience a "selection" process, but instead mutate in a neutral manner. Some mutations are beneficial, others are harmful, but most are neither. Strict Darwinians believed that no change is "silent."¹⁷ The "junk" in a DNA strand must be either helpful or harmful.¹⁶ None of these ideas completely rejected Darwinian evolution. Instead, all of them attempted to modify the mechanisms described by Charles Darwin.

Darwin achieved a balance of genius and humility. He was not dogmatic or too rigid in his theories. He admitted their weaknesses, but backed up his assertions with as much information that he had at his disposal. Most importantly, he looked outside his particular area of expertise. In a stroke of intuitive genius, he invented a new intellectual framework. The most important and far reaching idea that can be gleaned from Darwin's work is that no area of thought operates in a vacuum separate from its sister disciplines. Physicists, biologists, anthropologists, and philosophers all have shaped the acceptance of Darwin's theories, and continue to do so today. No field of thought or study is so comprehensive that it can find all of its answers in itself. Scientists, philosophers, historians, and lay persons not involved in these intellectual professions must look outside their own experiences and disciplines to fully understand the world. This was Darwin's truest and most lasting legacy.

Jeff Waldhoff is a senior history major and a member of the Historia staff. Mr. Waldhoff's interest in scientific history can be traced to his physics minor. However, his other areas of study include political science, economics, and secondary education. Last spring, he was inducted into the Phi Alpha Theta history honors organization.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*



Protector or Monarch: Images of Kingship 1656-1657

BY SETH D. RODGERS

On 30 January, 1649, a decade of civil conflict ended in England with the execution of Charles I.¹ The war, according to the victors, was fought to end the tyrannical power of kings and to establish "a commonwealth and free state."² Yet eight years later, the Parliamentarian government founded by anti-monarchical forces offered the crown to the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell.³ Despite the efforts of Parliament and the Army, the idea of Kingship had not been eliminated by the years of fighting. While there were practical reasons for offering the crown to Cromwell, there was also a cultural underpinning to the offer. The English people had an attachment to the crown that the revolution could not eradicate, an attachment that exhibited itself in the writings and attitudes of the time. While the Commonwealth and Protectorate had abolished the monarchy in name, a positive image of Kingship still existed in post-revolution England. This paper will argue the idea of Kingship was inseparable from the idea of government in England during the 1650s.

The King, in seventeenth-century England, represented more than just the head of state.⁴ Englishmen thought that the Monarchy "taught fundamental truths about human behavior and human value," and was the "center of the English structure of power—the center of politics, of culture, of law, and of religion."⁵ The English saw the monarchy as vital to the social and political cultures of the 1600s and early 1700s. A mere fifty years after the Protectorate, Queen Anne would unify the nation through the "revival and exploitation of royal ritual and symbol."⁶ Respect and reverence for Kingship had become so ingrained in English society that not even a republic could eradicate its existence.

It is important to understand how entrenched these images of kingship had become in the thought of virtually every English person. The Parliamentarians had come to power by opposing the rule of Charles I, though, even in the 1640s, they claimed they had fought the revolution to protect

¹ Derek Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 287.

² *Ibid.*, 292.

³ *Mercurius Politicus*, 26 March to 2 April 1657.

⁴ Cynthia Herrup, "Beyond Personality and Pomp: Recent Works on Early Modern Monarchies," *Journal of British Studies* Vol. 28 (April 1989): 175.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ E. O. Buehler, "Nothing but Ceremony": Queen Anne and the Limitations of Royal Ritual," *Journal of British Studies* Vol. 30 (July 1991): 288.

"king and Parliament."⁷ After the trial and execution of Charles I, any attempt to make such claim would have been met with ridicule. England now had only the House of Commons to run the government, and this body distanced itself from the monarchy. The Commons passed "an act prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be king of England or Ireland, or the dominions thereof."⁸ In 1656, it passed an act that was specifically for "renouncing and disannulling the pretended Title of Charles Stuart [Charles II]," an action that, in view of later actions taken by the Parliament, was not as redundant as it first appears.⁹ The men who passed laws against Kings and dissolved the House of Lords were the same men who felt a return to the monarchy, on their terms, was in the best interest of the nation. The possibility of a Cromwellian monarchy did not sit well with the opponents of the Protectorate.

