
लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L. B.S National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY
अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No 9944 - 113057
वर्ग संख्या
Class No. 909
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No His Vol. 20

THE HISTORIANS' HISTORY OF THE WORLD



THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY



HE HISTORIANS' HISTORY OF THE WORLD . . .

A COMPREHENSIVE NARRATIVE OF THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS AS RECORDED BY THE GREAT WRITERS OF ALL AGES

EDITED BY HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS LL.D

WITH THE COLLABORATION OF MANY SPECIALISTS AND WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

Prof. Thomas K. Cheyne, *Oxford University*
Prof. Adolf Erman, *University of Berlin*
Prof. Joseph Halévy, *College of France*
Prof. C. W. C. Oman, *Oxford University*
Prof. David H. Muller, *University of Vienna*
Prof. Albert B. Hart, *Harvard University*
Prof. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *University of Berlin*
Oscar Browning, M.A., *Cambridge University*
Prof. H. Marczali, *University of Budapest*
Prof. Henry F. Pelham, *Oxford University*
Prof. Alfred N. Rambaud, *University of Paris*
Prof. Eduard Meyer, *University of Berlin*
H. J. Mackinder, M.A., *Director of the London School of Economics*
Prof. Julius Wellhausen, *University of Gottingen*
Prof. T. F. Tout, *University of Manchester*
Prof. James T. Shotwell, *Columbia University*
Prof. Franz X. von Krones, *University of Graz*
Dr. J. Holland Rose, *Cambridge University*
Prof. Adolf Harnack, *University of Berlin*
Dr. James Gairdner, C.B., *London*
Prof. I. Goldziher, *University of Budapest*
Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, *University of Chicago*
Prof. A. Vambéry, *University of Budapest*
Capt. Frank Brinkley, *Tokio*
Prof. Otto Hirschfeld, *University of Berlin*
Prof. Wilhelm Soltau, *Zabern University*
Hugh Chisholm, M.A., *Editor of the "Encyclopædia Britannica"*
Prof. Hermann Diels, *University of Berlin*
G. F. Barwick, B.A., *British Museum*
Prof. R. Koser, *University of Berlin*
Dr. A. S. Rappoport, *School of Oriental Languages, Paris*
Dr. Paul Brönnle, *Royal Asiatic Society*
Prof. Theodor Nöldeke, *University of Strasburg*

IN TWENTY-FOUR VOLUMES VOL. XX

LONDON

The Times

1907

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON & CO.,
EDINBURGH

Copyright 1904, 1907 by Henry [illegible] Williams

CONTENTS

VOLUME XX

BOOK III. ENGLAND FROM 1642 TO 1791

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE CIVIL WAR (1642–1646 A.D.) 1

The state of society and literature at this period, 3. The press—the poets, 3. The outbreak of war, 4. First engagements; the battle of Edgehill, 7. The king repulsed at Turnham Green, 8. Macaulay's estimate of Hampden, 12. Gloucester and Newbury, 13. The Solemn League and Covenant with Scotland, 17. Growing importance of Cromwell, 18. Gardiner's estimate of Pym, 19. Religious fanaticism, 20. The Irish "Cessation" and the Scotch invasion, 20. The Mongrel Parliament at Oxford, 21. Marston Moor, Lostwithiel, and Newbury, 24. Parliamentary rigour, 26. The Self-Denying Ordinance and the new model, 26. Religious bigotries and Laud's execution, 27. The warring creeds and intolerance, 30. Peace negotiations at Uxbridge, 32. The victories of Montrose in Scotland, 33. The new model army, and Naseby, 34. The king's letters and insincerity, 37. The mission of Glamorgan in Ireland, 40. The king surrenders to the Scots, 42. Charles a captive in England, 44.

CHAPTER II

THE LAST YEARS OF CHARLES I (1646–1649 A.D.) 46

The army versus parliament, 48. Rise of the agitators, 50. The army abducts the king, 51. The expulsion of the eleven members, 52. Riots in London, 55. The Heads of the Proposals, 56. Rendezvous at Ware; mutiny suppressed, 59. The king escapes from Hampton Court, 60. The vote of non-addresses and the "second civil war," 62. The Scotch invasion and the battle of Preston, 65. Treaty of Newport and anti-royalist feeling, 68. Pride's Purge, 69. The king taken to Windsor, 71. The king before the high court, 73. Guizot's account of Charles's execution, 75. Various estimates of the event: Clarendon; Milton; Guizot; Knight, 79. John Lingard, 81. S. R. Gardiner, 81. Lord Macaulay, 82.

CHAPTER III

THE VICTORIOUS COMMONWEALTH (1649–1651 A.D.) 84

Guizot's comparison of the English and the French revolutions, 84. The organization of the English Republic, 88. Executions and mutinies, 92. Scotland and Charles II; the fate of Montrose, 93. Cromwell in Ireland, 96. Cromwell massacres

PAGE

the prisoners, 97. Cromwell's own account of the Irish massacres, 98. Further atrocities in Ireland, 99. The battle of Dunbar, 101. Charles II's "start" and his coronation, 105. The battle of Worcester and the flight of Charles, 108.

CHAPTER IV

CROMWELL AGAINST PARLIAMENT (1651-1653 A.D.) . . . 113

Final conquest of Scotland and Ireland, 116. Cruelties of the Irish settlement, 117. The subjugation of Scotland, 120. Transactions with Portugal and Spain, 122. Relations with Holland; the Navigation Act, 123. Naval battle of Blake and Tromp, 125. Cromwell's growing ambition, 128. Cromwell dissolves the Long Parliament, April 20th, 1653, 130. Review of the Long Parliament, 132. The new council of state appointed, 135. Cromwell calls a new parliament, 136. Guizot's account of the "Little" or "Barebones" Parliament, 137. The Instrument of Government makes Cromwell protector, 142. Hallam on Cromwell's usurpation, 143.

CHAPTER V

CROMWELL AS PROTECTOR 1653-1658 A.D.) 144

Scotland subdued and incorporated, 146. Final battles of the Dutch War, 147. Relations with France and Spain, 150. The first Protectorate Parliament, 151. Cromwell overawes the parliament, 153. Cromwell dissolves the parliament, 157. Royalist conspiracies and Cromwell's despotism, 158. Foreign affairs and naval expeditions, 160. The second Protectorate Parliament, 162. Cromwell would be king, 165. Cromwell refuses the title and is inaugurated protector, 167. Victory and death of Blake, 169. Cromwell calls and dissolves his fourth parliament, 171. The battle of the Dunes: capture of Dunkirk, 173. Cromwell's many distresses and death (September 3rd, 1658), 174. Various estimates of Cromwell; his dissimulation: Lingard, 178. The opinion of a contemporary royalist, Lord Clarendon, 180. A German estimate of Cromwell's influence on Europe (Von Ranke), 181. Cromwell as the typical Englishman, 182. A modern depreciation, 182. Lord Macaulay's comparison of Cromwell with Cæsar and Napoleon, 183. Carlyle's eulogium, 187.

CHAPTER VI

THE END OF THE COMMONWEALTH (1658-1660 A.D.) . . . 192

Richard Cromwell and his unruly parliament, 195. The discontent in the army, 197. The recall of the Long Parliament: the Rump (May 7th, 1659), 199. The retirement of the Cromwells, 200. The commonwealth restored, 201. Booth's rising and the Wallingford House petitions, 202. General Monk takes the reins, 203. End of the Rump Parliament, March 16th, 1660, 208. Lambert's insurrection and the Free Parliament, 209. Charles's Declaration from Breda, and the amnesty, 211. Commerce and literature of the republican period, 215. Prose writers, 217. The poets, 218. William Harvey, 219. Guizot on the Restoration, 220.

CHAPTER VII

PAGE
THE RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS (1660–1668 A.D.) . . . 222

Macaulay's picture of the times and of the new king, 222. Abolition of tenures by knight service and disbanding of the army, 223. Disputes between the roundheads and cavaliers renewed, 224. Religious dissension, 225. Unpopularity of the Puritans, 227. Character of Charles II, 230. Characters of the duke of York and earl of Clarendon, 233. The Convention Parliament, 234. The Bill of Indemnity; the regicides, 235. Revenge on the corpses of Cromwell and Blake, 237. The restoration of Episcopacy, 238. The parliament of 1661 and the Act of Uniformity, 238. The execution of Sir Harry Vane, 240. The affairs of Scotland and Ireland, 241. The profligacy of Charles: his marriage, 242. The sale of Dunkirk to the French, 244. Religious persecutions: the Conventicle Act and repeal of the Triennial Act, 244. War with the Dutch, 245. The plague, 248. The great London fire of 1666, 253. Wren's plan for rebuilding the city, 256. The fall of Clarendon, 262. Buckingham and the cabal ministry, 264. The triple alliance, 266. Macaulay's contrast of England and France at that period, 266.

CHAPTER VIII

THE LATTER PART OF CHARLES II'S REIGN (1668–1685 A.D.) . . 269

The king and the duke of York become Catholics, 270. The secret Treaty of Dover and the French alliance, 272. The accession of Nell Gwyn; Coventry Act, 273. The stop of the exchequer; the Declaration of Indulgence; the Dutch War, 275. Parliament bests the king; the Test Act, 277. The fall of the cabal (1674 A.D.); new opposition to the king, 279. The country party: the Non-Resistance Bill fails, 281. Charles II accepts a pension from Louis XIV, 282. William III of Orange visits England and marries the princess Mary, 284. Intrigues of the French and venality of the English, 285. Titus Oates and the alleged "Popish Plot," 287. Sir William Temple's plan of government, 291. The character of Halifax, 293. The Habeas Corpus Act, 294. The Exclusion Bill and the duke of Monmouth, 294. Violence of factions; whig and tory, 297. The second Short Parliament fails to pass the Exclusion Bill (1680–1681 A.D.), 298. The Oxford Parliament of 1681, 299. The tory reaction and persecution of the whigs, 300. The Ryehouse Plot: the death of Shaftesbury, Russell, and others, 303. Seizure of charters and other violations of the constitution, 304. The death of Charles II (February 6th, 1685), 309. Buckle's weighing of the good and evil of the reign, 312.

CHAPTER IX

THE STATE OF ENGLAND IN 1685 317

Population; taxation, 317. The military system, 319. The navy, 321. Charge of civil government, 324. State of agriculture, 325. Mineral wealth of the country, 327. The country gentlemen; the clergy, 328. Growth of the towns, 333. The city, 335. Condition of the streets, 337. Lighting of London, 338. Difficulty of travel-

PAGE

ling, 339. Stage coaches, 342. Highwaymen, 343. Inns, 344. Post office: newspapers, 346. Scarcity of books in country places: female education, 347. Literary attainments of gentlemen, 348. Influence of French literature, 348. Immorality of the polite literature of England, 349. State of science in England, 351. State of the fine arts, 353. State of the common people, 354. Benefits of the progress of civilisation, 357.

CHAPTER X

JAMES II AND THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION (1685–1688 A.D.) . . 359

James illegally levies customs; and releases Catholic prisoners, 360. The conviction of Oates and Baxter, 362. Monmouth's rebellion, 363. Cruelties of the soldiers in the west; Kirke's "lambs," 366. Macaulay's account of Judge Jeffreys and the bloody assizes, 369. Trial of Alice Lisle, 372. The bloody assizes, 373. Rebels transported, 376. Confiscation and extortion, 376. "Odious mercy," 378. Jeffreys made lord chancellor, 379. The slaughter in London, 379. Cruel persecution of the Protestant dissenters, 381. The king at odds with parliament, 382. James tampers with the bench and usurps the dispensing power, 383. The king interferes with the church, 384. Advances toward Catholicism, 386. The attack on the universities, 388. The king and the parliament, 389. The king and Ireland, 389. The calm before the storm, 390. Macaulay on the Declaration of Indulgence, 391. The clergy in general refuse to read the declaration, 395. The bishops prosecuted, and sent to the Tower, 396. The acquittal of the bishops, 398. Buckle on the intolerance of the clergy, 400. Failure of the theory of tolerance, 402. The king's isolation; the prince of Wales, 404. The prince of Orange, and his relations to the throne, 405. William of Orange invades England, 407. James II takes flight and is recaptured, 409. James II leaves England forever, 411. The interregnum; the Convention Parliament, 412. Macaulay's review of the Declaration of Right, and the Revolution, 414.

CHAPTER XI

WILLIAM AND MARY (1689–1702 A.D.) 420

Parliamentary affairs: the Bill of Rights, 420. The Act of Toleration, 423. The two English kings in Ireland, 424. Parliament and the king; the settlement of the revenue, 427. The naval defeat at Beachy Head, 429. Jacobite plots to restore James, 430. James issues a declaration, 432. Macaulay's account of the battle of La Hogue, 433. The confederate fleet, 434. Battle of La Hogue, 435. Rejoicings in England, 438. Further jacobite plots; English defeats and victories, 439. Marlborough's treacheries, 441. Parliamentary reforms; commencement of the national debt, 442. The origin of the cabinet; the Junto of 1693, 444. Establishment of the Bank of England, 446. The death of Queen Mary, 447. Parliamentary corruption, 448. William's success at Namur, 450. Reforms in the currency, and in treason trials, 452. Last of the jacobite assassination plots, 453. The Peace of Ryswick, 456. Parliament forces the reduction of the army, 456. The commons coerce the king and the lords in the Irish grants, 457. Fall of the whig junto; a tory ministry in power, 458. The Act of Settlement and the Treaties of Partition, 459. The death of James II, 1701, and of William III, 1702, 461. Macaulay's estimate of William III, 462.

CHAPTER XII

PAGE
QUEEN ANNE (1702–1714 A.D.) 470

Blenheim (August 13th, 1704), 473. Campaigns of 1704–1708, 474. Exactions of the allies cause a renewal of war, 477. Agitation regarding the separation of England and Scotland, 478. The Act of Union, 480. Party faction, 480. Harley's treachery, 481. The whig ministry; the trial of Sacheverell, 482. The triumph of the tories, 483. The fall of Marlborough, 486. The Peace of Utrecht, 487. The death of Godolphin, 488. Whimsical and jacobite tories, 489. The Schism Act, 491. The division of the ministry; the fall of Oxford, 492. Bolingbroke; the reappearance of Marlborough, 493. The illness and death of Queen Anne, 494. Political growth in reign of Anne, 496. Literary and scientific advancement, 498. Architecture, 500. Social and economic conditions, 503.

CHAPTER XIII

THE REIGN OF GEORGE I (1714–1727 A.D.) 506

The king, the pretender, and the new parliament, 507. Impeachment of Bolingbroke, Oxford, and Ormonde, 508. Mar's rising, 509. The Septennial Act, 512. The king and the prince of Wales, 514. England and the continental powers, 516. Ministerial dissensions, 517. The quadruple alliance, 518. Arrest of the prince of Wales, 520. War with Spain, 520. Bill for relief of dissenters, 521. Settlement of the Spanish difficulties, 522. The Peerage Bill, 524. The South Sea Bubble, 525. Walpole to the rescue, 528. Death of Stanhope and Marlborough, 530. Stuart aspirations, 531. Affairs of Ireland; Wood's brass half-pennies, 532. Impeachment of the lord chancellor, 535. Foreign relations, 535. The death of George I, 536.

CHAPTER XIV

THE REIGN OF GEORGE II (1727–1760 A.D.) 538

The accession of George II, 539. Walpole continues in power, 540. The Excise Bill, 541. Foreign affairs, 545. Walpole *versus* Bolingbroke, 546. The Gin Act, 546. The Porteous tragedy in Edinburgh, 548. Dissensions in the royal family, 551. Death of Queen Caroline, 553. The Spanish War, 554. Retirement of Walpole, 555. Stanhope's estimate of Walpole, 556. Walpole's successors, 558. England and the War of the Austrian Succession, 559. The young pretender in Scotland, 562. Battles of Falkirk and Culloden, 564. Escape of Charles; prosecution of his adherents, 564. Parliamentary affairs; the rise of Pitt, 567. End of the Austrian War; the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 568. The reform of the calendar, 570. Death of the prince of Wales, 571. The Jew Bill; the Marriage Act, 572. Newcastle, Fox, and Pitt, 573. Border warfare in America, 576. Naval engagements; George visits Hanover, 577. Single-speech Hamilton; Pitt's influence, 578. The loss of Minorca, 579. Hanover and Prussia, 581. Pitt as war minister, 582. The fate of Admiral Byng, 584. Victories in America, in India and on the sea, 588. Death of George II, 591.

CHAPTER XV

PAGE

THIRTY YEARS OF GEORGE III (1760–1791 A.D.) . . . 593

The king's marriage and coronation, 596. The retirement of Pitt, 597. The ascendancy of Bute, 598. War with Spain, 599. Bute is succeeded by Grenville, 601. The affair of Wilkes and the *North Briton* No. XLV, 601. The Stamp Act, 602. The Regency Bill, 604. Rockingham assumes the ministry, 605. The repeal of the Stamp Act, 606. Pitt created earl of Chatham, 608. Chatham's illness, 610. Another Wilkes contest, 611. The *Letters of Junius*, 612. The reappearance of Chatham, 613. Colonial affairs, 615. Arrests for publishing parliamentary debates, 617. The Royal Marriage Act, 619. East Indian tea in Boston harbour, 619. The Boston Port Bill, 621. The conflict imminent, 621. Outbreak of the American War, 624. France and Spain aid the colonists, 627. Domestic affairs, 630. Chatham's last speech and death, 630. Association for the redress of grievances, 632. The Lord George Gordon riots, 634. Conclusion of the American War, 637. Parliamentary censures of the terms of peace, 640. The coalition ministry, 641. Pitt at the helm, 643. Pitt's financial measures, 644. The illness of the king, 647. The influence of the French Revolution, 649. Burke's reflections on the Revolution, 651. The Birmingham riots, 652.

APPENDIX A

CHARLES JAMES FOX. By Prof. Oscar Browning . . . 654

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS . 661

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND (1642-1791 A.D.) . 664



ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME XX

	PAGE
Thomas Babington Macaulay	*Frontispiece*
Roundhead Soldiers	1
Milton's House	5
Monk Bar, Part of Old Town Wall of York	11
Interior of the Bowyer Tower	15
Prince Rupert	23
Viscount Strafford, William Howard	30
Herefordshire Headquarters of Prince Rupert before Battle of Ledbury	38
Execution of Charles I	46
Algernon Sidney	49
St. Giles, Cripplegate	61
A Cavalier of the Seventeenth Century	72
Warrant to Execute King Charles the First	*Facing page* 74
Oliver Cromwell	84
The Proscribed Royalist	*Facing page* 92
Cottage in Merton	95
Cromwell at Dunbar	*Facing page* 104
Charles II	108
House to which King Charles II retired while the Battle of Worcester was raging	111
Cromwell and his Family listening to Milton playing the Organ at Hampton Court	*Facing page* 114
Robert Blake	125
Costume of Soldier in Time of Charles II	135
Thomas Sydenham	140
Oliver Cromwell	*Facing page* 142
Chingford Church	143
Scythes used as Weapons in Civil Wars	162
Cavalier of the Seventeenth Century	167
Double Piscina, Merstham Church	191
English House, Fifteenth Century	200
Purse and Dagger of the Sixteenth Century	207
Old London Sign. Boar's Head, from Tavern in Eastcheap	221
Charles II	222
Brick Tower	226
Bridgewater Moat, Eltham	240

	PAGE
Sir Christopher Wren	257
Gloucester	269
Duke of Monmouth	305
Francis North	306
Ripon Cathedral	359
James II	362
Armour of James II	365
William and Mary	420
William III	422
Mary II	446
John Somers	457
Costume about 1700 A.D.	460
Queen Anne	472
John Churchill, First Duke of Marlborough	474
A Beau of the Time of Queen Anne	490
Sabretache of George III	505
George I	508
Eastgate House, Rochester	519
The South Sea Bubble	*Facing page* 526
A Jacobean Mansion in Birmingham	531
Jonathan Swift	534
George II	549
The Portsoys Mob	*Facing page* 548
Robert Walpole	557
Dr Johnson in the Ante Room of Lord Chesterfield	*Facing page* 570
A Corner of St Paul's	591
George III	593
George III	595
William Murray, Earl of Mansfield	614
Grenadier, 1775	625
British Uniform, 1776	628
Naval Uniform, about 1782	629
The Death of the Earl of Chatham	*Facing page* 630
William Pitt, First Earl of Chatham	632
Market Cross, Winchester, as in Early Nineteenth Century	636
Charles James Fox	642
A Buck from Old Fashion Book, South Kensington Museum	645
Costume of 1793	650
MAP—The World (showing British and Other Possessions)	*Facing page* 670

PART XXII

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

BOOK III. ENGLAND FROM 1642 TO 1791

BASED CHIEFLY UPON THE FOLLOWING AUTHORITIES

W. H. S. AUBREY, H. T. BUCKLE, E. BURKE, G. BURNET, LORD CAMPBELL, T. CARLYLE, LORD CLARENDON, J. EVELYN, S. R. GARDINER, W. GODWIN, J. R. GREEN, F. P. G. GUIZOT, H. HALLAM, D. HUME, C. KNIGHT, W. E. H. LECKY, J. LINGARD, LORD MACAULAY, C. MACFARLANE, SIR THOMAS E. MAY, J. MORLEY, S. PEPYS, L. VON RANKE, F. VON RAUMER, LORD STANHOPE, R. VAUGHAN, H. WALPOLE

TOGETHER WITH AN ESSAY ON


CHARLES JAMES FOX

BY

OSCAR BROWNING

WITH ADDITIONAL CITATIONS FROM

O. AIRY, T. ARNOLD, J. AUBREY, R. BAILLIE, SIR JAMES BALFOUR, S. BANNISTER, R. BAXTER, J. BERKLEY, T. BIRCH, SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, LORD BOLING BROKE, A. BRUODIN, J. H. BURTON, R. CAREY, T. CARTE, LORD CASTLEHAVEN, J. COLLIER, W. P. COURTNEY, W. COXE, J. DALRYMPLE, D. DEFOE, J. DRYDEN, LADY FANSHAWE, J. FORSTER, E. GIBBON, O. GOLDSMITH, T. GUMBLE, LORD HARDWICKE, J. HEATH, LORD HERVEY, N. HODGES, LORD HOLLES, L. HUTCHINSON, T. HUTCHINSON, JAMES II, T. KEIGHTLEY, J. M. KEMBLE, LORD LONSDALE, E. LUDLOW, J. LYNCH, SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, T. R. MALTHUS, A. MARVELL, W. MASSEY, J. MILTON, LORD MONMOUTH, D. NEAL, R. NORTH, J. OLDMIXON, SIR WILLIAM PETTY, SIR J. RERESBY, CARDINAL DE RETZ, J. RUSHWORTH, G. SAGREDO, DUC DE ST. SIMON, T. SMOLLETT, E. STILES, J. SWIFT, T. THOMSON, N. TINDAL, T. VINCENT, C. WALKER, J. WALKER, W. WALLER, SIR P. WARWICK, J. WHITE, B. WHITELOCKE, W. WILSON, C. WREN



BOOK III

ENGLAND FROM 1642 TO 1791

CHAPTER I

THE CIVIL WAR

[1642–1646 A.D.]

The Civil War, the outbreak of which was announced by the floating of Charles's standard on the hill at Nottingham, was rendered inevitable by the inadequacy of the intellectual methods of the day to effect a reconciliation between opposing moral and social forces, which derived their strength from the past development of the nation. The personal characters of the leaders might do much to shorten or prolong the time of open warfare, but no permanent restoration of harmony would be possible till some compromise, which would give security alike to the disciples of Hooker and to the disciples of Calvin, had been not only thought out by the few, but generally accepted by the many. On both sides the religious difficulty was complicated by a political difficulty; and, on the king's side at all events, it was from those who were least under the influence of religious motives that the loudest cry for war was heard. — S. R. GARDINER.[b]

LET us pause at this juncture, at which the public men of England are exhibiting the spirit of party in aspects so unusual and so portentous, and endeavouring to catch some faint glimpses of the life of the people immediately before the commencement of the Civil War. "Before the flame of the war broke out in the top of the chimneys, the smoke ascended in every country." So writes Lucy Hutchinson[c] a careful and honest observer of what was passing. She saw around her, in many places, "fierce contests and disputes, almost to blood, even at the first." The partisans of the king were carrying out his commissions of array. The partisans of the parliament were insisting upon obedi-

ence to the ordinance for the militia. The king proclaimed Essex, the captain-general of the parliament, and his officers, as traitors. The parliament voted the king's commissioners of array to be traitors. Not only were the king and the parliament each struggling to obtain possession of the munitions of war by seizing the fortified places, but each barrel of gunpowder was contested for by opposite parties.

Few of the members of parliament remained in London. The zealous men of influence in their several counties were in their own districts, raising volunteers, gathering subscriptions, drilling recruits, collecting arms. Each is subscribing largely "for defence of the kingdom." Fire-arms are scarce; and the old weapons of the long-bow and cross-bow are again put in use. Old armour, long since "hung by the wall," is brought down and furbished. The rustic, changed into a pikeman, puts on the iron skull-cap and greaves; and the young farmer becomes a dragoon, with his carbine and pistols. In the parliamentary army there is every variety of clothing. In some companies raised by gentlemen amongst their tenants, the old liveries of each family give the prevailing colour. Hampden's men are in green; Lord Brooke's in purple; others are in blue; others in red. The officers all wear an orange scarf, being the colour of their general. The buff doublet, "though not sword yet cudgel proof," is a substitute for armour. Haslerig's Lobsters, and Cromwell's Ironsides — each so called from their rough mail — are not formed as yet. Recruits are taken, at first, without much reference to their opinions.

Cromwell, with his super-eminent sagacity, saw the danger of this course. In a later period of his life, when he had attained supreme power, he thus described his position at the commencement of the war: "I was a person who, from my first employment, was suddenly preferred and lifted up from lesser trust to greater; from my first being a captain of a troop of horse." He then relates that he "had a very worthy friend, a very noble person, Mr. John Hampden, and he thus spake to him: 'Your troops are most of them old decayed serving-men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows; and their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger sons, and persons of quality: do you think that the spirits of such mean and base fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen that have honour, and courage, and resolution in them.'" What Cromwell did to meet the ardour of the cavalier with a zeal equally enthusiastic, he goes on to tell: "I raised such men as had the fear of God before them, as made some conscience of what they did." Cromwell did justice to the principle upon which the honour and courage of the cavaliers was founded. He saw, beneath their essenced love-locks and gilded doublets, clear heads and bold hearts. The gay were not necessarily debauched; the health-drinkers were not necessarily drunkards. There were other men in the royalist ranks than —

"The bravoes of Alsatia, the pages of Whitehall."

There were great spirits in both armies ready to measure their swords for "The king," or for "The cause."

We can scarcely assume that the bulk of the population, or even the greater number of the richer and more educated classes, at once took their sides in this great argument. We know they did not. Many of the best gentlemen of England withdrew from the quarrel which promised to be fatal either to order or to liberty. John Evelyn, whose inclinations were royalist, was one. Mr. Kemble[d] the editor of Twysden's "Government of England," from which we quote, says "Sir Roger Twysden was not the only gentleman

[1642 A.D.]

who, being unable to join either party, desired to leave England for a time." This learned student of our history adds, by way of accounting for the flight to other lands of some of the country gentlemen, that "they felt it was impossible to serve a king who never spoke a word of truth in his life; and yet could not arm against him, or remain neutral between the two parties."

THE STATE OF SOCIETY AND LITERATURE AT THIS PERIOD

From this period we cannot understand the causes and the events of the Civil War, without steadily keeping in mind that the zeal of the Puritans, in whatever sectarian differences it exhibited itself, was as much the sustaining principle of the great conflict, as the passionate desire for civil liberty. These two great elements of resistance to the Crown produced impressions upon the national character — for the most part salutary impressions — which centuries have not obliterated.

The strength of the Puritanical element in the parliament of 1642 led to bold interferences with popular habits. The parliamentary leaders knew that they would have the support of the most powerful of the community of London, and of many other great towns, if not of the majority of the nation, when they discouraged the ordinary amusements of the people, — the bear-baitings, the cock-fights, the horse-races, the May-poles; appointed a fast on Christmas Day; and shut up the theatres. Bitter must have been the heart-burnings amongst the actors when their vocation came to an end in London, in 1642. The five regular companies were dispersed. Their members became "vagabonds," under the old statutes, hanging about the camps of the cavaliers, or secretly performing in inns and private houses.

London is the shop of war; it is the home of thought. Let us look at the vast city under the first of these aspects. It has always had its trained bands. It has now its volunteers of every rank. Many who had been in the Protestant armies of the continent, some who had fought under Gustavus Adolphus, were competent to become instructors. Such a man was Skippon, who had been appointed major-general of the London Militia.

In the country the distractions of the time bore hard upon the richer families. Every manor-house was liable to attack by a royalist or a parliamentary band. Lady Brilliana Harley had to put her castle of Brompton, in Herefordshire, in a posture of defence, whilst her husband, Sir Robert Harley, was engaged in his parliamentary vocation. The courageous woman died at her post. Amidst such scenes as these, says Carlyle,[e] "in all quarters of English ground, with swords getting out of their scabbards," there is one neutral power not wholly cast down — "the constable's baton still struggling to reign supreme." That power never ceased to assert itself amidst hostile armies. The judges went their usual circuits. The sessions and the county courts were regularly held.

THE PRESS — THE POETS

In 1623 Charles had heard in Ben Jonson's "Prince's Masque" allusions to a power which was then beginning to make itself formidable. The "press in a hollow tree," worked by "two ragged rascals," expressed the courtly contempt of that engine which was to give a new character to all political action. In 1642, wherever Charles moved, he had his own press with him. His state papers, for the most part written by Hyde [later Clarendon] were appeals to the reason and the affections of his people, in the place of the old assertions of

absolute authority. In the same way, the declarations of the parliament approached the great questions in dispute, in the like spirit of acknowledgment that there was a court of appeal beyond the battle-field, where truth and right would ultimately prevail. This warfare of the pen gradually engaged all the master-minds of the country; some using the nobler artillery of earnest reasoning and impassioned rhetoric; others emptying their quivers of vehement satire, or casting their dirty missiles of abuse, on the opponents of their party.

Milton enters upon his task with a solemn expression: Cleveland rushes into the fray with an alacrity that suits his impetuous nature:

> "Ring the bells backward; I am all on fire;
> Not all the buckets in a country quire
> Shall quench my rage."

Herrick was living in his vicarage of Dean Prior in Devonshire, disliking the "people currish, churlish as the seas," amongst whom he lived; scarcely venturing to print till he was ejected from his benefice; but solacing his loyalty with the composition of stanzas to "the prince of cavaliers," and recording his political faith in two lines, which comprehended the creed of the "thorough" royalists:

> "The gods to kings the judgment give to sway:
> The subjects only glory to obey."

The general tone of the poets is expressed by Lovelace:

> "Our careless heads with roses bound,
> Our hearts with loyal flames."

Butler, from the time when he left his father's cottage at Strensham, on the banks of the Avon, to note down those manifold characteristics of his time which furnish the best picture of its common life, was a royalist. Cleveland, Carew, Suckling, Denham, Herrick, Butler, form a galaxy of cavalier verse-makers. The dramatic poets, who were left to see the suppression of the theatres, such as Shirley, were naturally amongst the most ardent haters of the Puritan parliament.

But Milton did not quite stand alone amongst those with whom civil and religious liberty was a higher sentiment than loyalty to the king. George Wither was the poet of Puritanism, as ready with bitter invective as Cleveland.


The inferior men of letters then rushed to take up the weapons of party in the small newspapers of the time. Their name was legion. Their chief writers, Marchamont Needham on the parliament side with his "Mercurius Britannicus," and John Birkenhead on the royalist side with his "Mercurius Aulicus," were models of scurrility. Whatever were their demerits, the little newspapers produced a powerful effect. They were distributed through the villages by the carriers and foot-posts.

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR

Such, then, is a very imperfect sketch of a few of the salient points of English society, at the time when rival armies of Englishmen stood front to front in the midland counties. The king in August had vainly attempted to obtain possession of Coventry. He had then gone to Leicester with a body

[1642 A.D.]

of cavalry. On the 21st of August, the king's nephew, Prince Rupert, had joined him, and received the command of the horse. The next day, as we saw in the last chapter, they rode to Nottingham. The king's purpose was, upon Nottingham Castle, to set up his standard — a ceremony which had not been seen in England since Richard III had raised his standard in Bosworth Field — a ceremony which was held by some legists to be equivalent to a declaration that the kingdom was in a state of war, and that the ordinary course of law was at an end. A stormy night came on; and, omen of disaster as many thought, the standard was blown down. The setting-up of the standard would appear from Clarendon's account to have been a hasty and somewhat desperate act. The king had previously issued a proclamation "requiring the aid and assistance of all his subjects on the north side of the Trent, and within twenty miles southward thereof, for the suppressing of the rebels, now marching against him." Clarendon says, "there appeared no conflux of men in obedience to the proclamation; the arms and ammunition were not yet come from York, and a general sadness covered the whole town."[g]



MILTON'S HOUSE.

Of Prince Rupert, the king's cavalry leader whom Pepys[h] called "the boldest attaquer in the world" it may be well to state the previous career.[a] Rupert, prince of Bavaria, the third son of Frederick V, elector palatine and king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth, sister of Charles I of England, was born at Prague on December 18, 1619. In 1630 he was placed at the university of Leyden, where he showed particular readiness in languages and in military discipline. In 1633 he was with the prince of Orange at the siege of Rhynberg, and served against the Spaniards as a volunteer in the prince's lifeguard. In December, 1635, he was at the English court, and was named as leader of the proposed expedition to Madagascar. In 1636 he visited Oxford, when he was made master of arts. Returning to the Hague in 1638 he made the first display of his reckless bravery at the siege of Breda, and shortly afterwards was taken prisoner by the Austrians in the battle before Lemgo. For three years he was confined at Linz, where he withstood the endeavours made to induce him to change his religion and to take service with the emperor. Upon his release in 1642 he returned to the Hague, and from thence went to Dover, but, the Civil War not having yet begun, he returned immediately to Holland. Charles now named Rupert general of the horse, and he joined the king at Leicester in August 1642, being present at the raising of the standard at Nottingham. He was also made a knight of the Garter. It is particularly to be noticed that he brought with him several military inventions, and, especially, introduced the "German discipline" in his cavalry operations. He at once displayed the most astonishing activity.[i]

The king, in new proclamations, repeated his declarations of the treason of the earl of Essex and others: at the moment when he had made another proposition that he would withdraw his proclamations if the parliament would withdraw theirs. Neither party would make the first concession. There is

nothing more remarkable, amidst the anger and suspicion of this momentous period, than the evident reluctance of both parties to proceed to extremities. In such a conflict all would be losers. But, there being no alternative but war, the parliament, on the 9th of September, 1642, published a declaration to the whole kingdom, setting forth the causes of the war. On that day, the earl of Essex marched in great state out of London to join the army in the midland counties with the trained bands. A few weeks later the parliament ordered London to be fortified; and the population, one and all, men, women, and children, turned out, day by day, to dig ditches, and carry stones for their bulwarks.

The flame of war is bursting forth in many places at once. Fortified towns are changing their military occupants. Portsmouth had capitulated to the parliament's army a fortnight before the king raised his standard at Nottingham. Lord Northampton, a royalist, had seized the stores at Banbury, and marched to the attack of Warwick Castle. That ancient seat of feudal grandeur was successfully defended by the commander who had been left in charge, whilst Lord Brooke marched with some forces to the parliament's quarters. Every manor-house was put by its occupiers into a state of defence. The heroic attitude of the English ladies who, in the absence of their husbands, held out against attacks whether of Cavaliers or Roundheads, was first exhibited at Caldecot manor-house, in the north of Warwickshire. Mrs. Purefoy, the wife of William Purefoy, a member of the house of commons, defended her house against Prince Rupert and four hundred cavaliers. The little garrison consisted of the brave lady and her two daughters, her son-in-law, eight male servants, and a few female. They had twelve muskets, which the women loaded as the men discharged them from the windows. The out buildings were set on fire, and the house would have been burnt had not the lady gone forth, and claimed the protection of the cavaliers.

Rupert respected her courage, and would not suffer her property to be plundered. This young man, who occupies so prominent a part in the military operations of the Civil War, was only twenty-three when Charles made him his general of horse. He had served in the wars for the recovery of the Palatinate, and had exhibited the bravery for which he was ever afterwards distinguished. But in his early warfare he had seen life unsparingly sacrificed, women and children put to the sword, villages and towns burnt, the means of subsistence for a peaceful population recklessly destroyed. His career in England did much to make the king's cause unpopular, though his predatory havoc has probably been exaggerated. The confidence which the king placed in him as a commander was not justified by his possession of the high qualities of a general.

About the middle of September, Charles marched with his small army from Nottingham to Derby. Essex, with the forces of the parliament, was at Northampton. The king's plans were very vague; but he at last determined to occupy Shrewsbury. He halted his army on the 19th at Wellington, where he published a "protestation," in which, amongst other assurances, he said, "I do solemnly and faithfully promise, in the sight of God, to maintain the just privileges and freedom of parliament, and to govern by the known laws of the land to my utmost power; and, particularly, to observe inviolably the laws consented to by me this parliament." There is a remarkable letter of the queen to the king, dated the 3rd of November, in which she expresses her indignant surprise that he should have made any such engagement. The only notion that the queen had of "royalty" was that it was to be "absolute." Who can believe that Charles ever resigned that fatal idea?

[1642 A.D.]

FIRST ENGAGEMENTS: THE BATTLE OF EDGEHILL

On the 22nd of September, Essex moved his army to Worcester. Here the first rencounter took place between the cavalry of Rupert and the parliamentary cuirassiers. The royalists had a decided advantage. Ludlow *i* who was in the skirmish, gives a ludicrous account of the inexperience, and something worse, of the parliament's raw troops. The lieutenant "commanded us to wheel about; but our gentlemen, not yet well understanding the difference between wheeling about and shifting for themselves, their backs being now towards the enemy whom they thought to be close in the rear, retired to the army in a very dishonourable manner; and the next morning rallied at head-quarters, where we received but cold welcome from our general, as we well deserved." After remaining at Shrewsbury about twenty days, Charles resolved to march towards London. He expected that, as the armies approached each other, many soldiers would come over to the royal standard. He was almost without money, except a sum of six thousand pounds which he received by "making merchandise of honour," to use Clarendon's *j* expression — being the price for which he created Sir Richard Newport a baron. His foot-soldiers were mostly armed with muskets; but three or four hundred had for their only weapon a cudgel. Few of the musketeers had swords, and the pikemen were without corselets.

The royal army moved from Shrewsbury on the 12th of October, on to Wolverhampton, Birmingham, and Kenilworth. Two days after, the earl of Essex marched from Worcester in the direction which Charles had taken. They were only separated by twenty miles when the king first moved from Shrewsbury, but it was ten days before they came near each other. "Neither army," says Clarendon, "knew where the other was." On the night of the 22nd of October, the king was at Edgecote, a village near Banbury. The council broke up late. There was disunion in the camp. The earl of Lindsay by his commission was general of the whole army; but when Charles appointed Prince Rupert his general of horse, he exempted him from receiving orders from any one but the king himself — to such extent did this king carry his overweening pride of blood. Rupert insolently refused to take the royal directions through Lord Falkland, the secretary of state. In the same spirit, when a battle was expected, Charles took the advice of his nephew, rejecting the opinion of the veteran Lindsay.

On Sunday morning, the 23rd, the banner of Charles was waving on the top of Edgehill, which commanded a prospect of the valley in which a part of the army of Essex was moving. The greater portion of the parliament's artillery, with two regiments of foot and one of horse, was a day's march behind. The king, having the advantage of numbers, determined to engage. He appeared amongst his ranks, with a black velvet mantle over his armour, and wearing his star and garter. He addressed his troops, declaring his love to his whole kingdom, but asserting his royal authority "derived from God, whose substitute, and supreme governor under Christ, I am." At two o'clock the royal army descended the hill. "Sir Jacob Astley," writes Warwick,*k* was major-general of the army under the earl of Lindsay; who, before the charge of the battle at Edgehill, made a most excellent, pious, short, and soldierly prayer: for he lifted up his eyes and hands to Heaven, saying, 'O Lord, thou knowest how busy I must be this day; if I forget Thee, do not Thou forget me,' And with that rose up, crying 'March on, boys.'"

"The great shot was exchanged on both sides, for the space of an hour or thereabouts. By this time the foot began to engage; and a party of the

enemy being sent to line some hedges on our right wing, thereby to beat us from our ground, were repulsed by our dragoons," says Clarendon. The foot soldiers on each side engaged with little result. But Rupert, at the head of his horse, threw the parliament's left wing into disorder. The disaster was attributable to the desertion of Sir Faithful Fortescue, who went over with his troop to the royalists, when he was ordered to charge. The fiery prince pursued the flying squadrons for three miles; he was engaged in plundering the parliamentary baggage-waggons, whilst the main body of the king's forces was sorely pressed by the foot and horse of Essex. The king's standard was taken. Sir Edmund Varney, the standard-bearer, was killed. The standard was afterwards recovered by a stratagem of two royalist officers, who put on the orange-scarf of Essex, and demanded the great prize from his secretary, to whom it had been entrusted. It was yielded by the unfortunate penman to those who bore the badge of his master. Brave old Lindsay was mortally wounded, and taken prisoner. Other royalists of distinction were killed.

"When Prince Rupert returned from the charge," writes Clarendon, "he found this great alteration in the field, and his majesty himself with few noblemen and a small retinue about him, and the hope of so glorious a day quite banished." Many around the king counselled a retreat; but Charles, with equal courage and sagacity, resolved to keep his ground. "He spent the night in the field, by such a fire as could be made of the little wood and bushes which grew thereabouts." When the day appeared, the parliamentary army still lay beneath Edgehill. It was, in most respects, a drawn battle. Gradually each army moved off, one to attack London, the other to defend it. The number of the slain at Edgehill was variously estimated by the two parties. Ludlow *i* very impartially says, "it was observed that the greatest slaughter on our side was of such as ran away, and on the enemy's side of those that stood." There was no general desire in either army to renew the struggle.

THE KING REPULSED AT TURNHAM GREEN (1642 A.D.)

After the battle of Edgehill the king wasted a few days in occupying Banbury and other small places, and on the 26th was with his army at Oxford. Essex was slowly advancing with his army towards London, and at the end of the month was at Northampton. In November Essex arrived, and received the thanks of the two houses. On the 11th of November Charles was at Colnbrook. Thither went a deputation from the parliament, under a safe conduct, to propose that the king should appoint some convenient place to reside, near London, "until committees of both houses of parliament may attend your majesty with some propositions for the removal of these bloody distempers and distractions." The king met the deputation favourably, and proposed to receive such propositions at Windsor. "Do your duty," he said, "we will not be wanting in ours. God in his mercy give a blessing." Ludlow records the duplicity which followed this negotiation: "Upon which answer the parliament thought themselves secure, at least against any sudden attempt: but the very next day the king, taking the advantage of a very thick mist, marched his army within half a mile of Brentford before he was discovered, designing to surprise our train of artillery (which was then at Hammersmith), the parliament, and city." Clarendon *j* endeavours to throw the blame of this dishonour upon Rupert.

The "assault intended for the city" at last became a reality. On the morning of the 12th of November, the sound of distant guns was heard in London. Before noon Rupert was charging in the streets of Brentford. The

regiment of Holles was quartered there, and they were not unprepared for the attack. The long and narrow street was barricaded. The contest was obstinately maintained for three hours by Holles' regiment. Hampden was at Acton, and Brooks in a neighbouring cantonment. Again and again the parliamentary forces charged the cavaliers. But the main body of the royal army now invested Brentford. The fighting went on till evening, when the royalists had a decided advantage, and compelled their enemy to retire from the town. They took many prisoners, amongst whom was John Lilburne, who began his career, when an apprentice, by calling down stripes and imprisonment upon his contumacy, and was now a captain of the trained bands. The old enemies of "sturdy John" did not forget his offences. He was tried for his life, and was about to be executed as a rebel, when Essex threatened that for every one of the parliament's officers thus put to death, he would execute three royalist prisoners. Lilburne was released, to be always foremost in opposition, whether to Charles or to Cromwell.

Many of the parliament's men were drowned in the Thames; but the greater number made their way in boats down the stream. Essex had arrived at Turnham Green with some trained bands, who, whilst the fighting was going on, had been exercising in Chelsea fields. It was dark when the trained bands, with the parliamentary regiments then recruited advanced again to Brentford, and the royalists fell back to the king's quarters at Hounslow. Skippon, the general of the city trained bands, came out with his well-disciplined shopkeepers and apprentices; talking now with one company, now with another, and calling them about him to make that famous oration which is more telling than all the rhetoric of Livy's Romans. "Come, my boys, my brave boys, let us pray heartily and fight heartily. I will run the same fortunes and hazards with you. Remember the cause is for God, and for defence of yourselves, your wives, and children. Come, my honest brave boys, pray heartily and fight heartily, and God will bless us." Twenty-four thousand of the parliamentary army were marshalled on that Sunday on Turnham Green.

Pacific counsels again prevailed. Hampden was recalled, when, in pursuance of a settled plan of attack, he was about to march by Acton and Osterley Park to take the royal army in the rear. Essex remained inactive, instead of advancing to Hounslow as had been agreed. The war, according to some writers, might have been brought to a conclusion in one day of certain triumph if the irresolution of Essex had yielded to the counsels of bolder spirits. The men were not yet in the field who were resolved to make war in earnest, whatever might be the consequences. Essex was brave and skilful; but, like many other good men, he fought with reluctance against his countrymen and his familiar friends.

After the royal army had withdrawn from the neighbourhood of London, the citizens, who had seen war so close at their doors, began to talk more earnestly of peace. But the exertions of this moderate party produced a corresponding determination of "the pious and movement party" that the war should be carried on with renewed energy. The Guildhall was the scene of many an angry debate. At length, on the 2nd of January, a petition from the common council was carried to the king at Oxford, in which he was asked to return to the capital, when all disturbance should be suppressed. Charles replied, that they could not maintain tranquillity amongst themselves. Amidst an immense uproar, Pym and Lord Manchester addressed the multitude, and the prospect of peace faded from the people's view.

The eastern counties formed themselves into an "Association," in the

organisation of which Cromwell was the master-spirit. Under his vigorous direction, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridge, Herts, not only kept the war away from their own localities, but furnished the most efficient support to its vigorous conduct in other quarters. The counties of Lincoln and Huntingdon soon joined this eastern association, with the like results. In the seven associated counties the cavaliers were never of any importance. During the winter a partisan warfare was going on in many places. The most important incident of these minor contests was the death of Lord Brooke at Lichfield. The war, as it proceeded, gradually assumed a fiercer character. It became to some extent, a war of classes.

In the beginning of 1643, the national feeling was exasperated by the landing of the queen with a foreign army. During a year she had been indefatigable in making the most of the funds she had acquired by the sale of the crown jewels, to purchase arms and ammunition, and to raise men. On the 22nd of February she arrived with four ships, and landed at Burlington. Batten, the admiral of the parliament had failed in intercepting her convoy; but he adopted measures of greater vigour than generosity when he arrived two days after the queen and her men had disembarked. These proceedings are described in the following characteristic letter of Henrietta Maria to Charles:

"One of the ships had done me the favour to flank my house, which fronted the pier, and before I could get out of bed, the balls were whistling upon me in such style that you may easily believe I loved not such music. Everybody came to force me to go out, the balls beating so on all the houses, that, dressed just as it happened, I went on foot to some distance from the village, to the shelter of a ditch, like those at Newmarket; but before we could reach it, the balls were singing round us in fine style, and a serjeant was killed twenty paces from me. We placed ourselves then under this shelter, during two hours that they were firing upon us, and the balls passing always over our heads, and sometimes covering us with dust. At last the admiral of Holland sent to tell them, that if they did not cease, he would fire upon them as enemies; that was done a little late, but he excuses himself on account of a fog he says there was. On this they stopped, and the tide went down, so that there was not water enough for them to stay where they were."

The earl of Newcastle, who came to escort the queen to York, had been authorised by the king to raise men for his service, "without examining their consciences"; and thus his army was styled by the parliament "the queen's army," and "the Catholic army." The prejudice against foreigners and Romanists thus came into renewed activity. To Oxford came commissioners from the parliament, towards the end of March, authorised to negotiate a suspension of arms, and a treaty of peace. Charles displayed his usual vacillation. He made concessions one day, and revoked them another. The parliament peremptorily recalled its commissioners. The battle must be fought out.

We have mentioned that during the Civil War the judges went their usual circuits. In the spring of 1643 this local administration of justice was temporarily suspended. The two houses of parliament, embarrassed by the king's possession of the great seal, ordered that the session of oyer and terminer should not be proceeded with "until it shall please God to end these distractions between the king and people." Charles issued a proclamation, commanding that the Eastern term should be held at Oxford instead of Westminster. The judges were ordered there to attend the king. Had this state of things continued, a greater evil would have ensued than the bloodshed and

[1643 A.D.]

plunder of the war. But, by what was a practical compromise for the remedy of an enormous social mischief — one that might have led to a general insecurity of life and property — the parliament resolved to establish a great seal: and under this authority, and that of the king, judges executed their functions as usual, after a suspension of a few months.

During these unhappy times England was in a great degree exempt from crimes of violence, except those committed under the pretence of martial necessity. No bands of plunderers infested the country; no lawless and ferocious spirits who, as many passages of the histories of other countries record, considering a time of public commotion as their opportunity, held the peaceful in terror. England was safe from those massacres and spoliations which characterise a nation when the reins of just government are loosened. This immeasurable blessing she owed to her ancient civil organisation, and to that respect for law which has made the constable's staff the efficient representative of the sovereign's sceptre.



Monk Bar, Part of Old Town Wall of York

The repose of Oxford was soon broken up by new military enterprises. The suspension of arms contemplated in the negotiations which commenced at the end of March, were, on the 15th of April, declared by the parliament to be at an end. On that day Essex marched his army to the siege of Reading. The king himself, on the 24th of April, set out from Oxford to head a force for the relief of the besieged. The army which he led was numerous and well appointed. At Caversham Bridge the royalist forces were repulsed by those of the parliament, and fell back upon Wallingford. That day Reading was surrendered to Essex. The cavaliers were indignant that the commander of the garrison had not longer held out; and he was tried, and sentenced to death. The king reprieved him. Hampden, who had taken an active part in the siege of Reading, now urged Essex to follow up their success by an attack upon Oxford. The bold counsels were overruled. The parliamentary commander gradually became distrusted by his party. His honour and his capacity were unquestionable; but he was too inclined to forego present good in the contemplation of uncertain evils.

Meanwhile, the war was proceeding with doubtful fortune in other quarters. Sir William Waller was successful against the royalists in the south and west. Fairfax was disputing with Lord Newcastle the supremacy of the north. The Cornish men, in arms for the king, had gained a battle over Lord Stamford. What could not be accomplished in the open field by the

cavaliers was sought to be effected by a secret plot. The lady Aubigny had received a permission from the parliament, with a pass, to proceed to Oxford to transact some business arising out of the death of her husband, who was killed at Edgehill. On her return to London she was commissioned by the king to convey a box thither, with great care and secrecy. His majesty told her "it much concerned his own service." On the 31st of May, the members of the two houses were listening to a sermon in St. Margaret's church, when a note was delivered to Pym. He hastily left.

That night Edmund Waller, once famous as a poet, but whose "smooth" verse we now little regard, was arrested. His brother-in-law, Tomkins, Challoner (a citizen), and other persons, were also taken into custody. Waller was a member of parliament, and had been at Oxford, in March, with the commissioners. There was unquestionably a plot to arm the royalists in London, to seize the persons of the parliamentary leaders, and to bring the king's troops into the capital. Waller, in a base spirit which contrasts with the conduct of most of the eminent of either party, made very abject confessions, with exaggerated denunciations of others, to save his own life. The parliament behaved with honourable moderation. Five persons were condemned by court-martial: two, Challoner and Tomkins, were executed. Waller was reserved, to exhibit in his literary character a subserviency to power which has fortunately ceased to be an attribute of poets — to eulogise the happy restoration of Charles II, as he had eulogised the sovereign attributes of the protector Cromwell. "He had much ado to save his life," says Aubrey,[1] "and in order to do it sold his estate in Bedfordshire, about 1300*l.* per annum, to Dr. Wright, for 10,000*l.* (much under value), which was procured in twenty-four hours' time, or else he had been hanged. With this money he bribed the house, which was the first time a house of commons was ever bribed."

Important events succeeded each other rapidly during this summer. Rupert's trumpet sounded to horse in Oxford streets on the 17th of June. After the occupation of Reading, the troops of Essex were distributed in cantonments about Thame and Wycombe. Rupert dashed in amongst the small towns and villages where these troops were quartered. Hampden had been visiting the scattered pickets, and urging upon Essex a greater concentration of his forces. On the morning of the 19th the prince was with a large force at Chalgrove Field, near Thame. Hampden, with a small detachment, attacked the cavaliers; expecting the main body of the parliamentary army soon to come up with reinforcements. The man who had triumphed in so many civil victories fell in this skirmish. On the first charge he was shot in the shoulder. The parliamentary troops were completely routed before Essex came up. The troops of Rupert were in the plain between the battle field and Thame, where the wounded Hampden desired to go for help. A brook crossed the grounds through which he must pass. By a sudden exercise of the old spirit of the sportsman he cleared the leap, and reached Thame; there to die, after six days of agony. "O Lord, save my bleeding country," were his last words.[2]

Macaulay's Estimate of Hampden

The public life of Hampden is surrounded by no obscurity. His history more particularly from the year 1640 to his death, is the history of England. The celebrated Puritan leader is an almost solitary instance of a great man who neither sought nor shunned greatness, who found glory only because glory lay in the plain path of duty. During more than forty years he was known

[1643 A.D.]

to his country neighbours as a gentleman of cultivated mind, of high principles, of polished address, happy in his family, and active in the discharge of local duties; and to political men, as an honest, industrious, and sensible member of parliament, not eager to display his talents, stanch to his party, and attentive to the interests of his constituents. A great and terrible crisis came. A direct attack was made by an arbitrary government on a sacred right of Englishmen, on a right which was the chief security for all their other rights. The nation looked round for a defender. Calmly and unostentatiously the plain Buckinghamshire esquire placed himself at the head of his countrymen, and right before the face and across the path of tyranny.

The times grew darker and more troubled. Public service, perilous, arduous, delicate, was required; and to every service the intellect and the courage of this wonderful man were found fully equal. He became a debater of the first order, a most dexterous manager of the house of commons, a negotiator, a soldier. He showed himself as competent to direct a campaign as to conduct the business of the petty sessions. We can scarcely express the admiration which we feel for a mind so great, and, at the same time, so healthful and so well proportioned, so willingly contracting itself to the humblest duties, so easily expanding itself to the highest, so contented in repose, so powerful in action. Almost every part of this virtuous and blameless life which is not hidden from us in modest privacy is a precious and splendid portion of our national history.

His enemies have allowed that he was a man in whom virtue showed itself in its mildest and least austere form. With the morals of a Puritan, he had the manners of an accomplished courtier.

He had indeed left none his like behind him. There still remained, indeed, in his party, many acute intellects, many eloquent tongues, many brave and honest hearts. There still remained a rugged and clownish soldier, half fanatic, half buffoon, whose talents, discerned as yet only by one penetrating eye, were equal to all the highest duties of the soldier and the prince. But in Hampden, and in Hampden alone, were united all the qualities which, at such a crisis, were necessary to save the state, the valour and energy of Cromwell, the discernment and eloquence of Vane, the humanity and moderation of Manchester, the stern integrity of Hale, the ardent public spirit of Sidney. Others might possess the qualities which were necessary to save the popular party in the crisis of danger; he alone had both the power and the inclination to restrain its excesses in the hour of triumph. Others could conquer; he alone could reconcile. A heart as bold as his brought up the cuirassiers who turned the tide of battle on Marston Moor. As skilful an eye as his watched the Scotch army descending from the heights over Dunbar. But it was when to the sullen tyranny of Laud and Charles had succeeded the fierce conflict of sects and factions, ambitious of ascendency and burning for revenge, it was when the vices and ignorance which the old tyranny had generated threatened the new freedom with destruction, that England missed the sobriety, the self-command, the perfect soundness of judgment, the perfect rectitude of intention, to which the history of revolutions furnishes no parallel, or furnishes a parallel in Washington alone.[m]

GLOUCESTER AND NEWBURY

Four months had elapsed between the landing of the queen in England and her return to her royal husband. [Meanwhile, parliament had impeached her of high treason "for assisting her husband with arms."] She was a bold

and determined woman, who aspired to direct councils and to lead armies. On the 27th of May she writes to the king from York, "I shall stay to besiege Leeds at once, although I am dying to join you; but I am so enraged to go away without having beaten these rascals, that, if you will permit me, I will do that, and then will go to join you; and if I go away I am afraid that they would not be beaten." She had her favourites, especially Jermyn and Digby, whose advancement she was constantly urging. The scandalous chroniclers of the time did not hesitate in casting the most degrading suspicions upon the queen in connection with one of these. Jermyn was made a peer.

On the 11th of July the queen entered Stratford-on-Avon, at the head of four thousand horse and foot soldiers. She slept at the house in which Shakespeare lived and died — then in the possession of his daughter, Mrs. Hall. On the 13th she met Charles where his first battle had been fought, and from Keinton they proceeded to Oxford. The tidings of a victory on the 15th over the parliamentary forces at Roundway Down in Wiltshire greeted their arrival. A previous victory over Sir William Waller at Lansdown, in Somersetshire, filled the royalists with the most sanguine hopes. Such partial successes on the other side as the brave defence of Nottingham Castle by Colonel Hutchinson had no material influence upon the state of affairs.

In the summer of 1643 the power of the parliament is visibly in danger. On the 27th of July, Bristol, a city only exceeded by London in population and wealth, is surrendered to Rupert, after an assault, with terrible slaughter on both sides. A design of Sir John Hotham to surrender Hull to the king was detected. He and his son were committed to the Tower on a charge of betraying the cause of the parliament. London was in a state of unusual agitation. The lords came to resolutions, upon a proposal of peace, of a far more moderate character than had previously been determined on. There was a conference between the two houses, in which the upper house urged that "these unnatural dissensions" would destroy all the former blessings of peace and abundance. The commons, by a majority of nineteen, decided that the proposals of the lords should be considered.

The city was in an uproar. A petition from the common-council called for the rejection of the proposals. Multitudes surrounded the houses to enforce the same demand. The proposals were now rejected by a majority of seven. An attempt was then made to enforce the demand for peace by popular clamour. Bands of women, with men in women's clothes, beset the doors of the house of commons, crying out, "Give us up the traitors who are against peace. We'll tear them in pieces. Give us up that rascal Pym." The military forced them away; but they refused to disperse. They were at last fired upon, and two were killed.

Many peers now left parliament and joined the king at Oxford, amongst whom was Lord Holland. Those who remained, peers or commoners, saw that the greatest danger was in their own dissensions. The royalist army was growing stronger in every quarter. London was again in peril.

Had there been unanimity in the councils of the king at this period of dissensions in London amongst the people; with the two houses divided amongst themselves; men of influence deserting the parliamentary cause; no man yet at the head of the parliamentary forces who appeared capable of striking a great blow, — it is probable that if he had marched upon the capital the war would have been at an end. There would have been peace — and a military despotism. Charles sent Sir Philip Warwick to the earl of Newcastle to propose a plan of co-operation between the armies of the south and north. "But

[1643 A.D.]

I found him very averse to this," Warwick[k] writes, "and perceived that he apprehended nothing more than to be joined to the king's army, or to serve under Prince Rupert; for he designed himself to be the man that should turn the scale, and to be a self-subsisting and distinct army, wherever he was." With this serious difficulty in concentrating his forces Charles determined upon besieging Gloucester. The garrison consisted of fifteen hundred men, under Edward Massey, the parliamentary governor. The inhabitants were under five thousand.

The people of Gloucester immediately set fire to all the houses outside the walls. From the 10th of August till the 6th of September these resolute people defended their city with a resolution and bravery unsurpassed in this warfare. All differences having been reconciled in London, the earl of Essex took the command of a force destined for the relief of "the godly city." At the head of fourteen thousand men he set out from London on the 24th of August. On the 5th of September he had arrived by forced marches within five miles of Gloucester. The king sent a messenger to him with pacific proposals. The answer was returned in a spirit of sturdy heroism: "The parliament gave me no commission to treat, but to relieve Gloucester; I will do it, or leave my body beneath its walls." The soldiers shouted, "No propositions." Gloucester was relieved. From the Prestbury hills Essex saw the flames of burning huts rising from the king's quarter. The royal army had moved away. On the 8th the parliamentary general entered the beleaguered city, bearing provisions to the famished people, and bestowing the due meed of honour upon their courage and constancy. On the 10th he was on his march back to London.



INTERIOR OF THE BOWYER TOWER.

Of the army of fourteen thousand men which marched to the relief of Gloucester, four regiments were of the London militia. These regiments were mainly composed of artisans and apprentices. At Prestbury they had to fight their way through Rupert's squadrons and to try how pikemen could stand up against a charge of horse. In less than a fortnight their prowess was to be proved in a pitched battle field. Charles and his army were lying round Sudeley Castle to the north-east of Gloucester. Essex marched to the south. In Cirencester which he surprised he found valuable stores for his men. The king's army moved in the same direction. Essex had passed Farringdon and was rapidly advancing upon Newbury on his road to Reading

when his scattered horse were attacked by Rupert and his cavaliers. There was a sharp conflict for several hours and Essex was compelled to halt at Hungerford.

When Essex came near to Newbury on the 19th of September, he found the royal army in possession of the town. The king had come there two hours before him. Essex was without shelter, without provisions. The road to London was barred against him. He "must make his way through or starve." On the morning of the 20th, the outposts of each force became engaged, and the battle was soon general. It was fought all day "with great fierceness and courage"; the cavaliers charging "with a kind of contempt of the enemy"; and the roundheads making the cavaliers understand that a year of discipline had taught them some of the best lessons of warfare. "The London trained bands and auxiliary regiments (of whose inexperience of danger, or any kind of service, beyond the easy practise of their postures in the Artillery Garden, men had till then too cheap an estimation), behaved themselves to wonder; and were, in truth, the preservation of that army that day," says Clarendon; "for they stood as a bulwark and rampire to defend the rest; and, when their wings of horse were scattered and dispersed, kept their ground so steadily, that, though Prince Rupert himself led up the choice horse to charge them, and endured their storm of small shot, he could make no impression upon their stand of pikes, but was forced to wheel about." The men of London, taken from the loom and the anvil, from the shops of Ludgate or the wharfs of Billingsgate, stood like a wall, as such men have since stood in many a charge of foreign enemies. On the night of the battle of Newbury, each army remained in the position it had occupied before that day of carnage. The loss of royalists of rank was more than usually great. Three noblemen fell, for whom there was lamentation beyond the ranks of their party — Lord Carnarvon, Lord Sunderland, and Lord Falkland.

Falkland, especially, still lives in memory, as one of the noblest and purest — the true English gentleman in heart and intellect. What is called his apostasy has been bitterly denounced, and not less intemperately justified, by historical partisans. Arnold,[n] whose intellect was as clear as his feelings were ardent in the cause of just liberty, has thus written of Falkland: "A man who leaves the popular cause when it is triumphant, and joins the party opposed to it, without really changing his principles and becoming a renegade, is one of the noblest characters in history. He may not have the clearest judgment or the firmest wisdom; he may have been mistaken, but as far as he is concerned personally, we cannot but admire him. But such a man changes his party not to conquer but to die. He does not allow the caresses of his new friends to make him forget, that he is a sojourner with them and not a citizen. His old friends may have used him ill, they may be dealing unjustly and cruelly; still their faults, though they may have driven him into exile, cannot banish from his mind the consciousness that with them is his true home, that their cause is habitually just and habitually the weaker, although now bewildered and led astray by an unwonted gleam of success. He protests so strongly against their evil that he chooses to die by their hands rather than in their company; but die he must, for there is no place left on earth where his sympathies can breathe freely; he is obliged to leave the country of his affections, and life elsewhere is intolerable. This man is no renegade, no apostate, but the purest of martyrs: for what testimony to truth can be so pure as that which is given uncheered by any sympathy; given not against enemies amidst applauding friends; but against friends, amidst unpitying or half-rejoicing enemies. And such a martyr was Falkland!"

[1643 A.D.]

It was not Falkland's duty to be in this battle. He was urged to stay away. "No," he said, "I am weary of the times; I foresee much misery to my country, but I believe I shall be out of it before night." Clarendon[1] tells us why his life had become a burthen to Falkland: "From the entrance into this unnatural war, his natural cheerfulness and vivacity grew clouded, and a kind of sadness and dejection of spirit stole upon him, which he had never been used to. When there was any overture or hope of peace, he would be more erect and vigorous, and exceedingly solicitous to press anything which he thought might promote it; and, sitting among his friends, often, after a deep silence and frequent sighs, would, with a shrill and sad accent, ingeminate the word Peace, Peace; and would passionately profess, 'that the very agony of the war, and the view of the calamities and desolation the kingdom did and must endure, took his sleep from him, and would shortly break his heart.'"

The relief of Gloucester and the battle of Newbury were fatal to many of the sanguine hopes of a speedy victory over disunited rebels which the royalists up to this time had entertained. They had seen how the despised trained bands had been disciplined into good soldiers. They had seen how such men as held the "godly city of Gloucester" for a whole month against the best troops of the king would die rather than surrender. There was a fatal concurrence of events to render it certain that although the queen was bestowing places upon her favourite courtiers the real power of the monarchy was fading away. The royalists called the battle of Newbury "a very great victory." Before this issue had been tried the parliament had appointed commissioners to negotiate a treaty of alliance with the Scots; for the parliament felt weak and dispirited.[1]

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT WITH SCOTLAND

Sir Henry Vane, the chief negotiator, had acceded to the imperative demand of the Scots parliament that the religious system of Scotland should be adopted as that of England. Vane, who was an Independent, and a supporter of toleration, contrived, after great debate, to satisfy the zealous Presbyterians, who proposed "a covenant." Vane stipulated for a "solemn league and covenant." This obligation was to be taken by both nations. The Scots proposed a clause "for the preservation of the king's person." Vane added, "in preservation of the laws of the land and liberty of the subject." To the clause for "reducing the doctrine and discipline of both churches to the pattern of the best reformed," Vane added "according to the word of God."[2] This solemn league and covenant was to bind those who subscribed to it, "to endeavour, without respect of persons, the extirpation of popery and prelacy."

On the 25th of September, all the members of parliament, assembled in St. Margaret's church, swore to maintain "the solemn league and covenant." The oath was signed by two hundred and twenty-eight members of the commons. It was adopted in the city with enthusiastic demonstrations of religious fervour. On the next day Essex was received in London with a warmth that

[1] "The parliament," says May,[c] the historian, "was now in a low ebb; they had no forces at all to keep the field, their main armies being quite ruined, and no hope in appearance left, but to preserve awhile those forts and towns which they then possessed; nor could they long hope to preserve them, unless the fortune of the field should change."]

[2] As Gardiner[b] notes, Vane, who was eager for religious liberty, slipped in these words which the Scots could not reject, but which afterward enabled every Englishman to deny any distasteful part of the creed as not "according to the word of God." Gardiner emphasises the distinction between this Solemn League and Covenant and the covenant solely of the Scots in 1638.]

may have consoled him for some previous complaints of his want of energy, and for annoyances which he had received in his command. The lords and commons gave him an assurance of their confidence: and he remained the general-in-chief, without the divided powers which had created a jealousy between himself and Sir William Waller.

GROWING IMPORTANCE OF CROMWELL

Whilst the members of parliament in London are lifting up their hands in reverent appeal to Heaven as they accept the covenant, and the people are shouting around the earl of Essex as the banners are displayed which he won in the Newbury fight, there is one man, fast growing into one of the most notable of men, who is raising troops, marching hither and thither, fighting whenever blows are needful—work which demands more instant attention than the ceremony of St. Margaret's church. In the early stages of his wonderful history nothing is more interesting than to trace the steps of this man, now Colonel Cromwell. Whatever he says or does has some marks of the vigour of his character—so original, so essentially different in its manifestations from the customary displays of public men. In Cromwell's speeches and writings we must not look for the smooth and equable movement of common diplomatists and orators. His grand earnestness makes the artifices of rhetoric appear petty by comparison. The fluency of the scholarly writer is weak by the side of his homely phrases. He is urging some great friends in Suffolk to raise recruits, and choose captains of horse: "A few honest men are better than numbers. * * * * I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain, who knows what he fights for, and loves what he knows, than that which you call 'a gentleman,' and is nothing else. I honour a gentleman that is so indeed."

In this spirit Cromwell is forming his "ironsides," and at this period is heading them in the earliest of those famous charges which determined so many battles. On the 10th of October, in the skirmish of Winceby, near Horncastle, his career is well nigh ended. His horse was killed at the first charge; and as he rose, he was knocked down by Sir Ingram Hopton, who led the royalists. He seized another horse, and the enemy was routed. Denzil Holles,[p] in his memoirs, more than insinuates doubts of Cromwell's personal courage. He calls him "as errand a coward, as he is notoriously perfidious, ambitious, and hypocritical"; and states, of his own knowledge, that he basely "kept out of the field at Keinton battle, where he, with his troop of horse, came not in, impudently and ridiculously affirming, the day after, that he had been all that day seeking the army and place of fight, though his quarters were but at a village near hand." We must receive this testimony for what it is worth, as coming from one who had become a bitter enemy of Cromwell, as the leader of the Independents. For the ambition of such a man as Cromwell, whether as a soldier or a politician, there was now ample room. His religious party was fast rising into importance. The secretaries of all denominations eagerly gathered under the standard of a leader who insisted that his men should be religious, but he left the particular form of religion to their own choice. The religious principle of the Civil War thus became more and more prominent, when enthusiasts of every denomination regarded it as a struggle for the right of private judgment in matters of faith, and despised every authority but that of the Bible.

Such a leader as Cromwell had tougher materials to conquer with than

[1643 A.D.]

Hampden, with his green-coated hunters of the Chilterns. He had themes to discourse upon in his oratory, so forcible, however, regardless of proem and peroration, which, far more than Pym's eloquent declamation, stirred the hearts of a parliament that had come to consider "the power of godliness" to be a higher cause than "the liberties of the kingdoms." Cromwell's opportunity was come. The man who had destroyed arbitrary taxation, and the man who had sent the counsellor of a military despotism to the block, were no more.

The year 1643 was memorable for the deaths of three of the greatest of the early patriots of the Long Parliament — Hampden, Falkland, and Pym. We have seen how two of the illustrious three died on the battle-field. Pym died on the 8th of December, having sunk under a lingering illness. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, his body being carried to its resting place on the shoulders of ten of the leading speakers and influential members of the house of commons.[g]

Clarendon[f] called Pym "the most popular man that ever lived." Parliament voted £10,000 to pay his debts. He had neglected his own affairs in the service of the country.[a]

Gardiner's Estimate of Pym

Peace may be made in two ways, by one side capitulating to the other, or by the discovery of a compromise which may give effect to the better aims of both sides. Pym was resolutely set against a capitulation, and he did not rise to the height of a mediator. His adversaries of the peace party, led by Holles and Maynard, had as little idea of a compromise as he had, and they were foolish enough to suppose it possible to obtain the assent of Charles and his supporters to the establishment of a Puritan church. Pym's policy was at least coherent with itself. In 1621, on his first prominent appearance in political life, he had advocated the formation of an association against popery. The protestation of 1641 was an attempt to carry this plan into practice and to make it at the same time available against royalist intrigues. The parliamentary covenant promulgated after the discovery of Waller's plot in June 1643 was an enlargement of the same project, and the solemn league and covenant in September, 1643, embraced the three kingdoms.

As long as he lived Pym was the soul of the parliamentary resistance to the king, but it is in the covenants and associations which he brought into existence that his permanent contribution to English political development is to be found. Eliot hoped to rally parliament and the constituencies as a whole to the cause which he maintained to be just. Strafford hoped to rouse the devotion of the nation as a whole to the king whose crown was supported by his own masterful intellect. Pym was the founder of party government in England. He recognised from the first that there were differences of religious opinions amongst his fellow-countrymen, and he hoped to rally round a common purpose those who on the whole felt as he did himself, with such liberty of opinion as was possible under such conditions. If the enterprise failed it was partly because he was assailed by intrigue as well as by fair opposition, and in his fierce struggle against intrigue learned to cling to doctrines which were not sufficiently expansive for the government of a nation, partly because the limitations of government itself and the insufficiency of force to solve a complicated religious and political problem were in his time very imperfectly understood. At least Pym prepared the way for the immediate victory of his party by summoning the Scots and by the financial measures which made the

campaigns of 1644 and 1645 possible. He did not, however, live to reap the harvest which was due to his efforts.[q]

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM

The men who now came upon the scene as the chief actors were of a different stamp than these earlier tribunes of the people. Henceforward the war will assume a broader character and a fiercer aspect. The prospect of accommodation will grow more and more faint. The religious element will go forward into what all who look impartially upon these times must consider as relentless persecution by one dominant party, and wild fanaticism amongst sectaries not yet banded into a common purpose. The arbitrary imposition of the covenant upon every minister of the Anglican church was the first great result of the alliance with the Scots. The Presbyterian parliament of England became more violent for conformity than the court of high commission which the parliament had destroyed. The canons of Laud had fallen lightly upon men who were indifferent about the position of the altar, or the precise amount of genuflexions; but the imposition of the covenant upon all the beneficed clergy was the declaration of an intolerant tyranny against the most conscientious.

The number of incumbents ejected from their livings, for their refusal to sign this obligation, has been variously reckoned. According to Neal[r] the historian of the Puritans, it was sixteen hundred; according to Walker[s] an extreme high churchman, it reached eight thousand. The statement of Walker is evidently a gross exaggeration. The sixteen hundred of Neal was about a fifth of the benefices of England. Whatever was the number of ejected ministers, and however some might have been, as was alleged, of evil lives, the tyranny of this measure is most odious, as coming from men who had themselves struggled against religious persecution; as Hallam[t] says: "The remorseless and indiscriminate bigotry of Presbyterianism might boast that it had heaped disgrace on Walton, and driven Lydiat to beggary; that it trampled on the old age of Hales, and embittered with insult the dying moments of Chillingworth." Amongst the eminent public men who advocated the covenant as a political measure, there were some who abhorred it as an instrument of persecution. The younger Vane, the chief promoter of it, declared upon the scaffold, that "the holy ends therein contained I fully assent to, and have been desirous to observe; but the rigid way of prosecuting it, and the oppressing uniformity that hath been endeavoured by it, I never approved."[q]

THE IRISH "CESSATION" AND THE SCOTCH INVASION

We have seen reasons for suspecting the king of authorizing the rising of the Irish Catholics. These men had now settled down to a kind of independent state; Kilkenny was the seat of government, where a general assembly was held, and a supreme council appointed to act as an executive. Ambassadors were to be sent to the pope and to the great Catholic princes. The English and Scottish forces had, however, meantime been reinforced, and they had frequently beaten the rebels in the field, and recovered several towns and forts. Charles had under various pretexts detained the earl of Leicester in England, that the earl (now marquis) of Ormonde, who was a zealous royalist, might have the authority in Ireland. The parliament, always jealous of the king's proceedings in that country, had sent over two of their members to watch matters there; but Ormonde after some time sent them back, and

[1644 A.D.]

he removed Parsons, and even committed him, Sir John Temple, and two other officers of state, to prison. The parliament, now with the tide of war rather running against them, viewed Ireland as of minor importance, and the Catholics had a fair prospect of becoming complete masters of the island; but they were composed of two parties, differing in origin though agreeing in religion, and those of the English blood did not wish to cast off their allegiance. Moreover, they knew the power of England, and saw clearly that if the parliament should conquer the king, a fearful vengeance would be taken for the atrocities that had been committed.

The proposals of Ormonde for a cessation of arms during a twelvemonth, though opposed by the mere Irish, were therefore listened to, and on the 15th of September (just four days before the battle of Newbury) the cessation was signed, the Irish agreeing to give the king 30,000*l*., half in money, half in cattle. In the following November Charles appointed Ormonde lord-lieutenant, and directed him to send over the regiments that were serving in Ireland. The intelligence of the cessation did injury to the cause of the king in England, for many deserted his party on account of it. In the king's defence it may be said, that he only followed the example of the parliament, who had sent to invite the Scots. But there was a wide difference between the Scots and the sanguinary bands whom Charles was willing to bring over from Ireland[1] to aid in restoring his despotism.[a]

The year 1644 opened with great events. On the 19th of January the Scottish army entered England. They marched from Dunbar, "in a great frost and snow"—"up to the knees in snow," said the narratives. Leslie, now earl of Leven, commanded them. The marquis of Newcastle was not strong enough long to oppose them. He had given up his attempt to take Hull, and was in winter-quarters at York. Leslie's army marched on to Newcastle, which they summoned to surrender. The governor and garrison were faithful to their trust. The Scots were straitened for provisions; and the royalist army of fourteen thousand men was intercepting their supplies. They determined to advance further into the heart of the country. At this juncture the English regiments that had been recalled by the king from Ireland, were besieging the parliamentary garrison at Nantwich. Sir Thomas Fairfax hurried to the relief of the place, and totally defeated this Anglo-Irish army, which was under the command of Sir John Byron. [They are said to have lost 500 killed and 1500 prisoners. Among these last was Colonel Monk, afterward famous.]

THE MONGREL PARLIAMENT AT OXFORD

Negotiation after negotiation between the king and the parliament having failed, and the appeal to the sword still remaining of doubtful issue, some strong measure was thought expedient to lower the character of the two houses sitting at Westminster. The king's notion was to issue a proclamation declaring the parliament to be dissolved; forbidding them to meet; and requiring all persons to reject their authority. Charles very unwillingly accepted Hyde's own counter-proposition. It was that of summoning the peers and commons that had adhered to the royal cause to meet him in parliament at Oxford. On the 22nd of December, 1643, the proclamation convoking this parliament was issued. On the 22nd of January, 1644, the parliament, or more truly convention, met at Oxford. A letter written from this assembly

[1 It is to be remembered, however, that these troops were not native Irishmen, but English soldiers hardened to the ruthless methods employed in Ireland.]

to the earl of Essex, expressing a desire for peace, was signed by forty-three peers, and one hundred and eighteen commoners. Others were absent on the king's service. In the same January, according to Whitelocke,[v] two hundred and eighty members appeared in the house of commons, besides those absent on the parliamentary services. A large majority of the commons were with the Westminster parliament; a large majority of peers with that of Oxford.

The measure might have been productive of advantage to the royal cause, had it not soon been manifest that the king and queen were impatient under any interference with the authority of royalty. This was more fatal than the absolute refusal of the parliament at Westminister to recognise "those persons now assembled at Oxford, who, contrary to their duty, have deserted your parliament," as they wrote to the king on the 9th of March. The parliament at Oxford continued to sit till the 16th of April, voting taxes and loans, passing resolutions of fidelity, but irritating the king in their refusal to be mere instruments for registering his edicts. But they produced no visible effect upon public opinion; and Charles congratulated the queen upon their being "freed from the place of all mutinous motions, his mongrel parliament," when he had willed its adjournment.

Whilst at Oxford the king's "mongrel parliament" only proved a hindrance to the vigorous prosecution of the war, the parliament at Westminster had adopted the rational course of strengthening their executive authority. A council was formed under the title of "The committee of the two kingdoms," consisting of seven lords, fourteen members of the commons, and four Scottish commissioners. The entire conduct of the war, the correspondence with foreign states, whatever belongs to the executive power as distinguished from the legislative, devolved upon this committee. In the spring of 1644 the parliament had five armies in the field, paid by general or local taxation, and by voluntary contributions. Including the Scottish army there were altogether 56,000 men under arms; the English forces being commanded, as separate armies, by Essex, Waller, Manchester, and Fairfax.[g]

In the west, the royal forces under Hopton had advanced as far as Arundel. Waller, who had about ten thousand men, was at Farnham, whence marching by night he surprised and cut to pieces a royal regiment at Alton, and then reduced Arundel (Jan. 6). The king having sent his general, the earl of Brentford, to reinforce Hopton, the two armies, about equal in number, engaged at Alresford (Mar. 29); the royalists were defeated with the loss of five hundred men, and Waller then took and plundered Winchester. Newark-upon-Trent, one of the strongest holds of the royalists, had been for some time besieged by the parliamentary forces. Prince Rupert, who was in Cheshire, having drawn together a good body of horse, prepared to relieve it. He marched with his usual rapidity, and came so unexpectedly on the besiegers (Mar. 22), that after a brief resistance they were glad to be allowed to depart, leaving their arms, ordnance, and ammunition. Lord Fairfax, being joined by his son Sir Thomas, engaged (April 11) at Selby, Colonel Bellasis, who commanded the royalists in Yorkshire, and routed him; Newcastle, who was at Durham, immediately fell back to York, where he was besieged by the Scots and the troops of Fairfax, to whose aid, some time after (June 3), came the troops of the eastern counties (fourteen thousand in number) under Lord Kimbolton, now earl of Manchester, and his lieutenant-general, Oliver Cromwell. Essex and Waller were at this time both gradually approaching Oxford with the intention of confining the king's forces to that city.[u]

The queen, who was in a situation that made the thought of remaining in

[1644 A.D.]

a city exposed to siege very irksome, determined to go to a place of greater safety. She went to Exeter in April, and never saw Charles again. He remained shut up in Oxford. Its walls were surrounded by lines of defence; but the blockading forces had become so strong that resistance appeared to be hopeless. On the night of the 3rd of June the king secretly left the city and passed safely between the two hostile armies. There had been jealousies and disagreements between Essex and Waller. The committee of the two kingdoms had assigned to Waller the command of the army of the west, in the event of the separation of the two armies. Essex, supported by the council of war, resolved to march to the west himself. He was directed by the committee to retrace his steps, and go in pursuit of the king. Essex replied to the committee that their orders were opposed to military discipline; and he marched on. Waller, meanwhile, had gone in pursuit of the king into Worcestershire. Charles suddenly returned to Oxford; and then, defeated Waller who had hastened back to encounter him at Cropredy Bridge, near Banbury. Essex was before the walls of Exeter, in which city the queen had given birth to a princess. The king hastened to the west. He was strong enough to meet either of the parliamentary armies, thus separated.



PRINCE RUPERT
(1619–1682)

Meanwhile the north of England became the scene of the most momentous conflict that distracted England had yet beheld. The dashing enterprise of Rupert in the relief of Lathom House, so bravely held by Charlotte de la Trémouille, countess of Derby, became of small importance amidst the greater event that was to follow in the north. The moated house of the Stanleys had been defended by the heroic countess for eighteen weeks against a detachment of the army of Fairfax. Their artillery could produce little impression upon the thick walls and lofty towers; and the demand to submit herself, her children and followers to the mercy of parliament, produced from the lady, immortalised by history and romance, the reply, that "the mercies of the wicked are cruel." Rupert hung the walls of Lathom House with the parliamentary banners which he had captured in a fierce battle at Bolton; and he went on towards York to a fiercer strife and a perilous defeat. The combined English and Scottish armies were besieging York. Rupert received a letter from the king, containing these words: "I command and conjure you, by the duty and the affection which I know you bear me, that all new enterprises laid aside, you immediately march, according to your first intention, with all your force to the relief of York." He did march. Marston Moor saw the result.

MARSTON MOOR, LOSTWITHIEL, AND NEWBURY (1644 A.D.)

As Rupert advanced towards York with twenty thousand men, the allied English and Scots retired. Their councils were not unanimous. Some were for fighting, some for retreating, and at length they moved to Tadcaster. Rupert entered York with two thousand cavalry. The earl of Newcastle was in command there. He counselled a prudent delay. The impetuous Rupert said he had the orders of the king for his guidance, and he was resolved to fight. Newcastle was indignant with the prince but he left him to his own course. On the 2nd of July, having rested two days in and near York and enabled the city to be newly provisioned, the royalist army went forth to fight. They met their enemy on Marston Moor. The two armies looked upon each other for two hours, with scarcely a cannon-shot fired. Newcastle asked Rupert what office he was to take. He replied that the earl might repose, for he did not intend to begin the action till the morrow. Newcastle went to his carriage, and left the prince to his supremacy.

The sun was in the west on the July evening when the battle began.[1] The sun had scarcely set when the battle was finished; and there were four thousand one hundred and fifty bodies lying dead on that plain. The issue would have been more than doubtful, but for Cromwell, who for the first time had headed his Ironsides in a great pitched battle. The right wing of the parliamentary army was scattered. Rupert was chasing and slaying the Scottish cavalry. The centre of each army, each centre composed of infantry, were fighting with the sturdy resolution of Englishmen, whatever be the quarrel. The charges of Fairfax and Cromwell decided the day. The flight of the Scottish horse proclaimed that the victory of the cavaliers was complete; and a messenger who reached Oxford from Newark announced such news to the enraptured courtiers as made the gothic pinnacles red with bonfires. In another day or two the terrible truth was known.

The victory of the parliamentary armies was so complete,[2] that the earl of Newcastle had left York, and had embarked at Scarborough for the continent. [He said he could not bear the laughter of the court.] Rupert marched away also, with the wreck of his army, to Chester. Each had announced his determination to the other, as they gloomily entered York on the night of the battle. Fifteen hundred prisoners, all the artillery, more than a hundred banners, remained with the victors. And the men who had achieved this success were the despised Puritans; those who had been a laughing-stock for half a century. "We had all the evidence," writes Cromwell to his brother-in-law, Colonel Valentine Walton, "of an absolute victory obtained by the Lord's blessing upon the godly party principally. We never charged but we routed the enemy. The left wing, which I commanded, being our own horse, saving

[1 "Of this battle, the bloodiest of the whole war, I must leave the reader to imagine it in general the most enormous hurly-burly of fire and smoke, and steel-flashings, and death-tumult, ever seen in those regions: the end of which, about ten at night, was, 'Four thousand one hundred and fifty bodies to be buried, and total ruin to the king's affairs in those northern parts.' The armies were not completely drawn up till after five in the evening; there was a ditch between them; they stood facing one another, motionless, except the exchange of a few cannon-shots, for an hour and half. Newcastle thought there would be no fighting till the morrow, and had retired to his carriage for the night. There is some shadow of surmise that the stray cannon shot, which proved fatal to Oliver's nephew, did also, rouse Oliver's humour to the charging point, bring on the general battle. 'The Prince of Plunderers,' invincible hitherto, here first tasted the steel of Oliver's Ironsides, and did not in the least like it. 'The Scots delivered their fire with such constancy and swiftness, it was as if the whole air had become an element of fire,' in the ancient summer gloaming there."—CARLYLE.]

[2 According to Gardiner Rupert and Newcastle were decidedly outnumbered by the parliamentary troops.]

[1644 A.D.]

a few Scots in our rear, beat all the prince's horse. God made them as stubble to our swords."

The queen, sinking under a serious illness, unable to call back the high spirit which had made her so determined in her councils and her actions, now fled to France. Essex was approaching with his army towards Exeter. She asked a safe conduct from him to go to Bath or Bristol. He offered to wait upon her himself to London;[1] but he could not obey her desire to go to any other place without directions from the parliament. On the 9th of July she wrote a letter from Truro to bid her husband adieu. "I am hazarding my life that I may not incommode our affairs." She embarked from Falmouth on the 14th, and landed at Brest.

Soon after her departure the king's arms had a considerable success over Lord Essex at Lostwithiel, in Cornwall. The parliamentary party were in alarm. The army was indeed in a sad condition. Essex wrote in vain for assistance; in vain urged a diversion, to take off the pressure of the royalist army by which he was surrounded. By the latter end of August he was encompassed by the royalists. The greater part of his army desired to capitulate, though his cavalry had succeeded in passing the enemy's posts. Essex hastily left the camp to avoid that humiliation, leaving Skippon in command. The old campaigner proposed to his officers to follow the example of the cavalry, at all risks. But Charles offered honourable terms of capitulation, only requiring the surrender of the artillery, arms, and ammunition.

The army of Essex returned as fugitives to London, or dispersed through the country. He wrote from Plymouth an account of "the greatest blow that ever befel our party." His fidelity to the cause he had adopted not only saved him from reproach, but the parliament hastened to give him a new mark of their confidence. The king was resolved to march to London from the west. Montrose was in arms in Scotland, and had gained two battles. The time for a great blow was thought to have arrived. Three armies under Essex, Manchester, and Waller were called out for the defence of the capital.

Essex, though retaining his authority, did not join the troops which fought the second battle of Newbury on the 27th of October. Manchester was there in command. This battle was hotly contested without any decisive results. The king withdrew to Oxford, renewing his project of advancing to London. The serious differences between the Presbyterians and the Independents were brought to an issue by this second battle of Newbury. There were no rejoicings in the city that the king had been checked in his approach. There was gloom and dissatisfaction amongst the people, which was evidently encouraged by men of bolder resolves than those who had the conduct of military affairs.[g]

After the battle of Newbury, when the king retired, Waller's cavalry pursued until a twice repeated order from Manchester brought him up. Waller and Cromwell begged Manchester to bring up his infantry, but he felt the risk too great. He preferred to pause and capture Donnington Castle. The attack was repulsed and shortly after the king relieved the castle, and got away safely again. This weak conclusion due to Manchester's hesitating policy embittered Cromwell against him.[a]

[1 The queen, who had lain-in on the 16th of June, sent about the end of the month to Essex for a safe conduct to go to Bath for her health. He replied that he could not without the direction of parliament, but that he would not only give her a safe conduct, but accompany her himself to London — where she was impeached! "It is painful," says Godwin[x] "to see the effect of civil broils as displayed in such instances as this; and we cannot but wonder at this style of reply from a commander so noted for good-breeding and a generous disposition as Essex, in which the brutality of the thought is only exceeded by the ironical language in which it was conveyed." — KEIGHTLEY.[a]]

PARLIAMENTARY RIGOUR

There was nothing in which the sufferings caused by a state of revolution were more evident than in the finances, and the parliament went, in this respect, far beyond everything that the king had formerly ventured. Clarendon / therefore exclaims, "Before the war, two subsidies, £150,000, were said to be an enormous sum; now £1,742,936 have been imposed." So early as November, 1642, the parliament demanded a payment of the twentieth part of the value of estates. The persons appointed to levy this tax were authorised by the law to value, to break open chests and trunks, to take away and sell, to imprison those who refused payment so long as they thought proper, and remove their families from London and vicinity. However, as notwithstanding such rigorous measures, this mode of direct taxation did not produce enough, heavy taxes on consumption were imposed in May 1643, and gradually extended and augmented on beer, wine, brandy, cider, tobacco, sugar, meat, salt, saffron, starch, alum, hops, drugs, paper, leather, glass, silks, etc.[1] At the same time interest at eight per cent. was given upon loans, the estates of many Catholics and bishops were sold, and the property of all clergymen who opposed the new laws of the church was sequestrated. Lastly, every one who had directly or indirectly assisted the royalists, carried on their business for them, received them into their houses, or gone to theirs, was branded with the name of delinquent, and by way of punishment compelled to pay the value of two years of his income.

Several pamphlets in favor of the king, did not fail to produce an effect, so that the parliament, finding that the liberty of the press was disadvantageous to it, passed laws instituting a rigid censorship, caused warehouses to be searched, presses to be broken to pieces, printers, sellers, and bookbinders to be imprisoned. In a similar manner, Montagu was expelled from the house of commons, and imprisoned, because he would not take an oath to live and die with the earl of Essex; for it appeared to the house (according to the journals) to be a great crime that a member would not be guided by the declarations of others, but by his own judgment, whereby it was assumed that the conviction of everybody must agree with that of the parliament. This, however, was so far from being the case, that many secret associations against it, for instance, that of Waller, were discovered, which led to punishments and new oaths. Nay, the two Hothams, father and son, who had before so greatly insulted the king, had been induced, by repentance or ambition, to enter into negotiations with him, as we have seen, for which they had been arrested, and, in the sequel, were executed.//

THE SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE AND THE NEW MODEL

The late successes of the king were attributed to the want of harmony among the parliamentary generals. Waller had been from the first a rival of Essex, and Manchester and Cromwell, his second in command, had opposite views and feelings. The religious differences of Presbyterian and Independent had now extended to the army also; Cromwell was at the head of the latter party, Manchester and Waller belonged to the former, while Essex preferred the Episcopalian church. Further, both he and Manchester wished to preserve the constitution in the state, while Cromwell desired a republic.' It was therefore suspected, and not without reason, that neither of these noblemen

[1] "With the fifth part of what was afterwards raised by taxation," says Clarendon, "the king and the state would have been saved."

[1644 A.D.]

was inclined to weaken the king too much. The affair of Donnington Castle brought the parties who had been for some time menacing each other to issue. Cromwell, when called on in the house of commons to state what he knew of it, accused Manchester of an averseness to ending the war by the sword, and of thinking that the king was now low enough for a peace to be made.

Next day Manchester took notice of this in the lords, and at his desire a day being fixed for the purpose, he gave his account of the Donnington affair, laying the chief blame on Cromwell. He also stated some speeches of Cromwell, proving him to be hostile to the peerage, and to the amity between England and Scotland; such as his saying that it would never be well with England till the earl of Manchester were plain Mr. Montagu, that the Scots had crossed the Tweed only to establish presbytery, and that in that cause he would as soon fight against them as the king. He added, that it was Cromwell's design to form an army of sectaries who might dictate to both king and parliament. The commons appointed a committee to inquire if this accusation of one of their members in the other house were not a breach of privilege. Meantime some of the Presbyterian party and the Scottish commissioners met at Essex House, and sending for the two lawyers Whitelocke and Maynard, took their opinion on the subject of accusing Cromwell as an incendiary between the two nations. The lawyers, however, being of opinion that the evidence was not sufficient, the plan was abandoned.

On the 9th of December the commons resolved themselves into a committee to consider the condition of the kingdom with regard to the war. After a long silence Cromwell rose and recommended that instead of an inquiry they should devise some general remedy of the evils. The next speaker said that the fault lay in the commands being divided. A third proposed that no member of either house should hold any civil or military command during the war. This was supported by Vane and opposed by Whitelocke, Holles, and others. An ordinance to this effect, however, passed the commons (21st), a vain attempt having been made to have the earl of Essex excepted. In the lords it met with much opposition; for, as they justly objected, it would exclude their entire order from all offices of trust and honour. They accordingly rejected it (Jan. 13, 1645).

Another project which was going on at the same time, was the "new model" of the army. On the 21st the names of the principal officers of it were put to the vote in the commons. Sir Thomas Fairfax was named commander-in-chief, Skippon major-general; twenty-four colonels were appointed, but nothing was said as to the post of lieutenant-general. The lords passed the ordinance[1] for the new model (Feb. 15); and an ordinance similar to the one they had rejected, but only requiring members to lay down the offices which they held, and being silent as to their reappointment, was sent up to them. This "Self-Denying Ordinance" was passed on the 3rd of April, Essex, Manchester and Denbigh having laid down their commands the day before.[u] While one party extolled this law as highly necessary and wise, as a most noble action, nay, as an unexampled and wonderful event, a second party declared that it was the most rash, dangerous, and unjust resolution that any parliament had ever passed.

RELIGIOUS BIGOTRIES AND LAUD'S EXECUTION (1645 A.D.)

As by Charles' giving up the right to dissolve it, all the power must fall into its hands, the parliament by the Self-Denying Ordinance in truth sacri-

[1 The word "ordinance" though it had been used in mediæval times of a royal edict without parliamentary assent, was now employed for a parliamentary act without royal assent.]

ficed itself, and created in the army a power which would be the greater and more independent, because Fairfax and Cromwell obtained the right of directing the levies of recruits, and of appointing all the officers, even the colonels. For the confirmation of everything done by them, which the parliament had reserved to itself, soon became a mere formality. This remarkable turn and change, with respect to the temporal power and predominance, cannot be fully comprehended till we examine the course of ecclesiastical and religious affairs. The English revolution differs from most others, and is doubly interesting and instructive, from the circumstance that it is by no means external force which excites, impels, and decides; but that thoughts everywhere manifest themselves, and all has a reference to ideas, and this not merely in the temporal matters of state and policy, but also in spiritual affairs of doctrine and church discipline. Thus, we find almost all possible gradations, from ultra royalists and ultra Catholics, to unbridled anarchists and believers in the millennium; and each of these gradations (so blind are vanity and arrogance) was considered by its advocates as absolutely true, of eternal duration, while they rejected and condemned whatever differed from it in however trifling a degree. They did not see, they did not even presage, that as the rapid revolution of things drove them from the lowest depression to the greatest elevation, from oppression to power, they must incessantly culminate and sink again.

The struggle between Catholics and Protestants in general appeared to both parties to be long since ended in theory, and the use of violence towards those who persevered in wilful blindness was not only permitted, but justified. Nay, setting aside all other reasons, toleration was impossible, because the party which granted it, while the other refused, would always have the disadvantage. The contest against the Catholics was followed by that against the Episcopal constitution. Without regard to the above mentioned equivocal expression in the treaty with the Scotch, it was rejected in October, 1643, and everything determined according to the opinions of the Puritanical majority of the house of commons. Accordingly, a law was passed that all paintings, statues, stone altars, lattice work, chandeliers, fonts, crosses, chalices, organs, ornamental floors and windows, should be removed from the churches. Naturally enough, the populace went beyond the directions of the violent legislators, and an indiscriminate destruction of images succeeded, in which, especially the tombs of bishops and kings, nay, all historical monuments placed in the sanctuaries of religion, were treated as worthy of destruction. The beards, noses, fingers, and arms of the statues were broken off, crowns torn away, organs demolished and the pipes melted into bullets, windows broken, inscriptions effaced, and ornamented pavements pulled up.

The parliament, though informed of these proceedings, confirmed, on the 9th of May, 1644, the former law, and merely added that no monument of a king, prince, or nobleman should be destroyed, unless he had passed for a saint. In order to root out every particle of foreign superstition, the pretended purifiers of religion ran into a Mohammedan hatred of art, and an ignorant incredible abhorrence of what was holy and consecrated. Besides this, all the theatres were closed, the *Book of Sports* treating of amusements permitted on Sunday was burnt by the hangman, all travelling on that day declared to be impious, and the figure of the cross no longer tolerated, even in the signs of public houses. The sermons often lasted from nine o'clock in the morning till four in the afternoon, or far longer than the human mind is capable of forming an uninterrupted series of thought, or of receiving it, so that we need not doubt the correctness of the observation that these discourses were often absurd and always tiresome; and as every extreme generally pro-

[1645 A.D.]

duces its contrary, we find, with this intolerant austerity, the most scandalous excesses committed by the image-breakers in consecrated places.

Meantime the parliament had, as we have seen, solemnly sworn to the covenant, at Westminster, on the 25th of September, 1643, and required the same oath from every person in office, and every clergyman in the kingdom. Collier[z] is perhaps right when he affirms that the Presbyterians expelled far more at this time than the Papists had done under Mary, and the bishops under Elizabeth. All this was, of course, recommended and approved from the pulpit. Thus, Stephen Marshall said in a sermon, "What soldier's heart is not appalled at the thought of piercing little children in a conquered city or of holding them up by the legs and dashing their heads against the wall. But if this work is done to avenge God's church (the Presbyterians) upon Babylon (the Church of England), happy is he that taketh the little ones and dasheth them against the stones." This increased intolerance was manifested towards no individual with more violence than Archbishop Laud, who had been imprisoned for three years, and was almost forgotten. "Poor Canterbury," so Baillie,[bb] the Scotch clergyman, writes, "is so contemptible that nobody thinks of him; he was only a ring in Strafford's ear." Yet, chiefly to please the Scotch, the proceedings against the old bishop were now resumed by the parliament, and very unjustly placed under the direction of his old adversary Prynne. His enemies now possessed the power (as he formerly had), and took care to exercise it. The main accusation, that he had attempted to overthrow the laws, religion, and the rights of parliament, was divided into numerous branches, which we have not space to detail.

Laud defended himself with boldness, acuteness, and wit; nay, he spoke rather as an accuser, than submissively and asking favour. Though everything was represented in the most unfavourable light, the judges declared, on the 17th of December, 1644, that they could not find the archbishop guilty of treason, and left the decision to the house of lords. The latter communicated the difficulty that had arisen to the lower house, which answered: That there was in the first place, treason against the king, on which the inferior tribunals decide according to the law; secondly, treason against the kingdom on which the parliament decided. However, as in the case of Strafford's trial, the form of the proceeding was changed into a bill of attainder, which was passed on the 4th of January, 1645, by the house of lords; and with much difficulty his petition was acceded to that he might not be hanged and quartered, but only beheaded. A pardon granted to the archbishop by the king, dated the 12th of April, 1643, was over-ruled and rejected.

On the 10th of January, 1645, Laud ascended the scaffold, and acknowledged that he was a great sinner, but that he had never endeavoured to subvert the laws of the realm, or change the Protestant religion, and that he had not done anything deserving death, according to the laws of the kingdom. He thanked God for suffering him to die for his honour; prayed for the happiness of the king, the restoration of the church to truth, peace, and prosperity; for the parliament according to its ancient and just power; and that the unhappy and distracted nation might penitently cease from war and bloodshed, and enjoy its hereditary rights and lawful liberties. "Now," said he, "the blind lead the blind, and all will fall into the ditch. As others would not honour the images which the king set up, I will not worship the vain phantoms which the people invent, nor will I abandon the temple and the truth of God to follow the bleating of Jeroboam's calves in Dan and Bethel. I am no enemy to parliaments, and acknowledge their utility; but *corruptio optimi est pessima.* For my part, I freely forgive everybody." Laud submitted to the fatal

stroke with courage and composure. Immediately before him, was executed Hotham, who had first accused Laud in parliament.

The trial and the condemnation of Laud are much less to be excused than that of the dangerous and powerful Lord Strafford; for the single points laid to his charge appear to be mere trifles, and the vague reproach of overthrowing the constitution, in church and state, he might have flung back with double force upon his accusers. They, besides, never attended the proceedings and examination of the witnesses, but deciding in the lower house entirely after the representations of their counsel; and of the lords, there were never more than fourteen present at the trial; and at the passing of the sentence only twelve, or, as others say, only seven. Except the speaker, not a single member had attended the trial from the beginning to the end. That an old man, seventy-two years of age, who was wholly powerless, was brought to the scaffold, after the overthrow of the Episcopal system, and four years' imprisonment, with the violation of so many legal forms, and without any motives of political necessity, was a proof of the blind passion of the pretended defenders of liberty, justice, and law. They could not, or would not see, what disgrace they prepared for their own reputation, and what honour for the archbishop, by thus raising him to the dignity of a martyr.



VISCOUNT STRAFFORD, WILLIAM HOWARD
(1612–1680)

Loud complaints of this and other despotic acts being made, the parliament, following the course which it had blamed in its opponents, again made the censorship of the press more severe; but was not able thereby to restrain its excesses, much less to repress arbitrary proceedings of another kind.

THE WARRING CREEDS AND INTOLERANCE

On the 4th of January, 1645, a few days before the execution of Laud, it had been resolved by the assembly of divines (in session since July 1, 1643) that the book of common prayer should be laid aside; the form of divine worship hitherto observed should be abolished; and a new directory, which had been framed by the assembly of divines, a creed, a catechism, and a scheme of a Presbyterian constitution of the church, were drawn up. In the creed all was on strict Calvinistic principles, and peculiar stress was laid on the doctrine of predestination. It was left to a future general assembly to decide a question which was stated to be of the highest importance, namely, whether there had been at Ephesus a classical presbytery, and in Jerusalem a simple congregation. Many of the old forms and arrangements, such as crosses, altars, and confessions of the sick, were abolished. "Nobody shall

[1645 A.D.]

write or preach against the new ordinances; he who shall in future use the old common prayer book either in the church or in public places, nay, even in his own house and family, shall pay for the first offence £5, for the second £10, and for the third be imprisoned for a year, and not allowed to give bail. The church having the right of the keys, may, through its priests, classes, and synods, censure, remove, depose, and excommunicate."

In this manner the Presbyterians had, in their opinion, obtained a complete victory; but, at the very moment when they were rejoicing at it and proclaimed it aloud, the real power, as usually happens in revolutions, had already passed into other hands. So long as the only question was a contest against the Papists and Episcopalians, there appeared to be scarcely any difference among the assailants, and this contributed to their victory. Now, however, that the Puritans wished to enforce their principles with the same partiality as those whom they had overcome had done before, many really liberal-minded men resisted this practical tyranny and were equally ready in adducing theoretical arguments in support of their assertions. Irritated by the unconditional claims of the Puritans, and excluded from all toleration, the Independents now opposed them, and affirmed that it was quite the same thing whether Christendom was tyrannised over by a pope, twenty bishops, or a thousand priests; and thus an external union and slavish subordination was not only necessary in spiritual Christianity, but was also contrary to Christian liberty; that every Christian congregation was in itself a complete perfect church, which was, immediately and independently of other churches, under Christ, by which, however, the idea of a universal Christian church, in a truly spiritual sense was not abolished; only it was maintained that no ecclesiastical constitution was absolutely of divine institution.

The Independents gave to every male communicant the right of voting in all ecclesiastical affairs or in determining points of doctrine, and in the appointment and removal of clergymen. The Erastians[1] rejected all church government whatever, and assigned only to the state the superintendence of all religious communities, merely however with regard to public safety and order. Lastly, appeared the Levellers, at the farthest extreme of the course we have pointed out: since they did not, like the Presbyterians, stop at the independence of a national church with a connected organisation; or, like the Independents, at that of the several congregations; but claimed for every individual an absolute right of self-government in religious matters, without denying that a similarity of sentiments might lead to a natural union.

In connection with these religious views, political actions were developed; and if the Episcopalians generally promoted unlimited monarchy, and the Puritans an essential limitation of it, the Independents for the most part recommended, and endeavoured to obtain, a republican constitution;[2] and the Levellers were in danger of rejecting civil as well as ecclesiastical authority and of running into pure anarchy.

At that time the victorious Presbyterians considered themselves as the only true divine church, the only one agreeable to God, and stigmatised all persons who entertained different sentiments as damnable heretics. The latter, however they differed in other respects, agreed that such discrepancies are natural; that liberty of conscience is an inalienable right; and that it is the indispensable duty of every one to inquire and decide for himself in matters of religion.

[1 A small party named from Thomas Erastus (Lieber), a German divine who died in 1588.]
[2 However, we are only half entitled to look on the Independents as necessarily republicans, for under other circumstances they were zealous adherents of the house of Hanover.]

It was and is of little importance what the Independents themselves taught on any particular point, but that they maintained the idea of toleration, and church government, in a new and highly important manner; nay, that they placed it at the head of their whole system. It is true that they contradicted themselves, inasmuch as they more or less excluded Romanists and Episcopalians from this toleration; this exception, however, was founded chiefly on the circumstance that these set up unlimited claims, and that political reasons had essential influence. It was only by degrees that Chillingworth, Hale, Locke, etc., freed the doctrine of the Independents from defects and exaggeration. Though the Independents were not able to get their views adopted in the assembly at Westminster, they met with much approbation among the people, and even in parliament. And thus the Presbyterians found that their apparently absolute victory availed them nothing, because the house of commons did not confirm their resolutions, and the people did not voluntarily adopt and carry them into effect. The heads of the Presbyterians, Holles, Long, Waller, etc., found themselves overpowered by the enthusiasm and worldly wisdom of their opponents, Cromwell, Vane, Whitelocke, Selden, Fiennes, St. John, Haslerig, and Martin; and the Self-Denying Ordinance was for the latter not merely a political but a theological victory, because above two-thirds of the officers and most of the soldiers in the newly-formed army were of the party of the Independents.

In this divided opposition both parties needed a mediator or an ally. Hence the king acquired new importance, and he thought that the disunion of his adversaries would enable him to become master of them all; though the events of the war had not led to any positive superiority but to misery of all kinds. Necessity and arrogance served equally as an occasion or pretext for acts of plunder and violence; whence an acute observer says, "The vexatious austerity of the Puritans was no less oppressive than the boastful licentiousness of many royalists." The one party plundered in the name of God, the other in the name of the king. On both sides the people's minds were agitated by the most powerful motives: liberty, religion, law, love of the king and of the country. No one dared to remain neutral; though, as we have said, not merely the timid and selfish would willingly have withdrawn, but even the most noble minded men scarcely knew what party to join, or how they should lead everything to a middle and moderate course.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS AT UXBRIDGE (1645 A.D.)

This deplorable state of things, and the position of the great religious and political parties in parliament and in the assembly at Westminster, had led, even before the passing of the Self-Denying Ordinance, to fresh attempts to negotiate a peace. On the 20th of November, 1644, four deputies from the house of commons, and two from the lords, repaired to Oxford, to submit to the king the conditions proposed by parliament. They received an answer, which they brought back to the parliament, at the end of November. Four lords, eight commoners, and four Scotchmen were commissioned to negotiate for peace, at Uxbridge, with the king's commissioners.[7]

On the 30th of January the commissioners on both sides met at Uxbridge. The royalists were sixteen in number, those of the parliament twelve, together with four Scottish commissioners; both parties were attended by their divines. After the preliminaries had been arranged, they commenced with the subject of religion. The parliament insisted on the unqualified abolition of Episcopacy and the establishment of Presbytery: the king would not abandon the former,

[1645 A.D.]

which he regarded as of divine institution; but he was willing to limit it, to reform abuses in it, and to grant indulgence to tender consciences in matters of ceremonies. This subject having been debated for three days to no purpose, they next passed to the militia. The parliament demanded that it should be entirely vested in them and in persons in whom they could confide. They relaxed so far as to demand it only for seven years, after which it should be settled by bill or agreement between the king and parliament. The king was willing to surrender it for three years, provided it then returned fully to the crown. With respect to Ireland, the parliament required the "Cessation" to be declared null and void, and the conduct of the war and government of that country to be committed to them; the royal commissioners justified the king in making the Cessation, and asserted that he was in honour bound to maintain it. These matters were debated over and over till the 22nd of February, when the parliament having refused to prolong the treaty, the commissioners returned to Westminster and Oxford, and preparations were made for another appeal to the sword.

This treaty, the inutility of which must have been apparent, had been entered into solely in compliance with the wishes of those on both sides who were weary of the evils of war and sincerely desirous of peace. Among these the king himself cannot be included, for he was determined to concede none of the points at issue, and his usual duplicity was displayed even in the commencement; for when he had been induced to style in his answer the two houses the parliament of England, he writes to the queen, "If there had been but two besides myself of my opinion, I had not done it; and the argument that prevailed with me was, that the calling did no ways acknowledge them to be a parliament," and he adds that it is so registered in the council book. He was besides negotiating for foreign aid, and treating for a peace and an army with the Irish rebels; and he was so much elated by exaggerated accounts of the successes of Montrose in Scotland, that he was in full expectation of being shortly able to resume the plentitude of his despotism.

In effect, when the situations and tempers of the parties are considered, it is manifest that there was no room for accommodation, that one or other must be subdued, and despotism of one kind or other be the result.

THE VICTORIES OF MONTROSE IN SCOTLAND

In the summer of the preceding year, the earls of Montrose and Antrim[1] had come to Oxford with tenders of their services to the crown. They were both inveterate enemies of Argyll, who had now the chief power in Scotland, and Montrose asserted that if Antrim could raise fifteen hundred or two thousand men in Ireland and land them in the Highlands, he himself would be able to join them with so many of the Highland clansmen, loyal to the king and enemies of Argyll, as would make such a diversion, as would, if not recover the kingdom, at least oblige the Scottish army in England to return to its defence. The king listened to the proposal, and gave them the necessary commissions. Antrim forthwith passed over to Ireland, and raising about eighteen hundred men among his clan there, sent them over under his kinsman Sir Alister M'Donnel named Colkitto.

Montrose having left Oxford with a good company, suddenly disappeared, and with only two attendants eluded the vigilance of both nations till he

[1] Randal M'Donnel, Earl of Antrim, an Irish Catholic nobleman, had married the widow of Buckingham, who was the daughter and heiress of the earl of Rutland. Her wealth gave him consideration; but Clarendon *f* describes him as a vain, weak man.

reached the foot of the Grampians, where he remained concealed till he heard of the landing of the Irish. He directed them to join him in Athole, where at their head he unfurled the royal standard, and summoned the clans to arms. They responded to his call; he poured down on the Lowlands; at Tippermuir (Sept. 1) he defeated the lord Elcho, and then entered and plundered the town of Perth. He then moved northwards; the bridge of Dee was defended by Lord Burleigh, but his men fled at the first shock, and the ferocious followers of Montrose entered Aberdeen pell-mell with them. The town was given up to pillage and massacre for four days. The Irish, we are told, displayed a thriftiness in their barbarity such as one might rather have looked for in the Scots, for they stripped their victims naked before they murdered them, lest their clothes should be spoilt.

The approach of Argyll with a superior force obliged Montrose to quit Aberdeen on the fifth day. He moved toward the Spey, and finding its opposite bank guarded he buried his ordnance in a morass, and went up the stream till he reached the forests of Strath Spey and the mountains of Badenoch. He then descended into Athole and Angus, still followed by Argyll, and suddenly crossing the Grampians, again moved northwards in hopes of rousing the Gordons to arms. At Fyvie Castle he was nearly surrounded, but after sustaining the repeated attacks of a superior force, he retired by night, and effected his retreat to Badenoch. Argyll, wearied out, as it was now far in the winter, returned to his castle of Inverary, where he deemed himself in perfect security. But the energetic and vindictive Montrose amidst the snows of December (13th), penetrated by passes only trodden by the herdsmen in summer into Argyllshire. The savage Irish, and no less savage clansmen, let all their fury loose on the devoted district; the inhabitants were massacred, the cattle driven off or destroyed, the houses and corn burnt. Argyll himself only escaped by putting to sea in an open boat.