After the overthrow of the Stuarts, the main opposition to the Commonwealth came from the Royalists. There had been an informal Royalist underground in England beginning with the death of Charles I.¹⁰ In March of 1655, Royalists organized and rebelled throughout the nation.¹¹ Riding under the royal colors, Cromwellian forces routed the rebels throughout the nation.¹² Assistance that could have saved the Royalists forces never came.¹³ The plan for a county-wide rebellion had failed. But the rebellion did not fail because of anti-royalist sentiment; rather, lack of planning and inferior numbers of troops were more costly. The Southwest would return "suspected persons" to Parliament in the 1656 elections, demonstrating royalist support in this area.¹⁴ The rebellion failed because the Royalists tried to overthrow Cromwell without allies and without mobilizing the whole of the Royalist body.¹⁵

The reaction of Cromwell and his government to the March uprising suggested that the new rulers thought resistance to the Protectorate went deeper than a body of men desiring a return to Stuart rule. Following the rebellion, England was divided into eleven districts, each to be governed by a Major General.¹⁶ This experiment in military rule seemed an extreme reaction since the Royalist defeat was an overwhelming one. Yet enough Royalists remained in England that the Protectorate could pay for the new arraignment by only taxing that base of old Stuart support.¹⁷ Thus, a sizeable portion of the English population remained wedded to the monarchy.

⁷Hirst, 222.

⁸*Mercurius Politicus*, 24 November to 3 December 1658.

⁹*Mercurius Politicus*, 27 November to 4 December 1658.

¹⁰David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England: 1649-1660* (New Haven: Yale

University Press, 1969), 18.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 127.

¹²*Ibid.*, 152.

¹³*Ibid.*, 153.

¹⁴Underdown, *Revol.*, 235.

¹⁵Underdown, *Royalist*, 165.

¹⁶Christopher Hill, *God's Englishmen* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 175.

¹⁷Underdown, *Royalist*, 159.

Some of the publications of the time reflected this attachment. In 1656 a reprint of a work by Thomas Wilson showed favor to kingship. *The Rule of Reason Containing the Arte of Logique* was "Imprinted at London by Richard Grafton, Printer to the Kynge."¹⁸ The opening page of the book hailed the king as the "most excellent Prince and sovereigne Lord."¹⁹ These words subverted the anti-monarchical stance of the nation. While the work was from the Pre-Stuart era, the reprinting, accompanied by the publishing information, suggested that a royalist market existed in England during the Protectorate.

But not only the Royalists concerned themselves with the idea of kingship; many religious books published during the kingship crisis of 1656-7 take a very different view of kingship than one would expect from publishers under a regicide republic. In *A New Positil Conteynyng Sermons Upon All the Sunday Gospettes*, a collection of sermons of English pastors, the image of kings was extremely positive. The sermons emphasized that secular kings should be "righteous."²⁰ Kings, good kings at least, were compared to Christ.²¹ John Jewel's *A Replis Unto M. Hardinges Answeres*, a commentary on a Catholic text, frequently invoked the name of Augustus Caesar. Jewel commented that kings had the "special privilege" of whatever council they choose, not just the council provided by law.²² The council he seemed to refer to was Parliament—the body responsible for removing a king who sought council that they did not approve. The positive portrayal of monarchy during a regicide republic reflected a societal connection to kingship that existed in the people of England.

Newspapers give us a limited, but important, public view of kingship. In 1656-7 only two newspapers existed: *Mercurius Politicus* and *Publick Intelligence*.²³ Both government publications, their contents were almost identical. Both appeared weekly and relied on reports mailed from the localities and foreign nations. The title page of the *Mercurius Politicus* announced that it reported the news of the "three nations," not three kingdoms.²⁴ This statement blazoned the front page though bills to unite England, Scotland and Ireland in a commonwealth were not introduced until 1656, seven years after the revolution to abolish the three kingdoms.²⁵ The first mention of Oliver Cromwell being the "Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, Ireland, &c." in the *Mercurius*

¹⁸Thomas Wilson, *The Rule of Reason Conteynyng the Arte of Logique* (London: 1655), title page.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 1.