After seven weeks spent in the work of devastation, Montrose moved toward Inverness. Argyll, who had rallied the scattered Campbells, was now with three thousand men at Inverlochy, at the western extremity of the chain of Highland lakes. By a secret and circuitous route, Montrose returned and fell on his vanguard by night. The moon giving her light, the troops skirmished till day. In the morning (Feb. 2, 1645) the fight began: Argyll, in whose character there was little of chivalry, viewed from a boat in the lake the noble but unavailing struggles of his gallant Campbells, and the slaughter of one half of their number. Montrose, elate with his victory, wrote to the king promising soon to come to his aid with a gallant army; and this letter arriving during the treaty of Uxbridge, aided to prevent the sanguine monarch from complying with terms on which peace might have been effected. Montrose returned to the north; the Grants and Gordons joined him; he spread his ravages as before; Dundee was stormed and partly burnt (Apr. 4). But the approach of a superior force under Baillie and that soldier of fortune Hurry, now again against the king, obliged him to return to the mountains with some loss. Baillie then entered Athole, while Hurry moved northwards after Montrose, to whom he gave battle at Aldean, near Nairn, and was defeated with the loss of two thousand men. Baillie himself was soon after overthrown at Alford on the Don.

THE NEW MODEL ARMY, AND NASEBY

The English parliament had now completed their New Model. It consisted of six thousand horse divided into ten regiments, one thousand dragoons,

[1645 A.D.]

and fourteen thousand foot in twelve regiments of ten companies each. These regiments were composed of men from the old armies, chiefly those of a religious cast and inclined to the party of the Independents. A more rigorous discipline was introduced than had hitherto prevailed, and thus was formed that noble army, which, actuated by a higher principle than the mere love of pay and plunder, never encountered a defeat, and has left its memory a subject of admiration to posterity. The king had given given the nominal command of his forces to the prince of Wales, but the real power to Prince Rupert as his lieutenant. He had also sent the prince to Bristol, ostensibly to command in the west, but really because, as he himself used to express it, "he and his son were too great a prize to be ventured in one bottom."

Goring and Greenvil had separate commands in the west, and the license in which these profligate commanders indulged their men, and the atrocities committed by them, gave origin to a defensive association among the country-people in the counties of Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, and Devon, and a similar association appeared in Gloucester and Worcester. The object of these people, who were named, from their principal weapon, clubmen, was to preserve their property from the hands of both parties; and as the royalists were the greater plunderers, their hostility was chiefly directed against them. Many of the loyal gentry however countenanced them, in hopes of being able hereafter to render them serviceable to the royal cause. About a third of the kingdom still obeyed the king; his army was more numerous than the New Model, but it was scattered and divided; its officers were at discord, and the men demoralised. He was, however, the first to take the field, and leaving Oxford (May 7) at the head of ten thousand men, of whom more than one half were cavalry, he proceeded to raise the siege of Chester. The enemy retired at the rumour of his approach.[a]

It was apprehended that Charles intended to join his army with the triumphant forces of Montrose in Scotland; and the Scottish army in England, which was then advancing to the south-east, hastily fell back upon Westmoreland and Cumberland to guard the approaches to Carlisle and the western borders. But Charles, after his success at Chester, turned round to the south-east, and soon carried the important city of Leicester by assault. This movement revived all the apprehensions about the associated counties in the east; and Fairfax, abandoning the siege of Oxford, marched into Northamptonshire, where he arrived on the 7th of June. His friend Cromwell was then in the Isle of Ely, most actively organising the militia there. At this critical moment, Fairfax and a general council of war, which he had called, requested the house of commons to dispense again in Cromwell's case with the Self-Denying Ordinance, and appoint him lieutenant-general, that second post in the army, which in all probability had purposely been left vacant from the beginning for Master Oliver. The house, which must have known by this time that no man so entirely possessed the confidence of the cavalry and of a great part of the army, sent him down a commission as lieutenant-general for three months; and Cromwell joined Fairfax just in time to be present at that great battle which was to decide the important question, "what the liberties and laws of England, and what the king's power and prerogative, should hereafter be."

The king, whose head-quarters were at Daventry, was amusing himself with field-sports, and his troops were foraging and plundering in all directions, when, on the 11th of June, old Sir Marmaduke Langdale brought him news of the unexpected approach of Fairfax. The royalist outposts were concentrated and strengthened; but, on the morning of the 12th, Fairfax beat them up at Borough Hill, and spread the alarm into the very lodgings of the king. The

parliamentarians, however, who were then very weak in cavalry, did not think fit to venture any further attempt. On the morning of the 13th, at about six o'clock, Fairfax called a council of war, and, in the midst of their debates, to the exceeding joy of the whole army, Lieutenant-General Cromwell reached head-quarters with a choice regiment of 600 horse raised by the associated counties of the east. Then all deliberation and hesitation were at an end, the drums beat, the trumpets sounded to horse, and the whole body of parliamentarians were drawn up under arms.

On Saturday, June the 14th, by three o'clock in the morning, Fairfax put himself in march from Gilling to Naseby. At five o'clock he halted close to Naseby, and shortly after several bodies of his majesty's horse showed themselves on the top of a hill in battle array. [At the very opening of the battle, Rossiter rode up with cavalry sufficient to raise the parliamentary army to nearly 14,000, almost twice the force of Charles who had 7,500.] The field-word of the royalists was "God and Queen Mary!" that of the parliament, "God our strength!" The royalists began the battle, "marching up in good order, a swift march, with abundance of alacrity, gallantry, and resolution." As in other battles, fortune at first seemed to flatter Charles, for the left wing of the parliament was worsted by the furious onslaught of Rupert. Ireton was wounded in the thigh with a pike, in the face with a halbert, and his horse being killed under him, he was made prisoner, and kept by the royalists during the greater part of the battle. Rupert, however, with his usual rashness, spurred on too far; the scattered foot rallied in his rear round their guns; and the broken horse of the left wing formed, closed, and rode up to support the centre and the right. Cromwell's charge, though gallantly met by Sir Marmaduke Langdale, was brilliant and decisive: after firing at close range and standing to it at the sword's point, the left wing of the royalists was broken, and driven far beyond all the king's foot. [Fairfax with his own hand killed an ensign, and seized his colours. When the soldier to whose charge he committed them boasted of the deed as his own, Fairfax said, "Let him retain that honour; I have to-day acquired enough beside."]

There was terrible fighting after this: the unflinching Skippon was dangerously wounded, and Cromwell was several times in peril. But a tremendous charge, conducted by the parliamentarians from several points at once, completely broke up the last steady body of the king's infantry. According to Clarendon, Rupert's cavalry thought they had acted their parts, and could never be brought to rally again in order, or to charge the enemy. They stood, with the rest, spiritless and inactive, till Cromwell and Fairfax were ready to charge them with horse and foot, and to ply them with their own artillery. Despair made Charles courageous, and, placing himself among them, he cried out, "One charge more, and we recover the day!" but he could not prevail with them to stand the shock of horse, foot, and ordnance, and they presently fled in disorder, both fronts and reserves, hotly pursued by Cromwell's horse, who took many prisoners.

Charles left behind him on the field five thousand prisoners, including an immense number of officers of all ranks, besides many of his household servants.[1] There were also taken twelve brass pieces of ordnance, two mortar

[1 "The worst fate was reserved for the unhappy women who followed the camp. About a hundred being of Irish birth, were knocked on the head without mercy. The faces of the English harlots were gashed in order to render them forever hideous, and it is not improbable that some officers' and soldiers' wives shared the fate of their frailer sisters. Puritanism was intolerant of vice, and it had no pity for the sex on which its hideous burden falls most heavily." — GARDINER. Later parliament gave an order at Fairfax's request that all the Irish prisoners should be put to death without mercy; this seems not to have been entirely carried out.]

[1645 A.D.]

pieces, eight thousand stand of arms, forty barrels of powder, all the bag and baggage, the rich pillage which the royalist soldiers had got just before at Leicester, above one hundred colours, the king's baggage, several coaches, and his majesty's private cabinet of papers and letters, which last were a means of sealing his doom. [The slain were one hundred killed in the battle and three hundred in the retreat.] With Cromwell's horse thundering close in his rear, the king got into Leicester; but not judging it safe to remain there, he rode off to Hereford. At Hereford, Prince Rupert, before any decision was taken as to what the king should do next, left his uncle, and made haste to Bristol, that he might put that place into a condition to resist a powerful and victorious enemy, which he had reason to believe would in a short time appear before it. Meanwhile Fairfax marched with his victorious army to Leicester, which was soon surrendered to him, and, leaving a garrison there, he moved westward, that he might both pursue the king and raise the siege of Taunton. The day after the battle the lord-general sent Colonel John Fiennes and his regiment up to London with the prisoners and colours taken, and with a short letter to the speaker of the house of commons, wherein Fairfax humbly desired that the honour of this great, never-to-be-forgotten mercy might be given to God in an extraordinary day of thanksgiving.

Cromwell, on the day of the battle, wrote to the parliament, averring that this was none other but the hand of God, and that to him alone belonged the glory. "The general," continued Cromwell, "served you with all faithfulness and honour, and the best commendation I can give him is, that I dare say he attributes all to God, and would rather perish than assume to himself. . . . Honest men served you faithfully in this action. Sir, they are trusty; I beseech you in the name of God not to discourage them. . . . . He that ventures his life for the liberty of his country, I wish he trust God for the liberty of his conscience, and you for the liberty he fights for." [This sentence was expurged by the commons when they published the letter.]

THE KING'S LETTERS AND INSINCERITY

But these letters were far inferior in interest to the epistles taken in the king's cabinet, now publicly read in London at a common hall, before a great assembly of citizens and many members of both houses of parliament, where leave was given to as many as pleased or knew the king's hand-writing to peruse and examine them all, in order to refute the report of those who said that the letters were counterfeit. And shortly after, a selection from them was printed and published by command of parliament.

"From the reading of these letters," says May,[o] "many discourses of the people arose. For in them appeared his transactions with the Irish rebels, and with the queen for assistance from France and the duke of Lorraine. Many good men were sorry that the king's actions agreed no better with his words. . . . . They were vexed also that the king was so much ruled by the will of his wife as to do everything by her prescript, and that peace, war, religion, and parliament should be at her disposal. It appeared, besides, out of those letters, with what mind the king treated with the parliament at Uxbridge, and what could be hoped for by that treaty." The reading of these letters is generally considered to have been as fatal to his cause as the field of Naseby where they were taken. The royalists themselves were startled by his contemptuous ingratitude; and men who had hitherto inclined to loyalty began to lose all respect for his character. From this time nothing prospered with the king.[cc]

A frequent topic in these letters is a treaty with the duke of Lorraine for his army of ten thousand men, to aid the royal cause in England. Charles also writes to the queen (Mar. 5), "I give thee power to promise in my name, to whom thou thinkest most fit, that I will take away all the penal laws against the Roman Catholics in England as soon as God shall enable me to do it, so as by their means or in their favours I may have so powerful assistance as may deserve so great a favour, and enable me to do it." Sir Kenelm Digby was at this time going to Rome to solicit aid from the pope, and the king had written to Ormonde (February 27), commanding him "to conclude a peace with the Irish, whatever it cost; so that my Protestant subjects there may be secured, and my regal authority there be preserved"; he had even sent Glamorgan on his secret mission to Ireland.

Each day brought tidings of losses. Leicester had surrendered when Fairfax appeared. He then marched to the relief of Taunton, whence Goring retired at his approach; but Fairfax brought him to action at Lamport in Somerset (July 10), and defeated him. Bridgewater, deemed impregnable, surrendered (23rd). Bath and Sherborne submitted. In the north, Scarborough, Pontefract, and Carlisle had yielded; and the Scots, who had been engaged in the siege of this last, came and sat down before Hereford. The king, quitting Wales, hastened to Newark, and finding that the Scottish horse were in pursuit of him, he burst into and ravaged the eastern counties, and at length (August 28th) reached Oxford in safety.



Herefordshire Headquarters of Prince Rupert before Battle of Ledbury

Here he was cheered with intelligence of another victory gained by Montrose. This indefatigable chief, having again issued from the mountains with a force of five thousand men, spread devastation over the country to the Forth. Baillie was advantageously posted at Kilsyth, near Stirling, and he wished to act on the defensive, but, like Pompey at Pharsalia, he was overruled by the committee of estates, and obliged to move from his strong position and prepare for battle. Ere his men were drawn up (August 15th) his horse were driven back on the foot, and the Irish and clansmen rushed on with wild yells and savage gestures. His troops broke and fled; they were pursued for the space of fourteen miles, and five thousand men, it is said, were slain. All Scotland was now open to Montrose. Glasgow and other towns submitted; the citizens of Edinburgh sent him their royalist prisoners; the marquis of Douglas and other nobles joined him, and a parliament was summoned to meet at Glasgow.

At this news, the Scottish horse under David Leslie, who were now (August 26th) at Nottingham, hastened back to their own country; and the king leaving Oxford with five thousand men, came and raised the siege of Hereford.

[1645 A.D.]

He was then proceeding to the relief of Bristol; but at Raglan Castle he learned to his utter dismay, that it had surrendered (September 10th). The king in his anger revoked his commission, and ordered him to quit the kingdom.[aa] Prince Rupert had a garrison of only 1,500, and the town lay in a hollow. He surrendered after a furious assault had shown him that there was no hope of resistance.[a] Despising his majesty's orders, Prince Rupert came to Belvoir Castle, ten miles short of Newark. Charles, greatly incensed, commanded him to stay where he was. But Rupert proceeded instantly to Newark, and Sir Richard Willis, who was governor of that place, and Gerrard, one of the king's principal officers, heedless of the king's commands, went out with an escort of 100 horse to meet the prince. Without being announced, and followed by a numerous retinue, all in arms, Rupert presented himself before his uncle, telling him that he was come to give an account of his surrender of Bristol, and to clear himself from unjust imputations which had been cast upon him by his majesty and the lord Digby.

Charles, greatly embarrassed, scarcely answered a syllable. Violent and indecent altercations ensued, not only between the king and his nephew, but also between his majesty and Sir Richard Willis, the governor. Most of the officers present took part with Willis, holding up his majesty's chief adviser, Digby, as a traitor, and defying the fallen kingly power by an act of mutiny. Rupert and his brother, Prince Maurice, with Sir Richard Willis, and about 200 horse, insolently turned their backs upon Newark and the king, and rode to Belvoir Castle, whence they sent one of their company to ask from the parliament "leave and passports to go beyond the seas." The commons readily sent them the passes, but the two princes did not yet quit England. They were subsequently reconciled to their uncle, and shut up with him in Oxford.[cc]

King Charles now led his forces to the relief of Chester, which Colonel Jones was besieging. He was followed by the parliamentary general Poyntz, who fell on his rear while he was attacking Jones (23rd); and the king was obliged to retire in disorder with the loss of six hundred slain and one thousand prisoners. He hastened to Bridgenorth and thence to Newark (October 4th). Here he halted for the remainder of the month, when, finding that his enemies were increasing around it, and that the Scots were returning, he stole away in the night (November 3rd), with a party of five hundred horse, and contrived to reach Oxford on the second day, where he remained for the winter.

The brilliant hopes excited by Montrose were now at an end; his highland followers had, after their usual manner, quitted him to go home to secure their plunder; and having stationed himself with the remainder at Philip-haugh, near Selkirk (September 13, 1645), in Ettrick Forest, he was suddenly fallen on by Leslie, and after doing all that was in man to avert defeat, he was totally routed, and forced to fly once more to the mountains.[1] Digby and Langdale, who were coming to join him with fifteen hundred English horse, after routing a party of the enemy at Doncaster, and being themselves defeated by Colonel Copley at Sherborne, reached Dumfries; but getting no account of Montrose, they disbanded their men and passed over to the Isle of Man, whence Digby proceeded to Dublin.

[1 Then ensued a butchery more horrible than any that had followed upon any of Montrose's victories. The wild clansmen of the north had contented themselves with taking vengeance upon men. The trained and disciplined soldiers of the Convenant slaughtered with hideous barbarity not only the male camp followers, but 300 Irish women, the wives of their slain or captured enemies, together with their infant children. According to a later tradition, fourscore women and children, who had perhaps escaped from the general massacre, were thrown from a bridge near Linlithgow, to be drowned as English Protestants had been drowned at Portadown. — GARDINER.[b]]

THE MISSION OF GLAMORGAN IN IRELAND

The negotiation with the duke of Lorraine was now at an end, and the king's only hopes lay in Ireland, where he had been carrying on a mysterious treaty with the insurgents. His wish had been to convert the cessation into a permanent peace; the native Irish, headed by their clergy, would be content with nothing short of the establishment of their religion. To this Ormonde, as a Protestant, neither could nor would consent; Charles then looked out for another agent, and such he found in Lord Herbert, eldest son of the marquis of Worcester, a Catholic, his personal friend, and romantically and devotedly loyal. Herbert, now created earl of Glamorgan, received in the month of January (1645) various instructions and commissions to treat with the Irish confederates, the king pledging himself to make good whatever he should conclude. They were sealed with the private signet and blanks left for the names of the pope and other princes, which he was to insert himself, "to the end," said Glamorgan, "the king might have a starting-hole to deny having given me such commissions, if excepted against by his own subjects; leaving me, as it were, at stake, who for his majesty's sake, was willing to undergo it, trusting to his word alone."

Thus furnished, Glamorgan proceeded to Ireland (April 30th), where Rinuccini, a papal nuncio, was now expected, to whom, as well as to the pope, he had letters from the king. Having communicated his instructions to a certain extent to Ormonde, negotiations were entered into with the supreme council of the Irish at Kilkenny, to which town Glamorgan proceeded; and he there (August 25th) concluded a secret treaty, by which the Catholics were to enjoy the public exercise of their religion, and all the churches and their revenues which were not actually in the possession of the Protestant clergy; they in return, were to supply the king with a body of ten thousand armed men, and to devote two-thirds of the church revenues to his service, during the war. A public treaty was, meantime, going on with Ormonde, who scrupled on the subject of religion. But while he hesitated, the parliament got hold of the secret treaty; for the titular archbishop of Tuam, a martial prelate, happening to be killed in a skirmish between the Scots and Irish (October 17th), copies of all the documents were found in his carriage, and transmitted to London.

When Ormonde got information of this, which was not till Christmas, he called a council, and it was determined, at the suggestion of Digby, to arrest Glamorgan for high-treason; and Digby wrote in very strong and indignant terms to the king. Charles, in a message to the parliament (January 29th, 1646), solemnly disavowed Glamorgan's proceedings, averring that he had only given him a commission to raise soldiers.[1] To Ormonde, who had Glamorgan's warrant now in his hands, the king wrote evasively, asserting that he had no recollection of it, and that if he did give such a warrant, it was with an understanding that it was not to be employed without the lord-lieutenant's approbation. Glamorgan, of whose innocence there could be no doubt, was not long a prisoner. He hastened to Kilkenny to resume the treaty (January 22nd), and obtained an immediate aid of six thousand men: but while he was waiting for transports to carry them to the relief of Chester, he learned the fall of that city, and the total ruin of the royal cause in England. He therefore disbanded his army, but still remained in Ireland.

After the surrender of Bristol the whole south and west of England were

[1 Gardiner] thinks that Glamorgan undoubtedly did overstep his instructions, though Charles is not entirely blameless in disavowing his acts.]

[1646 A.D.]

speedly reduced. While Fairfax was employed in the western counties Cromwell took Winchester (October 5th) and Basing House, the fortified mansion of the marquis of Winchester (14th); and in the north, Lathom House, which the intrepid countess of Derby[1] had defended for two years, Lord Seroop's castle of Bolton, and other places surrendered. The new year opened with the taking of Dartmouth by Fairfax (January 18th), who then resumed the siege of Exeter. At Torrington (February 16th) he totally routed Lord Hopton and his Cornish troops. He followed him into Cornwall, where the people submitted at his approach, and by a treaty (March 14th) Hopton disbanded his army, and surrendered all his arms, stores, and ammunition. The prince of Wales had gone to Scilly, whence he soon after passed over to Jersey, and finally joined his mother at Paris. Penryn and other places surrendered, and the lord-general came back to Exeter, which at length was yielded on articles (April 13th). The whole west being now reduced, Fairfax led his army back to Newbury.

Chester had surrendered early in February. Sir Jacob Astley, with a body of three thousand men whom he was leading to Oxford, was attacked (Mar. 22) and totally defeated at Stow in the Wolds, on the borders of Gloucestershire, by Colonel Morgan and Sir William Brereton. "Now you have done your work and may go play, unless you fall out among yourselves," said Sir Jacob to those who had made him a prisoner. The king's only hopes in fact lay in the divisions among his enemies; and had he known (which he never did know) how to act with judgment, he might have recovered a sufficient portion of his regal authority. The breach between the two religious parties was widening every day; the cordiality between the English parliament and their Scottish brethren was also on the wane. Charles intrigued with all these parties. "I am not without hope," he writes to Digby, "that I shall be able to draw either the Presbyterians or Independents to side with me for extirpating one or the other that I should be really king again." He used Montreuil, the French envoy, as his agent in his dealings with the Scots. His great object was to get to London, where he had numerous adherents, and where the peace-party was now strong. For this purpose he was urgent for a personal treaty, but to this the parliament, suspecting his object, would only consent on condition of his giving a previous assent to bills which they were preparing; the three first of which were the same as those offered at Uxbridge. The commons even went so far as to pass a vote (Mar. 31, 1646), that if the king came within their lines, the militia of London should apprehend those who came with him or resorted to him, and "secure his person from danger," *i.e.* confine him. They also ordered such as had borne arms against the parliament to quit London by the 6th of April.

The king's plan of playing the parties in parliament against one another was not a bad one if he had possessed skill to execute it. This will appear by the following view of that assembly. Until the end of the year 1645 the constitutional party had the preponderance. As a proof may be cited their vote on the 1st of December, in a debate on the proposition for peace. It was as follows. That Fairfax should be made a baron and have 5000*l.* a year settled on him, and his father be made an earl: Cromwell, Waller, and Haslerig also to be barons, the two former with 2500*l.*, the last with 2000*l.* a year; Northumberland, Essex, Warwick, and Pembroke to be dukes, and Salisbury and Manchester marquesses; Say, Roberts, Wharton, Willoughby of Parham, and Howard of Escrick to be earls; Holles, a viscount, and Stapleton and Sir

[1] This heroic lady was a Frenchwoman, a daughter of the noble house of La Trémouille.

Henry Vane senior barons. As these were nearly all Presbyterians, this vote, though it speaks little for the disinterestedness of the parliament, proves the strength of that party and their attachment to the monarchic form of government. But when, in consequence of deaths and the secession or expulsion of the royalists, it was found that nearly two hundred seats were vacant, the Presbyterians were obliged to give way and issue writs for new elections, and the house in the beginning of the following year presented an altered appearance. The royalists alone being excluded and the Self-Denying Ordinance being now a dead letter, the officers of the army and others of the Independent party obtained seats; for, as Ludlow*i* candidly confesses, "honest men (*i.e.* his own party) in all parts did what they could to promote the elections of such as were most hearty for the accomplishment of our deliverance," by which he means the establishment of a commonwealth. The parties now were more evenly balanced, though the preponderance was still on the Presbyterian side, and the royal name and authority if judiciously managed would have sufficed to incline the beam.

THE KING SURRENDERS TO THE SCOTS (1646 A.D.)

To resume the narrative: the parliamentary troops began to close in on Oxford, and the king must either resolve to sustain a siege and finally surrender himself a prisoner, or to fly from the town. He chose the latter, and on the night of the 27th of April, he quitted Oxford, having cut his hair and beard, and riding with a portmanteau behind him as the servant of his faithful follower Ashburnham; one Dr. Hudson, a loyal military clergyman who knew the country well, being their guide. They took the road to London. They passed through Uxbridge and Brentford, and thence turned to Harrow-on-the-Hill, where the king finally determined to give up all thoughts of London, and to follow his original design. He proceeded by St. Albans, and finding that his escape in the disguise of a servant was known, he assumed that of a clergyman. At length (30th) he came to Downham in Norfolk, where he remained while Hudson went to Montreuil at Newark. Montreuil had been for some time negotiating on the part of the king with the leaders of the Scottish army. The affair is involved in obscurity; but it would appear that the Scots had overreached the sanguine Frenchman, and led him to give the king hopes of what they never intended to perform. It was arranged that they should receive the monarch in their camp — a measure from which they proposed to themselves many advantages; but at the same time they required it to be done in such a manner as not to implicate them with the English parliament. Their plan was to send a party of cavalry to Harborough, whither the king was to come, as it were, accidentally on his way to Scotland, and he was to command their attendance on him. This plan however had been given up, and Charles on arriving at that place had found none there to meet him. Montreuil, though he now distrusted the Scots, thought when Hudson came to him that the king's only chance was to put himself into their hands. Charles therefore came (May 5) to Montreuil's abode at Southwell, and after dinner the envoy took him to Kelham, Leven's headquarters. Leven raised his hands in real or affected surprise; he and his officers showed the monarch the most marked attention; he assigned him Kelham House for his residence; but when Charles, to try if he was free, gave the word to the guard, Leven said, "I am the older soldier, sir; your majesty had better leave that office to me." They wrote off immediately to the parliament, saying that "they were astonished at the providence of the king's coming into their army,

[1646 A.D.]

which was so private that it was long ere they could find him there," etc.; and the king having ordered Bellasis to surrender Newark to them, they set out (May 9) on their march homewards, for the commons had voted that the king's person should be disposed of by both houses, and that he should be sent to Warwick castle. Poyntz, with a body of five thousand horse, was ordered to watch the Scottish army; but their march was so rapid that on the 18th the houses had intelligence of their arrival at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Next day they voted that they "had no further need of the army of their brethren the Scots in this kingdom," and voted them 100,000*l.*; half to be paid when they gave up Newcastle, Carlisle, and other places held by them; the other half when they had entered Scotland.

At Newcastle the king was treated with suitable respect, but none of his friends were given access to him. As the establishment of presbytery was a *sine qua non* with the Scots, he undertook, unaided as he was, to discuss the matter with their great champion Henderson. From the general insincerity of his character it was thought at the time that Charles was not in earnest in his maintenance of Episcopacy, but his sincerity in this matter is now beyond question. He had consented to its abolition in Scotland, but it was with a secret design of restoring it when he should have the power. He had in a similar manner, as we have seen, agreed to the abolition of Protestantism in Ireland; and as his attachment to the Protestant faith cannot be questioned we fear he meant to deceive the Catholics also. Yet at this very time he wished to throw himself into their hands. In a letter to Glamorgan (July 20) he says, "Tell the nuncio, that if once I can come into his and your hands, which ought to be extremely wished for by you both, as well for the sake of England as Ireland, since all the rest as I see despise me, I will do it." He also, while at Newcastle, meditated an escape by sea, but whether he intended to go to France or Ireland is uncertain. At this very time too, he was harassed by letters from the queen, Jermyn, Colepeper, and others, at Paris, and the foreign residents there, urging him to give up the church; the queen even threatening to go into a monastery if he refused. Yet he stood firm. In truth he saw that he should gain nothing by it, for nothing short of the militia would content the parliament, and this the queen and his other friends would not allow him to part with.

There were two points now under debate between the English and the Scots; the one the disposal of the royal person, the other the settlement of the arrears due to the Scottish army. The Scots declared (July 4) "that as they came into England out of affection, and not in a mercenary way, so they will be as willing to return home, and want of pay shall be no hindrance thereunto." In reply to this it was voted that the kingdom had no more need of them, and "is no longer able to bear them." The Scots (Aug. 12) then proposed to evacuate the kingdom, provided they were paid for their losses, etc.; it was voted (Aug. 14th) to give them 100,000*l.* and to have their accounts audited. "The houses," says Whitelocke,[v] "now saw the advantage of keeping up their army, as that which the more inclined the Scots to come to this offer." The Scots (19th) stated their demands at 500,000*l.*, but agreed (Sept. 1) to take 400,000*l.*, which sum the parliament consented to give; and so far the transaction appears to have had no reference to the king.

In the end of August the parliament sent nineteen propositions to the king; they were in substance the same with the Uxbridge articles, but the militia, with power to employ it, was to remain with the parliament for twenty years. To these the king gave a positive refusal, veiled indeed under the demand of a personal treaty. The enemies of peace and royalty exulted,

the moderate party were dejected at this event. The arrangements having been effected respecting the Scottish arrears, it was voted (Sept. 18) that the king's person should be disposed of as the two houses should think fit, but that no dispute on this subject should interfere with the treaties or the return of the Scots army. The Scottish commissioners strongly asserted the right of their nation to a share in the disposal of the king.

In November the Scottish parliament met; Hamilton, who was now at liberty, exerted himself strongly in favour of the king; all were of opinion that he should accept the propositions, but Charles was immovable on the subject of the church. A vote was notwithstanding obtained (Dec. 16) to maintain his personal freedom and right to the English throne. The general assembly, however, having declared it unlawful to support him while he refused to assent to the covenant, and the parliament, being aware of the madness of engaging in a war with England, and advised by Holles and the leading Presbyterians there that the surrender of the king was the only means of causing the Independent army to be disbanded, who were the great enemies of the king and of peace; they accordingly gave him up to commissioners sent to receive him (Feb. 1, 1647). Charles gladly left the Scots, and he was conducted to one of his mansions named Holdenby or Holmby House near Althorpe, in Northamptonshire.

CHARLES A CAPTIVE IN ENGLAND

Charles himself said that he "was bought and sold," and the charge of selling their king has been down to the present day reiterated against the Scots.[1] There are no doubt many circumstances in the affair which have a suspicious appearance. It seems certain that they would not have gotten so large a sum from the parliament as they did if the person of the king had not been in their hands, and they probably took advantage of this circumstance to insist on their demands. But there are no sufficient grounds for charging them with inviting him to their camp with this design; they did not give him up till they had no choice but that or war; they acted under the advice of the friends of monarchy in the English parliament; they stipulated in the most express terms for the safety of his person; nay, to the very last, if he would have given them satisfaction on the subject of religion, they would have declined surrendering him. Like the monarch himself, they were unhappily situated; but we do not think that they can be justly charged with the guilt of having sold their king.

The civil war, after a duration of nearly four years, was now at an end. Oxford, Worcester, and other places had surrendered; the old marquis of Worcester defended Raglan Castle against Fairfax and five thousand men, but he was obliged at last to open his gates (Aug. 19); and two days later Pendennis Castle in Cornwall also surrendered. Harlech Castle in North Wales was the last to submit (Mar. 30, 1647). Favourable terms were granted in all cases, and the articles were honourably observed. Much and justly as intestine warfare is to be deprecated, the English may look back with pride to this civil contest, unexampled in the history of the world. It does not, like the civil wars of other countries, disgust us by numerous butcheries and other

[1] "If it be not admitted they sold him," says Sir P. Warwick,[a] "it must be confessed they parted with him for a good price." [Gardiner[b] points out how gladly the Scotch would have protected Charles had he been willing to comply with what they felt to be just and due their creed. He thinks that the Scots "get less than justice" in the accounts of this transaction, as Charles' one idea in taking refuge with them was to get the two nations at war.]

savage atrocities; all was open and honourable warfare; a generous humanity for the most part was displayed on both sides; and those who were finally victorious, to their honour, sent none of the vanquished to the scaffold. While awarding praise we cannot in justice pass over the Catholic nobility and gentry of England. Urged by an impulse of generous loyalty, as appears to us, rather than by any cold calculations of interest, they ranged themselves on the side of the king, though they knew but too well that he was at all times ready to sacrifice them, and that they were the persons on whom the vengeance of the parliament would fall most heavily; in the royal cause they wasted their estates, and shed their blood; and dead must he be to generous feeling who honours not the names of the marquesses of Worcester and Winchester, Sir Marmaduke Langdale, and the other Catholic nobles and knights who fought on the side of royalty in the civil contest.

Montrose on receiving orders from the king laid down his arms and retired to the continent. Ormonde had by the royal command concluded a peace with the Irish Catholics, but the nuncio and the clergy having assembled at Waterford declared it void (Aug. 6). The nuncio then assumed the supreme power, and at the head of the united armies of Preston and Owen O'Neil[1] advanced against Dublin. As Ormonde had wasted the country they were obliged to retire, but he was well aware that it must fall into their hands if not relieved from England. The king was now a captive, and powerless; the Irish Catholics were entirely ruled by their priesthood, and nothing short of the extirpation of Protestantism and the English interest would content them. To avert this Ormonde entered into treaty with the parliament, and he agreed (Feb. 22, 1647) to put Dublin and the other garrisons into their hands. The sequestration was taken off from his own estate, and he had permission given him to reside for some time in England.

The Presbyterian system was at this time established by ordinance of parliament; each parish was to have its minister and lay elders; a number of adjoining parishes were to form a classis with its presbytery of ministers and elders; several classes a province with its assembly; and finally, a national assembly over all. But the system never came into full operation except in London and Lancashire; the parliament could not be brought to allow of the divine right of presbytery; they greatly limited the power of the keys, and they allowed of appeals from ecclesiastical courts. In their zeal for uniformity, hatred of toleration, lust of power, and tyrannical exercise of it, the Presbyterian clergy fell nothing short of the prelatical party who had been their persecutors. The moderate party in parliament lost at this time a great support by the death of the earl of Essex (Sept. 14). He died in consequence of overheating himself in the chase of a stag in Windsor Forest. He was buried with great state in Westminster Abbey (Oct. 22); the members of both houses, the civil and military officers, and all the troops in London attending the funeral.[u]

Gardiner[b] ascribes the military downfall of Charles to two facts: in the first place his cause appealed to the cavalier and aristocratic elements, while the great middle class and trade elements, the farmers and yeomen either kept aloof or sided against him; in the second place, he offended the English by his incessant appeals for aid, to the Welsh (who made up a large part of his army at Naseby), to the Irish, French, Lorrainers, Dutch and Scotch. Cromwell on the other hand stood for the national spirit.[a]

[1] Preston was the general of the Catholics of the English blood, O'Neil of the Ulster Irish.



CHAPTER II

THE LAST YEARS OF CHARLES I

[1646–1649 A.D.]

> Nobody now could foretell the course of events; either extreme seemed possible, the abolition or the restoration of the crown, the exclusive predominance of one creed or the toleration of many, the continuation of parliament or its diminution, the complete sway of the army or its combination with other forces, the maintenance of existing laws or social resolution. — VON RANKE.[b]

FROM this period, the supreme authority openly acknowledged by the people of England, was no longer divided, according to local feeling or circumstances, between the king and the parliament. The condition of the sovereign became in effect that of a private person, and the two houses exercised the functions of an independent commonwealth. But these powers were too recent in their origin, and the parties who wielded them were too little agreed among themselves, to allow of their working without hindrance or disorder. The Puritan spirit, with its ardent love of freedom up to a certain point, and its lamentable intolerance with respect to everything beyond it, still animated the Presbyterian body in both kingdoms; while the Independents, as they gradually rose into importance, by the sagacity which they brought to the management of public affairs, hardly less than by their exploits in the fields, became more fixed and definite in their demands on the side of the rights of conscience, and of a more equal liberty.

The army under Fairfax, consisting of twenty-two thousand men, was made up almost entirely from the Independents, and greatly outnumbered the Presbyterians, who were in arms under Massey and Poyntz. The Independents could also boast at this juncture of a small majority on many questions even in the house of commons; but the city was still mostly Presbyterian, and found its great ally in the Scottish army, which, by possessing the king's person, had become capable of negotiating with increased authority.

[1646 A.D.]

Added to which, as a further element of probable discord, the royalists, though scattered, were by no means extinct. The number of the slain in the late struggle was comparatively small, and the passions of those who survived the conflict must have been rather exasperated than allayed by what had befallen them.

The struggle between the Presbyterians and Independents in the commons, which, during the present year, had appeared, in some important instances, to be in favour of the former, had not been such uniformly. A motion which required that part of the army under Fairfax should embark for Ireland was defeated by a majority of ninety-one to ninety; and a resolution to disband the troops under Massey, consisting mostly of Presbyterians, was carried in the commons, and executed by Ludlow, with the concurrence of Fairfax, notwithstanding a remonstrance against it by the lords. But the two parties were so nearly balanced in the commons during this year, that questions affecting either were rarely carried by a majority of more than eight or ten votes; and some instances of understood compromise were necessary that the ordinary business of government might proceed.

Another matter which served to manifest the power of the Independents in public affairs at this juncture, was the settlement of the exact form in which the Presbyterian government should be established. The Independents, as we have before remarked, were opposed to any civil establishment of religion; and those who aided them in their present struggle, without being strictly of their opinion in that respect, were careful that the mode of its establishment should be such as to give a secure ascendency to the civil power. Nothing, however, could be more unacceptable to the Presbyterian clergy than such doctrines, inasmuch as their principles taught them to regard the secular establishment of religion as the first duty of a state; and, at the same time, to assert their own pure independence of the civil power, even while looking to it for protection and endowments, and for the force with which to maintain their particular species of dominion.

There was a bill against blasphemy which this party endeavoured to carry in 1646, and which they succeeded in passing two years later, the provisions of which bespeak a frightful spirit of intolerance, reminding us very forcibly of the many similar decrees which occur in the pages of ecclesiastical history, and which were made the ground of proceedings so disgraceful to Christianity. By this act, any denial of the Trinity, of the proper deity or humanity of Christ, of his death as an atonement for the guilty, of his freedom from sin, of his resurrection, of the general rising from the dead, of the day of judgment, or of the authenticity of the canonical scriptures — was declared to be a capital offence! Many less considerable heresies are named as to be punished by other penalties. The authors of this enactment had imbibed the sentiment that truth must be one; that to themselves pertained the rare felicity of having discovered it; and that the more consistent evidence of their hallowed attachment to its interests was in the adoption even of such means with a view to its support. Thus the reasoning which had descended from Bonner to Laud, passed from the latter to the men who brought him to the block!

By the influence of the Independents, which operated to delay the act concerning blasphemy, the commons were induced to pass several of the most important of the propositions that had been rejected by the king, in the shape of ordinances — a proceeding which gave them the force of acts of parliament without waiting for the royal sanction. This republican principle was acted upon with respect to those parts of the propositions which related to the abolition of episcopacy, and the sale of the bishops' lands; to a justification of the

proceedings in parliament in both kingdoms since the commencement of hostilities; to the appointment of the great officers of state by the parliament; and to its retaining the command of the forces during the next twenty years.

THE ARMY VERSUS PARLIAMENT

The surrender of the king by the Scots, which was viewed with much satisfaction by the English Presbyterians, both as it would materially reduce the expenditure of the government, and as it seemed, by placing the king in their hands, to confer on them the power of dictating the conditions of a settlement, was soon found to have placed the affairs of the kingdom, as a matter at issue, between an unarmed Presbyterian majority in the parliament and the capital, and the Independent minority of the lower house, sustained by nearly the whole strength of the army. On the departure of the Scots, the Presbyterians ceased to have a military force in which they could confide; and it accordingly became their great object to disband the army under Fairfax, which, they well knew, had been for some time governed by principles and passions most hostile to their plans. It was given out, with this view, that the war had reached its close, and that the time for returning to a peace establishment had arrived.

Nor was this considered a difficult work to perform. The Presbyterians in the city, in the fulness of their confidence, prepared a petition to be presented to the two houses, which prayed that no person disaffected to the covenant should be promoted to, or allowed to retain, any public trust; that persons not duly ordained should be no more suffered to preach, nor the meetings of separate congregations be tolerated; and that an ordinance should be passed to put down all heresies and schisms, by visiting their abettors with exemplary punishments.

It was agreed that Fairfax should retain his office as commander-in-chief. But it was also voted that every officer under his command should take the covenant, and conform to the government of the church as established by ordinance; that no commander of a garrison should remain a member of parliament; and that all offices above that of a colonel should be abolished, excepting, of course, the rank of commander-in-chief. The object of the Presbyterians in these votes was to purify the army generally from its leaven of independency, and to compel Cromwell, and other formidable opponents, such as Ludlow, Hutchinson, Ireton, and Algernon Sidney, to relinquish their connection either with the army or with the parliament. With the votes already mentioned was another, which ordered an immediate embarkation of a great part of the army under Fairfax to serve against the insurgent Catholics in Ireland. At the same time, the discussions in parliament with respect to the payment of arrears, were attended with so many difficulties and delays as to warrant suspicion of a design to elude the just demands of the army even in that respect.

The crisis between the Presbyterians and the Independents was now at hand. The latter found themselves called upon to submit to a yoke under the name of Presbyterianism, hardly less oppressive than they had fought against under the name of prelacy. They saw every practicable slight cast upon their leaders; their boasted liberty of conscience about to be wrested from them; their dismission meditated, even without a just settlement of their pecuniary claims on the power which they had protected and established at the hazard of their lives; and, above all, one division of their strength on the eve of being

[1647 A.D.]

drafted to Ireland, that the remainder might not be sufficient to impede measures designed to place the whole kingdom, with its new ecclesiastical establishment, under the guardianship of an army pledged to the covenant.

It was in order to intimate a determination not to submit to such a course of affairs, that the forces under Fairfax began an advance towards London. The arrears at this time due to the army were forty-three weeks' pay to the horse, and eighteen weeks' to the foot, a sum in the whole, considerably above three hundred thousand pounds. By a deputation for the purpose, the commons apprised the army of the vote in which they had pledged themselves to raise sixty thousand pounds a month for its support, and promised two months' pay to such regiments as should be disbanded. This, it will be perceived, was not one-fifth of the sum due to the cavalry, and less than half the amount owing to the infantry. But the great object of this deputation, was to make arrangements for the embarkation of a large portion of the army to Ireland. Many difficulties were thrown in the way of this object by the council of officers in their conference with the deputation; and a petition was prepared, to express the desires both of the officers and soldiers on various matters, but particularly with respect to an act of indemnity securing them against all proceedings on account of anything in their conduct during the war — and also that measures should be adopted to satisfy them with respect to their arrears before disbanding.



ALGERNON SIDNEY

The commons became aware of this proceeding, and, in order to repress it, and to prevent any similar attempt, summoned several officers who were suspected of being its promoters to their bar. On the same day it was voted that three regiments, commanded by colonels who were known to be zealous Presbyterians, should form part of the force to be retained in England. Holles, who was not without that sort of courage which arises from an insensibility to danger, concluded this day of bold measures by proposing that all persons adhering to the said petition should be prosecuted as enemies of the state, and this motion, carried at a late hour in the commons, was approved the next day by the lords. Such proceedings, against an army consisting of such men, were unjust and singularly impolitic.

The deputation to the army from the commons on the twentieth of March, was followed by another, which appeared in its quarters on the thirteenth of April. Colonel Lambert, in behalf of the assembled officers, insisted on the terms stated in the former conference. In conclusion, it was stated that no objection would be made to the service in Ireland if the men were allowed to

embark for that kingdom under their present commanders. About ten days subsequent, the commons went into a debate on the propriety of accepting the offer thus made by the convention of officers. They voted that such of the army as did not proceed to the service in Ireland according to order should be paid arrears for six weeks and disbanded. Filled with this ill-grounded confidence they continued to summon the most popular officers to their bar, on the charge of tampering with the soldiery in opposition to the wishes of the government. Some they committed to prison, and the whole body was not only threatened with punishment should they be detected in fomenting discontents, but were commanded to abstain from taking any part with the men under them in their attempts to obtain a redress of their pretended grievances.

RISE OF THE AGITATORS

One immediate effect of the separation thus produced between the men and the officers, was the institution of a sort of representative body from among the former, consisting mostly of non-commissioned officers, which subsequently became so memorable under the name of the council of Agitators—[a designation once supposed to have originated in a corruption of the word adjutators, or helpers].

If the civilians at Westminster had found the convention of officers unmanageable, their difficulties were of necessity multiplied by the imprudence which called forth this new power. The officers were a kind of middle class between the men whom they commanded, and the parliament with which they were at issue, having interests and sympathies in common with both; but this new council promised to embody the extreme principles and passions of the great body of the military, without the benefit of those modifications which the superior intelligence of their leaders would naturally have suggested. The officers had been censured when appearing in the character of petitioners, though on matters strictly military; but a more dangerous body was now about to appear in that character, and one which was not likely to be content with an interference on military affairs alone.

The first public act of the council of Agitators was to present a letter to their generals, Fairfax, Cromwell, and Skippon, bearing date the twenty-eighth of April, in which they complained of having been denounced as enemies of their country, and that by men, who, suddenly tasting the sweets of power, had forgotten their duties and professions, and were degenerating into tyrants. They spoke of the expedition to Ireland as an affair which had been so managed as to become a manifest expedient for putting an end to the army; and they were not disposed to witness its dissolution, until those rights of the subject, for the sake of which they had become soldiers, should be conceded and secured.

When this document was presented to the commons, it was moved that the three soldiers from whom it had been received should be sent to the Tower. Cromwell considered it important to check this vindictive course for the present and by his strong assurances that the army was by no means in so unmanageable a condition as the house seemed to conclude, put an end to the debate. He also accepted a commission with Skippon, Ireton, and Fleetwood, to go to the quarters of the military, and, by promising a bill of indemnity, and a further payment of arrears, to bring about, if possible, a settlement of differences. It may be safely credited that all these commissioners except Skippon, had been chief parties in encouraging and directing the agitation which

[1647 A.D.]

they were sent to allay. But, with a majority against them in the two houses, it was only by such subtle policy, or by an immediate appeal to force, that their objects could be accomplished.[d]

The "Agitators"[1] discussed in a sort of committee all measures that were to be adopted, and subjected all the resolutions of the parliament to a subsequent examination. They formed a kind of lower house, and the officers an upper house, by which the plan of resistance became more consolidated and connected than was believed in London to be the case. As soon as Cromwell, who was the soul of the whole affair, arrived there, he bitterly complained, with profound dissimulation, of the state of affairs, but affirmed, however, with his associates, that they had found in the army no distemper, but many grievances. The parliament returned thanks, on the 21st of May, to him and his associates for their exertions, and on the following days came to many resolutions respecting the time and manner of paying the troops, of disbanding them, and of sending a part to Ireland. When it was proposed about this time to place some of the most violent of the agitators in strict custody, a Mr. Werenworth could venture to say they might be put in safe custody, but in the best tavern in the city, and be well provided with wine and sugar.

Cromwell, referring to some violent debates, said still more plainly to Ludlow, "These people will never leave off till the army takes them by the ears and turns them out of parliament." And in fact they still believed, as the king had done before, in their own inviolability and omnipotence, and did not take any right measures either to resist the army or to satisfy and gain it.

On the 29th of May, the new council of war declared that till all the grievances of the army were removed it could not be dissolved, so that the parliamentary commissioners were obliged to return without effecting anything. Three days later, on the 1st of June, Fairfax willingly received a decisive proposal of the council of war, namely: In order the better to superintend the regiments, and to keep them in order, they shall be collected from their scattered quarters; then the general will not be obliged to go from place to place, and the parliament will clearly see how far it may depend on the army, and the latter what it may expect from parliament. Fairfax communicated this resolution of the council to the parliament, recommending kindness and mildness, though the most blind could not but see in it a formal declaration of war. Holles, with the most zealous of his friends, advised therefore that at a moment of such great danger Cromwell ought to be arrested, though complete proofs of his guilt were still wanting; and, in fact, this perhaps would have been the only means of averting the approaching revolution. But before it could be regularly brought forward in the slow parliamentary course, Cromwell had again left London for the army, to which he gave a new preponderance by a bold and unexpected measure.

THE ARMY ABDUCTS THE KING (1647 A.D.)

On the 3rd of June, 1647, Cornet Joyce, formerly a tailor, appeared at Holmby, at the head of a party of horse, and demanded to speak to the king. Being told that his majesty was already gone to bed, he paid the less regard to the objection, as his men had quickly come to an understanding with the garrison, and drunk to their brotherhood, and consequently neither the officers nor the commissioners of the parliament could depend upon their support.

[1 The form "Adjutator" is plainly a blunder, though it was contemporaneous with 'Agitator," which was used in the now obsolete sense of "agent."]

When the king had been waked from his sleep, Joyce went to him, armed, and declared that he was come to take him to the army. Being asked by whose authority he came, Joyce answered: "The soldiers at the door are my authority." The king: "This authority is in truth written so legibly that it may be read without spelling." When the king reached the army, Fairfax affirmed, as we believe with perfect truth, that he had known nothing whatever of the whole enterprise, to which Charles answered that he could not believe this unless he hanged Joyce. The cornet being summoned to appear, said: "I have acted by instructions from the army; let it be assembled, and if three-fourths, at least, do not approve of my conduct, I am ready to be hung at the head of my regiment."

It is absolutely impossible that Cromwell and his associates should have known nothing of this plan; on the contrary, it cannot be doubted that they had contrived and brought about the whole, in order to anticipate and outmanœuvre the Presbyterians; wherefore Milton,[e] the panegyrist of Cromwell, says: "The carrying off the king was indeed contrary to the laws; but, under such circumstances, the most worthy men have often boldly saved the state, and the laws have afterwards confirmed their proceedings." According to Huntingdon, Joyce said plainly that Cromwell had given him the commission; and the latter replied, "otherwise the parliament would have carried off the king." When news of all these proceedings was brought to London, the adversaries of the Independents were thrown into the utmost consternation. The Scotch deputies in London looked at this carrying off of the king from a very different point of view; they affirmed that it was contrary to the covenant and the express conditions stipulated for the security of Charles, when he was given up, and took it for granted that the English parliament had engaged to maintain and execute those conditions in which Scotland would readily afford every assistance.

At the instance of Cromwell, Ireton, Fleetwood, Harrison, and others, who, notwithstanding the Self-Denying Ordinance, held posts in the army, "A Solemn Engagement" had been brought about, on the 5th of June, and a document drawn up, in which the soldiers endeavoured to justify their preceding conduct, as well as the choice of agitators, and affirmed that it was by no means intended to overthrow the government of the Presbyterian constitution of the church, or to introduce general licentiousness, under the pretext of religious freedom; yet, at the same time, they speak of the injustice and tyranny of their enemies, and of the malicious and wicked designs and principles of certain persons in the parliament. They plainly declared, that till their grievances were redressed, and all their demands granted, the army would not suffer itself to be disbanded by anybody, either wholly or in part.

THE EXPULSION OF THE ELEVEN MEMBERS

Thus pressed by the disobedient refractory army, the parliament considered it as a very fortunate circumstance, when, on the 8th of June, a petition was presented from the city of London requesting all honourable means might be used to come to an understanding with the army, that bloodshed might be avoided, the covenant maintained, the king's person secured, fresh negotiations be commenced with him, Ireland assisted, and new laws made for the protection of the city and the parliament. On the same day numbers of discontented soldiers crowded round the house, and extorted a more prompt execution of what had been already granted. Thanks were, however, returned

[1647 A.D.]

to the city, and it was resolved on the 11th of June, that a committee of the parliament and of the capital should, for the safety of the kingdom and of the parliament, raise and arm men, and adopt all suitable measures; everybody was bound to obey and assist it. The army being speedily informed of all these circumstances, sent to the city of London a representation and justification of its conduct, and concluded their letter in the following words: "If you, or a great part of you, should be misled, notwithstanding these arguments, to employ arms against our just demands, we should, after this brotherly exhortation, be innocent of all the mischief that might befall your great and populous city."

Conjointly with these threats, the army caused a report to be spread that it intended to restore the king and civil order, to abolish taxes, establish peace, etc. Fairfax, too, sent to the parliament many petitions that were received in favour of the army. As it had formerly, in its mistrust, employed against the king arguments, reproaches, and conjectures, the same, now it had lost all credit and popularity, was done to itself, in scorn and ridicule, and all that it now ventured to do in its pretended omnipotence was to request that Fairfax, with the army, should not come within forty miles of London. He answered, on the 12th of June, that he was sorry not to be able to comply with this request, because the army, as circumstances had required, had already advanced within twenty miles of London. On the receipt of this intelligence, as Sanderson expresses it, such fear and boundless suspicion arose in the city that it seemed as if everybody were mad. The parliament deliberated day and night, but found that its resolutions, which at this time had been chiefly for the advantage of London, did not quiet the minds of the citizens, and that its measures did not alarm the soldiers. The latter and the general, on the contrary, answered the deputies of the parliament that the nearer they were to the city the more easy it was to obtain money, to restore order, and to establish peace.

From every concession of the parliament the army proved the justice of its earlier demands and raised them, referring to the principles which had been frequently declared by the two houses themselves. Instead of giving up the king as the parliament demanded, the army now treated him with uncommon respect, so that apprehensions were conceived that he might place himself at its head and disperse the parliament. The leaders of the Presbyterians, indeed, still preserved their courage, and endeavoured to prepare everything in London for serious resistance; but the violence of their opponents increased in an equal degree. When Holles, for instance, fell into a bitter dispute with Ireton, and challenged him, the latter answered it was contrary to his conscience to fight a duel. Hereupon Holles struck him in the face, and said, "Then let it be against your conscience to insult others." After such scenes between the leaders of the Presbyterians and Independents, no reconciliation could be thought of.

On the 14th of June, the parliament received a declaration of the army and the generals, drawn up principally by Ireton, with the assistance of Cromwell and Lambert, in which, among other things, they say: "We are no hired mercenaries, who must assist in all kinds of oppression, but came forward to defend the rights and liberties of the country, which are sufficiently known to us by the declaration of parliament, and by our own common sense. In Scotland, Portugal, and the Netherlands they went much further than the army has done; and the parliament itself has declared that where the rights of nature, of justice, and of nations are, there is no undue resistance to authority. We therefore demand the expulsion and impeachment of eleven members: viz.,

Holles, Stapleton, Lewis, Clotworthy, Waller, Maynard, Massey, Glyn, Long, Harley, and Nichols, who had particularly spoken against the army; they likewise demanded a month's pay in two days, etc. Further, that the parliament should not raise any new troops, or grant the obedient soldiers and officers any advantages over those who had disobeyed; and should give a strict account of the application of the public revenue; that the rights of the king should be determined in harmony with the rights of the subjects, and an amnesty for the past must be proclaimed.

"The present parliament must not continue indefinitely, according to the will of the members, which is contrary to the constitution of the country and the rights of the people, and leads to tyranny. Triennial parliaments must be restored, the representation of inconsiderable and decayed places must be altered, and a more uniform system introduced, founded on judicious principles; for instance, with reference to the payment of taxes. No person desires to overthrow the Presbyterian church, but neither ought those who are restrained by their consciences from following certain forms and ceremonies, but otherwise live peaceably and according to the laws, to be punished on that account, or be debarred any rights and privileges. Our demands are, in short, for the general good, and are not founded on partial and selfish views. Wherefore we hope that God, in his goodness and mercy, will through us, as his blessed instruments, cause the peace and happiness of this unhappy kingdom to be established."

All these demands not only obtained the approbation of the commander-in-chief, Fairfax, in a special letter, but met with many friends in the country. The taxes, it was complained, become daily heavier, and a great portion of the revenue is employed for selfish purposes, and no account given. Unheard-of harshness is used towards the vanquished friends of the king, and to the bishops who are reduced to distress. The star chamber is, indeed, abolished; but the committees formed in the counties arrest and punish at their discretion, and exercise a greater tyranny than ever, and all this too is done under religious pretexts, and every crime is accompanied with prayers and scripture phrases. If, therefore, objections may be made in some instances to the demands of the army, and if its haughty bearing cannot be justified, as far as the form is concerned, yet there remains no other means to put down the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the parliament. In this situation, which must have been more bitter to the parliament, which was lately so revered, when it considered its own conduct towards the king, it revoked the ordinance against the army, assigned money for its pay, and put a stop to the levy of recruits and to the preparations for defence.

But it passed over other points in silence, observed that the expulsion of the eleven members could not take place without a precise statement of the complaints against them and proofs; and, lastly, it again demanded that the army should remove to the distance of forty miles, and that the king should be given up to the parliament. Fairfax did not pay the slightest attention to these demands, at first did not answer at all, then evasively, and it was not till the 23rd of June that a new "humble petition" of the army and its leaders appeared. After long and warm debates, the parliament resolved, on the 25th of June, that the accused members could not be suspended from sitting in the house till particulars were produced and proofs given. On the following day, however, news was brought that the army had advanced within fifteen English miles; but merely, as Fairfax said, for the ease of the country and the soldiers. In this situation, when arguments and representations had no effect, and means were wanting to repel force by force, the eleven accused

[1647 A.D.]

members desired leave to absent themselves from the house. This was readily granted, though the Independents thereby gained the majority in parliament, and carried motions which had before been rejected.

The Independents, on their part, endeavoured more and more to gain the king; they treated him much more mildly than the Presbyterians, allowed his children, friends, and chaplain to have access to him, and held out hopes of complying with his wishes respecting the constitution of the Church. They, however, did not make him any definite proposals; whence sharp-sighted persons correctly inferred that they meant to use him as an instrument, and to keep him in suspense, rather than to determine disputed points according to his wishes. Hence Lanerick wrote to him that the army would certainly propose very hard terms to him, and at the most offer him religious liberty for the loss of all temporal power. The king asking, in a conversation, by what right he had been removed against his will from Holmby House, Fairfax replied, from necessity; on which Charles said, "I never ventured at the height of my power to do so much violence to the law, and yet those people cry out give us justice, or —— ! !"

RIOTS IN LONDON

On the 8th of July, a letter from the commander-in-chief, recommending and justifying the milder treatment of the king, was received by the parliament. The letter advised not to use greater severity towards him without necessity, which would only excite a new interest in his favor. The mixture of truth and error, of humility and arrogance, of apparent obedience and direct resistance, which we find in the addresses of the army to the parliament, calls to our minds its own proceedings against the king, only the retaliation is the more bitter because the soldiers ironically quoted an example or model for every step they took, from the journals of the legislators, who had now lost all their power. The latter, however, did not give up their cause as desperate, but endeavoured to combat the army with its own weapons, by means of petitions, and to bring over the capital, which was for the most part inclined to the Presbyterians, entirely to their own side. On the 14th of July, a representation to the following effect, said to be signed by 10,000 well-disposed young men, was presented, requesting the "restoration of the king and the parliament to their rights, the regulation of the government of the church, the abolition of the conventicles and of the undue liberty of religion, the punishment of the evil-minded, and the disbanding of the army."

This petition being neutralised by a second of an opposite tenor on the following day, the formation of the militia in London impeded, and the Presbyterian commanders removed; a number of citizens, young men, apprentices, officers, sailors, and watermen presented, on the 24th of July, a third representation, founded on a solemn league and covenant. They demanded that the army should not come any nearer, but that the king should come to London; that peace should be concluded on the conditions proposed by him, on the 12th of May, and that all things still in dispute should be speedily settled, in concert with the Scotch. These proposals and resolutions, they were resolved to defend with their lives and fortunes. The parliament, now stripped of all dignity and independence, had no alternative but to yield to the power of the army or of the city. It chose the former, rejected the last-mentioned demands, and declared all persons who had joined in that petition to be traitors. The army, being informed of all these circumstances, had declared, on the 28th, that it would not suffer such disobedience of the city to the

parliament, and would free it from all violence. On the other hand, the citizens boasted that they would treat with the same generosity that part of the parliament which acceded to their views, and accordingly, on the 25th of July, the sheriffs and some members of the common council appeared before the house of commons, with a petition that it would restore the independence of the London militia, and favor its speedy organisation.

Before any resolution could be taken, several thousand apprentices and others preferred a similar but much more violent petition; nay, they behaved in so riotous a manner that the seven lords (to which number the whole upper house was now reduced), immediately granted their petition, but then fled through a back door, and escaped by water. The house of commons, which did not wish to offend the army, most earnestly entreated the insolent petitioners to retire; but as their secret intention immediately to adjourn became known, the mob occupied all the doors; nay, the boldest entered the hall, forcibly took the speaker, who was going to retire, back to his chair, made various demands, with loud cries, but especially the confirmation of what the upper house had granted: the recall of the king to London, the return of the eleven members of parliament, the restoration of the militia to its old footing, and the abolition of all ordinances against the petitioners.

THE HEADS OF THE PROPOSALS

Charles was not inobservant of these violent proceedings in the city, and secretly expressed his approval of them, everything which served to place the two parties in an equipoise, or to embroil their affairs, being regarded by him as favourable to the part which he was disposed to act as an umpire between them.

As the natural consequence of such proceedings, and of the attempts which were continually made to detach the disaffected and the wavering from its ranks, the army had become more and more united and organised with a view to the accomplishment of its objects, and much less scrupulous about an immediate proposal of those political reforms and arrangements which were deemed expedient for the public interest. While the city was the scene of the excitement and disorder now described, the wisest men in the army, some of whom had been educated as lawyers, and others were naturally profound politicians, were employing themselves in framing a scheme for the settlement of affairs which was to be submitted to the approval of the king and of the two houses.[1]

This scheme provided that a new parliament should be convened every two years, upon a principle of election which required the extinction of decayed boroughs, and which regulated the number of members for boroughs and counties according to their relative extent and property. In its first session each parliament was to deliberate for one hundred and twenty days, after which space, and not before, it might be adjourned or dissolved by the king; and at the close of a second session of the same extent it dissolved of course. In all cases of impeachment, the judgment of the commons was made to be necessary to any sentence of condemnation pronounced by the lords, and the king was not to have the power to pardon when the two houses agreed in their verdict. The command of the militia was to be vested in the two houses for the next ten years, and to be resumed by the king at the close of that interval with the consent of parliament.

[1 This scheme called "The Heads of the Proposals" was drawn up by Ireton.]

[1647 A.D.]

The persons who should constitute the council of state now to be appointed were to be chosen with the concurrence of all the negotiating parties, and to hold their offices during good behaviour, but not for a longer period than seven years. The parliament, which was to retain the power of war and peace, was also to nominate the officers of state for the next ten years, and after that time was to be empowered to present three candidates for each of such offices, from which the king might make his selection. The prelates might be restored, but without the power to inflict any civil penalty upon any man on account of religion; nor were any means to be employed to compel the use of the common prayer, or the adoption of the covenant. With these more important provisions, were some enlightened proposals with respect to the choosing of grand jurymen, the appointment of sheriffs, the right of petitioning, and the reform of various evils connected with tithes, law-suits, and imprisonment for debt.

Some of the men who had been most occupied in the preparation of this scheme — a scheme which, all circumstances considered, was singularly wise and moderate — were determined republicans; but they felt that they had to negotiate for a nation in which an attachment to monarchy was still the prevailing sentiment, and not for the comparatively small sect which shared with them in their greater admiration of the commonwealths of the ancient world. The conduct of the monarch, however, made this effort in the way of compromise wholly unavailing. His language, when these overtures were made to him, was so haughty and irritating as to destroy all hope of conciliation in those who proposed them, and excited regret and astonishment among his friends who listened to it.

The mobs of the capital extorted the required votes from the parliament on Monday the 26th of June, and on the following Thursday the speakers of both houses, with about fourteen lords, and one hundred commoners, left the city, and two days later placed themselves under the protection of the army on Hounslow Heath. Little authority attached to the fragments of the two houses which remained at Westminster, and though the force at the command of the city was more numerous than the army advancing against it, the want of that discipline, and deep interest in the matters at issue which characterised the army under Fairfax, rendered all the hostile preparations made by his opponents rather ridiculous than formidable. On the seventh of August the army marched through London without the slightest appearance of opposition or disorder; the two houses assembled; the speakers resumed their seats; Fairfax received their thanks, and accepted from the hands of the lords and commons the office of constable of the Tower.

The parliament, being reassembled after the interval of disorder from the 26th of July to the 6th of August, was prevailed upon by the officers to make one more effort for the restoration of peace, which was done by recommending the old propositions submitted to the king at Newcastle to his further consideration. But those propositions were based upon the league and covenant, and the military leaders heard with much pleasure that the king professed to look upon the recent propositions of the army as more tolerant and equitable, and as being in consequence more adapted to become the groundwork of an adjustment. It was hoped that not more than three weeks would be required to complete a settlement upon that basis. But nearly two months passed, and Cromwell and his colleagues were still, notwithstanding all their labour, at some distance from their object — so difficult was it to bring the council of officers and the agitators, and the lords and commons, to such an agreement as might be expected to obtain the approval of the king.

In the mean time it was ascertained that the monarch had no sincere intentions toward peace upon such terms. He still indulged the hope of obtaining military aid from Ireland and Scotland, and flattered himself that, by bringing an army of covenanters from the north against the army of the Independents, he should soon be placed in a position to summon the scattered royalists in both kingdoms to his standard, and so to recover what he had lost. His intrigues with all these parties had led to the adoption of some extended and definite plans of action, when they were detected by Cromwell and Ireton, who, at their next meeting with Ashburnham, expressed high indignation on account of the perfidy which they had discovered in his master. Charles soon experienced the evil effects of this conduct. The spirit of the army became daily more violent; and those who had been accustomed to exercise the greatest control over it, began to look upon their power with apprehension. The agitators were heard to change their discourse, and to complain openly in council, both of the king, and of the malignants about him.

Much of the dangerous efficiency which these men possessed as speakers was the effect of their having taken upon them the office of preaching. The clergy who were at first connected with the several regiments as chaplains, soon retired from a mode of life so little congenial with their habits. They first saw war at the battle of Edgehill, and few of them exposed themselves to the sight a second time. But the consequence was, that the services of religion were left to fall almost into disuse, or to be conducted by military men. It is not to be doubted, however, that the republicanism of the private soldiers had been connected from the first with not a little fanatical extravagance; and as this feeling increased in that quarter, and as more moderate men sometimes deemed it prudent to make use of it in the struggle of parties, it is not surprising that the more sober commonwealthmen and the levellers should have been confounded by their enemies, and that the same obnoxious appellation should often have been given to both. The individuals who placed themselves at the head of the malcontents in the army at this moment were Major Scott, and the colonels Ewer and Rainsborough; and their jealousy was particularly directed against Cromwell, Ireton, and Vane.

On the 1st of November the agents of no less than sixteen regiments concurred in the adoption of a paper bearing the title of An Agreement of the People, and containing the leading principles of this sect. According to this avowal of their opinions, they were concerned to vest the sovereign power in the representatives of the nation, independent of the consent or concurrence of any other person or persons — their constituents being their only superior. They claimed equal protection from the laws; exemption from all forced service either in the army or navy; and full liberty of religious worship. That parliaments might be a more adequate representation and exercise of the popular sovereignty, it was urged that the right of suffrage should be much extended, and that all such assemblies should be convened anew at the close of every two years, and the session of each year be a sitting of six months.

These proceedings were opposed with some spirit by the two houses, and were discountenanced in every practicable way by Cromwell and Ireton, who, whatever may have been their private speculations, were satisfied that the country was in no state to be governed by such principles, and still less by such men.[1] That something might be conceded to the temper of this faction, the

[1] Ludlow with his usual prejudice against Cromwell, ascribes his conduct in this particular to a desire of making the army more subservient to his plans of personal ambition. But of this there is no proof. His plans, so far as they can be known, no doubt promised more advantage to himself than those which obtained the suffrage of the agitators and their adher-

[1647 A.D.]

parliament agreed to deprive the crown of its negative voice on bills, after passing the lords and commons; and Cromwell so far yielded to the stream as to vote with the council of officers upon the resolution that no further attempt should be made toward negotiating with the king. But these concessions did little to check the present spirit of insubordination, and it was manifest to sagacious men that, without prompt and decisive measures to curb this arrogance, all would be lost.

RENDEZVOUS AT WARE—MUTINY SUPPRESSED

Fairfax, who had always looked on the proceedings of the agitators with suspicion and displeasure, assembled a council of officers to deliberate on the best means of counteracting these projects, and of removing the distempered feeling in which they originated. It was resolved that the officers and agitators should repair from the head-quarters at Putney to their different regiments, in order that their influence might be employed in restoring discipline — the "agents" having been the parties just now most employed in producing this spirit of discontent, on which both the country and the parliament began to look with alarm. Several places of rendezvous were accordingly appointed, in the hope of finally adjusting all differences. In the mean time, the general urged on the parliament the importance of making some speedy arrangement for the payment of arrears, and on similar matters, as a course of proceeding that could not fail of rendering it manifest that the army was still intent on the good of the kingdom.

This was on the 9th of November, the day after the meeting of the council of officers at Putney. On the same day a petition was presented to the house from certain agents of the army — the same who had drawn up "the case" of that body — praying the house to take the latter document into consideration. The "petition" and the "case" were both condemned, as opposed to the privileges of parliament, and to the fundamental government of the kingdom; but some steps were taken with a view to the payment of arrears, and toward making a better provision for the wants of the soldiers.

On the 13th, the appointed rendezvous took place at Ware, the headquarters having been removed two days previously to Hertford. One brigade only had received orders to be present on that day; but besides the six regiments which it included, two others made their appearance. The general began by reading to each regiment a remonstrance agreed upon by the council of officers, and addressed the men in such terms as called forth loud applause, and all seemed to join in the pledge "to adhere to the general," notwithstanding the efforts made by Scott, Eyre, and others to induce them to declare for "the Agreement of the People."

But the two regiments present without orders were those commanded by Harrison and Lilburne, long known, particularly the latter, as the most mutinous in the army. Harrison's regiment appeared with a motto in their hat — "England's freedom and soldiers' rights;" but were prevailed on by the gen-

ents, but they were such as may have originated in a more enlightened regard to the claims of his country. Mr. Godwin[h] also, has represented Cromwell as insincere in his transactions with the king, but founds his views on a tissue of surmisings which are much more amusing than satisfactory. Berkeley[i] states that the king distrusted the officers, particularly Cromwell and Ireton, because they would not accept of favours from him. Such conduct seems to bespeak the sincerity of their dealing with the king, and to refute the slanders which were circulated as to their intended promotion in the king's government. Mrs. Hutchinson[j] expresses herself fully satisfied as to Cromwell's sincerity in these proceedings. According to a rumour sent abroad by that notorious court gossip the countess of Carlisle, Charles was pledged to create Cromwell earl of Essex, and to make him commander of the guard.

eral to destroy the mottoes, and to promise obedience. Cromwell now rode up to Lilburne's regiment, and called upon them to follow so proper an example. But he called in vain. The moment required decision. A council of war was called on the field, some fourteen of the more mutinous were seized, three were condemned, and one of this number, chosen by lot, was instantly shot at the head of his regiment. Eleven were placed in the hands of the marshal as a security for the obedience of the rest. By this decided method of proceeding the boldest were intimidated, and discipline was restored.

THE KING ESCAPES FROM HAMPTON COURT

Five days before this occurrence, Charles had made his escape from Hampton Court. He had been led to regard the changing temper of the army with apprehension. The officers who endeavoured to serve him had become on that account exceedingly unpopular. Ireton was excluded from the council of his colleagues, and Cromwell was threatened with impeachment; and the monarch saw, that, should the effort about to be made to restore subordination prove unsuccessful, not only his throne, but his life might be in imminent danger. But in what quarter should he seek an asylum? It was the advice of some that he should go to London and present himself at once in the house of lords. But it was objected that such a proceeding would probably lead to a collision between the city and the army, and subject the king to the charge of encouraging a second war.


In the mean time, the Scottish commissioners pressed him to deliver himself at once from his perplexities by accepting their propositions. His final resolution, and one formed probably under the direction of the parties who had connived at his escape, was to go to the Isle of Wight. Charles withdrew from Hampton Court on the evening of the 11th of November, and after riding with his attendants the whole of the night, which was dark and stormy, reached Sutton in Hampshire the next morning at daybreak. Charles at length determined that Ashburnham and Berkeley should proceed at once to the Isle of Wight, and that, having apprised the governor, Colonel Hammond, of the assurance the king had received from Cromwell and others concerning the dangers which threatened him at Hampton Court, they should express to him the confidence of the monarch in his readiness to serve him at such a crisis, either by affording him protection or favouring his escape.

Hammond listened to the communication of his visitors with distrust and alarm. He at length professed his readiness to receive the monarch, but it was in terms so cautious as to justify suspicion. The governor accompanied his guests on their return to Tichfield, where Ashburnham, leaving him with Berkeley and another military officer below, ascended to the king's apartment, and, stating what had passed, added that the governor was in the house, prepared to fulfil the pledges he had given. Charles, with that wavering judgment which he so often manifested during these vicissitudes, immediately laid his hand upon his breast, and exclaimed, "What! have you brought Hammond with you? then I am undone, for I can now stir no more!" Ashburnham was much affected on hearing this expression, and others to the same effect; but the king added, that things must now take the course they had assumed, and he so far suppressed his feelings, as to receive the governor with an air of cheerfulness and apparent cordiality. The monarch, on his landing on the island, was lodged with much courtesy in Carisbrooke castle; and the two houses were immediately apprised of his being there.

Four days subsequent to his landing in the Isle of Wight, Charles sent a

[1647 A.D.]

message to the parliament, stating the reasons which prevented his consenting to the abolition of Episcopacy, and to some other things proposed. About the same time Berkeley was sent to the head-quarters of the army at Windsor, to ascertain from the officers whether, as they had succeeded in their attempt to subdue the spirit of the mutineers, they were now prepared to forward a settlement on the basis of their late propositions. His communication was made to a council of officers, but was received in a manner which gave no promise of success. It was added, that these communications, which had been made by one regiment after another, had so far intimidated the more moderate men in the council of officers, that even Cromwell had confessed himself in fault, in having gone so far in his endeavours to promote an agreement with the king. It was also stated, that the leaders in this disaffection had formed a resolution to bring the king to trial, and that many trembled to think of what might in that case ensue. The king, in the language of Cromwell, "could not be trusted." The army was more thoroughly persuaded of that fact than himself; and these two circumstances at once determined the conduct of Cromwell and the fate of the monarch.



OLIVER CROMWELL WAS MARRIED IN THIS CHURCH

The parliament, in answer to the letter received from the king, determined that four bills, relating to the most material points at issue, should be submitted for his assent, and that a treaty should be commenced to settle the minor questions which remained. The first of these bills provided that the command of the military should be vested in the parliament during the next twenty years, together with a power of resuming that command even after that period, whenever the two houses should deem such a proceeding necessary to the safety of the kingdom; the second required a proclamation to be issued, justifying the acts of the parliament in the late war, and making void all declarations to the contrary; the third called upon the king to annul all patents of peerage of a date subsequent to the removal of the great seal from London in 1642, and declared that peers created in future should not have the power of sitting and voting in parliament without the consent of the lords and commons; and the fourth gave the two houses the power of adjournment from place to place, and from time to time, at their own pleasure.[1]

[1] The following is the account given by Clarendon[k] of the import of these bills:— "By one of them he was to confess the war to have been raised by him, and that he was guilty of all the blood that had been spilt. By another, he was totally to dissolve the government of the church by bishops, and to grant all the lands belonging to the church to such uses as they proposed, leaving the settling a future government in the place thereof to further time and councils. By a third, he was to grant and settle the militia in the manner and in the persons proposed, reserving not so much power in himself as any subject was capable of. In the last place, he was to sacrifice all those who had served or adhered to him to the mercy of the parliament." How are we to account for such misrepresentation?

The answer of the king was, that nothing which he had hitherto suffered, or could at present apprehend, would induce him to give his assent to these preliminaries so long as the matters which were to follow remained undetermined. Charles appears to have been disposed to this course, partly by his fear that the parliament might not be able to make good its overtures against the less friendly temper of the army; and still more by the interference of the Scotch commissioners, who assured him that Scotland was willing to forego her absolute demands on the matter of the covenant, for the sake of a peace with him, and in order to prevent the affairs of the country from passing into the hands of the Independents. In fact, a treaty to this effect was signed at Carisbrooke, before the king returned his answer to the two houses.

When Charles despatched that message, it was in the hope of being able to make his escape, and, by placing himself at the head of an army of covenanters and royalists on the borders of the two kingdoms, to accomplish by a second war what he failed to achieve in the first. But every attempt so far to elude the vigilance of Hammond was without effect, though the monarch found means of frequent correspondence with his family and adherents. Parliament, on receiving his message, decided that no further address should be made to him, and the army pledged itself to support the two houses in that resolution; and, with a reference to the conduct of the Scots, it was declared that all persons making an overture to the monarch without consent of parliament should be liable to the penalties of high treason.[d]

THE VOTE OF NON-ADDRESSES AND THE "SECOND CIVIL WAR"

Cromwell exultingly communicated the result of the proceedings at Carisbrooke to Col. Hammond. "The house of commons has this day voted as follows:—1st. They will make no more addresses to the king; 2nd. None shall apply to him without leave of the two houses, upon pain of being guilty of high treason; 3rd. They will receive nothing from the king, nor shall any other bring anything to them from him, nor receive anything from the king." The lords adopted the resolution, after some debate. "Unless there be some speedy change, the end will be accomplished that the majority in parliament contended for, "to settle the commonwealth without the king." That majority in the commons was a very formidable one — 141 to 91; and their resolution is justly described by Hallam[m] as "a virtual renunciation of allegiance." But, however the notion of a sovereign representative assembly as the government suited for England might please the political enthusiasts and the military fanatics, the great body of quiet people, who desired the protection of the law under a limited monarchy, were not prepared to endure that a democracy should be thrust upon them at the point of the sword. Discontent was very generally spread. Murmurings would shortly grow into revolts. Cromwell, who saw better than most men the inevitable result of political and religious discords, whilst the supreme authority was so unsettled, tried to effect some reconciliation between Presbyterians and Independents. The dinner at which Cromwell assembled them was given in vain. "One would endure no superior, the other no equal."

Ludlow,[g] who thus describes the result of this attempt, relates more minutely the proceedings of another meeting at which he was present. The grandees of the house and army, of whom he terms Cromwell the head, "would not declare their judgments either for a monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical government; maintaining that any of them might be good in themselves, or for us, according as Providence should direct us." The common-

[1647 A.D.]

wealth's men boldly declared against monarchy; that the king had broken his oath, and dissolved their allegiance; maintained that he had appealed to the sword, and should be called to account for the effusion of blood; after which an equal commonwealth, founded upon the consent of the people. The discussion, solemn as it was, had a ludicrous termination. "Cromwell," says Ludlow, "professed himself unresolved; and having learned what he could of the principles and inclinations of those present at the conference, took up a cushion and flung it at my head, and then ran down the stairs; but I overtook him with another, which made him hasten down faster than he desired." Cromwell told Ludlow the next day that "he was convinced of the desirableness of what was proposed, but not of the feasibleness of it."

There was a meeting some time after, conducted in a very different mood by Cromwell — a meeting of officers of the army at Windsor Castle, as reported by Adjutant-General Allen. These zealous men spent one whole day in prayer. They were exhorted by Cromwell to a thorough consideration of their actions as an army, and of their ways as private Christians. They became convinced that the Lord had departed from them, through "those carnal conferences which they held in the preceding year with the king and his party." They, with bitter weeping, took sense and shame of their iniquities. They came to a clear agreement that it was their duty to go forth and fight the enemies that had appeared against them. They finally came to a resolution, "That it was our duty, that, if ever the Lord brought us back again in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for that blood he had shed, and mischief he had done to his utmost, against the Lord's cause and people in these poor nations." These men, not hypocrites, not wholly fanatics, are very terrible in their stern resolves. They will go forth to fight "the enemies that had appeared against them" — and then! There is a reaction in many quarters in England. The Scots are preparing to invade. A second civil war is fast approaching.

When the parliament passed their resolution to receive no more communications from the king, and to forbid all correspondence with him, they published a declaration imputing all the misfortunes of his reign to himself personally, and not to evil counsellors, as had been the custom before monarchy had lost its respect even in the eyes of those who were opposed to its evil government. But the nation was tired of its distractions. It wearied for some permanent settlement that might end the hoarse disputes and subtle intrigues of parliament and army, of Presbyterian and Independent; that might free the possessors of rank and property from the dread of wild men with notions of social equality; that might restore industry to its healthful functions, and put an end not only to the cost of a standing military force, but to its fearful resistance to civil power. The desire of the peaceful portion of the nation was feebly heard amidst the surrounding clamour.

The attempt to express their impatience of existing evils by riot and revolt was necessarily a vain attempt. This spirit was displayed in the city of London, at the beginning of April. Cromwell and some of the other leaders attend a common-council; but they find the Presbyterians indisposed to listen to what they call "their subtleties." The next day there is a formidable riot. It is Sunday. The Puritan strictness in religious observances, and in minor matters, has come to be less respected than before the close of the war. Royalists, amidst their contempt for what they deem fanaticism, are now mixing again in the ordinary intercourse with the despised roundheads. The theatre is now not wholly proscribed. On that Sunday, the 9th of April, there are apprentices playing at bowls in Moorfields during church-time. They are

ordered to disperse by the militia guard; but they fight with the guard, and hold their ground. Soon routed by cavalry, they raise the old cry of "Clubs"; are joined by the watermen, a numerous and formidable body; fight on through the night; and in the morning have possession of Ludgate and Newgate, and have stretched chains across all the great thoroughfares.

There are forty hours of this tumult, in which the prevailing cry is "God and King Charles." At last a body of cavalry arrive from Westminster; there is an irresistible charge of the men who had ridden down far more terrible assailants; and that movement is at an end. But in many towns there are similar riots.

In Wales some Presbyterian officers of the parliamentary army, with Colonel Poyer at their head, have raised a far more formidable insurrection. Pembroke Castle is in their hands. They soon have possession of Chepstow Castle. The gentry have proclaimed the king. It is a Presbyterian-royalist insurrection, allied in principle with the purposes of the moderate Presbyterians of Scotland, who are organising their army for the march into England. The Welsh outbreak is somewhat premature; but nevertheless it is very formidable. It is alarming enough to demand the personal care of Lieutenant-General Cromwell. He leaves London on the 3rd of May, with five regiments. The Londoners are glad to be freed from his presence; for a rumour has been spread that the army at Whitehall are about to attack and plunder the city. Petitions were addressed to the commons that the army should remove further; and that the militia should be placed under the command of Skippon.

The reaction gave the Presbyterians again the command in parliament; and it was voted on the 28th of April, that the fundamental government of the kingdom by king, lords, and commons, should not be changed; and that the resolutions forbidding all communication with the king should be rescinded. Popular demonstrations immediately followed the departure of Cromwell. Surrey gentlemen, freeholders, and yeomen, came to Westminster with a petition that the king should be restored with all the splendour of his ancestors. A broil ensued between the parliamentary guard and these petitioners, who asked the soldiers, "Why do you stand here to guard a company of rogues?" Several of the Surrey men, and one of the guard, were killed. The royalists of Kent organised themselves in a far more formidable shape. They secured Sandwich and Dover; appointed as general, Goring, Earl of Norwich; and assembled at Rochester to the number of seven thousand. Troops were raised for the royal service in the eastern and midland counties.

More dangerous to the ruling powers than all these demonstrations, was the defection of the fleet. The unsteadiness and the inconstancy, the jealousy of the government under which the sailors served, belonged to a period when the government had long been indifferent to the national honour. These characteristics altogether passed away when the first thought of the English fleet was how "not to be fooled by the foreigner."

The sailors of 1648 put their admiral on shore, and carried their ships to Holland, to place them under the command of the prince of Wales, who appeared in the Channel — and did nothing. The royalists were in the highest exultation. They expected the king soon to be again at their head. The earl of Holland had turned once more to what he thought would be the winning side; and his mansion at Kensington was again the resort of cavaliers. But the king does not appear amongst them. An attempt at escape from Carisbrooke has a second time failed. On the 31st of May, Hammond wrote to the parliament that the king had again nearly effected his escape.

Another dread now came over the Presbyterian party. They would

[1648 A.D.]

negotiate with the king; but they would take strong measures against the royalists. All papists and malignants were banished from London under more severe penalties than before. Fairfax was directed to proceed with all his forces against the insurgents in Kent and Essex and the other counties around London. They issued new ordinances against heresy, which affected the Independents; and against swearing, which touched the cavaliers very nearly. The general and the army marched into Kent; dispersed the insurgents after an obstinate fight at Maidstone; and by rapid successes, wherever else there was resistance, put down the rising spirit. Lord Goring, after having led several thousand men to Blackheath, expecting assistance in London, was compelled to see the desertion of his followers, and he crossed the Thames into Essex. There the contest was more prolonged. Lord Capel and Sir Charles Lucas had collected a large force, with which they intended to march from Colchester upon London. Fairfax invested the town; and for two months there was a renewal of the former work of blockade and siege, until the place was surrendered on the 27th of August.

The triumph of Fairfax was tarnished by an exception to his usual humanity. Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle were tried by court-martial, and were shot. The earl of Holland and the young duke of Buckingham broke out in revolt at Kingston-on-Thames, when the main army of the parliament was investing Colchester. There was an action near Kingston, in which they were defeated; and passing into Hertfordshire, the remnant was cut up at St. Neot's by a detachment from the army of Fairfax, and Holland was taken prisoner. In all these movements, we see the absence of any supreme organising power. They were isolated efforts, which were quickly suppressed. Whatever miseries England had still to endure, it was freed from the misery of a long partisan warfare.

THE SCOTCH INVASION AND THE BATTLE OF PRESTON (1648 A.D.)

In Wales, where the resistance to the parliament was more concentrated, the presence even of Cromwell was not at first successful. He is before Pembroke, but he has no artillery to make short work of the siege. It was not till the 10th of July that the town and castle of Pembroke were surrendered to him. Six days before the capitulation the Scottish army entered England, under the duke of Hamilton. He was joined by five thousand English under Sir Marmaduke Langdale. The English general, Lambert, was retreating before them, having been directed by Cromwell to avoid an engagement, and to fall back. Two days after the surrender of Pembroke, Cromwell was on his march from the west. He waited not for orders. He knew where he was wanted. At this juncture a charge of treason had been preferred against him by Major Huntington, an officer of the army, which had been countenanced by some members of both houses. He was accused of endeavouring, by betraying the king, parliament, and army, to advance himself. The occasion was not opportune for such an attempt. When he left London he was equally distasteful to the Presbyterians and the commonwealth's men — who, with some, went by the general name of levellers.

The Scottish army that entered England could not be regarded as the army of the Scottish nation. The treaty which had been concluded with the king at Carisbrooke gave satisfaction only to a portion of the Presbyterians. The Scottish parliament, influenced by the duke of Hamilton and others, who professed moderate principles of ecclesiastical government, gave the engagements of that treaty their zealous support, especially that clause which pro-

vided that a military force should be sent to England to reinstate the king in his authority. They were in consequence called the "engagers." But the clergy generally proclaimed that Charles had not conceded enough for the establishment of their form of worship in England to warrant a war for his assistance. The marquis of Argyll, and other powerful chiefs who had fought against Montrose, were burning with resentment against the royalists of their own country, and were strenuously opposed to what was meant as an aid to the royalists of England. An army was however raised; and the engagers, with a raw and ill-disciplined force, crossed the Border.

The march of Cromwell, from the extremity of South Wales to the heart of Lancashire, was accomplished with a rapidity which belongs only to the movements of great commanders. He had to gather scattered forces on his way, and to unite himself with Lambert in Yorkshire. He was determined to engage with an enemy whose numbers were held to double his own. Through the whole breadth of South Wales, then a pastoral country, but now presenting all the unpicturesque combinations of mining industry, he advanced to Gloucester. This forced march of some hundred and fifty miles through Wales was an exhausting commencement. "Send me some shoes for my poor tired soldiers," wrote Cromwell to the executive committee in London. At Leicester he received three thousand pairs of shoes. At Nottingham he confers with Colonel Hutchinson, and leaves his prisoners with him. His cavalry have pushed on, and have joined Lambert at Barnard Castle. All Cromwell's forces have joined the northern troops by the 12th of August. The Scots, who, having passed Kendal, had debated whether they would march direct into Yorkshire, and so on towards London, have decided for the western road. The duke of Hamilton thinks he is sure of Manchester. Sir Marmaduke Langdale is their guide through the unknown ways into Lancashire, and leads the vanguard. There is very imperfect communication between the van and the rear of this army.

On the 16th of August the duke is at Preston. The same night Cromwell is at Stonyhurst. Langdale, to the left of Hamilton's main body, has ascertained that the dangerous enemy is close at hand and sends notice to the duke. "Impossible," exclaims Hamilton; "he has not had time to be here." The next morning Cromwell has fallen upon Sir Marmaduke, and utterly routed him, "after a very sharp dispute." Hamilton's army is a disjointed one. His cavalry in considerable numbers are at Wigan, under the command of Middleton. When the affair was settled with Langdale, there was a skirmish close by Preston between Hamilton himself and some of Cromwell's troopers. The duke was separated from his main force of infantry, under Baillie, but rejoined them only to see the bridge of the Ribble won by the enemy in a general battle. Cromwell describes the first four hours' fighting in a country all enclosure and miry ground, as "a hedge dispute." This being ended, the Scots were charged through Preston; and then not only was the bridge of the Ribble won, but the bridge of Over Darwen. Night was approaching, which put an end to any further fighting on the 17th.

The Scottish generals in a council of war determined to march off, as soon as it was dark, without waiting for Middleton and his cavalry. The weather was rainy; the roads heavy; their men were wet, weary, and hungry. They left their ammunition behind; and the next morning were at Wigan Moor, with half their number. No general engagement took place that day; and the Scots held Wigan.

Cromwell writes, "We lay that night in the field close by the enemy; being very dirty and weary, and having marched twelve miles of such ground as I

[1648 A.D.]

never rode in all my life, the day being very wet." The next day the Scots moved towards Warrington; and after some hard fighting, General Baillie surrendered himself, officers, and soldiers, as prisoners of war. The duke, with three thousand horse, was gone towards Nantwich. His course was undeterminded. The country people were hostile. His own men were mutinous. He surrenders to Lambert, and is sent prisoner to Nottingham.

The Scottish army was now utterly broken and dispersed. The news of Hamilton's complete failure in the invasion of England was the signal for the great Presbyterian party that had opposed the policy of the engagers to rise in arms. Argyll assembled his highland clans. In the western lowlands large bodies of peasantry, headed by their preachers, marched to Edinburgh. The memory of this insurrection has endured to this hour in the name of Whig. It was called "the whiggamore raid," from the word used in the west of Scotland when the carter urges forward his horses with Whig! whig! (get on); as the English carter says, Gee! gee! (go). Argyll was restored to power. The most zealous covenanters were again at the head of the executive authority. Cromwell entered Scotland on the 20th of September, and was received at Edinburgh, not as the man to whose might their brave countrymen had been compelled to yield; but as the deliverer from a royalist faction that might again have put the national religion in peril.[n]

At the commencement of this second war, a resolution had passed in the parliament, May 11th, which declared that no quarter should be given to the persons found in arms on the pretence of serving the king. Two years had passed since a war waged against the king had ended in making him prisoner; and as the parliament was now in fact the great authority of the nation, all men taken in arms against it were to be treated as rebels, and became liable to the penalties of treason. A council of war was accordingly convened at Colchester, on the fate of the leading delinquents who had now become prisoners; and it was determined that, in consequence of the innocent blood which they had caused to be shed, three of their number should suffer death, two of the condemned persons being Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle. Capel, and several others, generously declared that they were themselves as guilty as the men doomed to die, and requested to share in their fate. But the council adhered to its decision.

Lucas, making bare his chest, shouted in defiance, "Fire, rebels!" His body fell lifeless; Lisle embraced it affectionately, and, turning to the soldiers, bid them approach nearer. One of them said, "Fear not, sir, we shall hit you." He replied, "I have been nearer to you, my friends, and you have missed me." This sanguinary deed, whoever may have been its great mover, attaches indelible disgrace to all who were parties to it. The royalists had descended to many acts of cruelty; but this proceeding was without parallel in the history of the civil war. After the ordinance of the 11th of May, these sufferers might have been dealt with by the civil power as traitors, with as much appearance of justice as was usually attendant on state prosecutions; but their death, inflicted under such circumstances, could not fail to exhibit them, in the view of dispassionate men, as the victims of revenge, and the martyrs of loyalty.

It was with great difficulty that Hamilton had prevailed on the estates in Scotland to concur in the proposed invasion of England; and the news of his defeat at once turned the scale against him in that country. Argyll, his great opponent, took possession of the government. Cromwell himself soon made his appearance in Edinburgh, and, having done what was considered expedient to secure the ascendancy of the party of Argyll, contented himself

with procuring that no person who had taken arms against the English parliament should be deemed eligible to any place of trust or emolument. From the extent and the determination of the efforts which were made during this summer in favour of the king, it is manifest that the Presbyterians, in proposing so considerable a reduction of the army, must have been insincere, or have been almost entirely ignorant of the feeling of the country which they aspired to govern. The army in which, according to their policy, it would have been necessary to confide at this juncture, must have been one having its discipline and valour in a great degree to acquire, and one, in consequence, that would, in all probability, have been speedily subdued by the English royalists alone.

But by a series of actions, which the bravest and the most disciplined army in Europe could alone have achieved, the risings in the south were suppressed, and the invasion from the north was made to end in the subjection of the invaders. The Presbyterians, however, continued to flatter themselves with having acted prudently, inasmuch as this double overthrow of the royalists must serve to destroy all hope in the king of assistance from his more immediate adherents, while the avowed hostility of the soldiery must show that from them he had everything to fear — leaving him no prospect of regaining his throne, except by such a concurrence with the overtures of the Presbyterians as should unite them entirely in his favour, and enable them to resist the machinations and the power of his more relentless opponents.

TREATY OF NEWPORT AND ANTI-ROYALIST FEELING

Such was the condition and temper of parties, when, the vote of non-addresses being repealed, further negotiation was entered upon between the parliament and the king. This treaty, known by the name of the treaty of Newport, was based upon the propositions which had been submitted to the monarch at Hampton Court; and Charles, after many attempts to evade or modify the proposals of the parliamentary commissioners, assented to the whole, with the following exceptions only:— that the office of the bishops should be suspended for three years, but not abolished; that the Episcopal lands which had been sold should be reclaimed, at the farthest after ninety-nine years; that an act of indemnity should be passed in favour of his followers, without exception — so far as to admit the most obnoxious of the excepted persons to compound for their offences; and that the adoption of the covenant should not be enforced either in his own case, or in that of any other person.

But it soon became evident that the army and the party which adhered to it in the city were not disposed to an agreement with the king even upon his full acceptance of the propositions now submitted to him. A petition was presented to the commons from "thousands of well-affected persons in and near London," which, while it recognised the monarchy and the peerage, deprived them of nearly all their privileges, and prayed that the parliament "would lay to heart the blood spilt, and the infinite spoil and havoc that had been made of peaceable, harmless people, by express commission from the king, and to consider whether an act of oblivion was likely to satisfy the justice of God, and to appease His remaining wrath."

The course of proceeding thus suggested from the city was dwelt upon, with the greatest confidence in its rectitude, by one to another in the army. It was commonly said that the land had been defiled with blood, and could not be cleansed but by the blood of him who had shed it; and petitions were presented to Fairfax from the regiments under Ireton and Ingoldsby, which

[1648 A.D.]

urged that "impartial and steady justice should be done upon all criminal persons, that the same course should be taken in the case of king or lord, as in that of the poorest commoner; and that all persons who should speak or act in behalf of the king, until acquitted of the charge of shedding innocent blood, might be proceeded against as traitors." This petition was presented on the 18th of October. On the 20th of November, a remonstrance, adopted unanimously by the council of officers, was presented by a deputation from that body, and recommended to the attention of the house by Fairfax, in which it was urged that the present treaty with the king should be abandoned, and that judicial proceedings should be instituted against him, on account of the evils done by him; that the monarchy should be elective; that future parliaments should be annual or biennial, with a sure provision for their being regularly convened; that the elective franchises should be rendered more general and equal; and that no monarch should be allowed a negative voice on bills.

The Presbyterians, when these demands came before them, opposed them with courage and perseverance, and on a division exhibited a large majority. They knew the feeling of the country to be against such extreme measures; and they hoped, by a speedy agreement with the king, to overwhelm the abettors of them with confusion. But the military leaders were not ignorant that such was the policy of their opponents, and they adopted means for the greater security of the king's person. Nor could Charles avoid seeing the danger which threatened him. He accordingly, as in the eleventh hour, consented, with still smaller modifications, to the most obnoxious of the propositions from the two houses. He did not agree, even at this time, to abolish Episcopacy, or to alienate its wealth for ever, but he allowed the restoration of them to be matters dependent on the pleasure of parliament.

Charles, in parting from the parliamentary commissioners, expressed his fears that what he had now done would prove to have been done too late. On the following morning news was privately conveyed to him that an armed force was on its way to make him prisoner. His attendants entreated him to consult his safety by an immediate escape; but he spoke of his promise to wait twenty days for the answer of parliament; of his pledge not to break the parole which had been granted to him; and clung to so many sources of hesitation, that night came, and, instead of flying for his life, he retired to his chamber. About midnight the expected force arrived; early in the morning the king was summoned to leave his present lodgings; and in the course of that day was committed a prisoner to Hurst Castle, an edifice standing on a low projecting piece of land, joined by a narrow causeway to the coast of Hampshire. The removal of the king from Carisbrooke was on the 30th of November. On the day preceding, a declaration was issued by the officers, which described the majority of the parliament as consisting of men who, in the possession of power, had ceased to value their principles, and set forth, in obscure, but significant terms, the high trust which at this extraordinary crisis had been committed by the manifest will of Providence to the army.[d]

PRIDE'S PURGE

On the Monday the commons are debating all day — they are debating till five o'clock on Tuesday morning the 5th of December, 1648 — whether the king's concessions in the treaty of Newport are a ground of settlement. The practised orators have been heard again and again on this great question.

There is an old man amongst them — one who has only been a member three weeks — who boldly stands up for the cause of fallen majesty. He is no royal favourite, he says. The favours he has received from the king and his party were, the loss of his two ears — his pillorings, his imprisonments, his fines. It was Prynne, who spoke for hours; with honest energy, but with no great prudence when he described the army at their very doors as "inconstant, mutinous, and unreasonable servants." Yet, whatever might have been the effect of this learned man's courageous effort for reconciliation, the very recital of his ancient sufferings must have revived in some a bitter recollection of past tyrannies, and a corresponding dread of their return. The house decided, by one hundred and twenty-nine to eighty-three, that the king's concessions are a ground of settlement.

There was another assembly on the same day whose resolutions at that moment were of more importance even than a vote of the commons. Ludlow[9] says, "Some of the principal officers of the army came to London with expectation that things would be brought to this issue, and consulting with some members of parliament and others, it was concluded, after a full and free debate, that the measures taken by the parliament were contrary to the trust reposed in them, and tending to contract the guilt of the blood that had been shed, upon themselves and the nation: that it was therefore the duty of the army to endeavour to put a stop to such proceedings." They went about this work in a very business-like manner. "Three of the members of the house, and three of the officers of the army, withdrew into a private room to attain the ends of our said resolution; when we agreed that the army should be drawn up the next morning, and guards placed in Westminster hall, the Court of Requests, and the Lobby; that none might be permitted to pass into the house but such as continued faithful to the public interests. To this end we went over the names of all the members, one by one. Commissary-General Ireton went to Sir Thomas Fairfax, and acquainted him with the necessity of this extraordinary way of proceeding." Lieutenant-General Cromwell was still in the north.

What was thus deliberately resolved on the 6th of December was as promptly effected on the 7th. An order is given that the trained bands of the city shall withdraw from their accustomed duty of guard at Westminster. Colonel Rich's regiment of horse take up a position on that morning in Palace Yard. Colonel Pride's regiment of foot throng Westminster Hall, and block up every entrance to the house of commons. Colonel Pride has a written list of names in his hand — the names of those against whom the sentence of exclusion has been passed. As the members of the house approach, Lord Grey of Groby, who stands at the elbow of Colonel Pride, gives a sign or word that such a one is to pass, or to be turned back. Forty-one were ordered that day to retire to "the queen's court."

It is easier to imagine than to describe the indignation expressed by the ejected. They are kept under restraint all the day; and in the evening are conducted to a tavern. There were two taverns abutting upon and partly under the hall, known as "Heaven" and "Hell" — very ancient places of refreshment much used by the lawyers in term-time; mentioned by Ben Jonson; and which, with a third house called "Purgatory," are recited in a grant of the time of Henry VII. To "Hell," perhaps without the intention of a bad joke, these forty-one of the parliamentary majority were led, and lodged for the night. The process went on for several days; till some hundred members are disposed of. Before the minority have obtained an entire ascendancy Colonel Pride is questioned for his conduct; but no satisfaction is given. The

[1649 A.D.]

house makes a show of disapprobation; but the serjeant-at-arms has brought a message that the excluded members are detained by the army; and business proceeds as if the event were of small consequence.

Cromwell has arrived on the night after the sharp medicine known as "Pride's purge" has been administered; and, says Ludlow,[9] "lay at Whitehall, where, and at other places, he declared that he had not been acquainted with this design; yet since it was done he was glad of it, and would endeavour to maintain it." Vane, who had spoken vehemently in the great debate of the 4th, against accepting the king's concessions as a ground of settlement, even boldly proclaiming himself for a republic, appears to have taken no part in the illegal proceedings which laid the parliament at the feet of the army. He retired to his estate, and did not come again to parliament till a month after the final blow against monarchy had been struck. The parliamentary minority, being now almost unanimous in their resolve to overthrow the existing government, though perhaps not yet agreed as to the mode of accomplishing this as far as regarded the person of the king, voted to rescind all the votes which had recently passed as to the grounds of a settlement. Another act of military power soon marshalled the way to a resolution of such doubts.

THE KING TAKEN TO WINDSOR

The drawbridge of Hurst Castle is lowered during the night of the 17th of December, and the tramp of a troop of horse is heard by the wakeful prisoner. He calls for his attendant Herbert, who is sent to ascertain the cause of this midnight commotion. He is informed that the troop are to conduct him to Windsor. Two days after, the king sets out. At Winchester he is received in state by the mayor and aldermen; but they retire alarmed on being told that the house has voted all to be traitors who should address the king. The king urged his desire to stop at Bagshot, and dine in the forest at the house of Lord Newburg. He had been apprised that his friend would have ready for him a horse of extraordinary fleetness, with which he might make one more effort to escape. The horse had been kicked by another horse the day before, and was useless. That last faint hope was gone. On the night of the 23rd of December the king slept, a prisoner surrounded with hostile guards, in the noble castle which in the days of his youth had rung with Jonson's lyrics and ribaldry; and the gypsy of the masque had prophesied that his "name in peace or wars, nought should bound." But he had an undoubting confidence that he should be righted, by aid from Ireland, from Denmark, from other kingdoms: "I have three more cards to play, the worst of which will give me back everything." After three weeks of comparative comfort, the etiquette observed towards him was laid aside; and with a fearful sense of approaching calamity in the absence of "respect and honour, according to the ancient practice," he exclaimed, "is there anything more contemptible than a despised prince?"

During the month in which Charles had remained at Windsor, there had been proceedings in parliament of which he was imperfectly informed. On the day he arrived there, it was resolved by the commons that he should be brought to trial. On the 2nd of January, 1649, it was voted that, in making war against the parliament, he had been guilty of treason; and a high court was appointed to try him. One hundred and fifty commissioners were to compose the court — peers, members of the commons, aldermen of London. The ordinance was sent to the upper house, and was rejected. On the 6th, a fresh ordinance, declaring that the people being, after God, the source of all

just power, the representatives of the people are the supreme power in the nation; and that whatsoever is enacted or declared for law by the commons in parliament hath the force of a law, and the people are concluded thereby, though the consent of king or peers be not had thereto. Asserting this power, so utterly opposed either to the ancient constitution of the monarchy, or to the possible working of a republic, there was no hesitation in constituting the high court of justice in the name of the commons alone. The number of members of the court was now reduced to one hundred and thirty-five. They had seven preparatory meetings, at which only fifty-eight members attended.



A Cavalier of the 17th Century

Algernon Sidney, although bent upon a republic, opposed the trial, apprehending that the project of a commonwealth would fail, if the king's life were touched. It is related that Cromwell, irritated by these scruples, exclaimed, "No one will stir. I tell you, we will cut his head off with the crown upon it." Such daring may appear the result of ambition, of fear, or revenge, or innate cruelty, in a few men who had obtained a temporary ascendency. These men were, on the contrary, the organs of a wide-spread determination amongst thousands throughout the country, who had long preached and argued and prophesied about vengeance on "the great delinquent"; and who had ever in their mouths the text that "blood defileth the land, and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." They had visions of a theocracy, and were impatient of an earthly king.

Do we believe, as some, not without reasonable grounds, may believe, that the members of the high court of justice expressed such convictions upon a simulated religious confidence? Do we think that, in the clear line of action which Cromwell especially had laid down for his guidance, he cloaked his worldly ambition under the guise of being moved by some higher impulse than that of taking the lead in a political revolution? Certainly we do not. The infinite mischiefs of assuming that the finger of God directly points out the way to believers, when they are walking in dangerous and devious paths, may be perfectly clear to us, who calmly look back upon the instant events which followed upon Cromwell's confidence in his solemn call to a fearful duty. But we are not the more to believe, because the events have a character of guilt in the views of most persons, that such a declared conviction was altogether, or in any degree, a lie. Those were times in which men believed in the immediate direction of a special Providence in great undertakings. The words, "God hath given us the victory," were not with them a mere form. If we trace amidst these solemn impulses the workings of a deep sagacity — the union of the fierce resolves of a terrible enthusiasm with the foresight and energy of an ever-present common-sense — we are not the more to conclude that their spiritualism, or fanaticism, or whatever we please to call their ruling principle, was less sincere by being mixed up with the ordinary motives through which the affairs of the world are carried on.

[1649 A.D.]

THE KING BEFORE THE HIGH COURT

On the 19th of January, Major Harrison appeared again at Windsor with his troop. There was a coach with six horses in the court-yard, in which the king took his seat; and, once more, he entered London, and was lodged at St. James's Palace. The next day, the high court of justice was opened in Westminster Hall. The king came from St. James's in a sedan; and after the names of the members of the court had been called, sixty-nine being present, Bradshaw, the president, ordered the serjeant to bring in the prisoner. Silently the king sat down in the chair prepared for him. He moved not his hat, as he looked sternly and contemptuously around. The sixty-nine rose not from their seats, and remained covered.

It was scarcely eight years since he was a spectator of the last solemn trial in this hall — that of Strafford. What mighty events have happened since that time! There are memorials hanging from the roof which tell such a history as his saddest fears in the hour of Strafford's death could scarcely have shaped out. The tattered banners taken from his cavaliers at Marston Moor and Naseby are floating above his head. There, too, are the same memorials of Preston. But still he looks around him proudly and severely. Who are the men that are to judge him, the king, who, says Blackstone,[o] "united in his person every possible claim by hereditary right to the English as well as the Scottish throne, being the heir both of Egbert and William the Conqueror?" These men are, in his view, traitors and rebels, from Bradshaw, the lawyer, who sits in the foremost chair calling himself lord-president, to Cromwell and Marten in the back seat, over whose heads are the red-cross of England and the harp of Ireland, painted on an escutcheon, whilst the proud bearings of a line of kings are nowhere visible. Under what law does this insolent president address him as "Charles Stuart, king of England," and say, "The commons of England being deeply sensible of the calamities that have been brought upon this nation, which are fixed upon you as the principal author of them, have resolved to make inquisition for blood"? He will defy their authority.

The clerk reads the charge, and when he is accused therein of being tyrant and traitor, he laughs in the face of the court. "Though his tongue usually hesitated, yet it was very free at this time, for he was never discomposed in mind," writes Warwick.[p] "And yet," it is added, "as he confessed himself to the bishop of London that attended him, one action shocked him very much: for whilst he was leaning in the court upon his staff, which had a head of gold, the head broke off on a sudden. He took it up, but seemed unconcerned, yet told the bishop it really made a great impression upon him." It was the symbol of the treacherous hopes upon which he had rested — golden dreams that vanished in this solemn hour. Again and again contending against the authority of the court, the king was removed, and the sitting was adjourned to the 22nd. On that day the same scene was renewed; and again on the 23rd. A growing sympathy for the monarch became apparent. The cries of "Justice, justice," which were heard at first, were now mingled with "God save the king."

He had refused to plead; but the court nevertheless employed the 24th and 25th of January in collecting evidence to prove the charge of his levying war against the parliament. Coke, the solicitor-general, then demanded whether the court would proceed to pronouncing sentence; and the members adjourned to the painted chamber. On the 27th the public sitting was resumed. When the name of Fairfax was called, a voice was heard from the

gallery, "He has too much wit to be here." The king was brought in; and, when the president addressed the commissioners, and said that the prisoner was before the court to answer a charge of high treason, and other crimes brought against him in the name of the people of England, the voice from the gallery was again heard, "It's a lie — not one half of them." The voice came from Lady Fairfax. The court, Bradshaw then stated, had agreed upon the sentence. Ludlow[g] records that the king "desired to make one proposition before they proceeded to sentence; which he earnestly pressing, as that which he thought would lead to the reconciling of all parties, and to the peace of the three kingdoms, they permitted him to offer it: the effect of which was, that he might meet the two houses in the painted chamber, to whom he doubted not to offer that which should satisfy and secure all interests." Ludlow goes on to say, "Designing, as I have been since informed, to propose his own resignation, and the admission of his son to the throne upon such terms as should have been agreed upon."

The commissioners retired to deliberate, "and being satisfied, upon debate, that nothing but loss of time would be the consequence of it, they returned into the court with a negative to his demand." Bradshaw then delivered a solemn speech to the king, declaring how he had through his reign endeavoured to subvert the laws and introduce arbitrary government; how he had attempted, from the beginning, either to destroy parliaments, or to render them subservient to his own designs; how he had levied war against the parliament, by the terror of his power to discourage for ever such assemblies from doing their duty, and that in this war many thousands of the good people of England had lost their lives. The clerk was commanded to read the sentence, that his head should be severed from his body; "and the commissioners," says Ludlow, "testified their unanimous assent by standing up." The king attempted to speak; "but being accounted dead in law, was not permitted."

On the 29th of January, the court met to sign the sentence of execution; addressed to "Colonel Francis Hacker, Colonel Huncks, and Lieutenant-Colonel Phayr, and to every one of them." This is the memorable document:—

"Whereas Charles Stuart, king of England, is and standeth convicted, attainted and condemned of High Treason and other high Crimes: and Sentence upon Saturday last was pronounced against him by this Court, to be put to death by the severing of his head from his body; of which Sentence execution remaineth to be done:

"These are therefore to will and require you to see the said Sentence executed, in the open street before Whitehall, upon the morrow, being the thirtieth day of this instant month of January, between the hours of ten in the morning and five in the afternoon with full effect. And for so doing, this shall be your warrant.

"And these are to require all Officers and Soldiers, and others the good People of this Nation of England, to be assisting unto you in this service.

"Given under our hands and seals,

"JOHN BRADSHAW.
"THOMAS GREY.
"OLIVER CROMWELL."
And fifty-six others.

The statements of the heartless buffoonery, and the daring violence of Cromwell, at the time of signing the warrant, must be received with some suspicion. He smeared Henry Marten's face with the ink of his pen, and Marten in return smeared his, say the narratives. Probably so. With reference to this anecdote it has been wisely observed by Foster,[q] "Such 'toys of desperation' commonly bubble up from a deep flowing stream below." Another anecdote is told by Clarendon[k]; that Colonel Ingoldsby, one who signed the warrant, was forced to do so with great violence, by Cromwell and

Warrant to Execute King Charles the First. A. D. 1648.

At the high Court of Justice for the tryinge and judginge of Charles Stewart Kinge of England January xxix^th Anno Dñi 1648.

Whereas Charles Stewart Kinge of England is and standeth convicted attainted and condemned of high Treason and other high Crymes And Sentence vppon Saturday last was pronounced against him by this Court to be putt to death by the Severinge of his Head from his Body Of w^ch Sentence execution yet remaineth to be done These are therefore to will and require you to see the said Sentence executed In the open Streete before Whitehall vppon the morrow being the Thirtieth day of this instant moneth of January Betweene the houres of Tenn in the morninge and five in the afternoone of the same day w^th full effect And for soe doeing this shall be yo^r sufficient warrant And these are to require All Officers and Souldiers and other the good people of this Nation of England to be assistinge vnto you in this Service Given vnder o^r hands and Seales.

To Colonell ffrancis Hacker Colonell Huncks Har Waller
and Lieutenant Colonell Phayre and to every
of them

Jo Bradshawe
Tho Grey
O Cromwell
Edw Whalley

Jo Bourchier
Jo Barkstead
The Mauleverer

John Blakiston
Jo Hutchinson
Wm Goffe
Thomas Pride
Jo Temple
Jo Harrison
Hen Smyth
Per Pelham
R. Deane
Robert Tichborne
Daniel Blagrave
Owen Rowe
Willm Purefoy
Jo Sorope
James Temple

Jo Carlell
Edm. Ludlowe
Henry Marten
Vincent Potter
Wm Constable
Rich Ingoldesby
Wil Cawley
Jo Barkstead
Wm Ewer
John Dixwell
Valentine Walton

Symon Mayne
Tho: Horton
J Jones
John Moore
Gilbt Millington
Jo Fleetwood
Jo Hewson
Rob Lilburne
Will Say
Nath Rapley
Ge Norton
Tho Challoner

Tho. Wogan
John Venn
Gregory Clement
Jo Downes
Geo Wayte

Tho Scot
Jo Carew
Jnlius Cobbett

FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS

[1649 A.D.]

others; "and Cromwell, with a loud laughter, taking his hand in his, and putting the pen between his fingers, with his own hand writ 'Richard Ingoldsby,' he making all the resistance he could." Ingoldsby gave this relation, in the desire to obtain a pardon after the Restoration; and to confirm his story he said, "if his name there were compared with what he had ever writ himself, it could never be looked upon as his own hand." Warburton in a note upon this passage, says, "The original warrant is still extant, and Ingoldsby's name has no such mark of its being wrote in that manner." The king knew his fate. He resigned himself to it with calmness and dignity.[n]

GUIZOT'S ACCOUNT OF CHARLES' EXECUTION

Before reading his last sentence Bradshaw addressed to the king a long discourse — a solemn apology for the parliament's conduct: he recounted all the faults of which the king had been guilty, and referred all the evils of the civil war to him alone, since his tyranny had rendered resistance a duty as well as a necessity. The language of the speaker was severe and bitter, but grave, pious, free from insult, and expressive of an evidently profound conviction, although mingled with something of a vindictive character. The king listened to him without interruption, and with equal gravity. Still, as the discourse drew towards its close, visible agitation took possession of him; and as soon as Bradshaw had finished speaking, he attempted himself to speak. Bradshaw would not permit this, but ordered the clerk to read the sentence. When it was finished, Bradshaw said, "The sentence now read and published is the act, sentence, judgment, and resolution of the whole court;" and the whole court rose in token of assent.

"Sir," said the king, suddenly, "will you hear me a word?"

Bradshaw.—"Sir, you are not to be heard after sentence."

The king.—"No, sir?"

Bradshaw.—"No, sir; by your favour, sir. Guards, withdraw your prisoner!"

The king.—"I may speak after sentence; by your favour, sir, I may speak after my sentence, ever. By your favour—"

"Hold!" said Bradshaw.