²⁰J. Bacon, *A New Positil Conteynyng Sermons Upon All the Sunday Gospettes* (1656), folio 3.

²¹Bacon, folio 2.

²²John Jewel, *A Replis Unto M. Hardinges Answeres: by Perusinge Whereof the Discrete and Diligent Reader May Easily See, the Weakes, and Unstablie Groundes of the Romaine Religion, Whiche of Late Hath Beene Accompted Catholique* (London: 1656), 294.

²³Hirst, 340.

²⁴*Mercurius Politicus*, 29 October to 6 November 1656.

²⁵*Mercurius Politicus*, 13 November to 20 November 1656.

Politicus came not until January of 1657.²⁶ Instead, since at least 1653, the papers referred to Cromwell as "his highness."²⁷ Occasionally they expanded the title, after the declaration of the Protectorate, to "his Highness, the Lord Protector," but more commonly they omitted the "Lord Protector."²⁸ Only after the refusal of kingship did the paper refer to Cromwell consistently as "His highness the Lord Protector."²⁹

The *Mercurius Politicus* also showed varying attitudes about Charles I and Charles II. A report from Flanders calls Charles II "the Scottish King," ignoring the union between Scotland and England.³⁰ But advertisements showed differing attitudes about Charles I. One, an advertisement for the printed reports of the Court of Exchequer, calls Charles I "the late Prince Charles," denying the existence of his kingship, while another titled him the "late King Charles."³¹ These advertisements in a government-run publication showed the difficulty in exhibiting a consistent government stance toward the Stuarts. If Charles II was the exiled king of Scotland, then this cast doubts upon the legitimacy of the union of England and Scotland, and by extension the legitimacy of the Protectorate itself. And if the government could not decide on how to refer to Charles I, then how could the populace reach a conclusion about the nature of the deposed line? The government in this situation failed to provide a consistent image of the ousted line, and continued the image of the King of England that it had tried to eliminate.

The advertisements in the newspaper also revealed a still deep-seated belief in the notion of social, and by implication political, hierarchy. The acceptance of the theory of divine right dominated the structure of the monarchy.³² This hierarchal belief assumed that authority flowed from God to King, and then down through the social classes in a great chain of being. This idea was exhibited in the paper through notices of runaway servants and apprentices. Newspapers grouped these notices regarding servants with advertisements about runaway livestock. The lower classes ranked next to animals.³³ Professional services, gentlemen's announcements, and bookseller adverts, were placed together, coupling the high classes with business and knowledge.³⁴ The language in the advertisements pertaining to runaways also drew the lines in the class system. John Towers was said to have, while "distracted, went from his keeper," George Wood.³⁵ The use of "keeper" places Mr. Towers on a level less than Mr.

²⁶*Mercurius Politicus*, 22 January to 29 January 1657.

²⁷*Mercurius Politicus*, 24 November to 2 December 1653.

²⁸*Mercurius Politicus*, 20 November to 27 November 1656.

²⁹*Mercurius Politicus*, 7 May to 14 May 1657.

³⁰*Mercurius Politicus*, 18 April to 23 April 1657.

³¹*Mercurius Politicus*, 6 February to 12 February 1657; 24 April to 1 May 1655.

³²Hirst, 86.

³³*Mercurius Politicus*, 2 April to 9 April 1657.

³⁴*Mercurius Politicus*, 19 February to 26 February 1657.

³⁵*Mercurius Politicus*, 29 October to 6 November 1656.

Wood, reducing him to the lost horses surrounding his name. Social order in Interregnum England remained based on a great chain of being at the head of which was the monarch, second only to God.