"The sentence, sir — I say, sir, I do — I am not suffered to speak. Expect what justice other people will have!"

At this moment, the soldiers surrounded him, removed him from the bar, and conveyed him with violence as far as the place where his sedan-chair was waiting for him. He had, while descending the staircase, to endure the grossest insults: some threw their lighted pipes before him as he passed; others blew the smoke of their tobacco into his face; all shouted in his ears, "Justice! Execution!" Amid these cries, however, others were still to be heard occasionally from the people, "God save your majesty! God deliver your majesty out of such enemies' hands!" And until he was seated in the chair, the bearers of it remained with their heads uncovered, notwithstanding the commands of Axtell, who even went so far as to strike them for their disobedience. They set out for Whitehall: on both sides, the way was lined with troops; before all the shops, doors, and windows, there were crowds of people, most of them silent, some weeping, some praying aloud for the king. The soldiers incessantly renewed their cries of "Justice! justice! Execution! execution!" in order to celebrate their triumph. But Charles had recovered his wonted serenity, and, too haughty to believe in the sincerity of their hatred, he said

as he came out of his chair, "Poor souls! for a piece of money they would do so for their commanders!"

As soon as he reached Whitehall, he said to Herbert, "Hark ye! my nephew the prince elector will endeavour to see me, and some other lords that love me: which I should take in good part; but my time is short and precious, and I am desirous to improve it as best I may in preparation. I hope they will not take it ill that none have access now to me but my children. The best office they can do me is to pray for me." He then sent a request that his young children, the princess Elizabeth and the duke of Gloucester, who remained under the care of the parliament, might come to him; he also sent for Juxon, the bishop of London. Both requests were granted. The next day, the 28th, the bishop came to St. James's, whither the king had just been transferred. When he first met the king again, he burst into uncontrollable lamentations. "Leave off this, my lord," said Charles, "we have not time for it; let us think of our great work, and prepare to meet that great God, to whom, ere long, I am to give an account of myself; and I hope I shall do it with peace, and that you will assist me therein. We will not talk of these rogues, in whose hands I am; they thirst after my blood, and they will have it; and God's will be done! I thank God I heartily forgive them, and I will talk of them no more." He passed the rest of the day in pious conference with the bishop.

On the next day, the 29th, almost at daybreak, the bishop returned to St. James's. When morning prayers were over, the king brought out a box containing broken crosses of St. George and the order of the Garter: "You see," said he to Juxon and Herbert, "all the wealth now in my power to give to my two children." They were brought to him. The princess Elizabeth, who was twelve years old, on seeing her father burst into tears; the duke of Gloucester, who was only eight, wept when he saw the tears of his sister. Charles took them on his knee, shared his jewels among them, comforted his daughter, gave her counsels as to the books she should read in order to fortify her mind against the papacy, charged them to tell their brothers that he had forgiven his enemies, and their mother that his thoughts never wandered from her, and that he would love her up to the last moment as he had loved her on their marriage-day. Then turning to the little duke, "Sweetheart," he said, "they will soon cut off thy father's head." The child looked steadfastly at him, with a very serious air. "Mark, child, what I say: they will cut off my head and perhaps make thee king; but mark what I say, thou must not be king so long as thy brothers Charles and James live; but they will cut off thy brothers' heads if they can catch them; and thine, too, they will cut off at last! Therefore, I charge thee, do not be made a king by them." "I will be torn in pieces first," replied the child, with great fervour. Charles kissed him passionately; placed him on the ground, kissed his daughter, blessed them both, and prayed God to bless them; then suddenly rising, "Have them taken away," he said to Juxon. The children sobbed. The king, standing upright, resting his head against the window, repressed his tears; the door was opened, and the children were about to leave him. Charles hastily left the window, took them again in his arms, blessed them once more, and, tearing himself at length from their caresses, fell on his knees and prayed with the bishop and Herbert, the sole witnesses of this affecting farewell.

On his last morning, after four hours' profound sleep, Charles rose from his bed. "I have a great work to do this day," said he to Herbert, "I must get up immediately;" and he commenced his toilet. Herbert, in his agitation, combed his hair with less care than usual. "I pray you," said the king, "though my head be not long to stand on my shoulders, take the same pains

[1649 A.D.]

with it as you were wont to do. This is my second marriage-day. I would be as trim to-day as may be; for before night I hope to be espoused to my blessed Jesus." As he was dressing, he asked to have an extra shirt: "The season is so sharp," he said, "as probably may make me shake, which some observers will imagine proceeds from fear. I would have no such imputation; I fear not death; death is not terrible to me. I bless my God that I am prepared." Shortly after daybreak Bishop Juxon arrived, and commenced the religious exercises of the day. Several companies of infantry were drawn up in the park, and formed a double line on his passage; a detachment of halberdiers marched in front, with flying banners; drums were beating — their noise drowned all other sounds. At the king's right hand was the bishop; on his left was Colonel Tomlinson, the commander of the guard. His head was uncovered, and Charles was so moved with the marks of respect which he showed that he requested him not to move from his side till the last moment. Charles conversed with him on the way, spoke of his funeral, and of the persons to whom he desired the care of it should be entrusted: his whole air was indicative of calmness and serenity; his look was steady and penetrating; his step was firm, and he walked even more quickly than the soldiers, expressing surprise at their slow pace.

On arriving at Whitehall, he mounted the stairs with a light step, passed along the great gallery, and entered his bedroom, where he was left alone with the bishop, who had prepared to administer the sacrament. Some Independent ministers, Nye and Goodwin, among others, knocked at his door, saying that they desired to offer their services to the king. The bishop replied by telling them that the king was at his own private devotions. They still pressed their services. "Then thank them from me," said Charles to the bishop, "for the tender of themselves; but tell them plainly that they, that have so often and causelessly prayed against me, shall never pray with me in this agony. They may, if they please, pray for me, and I'll thank them for it." They retired. The king kneeled, received the holy communion from the bishop's hands, and rising from his knees, with a cheerful and steady countenance, "Now," said he, "let the rogues come; I have heartily forgiven them, and am prepared for all I am to undergo." His dinner had been prepared, but he had resolved to touch nothing after the sacrament; the bishop expostulated with him, reminded him how long he had fasted, how severe the weather was, and how some fit of fainting might seize him upon the scaffold, which he knew he would regret, on account of the interpretation his murderers would put upon it. The king yielded to these representations, and took a piece of bread and a glass of claret. At one o'clock Hacker knocked at the door.

The king walked to the scaffold, with his head erect, looking about him on all sides for the people, intending to speak to them; but the space all round was filled with troops, so that no one could approach. He turned towards Juxon and Tomlinson, and said, "I shall be very little heard of anybody else; I shall, therefore, speak a word to you here," and accordingly he addressed to them a short speech that he had prepared; it was grave and calm, even to frigidity, its sole object being to maintain that he was in the right — that contempt for the rights of the sovereign had been the true cause of the miseries of the people — that the people ought to have no share in the government — and that on this condition only would the kingdom recover its liberties and tranquillity. While he was speaking, some one touched the axe. He turned round hastily, saying, "Do not hurt the axe that may hurt me." And after his address was finished, some one again approached it. "Take heed of the

axe! pray, take heed of the axe!" he repeated in a tone of alarm. The profoundest silence prevailed; he put a silk cap on his head, and, addressing the executioner, said, "Does my hair trouble you?" The man begged his majesty to put it under his cap. The king so arranged it, with the help of the bishop. "I have a good cause and a gracious God on my side," said he, while doing this.

"There is but one stage more," said Juxon; "the stage is turbulent and troublesome; it is a short one; but you may consider it will soon carry you a very great way; it will carry you from earth to heaven." "I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be," answered the king; and, turning towards the executioner, he said, "Is my hair well?" He took off his cloak and gave it to the bishop, saying at the same time "Remember!" It was never known to what this injunction referred. He then took off his coat, put on his cloak again, and looking at the block, said to the executioner, "You must set it fast." "It is fast, sir," was the reply. The king told him to wait while he offered up a short prayer; "When I put out my hands this way," said he, stretching them out, "then—— " He passed a few minutes in meditation, uttering a few words in a low tone of voice, raised his eyes to heaven, kneeled, placed his head on the block: the executioner touched his hair in order to put it more completely under his cap; the king thought he intended to strike. "Stay for the sign," he said. "Yes, I will, an't please your majesty," said the man.

After an instant, the king stretched out his hands; the axe fell, and his head was severed from his body at a single blow. "Behold the head of a traitor!" cried the executioner, holding it up to the view of the people; a long, deep groan rose from the multitude; many rushed to the foot of the scaffold in order to dip their handkerchiefs in the king's blood. Two bodies of cavalry, advancing in different directions, slowly dispersed the crowd. The scaffold was cleared, and the body was taken away. It was already enclosed in the coffin, when Cromwell desired to see it: he looked at it attentively, raised the head with his own hands as if to assure himself that it was really severed from the trunk, and remarked upon the sound and vigorous appearance of the body, which he said, promised a long life.

The coffin remained at Whitehall for seven days, exposed to public view: an immense concourse of people pressed to the door, but few obtained permission to enter. On the 6th of February, by the order of the commons, it was delivered to Herbert and Mildmay, who were authorised to bury it in St. George's Chapel, in Windsor Castle, in a vault which also contains the remains of Henry VIII. The funeral procession was decent but not pompous. Six horses, covered with black cloth, drew the hearse; four carriages followed, two of which, also covered with black cloth, carried those faithful servants who had attended upon the king in his last hours, and those who had accompanied him to the Isle of Wight. On the next day, the 8th of February, the duke of Richmond, the marquis of Hertford, the earls of Southampton and Lindsay, and Bishop Juxon, arrived at Windsor, having come with the consent of the commons to attend the funeral. These words only were engraved on the coffin: Charles, Rex. 1648.[1]

As they were removing the body from the interior of the castle to the chapel, the weather, which until then had been clear and serene, suddenly changed; snow fell abundantly; the black velvet pall was entirely covered

[1 Old Style. The year in England began at that time on the 24th of March, as it had not yet been arranged according to the Gregorian calendar. Therefore the 30th of January, 1648, the day of Charles' death, corresponds to the 9th of February, 1649, in our year.]

[1649 A.D.]

with it, and the servants of the king were pleased to see, in the sudden whiteness that covered their unfortunate master's coffin, a symbol of his innocence. The procession arrived at the spot selected for sepulture, and Bishop Juxon was preparing to officiate according to the rites of the Anglican church, when Whichcott, the governor of the castle, objected "that it was improbable the parliament would permit the use of what they had so totally abolished, and therein destroy their own act," and he would not permit the service to be so performed. They submitted; no religious ceremony took place, the coffin was lowered into the vault, all left the chapel, and the governor closed the doors. The house of commons had an account of the expenses of the funeral laid before them, and allowed five hundred pounds to pay them. On the very day of the king's death, before any messenger had left London, they published an ordinance declaring any one to be a traitor who should proclaim in his place, and as his successor, "Charles Stuart, his son, commonly called prince of Wales, or any other person whatever." On the 6th of February, after a long debate, and in spite of the opposition of twenty-nine voices against forty-four members, the house of lords was formally abolished.[r]

VARIOUS ESTIMATES OF THE EVENT

Clarendon: Milton: Guizot: Knight

It is scarcely necessary that we should offer any opinion upon this tremendous event. The world had never before seen an act so daring conducted with such a calm determination; and the few moderate men of that time balanced the illegality, and also the impolicy of the execution of Charles, by the fact that "it was not done in a corner," and that those who directed or sanctioned the act offered no apology, but maintained its absolute necessity and justice. "That horrible sentence upon the most innocent person in the world; the execution of that sentence by the most execrable murder that was ever committed since that of our blessed Saviour"; forms the text which Clarendon[k] gave for the rhapsodies of party during two centuries. On the other hand, the eloquent address of Milton[s] to the people of England has been in the hearts and mouths of many who have known that the establishment of the liberties of their country, duly subordinated by the laws of a free monarchy, may be dated from this event: "God has endued you with greatness of mind to be the first of mankind, who, after having conquered their own king, and having had him delivered into their hands, have not scrupled to condemn him judicially, and, pursuant to that sentence of condemnation, to put him to death."

In these times we can afford to refuse our assent to the blasphemous comparison of Clarendon (blasphemy more offensively repeated in the church service for the 30th of January), and at the same time affirm that the judicial condemnation which Milton so admires was illegal, unconstitutional, and in its immediate results dangerous to liberty. But feeling that far greater dangers would have been incurred if "the caged tiger had been let loose," and knowing that out of the errors and anomalies of those times a wiser revolution grew, for which the first more terrible revolution was a preparation, we may cease to examine this great historical question in any bitterness of spirit, and even acknowledge that the death of Charles, a bad king, though in some respects a good man, was necessary for the life of England, and for her "teaching other nations how to live."

We must accept as just and true Milton's admonition to his countrymen

in reference to this event, which he terms "so glorious an action," with many reasonable qualifications as to its glory; and yet apply even to ourselves his majestic words: — "After the performing so glorious an action as this, you ought to do nothing that is mean and little, not so much as to think of, much less to do anything but what is great and sublime. Which to attain to, this is your only way: as you have subdued your enemies in the field, so to make appear, that unarmed, and in the highest outward peace and tranquillity, you of all mankind are best able to subdue ambition, avarice, the love of riches, and can best avoid the corruptions that prosperity is apt to introduce (which generally subdue and triumph over other nations), to show as great justice, temperance, and moderation in the maintaining of your liberty, as you have shown courage in freeing yourselves from slavery."

There was, at the time of the king's execution, a book being printed which was to surround his life with the attributes of a saint, and to invest him in death with the glory of a martyr. The "Eikon Basilike, or Portraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings," purported to be written by Charles the First himself. Milton, who was directed by the parliament to answer this Eikon, or Image, treats it in his Eikonoklastes, or Image-breaker, as if the king had "left behind him this book as the best advocate and interpreter of his own actions"; but at the same time Milton is careful to add, "as to the author of these soliloquies, whether it were the late king, as is vulgarly believed, or any secret coadjutor (and some stick not to name him), it can add nothing, nor shall take from the weight, if any be, of reason which he brings." The question of the authorship of this book has now passed out of the region of party violence; the controversy on that matter has almost merged, as a literary problem, into the belief that it was written by Gauden, afterwards bishop of Exeter. This divine probably submitted it to Charles during his long sojourn in the Isle of Wight; he published it as the work of the king; but he claimed the authorship after the restoration.

Hallam[m] remarks upon the internal evidence of its authenticity that "it has all the air of a fictitious composition. Cold, stiff, elaborate, without a single allusion that bespeaks the superior knowledge of facts which the king must have possessed, it contains little but those rhetorical commonplaces which would suggest themselves to any forger." But these "rhetorical commonplaces" are the best evidence, not of the genuineness of the book, but of the skill of the author. They were precisely what was required to make "attachment to the memory of the king become passion, and respect, worship"; — so Guizot[r] describes the effect of the Eikon. It was an universal appeal to the feelings, in a style moving along with a monotonous dignity, befitting royalty, though occasionally mingled with cold metaphors. It set forth the old blind claims to implicit obedience — or, as Milton has it, maintained "the common grounds of tyranny and popery, sugared a little over," — amidst the manifestations of a sincere piety and a resigned sadness. In one year there were fifty editions of this book sold. "Had it appeared a week sooner it might have preserved the king," thinks one writer. That may be doubted. But it produced the effect which those so-called histories produce which endeavour to fix the imagination solely upon the personal attributes and sorrows of kings and queens, instead of presenting a sober view of their relations to their subjects. Sentiment with the majority is always more powerful than reason; and thus Milton's "Eikonoklastes," being a partisan's view of Charles' public actions — a cold though severe view, in the formal style of a state-paper — produced little or no effect upon the national opinions, and is now read only for the great name of the author.[n]

John Lingard.

Such was the end of the unfortunate Charles Stuart; an awful lesson to the possessors of royalty, to watch the growth of public opinion, and to moderate their pretensions in conformity with the reasonable desires of their subjects. Had he lived at a more early period, when the sense of wrong was quickly subdued by the habit of submission, his reign would probably have been marked with fewer violations of the national liberties. It was resistance that made him a tyrant. The spirit of the people refused to yield to the encroachments of authority; and one act of oppression placed him under the necessity of committing another, till he had revived and enforced all those odious prerogatives, which, though usually claimed, were but sparingly exercised, by his predecessors. For some years his efforts seemed successful; but the Scottish insurrection revealed the delusion; he had parted with the real authority of a king, when he forfeited the confidence and affection of his subjects.

But while we blame the illegal measures of Charles, we ought not to screen from censure the subsequent conduct of his principal opponents. From the moment that war seemed inevitable, they acted as if they thought themselves absolved from all obligations of honour and honesty. They never ceased to inflame the passions of the people by misrepresentation and calumny; they exercised a power far more arbitrary and formidable than had ever been claimed by the king; they punished summarily, on mere suspicion, and without attention to the forms of law; and by their committees they established in every county a knot of petty tyrants, who disposed at will of the liberty and property of the inhabitants. Such anomalies may, perhaps, be inseparable from the jealousies, the resentments, and the heart-burnings, which are engendered in civil commotions; but certain it is that right and justice had seldom been more wantonly outraged, than they were by those who professed to have drawn the sword in the defence of right and justice.

Neither should the death of Charles be attributed to the vengeance of the people. They, for the most part, declared themselves satisfied with their victory; they sought not the blood of the captive monarch; they were even willing to replace him on the throne, under those limitations which they deemed necessary for the preservation of their rights. The men who hurried him to the scaffold were a small faction of bold and ambitious spirits, who had the address to guide the passions and fanaticism of their followers, and were enabled through them to control the real sentiments of the nation. Even of the commissioners appointed to sit in judgment on the king, scarcely one-half could be induced to attend at his trial; and many of those who concurred in his condemnation subscribed the sentence with feelings of shame and remorse. But so it always happens in revolutions: the most violent put themselves forward; their vigilance and activity seem to multiply their number; and the daring of the few wins the ascendancy over the indolence or the pusillanimity of the many.[v]

S. R. Gardiner

Only after long years does a nation make clear its definite resolve, and for this reason wise statesmen — whether monarchical or republican — watch the currents of opinion, and submit to compromises which will enable the national sentiment to make its way without a succession of violent shocks.

Charles' fault lay not so much in his claim to retain the negative voice as in his absolute disregard of the condition of the time, and of the feelings and opinions of every class of his subjects with which he happened to disagree. As long as he remained a factor in English politics, government by compromise was impossible. All can perceive that with Charles' death the main obstacle to the establishment of a constitutional system was removed.[u]

Lord Macaulay

The king could not be trusted. The vices of Charles had grown upon him. They were, indeed, vices which difficulties and perplexities generally bring out in the strongest light. Cunning is the natural defence of the weak. A prince, therefore, who is habitually a deceiver when at the height of power, is not likely to learn frankness in the midst of embarrassments and distresses. Charles was not only a most unscrupulous but a most unlucky dissembler. There never was a politician to whom so many frauds and falsehoods were brought home by undeniable evidence. He publicly recognised the houses at Westminster as a legal parliament, and, at the same time, made a private minute in council, declaring the recognition null. He publicly disclaimed all thought of calling in foreign aid against his people: he privately solicited aid from France, from Denmark, and from Lorraine. He publicly denied that he employed papists: at the same time he privately sent to his generals directions to employ every papist that would serve. He publicly took the sacrament at Oxford, as a pledge that he never would even connive at Roman Catholicism: he privately assured his wife, that he intended to tolerate Roman Catholicism in England; and he authorised Lord Glamorgan to promise that Roman Catholicism should be established in Ireland. Then he attempted to clear himself at his agent's expense. Glamorgan received, in the royal handwriting, reprimands intended to be read by others, and eulogies which were to be seen only by himself.


To such an extent, indeed, had insincerity now tainted the king's whole nature, that his most devoted friends could not refrain from complaining to each other, with bitter grief and shame, of his crooked politics. His defeats, they said, gave them less pain than his intrigues. Since he had been a prisoner, there was no section of the victorious party which had not been the object both of his flatteries and of his machinations: but never was he more unfortunate than when he attempted at once to cajole and to undermine Cromwell. Cromwell had to determine whether he would put to hazard the attachment of his party, the attachment of his army, his own greatness, nay his own life, in an attempt, which would probably have been vain, to save a prince whom no engagement could bind. With many struggles and misgivings, and probably not without many prayers, the decision was made. Charles was left to his fate. The military saints resolved that, in defiance of the old laws of the realm, and of the almost universal sentiment of the nation, the king should expiate his crimes with his blood. He for a time expected a death like that of his unhappy predecessors, Edward II and Richard II. But he was in no danger of such treason. Those who had him in their gripe were not midnight stabbers. What they did they did in order that it might be a spectacle to heaven and earth, and that it might be held in everlasting remembrance.

They enjoyed keenly the very scandal which they gave. That the ancient constitution and the public opinion of England were directly opposed

[1649 A.D.]

to regicide made regicide seem strangely fascinating to a party bent on effecting a complete political and social revolution. In order to accomplish their purpose, it was necessary that they should first break in pieces every part of the machinery of the government; and this necessity was rather agreeable than painful to them. The commons passed a vote tending to accommodation with the king. The soldiers excluded the majority by force. The lords unanimously rejected the proposition that the king should be brought to trial. Their house was instantly closed. No court, known to the law, would take on itself the office of judging the fountain of justice. A revolutionary tribunal was created. That tribunal pronounced Charles a tyrant, a traitor, a murderer, and a public enemy; and his head was severed from his shoulders before thousands of spectators, in front of the banqueting hall of his own palace.

In no long time it became manifest that those political and religious zealots, to whom this deed is to be ascribed, had committed, not only a crime, but an error. They had given to a prince, hitherto known to his people chiefly by his faults, an opportunity of displaying, on a great theatre, before the eyes of all nations and all ages, some qualities which irresistibly call forth the admiration and love of mankind, the high spirit of a gallant gentleman, the patience and meekness of a penitent Christian. Nay, they had so contrived their revenge that the very man whose whole life had been a series of attacks on the liberties of England now seemed to die a martyr in the cause of those liberties. No demagogue ever produced such an impression on the public mind as the captive king, who, retaining in that extremity all his regal dignity, and confronting death with dauntless courage, gave utterance to the feelings of his oppressed people, manfully refused to plead before a court unknown to the law, appealed from military violence to the principles of the constitution, asked by what right the house of commons had been purged of its most respectable members and the house of lords deprived of its legislative functions, and told his weeping hearers that he was defending not only his own cause, but theirs. His long misgovernment, his innumerable perfidies, were forgotten. His memory was, in the minds of the great majority of his subjects, associated with those free institutions which he had, during many years, laboured to destroy: for those free institutions had perished with him, and, amidst the mournful silence of a community kept down by arms, had been defended by his voice alone. From that day began a reaction in favour of monarchy and of the exiled house, a reaction which never ceased till the throne had again been set up in all its old dignity.[t]



CHAPTER III

THE VICTORIOUS COMMONWEALTH

[1649–1651 A.D.]

The execution of Charles I — the work of military violence cloaked in the merest tatters of legality — had displayed to the eyes of the world the forgotten truth that kings, as well as subjects, must bear the consequences of their errors and misdeeds. More than this the actors in the great tragedy failed to accomplish, and, it may fairly be added, must necessarily have failed to accomplish. It is never possible for men of the sword to rear the temple of recovered freedom, nd the small minority in parliament which had given the semblance f constitutional procedure to the trial in Westminster Hall were o more than instruments in the hands of the men of the sword. Honestly as both military and political leaders desired to establish popular government, they found themselves in a vicious circle from which there was no escape. — S. R. GARDINER.[b]

GUIZOT'S COMPARISON OF THE ENGLISH AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONS

UNTIL the occurrence of the French Revolution, the English Revolution was the greatest event in the annals of modern Europe. The French Revolution exceeded it in magnitude, but did not lessen its intrinsic greatness; both victories were won in the same war, and tended to the furtherance of the same cause; and instead of eclipsing each other, they became magnified by comparison. If we are to put faith in an opinion which is very prevalent, it would seem that these two revolutions were extraordinary events, which emanated from unheard-of principles, and aimed at unprecedented designs; which forced society out of its ancient and natural course; which, like whirlwinds or earthquakes, were mysterious phenomena guided by laws unknown to men, and bursting forth suddenly, like providential *coups d'état*, possibly to destroy, and possibly to revivify the earth. Both friends and enemies, panegyrists and detractors, employ the same language on this point: according to the former, these glorious crises brought truth, liberty, and justice to light, for the first time; before their occurrence, absurdity, iniquity, and tyranny prevailed, and the human race is indebted to them alone for its deliverance from

those evils; according to the latter, these deplorable catastrophes interrupted a long era of wisdom, virtue, and happiness; their authors proclaimed principles, set up pretensions, and committed crimes previously unparalleled; the two nations, in a fit of madness, deviated from their accustomed path, and an abyss opened immediately beneath their feet.

Thus, whether they are extolled or deplored, blessed or execrated, all agree in forgetting every other consideration in presence of these revolutions, in isolating them completely from the past, in rendering them responsible for the destiny of the world, and in loading them alone with curses or with glory. It is time to have done with such puerile and false declamations. Far from having broken off the natural course of events in Europe, neither the English nor the French revolution asserted, attempted, or effected anything which had not been already asserted, attempted, or effected a hundred times before their occurrence. They proclaimed the illegitimacy of absolute power: but free consent to laws and taxes, and the right of armed resistance, were among the constituent principles of the feudal system; and the church had often repeated these words of St. Isidore, to be found in the canons of the fourth council of Toledo: "He is king who rules his people justly; if he does otherwise, he shall be no longer king." They attacked privilege, and laboured to introduce more equality into the social system: but, throughout all Europe, kings have done the same. They demanded that public employments should be thrown open to all citizens, and be bestowed on merit alone, and that the government should consent to this competition; but this is the fundamental principle of the internal constitution of the church; and the church has not only carried it into effect, but has openly professed it. Whether we consider the general doctrines of the two revolutions, or the applications which they made of them — whether we contemplate the government of the state or civil legislation, property or persons, liberty or power — we shall find nothing of their own invention, nothing which is not to be met with, and which did not at least originate, in more regular times.

Nor is this all: the principles, designs, and efforts which are exclusively attributed to the French and English revolutions, not only preceded them by several centuries, but are the same principles and efforts to which society in Europe is indebted for all its progress. Was it by its disorders and privileges, by its brute force, and its subjugation of other men beneath its yoke, that the feudal aristocracy contributed to the development of nations? No: but it struggled against royal tyranny; it availed itself of the right of resistance, and maintained the maxims of liberty. And why have nations blessed their kings? For their pretensions to divine right, their assumptions of absolute power, their lavish expenditure, or their luxurious courts? No: but kings attacked the feudal system and aristocratic privilege; they introduced unity into legislation and into the administration of affairs; they promoted the development of equality. And whence have the clergy derived their strength? In what way have they helped forward civilisation? By separating themselves from the people, by affecting to dread human reason, and by sanctioning tyranny in the name of heaven? No: but by assembling the great and the little, the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, beneath the roof of the same church, and under the same law of God; by honouring and cultivating learning, instituting schools, favouring the diffusion of knowledge, and rewarding activity of mind. Consult the history of the masters of the world; analyse the influence of the various classes that have determined its fate; wherever any good is manifest, whenever the continued gratitude of mankind bears witness to a service rendered to humanity — a step has been taken towards

the object aimed at by the French and English revolutions; we are in presence of one of the principles which they endeavoured to render victorious.

Let us then cease to portray these revolutions as monstrous apparitions in the history of Europe; let us hear no more of their unprecedented pretensions and infernal inventions; they helped civilisation to advance along the road which it has been pursuing for centuries; they professed the maxims, and pushed forward the labours to which man has, in all ages, been indebted for the development of his nature and the improvement of his condition; they did that which has in turn constituted the chief merit and glory of clergy, nobles, and kings. If it be asked in what respect these two revolutions are distinguished from every other epoch: what is the reason that, while they merely continued the common work of all ages, they deserved their name, and positively changed the face of the world? This is the answer — Various powers have successively held sway in European society, and marched in turn at the head of civilisation. After the fall of the Roman Empire and the invasion of the barbarians, amidst the dissolution of all social ties and the destruction of all recognised powers, the predominance everywhere fell to daring and brutal force; the conquering aristocracy took possession of everything, persons and lands, people and country. In vain did a few great men, Charlemagne in France, and Alfred in England, endeavour to reduce this chaos to the unity of a monarchical system. All unity was impossible. The feudal hierarchy was the only form which society would consent to accept. This hierarchy prevailed universally, in the church as well as in the state; the bishops and abbots became barons; the king was the chief seigneur. In spite of the rude and unstable character of this organisation, Europe was indebted to it for its first steps out of barbarism. It was among the proprietors of fiefs — in their mutual relations, laws, customs, feelings, and ideas — that European civilisation commenced.

The fief-holders were a great burden on the people. The clergy alone endeavoured to claim for all a little reason, justice, and humanity. Those who had no place in the feudal hierarchy could find no asylum but the churches, and no protectors but the priests. This protection, though insufficient, was nevertheless an immense boon, for it was the only one. The priests, moreover, alone offered any sustenance for the moral nature of man, for that unconquerable necessity of thinking, knowing, hoping, and believing, which overcomes all obstacles, and survives all misfortunes. The church soon acquired prodigious power throughout all Europe. Royalty, then in its infancy, lent it fresh strength by borrowing its assistance. The predominance passed from the hands of the conquering aristocracy into those of the clergy. With the assistance of the church, and by its own inherent strength, the royal power increased, and raised itself above its rivals; but the clergy had no sooner assisted it, than they attempted to subjugate it. In this new emergency, the royal power invoked the help, sometimes of the now less formidable barons, but more frequently of the people: the townsmen, who were already strong enough to be valuable allies, though not sufficiently powerful to require a high price for their services. By their aid, the royal power triumphed in its second conflict, and became in its turn the dominant power, invested with the confidence of the nations. Such is the history of old Europe: the feudal aristocracy, the clergy, and the royal power, alternately possessed it, and successively presided over its destiny and progress. To their co-existence and conflict it was long indebted for all the liberty, prosperity, and enlightenment it had obtained; in a word, for the development of its civilisation.

In England in the seventeenth century, and in France in the eighteenth,

[1649 A.D.]

all conflict between these three powers had ceased; they were living together in peace and tranquillity. We might almost say that they had lost their historical character, and even their recollection of the labours which had formerly given them strength and renown. Their aristocracy no longer defended public liberties, it did not even defend its own; the royal power no longer laboured to abolish aristocratic privilege, it seemed even to have become favourable to the possessors of that privilege in return for their servility; and the clergy, the spiritual power, was afraid of the human mind, and, being unable to lead it, endeavoured to arrest its progress by menaces. Meanwhile, civilisation pursued its course, and daily became more general and active. Abandoned by their old leaders, surprised at their apathy and ill temper, and indignant at finding that less was done for them as their desires and strength grew greater, the people began to think that it was their duty to attend to their own interests; and assuming the entire responsibility of their affairs, about which no one seemed any longer to care, they simultaneously demanded liberty from the crown, equality from the aristocracy, and intellectual freedom from the clergy. Then revolutions broke forth.

They effected, for the benefit of a new power, a change which Europe had already witnessed on several occasions: they gave to society, leaders who were willing and able to guide it in its progress. On this ground alone, the aristocracy, the church, and the king, had in turn possessed the preponderance. The people now seized it in virtue of the same right, by the same means, and in the name of the same necessities. Such is the real work, the true character, of both the English and French revolutions. After having considered them as absolutely alike, it has been said that they were similar only in appearance. The English Revolution, we are told, was political rather than social; the French Revolution attempted to change both society and the government together — the one sought to establish liberty, the other equality — the one was rather religious than political, and merely substituted one set of dogmas for another, and one church for another church; the other was pre-eminently philosophical, and asserted the complete independence of reason. The comparison is ingenious, and not altogether void of truth; but it is almost as superficial and frivolous as the opinion which it assumes to supersede. Just as great differences are visible beneath the external resemblance of the two revolutions, so an even deeper resemblance is concealed beneath their differences.

From the very causes which produced its ebullition more than a century before the revolution in France, the English Revolution, it is true, retained a deeper impress of the old social condition of the country; there, free institutions, born amid barbarism, had survived even the despotism which they had been unable to prevent; the feudal aristocracy, in part, at least, had made common cause with the people. The royal power, even in the days of its predominance, had never been fully or undisturbedly absolute; the national church had itself commenced the work of religious reform, and stimulated the minds of the people to boldness of inquiry and speculation. Everywhere, in the laws, manners, and creed of the nation, the revolution found its work half effected; and from the government which it aspired to change, it derived, at the same time, both succour and obstruction, useful allies and powerful adversaries. Thus it presented a singular combination of elements apparently the most diverse; it was at once aristocratic and popular, religious and philosophical, invoking laws and theories by turns; sometimes announcing a new yoke for consciences, sometimes proclaiming their entire liberty; now narrowly confined within the limits of fact, and now indulging in the most daring

speculations — it was, in a word, placed between the old and new state of society, rather as a bridge to connect than as an abyss to separate them.

In the French Revolution, on the other hand, the most terrible unity prevailed; the spirit of innovation held undivided sway over its proceedings; the *ancien régime*, far from taking its proper place and part in the movement, sought only to defend itself against it, and succeeded scarcely for a moment in the attempt, for it was equally destitute of strength and virtue. On the day on which the revolution broke out, one fact alone remained positive and influential, and that was the general civilisation of the country. In this great but solitary result were concentrated all the old institutions, all the old manners, beliefs, and recollections — indeed, the whole life of the nation. The many active and glorious centuries which had elapsed had produced nothing but France. Hence arose the immensity of the results of the revolution, and the portentous magnitude of its errors — it possessed absolute power.

The difference is certainly great, and well worthy of consideration; it is particularly striking when we consider the two revolutions in themselves as isolated events, when we detach them from general history, and endeavour to distinguish their peculiar physiognomy and individual character. But, if they resume their place in the course of time — if we examine what they have done for the development of European civilisation — we shall see the resemblance reappear, and rise above all diversities. Originating in the same causes, by the decay of the feudal aristocracy, the church, and the royal power, they laboured to effect the same work — to secure the domination of the people in public affairs. They struggled for liberty against absolute power, for equality against privilege, for progressive and general interests against stationary and individual interests. Their positions were different, and their strength unequal; what the one clearly perceived, the other saw only imperfectly; in the career which the one followed to the end, the other soon stopped short; on the same field of battle, the one found victory and the other defeat; the one erred from cynicism, the other from hypocrisy; the one was marked by great prudence, the other by great power; but they varied only in the means they employed, and the success they achieved; they were the same in tendency and in origin; their desires, efforts, and progress aimed at the same object; all that the one attempted or accomplished, the other also effected or attempted. Although guilty of religious persecution, the English Revolution unfurled the banner of liberty of conscience; in spite of its aristocratic alliances, it established the predominance of the commons; as its chief occupation was with civil order, it demanded a simpler legislative system, parliamentary reform, the abolition of entails and of the right of primogeniture; and although deceived in many premature expectations, it liberated English society, to an immense extent, from the monstrous inequality of the feudal régime — in a word, such is the analogy between the two revolutions, that the first would never have been properly understood unless the second had occurred.[c]

THE ORGANISATION OF THE ENGLISH REPUBLIC

We have already related the downfall of an ancient monarchy, and the violent death of a king who was worthy of respect, although he governed his people badly and unjustly. We have now to relate the vain efforts of a revolutionary assembly to found a republic; and to describe the ever-tottering, but strong and glorious government of a revolutionary despot, whose bold and prudent genius commands our admiration, although he attacked

and destroyed, first legal order, and then liberty, in his native land. Such men are full of contradiction and of mystery: in them are mingled and combined, in undiscoverable proportions, capabilities and failings, virtues and vices, enlightenment and error, grandeur and weakness; and after having filled the age in which they lived with the splendour of their actions and the magnitude of their destiny, they remain personally obscure in the midst of their glory, alternately cursed and worshipped by the world which does not know them.

At the opening of the Long Parliament, on the 3rd of November, 1640, the house of commons consisted of five hundred and six members. In 1649, after the execution of the king, when it abolished kingship and proclaimed the commonwealth, there scarcely remained a hundred who took part in its sittings and acts. During the month of February, the house divided ten times; and at the most numerous division, only seventy-seven members were present to record their votes. Thus mutilated and reduced to the condition of a victorious coterie, this assembly set to work, with an ardour full at once of strong faith and deep anxiety, to organize the republican government.[d] Some had wished the royal authority to be transferred to Charles II, under the conditions which had been proposed to his father; for all that had been alleged against him was inapplicable to his son. Others proposed to pass him over, because he had borne arms against the parliament, and to give the English crown by election to his younger brother. Others disapproved of elections and deviations from the strict line of succession. But the republicans were more powerful than the several classes and gradations of the royalists.

The final discussion, however, was with the parliament, or rather with the army. Already, on the 20th of January, that is before the execution of Charles, the army had proposed an agreement upon the future constitution and government, in which it demanded the speedy dissolution of the parliament; a new regulation of the representation; elections every two years, mostly according to the population; the exclusion of all the adversaries of the parliament; the election by it of the administrative council of state; religious liberty (but without the re-establishment of the papacy and the bishops), the abolition of the excise, and a change in many laws. The parliament returned hearty thanks to his excellency the general and the army, for their indefatigable, great, and excellent services; and resolved that this document should be immediately printed, to show the affection and unanimity that prevailed between the army and the parliament.

On the very day of Charles's death it was declared to be high treason to acknowledge any person whatever as king of England; and immediately afterwards every member was excluded from parliament who had voted for a treaty with the king, or who had latterly not approved of everything that was done, or had withdrawn himself. The number of members was reduced to about seventy, of whom it often happened that not one half appeared in the house. On the 26th of February, 1649, the conquerors decided, by a majority of forty-four to twenty-nine, "The house of lords is useless and dangerous, and is therefore abolished"; and on the 7th of March, it was further decided, "Royalty is useless, burdensome, and dangerous for England, and contrary to the freedom as well as to the safety and interests of the people. A council of state, consisting of forty-nine members, undertakes the administration of public affairs."

In a declaration of the 21st of March, the reasons for the introduction of a republic were set forth. "The office of the king," says this declaration, "was established by an agreement of the people, and filled by election. It was

very seldom that any one performed his duties, whereas the greater number have been the cause of much misery and bloodshed. Charles I, in particular, was justly condemned and executed for treachery, murder, and other odious crimes; his sons, as nothing better can be expected from them, and the eldest has already borne arms against the parliament, are declared unworthy of the throne, and all the inhabitants of the kingdom are released from their oaths and duties to them. Rome, Venice, Switzerland, the Netherlands, have proved to what a height of prosperity republics rise, and that wealth, liberty, and justice there go hand in hand. The great are there no longer able to oppress the poor; ambition vanishes; disputes about succession, and civil wars, are prevented; and liberty of conscience, persons, and property is untouched. The pure form of a republic, and the public safety, made it necessary to abolish the upper house, with its objections, which only caused delay: but the lords may be chosen members of the house of commons. He who will not take an oath to a constitution without a king and upper house is incapable of holding any office in the church and state. The new great seal has on one side the map of England and Ireland, and on the reverse, bears the inscription, 'In the first year of freedom, by God's blessing restored.'"

It was then declared that God had wonderfully revealed himself, and destroyed in England tyranny, superstition, and popery; for which all owed him gratitude and obedience. But, instead of that, they were guilty of the most crying sins and blasphemy. That such a state of things might have an end, and the great enterprise further prosper, that all dissensions might be reconciled in brotherly love, and all conspiracies of wicked people might cease, a day of fasting and prayer was ordered. This external means, however, did not produce the intended result; on the contrary, the discontent in England increased, and open war ensued with Scotland and Ireland.[e] On the 7th of February the parliament had voted the creation of a council of state, "to be henceforth the executive power"; and five members, Scott, Ludlow, Lisle, Holland, and Robinson, chosen from among the staunchest republicans, were ordered "to present to the house instructions to be given to the council of estates; and likewise the names of such persons as they conceive fit to be of that council."[1] Six days after, on the 13th of February, Scott presented his report to the house. All the practical functions of the government were vested in the council of state under the control and in obedience to the instructions of parliament — the sole depositary of the national sovereignty.

On the two following days, the house proceeded to appoint the forty-one councillors of state, voting specially on each name. Five ex-peers of the realm, the three chief judges, the three leaders of the army, Fairfax, Cromwell, and Skippon, and thirty country gentlemen and citizens, nearly all of whom were members of the house, were elected. The nomination of the five peers met with objections; the democrats wished to exclude them, as well as the house of lords itself, from all participation in the government of the commonwealth; but the more prudent politicians, on the contrary, gave an eager welcome to these noblemen, who were still powerful by their wealth and name. The entire list proposed by the commissioners of the parliament was adopted, with the exception of two names, Ireton and Harrison, who were

[1] We may here mention that, at this period, England had not yet adopted the reformed Gregorian Calendar, and that her chronology was ten days behind that of the Continent. The 7th of February in England, in the seventeenth century, would therefore correspond with the 17th of February on the Continent. We have adopted the English date in speaking of English events.

probably thought too devotedly attached to Cromwell, and for whom two republicans were substituted, conspicuous for their uncompromising distrust of the army and its leaders. They were all appointed for a year.

When they met for the first time, on the 17th of February, 1649, they were required to sign an engagement, expressing approbation of all that had been done in the king's trial, in the overthrow of kingship, and in the abolition of the house of lords. Nineteen in all, signed the engagement; but twenty-two persisted in refusing it. They stated that they were resolved, in future, faithfully to serve the government of the house of commons, as it was the supreme power, the only one which remained in existence, and therefore necessary to the liberties and safety of the people; but, from various motives, and in terms more or less distinct, they refused to give their sanction to all the past. The house, in great excitement, proceeded at once to deliberate on this report, forbidding all the members present to leave the hall without express permission; but political good sense acted as a check upon passion: to originate dissensions among the republicans, in the first days of the commonwealth, would, it was felt, be madness; the regicides knew that, if left alone, they would not be strong enough to maintain their position. The matter was arranged without further difficulty; the pledge of fidelity which the dissidents offered for the future was accepted, and they took their seats besides the regicides in the republican council of state.

This compromise was to a very great extent the work, on the one hand, of Cromwell, and on the other, of Sir Harry Vane, the most eminent, the most sincere, the most able, and the most chimerical of the non-military republicans. He was an ardent revolutionist, and he detested revolutionary violence. When, on the 6th of November, 1648, the army had expelled the entire Presbyterian party from the house of commons, Vane had boldly denounced that act, and ceased to take part in the sittings of the mutilated house. He had protested still more strongly against the trial of the king, and ever since that period he had resided at his country-seat at Raby, completely unconnected with public affairs. But the commonwealth was the object at once of his faith and of his aspirations; as soon as it appeared, he belonged to it, heart and soul. He it was, who, setting aside the past, suggested the oath of fidelity for the future, and Cromwell, quite sure that this would be enough to secure Vane to the service of the council of state and to the parliament, was one of the most eager to express his entire approval of the suggestion. Cromwell was right, for no sooner had they taken their seats than this same Vane, and that same majority of the council of state who had refused to take any share in the responsibility of the regicides, elected as their president, John Bradshaw, the president of the high court which had condemned Charles I; and three days after, Vane, with several of his colleagues, proceeded to "a small house in Holborn, which opens backwards into Lincoln's Inn Fields," to offer the post of Latin secretary to the council to a kinsman of Bradshaw's, who had recently maintained, in an eloquent pamphlet, "that it is lawful to call to account a tyrant, or wicked king, and after due conviction, to depose and put him to death!" That man was Milton.

At the same time that it was engaged in the constitution of the council of state, the house turned its attention also to the courts of law. Of the twelve principal judges, ten had been appointed by the parliament itself since the outbreak of the civil war; and yet, on the 8th of February, 1649, six of them refused to give any oath of fidelity to the commonwealth, and the other six would only consent to continue the discharge of their functions on

condition that, by a formal declaration of the house, the ancient laws of the country should be maintained, and that the judges should continue to take them as the rule of their decisions. These demands were complied with, and the six judges who had tendered their resignation were not replaced until the following summer. The earl of Warwick, the lord high admiral, lived on intimate terms with Cromwell; but he was a decided Presbyterian, who inspired the republicans with no confidence, and who himself preferred his own ease to their service. His office was taken from him on the 20th of February, 1649; the powers of the admiralty were vested in the council of state, which delegated them to a committee of three members, of whom Vane was the chief; and the command of the fleet passed into the hands of three officers, Edward Popham, Richard Deane, and Robert Blake — the last a literate and warlike Puritan, who had already given proof of his great qualities as a soldier, and who was destined to augment at sea the power and glory of the commonwealth, which he served with austere and unflinching devotedness.[d]

EXECUTIONS AND MUTINIES.

While the commons were thus converting the ancient monarchy of England into a republic, a high court of justice was sitting in judgment on the royalists of rank who were prisoners in their hands. On the night after the death of the king, the duke of Hamilton had made his escape from Windsor, but he was recognised and arrested by some troopers next day as he was knocking in disguise at an inn gate in Southwark. Lord Capel also escaped out of the Tower, but he was discovered and seized by two watermen at a house in Lambeth. These two noblemen, with Lord Norwich and Sir John Owen, were some days after (10th) brought before a high court of justice presided over by Bradshaw, and arraigned for treason. They were all sentenced to lose their heads (March 6).

The house proceeded to vote on their several cases; it was determined that the duke and Lord Capel should not be reprieved; the votes for and against were equal in the cases of Holland and Norwich, and the speaker, by his casting vote, condemned the former and saved the latter. Colonel Hutchinson seeing Sir John Owen without any one to make an exertion in his favour, took pity on him and prevailed on Ireton to give him his interest, and by their joint influence he was saved by a majority of five. Hamilton, Holland and Capel were beheaded the next day (9th) in Palace Yard: they met their fate with courage and constancy, especially the last, who behaved, we are told, "like a stout Roman."

The new government was in fact that species of tyranny denominated oligarchy, and depending, like all other tyrannies, for its existence on the power of the sword. But it was here that its chief source of danger lay; the fanatic principles of the levellers were widely spread among the Prætorian guards of the new commonwealth, and it was not long ere they broke out into action. The fearless John Lilburne, the sworn foe to despotism of every kind, led the way by a petition against the "Agreement of the People"; petitions from officers and soldiers, and from the well-affected in various parts, poured in, calling for annual parliaments with entirely new members; the enforcement of the Self-Denying Ordinance; the abolition of the council of state and the high court of justice; requiring legal proceedings to be in English, and the fees of lawyers to be reduced; the excise and customs to be abolished, and the estates of delinquents to be sold; liberty of conscience,



THE PROSCRIBED ROYALIST

(From the painting by Sir John Everett Millais, P.R.A., in the Pender Collection)

[1649 A.D.]
abolition of tithes, and fixed salaries of 100*l.* a year for the ministers of the Gospel.

To quell the spirit of the army vigorous means were employed. Five troopers, the bearers of a remonstrance from several regiments were sentenced by a court-martial to ride the wooden horse, have their swords broken over their heads, and be cashiered. Lilburne, who was keeping up a constant fire of pamphlets, ("England's New Chains Discovered"; "A Second Part" of the same; and "The Hunting of the Foxes from Newmarket and Triploe-heath to Westminster, by five small Beagles," alluding to the five troopers, etc.) was, with his associates Walwyn, Prince and Overton, committed to the Tower (March 29). Numerous petitions, especially from the women, were presented in their favour, but without effect. "They were bid," says Walker *i* to go home and wash their dishes, to which some of them replied, they had neither dishes nor meat left." A very different answer, he says, from what they used to receive "when they had money, plate, rings, bodkins and thimbles to sacrifice to these legislative idols." Mutinies broke out in the regiments destined for Ireland; the first was at Bishopsgate, in the city, where a troop of horse seized the colours and refused to march. For this five of them were sentenced to be shot, but with the exception of one named Lockier they were pardoned by the general. At the funeral of Lockier (April 30) the corpse, adorned with bundles of rosemary dipped in blood, was preceded by one hundred men in files; six trumpeters sounding a soldier's knell went on each side of it; his horse covered with mourning was led after it; then came thousands of people with sea-green and black ribbons at their breasts. The women brought up the rear; thousands more of the better sort met them at the grave.

This funeral convinced the government of the necessity of acting with energy, for the mutiny was spreading fast. A captain Thompson, at the head of two hundred men, set forth at Banbury a manifesto named "England's Standard Advanced." They were, however, surprised by Colonel Reynolds (May 13); Thompson fled, and his men surrendered. A body of more than one thousand men moved from Salisbury to Burford, where Fairfax came up with them. At midnight Cromwell forced his way into the town and made four hundred of them prisoners, several of whom were shot by sentence of a court-martial (19th); the rest were pardoned. Thompson was slain shortly after at Wellingborough (21st), and the mutiny was finally suppressed. On Cromwell's making a report to that effect to the house (26th) a general day of thanksgiving for that great mercy was ordered. There was another kind of levellers at this time, named the "diggers," whose principle it was that the barren earth was to be made fruitful. They accordingly repaired to St. George's Hill, near Walton, in Surrey, and began to dig a common there, and to sow beans and other plants in it. Fairfax sent two troops of horse and easily dispersed them, as their number was only thirty.

SCOTLAND AND CHARLES II; THE FATE OF MONTROSE

It is now time that we should take a view of the state of affairs in Scotland at this conjuncture. The parliament there, now under the control of Argyll, had sent instructions to their commissioners to protest against the trial and execution of the king. No notice had been taken of the Scottish protest. When tidings of the execution of the king reached Edinburgh the parliament had forthwith (Feb. 5) proclaimed Charles II, provided he

would take the covenant and adhere to the solemn league between the two kingdoms. Afterwards, when they found themselves treated with contempt by the English parliament, and their commissioners actually sent under a guard to the frontiers, they appointed commissioners to proceed to the Hague to treat with the king. These on arriving (March 26) found Lanark (later duke of Hamilton), Lauderdale and Callendar, the chiefs of the engagers, and the royalists Montrose, Kinnoull and Seaforth already there. The antipathies and disputes of these parties caused distraction and confusion; and Charles, whose real design was to repair to Ormonde and the Catholics in Ireland, was little inclined to give them satisfaction.

The murder of Dorislaus, which occurred soon after, made it expedient for Charles to quit the Hague. This civilian had been sent as envoy from the parliament to the states. On the very evening of his arrival (May 3), as he was at supper in an inn, six gentlemen entered the room with drawn swords, and dragging him from his chair, murdered him on the ground. Ascham, the republican envoy to the court of Madrid, was also assassinated by the royalists. Clarendon[9] does not, by any means, condemn the deed. The assassins of Dorislaus escaped, but it was known that they were Scotchmen and followers of Montrose. Charles immediately left the Hague and proceeded to Paris, whence, after a delay of three months, he went to Jersey in order to take shipping for Ireland. But the intelligence which he received from that country showing that his cause there was hopeless, he renewed his negotiations with the Scots.

Many months passed without anything being done; but early in the following year (March 15, 1650) he met the commissioners, who were the earls of Cassilis and Lothian, two barons, two burgesses, and three ministers, at the prince of Orange's town of Breda. But though urged by his mother, the prince of Orange and several of his other friends, to take the covenant and comply with the other demands, he still protracted the treaty.

The truth is, Charles, who had all the insincerity distinctive of his family, had in view another mode of recovering his throne. The restless and enterprising Montrose having obtained some supplies of arms and money from the northern courts, had embarked at Hamburg with about six hundred men, Germans and Scottish exiles. He sailed to the Orkney Isles, where by a forced levy he raised his troops to about fourteen hundred, with whom he passed over to the opposite coast; but as he marched through Caithness and Sutherland the people, instead of joining him as he expected, fled at his approach. At Corbinsdale, in Fifeshire, he was encountered (April 17) by a party of three hundred horse, under Strachhan; the main army of four thousand men under David Leslie not being yet come up. The unwarlike islanders, when charged by cavalry, threw down their arms and fled; the Germans retreated to a wood, where they surrendered.

Montrose, in the disguise of a peasant, escaped by swimming across a river, but he was betrayed (May 8) by a person with whom he had taken refuge, and was conducted a prisoner to Edinburgh. Every insult that could be devised was heaped on him by his ungenerous captors. The magistrates of Edinburgh met him at the gates, and by their directions he was placed, bareheaded and pinioned, on a high seat in a cart, and thus led by the executioner to the common gaol, his officers walking two and two before the cart. Within two days he was brought before the parliament to receive his sentence. The chancellor in a bitter tone enumerated all his offences. He replied that he had always acted by the royal command.

He was then sentenced to be hung on a gallows thirty feet high, his head

[1650 A.D.]

to be fixed on a spike in Edinburgh, his arms on the gates of Perth and Stirling, his legs on those of Glasgow and Aberdeen, his body to be buried by the hangman on the Burrow moor. He heard this sentence with an unchanged countenance. The clergy then came to torture him; they told him that his punishment here was but a shadow of what awaited him in the next world. He repelled them with disdain: he was prouder, he said, to have his head placed on the prison walls than his picture in the king's bed-chamber, and he wished he had flesh enough to be dispersed through Christendom to attest his loyalty. He appeared on the scaffold (May 20th) in a splendid dress, and addressed the people in explanation of his dying unabsolved by the church; the executioner then hung the book containing the history of his exploits about his neck; he smiled at their malice, and said he wore it with more pride than the Garter. His behaviour at his last moments gained many proselytes to the cause for which he suffered.



COTTAGE IN MERTON

Montrose was only thirty-eight years of age. His mind was irregularly great, always aiming at what was beyond his power to achieve. He never displayed the talents of a great commander, but as a partisan or guerilla he was not to be excelled. Personal aggrandisement or the gratification of personal enmity was the impelling cause of most of his actions. His barbarous death has in some measure effaced the memory of the cruelties which he had committed. Sir Francis Hay Spotswood, grandson of the archbishop, Colonel Sibbald and Colonel Hurry, his companions, were all executed a few days after Montrose. His friend Lord Frendaught balked the public vengeance by a voluntary death.

When the news of Montrose's defeat reached Charles, he lost no time in declaring that he had forbidden him to proceed in his design, and that he was not sorry for what had befallen him. He then submitted without reserve to the demands of the commissioners. Beside taking the covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, he bound himself not to tolerate Roman Catholicism in any part of his dominions, and to govern by the advice of the parliament and the kirk. He then embarked (June 2) on board of a Dutch fleet employed to protect the herring fisheries, and after a tedious voyage of three weeks reached the mouth of the Spey (23rd). [The treaty was actually signed while the fleet was anchored in the roads of Helgoland, June 11th; hence it is called the Treaty of Helgoland.] A court was arranged for him

with all the proper officers, but none of the engagers were permitted to approach it; and none of his English followers, but the duke of Buckingham, Lord Wilmot and a few servants, were suffered to remain with him.

He soon found that he was to be a mere pageant of royalty, and the insolence of the despotic fanatic clergy made his life wearisome. Evermore he was compelled to listen to their invectives against the iniquity of his father's house, the idolatry of his mother, and his own connection with malignants. Long prayers, tedious sermons, rigid fasts, and Judaical sabbaths were inflicted on him, and the slightest levity in look or conduct was severely reprehended. How long a licentious youth (for such was Charles) and these sour religionists could have agreed is uncertain; but the time for the experiment was brief; for Charles had been but one short month in Scotland when (July 22) Cromwell, flushed with victory in Ireland, crossed the Tweed at the head of an English army.

CROMWELL IN IRELAND

In Ireland, when the nuncio Rinuccini and the clergy had got the supreme power into their hands, they had exercised it weakly, passionately and injudiciously; but the marquis of Clanricarde and some other peers rallied against them, and finally obliged the nuncio to fly to the camp of his friend Owen O'Neil. Lord Inchiquin, who had been hitherto on the side of the parliament, having declared for the royal cause, the council invited Ormonde to return and resume the lieutenancy; and on his arrival, the insolent, turbulent Italian found it necessary to quit the kingdom in which his presence had been productive only of evil. The account of the execution of Charles I had caused the Scottish army in Ulster to declare for the royal cause. Owen O'Neil, who was closely connected with the party of the nuncio, refused to be included in it, and formed an alliance with the parliamentary commanders. Ormonde being joined by Inchiquin from Munster, was enabled to appear at the head of a combined army of eleven thousand men, Protestants and Catholics, before the walls of Dublin (June 19), while Inchiquin reduced Drogheda. Monk, who commanded at Dundalk, had concerted with O'Neil a plan for drawing the lord-lieutenant away from Dublin; but Inchiquin fell on and routed a body of O'Neil's troops who were convoying the ammunition sent him by Monk for this purpose, and then compelled Monk himself to surrender. He also reduced Newry, Carlingford, Trim, and other towns, and then rejoined Ormonde before Dublin. Owen O'Neil meantime advanced toward Londonderry, which was hard pressed by the royalists, and he obliged them to raise the siege.

The parliament had appointed Cromwell to the command in Ireland (March 15), but he hesitated to accept it; the council of officers then directed two from each regiment to meet and seek God as to what advice to offer him, and at length he declared himself willing to undertake that service. He was appointed lord-lieutenant, with supreme authority both civil and military, for three years. He demanded a force of twelve thousand men with all needful supplies, and 100,000*l.* in money.[1] These preparations caused so much delay, that Cromwell did not leave London till the 10th of July; on which day, when three ministers had offered up prayers for his success, and he himself, Goffe and Harrison "did" says Whitelock,[2] "expound some places of Scripture excellently well and pertinent to the occasion," he left

[1] Cromwell received £3,000 for his outfit, £10 per day as general while he remained in England, and £3,000 per quarter in Ireland, besides his salary as lord-lieutenant. — LINGARD.[A]

[1649 A.D.]

Whitehall with a train of carriages, each drawn by six horses, with his life-guard of eighty gentlemen, all of whom had been officers, and a numerous suite of attendants. Ere their departure, his officers presented a petition to parliament, praying that drunkenness, profane swearing, etc., might be restrained; legal proceedings be in English, cheap and certain; lands and houses with their encumbrances be registered in each parish; tithes be abolished, and two shillings in the pound be levied on the land for the support of the clergy and the poor.*i*

It had been fixed that the expedition should sail from Milford Haven; but the impatience of the general was checked by the reluctance and desertion of his men. The recent transaction between Monk and O'Neil had diffused a spirit of distrust through the army. It was pronounced an apostasy from the principles on which they had fought. The exaggerated horrors of the massacre in 1641 were recalled to mind; the repeated resolutions of parliament to extirpate the native Irish, and the solemn engagement of the army to revenge the blood which had been shed, were warmly discussed; and the invectives of the leaders against the late king, when he concluded a peace with the confederate Catholics, were contrasted with their present backsliding, when they had taken the men of Ulster for their associates and for their brethren in arms. To appease the growing discontent, parliament annulled the agreement. Monk, who had returned to England, was publicly assured that, if he escaped the punishment of his indiscretion, it was on account of his past services and good intentions. Peters from the pulpit employed his eloquence to remove the blame from the grandees; and, if we may judge from the sequel, promises were made, not only that the good cause should be supported, but that the duty of revenge should be amply discharged.

While the army was thus detained in the neighbourhood of Milford Haven, Jones, in Dublin, reaped the laurels which Cromwell had destined for himself. The royal army had advanced on both banks of the Liffy to the siege of that capital. Jones, sallying from the walls (Aug. 2), overpowered the guard, and raised an alarm in the camp. It was in vain that Ormonde, aroused from his sleep, flew from post to post; a general panic ensued, and the whole army on the right bank fled in every direction. The artillery, tents, baggage, and ammunition fell into the hands of the conquerors, with two thousand prisoners, three hundred of whom were massacred in cold blood at the gate of the city. This was called the battle of Rathmines, a battle which destroyed the hopes of the Irish royalists and taught men to doubt the abilities of Ormonde. At court, his enemies ventured to hint suspicions of treason; but Charles, to silence their murmurs and assure him of the royal favour, sent him the order of the Garter.

CROMWELL MASSACRES THE PRISONERS

The news of this important victory hastened the departure of Cromwell. He sailed from Milford with a single division (Aug. 18, 1649 [1]); his son-in-law, Ireton, followed with the remainder of the army, and a fortnight was allowed to the soldiers to refresh themselves after their voyage. The campaign was opened with the siege of Drogheda (Sept. 3). Ormonde had thrown into the town a garrison of two thousand five hundred chosen men, under the command of Sir Arthur Ashton, an officer who had earned a brilliant reputation by his services to the royal cause in England during the civil war (Sept. 11).*k*

[1 On the occasion of the crossing, which was rough, a spectator noted that Cromwell "was as sea sick as ever I saw a man in my life."]

Cromwell's Own Account of His Irish Massacres[1]

Your army came before the town upon Monday following. Where having pitched, as speedy course was taken as could be to frame our batteries; which took up the more time because divers of the battering guns were on shipboard. Upon Monday, the batteries began to play. Whereupon I sent Sir Arthur Ashton, the then governor, a summons, to deliver the town to the use of the parliament of England. To the which receiving no satisfactory answer, I proceeded that day to beat down the steeple of the church on the south side of the town, and to beat down a tower not far from the same place. Our guns not being able to do much that day, it was resolved to endeavour to do our utmost the next day to make breaches assaultable, and by the help of God to storm them. The place pitched upon was that part of the town wall next a church called St. Mary's; which was the rather chosen because we did hope that if we did enter and possess that church, we should be the better able to keep it against their horse and foot until we could make way for the entrance of our horse. The batteries planted were two: one was for that part of the wall against the east end of the said church; the other against the wall on the south side. Being somewhat long in battering, the enemy made six retrenchments: three of them from the said church to Duleek Gate; and three of them from the east end of the church to the town wall and so backward. The guns, after some two or three hundred shot, beat down the corner tower, and opened two reasonable good breaches in the east and south wall.

Upon Tuesday, about five o'clock in the evening we began to storm: and after some hot dispute we entered, about seven or eight hundred men; the enemy disputing it very stiffly with us. And indeed, through the advantages of the place, and the courage God was pleased to give the defenders, our men were forced to retreat quite out of the breach, not without some considerable loss. Although our men that stormed the breaches were forced to recoil, as is before expressed; yet, being encouraged to recover their loss, they made a second attempt: wherein God was pleased so to animate them that they got ground of the enemy, and by the goodness of God, forced him to quit his intrenchments. And after a very hot dispute, the enemy having both horse and foot, and we only foot, within the wall — they gave ground, and our men became masters both of their retrenchments and of the church; which indeed, although they made our entrance the more difficult yet they proved of excellent use to us; so that the enemy could not annoy us with their horse, but thereby we had advantage to make good the ground, that so we might let in our own horse; which accordingly was done, though with much difficulty.

Divers of the enemy retreated into the Mill-Mount: a place very strong and of difficult access; being exceedingly high, having a good graft, and strongly palisadoed. The governor, Sir Arthur Ashton, and divers considerable officers being there, our men getting up to them, were ordered by me to put them all to the sword. And indeed, being in the heat of action, I forbade them to spare any that were in arms in the town: and, I think, that night they put to the sword about 2,000 men; divers of the officers and soldiers being fled over the bridge into the other part of the town, where about 100 of them possessed St. Peter's church-steeple, some the west gate, and others a strong round tower next the gate called St. Sunday's. These being summoned to yield to mercy, refused. Whereupon I ordered the steeple of St.

[1] In a letter to William Lenthall, speaker of the Long Parliament, dated Dublin, September 17th, 1649.]

[1649 A.D.]

Peter's church to be fired, when one of them was heard to say in the midst of the flames: "God damn me, God confound me; I burn, I burn."

The next day, the other two towers were summoned; in one of which was about six or seven score; but they refused to yield themselves; and we knowing that hunger must compel them, set only good guards to secure them from running away until their stomachs were come down. From one of the said towers, notwithstanding their condition, they killed and wounded some of our men. When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head; and every tenth man of the soldiers killed and the rest shipped for the Barbadoes. The soldiers in the other tower were all spared, as to their lives only; and shipped likewise for the Barbadoes. I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood; and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future. Which are the satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret. Since this great mercy vouchsafed to us, I sent a party of horse and dragoons to Dundalk; which the enemy quitted, and we are possessed of — as also of another castle they deserted, between Trim, and Tredah [Drogheda], upon the Boyne.

And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work is wrought. It was set upon some of our hearts, that a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the spirit of God. And is it not so, clearly? That which caused your men to storm so courageously, it was the spirit of God, who gave your men courage, and took it away again; and gave the enemy courage, and took it away again; and gave your men courage again, and therewith this happy success. And therefore it is good that God alone have all the glory. It is remarkable that these people, at the first, set up the mass in some places of the town that had been monasteries; but afterwards grew so insolent that, the last Lord's day before the storm, the Protestants were thrust out of the great church called St. Peter's and they had public mass there: and in this very place near one thousand of them were put to the sword, fleeing thither for safety. I believe all their friars were knocked on the head promiscuously but two; the one of which was father Peter Taaff, brother to the lord Taaff, whom the soldiers took, the next day, and made an end of. The other was taken in the Round Tower, under the repute of a lieutenant, and when he understood that the officers in that tower had no quarter he confessed he was a friar; but that did not save him. I do not think we lost one hundred men upon the place, though many be wounded.[k]

FURTHER ATROCITIES IN IRELAND

According to other reports, by royalist and even parliamentary writers, not only did the carnage last two days, but officers who were discovered after the lapse of five or six days, during which they had been concealed by the humanity of some of the soldiers, were put to death in cold blood; and at the moment of the massacre, women and children met with the same fate as armed men. "It was," says a contemporary panegyrist of Cromwell, "a sacrifice of three thousand Irish to the ghosts of ten thousand English, whom they had massacred some years before." The sacrifice did not produce the effect which Cromwell had anticipated would justify it; it did not suffice to prevent the further effusion of blood; another such example had to be made. Wexford, a month afterwards, defended itself with the same obstinacy as Drogheda, and witnessed a similar massacre.[d]

According to a story which Gardiner[b] doubts but Lingard[h] accepts, three hundred women who gathered round the cross in the market place, were put to the sword without mercy. The Irish commanders disdained to imitate the cruelty of their enemies. "I took," says Lord Castlehaven,[l] "Athy by storm, with all the garrison (seven hundr d men) prisoners. I made a present of them to Cromwell, desiring him by letter that h> would do the like with me, as any of mine should fall in his power. But he little valued my civility. For, in a few days after, he besieged Gowran; and the soldiers mutinying, and giving up the place with their officers, he caused the governor, Hammond, and some other officers, to be put to death." Ormonde[m] also says, in one of his letters, "the next day Rathfarnham was taken by storm, and all that were in it made prisoners; and though five hundred soldiers entered the castle before any officer of note, yet not one creature was killed; which I tell you by the way, to observe the difference betwixt our and the rebels making use of a victory."[a]

Other places, it is true, from intimidation or treachery, surrendered: Cork, Ross, Youghal, and Kilkenny, submitted without resistance; but other places again, Callan, Gowran, and Clonmel, made a bold defence; and some, Waterford for instance, resisted so vigorously that Cromwell was obliged to raise the siege. And, even where success seemed won most easily, it was sullied by acts of wanton cruelty: at Gowran the soldiers obtained their lives on surrendering the place, but on the condition of giving up their officers, who were all put to death. The bishop of Ross was hanged in his Episcopal robes, under the walls of a fortress defended by his troops. Clonmel made an heroic resistance, and when at length it surrendered, Cromwell found not a single man belonging to the garrison in it; whilst he was signing the articles of capitulation with the inhabitants, they had left the town by night with their arms and baggage, to recommence the war elsewhere.

It is the ordinary artifice of bad passions to impute the cruel satisfaction with which they glut themselves, either to some great idea whose accomplishment they are earnestly pursuing, or to the absolute necessity of success. History would be dishonoured by admitting these lying excuses: it is her duty to refer evil to its source, and to render to the vices of mankind that which is their due. Human fanaticism also lies, or allows itself to be deluded by pride, when it pretends to be the executor of the high decrees of divine justice: it is not the office of man to pronounce upon nations the sentences of God. Cromwell was not bloodthirsty; but he was determined to succeed rapidly and at any cost, from the necessities of his fortune, far more than for the advancement of his cause: and he denied no outlet to the passions of those who served him. He was an ambitious and selfish, though really great, man, who had narrow-minded and hard-hearted fanatics for his instruments.

His great and true means of success did not consist in his massacres, but in his genius, and in the exalted idea which the people had already conceived of him. Sometimes by instinct, sometimes from reflection, he conducted himself in Ireland towards both his friends and his enemies with an ability as pliant as it was profound; for he excelled in the art of treating with men, and of persuading, or seducing, or appeasing those even who naturally regarded him with the greatest distrust and aversion. At the same time that he gave up to murder and pillage the towns which fell into his hands, he maintained in other respects the severest discipline in his army, not suffering it to do the inhabitants any wrong, and taking care that it paid for all it consumed. That very man who boasted that at Drogheda "all the friars were knocked on the head promiscuously," and who always pompously excepted the Catholics

[1650 A.D.]

from his promises of Christian toleration, that very man maintained, by means of Irish monks, a most active police among his enemies, who kept him always well informed of their designs and movements, and were sometimes influential enough to procure their failure by promoting dissensions among them. He laboured incessantly to detach all men of importance from the royal cause.[d]

Gardiner[b] condemns the conduct of Cromwell in instigating the massacre. Nor will he agree with those modern critics who claim that Cromwell only exercised the laws of war as practised by Tilly and others. He considers it adequate answer to these apologists, to demand whether Cromwell did here in Ireland on this occasion as he himself had done in England. The answer is not doubtful; everywhere except at Basing House, Cromwell had shown a merciful disposition toward the vanquished; that he should have permitted the slaughter of prisoners of war seems an inexcusable atrocity.

Morley[n] is equally scathing in his estimate of this deed of vengeance. He reminds the reader that if we are to excuse such conduct as that of Cromwell, we shall scarcely know where to draw the line in estimating the claim that "in the long run the gibbet, stake, torch, sword, and bullet are the truest mercy." Nor may we view with greater leniency Cromwell's plea that he was inflicting a righteous vengeance upon men whose hands were imbrued with the innocent blood shed in Ulster eight years earlier. In making such a plea, Cromwell can scarcely have spoken in good faith, for he must have known that there was little likelihood of finding a single man who had taken part in the Ulster atrocities of 1641 among the three thousand men whom he caused to be butchered at Drogheda, and the unnumbered friars who, it is alleged, were slaughtered promiscuously. Equally futile must be regarded the claim that the massacre at Drogheda was a measure calculated to prevent further uprisings, since the war was not finished until almost three years later. Morley concludes his indictment by a sarcastic reference to Cromwell's claim that he had "massacred, destroyed, or banished no one in Ireland who was not actually in arms." But even if this criticism be just, we can hardly doubt that Cromwell in permitting the massacre at Drogheda acted according to his best judgment, in the carrying out of a carefully planned policy, and not through any momentary ebullition of passion.[o]

THE BATTLE OF DUNBAR (1650 A.D.)

It was the negotiation between the Scots and their nominal king that arrested Cromwell in the career of victory, and called him away from the completion of his Irish conquest. The rulers of the commonwealth were aware of the intimate connection which the Solemn League and Covenant had produced between the English Presbyterians and the kirk of Scotland, whence they naturally inferred that, if the pretender to the English were once seated on the Scottish throne, their own power would be placed on a very precarious footing. From the first they had watched with jealousy the unfriendly proceedings of the Scottish parliament. Advice and persuasion had been tried, and had failed. There remained the resource of war; and war, it was hoped would either compel the Scots to abandon the claims of Charles, or reduce Scotland to a province of the commonwealth. Fairfax, indeed (he was supposed to be under the influence of a Presbyterian wife and of the Presbyterian ministers), disapproved of the design; but his disapprobation, though lamented in public, was privately hailed as a benefit by those who were acquainted with the aspiring designs of Cromwell, and built on his elevation the flattering hope of their own greatness. By their means, as soon as the lord-lieutenant had

put his troops into winter quarters, an order was obtained from parliament for him to attend his duty in the house; but he resumed his military operations, and two months were suffered to elapse before he noticed the command of the supreme authority, and condescended to make an unmeaning apology for his disobedience.

On the renewal of the order, he left the command in Ireland to Ireton, and, returning to England, appeared in his seat (June 4). He was received with acclamations; the palace of St. James's was allotted for his residence, and a valuable grant of lands was voted as a reward for his eminent services. In a few days followed the appointment of Fairfax to the office of commander-in-chief, and of Cromwell to that of lieutenant-general of the army designed to be employed in Scotland. Each signified his "readiness to observe the orders of the house"; but Fairfax at the same time revealed his secret and conscientious objections to the council of state. A deputation of five members, Cromwell, Lambert, Harrison, Whitelocke, and St. John waited on him at his house; the conference was opened by a solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit, and the three officers prayed in succession with the most edifying fervour. Then Fairfax said that, to his mind, the invasion of Scotland appeared a violation of the Solemn League and Covenant which he had sworn to observe. The next day another attempt ended with as little success, the lord-general alleging the plea of infirm health and misboding conscience, and the chief command of all the forces raised, or to be raised by order of parliament, was conferred on Oliver Cromwell. Thus he obtained at the same time the praise of moderation and the object of his ambition. Immediately he left the capital for Scotland (June 29); and Fairfax retired to his estate in Yorkshire, where he lived with the privacy of a country gentleman, till he once more drew the sword, not in support of the commonwealth, but in favour of the king. To a spectator who considered the preparations of the two kingdoms, there could be little doubt of the result. Cromwell passed the Tweed (July 22), at the head of sixteen thousand men, most of them veterans, all habituated to military discipline, before the raw levies of the Scots had quitted their respective shires.

By order of the Scottish parliament, the army had been fixed at thirty thousand men; the nominal command had been given to the earl of Leven, the real, on account of the age and infirmities of that officer, to his relative, David Leslie, and instructions had been issued that the country between Berwick and the capital should be laid waste, that the cattle and provisions should be removed or destroyed, and that the inhabitants should abandon their homes under the penalties of infamy, confiscation, and death. In aid of this measure, reports were industriously circulated of the cruelties exercised by Cromwell in Ireland; that, wherever he came, he gave orders to put all the males between sixteen and sixty to death, to deprive all the boys between six and sixteen of their right hands, and to bore the breasts of the females with red-hot irons. The English were surprised at the silence and desolation which reigned around them; for the only human beings whom they met on their march through this wilderness, were a few old women and children who on their knees solicited mercy. But Cromwell conducted them by the sea-coast; the fleet daily supplied them with provisions, and their good conduct gradually dispelled the apprehensions of the natives (July 28). Cromwell employed all his art to provoke, Leslie to avoid, an engagement. It was in vain that for more than a month the former marched and countermarched; that he threatened general, and made partial, attacks. Leslie remained fixed within his lines; or, if he occasionally moved, watched the motions of the

[1650 A.D.]

enemy from the nearest mountains, or interposed a river or morass between the two armies. The English began to be exhausted with fatigue; sickness thinned their ranks; the arrival of provisions depended on the winds and waves; and Cromwell was taught to fear, not the valour of the enemy, but the prudence of their general.

The reader will already have observed how much at this period the exercises of religion were mixed up with the concerns of state and even the operations of war. Both parties equally believed that the result of the expedition depended on the ill of the Almighty, and that it was, therefore, their duty to propitiate hi anger by fasting and humiliation. In the English army the officers prayed and preached: they "sanctified the camp," and exhorted the men to unity of mind and godliness of life. Among the Scots this duty was discharged by the ministers; and so fervent was their piety, so merciless their zeal, that, in addition to their prayers, they occasionally compelled the young king to listen to six long sermons on the same day, during which he assumed an air of gravity, and displayed feelings of devotion, which ill-accorded with his real disposition. But the English had no national crime to deplore; by punishing the late king, they had atoned for the evils of the civil war; the Scots, on the contrary, had adopted his son without any real proof of his conversion, and therefore feared that they might draw down on the country the punishment due to his sins and those of his family. It happened that Charles, by the advice of the earl of Eglinton, presumed to visit the army on the links of Leith.

He was received with shouts of enthusiasm by the soldiers, who, on their knees, pledged the health of their young sovereign; but the committee of the kirk complained that his presence led to inebriety and profaneness, and he received a request, equivalent to a command, to quit the camp. The next day a declaration was made, that the company of malignants, engagers, and enemies to the covenant, could not fail of multiplying the judgments of God upon the land; an inquiry was instituted into the characters of numerous individuals; and eighty officers, with many of their men, were sashiered, that they might not contaminate by their presence the army of the saints. Still it was for Charles Stuart, the chief of the malignants, that they were to fight, and therefore from him, to appease the anger of the Almighty, an expiatory declaration was required in the name of the parliament and the kirk. In this instrument he was called upon to lament, in the language of penitence and self-abasement, his father's opposition to the work of God and to the Solemn League and Covenant, which had caused the blood of the Lord's people to be shed, and the idolatry of his mother, the toleration of which in the king's house could not fail to be a high provocation against him who is a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children; to declare that he had subscribed the covenant with sincerity of heart, and would have no friends or enemies but those who were friends or enemies to it; to acknowledge the sinfulness of the treaty with the bloody rebels in Ireland, which he was made to pronounce null and void; to detest popery and prelacy, idolatry and heresy, schism and profaneness; and to promise that he would accord to a free parliament in England the propositions of the two kingdoms, and reform the Church of England according to the plan devised by the assembly of divines at Westminster.

When first this declaration, so humbling to his pride, so offensive to his feelings, was presented to Charles for his signature, he returned an indignant refusal (August 13). The two committees of the kirk and kingdom protested that they would never prosecute his interest without his acknowledgment of

the sins of his family and of his former ways. This protestation was printed and furtively sent to the English camp; the officers of the army presented to the committee of estates a remonstrance and supplication expressive of their adhesion; and the ministers maintained from their pulpits that the king was the root of malignancy, and a hypocrite, who had taken the covenant without an intention of keeping it. Charles, yielding to his own fears and the advice of his friends, on August 16th, subscribed, with tears, the obnoxious instrument. If it were folly in the Scots to propose to the young prince a declaration so repugnant to his feelings and opinions, it was greater folly still to believe that professions of repentance extorted with so much violence could be sincere or satisfactory; yet his subscription was received with expressions of joy and gratitude; both the army and the city observed a solemn fast for the sins of the two kings, the father and the son; and the ministers, now that the anger of heaven had been appeased, assured their hearers of an easy victory over a "blaspheming general and a sectarian army."

If their predictions were not verified, the fault was undoubtedly their own. The caution and vigilance of Leslie had triumphed over the skill and activity of "the blasphemer." Cromwell saw no alternative but victory or retreat: of the first he had no doubt, if he could come in contact with the enemy; the second was a perilous attempt, when the passes before him were pre-occupied, and a more numerous force was hanging on his rear. At Musselburgh (August 30th), having sent the sick on board the fleet (they suffered both from the "disease of the country," and from fevers caused by exposure on the Pentland hills), he ordered the army to march the next morning to Haddington, and thence to Dunbar; and the same night a meteor, which the imagination of the beholders likened to a sword of fire, was seen to pass over Edinburgh in a southeasterly direction, an evident presage, in the opinion of the Scots, that the flames of war would be transferred to the remotest extremity of England. At Dunbar, Cromwell posted his men in the vicinity of Broxmouth House; Leslie with the Scots moving along the heights of Lammermuir, occupied a position on Doon Hill, about two miles to the south of the invaders; and the advanced posts of the armies were separated only by a ravine of the depth and breadth of about thirty feet. Cromwell was not ignorant of the danger of his situation; he had even thought of putting the infantry on board the fleet, and of attempting to escape with the cavalry by the only outlet, the high road to Berwick; but the next moment he condemned the thought as "a weakness of the flesh, a distrust in the power of the Almighty; and ordered the army to seek the Lord, who would assuredly find a way of deliverance for his faithful servants." On the other side the committees of the kirk and estates exulted in the prospect of executing the vengeance of God upon "the sectaries"; and afraid that the enemy should escape, compelled their general to depart from his usual caution, and to make preparation for battle.

Cromwell, with his officers, had spent part of the day in calling upon the Lord; while he prayed, the enthusiast felt an enlargement of the heart, a buoyancy of spirit, which he took for an infallible presage of victory; and, beholding through his glass the motion in the Scottish camp, he exclaimed, "They are coming down; the Lord hath delivered them into our hands." During the night, he advanced the army to the edge of the ravine; and at an early hour in the morning of September 3rd, the Scots attempted to seize the pass on the road from Dunbar to Berwick. After a sharp contest, the Scottish lancers, aided by their artillery, charged down the hill, drove the brigade of English cavalry from its position, and broke through the infantry, which had advanced to the support of the horse. At that moment the sun made its



By permission of [illegible] *and* [illegible]. *Copyright, 1899, by Photograph* [illegible]

CROMWELL AT DUNBAR

(From the painting by Andrew C. Gow R.A. in the Tate Gallery)

appearance above the horizon; and Cromwell, turning to his own regiment of foot, exclaimed, "Let the Lord arise, and scatter his enemies." They instantly moved forward with their pikes levelled; the horse rallied; and the enemy's lancers hesitated, broke, and fled. At that moment the mist dispersed, and the first spectacle which struck the eyes of the Scots, was the rout of their cavalry. A sudden panic instantly spread from the right to the left of their line; at the approach of the English they threw down their arms and ran. Cromwell's regiment halted to sing Psalm cxvii; but the pursuit was continued for more than eight miles; the dead bodies of three thousand Scots strewed their native soil; and ten thousand prisoners, with the artillery, ammunition, and baggage, became the reward of the conquerors. Of the prisoners, five thousand one hundred, something more than one-half, being wounded, were dismissed to their homes, the other half were driven "like turkeys" into England.[1] Of these, one thousand six hundred died of a pestilential disease, and five hundred were actually sick on October 31st. *h*

Cromwell now marched confidently back to the capital. The hope of resistance was abandoned; the gates of Edinburgh and Leith were opened, and the entire country to the Forth acknowledged the supremacy of English arms.

Gardiner *b* considers Dunbar and Naseby to have been the two great decisive battles of Cromwell's career. In his view, the specific result of Naseby was to render the re-establishment of a purely personal government forever impossible in England. Dunbar overthrew the Solemn League and Covenant, making it impossible in future for Scotland to impose upon England a form of ecclesiastical or political government that did not meet the approval of the majority of Englishmen. Meantime it forever removed the stricter covenanters from the seats of political control in Scotland itself. *a*

CHARLES II'S "START," AND HIS CORONATION

Still the presumption of the six ministers who formed the committee of the kirk was not humbled. Though their predictions had been falsified, they were still the depositaries of the secrets of the Deity; and, in a "Short Declaration and Warning," they announced (Sept. 12) to their countrymen the thirteen causes of this national calamity, the reasons why "God had veiled for a time his face from the sons of Jacob." It was by the general profaneness of the land, by the manifest provocations of the king and the king's house, by the crooked and precipitant ways of statesmen in the Treaty of Breda, by the toleration of maligants in the king's household, by suffering his guard to join in the battle without a previous purgation, by the diffidence of some officers who refused to profit by advantages furnished to them by God, by the presumption of others who promised victory to themselves without eyeing of God, by the rapacity and oppression exercised by the soldiery, and by the carnal self-seeking of men in power, that God had been provoked to visit his people with so direful and yet so merited a chastisement.

To the young king the defeat at Dunbar was a subject of real and ill-dissembled joy. Hitherto he had been a mere puppet in the hands of Argyll and his party; now their power was broken, and it was not impossible for him to gain the ascendency. He entered into a negotiation with Murray, Huntley, Athol, and the numerous royalists in the highlands; but the secret, without the particulars, was betrayed to Argyll, probably by Buckingham, who dis-

[1 Cromwell claimed to have lost only twenty slain. Many of the prisoners were shipped to New England where they underwent a brief servitude.]

approved of the project; and all the cavaliers but three received an order to leave the court in twenty-four hours — the kingdom in twenty days. The vigilance of the guards prevented the execution of the plan which had been laid; but one afternoon, under pretence of hawking, Charles escaped from Perth, and riding forty-two miles, passed the night in a miserable hovel, called Clova, in the braes of Angus. At break of day he was overtaken by Colonel Montgomery, who advised him to return, while the viscount Dudhope urged him to proceed to the mountains, where he would be joined by seven thousand armed men. Charles wavered; but Montgomery directed his attention to two regiments of horse that waited at a distance to intercept his progress, and the royal fugitive consented to return to his former residence in Perth. The Start (so this adventure was called) proved, however, a warning to the committee of estates. They prudently admitted the apology of the king, who attributed his flight to information that he was that day to have been delivered to Cromwell; and they allowed him, for the first time, to preside at their deliberations, and they employed his authority to pacify the royalists in the Highlands, who had taken arms in his name under Huntley, Athol, Seaforth and Middleton. These, after a long negotiation, accepted an act of indemnity, and disbanded their forces.

In the mean while Cromwell in his quarters at Edinburgh laboured to unite the character of the saint with that of the conqueror; and, surrounded as he was with the splendour of victory, to surprise the world by a display of modesty and self-abasement. To his friends and flatterers, who fed his vanity by warning him to be on his guard against its suggestions, he replied, that he "had been a dry bone, and was still an unprofitable servant," a mere instrument in the hands of almighty power; if God had risen in his wrath, if he had bared his arm and avenged his cause, to him, and to him alone, belonged the glory. Assuming the office of a missionary, he exhorted his officers in daily sermons to love one another, to repent from dead works, and to pray and mourn for the blindness of their Scottish adversaries; and, pretending to avail himself of his present leisure, he provoked a theological controversy with the ministers in the castle of Edinburgh, reproaching them with pride in arrogating to themselves the right of expounding the true sense of the Solemn League and Covenant; vindicating the claim of laymen to preach the gospel and exhibit their spiritual gifts for the edification of their brethern; and maintaining that, after the solemn fasts observed by both nations, after their many and earnest appeals to the God of armies, the victory gained at Dunbar must be admitted an evident manifestation of the divine will in favour of the English commonwealth. Finding that he made no proselytes of his opponents, he published his arguments for the instruction of the Scottish people; but his zeal did not escape suspicion; and the more discerning believed that, under the cover of a religious controversy, he was in reality tampering with the fidelity of the governor.[h]

To raise a new army was now the first object of the Scottish government, but this could hardly be effected if the religious test were retained in all its rigour. The commissioners of the kirk, on being consulted, passed two resolutions to the following effect: those who had made defection or had been hitherto backward in the work, ought to be admitted to make profession of repentance, and on doing so might be allowed to serve and to defend their country. Mock penitents now appeared in abundance; royalists, engagers, and all the excluded crowded to court and camp. But a new schism hence arose, for the more rigid and fanatic portion of the clergy protested against the resolutions as an insult to God and a betrayal of the good cause.

[1651 A.D.]

The kirk was now split into resolutioners and protesters, or remonstrants; for the five most fanatic counties of the west, Renfrew, Ayr, Galloway, Wigton, and Dumfries, presented a remonstrance against the treaty with the king, and required him to be excluded from the government. On the first day of the new year, however, Charles was solemnly crowned at Scone, January 1, 1651. When he had sworn on his knees and with upraised hand to observe the two covenants, to maintain presbytery, govern according to the laws of God and the land, and root out false religion and heresy, the crown was placed on his head by the marquis of Argyll, and the nobility and people swore allegiance to him.[j]

During the ceremony, and after the conclusion, Douglas, the minister, addressed the king, reminding him that he was king by compact with his people; that his authority was limited by the law of God, the laws of the people, and the association of the estates with him in the government; that, though every breach did not dissolve the compact, yet every abuse of power to the subversion of religion, law, or liberty, justified opposition in the people; that it was for him, by his observance of the covenant, to silence those who doubted his sincerity; that the evils which had afflicted his family arose out of the apostasy of his father and grandfather; and that, if he imitated them, he would find that the controversy between him and God was not ended, but would be productive of additional calamities. The reader may imagine what were the feelings of Charles while he listened to the admonitions of the preacher, and when he swore to perform conditions which his soul abhorred, and which he knew that on the first opportunity he should break or elude. But he passed with credit through the ceremony; the coronation exalted him in the eyes of the people; and each day brought to him fresh accessions of influence and authority.[k] His friends were now admitted to parliament, and to gain Argyll more entirely to his side he hinted at a marriage with his daughter; but that wary nobleman was not to be caught by an offer in which he knew he was not sincere.

By the joint exertions of all parties, an army of twenty thousand men was assembled at Stirling in the month of April. The king himself took the chief command, with Hamilton for his lieutenant, and Leslie for his major-general. The passes of the Forth were secured, and the army was encamped in a strong position at the Torwood, near Stirling. Cromwell, who had been suffering so severely from ague as to have obtained permission to return to England, finding himself unexpectedly better at the approach of summer, resumed operations in July. By means of a fleet of boats which had been collected at Queensferry Overton passed over and fortified a hill at Inverkeithing; he was followed by Lambert; the Scottish force sent to oppose them was driven off (July 21st); Cromwell lost no time in transporting the remainder of the army; the whole of Fife was rapidly reduced, and Perth opened her gates August 2nd.

The communications of the royal army with the north were now cut off, and if it remained in its present position it must either starve, disband, or fight at a disadvantage. In this dilemma the king proposed the desperate expedient of a march into England; Argyll alone opposed it in the council, and when his reasons were rejected he obtained permission to retire to his estates. The king then at the head of fourteen thousand men left Stirling (July 31st) on his way for England. Cromwell immediately sent Lambert with a body of three thousand horse to hang on his rear, and he ordered Harrison to advance from Newcastle with an equal number to press on his flank; he himself, leaving Monk with five thousand men to complete the conquest of Scotland, moved rapidly (August 7th) in the direction of York.

THE BATTLE OF WORCESTER AND THE FLIGHT OF CHARLES (1651 A.D.)

Charles entered England at Carlisle; at Warrington (August 16th) Lambert and Harrison attempted to prevent his passage of the Mersey, but they were not in time to break down the bridge, and he passed them by, and marching rapidly through Cheshire and Shropshire came to Worcester (August 22nd), where he was solemnly proclaimed by the mayor and some of the gentlemen of the county. The aspect of his affairs was, however, by no means cheering. The royalists had not been prepared, and few of them came to join him; the committee of the kirk forbade anyone to be employed who did not take the covenant; and the attempts of Massey the defender of Gloucester, who was now one of the royal commanders, to raise men in Lancashire, failed in consequence of it. At the first intelligence of the king's march into England the council of state were in great alarm, for they supposed that it must have been concerted with the Presbyterians, and they expected the royalists everywhere to rise: they even suspected Cromwell of treachery. They soon however resumed their courage; they caused the declaration which Charles had published to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman; and they proclaimed him and all his abettors guilty of high-treason; they put suspected persons into prison, and ordered the militia of the adjoining counties to march toward Worcester.



CHARLES II
(1630-1685)

The very day that Charles entered Worcester, a Presbyterian clergyman named Love, and a layman named Gibbons, were beheaded on Tower Hill for their share in a conspiracy, in favour of royalty as is later described. Cromwell himself soon arrived (August 28th), and found himself at the head of thirty thousand men, while the royalists were not half the number and but a sixth part of them English. That very day Lambert made himself master of the bridge over the Severn at Upton, in the defence of which Massey received a severe wound which deprived the royal army of his valuable services. On the 3rd of September (the day of the victory at Dunbar) Fleetwood, advancing from Upton on the west bank of the Severn, proceeded to force the passage of the Team, while Cromwell threw a bridge of boats over the Severn to come to his aid. The Scots having the advantage of the

[1651 A.D.]

numerous hedges in that part, fought gallantly; but Cromwell having passed over some regiments, they were at length driven back to the city.

Meantime the remainder of the royal forces issued from the town and attacked the troops on the east side. At first their efforts were successful, but they were finally driven back by Cromwell's veteran reserve and forced into the city. Cromwell stormed the fort named Fort Royal,[1] and turned its guns on the town, which the royalists speedily abandoned. The battle had lasted five hours; the Scots had fought nobly. "This has been," said Cromwell in his despatch, "a very glorious mercy, and as stiff a contest for four or five hours as ever I have seen." Of the vanquished three thousand men were slain, of the victors only two hundred; but as the whole country rose against the Scots, whose speech betrayed them, the number of the prisoners amounted to ten thousand. Among these were the earls of Derby, Cleveland, and Shrewsbury of the English nobility, and the duke of Hamilton (who was mortally wounded), the earls of Lauderdale, Rothes, and Kelly, and the lords Sinclair, Kenmore, and Spynie of the Scottish; also the generals Leslie, Middleton, and Massey. The earl of Derby and two others were tried by a court-martial at Chester and put to death; the others were kept in prison, from which Massey and Middleton escaped.

"It is certain," says Godwin,[o] "there was on the whole a great spirit of clemency displayed in the limits the government thought proper to prescribe to itself on this occasion. Of the common soldiers taken prisoners, the greater part were sent to the plantations [as slaves], and fifteen hundred were granted to the Guinea merchants, and employed to work in the mines of Africa." Not one word of reprehension has the prejudiced historian to bestow on this barbarous treatment of the freeborn soldiers of an independent nation! The republicans seemed resolved, we may see, to tread faithfully in the foot-prints of the Greeks and Romans.

The dangers and escapes of Charles after the defeat of Worcester are so interesting in themselves and serve so much to display the nobler and more generous feelings of our nature, that we cannot refrain from relating them somewhat in detail. Charles, who had shown no want of courage during the battle, left the town with the Scottish horse; but he parted from them during the night with about sixty followers, and directed his course for Boscobel House in Staffordshire, the seat of Mrs. Cotton, a Catholic lady, where Lord Derby had found shelter some days before. He was, however, conducted instead to White Ladies, another of Mrs. Cotton's houses, and here his companions took leave of him. He cut off his hair, stained his face and hands, and putting on the coarse threadbare clothes of a rustic, went forth in the morning with a bill in his hand, as a wood-cutter, in the company of four brothers, labouring men, named Penderel, and Yates their brother-in-law, all Catholics. One of them accompanied him into the thickest part of the wood while the rest kept watch. As the day was wet and stormy and Charles was weary with his previous exertions, his companion spread a blanket for him under a tree, whither Yates' wife brought him some food. He was startled at the sight of her, but she assured him that she would die sooner than betray him; and the aged mother of the Penderels, when she

[1 Gardiner[b] says that Cromwell, at the risk of his own life, rode up to offer quarter. The entire army was either made prisoners or slain, and the force absolutely disappeared as a fighting unit. It was the first battle since Cropredy bridge in which non-professional soldiers took part, nearly a third of the English army being militia evoked by the hatred of invasion. As Gardiner points out Cromwell now for the first time had secured the popular support.]

11305 7

came to see him, fell on her knees and blessed God for having chosen her sons to save the life of their king.

About nine in the evening the king and Richard Penderel left the wood and proceeded to Madeley, the house of a Catholic gentleman named Wolf, which was near the Severn, it being his intention to pass over into Wales. They did not reach it till midnight; all the next day (September 5th) they remained concealed behind the hay in a barn, while Wolf sent to examine the river. But all the bridges were guarded and all the boats secured, and they found it necessary to abandon their design, and when night set in to direct their steps to Boscobel. Here the king met Colonel Careless, a Catholic royalist, and as the soldiers were very numerous about there they both concealed themselves all the next day in the dense foliage of an oak-tree which grew close to the foot-path in a meadow in the centre of the wood; whence they could frequently discern the red coats of the soldiers as they passed through the trees. In the night they returned to the house, where Charles remained quietly all the next day, which was Sunday. On Monday (the 8th) he received a message from Lord Wilmot, to meet him at Moseley, the house of Mr. Whitegrave, also a recusant. As his feet had been cut and blistered by the walk to and from Madeley, he rode a horse belonging to one of the Penderels, the six brothers attending him armed.

Here a new plan of escape was devised for him: Jane Lane, the daughter of a Protestant gentleman of Bentley, had obtained a pass to go visit Mrs. Norton, her relation, near Bristol, and it was proposed that the king should ride before her as her servant. To this she readily consented, and in the night Wilmot went to Bentley to make the arrangements. Next day (the 9th) a party of troopers came; the king was shut up in the "priest's hole,"[1] but they departed without searching the house. In the night he went to Bentley, and on the second day, equipped in a suit of gray he mounted before Miss Lane: her cousin, Lassells, rode beside them, and on the 14th they reached Mr. Norton's in safety. Wilmot, who had boldly ridden with a hawk on his fist and dogs at his heels, also eluded discovery, and he took up his abode at Sir John Winter's in the neighbourhood. Jane Lane, pretending that her servant was unwell, obtained a separate apartment for him; but the butler, who had been a servant in the palace at Richmond, recognised him as soon as he saw him. He told his suspicions to Lassells, and the king then deemed it his wisest course to confide in him. His confidence was not deceived; the man was faithful and zealous. By his means Wilmot had a private meeting with the king on the 17th; and as the butler had enquired without success for a ship to take them to France or Spain, it was arranged that they should go to Colonel Windham's at Trent, near Sherborne, in Dorset, and that a letter, as if her father were dangerously ill, should be given to Miss Lane to serve as a pretext for her sudden departure. They therefore left Mr. Norton's the next morning, and reached Trent the following day. Miss Lane and Lassells then returned home.

A ship was soon hired at Lyme to convey a gentleman and his servant (Wilmot and the king) to France. They went down in the evening of the 23rd, Charles riding before a young lady, to a little inn at Charmouth, where they were to be taken on board; but no bark came, for when the master was leaving his house for the purpose his wife had stopped him and would not suffer him to stir. At dawn Wilmot went to Lyme to learn the cause of the disappointment: the others meantime rode to Bridport, which was full of

[1 Catholic homes frequently had secret chambers where the priests could hide from persecution.]

[1651 A.D.]

soldiers; Charles led the horses through them into the inn-yard, rudely pushing them out of the way. But the hostler here claimed acquaintance with him, saying that he had known him in the service of a Mr. Potter at Exeter (in whose house Charles really had lodged). Taking advantage of the confusion of the hostler's memory, the king replied, "True, I did live with him, but I have no time now; we will renew our acquaintance over a pot of beer on my return to London."

When Wilmot came to say that the master would not put to sea, they rode back to Trent,[1] where the king stayed till the 8th of October, when he removed to Heale near Salisbury, the residence of a widow named Hyde, where he remained concealed for five days, during which Colonel Gunter, through one Mansell a merchant, engaged the master of a collier which was lying at Shoreham in Sussex. Charles rode to the adjoining fishing-village of Brighthelmstone on the 14th, where he sat down to supper with the colonels Philips and Gunter, and Mansell, and Tattershall the captain of the vessel. This last recognised the king, having been detained in the river by him in 1648. He called Mansell aside and complained of fraud; the king when informed took no notice, but kept them all drinking and smoking till four in the morning, when they set out for Shoreham. Ere he departed, as he was alone, the landlord came behind him and kissed his hand, which was on the back of a chair, saying, "I have no doubt that if I live I shall be a lord and my wife a lady." The king laughed.



HOUSE TO WHICH KING CHARLES II RETIRED WHILE THE BATTLE OF WORCESTER WAS RAGING

When they were aboard, Tattershall assured the king of his fidelity. The ship when under weigh stood along the coast as if for Deal, whither she was bound. At five, Charles, as had been arranged, addressed the crew, saying that he and his companion were flying from their creditors, and begged them to join him in prevailing on the captain to land them in France; at the same time he gave them twenty shillings for drink. The sailors became zealous advocates; Tattershall made many objections; at length he affected

[1 At Trent one day a trooper rode in and boasted that he had with his own hand slain Charles and taken from him the coat he then wore. The villagers rang the bells, and set bonfires going, and Charles had the rare privilege of looking on at the celebration of his own obsequies.]


to yield, and the next morning, October 16th, the two adventurers were put ashore at Fechamp in Normandy.

Cardinal de Retz *p* tells us, that Charles had not a second shirt when he reached Paris, nor his mother money enough to buy him one. After the Restoration, Careless and the Penderels were rewarded by the king; Miss Lane and Colonel Windham by the parliament.

Upwards of forty persons, it appears, were privy to the escape of Charles; a reward of 1,000*l.* had been offered (September 9th) for his apprehension; yet no one, not even a servant, was base enough to betray him. This surely is creditable to human nature. It is only to be regretted that the object of such devotion should have afterwards proved so worthless.*i*

Von Ranke notes the curious coincidence that the humble vessel in which Charles escaped carried him to Normandy, that spot whence long ago William had embarked for England with the noblest fleet of the time. The contrast with the present event was absolute. Furthermore the army of the Independents before whom Charles had fled, had often published its determination to destroy that constitution of the state which traced back to the Norman conquest. *q*





CHAPTER IV

CROMWELL AGAINST PARLIAMENT

[1651-1653 A.D.]

> In these kingdoms the commonwealth now held supreme authority. It had conquered everywhere the two hostile forces just as they were eager for reconciliation, the royal prerogative and the parliamentary or religious faction. In England the parliamentary party with its Presbyterian creed had been ruined from the moment it had tried to patch up a peace with Charles I. Scotland likewise was defeated in the moment of its arrival at a satisfactory understanding with Charles II. In Ireland Cromwell crushed both the Protestant and the Catholic parties when they were just about reconciled. In the history of Great Britain the epoch of the commonwealth is one of the great links in the general historical progress. By striking decisive blows for the commonwealth in all three countries, Cromwell wins an imperishable importance in Great Britain whatever opinion may be held of his personal achievements or his character. — VON RANKE.[b]

THE parliament and people of England felt that Cromwell had saved the commonwealth. He had done more than maintain a form of government. He had stopped the triumphant return to unlimited power of a prince who, once seated at Whitehall by military superiority, would have swept away every vestige of the liberty and security that had been won since 1640. The greater part of Europe was fast passing into complete despotism; and the state vessel of England would have been borne along helplessly into that shoreless sea. The enemies of Cromwell — the enthusiastic royalists and the theoretic republicans — saw, with dread and hatred, that by the natural course of events, the victorious general would become the virtual head of the commonwealth. He probably could not suppress the same conviction in his own breast. Ludlow[c] thus writes of Cromwell's return to London after the battle of Worcester: "The general, after this action, which he called the

crowning victory, took upon him a more stately behaviour, and chose new friends; neither must it be omitted, that instead of acknowledging the services of those who came from all parts to assist against the common enemy, though he knew they had deserved as much honour as himself and the standing army, he frowned upon them, and the very next day after the fight dismissed and sent them home, well knowing that a useful and experienced militia was more likely to obstruct than to second him in his ambitious designs.

"In a word, so much was he elevated with that success, that Mr. Hugh Peters, as he since told me, took so much notice of it, as to say in confidence to a friend upon the road in his return from Worcester, that Cromwell would make himself king." Again and again Ludlow dwells upon the expression used by Cromwell in his letter to the parliament, as if it were a foreshadowing of his own "crowning." Later writers accept it in the same sense. Cromwell's real phrase is this: "The dimensions of this mercy are above my thoughts: it is, for aught I know, a crowning mercy." To one who was as familiar with Scripture phraseology as Ludlow was, it seems extraordinary that he should attach any more recondite sense to this epithet than that of a perfecting mercy or victory. "Thou crownest the year with thy goodness" is the same as "Thou completest the year with thy goodness."[d]

The parliament seemed at a loss to express its gratitude to the man to whose splendid services the commonwealth owed its preservation. At Aylesbury, Cromwell was met by a deputation of the two commissioners of the great seal, the lord chief justice, and Sir Gilbert Pickering; to each of whom, in token of his satisfaction, he made a present of a horse and of two Scotsmen selected from his prisoners. At Acton he was received by the speaker and the lord president, attended by members of parliament and of the council, and by the lord mayor with the aldermen and sheriffs; and heard from the recorder, in an address of congratulation, that he was destined "to bind kings in chains, and their nobles in fetters of iron." He entered the capital (Oct. 12) in the state carriage, was greeted with the acclamations of the people as the procession passed through the city, and repaired to the palace of Hampton Court, where apartments had been fitted up for him and his family at the public expense. In parliament it was proposed that the 3rd of September should be kept a holiday forever in memory of his victory; a day was appointed for a general thanksgiving; and in addition to a former grant of lands to the amount of two thousand five hundred pounds per annum, other lands of the value of four thousand pounds were settled on him in proof of the national gratitude. Cromwell received these honours with an air of profound humility. He was aware of the necessity of covering the workings of ambition within his breast with the veil of exterior self-abasement; and therefore professed to take no merit to himself, and to see nothing in what he had done, but the hand of the Almighty fighting in behalf of his faithful servants.[1]

In the preceding chapter we have followed the fortunes of Charles Stuart from his landing in Scotland to his defeat at Worcester and his escape to the continent. We may now look back and direct our attention to some of the more important events which occurred during the same period, in England and Ireland. The reader is aware that the form of government established in England was an oligarchy. A few individuals, under the cover of a nominal

[1] "Next day, 13th, the common prisoners were brought through Westminster to Tuthill fields — a sadder spectacle was never seen except the miserable place of their defeat — and there sold to several merchants, and sent to the Barbadoes," says Heath. "Fifteen hundred were granted as slaves to the Guinea merchants, and transported to the Gold Coast in Africa.



CROMWELL AND HIS FAMILY LISTENING TO MILTON PLAYING THE ORGAN AT HAMPTON COURT

[illegible] the Queen's Collection, by the Gracious Command of Her Majesty

parliament, ruled the kingdom with the power of the sword. Could the sense of the nation have been collected, there cannot be a doubt that the old royalists of the cavalier, and the new royalists of the Presbyterian party, would have formed a decided majority; but they were awed into silence and submission by the presence of a standing army of forty-five thousand men; and the maxim that power gives right was held out as a sufficient reason why they should swear fidelity to the commonwealth. This numerous army, the real source of their security, proved, however, a cause of constant solicitude to the leaders.

The pay of the officers and men was always in arrear; the debentures which they received could be seldom exchanged for money without a loss of fifty, sixty, or seventy per cent.; and the plea of necessity was accepted as an excuse for the illegal claim of free quarters which they frequently exercised. To supply their wants, recourse was therefore had to additional taxation, with occasional grants from the excise, and large sales of forfeited property; and, to appease the discontent of the people, promises were repeatedly made, that a considerable portion of the armed force should be disbanded, and the practice of free quarter be abolished. But of these promises, the first proved a mere delusion; for, though some partial reductions were made, on the whole the amount of the army continued to increase; the second was fulfilled; but in return, the burthen of taxation was augmented; for the monthly assessment on the counties gradually swelled from sixty to ninety, to one hundred and twenty, and in conclusion, to one hundred and sixty thousand pounds.

Another subject of disquietude sprung out of those principles of liberty which, even after the suppression of the late mutiny, were secretly cherished and occasionally avowed by the soldiery. Lilburne was revered as an apostle and a martyr; they read with avidity the publications which repeatedly issued from his cell; and they condemned as persecutors and tyrants the men who had immured him and his companions in the Tower. An act was passed making it treason to assert that the government was tyrannical, usurped, or unlawful. No enactments, however, could check the hostility of Lilburne. He published more offensive tracts, and distributed them among the soldiery. A new mutiny broke out at Oxford; its speedy suppression emboldened the council; and Keble, with forty other commissioners, was appointed to try him for his last offence on the recent statute of treasons. He electrified the audience by frequent appeals to Magna Charta and the liberties of Englishmen, and stoutly maintained the doctrine that the jury had a right to judge of the law as well as of the fact. It was in vain that the court pronounced this opinion "the most damnable heresy ever broached in the land," and that the government employed all its influence to win or intimidate the jurors; after a trial of three days, Lilburne obtained a verdict of acquittal.

Before the end of the next year he drew upon himself the vengeance of the men in power, by the distribution of a pamphlet which charged Sir Arthur Haslerig and the commissioners at Haberdashers' Hall with injustice and tyranny. This by the house was voted a breach of privilege, and the offender was condemned (Jan. 16, 1652) in a fine of seven thousand pounds with banishment for life. Probably the court of Star Chamber never pronounced a judgment in which the punishment was more disproportionate to the offence. Lilburne submitted; but his residence on the continent was short: the reader will soon meet with him again in England.

The levellers had boldly avowed their object, the royalists worked in the dark and by stealth; yet the council by its vigilance and promptitude proved

a match for the open hostility of the one and the secret machinations of the other. A doubt may, indeed, be raised of the policy of the Engagement, a promise of fidelity to the commonwealth without king or house of lords. As long as it was confined to those who held office under the government, it remained a mere question of choice; but when it was exacted from all Englishmen above seventeen years of age, under the penalty of incapacity to maintain an action in any court of law, it became to numbers a matter of necessity and served rather to irritate than to produce security. A more efficient measure was the permanent establishment of a high court of justice to inquire into offences against the state, to which was added the organisation of a system of espionage by Captain Bishop, under the direction of Scott, a member of the council.

While the king was on his way to Scotland, a number of blank commissions had been seized in the possession of Dr. Lewen, a civilian, who suffered the penalty of death. Soon afterwards Sir John Gell, Colonel Eusebius Andrews, and Captain Benson, were arraigned on the charge of conspiring the destruction of the government established by law. Andrews and Benson suffered death, and Gell, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, with the forfeiture of his property. These executions did not repress the eagerness of the royalists, nor relax the vigilance of the council. In the beginning of December (1650) the friends of Charles took up arms in Norfolk, but the rising was premature; a body of roundheads dispersed the insurgents; and twenty of the latter atoned for their temerity with their lives. Still the failure of one plot did not prevent the formation of another; and many of the Presbyterians, through enmity to the principles of the Independents, devoted themselves to the interests of the prince. Love, one of the most celebrated of the ministers, was apprehended with several of his associates. It was clearly proved against him that the meetings had been held in his house, the money collected for the royalists had been placed on his table, and the letters received, and the answers to be returned, had been read in his hearing. The unfortunate minister lost his head on Tower Hill with the constancy and serenity of a martyr. Of his associates, only one, Gibbons, a citizen, shared his fate.[m]

FINAL CONQUEST OF SCOTLAND AND IRELAND

The Channel Islands, Scilly, Man, and the colonies of Barbadoes and Virginia had been reduced by the end of the year 1651. Scotland and Ireland only remained to occupy the attention of the council of state. The total conquest of Ireland was speedily achieved. After the departure of Cromwell, Ireton had reduced Waterford and Carlow, while Sir Charles Coote was equally successful in Ulster, and Lord Broghill in Munster. Connaught and the city of Limerick only remained to the Irish. Ormonde, thwarted and impeded in every possible manner by the priesthood, quitted the kingdom (Dec. 7), leaving his uneasy seat to be filled by the marquis of Clanricarde, a Catholic nobleman of high honour and unsullied loyalty. Clanricarde was half-brother to the late earl of Essex. Their mother was the daughter of Sir Francis Walsingham and widow of Sir Philip Sidney. A negotiation was meantime going on with that princely *condottiere* the duke of Lorraine for the service of himself and his army; but he required for himself, his heirs, and successors the title of protector-royal, with the chief civil and military authority, to be retained until Charles Stuart should repay him his expenses. To these extravagant demands the agents sent to Brussels subscribed (July 27, 1651); but Clanri-

[1652 A.D.]

carde rejected them with indignation, and the arrest of the duke by the Spanish government soon put an end to all hopes from that quarter.

Ireton opened the campaign of 1651 with the siege of Limerick (June 11). It had a garrison of three thousand men under Hugh O'Neil, the gallant defender of Clonmel, but the keys of the gates and the government of the city remained with the mayor. Coote advanced from the north, and in spite of Clanricarde pushed on to Portumna and Athunree; Broghill defeated Lord Muskerry, the Catholic commander in Munster; Ireton himself forced the passage of the Shannon at Killaloe, and transported a part of his army to the Clare side of that river; and Limerick was thus shut in on all sides. The defence was gallant, and it was not till after a siege of four months and a wide breach having been effected in the walls, that the people and the garrison consented to treat (Oct. 27). Twenty-two persons were excepted from mercy, of whom five, namely, the bishop of Emly, Woulfe a turbulent friar, Stritch the mayor, Barron one of the town-council, and General Purcell, were executed. The intercession of the members of the court-martial which tried him saved the life of the brave O'Neil. Ireton did not long outlive his conquest; he fell a victim to the plague, which was then raging in that part of the kingdom (Nov. 25). His remains were transmitted to England and honoured with a magnificent funeral in Westminster Abbey, and an estate of 2000*l.* a year was settled on his family. Lieutenant-General Ludlow, who succeeded to the command, completed the subjugation of the country in the following year.

The parliament appointed Lambert to the office of lord-deputy in Ireland (Jan. 30, 1652). Lambert, who was a vain ostentatious man, went immediately to great expense, laying out not less than 5000*l.* on his coach and equipage; but a simple accident came to terminate his visions of glory. His wife and Ireton's widow happened to meet in the park; the former, as the lady of the actual deputy, claimed precedence. The mortified relict complained to her father; about the same time she gave her hand to Lieutenant-General Fleetwood, who was now a widower; and to complete her triumph over her rival, it only remained that her husband and not Lambert should be the deputy, and this was easily effected. It was proposed to limit Lambert's commission to six months, but he objected to this and sent in his resignation. Cromwell was then empowered to appoint the commander of the forces for Ireland, and he nominated Fleetwood (July 9).

Commissioners, as in the case of Scotland, were appointed to regulate the affairs of Ireland. The people of that most unhappy country were treated as we shall now proceed to relate.*f*

CRUELTIES OF THE IRISH SETTLEMENT

One of the first cares of the commissioners was to satisfy the claims of vengeance. In the year 1644 the Catholic nobility had petitioned the king that an inquiry might be made into the murders alleged to have been perpetrated on each side in Ireland, and that justice might be executed on the offenders without distinction of country or religion. To the conquerors it appeared more expedient to confine the inquiry to one party; and a high court of justice was established to try Catholics charged with having shed the blood of any Protestant out of battle since the commencement of the rebellion in 1641. Donnelan, a native, was appointed president, with Commissary-General Reynolds, and Cook, who had acted as solicitor at the trial of Charles I. for his assessors. Lords Muskerry and Clanmaliere, with Mac-

carthy Reagh, whether they owed it to their innocence or to the influence of friends, had the good fortune to be acquitted; the mother of Colonel Fitzpatrick was burned; Lord Mayo, colonels Tool, Bagnal, and about two hundred more, suffered death by the axe or by the halter. It was, however, remarkable, that the greatest deficiency of proof occurred in the province where the principal massacres were said to have been committed. Of the men of Ulster, Sir Phelim O'Neil is the only one whose conviction and execution have been recorded.