During 1656-7, the Protectorate would enter a crisis concerning kingship, a crisis that almost resulted in the crowning of Oliver Cromwell. The background to the crisis is worth retelling. In January 1656, government agents uncovered a plot to assassinate Cromwell. Miles Sindercombe, under the direction of the exiled Leveller Edward Sexby, was to make the attempt on the Protector's life.³⁶ The Levellers, who had argued for a Republic before the execution of the King, had entered a quasi-alliance with the Royalists.³⁷ The diametrically opposed groups felt that Cromwell was on the verge of taking the crown for himself.³⁸ Sexby wrote, "We wish we had rather endured thee (O Charles) than have been condemned to this mean tyrant."³⁹

But the real difficulty for the Protectorate surrounding the assassination attempt came during the trial of Sindercombe. The judgement of the court, as reported by the *Mercurius Politicus* was

that by the Common Law to compass or imagine the death of the Chief Magistrate of the land, by what name soever he was called, whether Lord Protector or otherwise, is high-treason...and that the statutes of treason made 25 Ed 3 as to this, did onely declare what the Common Law was before the making of that statute, and was not introductive of a new law.⁴⁰

The same people who executed the king in the name of the law admitted that their actions were also treasonous. At the time of his execution, Charles I was "the Chief Magistrate of the land." By referring to royal laws, they raised the question by whose authority did Parliament try the king in 1649. If the laws of past Kings provide the basis for the Protectorate's survival, then the anti-monarchical nature of the government was compromised. Thus, appeals to the Ancient Constitution did nothing to assure the position of the Commonwealth.

What happened was that the courts and Parliament selectively manipulated the Ancient Constitution. The Ancient Constitution, an unwritten body of laws and legal decisions that provided the basis for English Common Law, established the principle of a three headed government: Commons, Lords, and King.⁴¹ In 1657 two-thirds of the Constitutional govern-

³⁶Underdown, *Royalists*, 192.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 192.

³⁸Edward Sexby, "Killing Noe Murder," in *Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England*, ed. David Wootton (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1986), 388.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 386.

⁴⁰*Mercurius Politicus*, 5 February to 12 February 1657.

⁴¹Philip Hunton, "A Treatise of Monarchy, Containing Two Parts: I. Concerning Monarchy in General. II. Concerning This Particular Monarchy. Wherein All the Maines Questions Occurrent in Both, are Stated, Disputed, and Determined. . . . Done by an Earnest Desirer of His Countries Peace," in *Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England*, ed. David Wootton (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1986), 201.

ment did not exist. The Commons had executed the King and dismissed the Lords. Parliament, despite working outside of the Constitution, found it necessary to refer back to it to justify their actions. Historian Charles Firth writes that the desire to return to the monarchy was indicative of the want of "the re-establishment of constitutional government, and therefore of the only form of constitutional government with which they were familiar."⁴² Parliament tried to maintain an anti-monarchical stance while creating a new monarchy.⁴³

Pressures existed from outside as well that pushed the Parliament to offer Cromwell the crown. A pamphlet titled "A Copy of a Letter written to an Officer of the Army by a True Commonwealth's Man and no Courtier, concerning the Right and Settlement of our present Government and Governmenters," argued that historical precedent and the need to abolish "factions, insurrections, and confusion," necessitated a return to royal rule.⁴⁴ The discussion of the issue began seriously in September of 1655.⁴⁵ Opposition came from officers in the army, but the rest of Parliament supported the motion.⁴⁶ With this alignment never shifting, the Parliament drafted *The Petition and Advice* that contained the offer of the crown.

Oliver had, in fact, taken on the role of the king in action if not name. On 3 March 1657, the paper reported that Cromwell conferred a knighthood on Alderman Dickenson of York, a very kingly duty.⁴⁷ He had also created a second house of Parliament with a "new aristocracy."⁴⁸ Cromwell had already assumed such duties as calling and dismissing Parliament and consenting to bills—functions performed in the past by kings. The speaker of the House of Commons had, in a speech on the failed assassination, compared Cromwell to "the best of Kings, David."⁴⁹ With the royal air that surrounded the court of Cromwell, the offer of Kingship on 31 March should not have come as a surprise. The speaker of the House of Commons

took occasion for several reasons, to commend the title and office of a king, in this nation; As that a king first settled Christianity in this island; that it had long received and approved by our ancestors, who by experience found it to be consisting with their liberties; that it was a title best know to our laws, most agreeable to the Constitution, and to the temper of the people.⁵⁰

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Charles Firth, "Cromwell and the Crown," *The English Historical Review* LXVII (July 1902): 430.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 431.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 432.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 435.

⁴⁷ *Mercurius Politicus*, 5 March to 12 March 1657.

⁴⁸ Wilbur Cortez Abbott, ed., *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, Vol IV *The Protectorate: 1655-1658* (Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1947; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 376.

⁴⁹ *Mercurius Politicus*, 22 January to 29 January 1655.

⁵⁰ *Mercurius Politicus*, 26 March to 2 April 1667.

This offer became yet another in a long line of attempts since 1653 to make Cromwell the king of England.⁵¹ Cromwell had consistently rejected past offers, but met the 1657 offer with some thought.⁵² In response to that offer, *Mercurius Politicus* reported "that before he [Cromwell] give a resolution, his intent was first to seek God, who had been his guide hitherto, to have an answer put into his heart."⁵³

The arguments used for offering the crown to Cromwell are interesting because of their appeal to the more traditional duties of a king. The image of the king as the head of the Church of England was one of these traditional duties. Since the English Reformation, the king had been the head of the Anglican Church, but Cromwell believed in toleration for all Protestant sects.⁵⁴ To compare Cromwell to a head of the Church was to go against his tolerationist principles.⁵⁵ When the Parliament tried to institute a Presbyterian system on the churches of England, Cromwell reacted by dissolving Parliament.⁵⁶ While there was support in England for a state church, Cromwell could not back it because of his religious beliefs.⁵⁷ The government, thought Cromwell, should not "impose what religions they will on the consciences of men."⁵⁸

The Speaker's reference to the relation between king and Constitution admitted the failure of the new government to adapt to the law of the land. And by saying that a king was more compatible with "the temper of the people," he acknowledged an underlying attachment of the people to the Crown. The Protectorate government was forced to accept the failure of their experiment in a kingless England. Wilbur Abbott writes, "all their [England's] history, all their traditions,...all their political and legal concepts were bound up with kingship...it was an inconvenience not to have a monarchy."⁵⁹

But what of Cromwell's thoughts on the crown? In a speech to Parliament on January 23, 1657, Cromwell says that "God hath bestowed upon you, (and you are in possession of it,) three nations," a statement in the greatest tradition of patriarchal divine right.⁶⁰ Cromwell continued,

We shall know, you and I, as the father of this family, how to dispose our mercies to God's glory, how to disposa our severity, how to distinguish betwixt obedient and rebellious children.⁶¹

England's Protector, not the King, was now the father of the nation. Sexby echoed this sentiment when he wrote with intended irony that Cromwell

⁵¹ Hill, 179.

⁵² *Mercurius Politicus*, 26 March to 2 April 1657.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Underdown, *Repeal*, 239.

⁵⁵ Hill, 77.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 185.

⁵⁷ Abbott, 375.

⁵⁸ *Qtd. in Hill*, 186.

⁵⁹ Abbott, 376.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 339.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 390.

was now "the true father of [our] country."⁶² Divine right rested on the analogous relation of God-King-Father to Church-Country-Children. Cromwell in this speech invokes the argument used to justify the rule of kings.

When Parliament formally offered the crown to Cromwell, he said he needed "time to deliberate and consider what particular answer [he] may return," not the answer expected of a regicide.⁶³ On 3 April, in a meeting with members of Commons, he apparently refused the crown, saying, "I have not been able to find it in my duty to God and you to undertake this charge under that title."⁶⁴ But in the same statement, Cromwell said that, "if Parliament be so resolved [to necessitate my answer to be categorical] it will not be fit for me to use any inducements by you to alter their resolutions."⁶⁵ On one hand, Cromwell had rejected the offer of kingship, but on the other, he made it known that if it were the desire of Parliament to crown him, he would consent.