Cromwell had not been long in the island before he discovered that it was impossible to accomplish the original design of extirpating the Catholic population; and he had therefore adopted the expedient of allowing their leaders to expatriate themselves with a portion of their countrymen, by entering into the service of foreign powers. This plan was followed by his successors in the war, and was perfected by an act of parliament, banishing all the Catholic officers. Each chieftain, when he surrendered, stipulated for a certain number of men: every facility was furnished him to complete his levy; and the exiles hastened to risk their lives in the service of the Catholic powers who hired them; many in that of Spain, others of France, others of Austria, and some of the republic of Venice. Thus the obnoxious population was reduced by the number of thirty, perhaps forty thousand able-bodied men; but it soon became a question how to dispose of their wives and families, of the wives and families of those who had perished by the ravages of disease and the casualties of war, and of the multitudes who, chased from their homes and employments, were reduced to a state of utter destitution. These at different times, to the amount of several thousands, were collected in bodies, driven on shipboard, and conveyed to the West Indies.

According to Petty,[g] six thousand boys and women were sent away. Lynch[h] (*Cambrensis Eversus*) says that they were sold for slaves. Bruodin[i] in his *Propugnaculum* (Prague, 1669), numbers the exiles at one hundred thousand. After the conquest of Jamaica in 1655, the protector, that he might people it, resolved to transport a thousand Irish boys and a thousand Irish girls to the island.

Yet with all these drains on the one party, and the continual accession of English and Scottish colonists on the other, the Catholic was found to exceed the Protestant population in the proportion of eight to one. Cromwell, when he had reached the zenith of his power, had recourse to a new expedient. He repeatedly solicited the fugitives, who, in the reign of the late king, had settled in New England, to abandon their plantations and accept of lands in Ireland. On their refusal, he made the same offer to the Vaudois, the Protestants of Piedmont, but was equally unsuccessful. They preferred their native valleys, though under the government of a Catholic sovereign, whose enmity they had provoked, to the green fields of Erin, and all the benefits which they might derive from the fostering care and religious creed of the protector. By an act of Aug. 12, 1652, entitled "An Act for the Settlement of Ireland," the parliament divided the royalists and Catholics into different classes, and allotted to each class an appropriate degree of punishment. Forfeiture of life and estate was pronounced against all the great proprietors of lands, banishment against those who had accepted commissions; the forfeiture of two-thirds of their estates against all who had borne arms under the confederates of the king's lieutenant, and the forfeiture of one-third against all persons whomsoever who had not been in the actual service of parliament, or had not displayed their constant affection to the commonwealth of England. This was the doom of persons of property: to all others, whose estates, real and personal, did not

[1652 A.D.]

amount to the value of ten pounds, a full and free pardon was graciously offered.

Care, however, was taken that the third parts, which by this act were to be restored to the original proprietors, were not to be allotted to them out of their former estates, but "in such places as the parliament, for the more effectual settlement of the peace of the nation, should think fit to appoint." When the first plan of extermination had failed, another project was adopted of confining the Catholic landholders to Connaught and Clare, beyond the river Shannon, and of dividing the remainder of the island, Leinster, Munster, and Ulster, among Protestant colonists. This, it was said, would prevent the quarrels which must otherwise occur between the new planters and the ancient owners; it would render rebellion more difficult and less formidable; and it would break the hereditary influence of the chiefs over their septs, and of the landlords over their tenants. Accordingly the Little Parliament, called by Cromwell and his officers (Sept. 26) passed a second act, which assigned to all persons, claiming under the qualifications described in the former, a proportionate quantity of land on the right bank of the Shannon; set aside the counties of Limerick, Tipperary, and Waterford in Munster, of King's County, Queen's County, Westmeath, and Meath in Leinster, and of Down, Antrim, and Armagh in Ulster, to satisfy in equal shares the English adventurers who had subscribed money in the beginning of the contest, and the arrears of the army that had served in Ireland since Cromwell took the command; reserved for the future disposal of the government the forfeitures in the counties of Dublin, Cork, Kildare, and Carlow; and charged those in the remaining counties with the deficiency, if there should be any in the first ten, with the liquidation of several public debts, and with the arrears of the Irish army contracted previously to the battle of Rathmines.

To carry this act into execution, the commissioners, by successive proclamations, ordered all persons who claimed under qualifications, and in addition, all who had borne arms against the parliament, to "remove and transplant" themselves into Connaught and Clare before the first of May, 1654. How many were prevailed upon to obey, is unknown; but that they amounted to a considerable number is plain from the fact that the lands allotted to them in lieu of their third portions extended to more than 800,000 English acres. Many, however, refused. Retiring into bogs and fastnesses, they formed bodies of armed men, and supported themselves and their followers by the depredations which they committed on the occupiers of their estates. They were called rapparees and tories. This celebrated party name, "tory," is derived from "toruighim," to pursue for the sake of plunder. So formidable did they become to the new settlers, that in certain districts, the sum of two hundred pounds was offered for the head of the leader of the band, and that of forty pounds for the head of any one of the privates. To maintain this system of spoliation, and to coerce the vindictive passions of the natives, it became necessary to establish martial law, and to enforce regulations the most arbitrary and oppressive. No Catholic was permitted to reside within any garrison or market town, or to remove more than one mile from his own dwelling without a passport describing his person, age, and occupation; every meeting of four persons besides the family was pronounced an illegal and treasonable assembly; to carry arms, or to have arms at home, was made a capital offence; and any transplanted Irishman, who was found on the left bank of the Shannon, might be put to death by the first person who met him, without the order of a magistrate.

Seldom has any nation been reduced to a state of bondage more galling

and oppressive. Under the pretence of the violation of these laws, their feelings were outraged, and their blood was shed with impunity. They held their property, their liberty, and their lives, at the will of the petty despots around them, foreign planters, and the commanders of military posts, who were stimulated by revenge and interest to depress and exterminate the native population. The religion of the Irish proved an additional source of solicitude to their fanatical conquerors. By one of the articles concluded with Lord Westmeath, it was stipulated that all the inhabitants of Ireland should enjoy the benefit of an act lately passed in England "to relieve peaceable persons from the rigours of former acts in matters of religion"; and that no Irish recusant should be compelled to assist at any form of service contrary to his conscience. When the treaty was presented for ratification, this concession shocked and scandalised the piety of the saints. The first part was instantly negatived; and, if the second was carried by a small majority through the efforts of Marten and Vane, it was with a proviso that "the article should not give any the least allowance, or countenance, or toleration, to the exercise of the Catholic worship in any manner whatsoever."

In the spirit of these votes the civil commissioners ordered by proclamation of January 6th, 1653, all Catholic clergymen to quit Ireland within twenty days, under the penalties of high treason, and forbade all other persons to harbour any such clergymen under the pain of death. Additional provisions tending to the same object followed in succession. Whoever knew of the concealment of a priest, and did not reveal it to the proper authorities, was made liable to the punishment of a public whipping and the amputation of his ears; to be absent on a Sunday from the service at the parish church, subjected the offender to a fine of thirty pence; and the magistrates were authorised to take away the children of Catholics and send them to England for education, and to tender the oath of abjuration to all persons of the age of one and twenty years, the refusal of which subjected them to imprisonment during pleasure, and to the forfeiture of two-thirds of their estates real and personal. During this period the Catholic clergy were exposed to a persecution far more severe than had ever been previously experienced in the island. The Irish people lay prostrate at the feet of their conquerors; the military were distributed in small bodies over the country; their vigilance was sharpened by religious antipathy and the hope of reward; and the means of detection were facilitated by the prohibition of travelling without a license from the magistrates. Of the many priests who still remained in the country, several were discovered, and forfeited their lives on the gallows; those who escaped detection concealed themselves in the caverns of the mountains, or in lonely hovels raised in the midst of the morasses, whence they issued during the night to carry the consolations of religion to the huts of their oppressed and suffering countrymen. A proclamation was also issued ordering all nuns to marry or leave Ireland. They were successively transported to Belgium, France, and Spain, where they were hospitably received in the convents of their respective orders.

THE SUBJUGATION OF SCOTLAND

In Scotland the power of the commonwealth was as firmly established as in Ireland. When Cromwell had hastened in pursuit of the king to Worcester, he had left Monk with eight thousand men to complete the conquest of the kingdom. Monk had invested Stirling, and the Highlanders who composed the garrison compelled the governor to capitulate (Aug. 14, 1651). The

[1651-1652 A.D.]

maiden castle, which had never been violated by the presence of a conqueror, submitted to the English "sectaries"; and, what was still more humbling to the pride of the nation, the royal robes, part of the regalia, and the national records, were irreverently torn from their repositories, and sent to London as the trophies of victory. Thence the English general marched forward to Dundee, where he received a proud defiance from Lumsden, the governor. During the preparations for the assault, he learned that the Scottish lords, whom Charles had entrusted with the government in his absence, were holding a meeting on the moor at Ellet, in Angus. By his order, six hundred horse, under the colonels Alured and Morgan, aided, as it was believed, by treachery, surprised them at an early hour in the morning (Aug. 28).

Three hundred prisoners were made, including the two committees of the estates and the kirk, several peers, and all the gentry of the neighbourhood; and these, with such other individuals as the general deemed hostile and dangerous to the commonwealth, followed the regalia and records of their country to the English capital. At Dundee a breach was soon made in the wall: the defenders shrunk from the charge of the assailants; and the governor and garrison were massacred (Sept. 1). Balfour[j] says "Mounche commaundit all, of quhatsummeuer sex, to be putt to the edge of the suord. Ther wer eight hundred inhabitants and souldiers killed, and about two hundred women and children. The plounder and buttie they gatte in the toune, exceided 2 millions and a halffe" (about £200,000). That, however, the whole garrison was not put to the sword appears from the mention in the Journals (Sept. 12) of a list of officers made prisoners, and from Monk's letter to Cromwell. Cary[k] says "There was killed of the enemy about five hundred, and two hundred or thereabouts taken prisoners. The stubbornness of the people enforced the soldiers to plunder the town."

Warned by this awful example, St. Andrews, Aberdeen, and Montrose opened their gates; the earl of Huntley and Lord Balcarres submitted; the few remaining fortresses capitulated in succession. To show the hopelessness of resistance, the army was successively augmented to the amount of twenty thousand men; citadels were marked out to be built of stone at Ayr, Leith, Perth, and Inverness; and a long chain of military stations drawn across the highlands served to curb, if it did not tame, the fierce and indignant spirit of the natives. The parliament declared the lands and goods of the crown public property, and confiscated the estates of all who had joined the king or the duke of Hamilton in their invasions of England, unless they were engaged in trade, and worth no more than £5, or not engaged in trade, and worth only £100.

All authority derived from any other source than the parliament of England was abolished by proclamation (Jan. 31, 1651); the different sheriffs, and civil officers of doubtful fidelity, were removed for others attached to the commonwealth; a yearly tax of £130,000 was imposed in lieu of free quarters for the support of the army; and English judges, assisted by three or four natives, were appointed to go the circuits, and to supersede the courts of session.

The English judges were astonished at the spirit of litigation and revenge which the Scots displayed during the circuit. More than one thousand individuals were accused before them of adultery, incest, and other offences, which they had been obliged to confess in the kirk during the last twenty or thirty years. When no other proof was brought, the charge was dismissed. In like manner sixty persons were charged with witchcraft. These were also acquitted; for, though they had confessed the offence, the confession had been drawn from them by torture. It was usual to tie up the supposed witch

by the thumbs, and to whip her till she confessed; or to put the flame of a candle to the soles of the feet, between the toes, or to parts of the head, or to make the accused wear a shirt of hair steeped in vinegar.

It was with grief and shame that the Scots yielded to these innovations; though they were attended with one redeeming benefit, the prevention of that anarchy and bloodshed which must have followed, had the cavaliers and covenanters, with forces nearly balanced, and passions equally excited, been left to wreak their vengeance on each other. But they were soon threatened with what in their eyes was a still greater evil.

The parliament resolved to incorporate the two countries into one commonwealth, without kingly government or the aristocratical influence of a house of peers. This was thought to fill up the measure of Scottish misery. Not only national but religious feelings were outraged. The ministers forbade the people to give support to the measure. The parliamentary commissioners (they were eight, with St. John and Vane at their head), secure of the power of the sword, derided the menaces of the kirk. They convened at Dalkeith the representatives of the counties and burghs, who were ordered to bring with them full powers to treat and conclude respecting the incorporation of the two countries. Twenty-eight out of thirty shires, and forty-four out of fifty-eight burghs, gave their consent; and the result was a second meeting at Edinburgh, in which twenty-one deputies were chosen to arrange the conditions with the parliamentary commissioners at Westminster. There conferences were held, and many articles discussed (Sept. 22, 1652); but, before the plan could be amicably adjusted, the parliament itself, with all its projects, was overturned by the successful ambition of Cromwell.

TRANSACTIONS WITH PORTUGAL AND SPAIN

From the conquest of Ireland and Scotland we may now turn to the transactions between the commonwealth and foreign powers. The king of Portugal was the first who provoked its anger, and felt its vengeance. At an early period in 1649, Prince Rupert, with the fleet which had revolted from the parliament to the late king, had sailed from the Texel, swept the Irish Channel, and inflicted severe injuries on the English commerce. Vane, to whose industry had been committed the care of the naval department, had made every exertion to equip a formidable armament, the command of which was given to three military officers, Blake,[1] Deane, and Popham. Rupert retired before this superior force to the harbour of Kinsale; the batteries kept his enemies at bay; and the Irish supplied him with men and provisions. At length the victories of Cromwell by land compelled him to quit his asylum; and, with the loss of three ships, he burst through the blockading squadron, sailed to the coast of Spain, and during the winter months sought shelter in the waters of the Tagus. In March, 1650, Blake appeared with eighteen men-of-war at the mouth of the river; to his request that he might be allowed to attack the pirate at his anchorage, he received from the king of Portugal a peremptory refusal; and, in his attempt to force his way up the river he was driven back by the fire from the batteries.

In obedience to his instructions, he revenged himself on the Portuguese trade, and John IV. by way of reprisal, arrested the English merchants, and took possession of their effects. Alarmed, however, by the losses of his subjects, he compelled Rupert to quit the Tagus (Dec. 17), and despatched an

[1 Blake had never been to sea when he took command at the age of fifty, but he speedily revolutionised old-school methods.]

[1652 A.D.]

envoy, named Guimaraes, to solicit an accommodation. Rupert sailed into the Mediterranean, and maintained himself by piracy, capturing not only English but Spanish and Genoese ships. All who did not favour him were considered as enemies. Driven from the Mediterranean by the English, he sailed to the West Indies, where he inflicted greater losses on the Spanish than the English trade. Here his brother, Prince Maurice, perished in a storm; and Rupert, unable to oppose his enemies with any hope of success, returned to Europe, and anchored in the harbour of Nantes, in March, 1652. He sold his two men-of-war to Cardinal Mazarin. The progress of the treaty with Portugal was interrupted by the usurpation of Cromwell, and another year elapsed before it was concluded. By it valuable privileges were granted to the English traders; four commissioners — two English and two Portuguese, were appointed to settle all claims against the Portuguese government; and it was agreed that an English commissary should receive one-half of all the duties paid by the English merchants in the ports of Portugal, to provide a sufficient fund for the liquidation of the debt.

To Charles I (nor will it surprise us, if we recollect his treatment of the infanta) the court of Spain had always behaved with coldness and reserve. The ambassador Cardenas continued to reside in London, even after the king's execution, and was the first foreign minister whom the parliament honoured with a public audience. He made it his chief object to cement the friendship between the commonwealth and his own country, fomented the hostility of the former against Portugal and the United Provinces, the ancient enemies of Spain, and procured the assent of his sovereign that an accredited minister from the parliament should be admitted by the court of Madrid. The individual selected for this office was Ascham, a man who, by his writings, had rendered himself peculiarly obnoxious to the royalists. He landed near Cadiz, proceeded under an escort for his protection to Madrid, and repaired to an inn, till a suitable residence could be procured. The next day, while he was sitting at dinner with Riba, a renegado friar, his interpreter, six Englishmen entered the house; four remained below to watch; two burst into the room, exclaiming, "Welcome, gallants, welcome"; and in a moment both the ambassador and the interpreter lay on the floor weltering in their blood. Of the assassins, one — Sparkes, a native of Hampshire — was taken about three miles from the city; and the parliament, unable to obtain more, appeared to be content with the blood of this single victim.

RELATIONS WITH HOLLAND; THE NAVIGATION ACT

These negotiations ended peaceably; those between the commonwealth and the United Provinces, though commenced with friendly feelings, led to hostilities. It might have been expected that the Dutch, mindful of the glorious struggle for liberty maintained by their fathers, and crowned with success by the Treaty of Munster, would have viewed with exultation the triumph of the English republicans. But William II, prince of Orange, had married a daughter of Charles I; his views and interests were espoused by the military and the people; and his adherents possessed the ascendancy in the states general and in all the provincial states, excepting those of Friesland and Holland. As long as he lived, no atonement could be obtained for the murder of Dorislaus, no audience for Strickland, the resident ambassador, though that favour was repeatedly granted to Boswell, the envoy of Charles. However, in November, 1650, the prince had died of the small-pox

in his twenty-fourth year; and a few days later his widow was delivered of a son, William III, the same who subsequently ascended the throne of England. The infancy of his successor emboldened the democratical party; they abolished the office of stadtholder, and recovered the ascendency in the government.

Among the numerous projects which the English leaders cherished under the intoxication of success, was that of forming, by the incorporation of the United Provinces with the commonwealth, a great and powerful republic, capable of striking terror into all the crowned heads of Europe. But so many difficulties were foreseen, so many objections raised, that the ambassadors received instructions to confine themselves to the more sober proposal of "a strict and intimate alliance and union, which might give to each a mutual and intrinsical interest" in the prosperity of the other. The states had not forgotten the offensive delay of the parliament to answer their embassy of intercession for the life of Charles I; nor did they brook the superiority which it now assumed, by prescribing a certain term within which the negotiation should be concluded. Pride was met with equal pride. The states, having demanded in vain an explanation of the proposed confederacy, presented a counter project; but while the different articles remained under discussion, the period prefixed by the parliament expired, and the ambassadors departed. To whom the failure of the negotiation was owing became a subject of controversy. The Hollanders blamed the abrupt and supercilious carriage of St. John and his colleague; the ambassadors charged the states with having purposely created delay, that they might not commit themselves by a treaty with the commonwealth, before they had seen the issue of the contest between the king of Scotland and Oliver Cromwell.

In a short time that contest was decided in the battle of Worcester, and the states condescended to become petitioners in their turn. Their ambassadors arrived in England with the intention of resuming the negotiation where it had been interrupted by the departure of St. John and his colleague. But circumstances were now changed; success had enlarged the pretensions of the parliament; and the British, instead of shunning, courted a trial of strength with the Belgic lion. First the Dutch merchantmen were visited under the pretext of searching for munitions of war, which they were carrying to the enemy; and then, at the representation of certain merchants, who conceived themselves to have been injured by the Dutch navy, letters of marque were granted to several individuals, and more than eighty prizes brought into the English ports.

In addition, the Navigation Act had been passed and carried into execution, by which it was enacted that no goods, the produce of Africa, Asia, and America, should be imported into England in ships which were not the property of England or its colonies; and that no produce or manufacture of any part of Europe should be imported, unless in ships the property of England or of the country of which such merchandise was the proper growth or manufacture. Hitherto the Dutch had been the common carriers of Europe; by this act, the offspring of St. John's resentment, one great and lucrative branch of their commercial prosperity was lopped off, and the first, but fruitless demand of the ambassadors was that, if not repealed, it should at least be suspended during the negotiation. The Dutch merchants had solicited permission to indemnify themselves by reprisals; but the states ordered a numerous fleet to be equipped, and announced to all the neighbouring powers that their object was, not to make war, but to afford protection to their commerce. By the council of state, the communication was received

[1652 A.D.]

as a menace; the English ships of war were ordered to exact in the narrow seas the same honour to the flag of the commonwealth as had been formerly paid to that of the king; and the ambassadors were reminded of the claim of indemnification for the losses sustained by the English in the East Indies, of a free trade from Middelburg to Antwerp, and of the tenth herring which was due from the Dutch fishermen for the permission to exercise their trade in the British seas.

NAVAL BATTLES OF BLAKE AND TROMP

While the conferences were yet pending, Commodore Young met a fleet of Dutch merchantmen under convoy in the Channel (May 12, 1652); and, after a sharp action, compelled the men-of-war to salute the English flag. A few days later (May 18) the celebrated Tromp appeared with two-and-forty sail in the Downs. He had been instructed to keep at a proper distance from the English coast, neither to provoke nor to shun hostility, and to salute or not according to his own discretion; but on no account to yield to the newly-claimed right of search. To Bourne, the English commander, he apologised for his arrival, which, he said, was not with any hostile design, but in consequence of the loss of several anchors and cables on the opposite coast. The next day (May 19) he met Blake off the harbour of Dover; an action took place between the rival commanders; and, when the fleets separated in the evening, the English cut off two ships of thirty guns, one of which they took, the other they abandoned, on account of the damage which it had received. It was a question of some importance who was the aggressor. By Blake it was asserted that Tromp had gratuitously come to insult the English fleet in its own roads, and had provoked the engagement by firing the first broadside. The Dutchman replied that he was cruising for the protection of trade; that the weather had driven him on the English coast; that he had no thought of fighting till he received the fire of Blake's ships; and that, during the action, he had carefully kept on the defensive, though he might with his great superiority of force have annihilated the assailants.



ROBERT BLAKE
(1598–1657)

The great argument of the parliament in their declaration is the following: Tromp came out of his way to meet the English fleet, and fired on Blake without provocation; the states did not punish him, but retained him in the command; therefore he acted by their orders, and the war was begun by them. Each of these assertions was denied on the other side. Tromp showed the reasons which led him into the track of the English fleet; and the states asserted, from the evidence before them, that Tromp had ordered his

sails to be lowered, and was employed in getting ready his boat to compliment the English admiral at the time when he received a broadside from the impatience of Blake.

The reader will probably think, that those who submitted to solicit the continuance of peace were not the first to seek the commencement of hostilities. Immediately after the action at sea, the council ordered the English commanders to pursue, attack, and destroy all vessels the property of the United Provinces; and, in the course of a month, more than seventy sail of merchantmen, besides several men-of-war, were captured, stranded, or burnt. The Dutch, on the contrary, abstained from reprisals; their ambassadors thrice assured the council that the battle had happened without the knowledge, and to the deep regret of the states; and on each occasion earnestly deprecated the adoption of hasty and violent measures, which might lead to consequences highly prejudicial to both nations. They received an answer, which, assuming it as proved that the states intended to usurp the rights of England on the sea, and to destroy the navy, the bulwark of those rights, declared that it was the duty of parliament to seek reparation for the past, and security for the future. Soon afterwards Pauw, the grand pensionary of Holland, arrived. He proposed that a court of inquiry, consisting of an equal number of commissioners from each nation, should be appointed, and exemplary punishment inflicted on the officer who should be found to have provoked the engagement; and demanded that hostilities should cease, and the negotiation be resumed. He was told by order of parliament, that the English government expected full compensation for all the charges to which it had been put by the preparations and attempts of the states, and hoped to meet with security for the future in an alliance which should render the interests of both nations consistent with each other. These, it was evident were conditions to which the pride of the states would refuse to stoop; Pauw demanded an audience of leave of the parliament (June 30); and all hope of reconciliation vanished.

If the Dutch had hitherto solicited peace, it was not that they feared the result of war. The sea was their native element; and the fact of their maritime superiority had long been openly or tacitly acknowledged by all the powers of Europe. But they wisely judged that no victory by sea could repay them for the losses which they must sustain from the extinction of their fishing trade, and the suspension of their commerce. For the commonwealth, on the other hand, it was fortunate that the depredations of Prince Rupert had turned the attention of the leaders to naval concerns. Their fleet had been four years in commission;[1] the officers and men were actuated by the same spirit of civil liberty and religious enthusiasm which distinguished the land army; Ayscue had just returned from the reduction of Barbadoes with a powerful squadron; and fifty additional ships were ordered to be equipped, an object easily accomplished at a time when any merchantman capable of carrying guns could, with a few alterations, be converted into a man-of-war. Ayscue with the smaller division of the fleet remained at home to scour the Channel.

Blake sailed to the north, captured the squadron appointed to protect the Dutch fishing-vessels, exacted from the busses the duty of every tenth herring, and sent them home with a prohibition against fishing without a license from the English government. In the meanwhile Tromp sailed from the Texel with seventy men-of-war. It was expected in Holland that

[1 As Gardiner points out, the Dutch were out of practice, having had no fighting since 1639.]

[1652 A.D.]

he would sweep the English navy from the face of the ocean. His first attempt was to surprise Ayscue, who was saved by a calm followed by a change of wind. He then sailed to the north in search of Blake. But his fleet was dispersed by a storm; and on his return he was received with murmurs and reproaches by the populace. Indignant at a treatment which he had not deserved, he justified his conduct before the states, and then laid down his commission. De Ruyter, a name almost equally illustrious on the ocean, was appointed his successor. That officer sailed to the mouth of the channel, took under his charge a fleet of merchantmen, and on his return was opposed by Ayscue with nearly an equal force. The English commander burst through the enemy, and was followed by nine sail; the rest of the fleet took no share in the action, and the convoy escaped. The blame rested not with Ayscue, but with his inferior officers; but the council took the opportunity to lay him aside, not that they doubted his courage or abilities, but because he was suspected of a secret leaning to the royal cause. To console him for his disgrace, he received a present of three hundred pounds, with a grant of land of the same annual rent in Ireland.

De Witt now joined De Ruyter, and took the command. Blake accepted the challenge of battle (Sept. 28) off the Kentish Knock, and night alone separated the combatants. The next morning the Dutch fled, and were pursued as far as the Gorée. Their ships were in general of smaller dimensions, and drew less water than those of their adversaries, who dared not follow among the numerous sand-banks with which the coast is studded.[m] The English commander Appleton sent to convoy home the Smyrna fleet was blockaded in Leghorn by a Dutch fleet and on August 27th Badiley, sent to his relief, was attacked near Elba by the Dutch under Van Galen and was driven to take refuge in a friendly Spanish port after losing a ship. Meanwhile the Danish king had detained twenty English merchantmen. Parliament now ordered thirty new frigates built.[a] Blake, supposing that naval operations would be suspended during the winter, had detached several squadrons to different ports, and was riding in the Downs with thirty-seven sail, when he was surprised by the appearance of a hostile fleet of double that number, under the command of Tromp, whose wounded pride had been appeased with a new commission.[1] A mistaken sense of honour induced the English admiral to engage in the unequal contest. The battle raged from eleven in the morning till night. The English, though they burned a large ship and disabled two others, lost five sail either sunk or taken; and Blake, under cover of the darkness, ran up the river as far as Leigh. Tromp sought his enemy at Harwich and Yarmouth; returning, he insulted the coast as he passed; and continued to cruise backwards and forwards from the North Foreland to the Isle of Wight [capturing prizes, including one man-of-war. Dutch sailors also landed on the coast of Sussex and carried off cattle].

The parliament made every exertion to wipe away this disgrace. The ships were speedily refitted; two regiments of infantry embarked to serve as marines; a bounty was offered for volunteers; the wages of the seamen were raised; provision was made for their families during their absence on service; a new rate for the division of prize-money was established; and, in aid of Blake, two officers, whose abilities had been already tried, Deane and Monk, received the joint command of the fleet. On the other hand, the Dutch were

[1 According to Gardiner Blake went into battle with 45 sail to Tromp's 85. Blake's ships, however, were as a rule much more powerful than Tromp's. But 20 of Blake's ships kept out of the fight. See also the history of the Netherlands, chapter XIV, for the Dutch view of the wars.]

intoxicated with their success; they announced it to the world in prints, poems, and publications; and Tromp affixed a broom to the head of his mast as an emblem of his triumph.[1] He had gone to the Île de Ré to take homeward-bound trade under his charge, with orders to resume his station at the mouth of the Thames, and to prevent the egress of the English. But Blake had already stationed himself with more than seventy sail across the Channel, opposite the Isle of Portland, to intercept the return of the enemy. On the 18th of February, 1653, the Dutch fleet, equal in number, with one hundred and fifty merchantmen under convoy, was discovered near Cape La Hogue, steering along the coast of France. The action was maintained with the most desperate obstinacy. The Dutch lost six sail, either sunk or taken, the English one, but several were disabled, and Blake himself was severely wounded.

The following morning the enemy were seen opposite Weymouth, drawn up in the form of a crescent covering the merchantmen. Many attempts were made to break through the line; and so imminent did the danger appear to the Dutch admiral, that he made signal for the convoy to shift for themselves.[2] The battle lasted at intervals through the night; it was renewed with greater vigour near Boulogne in the morning; till Tromp, availing himself of the shallowness of the coast, pursued his course homeward unmolested by the pursuit of the enemy. The victory was decidedly with the English; the loss in men might be equal on both sides; but the Dutch themselves acknowledged that nine of their men-of-war and twenty-four of the merchant vessels had been either sunk or captured.

CROMWELL'S GROWING AMBITION

This was the last naval victory achieved under the auspices of the parliament, which, though it wielded the powers of government with an energy that surprised the several nations of Europe, was doomed to bend before the superior genius or ascendancy of Cromwell. When he first formed the design of seizing the supreme authority, is uncertain; it was not till after the victory at Worcester that he began gradually and cautiously to unfold his object. He saw himself crowned with the laurels of conquest; he held the command in chief of a numerous and devoted army; and he dwelt with his family in a palace formerly the residence of the English monarchs. His adversaries had long ago pronounced him, in all but name, "a king"; and his friends were accustomed to address him in language as adulatory as ever gratified the ears of the most absolute sovereign. His importance was perpetually forced upon his notice by the praise of his dependants, by the foreign envoys who paid court to him, and by the royalists who craved his protection. In such circumstances it cannot be surprising if the victorious general indulged the aspirings of ambition; if the stern republican, however he might hate to see the crown on the brows of another, felt no repugnance to place it upon his own.

The grandees of the army felt that they no longer possessed the chief sway in the government. War had called them away to their commands in Scot-

[1 This story though discredited by some writers is accepted by the vast majority.]

[2 As Gardiner[1] points out Tromp had long been removed from his base of refitting, and his ammunition now gave out, half of his ships having none at all; while Blake's fleet was fully supplied. Gardiner says that while the victory remained with the English it was due to circumstances rather than to their commanders and "the honours of that heroic struggle lay with Tromp" for his "magnificent seamanship and undaunted courage." The geographical position of England, he says, gave her always an advantage over Dutch commerce which must always be convoyed in time of war thus hampering any war fleet.]

[1652 A.D.]

land and Ireland; and during their absence, the conduct of affairs had devolved on those who, in contradistinction, were denominated the statesmen. Thus, by the course of events, the servants had grown into masters, and the power of the senate had obtained the superiority over the power of the sword. Still the officers in their distant quarters jealously watched, and severely criticised the conduct of the men at Westminster. With want of vigour in directing the military and naval resources of the country, they could not be charged; but it was complained that they neglected the internal economy of government; that no one of the objects demanded in the Agreement of the People had been accomplished; and that, while others sacrificed their health and their lives in the service of the commonwealth, all the emoluments and patronage were monopolized by the idle drones who remained in the capital.

On the return of the lord-general, the council of officers had been re-established at Whitehall (Sept. 16, 1651); and their discontent was artfully employed by Cromwell in furtherance of his own elevation. When he resumed his seat in the house, he reminded the members of their indifference to two measures earnestly desired by the country, the Act of Amnesty and the termination of the present parliament. Bills for each of these objects had been introduced as far back as 1649; but, after some progress, both were suffered to sleep in the several committees; and this backwardness of the "statesmen" was attributed to their wish to enrich themselves by forfeitures, and to perpetuate their power by perpetuating the parliament. The influence of Cromwell revived both questions. An Act of Oblivion was obtained (Feb. 24, 1652), which, with some exceptions, pardoned all offences committed before the battle of Worcester, and relieved the minds of the royalists from the apprehension of additional forfeitures. On the question of the expiration of parliament, after several warm debates, the period had been fixed (Nov. 18, 1651) for the 3rd of November, 1654; a distance of three years, which, perhaps, was not the less pleasing to Cromwell, as it served to show how unwilling his adversaries were to resign their power. The interval was to be employed in determining the qualifications of the succeeding parliament.

In the winter, the lord-general called a meeting of officers and members at the house of the speaker; and it must have excited their surprise, when he proposed to them to deliberate, whether it were better to establish a republic, or a mixed form of monarchical government. The officers in general pronounced in favour of a republic, as the best security for the liberties of the people; the lawyers pleaded unanimously for a limited monarchy, as better adapted to the laws, the habits, and the feelings of Englishmen. With the latter Cromwell agreed, and inquired whom in that case they would choose for king. It was replied, either Charles Stuart or the duke of York, provided they would comply with the demands of the parliament; if they would not, the young duke of Gloucester, who could not have imbibed the despotic notions of his elder brothers. This was not the answer which Cromwell sought: he heard it with uneasiness; and, as often as the subject was resumed, diverted the conversation to some other question. In conclusion, he gave his opinion, that, "somewhat of a monarchical government would be most effectual, if it could be established with safety to the liberties of the people, as Englishmen and Christians." That the result of the meeting disappointed his expectations, is evident; but he derived from it this advantage, that he had ascertained the sentiments of many, whose aid he might subsequently require. None of the leaders from the opposite party appear to have been present.

Jealous, however, of his designs, "the statesmen" had begun to fight him with his own weapons. As the commonwealth had no longer an enemy to

contend with on the land, they proposed a considerable reduction in the number of the forces, and a proportionate reduction of the taxes raised for their support. The motion was too reasonable in itself, and too popular in the country, to be resisted with safety: one-fourth of the army was disbanded (Dec. 19), and the monthly assessment lowered from one hundred and twenty thousand pounds to ninety thousand pounds. Before the expiration of six months, the question of a further reduction was brought forward; but the council of war took the alarm, and a letter from Cromwell to the speaker induced the house to continue its last vote. In a short time it was again mentioned; but (August 13) six officers appeared at the bar of the house with a petition from the army, which, under pretence of praying for improvements, tacitly charged the members with the neglect of their duty. Whitelocke remonstrated with Cromwell on the danger of permitting armed bodies to assemble and petition. He slighted the advice.

Soon afterwards the lord-general requested a private and confidential interview with that lawyer. So violent, he observed, was the discontent of the army, so imperious the conduct of the parliament, that it would be impossible to prevent a collision of interests, and the subsequent ruin of the good cause, unless there were established "some authority so full and so high" as to be able to check these exorbitances, and to restrain the parliament. Whitelocke replied, that, to control the supreme power was legally impossible. All, even Cromwell himself, derived their authority from it. At these words the lord-general abruptly exclaimed, "What, if a man should take upon him to be king?" The commissioner answered that the title would confer no additional benefit on his excellency. By his command of the army, his ascendancy in the house, and his reputation, both at home and abroad, he already enjoyed, without the envy of the name, all the power of a king. When Cromwell insisted that the name would give security to his followers, and command the respect of the people, Whitelocke rejoined, that it would change the state of the controversy between the parties, and convert a national into a personal quarrel. His friends had cheerfully fought with him to establish a republican in place of monarchical government; would they equally fight with him in favour of the house of Cromwell against the house of Stuart? They separated; and Whitelocke soon discovered that he had forfeited his confidence.

CROMWELL DISSOLVES THE LONG PARLIAMENT APRIL 20TH, 1653

At length Cromwell fixed on a plan to accomplish his purpose by procuring the dissolution of the parliament, and vesting for a time the sovereign authority in a council of forty persons, with himself at their head. It was his wish to effect this quietly by the votes of parliament — his resolution to effect it by open force, if such votes were refused. Several meetings were held by the officers and members at the lodgings of the lord-general in Whitehall. St. John and a few others gave their assent; the rest, under the guidance of Whitelocke and Widdrington, declared that the dissolution would be dangerous, and the establishment of the proposed council unwarrantable. On the last meeting, held on the 19th of April, 1653, all these points were long and warmly debated. Some of the officers declared that the parliament must be dissolved "one way or other"; but the general checked their indiscretion and precipitancy; and the assembly broke up at midnight, with an understanding that the leading men on each side should resume the subject in the morning. At an early hour (April 20) the conference was recommenced, and after a short time interrupted, in consequence of the receipt of a notice by the general

[1653 A.D.]

that it was the intention of the house to comply with the desires of the army. This was a mistake: the opposite party, led by Vane, who had discovered the object of Cromwell, had indeed resolved to pass a bill of dissolution, not, however, the bill proposed by the officers, but their own bill, containing all the obnoxious provisions; and to pass it that very morning, that it might obtain the force of law before their adversaries could have time to appeal to the power of the sword. While Harrison "most sweetly and humbly" conjured them to pause before they took so important a step, Ingoldsby hastened to inform the lord-general at Whitehall. His resolution was immediately formed; and a company of musketeers received orders to accompany him to the house.

At this eventful moment, big with the most important consequences both to himself and his country, whatever were the workings of Cromwell's mind, he had the art to conceal them from the eyes of the beholders. Leaving the military in the lobby, he entered the house, and composedly seated himself on one of the outer benches. His dress was a plain suit of black cloth, with grey worsted stockings. For a while he seemed to listen with interest to the debate; but, when the speaker was going to put the question, he whispered to Harrison, "This is the time; I must do it"; and rising, put off his hat to address the house. At first his language was decorous and even laudatory. Gradually he became more warm and animated: at last he assumed all the vehemence of passion, and indulged in personal vituperation. He charged the members with self-seeking and profaneness; with the frequent denial of justice, and numerous acts of oppression; with idolising the lawyers, the constant advocates of tyranny; with neglecting the men who had bled for them in the field, that they might gain the Presbyterians who had apostatised from the cause; and with doing all this in order to perpetuate their own power, and to replenish their own purses. But their time was come; the Lord had disowned them; he had chosen more worthy instruments to perform his work.

Here the orator was interrupted by Sir Peter Wentworth, who declared that he never before heard language so unparliamentary, language, too, the more offensive, because it was addressed to them by their own servant, whom they had too fondly cherished, and whom, by their unprecedented bounty, they had made what he was. At these words Cromwell put on his hat, and, springing from his place, exclaimed, "Come, come, sir, I will put an end to your prating." For a few seconds, apparently in the most violent agitation, he paced forward and backward, and then, stamping on the floor, added, "You are no parliament. I say you are no parliament: bring them in, bring them in." Instantly the door opened, and Colonel Worseley entered, followed by more than twenty musketeers. "This," cried Sir Henry Vane, "is not honest. It is against morality and common honesty." "Sir Henry Vane," replied Cromwell, "O Sir Henry Vane! The Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane! He might have prevented this. But he is a juggler, and has not common honesty himself." From Vane he directed his discourse to Whitelocke, on whom he poured a torrent of abuse; then, pointing to Challoner, "There," he cried, "sits a drunkard"; next, to Marten and Wentworth, "There are two whoremasters"; and afterwards, selecting different members in succession, described them as dishonest and corrupt livers, a shame and a scandal to the profession of the gospel.

Suddenly, however, checking himself, he turned to the guard, and ordered them to clear the house. At these words Colonel Harrison took the speaker by the hand, and led him from the chair; Algernon Sidney was next compelled to quit his seat; and the other members, eighty in number, on approach of the

military, rose and moved towards the door. Cromwell now resumed his discourse. "It is you," he exclaimed, "that have forced me to do this. I have sought the Lord both day and night, that he would rather slay me, than put me on the doing of this work." Alderman Allen took advantage of these words to observe, that it was not yet too late to undo what had been done; but Cromwell instantly charged him with peculation, and gave him into custody. When all were gone, fixing his eye on the mace, "What," said he, "shall we do with this fool's bauble? Here, carry it away." Then, taking the act of dissolution from the clerk, he ordered the doors to be locked, and, accompanied by the military, returned to Whitehall.

That afternoon the members of the council assembled in their usual place of meeting. Bradshaw had just taken the chair, when the lord-general entered, and told them, that if they were there as private individuals, they were welcome; but, if as the council of state, they must know that the parliament was dissolved, and with it also the council. "Sir," replied Bradshaw, with the spirit of an ancient Roman, "we have heard what you did at the house this morning, and before many hours all England will know it. But, sir, you are mistaken to think that the parliament is dissolved. No power under heaven can dissolve them but themselves. Therefore take you notice of that." After this protest they withdrew.

REVIEW OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT

Thus, by the parricidal hands of its own children, perished the Long Parliament, which, under a variety of forms, had, for more than twelve years, defended and invaded the liberties of the nation. It fell without a struggle or a groan, unpitied and unregretted. The members slunk away to their homes, where they sought by submission to purchase the forbearance of their new master; and their partisans, if partisans they had, reserved themselves in silence for a day of retribution, which came not before Cromwell slept in his grave. The royalists congratulated each other on an event which they deemed a preparatory step to the restoration of the king; the army and navy, in numerous addresses, declared that they would live or die, stand or fall, with the lord-general, and in every part of the country the congregations of the saints magnified the arm of the Lord which had broken the mighty, that in lieu of the sway of mortal men, "the fifth monarchy, the reign of Christ, might be established upon earth."

It would, however, be unjust to the memory of those who exercised the supreme power after the death of the king, not to acknowledge that there existed among them men capable of wielding with energy the destinies of a great empire. They governed only four years; yet, under their auspices, the conquests of Ireland and Scotland were achieved, and a navy was created, the rival of that of Holland and the terror of the rest of Europe. But there existed an essential error in their form of government. Deliberative assemblies are always slow in their proceedings; yet the pleasure of parliament, as the supreme power, was to be taken on every subject connected with the foreign relations, or the internal administration of the country; and hence it happened that, among the immense variety of questions which came before it, those commanded immediate attention which were deemed of immediate necessity: while the others, though often of the highest importance to the national welfare, were first postponed, then neglected, and ultimately forgotten. To this habit of procrastination was perhaps owing the extinction of its

[1653 A.D.]

authority. It disappointed the hopes of the country, and supplied Cromwell with the most plausible argument in defence of his conduct.

Of the parliamentary transactions up to this period, the principal have been noticed in the preceding pages. We shall add a few others which may be thought worthy the attention of the reader. It was complained that, since the abolition of the spiritual tribunals, the sins of incest, adultery, and fornication had been multiplied, in consequence of the impunity with which they might be committed; and, at the prayer of the godly, they were made criminal offences, cognisable by the criminal courts, and punishable, the first two with death, the last with three months' imprisonment. But it was predicted at the time, and experience verified the prediction, that the severity of the punishment would defeat the purpose of the law. Scarcely a petition was presented, which did not, among other things, pray for the reformation of the courts of justice; and the house, after several long debates, acquiesced in a measure, understood to be only the forerunner of several others, that the law books should be written, and law proceedings be conducted in the English language.

So enormous were the charges of the commonwealth, arising from incessant war by sea or land, that questions of finance continually engaged the attention of the house. There were four principal sources of revenue; the customs, the excise, the sale of fee-farm rents, of the lands of the crown, and of those belonging to the bishops, deans, and chapters, and the sequestration and forfeiture of the estates of papists and delinquents. The ordinances for the latter had been passed as early as the year 1643, and in the course of the seven succeeding years, the harvest had been reaped and gathered. Still some gleanings might remain: and (Jan. 22, 1650) an act was passed for the better ordering and managing such estates; the former compositions were subjected to examination; defects and concealments were detected; and proportionate fines were in numerous cases exacted. In 1651, seventy individuals, most of them of high rank, all of opulent fortunes, who had imprudently displayed their attachment to the royal cause, were condemned to forfeit their property, both real and personal, for the benefit of the commonwealth. The fatal march of Charles to Worcester furnished grounds for a new proscription in 1652. First nine-and-twenty, then six hundred and eighty-two royalists were selected for punishment. It was enacted that those in the first class should forfeit their whole property; while to those in the second, the right of pre-emption was reserved at the rate of one-third part of the clear value, to be paid within four months.

During the late reign, as long as the Presbyterians retained their ascendancy in parliament, they enforced with all their power uniformity of worship and doctrine. The clergy of the established church were ejected from their livings, and the professors of the Catholic faith were condemned to forfeit two-thirds of their property, or to abjure their religion. Nor was the proof of recusancy to depend, as formerly, on the slow process of presentation and conviction; bare suspicion was held a sufficient ground for the sequestrator to seize his prey; and the complainant was told that he had the remedy in his own hands, he might take the oath of abjuration. The Independents, indeed, proclaimed themselves the champions of religious liberty: they repealed the statutes imposing penalties for absence from church; and they declared that men were free to serve God according to the dictates of conscience. Yet their notions of toleration were very confined: they refused to extend it either to prelacy or popery, to the service of the Church of England, or of the church of Rome. The ejected clergymen were still excluded

from the pulpit, and the Catholics were still the victims of persecuting statutes. In 1650, an act was passed offering to the discoverers of priests and Jesuits, or of their receivers and abettors, the same reward as had been granted to the apprehenders of highwaymen. Immediately officers and informers were employed in every direction; the houses of Catholics were broken open and searched at all hours of the day and night; many clergymen were apprehended, and several were tried, and received judgment of death. Of these only one, Peter Wright, chaplain to the marquis of Winchester, suffered. The leaders shrunk from the odium of such sanguinary exhibitions, and transported the rest of the prisoners to the continent.

But if the zeal of the Independents was more sparing of blood than that of the Presbyterians, it was not inferior in point of rapacity. The ordinances for sequestration and forfeiture were executed with unrelenting severity. In 1650 the annual rents of Catholics in possession of the sequestrators were returned at £62,048 17*s.* 3½*d.* It should, however, be observed that thirteen counties were not included. It is difficult to say which suffered most cruelly - families with small fortunes who were thus reduced to a state of penury; or husbandmen, servants, and mechanics, who, on their refusal to take the oath of abjuration, were deprived of two-thirds of their scanty earnings, even of their household goods and wearing apparel. The sufferers ventured to solicit from parliament such indulgence as might be thought "consistent with the public peace and their comfortable subsistence in their native country." The petition was read: Sir Henry Vane spoke in its favour; but the house was deaf to the voice of reason and humanity, and the prayer for relief was indignantly rejected. In proof we may be allowed to mention one instance of a Catholic servant-maid, an orphan, who, during a servitude of seventeen years, at seven nobles a year, had saved twenty pounds. The sequestrators, having discovered with whom she had deposited her money, took two-thirds, thirteen pounds six shillings and eightpence, for the use of the commonwealth, and left her the remainder, six pounds thirteen and fourpence. In March, 1652, she appealed to the commissioners at Haberdashers' Hall, who replied that they could afford her no relief, unless she took the oath of abjuration.[m]

Hallam[n] has said of the Long Parliament that "scarce two or three public acts of justice, humanity, or generosity, and very few of political wisdom or courage, are recorded of them from their quarrel with the king to their expulsion by Cromwell." They fell unlamented by the nation, though a few republican enthusiasts have chanted dirges to their memory. The praises of their panegyrists, we may observe, are almost confined to their successes in war; but these are surely the praises of Cromwell, Blake, and such men, and not of them. Their financial system was as simple as that of an eastern despot: they laid on enormous taxes and levied them by the swords of the soldiery; if they wanted money on any occasion, they ordered the sale of delinquents' estates; if timber was required for the navy, they directed the woods of some delinquent to be felled. In these cases justice was not to be had from them. Lord Craven, for example, had been out of England all the time of the war; one might therefore expect that no charge of delinquency could be made against him; but some one having sworn that he had seen the king in Holland, the parliament voted that his lands should be sold, though it is said he convicted the informer of perjury. Many other acts of oppression of a similar nature will be found.

At the same time they were most liberal in providing for themselves; they of course monopolised all lucrative offices; and in perusing Whitelocke[o]

[1653 A.D.]

and the journals, the ignorant admirers of these stern republicans will be surprised at the sums which they voted themselves under the name of arrears, compensations for losses, etc. Neither should their high court of justice and their abolition of trial by jury be forgotten; at the same time it should be recorded to their credit, that they always inflicted the penalty of death in a mild form, and never butchered their victims by quartering and disemboweling, as was done under the monarchy. One most remarkable part of the policy of the republicans has been left almost unnoticed by historians, namely, their selling their prisoners for slaves. This we may suppose they did in imitation of the Greeks and Romans. They actually commenced this practice during the lifetime of the king, for the Welsh taken by Cromwell in 1648 were sold into the plantations. The same, as we have seen, was the fate of the Scots after the battle of Worcester. That the wretched Irish should have been sold without compunction was a matter of course; but even the English were not treated any better; for as we shall see, Cromwell after the rising of Grove and Penruddock in 1655, sold the prisoners for slaves. The tyranny, as it was termed, of Charles, surely did not extend so far as this. We shall however find that the example of the commonwealth was not lost on his sons.*f*



COSTUME OF SOLDIER IN TIME OF CHARLES II

THE NEW COUNCIL OF STATE APPOINTED

Whoever has studied the character of Cromwell will have remarked the anxiety with which he laboured to conceal his real designs from the notice of his adherents. If credit were due to his exertions, he cherished none of those aspiring thoughts which agitate the breasts of the ambitious; the consciousness of his weakness taught him to shrink from the responsibility of power; and at every step in his ascent to greatness, he affected to sacrifice his own feelings to the judgment and importunity of others. But in dissolving the late parliament he had deviated from this his ordinary course: he had been compelled to come boldly forward by the obstinacy or the policy of his opponents, who during twelve months had triumphed over his intrigues, and were preparing to pass an act which would place new obstacles in his path. Now, however, that he had forcibly taken into his own hands the reins of government, it remained for him to determine whether he should retain them in his grasp, or deliver them over to others. He preferred the latter; for the maturity of time was not yet come: he saw that, among the officers who blindly submitted to be the tools of his ambition, there were several who would abandon the idol of their worship, whenever they should suspect him of a design to subvert the public liberty. But if he parted with power for the moment, it was in such manner as to warrant the hope that it would shortly return to him under another form, not as won by the sword of the military, but as deposited in his hands by the judgment of parliament.

It could not escape the sagacity of the lord-general that the fanatics

with whose aid he had subverted the late government, were not the men to be entrusted with the destinies of the three kingdoms; yet he deemed it his interest to indulge them in their wild notions of civil and religious reformation, and to suffer himself for a while to be guided by their counsels. Their first measure was to publish a vindication of their proceedings (April 22nd, 1653). They next proceeded to establish a council of state. Some proposed that it should consist of ten members, some of seventy, after the model of the Jewish sanhedrim; and others of thirteen, in imitation of Christ and his twelve apostles. The last project was adopted as equally scriptural, and more convenient. With Cromwell, in the place of lord president, were joined four civilians and eight officers of high rank; so that the army still retained its ascendency, and the council of state became in fact a military council. From this moment for some months it would have embarrassed any man to determine where the supreme power resided.

CROMWELL CALLS A NEW PARLIAMENT

In the mean while, the lord-general continued to wear the mask of humility and godliness; he prayed and preached with more than his wonted fervour; and his piety was rewarded, according to the report of his confidants, with frequent communications from the Holy Spirit.

In the month of May he spent eight days in close consultation with his military divan; and the result was a determination to call a new parliament, but a parliament modelled on principles unknown to the history of this or of any other nation. It was to be a parliament of saints, of men who had not offered themselves as candidates, or been chosen by the people, but whose chief qualification consisted in holiness of life, and whose call to the office of legislators came from the choice of the council. With this view the ministers took the sense of the "congregational churches" in the several counties: the returns contained the names of the persons, "faithful, fearing God, and hating covetousness," who were deemed qualified for this high and important trust; and out of these the council in the presence of the lord-general selected one hundred and thirty-nine representatives for England, six for Wales, six for Ireland, and five for Scotland. To each of them was sent a writ of summons under the signature of Cromwell, requiring his personal attendance at Whitehall on a certain day, to take upon himself the trust, and to serve the office of member for some particular place. Of the surprise with which the writs were received by many the reader may judge. Yet, out of the whole number, two only returned a refusal: by most the very extraordinary manner of their election was taken as a sufficient proof that the call was from heaven.

On the appointed day, the 4th of July, 1653, one hundred and twenty of these faithful and godly men attended in the council chamber at Whitehall. They were seated on chairs round the table; and the lord-general took his station near the middle window, supported on each side by a numerous body of officers. He addressed the company standing, and it was believed by his admirers, perhaps by himself, "that the Spirit of God spoke in him and by him." Having vindicated in a long narrative the dissolution of the late parliament, he congratulated the persons present on the high office to which they had been called. It was not of their own seeking. It had come to them from God by the choice of the army, the usual channel through which in these latter days the divine mercies had been dispensed to the nation. He would not charge them, but he would pray that they might "exercise

[1653 A.D.]

the judgment of mercy and truth," and might "be faithful with the saints," however those saints might differ respecting forms of worship.

His enthusiasm kindled as he proceeded; and the visions of futurity began to open to his imagination. It was, he exclaimed, marvellous in his eyes; they were called to war with the Lamb against his enemies; they were come to the threshold of the door, to the very edge of the promises and prophecies; God was about to bring his people out of the depths of the sea; perhaps to bring the Jews home to their station out of the aisles of the sea. "God," he exclaimed, "shakes the mountains, and they reel; God hath a high hill, too, and his hill is as the hill of Bashan; and the chariots of God are twenty thousand of angels; and God will dwell upon this hill forever." At the conclusion "of this grave, Christian, and seasonable speech," he placed on the table an instrument under his own hand and seal, entrusting to them the supreme authority for the space of fifteen months from that day, then to be transmitted by them to another assembly, the members of which they should previously have chosen.[m]

GUIZOT'S ACCOUNT OF THE "LITTLE" OR "BAREBONES" PARLIAMENT

The members resolved, after a long debate, and by a majority of sixty-five votes against forty-six, that they would assume the name of the parliament. They elected as their speaker Francis Rouse, who had been a member of the Long Parliament; ordered that the mace, which Cromwell had removed, should be replaced on their table; appointed a council of state of thirty-one members, with instructions similar to those given to the preceding council; and, in short, resumed all the prerogatives and re-established all the usages of the expelled parliament. Cromwell and his officers had made them a parliament; to show their gratitude, they voted, in their turn, that the lord-general, major-generals Lambert, Harrison, and Desborough, and Colonel Tomlinson should be invited to sit with them as members of the house. On the day on which they installed themselves at Westminster, they devoted nearly their whole sitting to pious exercises; not, as the previous parliament had done, by attending sermons preached by specially appointed ministers, but by themselves engaging in spontaneous prayers, without the assistance of any professional ecclesiastic.

Eight or ten members often spoke in succession, invoking the divine blessing on their labours, or commenting on passages of Scripture; "and some affirmed," says one of them, "they never enjoyed so much of the spirit and presence of Christ in any of the meetings and exercises of religion in all their lives as they did that day." They therefore persisted in this practice, and instead of appointing a chaplain every day, as soon as a few members had arrived, one of them engaged in prayer, and others followed him, until a sufficient number had assembled to open the sitting and begin business. On the day after their installation, they voted that a special day should be devoted to the solemn invocation of the divine blessing upon their future acts; and having discharged this duty, with a view to induce the nation to join its prayers to their own, for the same purpose, they published a declaration, which is expressive at once of proud hopes, of mystical enthusiasm, and of feelings of the deepest humility.

"We declare ourselves, to be the parliament of the commonwealth of England. . . . . When we look upon ourselves, we are much afraid, and tremble at the mighty work and heavy weight before us, which we justly acknowledge far above, and quite beyond, our strength to wield or pose; so that we oft cry out and say with Jehoshaphat, '*O Lord we know not what*

to do, but our eye is towards thee! . . . . We hope that God, in his great and free goodness, will not forsake his people; and that we may be fitted and used as instruments in his hand, that all oppressing yokes may be broken, and all burdens removed, and the loins also of the poor and needy may be filled with blessing, that all nations may turn their swords and spears into plough-shares and pruning-hooks, that the wolf may feed with the lamb, and the earth be full of the knowledge of God, as waters cover the sea. This is all we say, if this undertaking be from God, let him prosper and bless it, and let every one take heed of fighting against God; but if not, let it fall, though we fall before it."

Thus strengthened and confident, they set to work finally to effect those reforms which had been so long and so earnestly desired. Twelve committees were appointed for this purpose. The ardour and assiduity of these committees, and of the parliament itself, in their respective labours, were great. The parliament voted that it would meet at eight o'clock in the morning of every day in the week, excepting Sunday. A sincere zeal animated the assembly; questions and considerations of private interest had but little influence in their deliberations; like bold and honest men, their only thought was how they might best serve and reform the state. But two contingencies which popular reformers never foresee, obstacles and speculative theories, soon arose. In order to accomplish great reforms in a great society, without destroying its peace, the legislator must possess extraordinary wisdom and a high position: reforms, when they originate with the lower classes, are inseparable from revolutions. The parliament of Cromwell's election was neither sufficiently enlightened, nor sufficiently influential to reform English society, without endangering its tranquillity; and as, at the same time, it was neither so insane, nor so perverse, nor so strong, as blindly to destroy instead of reforming, it soon became powerless, in spite of its honesty and courage, and ridiculous, because it combined earnestness with impotence.