Parliament voted 77 to 65 to "adhere to the *Petition and Advice*."⁶⁶ The Crown was still available for Cromwell's taking. On April 11th, in a meeting on the issue of the offer, Sir Charles Wolsey argued that "this nation hath ever been a lover of Monarchy, and of Monarchy under the title of King."⁶⁷ Two days later, Cromwell stated that, "Kingship be not a title, but a name of office that runs through the law."⁶⁸ He continued, saying that he would "rather have any name from this Parliament, than any name without it," implying that the crown would be accepted.⁶⁹

Still, Cromwell refused the crown on 8 May.⁷⁰ The final resolution to the crisis came on 19 May when Parliament decided to resubmit *The Petition and Advice* with the title of King changed to Lord Protector.⁷¹ On 25 May, Oliver Cromwell consented to *The Petition*, with the change from King to Protector as the only alteration.⁷² Cromwell had consented to a bill that made him king, not in name but in practice.⁷³

There are limits to the image of kingship during the Protectorate, primarily Cromwell's refusal of the Crown. There were, however, enough royal trappings around the Protector to warrant comparison. During the kingship crisis, to Cromwell himself the problem was "a mere difference of names."⁷⁴ Either Cromwell believed his role was already a regal one or he

⁶²Seaby, 361.

⁶³Abbott, 443.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, 446.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 447.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 460.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*, 468.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, 468.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 510.

⁷¹*Mercurius Politicus*, 14 May to 21 May 1657.

⁷²*Mercurius Politicus*, 21 May to 28 May 1657.

⁷³Sir Richard Tangye, *The Two Protectors: Oliver and Richard Cromwell* (1899; reprint, Part Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1971), 200.

⁷⁴Abbott, 463.

did not understand the comparison he was making. The Lord Protector was in a delicate situation during the crisis of kingship. Because of its power, Cromwell needed support for his policies and his legitimacy from the Army—that faction in the government most opposed to his accepting the Crown.⁷⁵ Acceptance of kingship would have placed the Army in opposition to the Protectorate, and might have possibly set off another round of civil war.

The change from the three kingdoms to the three nations was another limit on the image of Kingship. While it was a difference in name, the impact of the words was powerful. The reference to the country denied kingship. Yet the denial was not complete. The *Mercurius Politicus* admitted that Charles II was "the Scottish King," thus implying that one of the three nations was still a Kingdom.⁷⁶ The need of Parliament to revoke the claim Charles II had made to the English throne also showed the belief that the English throne remained open to claim.⁷⁷ If the nation were no longer a monarchy, there would have been no need, except for symbolic value, to disannul the Stuart claims.

On 26 June 1657, just one month after rejecting the offer of the crown, Parliament reinstated Cromwell as Protector in a ceremony that rivaled a royal coronation.⁷⁸ He had refused the title of king, but the images of Kingship surrounded his rule. And the images were not just in government, they were entrenched in culture, law, and religion.⁷⁹ In three years, England returned to its monarchy.

The Protectorate abolished the Crown. But in the end, the traditions of English government triumphed. The patriarchal right that Cromwell invoked in his speech of 23 January 1657 was connected to the divine right of kings. The English people could not rid themselves of the notion of hierarchy, and the government reflected this. The reliance on the Ancient Constitution was another failure of the Protectorate to rid the nation of ideas of kingship. The law relied so heavily on the office of king, that failure to have a king, or a king-like figure, rendered government ineffective. Only through the regal nature of the Protectorate could the English government function.

Seth Rogers is a senior history major. On April 16, his "Protector or Monarch: Images of Kingship 1656-1657" won runner-up prize in the undergraduate category of the Phi Alpha Theta Lower Illinois Regional Conference at Greenville College. In addition, his paper was named runner-up for the 1994 Eastern Illinois University Social Science Writing Award.

⁷⁵First, 485.

⁷⁶*Mercurius Politicus*, 16 April to 23 April 1657.

⁷⁷*Mercurius Politicus*, 27 November to 4 December 1656.

⁷⁸Tangye, 200.

⁷⁹Herrup, 175.