It found, however, one part of its task in a very advanced state: the two committees which the Long Parliament had appointed in 1651 for the purpose of preparing a scheme of law-reform, had left a large body of materials, in which most of the questions mooted were solved, and the solutions even given at length. Twenty-one bills were ready prepared to receive the force of laws by the vote of the house. After long debates, however, four measures of reform were alone carried; one to place under the control of the civil magistrates, the celebration and registration of marriages, and the registration of births and deaths; the other three, for the relief of creditors and poor prisoners for debt, for the abolition of certain fines, and for the redress of certain delays in procedure.[1] The collection of taxes, the concentration of all the revenues of the state in one public treasury, and the administration of the army and navy, also formed the subject of regulations which put an end to grave abuses. The question of the distribution of confiscated lands in Ireland, first among the subscribers to the various public loans, and then among the disbanded

[1] The condition of the law was in itself certainly bad enough, but they regarded it as a perfect Augean stable. There were said to be not less than twenty-three thousand causes pending in the court of chancery, some of which had been there twenty, others thirty years; the expenses were enormous; the justice of the decisions was suspicious. The whole body of the law itself being in their eyes a mere chaos of confusion, made up of traditions, statutes and decisions, often obscure, often contradictory, it was deemed the wisest course to do away with it altogether, and form out of it a reasonable code which might be comprised in a pocket-volume and be accessible to all men, and not be a mystery confined to a few. A committee was appointed to effect this, and a commencement was made with the articles "*Treason*" and "*Murder*." In matters of religion one of the first points which presented itself was that of advowsons. Nothing seemed to be (perhaps nothing is) more adverse to the spirit of true religion, than that a layman, merely as the owner of land, should have the right of imposing a religious teacher on a parish, and could even sell that right like any other species of property. It was therefore resolved that the right of presentation should be taken away, and that the parishioners should be empowered to choose their own pastors. — KEIGHTLEY.

[1653 A.D.]

officers and soldiers, was finally settled. The salaries of the persons employed in several departments of the public service were reduced; and serious and persevering efforts were made to meet all the expenses, and discharge all the liabilities of the state.

But, when it came to treat of really great political questions, when it was in presence of the obstacles and enemies which those questions raised up against it, then the insufficiency of its information, its chimerical ideas, its anarchical tendencies, its internal dissensions, and the weakness of its position, became fully apparent. Not only were their innovations naturally opposed by those classes whose interests would be seriously affected by their adoption, by the clergy, the lay impropriators, the magistrates, the lawyers, and all the professions dependent on these; but they interfered, more or less directly, with those rights of property and hereditary succession which could not be infringed upon, even in the slightest degree, without shaking the whole framework of society. Accordingly, whenever these vital questions were mooted, a deep schism arose in the parliament. But the reformers, wilfully or blindly obedient to the revolutionary spirit, required that, in the first instance, the innovations which they demanded should be resolved upon, and the principle which they involved be absolutely admitted, and that the house should then inquire what was to be done to fill up the vacancies, and repair the losses which they had occasioned.

Irritated at resistance, the revolutionary spirit became increasingly manifest; strange propositions multiplied — some of them puerile, as this, "that all who have applied for offices shall be incapable of public employment"; others menacing, not only to the higher classes, but to all who had a settled occupation, from the demagogic and destructive mysticism which they exhibited. Although strongly opposed in their progress through parliament, these propositions were always sooner or later adopted; for the zealous and mystical sectaries, with Major-General Harrison at their head, daily obtained a greater preponderance in the house. From their friends out of doors they received impetuous encouragement and support: all questions, whether political or religious, which at any time occupied the attention of parliament, were discussed at the same time by meetings of private citizens, unlimited as to numbers, unrestricted as to ideas and language. Two Anabaptist preachers, Christopher Feake and Vavasor Powell, may be particularly mentioned. These eloquent enthusiasts held meetings every Monday at Blackfriars, which were crowded by multitudes of hearers, mutually encouraging one another to a spirit of opposition and revolution. At these meetings, foreign politics were treated of, as well as home affairs, with equal violence and even greater ignorance.

Cromwell was an attentive observer of these disorders and conflicts. It was in the name and with the support of the reforming sectaries that he had expelled the Long Parliament, and assumed possession of the supreme power. But he had quickly perceived that such innovators, though useful instruments of destruction, were destructive to the very power they had established; and that the classes among whom conservative interests prevailed, were the natural and permanent allies of authority. Besides, he was influenced by no principles or scruples powerful enough to prevent him, when occasion required, from changing his conduct and seeking out other friends. To govern was his sole aim; whoever stood in the way of his attainment of the reins of government, or of his continuance at the head of the state, was his adversary—he had no friends but his agents. The landed proprietors, the clergy, and the lawyers, had need of him, and were ready to support him if he would defend

them: he made an alliance with them, thus completely changing his position, and becoming an aristocrat and conservative instead of a democrat and revolutionist. But he was an able and prudent man, and he knew the art of breaking with old allies only so far as suited his purpose, and of humouring them even when he intended to break with them. He sent for the principal leaders of the sectaries, the Anabaptist preacher, Feake, among others; upbraided them with the blind violence of their opposition which, both at home and abroad, tended only to the advantage of their common enemies, and declared that they would be responsible for all the consequences that might ensue. He dismissed them without further rebuke. But his resolution was taken; and, in his soul, the fate of a parliament in which such persons had so much influence, was irrevocably determined.



THOMAS SYDENHAM
(1624-1689)

On Monday, the 12th of December, 1653, a number of members devoted to Cromwell, were observed to enter the house of commons at an unusually early hour. No sooner had prayers been said, than Colonel Sydenham rose and made a most violent attack upon the measures of the parliament, particularly of a majority of its members. "They aimed," he went on to say, "at no less than destroying the clergy, the law, and the property of the subject. Their purpose was to take away the law of the land, and the birthrights of Englishmen, for which all had so long been contending with their blood, and to substitute in their room a code, modelled on the law of Moses, and which was adapted only for the nation of the Jews. In these circumstances, he could no longer satisfy himself to sit in that house; and he moved that the continuance of this parliament, as now constituted, would not be for the good of the commonwealth; and that, therefore, it was requisite that the house, in a body, should repair to the lord-general, to deliver back into his hands the powers which they had received from him." Colonel Sydenham's motion was at once seconded by Sir Charles Wolseley, a gentleman of Oxfordshire, and one of Cromwell's confidants.

Notwithstanding their surprise and indignation, the reformers defended themselves. The debate promised to be of considerable duration. The issue seemed exceedingly doubtful. Rous, the speaker, suddenly left the chair, and broke up the sitting. The serjeant took up the mace and carried it before him, as he left the hall. About forty members followed him, and they proceeded together towards Whitehall. Thirty or thirty-five members

[1653 A.D.]

remained in the house, in great indignation and embarrassment, for they were not sufficiently numerous to make a house; but twenty-seven of them, Harrison among the number, resolved to keep their seats, and proposed to pass the time in prayer. But two officers, Colonel Goffe and Major White, suddenly entered the house and desired them to withdraw; they answered that they would not do so, unless compelled by force. White called in a file of musketeers; the house was cleared, and sentinels were placed at the doors, in charge of the keys. The cavaliers, in their ironical narratives of the occurrence, assert that, on entering the house, White said to Harrison, "What do you here?" "We are seeking the Lord" replied Harrison. "Then," returned White, "you may go elsewhere, for, to my certain knowledge he has not been here these twelve years."

Meanwhile, the speaker, and the members who had accompanied him, had arrived at Whitehall. They first of all went into a private room, and hurriedly wrote a brief resignation of their power into Cromwell's hands. This they signed, and then demanded an interview with the lord-general. He expressed extreme surprise at their proceeding, declaring that he was not prepared for such an offer, nor able to load himself with so heavy and serious a burden. But Lambert, Sydenham, and the other members present, insisted, their resolution was taken—he must accept the restoration of power which he had himself conferred. He yielded at last. The act of abdication was left open for three or four days, for the signatures of those members who had not come to Whitehall; and it soon exhibited eighty names — a majority of the whole assembly. Cromwell had slain the Long Parliament with his own hand; he did not vouchsafe so much honour to the parliament which he had himself created; a ridiculous act of suicide, and the ridiculous nickname which it derived from one of its most obscure members, Mr. Praise-god Barebone,[1] a leather-seller in the city of London, are the only recollections which this assembly has left in history. And yet, it was deficient neither in honesty nor in patriotism; but it was absolutely wanting in dignity when it allowed its existence to rest on a falsehood, and in good sense when it attempted to reform the whole framework of English society: such a task was infinitely above its strength and capacity. The Barebones Parliament had been intended by Cromwell as an expedient; it disappeared as soon as it attempted to become an independent power.

Four days after the fall of the Barebones Parliament, on the 16th of December, 1653, at one o'clock in the afternoon, a pompous cavalcade proceeded from Whitehall to Westminster, between a double line of soldiery. The lords commissioners of the great seal, the judges, the council of state, the lord mayor and aldermen of the city of London, in their scarlet robes and state carriages, headed the procession. After them came Cromwell, in a simple suit of black velvet, with long boots, and a broad gold band round his hat. His guards and a large number of gentlemen, bareheaded, walked before his carriage, which was surrounded by the principal officers of the army, sword in hand, and hat on head. On arriving at Westminster Hall, the procession entered the court of chancery, at one end of which a chair of state had been placed. Cromwell stood in front of the chair, and as soon as the assembly was seated, Major-General Lambert announced the voluntary

[1] Godwin *p* and Forster *q* have taken considerable pains to establish that this person's real name was Barbone, and not Barebone, and thus to remove the ridicule attaching to the latter name; but, by their own admission, the writ of summons addressed to this member spells his name as Barebone; I have therefore retained this spelling, which seems to be at once officially and historically correct.

dissolution of the late parliament, and in the name of the army, of the three nations, and of the exigencies of the time, prayed the lord-general to accept the office of protector of the commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland.[r]

THE INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT MAKES CROMWELL PROTECTOR

The instrument of government, as the plan of the new constitution was named, was then read by one of the clerks of the council. Cromwell having with feigned reluctance given his consent, the oath was read to him by the lord-commissioner Lisle, and he signed it. Lambert then on his knees offered him the civic sword in a scabbard; he took it, and at the same time laid aside his own military one. He then sat down and put on his hat; the commissioners handed him the seal, the lord mayor the sword; he took them and gave them back. Having exercised these acts of sovereignty he returned to Whitehall. Next day the new government was proclaimed with the ceremonies usual at the accession of a king.

The substance of the instrument was, that the supreme authority should be in the lord protector and the parliament; the protector to be assisted by a council of not less than thirteen, nor more than twenty-one persons, immovable except for corruption or other miscarriage in their trust. The former functions of royalty in general were to be exercised by the protector, with the consent of parliament or the council. A parliament was to be summoned for the 3rd of September, 1654, and once in every third year, reckoned from the dissolution of the last, and not to be adjourned, prorogued, or dissolved for the space of five months without its own consent. The parliament was to consist of four hundred members for England and Wales, thirty for Scotland, and thirty for Ireland. The smaller boroughs were disfranchised and the number of county members was increased; the qualification for electors was to be the possession of an estate, real or personal, of the value of 200*l*. Those persons who had aided or abetted the royal cause in the late wars were to be incapable of being elected or of voting at elections for the next and three succeeding parliaments. Catholics, and the aiders and abettors of the Irish rebellion, were to be disabled forever. A provision more certain and less subject to scruple than tithes was to be made for the teachers of religion. All who professed faith in God through Jesus Christ were to be protected; but this liberty was not to extend "to popery or prelacy, or to such as under the profession of Christ hold forth and practise licentiousness."

Oliver Cromwell had thus, by taking advantage of a train of favourable circumstances, raised himself to the summit on which, since his victory at Worcester, he had probably fixed his view. His usurpation, if such it is to be called, was the greatest benefit that could befall the country in its present condition. Had the Presbyterians recovered their power, they would have bound their odious intolerant religious despotism on the necks of the people; the royalists, if triumphant, would have introduced the plenitude of absolute power. The rule of Cromwell gave time for men's minds to settle.[t] Von Ranke contrasts Cromwell's *coup d'état* with that of Napoleon, as follows:[a] "Were we to describe in a word the chief difference between the revolution in England and the similar catastrophe that occurred in France a hundred and fifty years later, we might say that the social revolution in France was practically complete before the victorious general grasped the sovereignty; while, by contrast, in England the rule of the sword intervened at an earlier period, and put a check to the progress of revolution the moment it began to undermine the social foundations."[b]




OLIVER CROMWELL


[illegible] Peter Pohy in the Pitti Palace, Florence. By the Pr[illegible] The Grand Duke Ferdinand III

[1653 A.D.]

Hallam on Cromwell's Usurpation

It can admit of no doubt that the despotism of a wise man is more tolerable than that of political or religious fanatics; and it rarely happens that there is any better remedy in revolutions which have given the latter an ascendant. Cromwell's assumption, therefore, of the title of protector was a necessary and wholesome usurpation, however he may have caused the necessity; it secured the nation from the mischievous lunacy of the Anabaptists, and from the more cool-blooded tyranny of that little oligarchy which arrogated to itself the name of commonwealth's men. Though a gross and glaring evidence of the omnipotence of the army, the instrument under which he took his title accorded to him no unnecessary executive authority. The sovereignty still resided in the parliament; he had no negative voice on their laws. Until the meeting of the next parliament a power was given him of making temporary ordinances: but this was not, as Hume,[s] on the authority of Clarendon[t] and Warwick,[u] has supposed, and as his conduct, if that were any proof of the law, might lead us to infer, designed to exist in future intervals of the legislature. In the ascent of this bold usurper to greatness he had successively employed and thrown away several of the powerful factions who distracted the nation. He had encouraged the levellers and persecuted them; he had flattered the Long Parliament and betrayed it; he had made use of the sectaries to crush the commonwealth; he had spurned the sectaries in his last advance to power. These, with the royalists and the Presbyterians, forming in effect the whole people, though too disunited for such a coalition as must have overthrown him, were the perpetual, irreconcilable enemies of his administration. Master of his army, which he knew well how to manage, surrounded by a few deep and experienced counsellors, furnished by his spies with the completest intelligence of all designs against him, he had no great cause of alarm from open resistance. But he was bound by the instrument of government to call a parliament; and in any parliament his adversaries must be formidable."[v]





CHAPTER V

CROMWELL AS PROTECTOR

[1653–1658 A.D.]

> Cromwell at the head of the army had conquered and crushed king, lords, and commons. As opposed to the constitution of the kingdom he seemed to be a great destroyer. But further than this he would not budge. The instant his partisans inclined to threaten civil institutions and the social structure they found him their most potent enemy. In the wreckage of all authority, political or churchly, Cromwell rose the champion of the social fabric of property, of civil rights, and the lower clergy. It was in this spirit that he grasped the supreme power — and with the approval of a large part of the public. Both lawyers and clergymen had seen their very existence endangered by the destructive enactments of the Independents. Cromwell was their deliverer, to them the full meaning of the word was implied by his title, protector. — VON RANKE.[b]

IT cannot be supposed that this elevation of Cromwell to the supreme power was viewed with satisfaction by any other class of men than his brethren in arms, who considered his greatness their own work, and expected from his gratitude their merited reward. But the nation was surfeited with revolutions. They readily acquiesced in any change which promised the return of tranquillity in the place of solicitude, danger, and misery. The protector, however, did not neglect the means of consolidating his own authority. Availing himself of the powers entrusted to him by the "instrument," he gave the chief commands in the army to men in whom he could confide; quartered the troops in the manner best calculated to put down any insurrection; and, among the multitude of ordinances which he published, was careful to repeal the acts enforcing the Engagement; to forbid all meetings on racecourses or at cockpits, to explain what offences should be deemed treason against his government; and to establish a high court of justice for the trial of those who might be charged with such offences.

[1658 A.D.]

He could not, however, be ignorant that, even among the former companions of his fortunes, the men who had fought and bled by his side, there were several who, much as they revered the general, looked on the protector with the most cordial abhorrence. They scrupled not, both in public companies, and from the pulpit, to pronounce him "a dissembling perjured villain"; and they openly threatened him with "a worse fate than had befallen the last tyrant." If it was necessary to silence these declaimers, it was also dangerous to treat them with severity. He proceeded with caution, and modified his displeasure by circumstances. Some he removed from their commissions in the army and their ministry in the church; others he did not permit to go at large till they had given security for their subsequent behaviour; and those who proved less tractable, or appeared more dangerous, he incarcerated in the Tower. Among the last were Harrison, formerly his fellow-labourer in the dissolution of the Long Parliament, now his most implacable enemy; and Feakes and Powell, the Anabaptist preachers, who had braved his resentment during the last parliament. Symson, their colleague, shared their imprisonment, but procured his liberty by submission.

To the royalists, as he feared them less, he showed less forbearance. Charles, who still resided in Paris, maintained a constant correspondence with the friends of his family in England. Among the agents whom he employed were men who betrayed his secrets, or pretended secrets, to his enemies, or who seduced his adherents into imaginary plots, that by the discovery they might earn the gratitude of the protector. Of the latter class was an individual named Henshaw, who had repaired to Paris, and been refused what he solicited—admission to the royal presence. On his return, he detailed to certain royalists a plan by which the protector might be assassinated on his way to Hampton Court, the guards at Whitehall overpowered, the town surprised, and the royal exile proclaimed. When a sufficient number were entangled in the toil, forty were apprehended and examined. Of these, three were selected for trial before the high court of justice. Fox pleaded guilty and obtained his pardon. Vowell, a schoolmaster, and Gerard, a young gentleman two-and-twenty years of age, received judgment of death.

On the same scaffold, but an hour later, perished a foreign nobleman, only nineteen years old, Dom Pantaleon Sa, brother to Guimaraes, the Portuguese ambassador. Six months before, he and Gerard, whose execution we have just noticed, had quarrelled in the New Exchange. Pantaleon, the next evening, repaired to the same place with a body of armed followers; a fray ensued; Greenway, a person unconcerned in the dispute, was killed by accident or mistake; and the Portuguese fled to the house of the ambassador, whence they were conducted to prison by the military. The people, taking up the affair as a national quarrel, loudly demanded the blood of the reputed murderers. On behalf of Pantaleon it was argued that he was an ambassador, and therefore answerable to no one but his master; but the instrument which he produced in proof of the first allegation was no more than a written promise that he should succeed his brother in office. He was sacrificed, if we believe one of them, to the clamour of the people, whose feelings were so excited, that when his head fell on the scaffold, the spectators proclaimed their joy by the most savage yells of exultation. It was the very day on which his brother, perhaps to propitiate the protector, had signed the treaty between the two nations.

These executions had been preceded by one of a very different description. Colonel Worseley had apprehended a Catholic clergyman, of the name of Southworth, who, thirty-seven years before, had been convicted at Lan-

caster, and sent into banishment. The old man (he had passed his seventy-second year), at his arraignment, pleaded that he had taken orders in the church of Rome, but was innocent of any treason. Judgment of death was pronounced; and the protector, notwithstanding the urgent solicitations of the French and Spanish ambassadors, resolved that he should suffer. It was not that Cromwell approved of sanguinary punishments in matters of religion, but that he had no objection to purchasing the good-will of the godly by shedding the blood of a priest. The fate of this venerable man excited the sympathy of the higher classes. On the scaffold he pointed out the inconsistency of the men who pretended to have taken up arms for liberty of conscience, and yet shed the blood of those who differed from them in religious opinions. He suffered the usual punishment of traitors.

SCOTLAND SUBDUED AND INCORPORATED

In Scotland as in Ireland the spirit of disaffection equally prevailed among the superior officers; but their attention was averted from political feuds by military operations. In the preceding years, under the appearance of general tranquillity, the embers of war had continued to smoulder in the Highlands: they burst into a flame on the departure of Monk to take the command of the English fleet. To Charles in France, and his partisans in Scotland, it seemed a favourable moment; the earls of Glencairn and Balcarres, were successively joined by Angus, Montrose, Athol, Seaforth, Kenmore, and Lorne, the son of Argyll; and Wogan, an enterprising officer, landing at Dover (November 22nd, 1653), raised a troop of loyalists in London, and traversing England under the colours of the commonwealth, reached in safety the quarters of his Scottish friends. A petty but most destructive warfare ensued. To Middleton the protector opposed Monk. Middleton was surprised at Loch Garry (July 19th) by the force under Morgan; his men, embarrassed in the defile, were slain or made prisoners; and his loss taught the royalist leaders to deserve mercy by the promptitude of their submission, and the lenity of Monk contributed as much as the fortune of war to the total suppression of the insurgents.

Cromwell, however, did not wait for the issue of the contest. Before Monk had joined the army, he published three ordinances, by which, of his supreme authority, he incorporated Scotland with England, absolved the natives from their allegiance to Charles Stuart, abolished the kingly office and the Scottish parliament, with all tenures and superiorities importing servitude and vassalage, erected courts-baron to supply the place of the jurisdictions which he had taken away, and granted a free pardon to the nation, with the exception of numerous individuals whom he subjected to different degrees of punishment.

Thus the whole frame of the Scottish constitution was subverted: yet no one ventured to remonstrate or oppose. The spirit of the nation had been broken. The experience of the past, and the presence of the military, convinced the people that resistance was fruitless. Of the nobility, many languished within the walls of their prisons in England; and the others were ground to the dust by the demands of their creditors, or the exactions of the sequestrators; and even the kirk, which had so often bearded kings on their thrones, was taught to feel that its authority, however it might boast of its celestial origin, was no match for the earthly power of the English commonwealth. Soon after Cromwell had called his Little Parliament, the general assembly of the kirk met at the usual place in Edinburgh; and Dickson, the

[1653 A.D.]

moderator, had begun his prayer, when Colonel Cotterel, leaving two troops of horse and two companies of foot at the door, entered the house, and inquired by what authority they sat there; Was it by authority of the parliament, or of the commander of the forces, or of the English judges in Scotland? The moderator meekly but firmly replied, that they formed a spiritual court, established by God, recognised by law, and supported by the Solemn League and Covenant. But this was a language which the soldier did not, or would not, understand.

Mounting a bench, he declared that there existed no authority in Scotland which was not derived from the parliament of England; that it was his duty to put down every illegal assumption of power; and that they must immediately depart or suffer themselves to be dragged out by the military under his command. No one offered to resist: a protestation was hastily entered on the minutes; and the whole body was marched between the two files of soldiers through the streets, to the surprise, and grief, and horror of the inhabitants. At the distance of a mile from the city, Cotterel discharged them with an admonition. "Thus," exclaims Baillie, "our general assembly, the glory and strength of our church upon earth, is by your soldiery crushed and trod under foot. For this our hearts are sad, and our eyes run down with water."

Yet after this they were permitted to meet in synods and presbyteries, an indulgence which they owed not to the moderation of their adversaries, but to the policy of Vane, who argued that it was better to furnish them with the opportunity of quarrelling among themselves, than, by establishing a compulsory tranquillity, allow them to combine against the commonwealth. For the ministers were still divided into resolutioners and protestors, and the virulence of this religious feud appeared to augment in proportion as the parties were deprived of real power.

FINAL BATTLES OF THE DUTCH WAR

By foreign powers the recent elevation of Cromwell was viewed without surprise. All who had reason to hope from his friendship, or to fear from his enmity, offered their congratulations, and ambassadors and envoys from most of the princes of Europe crowded to the court of the protector. He received them with all the state of a sovereign. It appears from the Council Book that the quarterly expense of the protector's family amounted to thirty-five thousand pounds.

The treaty with the United Provinces was the first which engaged the attention of the protector, and was not concluded till repeated victories had proved the superiority of the English navy, and a protracted negotiation had exhausted the patience of the states. In the preceding month of May the hostile fleets, each consisting of about one hundred sail, had put to sea, the English commanded by Monk, Deane, Penn, and Lawson; the Dutch by Tromp, De Ruyter, De Witt, and Evertsen. While Monk insulted the coast of Holland, Tromp cannonaded the town of Dover. They met each other (June 2nd, 1653) off the North Foreland, and the action continued the whole day. The enemy lost two sail; on the part of the English, Deane was killed by a chain-shot. He fell by the side of Monk, who instantly spread his cloak over the dead body, that the men might not be alarmed at the fate of their commander.

The battle was renewed the next morning. Though Blake, with eighteen sail, had joined the English in the night, Tromp fought with the most deter-

mined courage; but a panic pervaded his fleet; his orders were disobeyed; several captains fled from the superior fire of the enemy; and, ultimately, the Dutch sought shelter within the Wielings, and along the shallow coast of Zealand. They lost one-and-twenty sail; thirteen hundred men were made prisoners, and the number of killed and wounded was great in proportion.[1]

Cromwell received the news of this victory with transports of joy. Though he could claim no share in the merit (for the fleet owed its success to the exertions of the government which he had overturned), he was aware that it would shed a lustre over his own administration; and the people were publicly called upon to return thanks to the Almighty for so signal a favour.

To the states, the defeat of their fleet proved a subject of the deepest regret. It was not the loss of men and ships that they deplored; such loss might soon be repaired; but it degraded them in the eyes of Europe, by placing them in the position of suppliants deprecating the anger of a victorious enemy. In consequence of the importunate entreaties of the merchants, they had previously appointed ambassadors to make proposals of peace to the new government. They were informed that England would waive the claim of pecuniary compensation, providing Tromp were removed for a while from the command of their fleet, as an acknowledgment that he was the aggressor; but that, on the other hand, it was expected that the states should consent to the incorporation of the two countries into one great maritime power, to be equally under the same government, consisting of individuals chosen out of both.[2] This was a subject on which the ambassadors had no power to treat; and it was agreed that two of their number should repair to the Hague for additional instructions.

But a few days before their departure, another battle had been fought at sea (July 31st), and another victory won by the English. For eight weeks Monk had blockaded the entrance of the Texel; but Tromp, the moment his fleet was repaired, put to sea. Each admiral commanded about one hundred sail; and as long as Tromp lived, the victory hung in suspense; he had burst through the English line, and returned to his first station, when he fell by a musket-shot; then the Dutch began to waver; in a short time they fled, and the pursuit continued till midnight. That which distinguished this from every preceding action was the order issued by Monk to make no prizes, but to sink or destroy the ships of the enemy. Hence the only trophies of victory were the prisoners, men who had been picked up after they had thrown themselves into the water, or had escaped in boats from the wrecks. Of these, more than a thousand were brought to England, a sufficient proof that, if the loss of the enemy did not amount to twenty sail, as stated by Monk, it exceeded nine small vessels, the utmost allowed by the states.[3]

[1 Gardiner[c] points out that in the first place Tromp had but 104 sail, six of them fireships; the English had 115 including 5 fireships, their vessels and cannon being decidedly superior in size and weight. Furthermore, Blake came up now with 13 fresh ships, and once more Tromp's ammunition began to give out, as the parsimony of the Dutch republic had insufficiently supplied him. Gardiner again credits Tromp with superior seamanship.]

[2 Gardiner[c] calls this "the most astounding proposal ever made by an Englishman to the minister of a foreign state." It was proposed to include Denmark, Sweden and the Protestant German provinces in one great amalgamation to partition the whole world, the Dutch to have all of Asia, the English all of America.]

[3 Gardiner[c] puts the Dutch loss at 26 men-of-war, 2,700 drowned, 2,500 wounded and 1,000 prisoners. The English lost 2 ships, 7 captains and 250 men slain, and 5 captains and 800 men wounded; the fleet was so badly shattered, however, that it was compelled to abandon the blockade to refit. Of Tromp, Gardiner says that he "was, in every sense, the hero of the war. If tactical skill could have merited victory from an enemy greatly superior in force he would have made the battle off the Gabbard as glorious for his countrymen as had been the fight in the Downs in 1639." Fighting for the liberty of his country's trade he was borne

[1653 A.D.]

During the absence of the other ambassadors, Cromwell sought several private interviews with the third who remained, Beverning, the deputy from the states of Holland; and the moderation with which he spoke of the questions in dispute, joined to the tears with which he lamented the enmity of two nations so similar in their political and religious principles, convinced the Dutchman that an accommodation might be easily and promptly attained. At his desire his colleagues returned; the conferences were resumed; the most cheering hopes were indulged; when suddenly (November 24th) the English commissioners presented seven-and-twenty articles, conceived in a tone of insulting superiority, and demanding sacrifices painful and degrading. Every question was adjusted, with the exception of this: whether the king of Denmark, the ally of the Dutch, who, to gratify them, had seized and confiscated twenty-three English merchantmen in the Baltic (January 6th, 1651), should be comprehended or not in the treaty. The ambassadors were at Gravesend on their way home, when Cromwell proposed a new expedient, which they approved. At the same time he equipped a fleet of one hundred sail, and ordered several regiments to embark. The ambassadors, aware that the states had made no provision to oppose this formidable armament, reluctantly acquiesced; and on the 5th of April, after a negotiation of ten months, the peace was definitively signed.

By this treaty the English cabinet silently abandoned those lofty pretensions which it had originally put forth. It made no mention of indemnity for the past, of security for the future, of the incorporation of the two states, of the claim of search, of the tenth herring, or of the exclusion of the prince of Orange from the office of stadtholder. To these humiliating conditions the pride of the states had refused to submit; and Cromwell was content to accept two other articles, which, while they appeared equally to affect the two nations, were in reality directed against the Stuart family and its adherents. It was stipulated that neither commonwealth should harbour or aid the enemies, rebels, or exiles of the other. The only questions which latterly retarded the conclusion of the treaty related to the compensation to be made to the merchants for the depredations on their trade in the East Indies before, and the detention of their ships by the king of Denmark during the war. It was, however, agreed that arbitrators should be chosen out of both nations, and that each government should be bound by their award. These determined that the island of Polerone should be restored, and damages to the amount of one hundred and seventy thousand pounds should be paid to the English East India Company; that three thousand six hundred and fifteen pounds should be distributed among the heirs of those who suffered at Amboyna;[1] and that a compensation of ninety-seven thousand nine hundred and seventy-three pounds should be made to the traders to the Baltic.

By Sagredo,[d] the Venetian ambassador, who resided during the war at Amsterdam, we are told that the Dutch acknowledged the loss of one thousand one hundred and twenty-two men-of-war and merchantmen; and that the expense of this war exceeded that of their twenty years' hostilities with Spain. He states that their inferiority arose from three causes: that the English ships were of greater bulk; the English cannon were of brass, and

down by official incompetence, and by the defects of a complicated administrative machinery even more than by the material superiority of the English navy." For fuller accounts of his character, see the history of Holland.]

[1 The Amboyna massacre took place in 1623 at Amboyna, one of the Molucca islands, where the Dutch claiming that certain Englishmen had conspired to seize the island and murder the inhabitants, put 110 English to death after torturing them. See the history of the Netherlands, chapter XII, volume XIII.]

of a larger calibre; and the number of prizes made by the English at the commencement crippled the maritime resources of their enemies. It has been said that the Dutch employed one hundred thousand men in the herring-fishery.

On one subject, in the protector's estimation of considerable importance, he was partially successful. Possessed of the supreme power himself, he considered Charles as a personal rival, and made it his policy to strip the exiled king of all hope of foreign support. From the prince of Orange, so nearly allied to the royal family, Cromwell had little to fear during his minority; and, to render him incapable of benefiting the royal cause in his more mature age, the protector attempted to exclude him by the treaty from succeeding to those high offices which might almost be considered hereditary in his family. The determined refusal of the states had induced him to withdraw the demand; but he intrigued, through the agency of Beverning, with the leaders of the Louvestein party;[1] and obtained a secret article, by which the states of Holland and Friesland promised never to elect the prince of Orange for their stadholder, nor suffer him to have the chief command of the army and navy.

RELATIONS WITH FRANCE AND SPAIN

The war in which the rival crowns of France and Spain had so long been engaged induced both Louis and Philip to pay their court to the new protector. Alonzo de Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador, had the advantage of being on the spot. He waited on Cromwell to present to him the congratulations of his sovereign, and to offer to him the support of the Spanish monarch, if he should feel desirous to rise a step higher, and assume the style and office of king. When Don Alonzo communicated the draft of a treaty of alliance which had all but concluded with the deputies appointed by the late parliament, he was asked whether the king of Spain would consent to a free trade to the West Indies, would omit the clause respecting the Inquisition,[2] reduce to an equality the duties on foreign merchandise, and give to the English merchant the pre-emption of the Spanish wool. He replied, that his master would as soon lose his eyes as suffer the interference of any foreign power on the two first questions; as to the others, satisfactory adjustments might easily be made. This was sufficient for the present. Cromwell affected to consider the treaty at an end; though the real fact was, that he meditated a very different project in his own mind, and was careful not to be precluded by premature arrangements.

The French ambassador, though he commenced his negotiation under less propitious auspices, had the address or good fortune to conduct it to a more favourable issue. That the royal family of France, from its relationship to that of England, was ill-disposed towards the commonwealth, there could be no doubt; but its inclinations were controlled by the internal feuds which distracted, and the external war which demanded, the attention of the government. The first proof of hostility was supposed to be given before the death of the king, by a royal *arrêt* (October 21st, 1648) prohibiting the importation into France of English woollens and silks; and this was after-

[1] The leaders of the republicans were so called, because they had been confined in the castle of Louvestein, whence they were discharged on the death of the late prince of Orange.

[2] The clause respecting the Inquisition was one which secured the English traders from being molested by that court, on condition that they gave no scandal, — modo ne dent scandalum. This condition Cromwell wished to be withdrawn.

wards met by an order of parliament (August 23rd, 1649) equally prohibiting the importation into England of French woollens, silks, and wines. The alleged infraction of these commercial regulations led to the arrest and subsequent condemnation of vessels belonging to both nations; each government issued letters-of-marque to the sufferers among its subjects; and the naval commanders received instructions to seek that compensation for the individuals aggrieved which the latter were unable to obtain of themselves. Thus the maritime trade of both countries was exposed to the depredations of private and national cruisers, while their respective governments were considered as remaining at peace. But in 1651, when the cardinal Mazarin had been banished from France, it was resolved by Cromwell, who had recently won the battle of Worcester, to tempt the fidelity of d'Estrades, the governor of Dunkirk and a dependant on the exiled minister. An officer of the lord general's regiment made to d'Estrades the offer of a considerable sum, on condition that he would deliver the fortress into the hands of the English: or of the same sum, with the aid of a military force to the cardinal, if he preferred to treat in the name of his patron. The governor complained of the insult offered to his honour; but intimated that, if the English wished to purchase Dunkirk, the proposal might be addressed to his sovereign. The hint was taken, and the offer was made, and debated in the royal council at Poitiers. The cardinal, who returned to France at the very time, urged its acceptance; but the queen-mother and the other counsellors were so unwilling to give the English a footing in France, that he acquiesced in their opinion and a refusal was returned. Cromwell did not fail to resent the disappointment. By the facility which he afforded to the Spanish levies in Ireland, their army in Flanders was enabled to reduce Gravelines, and, soon afterwards, to invest Dunkirk. That fortress was on the point of capitulating when a French flotilla of seven sail, carrying from twenty to thirty guns each, and laden with stores and provisions, was descried stealing along the shore to its relief. Blake, who had received secret orders from the council, gave chase; the whole squadron was captured (September 5th, 1652), and the next day Dunkirk opened its gates.

Bordeaux had been appointed ambassador to the parliament (February 21st, 1653); after the inauguration of Cromwell it became necessary to appoint him ambassador to his highness the protector. But in what style was Louis to address the usurper by letter? "Mon cousin" was offered and refused; "mon frère," which Cromwell sought, was offensive to the pride of the monarch; and, as a temperament between the two, "monsieur le protecteur" was given and accepted. Bordeaux proposed a treaty of amity. To thwart the efforts of his rival, Don Alonzo, abandoning his former project, brought forward the proposal of a new commercial treaty between England and Spain. Cromwell was in no haste to conclude with either. He was aware that the war between them was the true cause of these applications; that he held the balance in his hand, and that it was in his power at any moment to incline it in favour of either of the two crowns. His determination, indeed, had long been taken; but it was not his purpose to let it transpire; and when he was asked the object of the two great armaments preparing in the English ports, he refused to give any satisfactory explanation.

THE FIRST PROTECTORATE PARLIAMENT

In this state of the treaty, its further progress was for a while suspended by the meeting of the protector's first parliament. He had summoned it for

the 3rd of September, his fortunate day, as he perhaps believed himself, as he certainly wished it to be believed by others. But the 3rd happened in 1654 to fall on a Sunday; and, that the Sabbath might not be profaned by the agitation of worldly business, he requested the members to meet him at sermon in Westminister Abbey on the following morning. At ten the procession set out from Whitehall. The personal appearance of the protector formed a striking contrast with the parade of the procession. He was dressed in a plain suit, after the fashion of a country gentleman, and was chiefly distinguished from his attendants by his superior simplicity, and the privilege of wearing his hat. After sermon, he placed himself in the chair of state in the Painted Chamber, while the members seated themselves, uncovered, on benches ranged along the walls. The protector then rose, took off his hat, and addressed them in a speech which lasted three hours. It was, after his usual style, verbose, involved, and obscure, sprinkled with quotations from Scripture to refresh the piety of the saints, and seasoned with an affectation of modesty to disarm the enmity of the republicans.

He described the state of the nation at the close of the last parliament. He then bade them contrast this picture with the existing state of things. The taxes had been reduced; judges of talent and integrity had been placed upon the bench; the burthen of the commissioners of the great seal had been lightened by the removal of many descriptions of causes from the court of Chancery to the ordinary courts of law; and "a stop had been put to that heady way for every man who pleased to become a preacher." The war with Holland had terminated in an advantageous peace; treaties of commerce and amity had been concluded with Denmark and Sweden;[1] a similar treaty, which would place the British trader beyond the reach of the Inquisition, had been signed with Portugal, and another was in progress with the ambassador of the French monarch. Thus had the government brought the three nations by hasty strides towards the land of promise; it was for the parliament to introduce them into it. The prospect was bright before them; let them not look back to the onions and flesh-pots of Egypt.

To procure a parliament favourable to his designs, all the power of the government had been employed to influence the elections; the returns had been examined by a committee of the council, under the pretext of seeing that the provisions of the "instrument" were observed; and the consequence was, that the lord Grey of Groby, Major Wildman, and some other noted republicans, had been excluded by command of the protector. Still he found himself unable to mould the house to his wishes. By the court, Lenthall was put in nomination for the office of speaker; by the opposition, Bradshaw, the boldest and most able of the opposite party. After a short debate, Lenthall was chosen, by the one, because they knew him to be a timid and a time-serving character; by the other, because they thought that, to place him in the chair was one step towards the revival of the Long Parliament, of which he had been speaker.

It was not long before the relative strength of the parties was ascertained.

[1] That with Sweden was negotiated by Whitelocke, who had been sent on that mission against his will by the influence of Cromwell. The object was to detach Sweden from the interest of France, and engage it to maintain the liberty of trade in the Baltic, against Denmark, which was under the influence of Holland. It was concluded April 11. After the peace with Holland, the Danish monarch hastened to appease the protector; the treaty which, though said by Cromwell to be already concluded, was not signed till eleven days afterwards, stipulated that the English traders should pay no other customs or dues than the Dutch. Thus they were enabled to import naval stores on the same terms, while before, on account of the heavy duties, they bought them at second hand of the Dutch.

[1654 A.D.]

After a sharp debate, in which it was repeatedly asked why the members of the Long Parliament then present should not resume the authority of which they had been illegally deprived by force, and by what right, but that of the sword, one man presumed to "command his commanders," the question was put, that the house resolve itself into a committee, to determine whether or not the government shall be in a single person and a parliament; and, to the surprise and alarm of Cromwell, it was carried (September 8th) against the court by a majority of five voices. The leaders of the opposition were Bradshaw, Haslerig, and Scott, who now contended in the committee that the existing government emanated from an incompetent authority, and stood in opposition to the solemn determination of a legitimate parliament; while the protectorists, with equal warmth, maintained that, since it had been approved by the people, the only real source of power, it could not be subject to revision by the representatives of the people. The debate lasted several days, during which the commonwealth party gradually increased in number. That the executive power might be profitably delegated to a single individual, was not disputed; but it was contended that, of right, the legislative authority belonged exclusively to the parliament.

This was far more than the assertion of a rival ambition: it was a systematic determination to admit the legitimacy of no government and of no power which did not emanate from the parliament, as the creature from its creator; it was the proclamation of the primordial, individual, and absolute sovereignty, in principle, of the people, and in fact, of the parliament, as representing the people.

Cromwell was not a philosopher, he did not act in obedience to systematic and premeditated views; but he was guided in his government by the superior instinct and practical good sense of a man destined to govern. He had watched the operation of this arrogant design to create the entire government by the sole will of the people, or of the parliament; he had himself audaciously promoted the work of destruction which had preceded the new creation; and, amidst the ruins which his hands had made, he had perceived the vanity of his rash hopes; he had learned that no government is, or can be, the work of man's will alone; he had recognised, as essential to its production, the action of time, and a variety of other causes apart from human deliberation. Entering, so to speak, into council with these superior powers, he regarded himself as their representative and minister, by the right of his genius, and of his manifold successes. He resolved not to suffer interference with what they had done, and he had done, to establish, in the stead of fallen monarchy, the new government over which he presided.

CROMWELL OVERAWES THE PARLIAMENT (1654 A.D.)

The parliament had spent four days in discussing the question whether it should give this government its approbation. On the morning of the 12th of September, 1654, the members were proceeding to the house, as usual, to continue this debate; and on their way they were constantly met by reports that the parliament was dissolved, and that the council of state and council of war, sitting together as one body, had decided upon its dissolution. On their arrival at Westminister, they found the doors of the parliament house shut, and guarded by soldiers; some of them attempted to go up the stairs: "There is no passage that way," said the guard; "the house is locked up, and we have orders to give no admittance to any person. If you are a member, go into the Painted Chamber, where the protector will presently be."

At about ten o'clock Cromwell appeared, attended by his officers and life guards, and took his stand on the raised dais where he had stood a week before to open the parliament.

"Gentlemen," he said to them, in part, "it is not long since I met you in this place, upon an occasion which gave me much more content and comfort than this doth. I called not myself to this place. I was by birth a gentleman, living neither in any considerable height, nor yet in obscurity. I have been called to several employments in the nation — to serve in parliament and elsewhere; and I did endeavour to discharge the duty of an honest man in those services. Having had some occasions to see, together with my brethren and countrymen, a happy period put to our sharp wars and contests with the then common enemy, I hoped, in a private capacity, to have reaped the fruit and benefit of our hard labours and hazards. I hoped to have had leave to retire to a private life. I begged to be dismissed of my charge; I begged it again and again — and God be judge between me and all men if I lie in this matter. That I lie not, in matter of fact, is known to very many; but whether I tell a lie in my heart, as labouring to represent to you what was not upon my heart, I say, the Lord be judge."

He then proceeded to narrate, in this tone, all his past career — his struggle with the Long Parliament, the overtures he had received from that body, and the necessity he had been under to dissolve it. "Because of my manner of life," he continued, "which had led me up and down the nation, thereby giving me to see and know the temper and spirits of all men, and of the best of men; I knew that the nation loathed their sitting. Under their arbitrary power, poor men were driven, like flocks of sheep, by forty in a morning, to the confiscation of goods and estates, without any man being able to give a reason why two of them had deserved to forfeit a shilling. And so far as I could discern, when they were dissolved, there was not so much as the barking of a dog, or any general and visible repining at it!"

He then referred to the convocation of the Barebones Parliament. "I have appealed to God before you already," he said, "though it be a tender thing to make appeals to God, yet I trust in such exigencies as these it will not offend his majesty. And I say to you again, in the presence of that God who hath blessed, and been with me in all my adversities and successes, that my greatest end was to lay down the power which was in my hands. The authority I had was boundless — for by act of parliament, I was general of all the forces in the three nations; in which unlimited condition I did not desire to live a day — wherefore, we called that meeting. The result was that they came and brought to me a parchment, signed by very much the major part of them, expressing their re-delivery and resignation of the power and authority that had been committed them, back again into my hands. And I can say it, in the presence of divers persons here who know whether I lie in that, that I did not know one tittle of that resignation, till they all came and brought it, and delivered it into my hands.

"My power was again, by this resignation, become as boundless and unlimited as before. All government was dissolved: all civil administration was at an end. I was arbitrary in power; having the armies in the three nations under my command; and truly not very ill-beloved by them, nor very ill-beloved by the people — by the good people. The gentlemen that undertook to frame this government did consult divers days together, how to frame somewhat that might give us settlement; and that I was not privy to their councils they know. When they had finished their model in some measure, they told me that except I would undertake the government,

[1654 A.D.]

they thought things would hardly come to a composure or settlement, but blood and confusion would break in upon us. I refused it again and again; not complimentingly — as they know, and as God knows! They urged on me, 'That I did not hereby receive anything which put me into a higher capacity than before; but that it limited me — that it bound my hands to act nothing without the consent of a council, until the parliament met, and then limited me by the parliament. After many arguments, and at the entreaty and request of divers persons of honour and quality, I did accept of the place and title of protector. I shall submit to your judgment, that I brought not myself into this condition.

"This was not done in a corner: it was open and public. I have a cloud of witnesses. I have witnesses within, without, above! I had the approbation of the officers of the army, in the three nations. And with their express consent, there went along an implied consent also of a body of persons who had had somewhat to do in the world; who had been instrumental, under God, to fight down the enemies of God and of His people — I mean the soldiery. And truly, the soldiery were a very considerable part of these nations, especially when all government was thus dissolved, and nothing to keep things in order but the sword. And yet they — which many histories will not parallel — even they were desirous that things ought to come to a consistency, and arbitrariness be taken away, and the government be put into the hands of a person limited and bounded, as in the Act of Settlement, whom they distrusted the least, and loved not the worst.

"Nor is this all. The judges did declare, that they could not administer justice to the satisfaction of their consciences, until they had received commissions from me. And I have yet more witnesses. All the sheriffs in England are my witnesses; and all that have come in upon a process issued out by sheriffs are my witnesses. All the people in England are my witnesses; and many in Ireland and Scotland. And I shall now make you my last witnesses — and shall ask you, whether you came not hither by my writs, directed to the several sheriffs? To which writs the people gave obedience; having also had the Act of Government communicated to them, which was required to be distinctly read unto the people at the place of election, to avoid surprises, or misleadings of them through their ignorance. There also they signed the indenture, with proviso 'That the persons so chosen should not have power to alter the government as now settled in one single person and a parliament.'

"This being the case, though I told you in my last speech that you were a free parliament, yet I thought it was understood withal that I was the protector, and the authority that called you; that I was in possession of the government by a good right from God and men. I do not know why I may not balance this providence, in the sight of God, with any hereditary interest. And for you to disown or not to own it; for you to act with parliamentary authority, especially in the disowning of it, contrary to the very fundamental things, yea, against the very root itself of this establishment; to sit, and not own the authority by which you sit — is that which I believe astonisheth more men than myself, and doth as dangerously disappoint and discompose the nation as anything that could have been invented by the greatest enemy to our peace and welfare, or that could well have happened. In every government there must be somewhat fundamental, somewhat like a Magna Charta, which should be standing, unalterable."[1]

He would have them to know that four things were fundamental: (1) that the supreme power should be invested in a single person and parliament;

(2) that the parliament should be successive, and not perpetual; (3) that neither protector nor parliament alone should possess the uncontrolled command of the military force; and (4) that liberty of conscience should be fenced round with such barriers as might exclude both profaneness and persecution. The other articles of the instrument were less essential; they might be altered with circumstances; and he should always be ready to agree to what was reasonable. But he would not permit them to sit, and yet disown the authority by which they sat.[e]

He went on: "I can sooner be willing to be rolled into my grave, and buried with infamy, than I can give my consent unto the wilful throwing away of this government, in the fundamentals of it! And therefore I must deal plainly with you. What I forbore upon a just confidence at first, you necessitate me unto now! Seeing the authority which called you is so little valued, and so much slighted — till some assurance be given and made known that the fundamental interest shall be settled and approved, according to the proviso in the writ of return, and such a consent testified as will make it appear that the same is accepted — I have caused a stop to be put to your entrance into the parliament house.

"I am sorry, I am sorry, and I could be sorry to the death, that there is cause for this. But there is cause. There is therefore somewhat to be offered to you: a promise of reforming as to circumstantials, and agreeing in the substance and fundamentals, that is to say, in the form of government now settled. The making of your minds known in that, by giving your assent and subscription to it, is the means that will let you in, to act those things as a parliament which are for the good of the people. The place where you may come thus and sign, as many as God shall make free thereunto, is in the lobby without the parliament door."

So much boldness in displaying his power, and in making indiscriminate use of force and right, truth and falsehood, in the assertion of his authority, struck all minds with stupor. Indignant, but powerless, the republican leaders, Bradshaw, Scott, and Haslerig, refused to give any pledge, and returned home again; and to the honour of the party, about a hundred and fifty members followed their example. But the majority of members either approved or submitted; on the very first day, a hundred and forty signed the required engagement; before the end of the month, more than three hundred had subscribed it, and the parliament resumed its labours. Cromwell manifested no ill-feeling towards the recusant members. On the 18th of September, in order to give an air of independence to their servility, the house converted the whole of Cromwell's recent conduct into a measure of their own, and resolved: "That all persons returned, or who shall be returned, to serve in this parliament, shall, before they be admitted to sit in the house, subscribe the recognition of the government — to be true and faithful to the lord protector, and not to propose, or give consent, to alter the government, as it is settled in one person and a parliament." A disreputable artifice of a mutilated assembly, which falsely ascribed to itself an act of violence, in order to cover its humiliation by the lie!

A singular accident was well nigh causing the abrupt overthrow of the precarious edifice, so laboriously supported by the strong arm of one man. On the 29th of September, Cromwell had taken it into his head to dine in the open air, in Hyde Park, with Thurloe and some of his household; his carriage was harnessed with six Friesland horses which the duke of Oldenburg had sent him not long before; and he resolved to try, with his own hand, the mettle of these animals, "not doubting," says Ludlow,[g] "but they would prove

as tame as the three nations which were ridden by him." Thurloe[h] could not resist the desire to ride in a carriage driven by the protector, and so got inside. Cromwell, he says, "drove pretty handsomely for some time, but, at last, provoking the horses too much with the whip, they grew unruly"; the postilion was thrown; Cromwell fell from the coach-box upon the pole, and from the pole to the ground; his foot caught in the harness, and he was dragged along for a moment, but he quickly extricated himself, and the carriage passed on without touching him. During his fall, a pistol went off in his pocket, revealing, in the accidental danger which he had incurred, his secret precautions against the constant dangers by which he was surrounded. He was immediately taken up — as well as Thurloe, who had dislocated his ankle by jumping out of the carriage — and conveyed to Whitehall, where he was let blood, and remained confined to his room for nearly three weeks, during which time he received few visitors, and gave but little attention to business. The government newspapers made no allusion to the accident; those of the opposition merely mentioned the danger to which the protector had been exposed, without specifying its cause; the court poets celebrated his miraculous deliverance.[1]

Cromwell's real or apparent inactivity lasted much longer than his indisposition; for more than three months, he remained almost utterly unmoved and silent, as if his only intention were to watch and wait. Meanwhile parliament was discussing the constitution of the protectorate.

CROMWELL DISSOLVES THE PARLIAMENT (1655 A.D.)

The force so lately put on the parliament, and the occasion of that force, had opened the eyes of the most devoted among his adherents. His protestations of disinterestedness, his solemn appeals to heaven in testimony of his wish to lead the life of a private gentleman, were contrasted with his aspiring and arbitrary conduct; and the house, though deprived of one-fourth of its number, still contained a majority jealous of his designs and anxious to limit his authority. The accident which had placed his life in jeopardy naturally led to the consideration of the probable consequences of his death; and, to sound the disposition of the members, the question of the succession was repeatedly, though not formally, introduced. The remarks which it provoked afforded little encouragement to his hopes; yet, when the previous arrangements had been made, and all the dependants of the government had been mustered, Lambert, having in a long and studied speech detailed the evils of elective, the benefits of hereditary, succession, moved that the office of protector should be limited to the family of Oliver Cromwell, according to the known law of inheritance. To the surprise and the mortification of the party, the motion was negatived by a division of two hundred against eighty voices; and it was resolved that, on the death of the protector, his successor should be chosen by the parliament if it were sitting, and by the council in the absence of parliament. Cromwell, on his part, betrayed no symptom of impatience; but waited quietly for the moment when he had resolved to break the designs of his adversaries. They proceeded with the revision of the "instrument"; their labours were embodied in a bill, and the bill was read a third time. During two days the courtiers prolonged the debate by moving a variety of amendments; on the third Cromwell summoned the house to meet him in the Painted Chamber. Displeasure and contempt were marked

[1 The cavaliers declared with better wit than prophesy that Cromwell's next fall would be from the end of a hangman's cart.]

on his countenance; and the high and criminatory tone which he assumed taught them to feel how inferior the representatives of the people were to the representative of the army.

They appeared there, he observed, with the speaker at their head, as a house of parliament. Yet, what had they done as a parliament? He never had played, he never would play, the orator; and therefore he would tell them frankly, they had done nothing. For five months they had passed no bill, had made no address, had held no communication with him. But had they then done nothing? Yes: they had encouraged the cavaliers to plot against the commonwealth, and the levellers to intrigue with the cavaliers. By their dissension they had aided the fanatics to throw the nation into confusion, and by the slowness of their proceedings had compelled the soldiers to live at free quarters on the country. They supposed that he sought to make the protectorship hereditary in his family. It was not true; had they inserted such a provision in the "instrument," on that ground alone he would have rejected it. He spoke in the fear of the Lord, who would not be mocked, and with the satisfaction that his conscience did not belie his assertion. The different revolutions which had happened were attributed to his cunning. How blind were men who would not see the hand of providence in its merciful dispensations, who ridiculed as the visions of enthusiasm the observations "made by the quickening and teaching Spirit!" It was supposed that he would not be able to raise money without the aid of parliament. But "he had been inured to difficulties, and never found God failing when he trusted in Him." But that he might trouble them no longer, it was his duty to tell them that their continuance was not for the benefit of the nation, and therefore he did then and there declare that he dissolved the parliament.

This was a stroke for which his adversaries were unprepared. The "instrument" had provided that the parliament should continue to sit during five months, and it still wanted twelve days of the expiration of that term. But Cromwell chose to understand the clause not of calendar but of lunar months, the fifth of which had been completed on the preceding evening. Much might have been urged against such an interpretation; but a military force was ready to support the opinion of the protector, and prudence taught the most reluctant of his enemies to submit.[c]

ROYALIST CONSPIRACIES AND CROMWELL'S DESPOTISM

The coalition of royalists and republicans to which Cromwell alluded was no fiction. The common hatred of him united them, and each hoped that when he was overthrown they would be able to subdue their allies and establish their own system. Some of the leading republicans, such as Colonel Overton and Major Wildman, entered into correspondence with the exiled king. Okey, Alured, Lawson, and Hacker, held consultations with Wildman, at which Marten and Lord Grey of Groby are said to have been sometimes present. Of the co-operation of Haslerig, Harrison, Carew, and some others, there seems to have been no doubt. The vigilance of the government, however, disconcerted all their plans. Overton was arrested and sent up from Scotland; Lord Grey, Harrison, and Carew, were committed to various prisons. Wildman was taken in the very act of dictating "The Declaration of the free and well-affected people of England, now in arms against the tyrant Oliver Cromwell, Esq." A part of Whitelocke's[i] remarks on it are as follows: "Divers suspected their designs at the bottom in it to intend the bringing in of the king; because they conclude in their declaration for a truly free parliament, which

[1655 A.D.]

was the way for the king's restauration. And that began now to be held fit and requisite by many sober and faithful patriots, who were distasted at the private ambition of some and their domineering." He hints that he was himself of this way of thinking. We everywhere meet with proofs of the general wish for the restoration of the monarchy.

The general rising of the royalists had been fixed for the beginning of March (1655). Wilmot (now earl of Rochester) and Sir Joseph Wagstaff came over privately to take the command of them, and Charles himself with Ormonde and others moved from Cologne to Middelburg, to be ready to pass over to England. The wakeful eye of government, however, was on their projects, and the partial risings which they made in Yorkshire and the west were easily suppressed. Sir Henry Slingsby and Sir Richard Malever, who had been with Wilmot at the head of the former, were taken, but Wilmot himself escaped. In the west, Wagstaff being joined by Colonel Penruddock, Captain Grove, and about two hundred others, entered Salisbury on a Sunday night (March 11th), and seized in their beds the judges and the sheriff who were there to hold the assizes next day. In the morning Wagstaff prepared to hang them; but Penruddock and others, horrified at such barbarity, interposed so warmly that he consented to liberate them. The insurgents then proclaimed the king, but finding that none joined them, and that a reinforcement which they expected from Hampshire did not arrive, they retired and passed through Dorset into Devon, where they were attacked at South Molton by Captain Crooke, and routed. Wagstaff made his escape, the rest surrendered. Cromwell resolved to venture on trying them by jury, and as their guilt was manifest according to the existing laws, they were all found guilty. Grove and Penruddock were beheaded; some were hanged, others were pardoned; the remainder, without any regard to their station in life, were, in the usual way, shipped off for slaves to Barbadoes.

Hitherto Cromwell had been lenient to the royalists in the hopes of gaining them; of this he now despaired, and he resolved to keep measures with them no longer. A great number of noblemen and gentlemen were arrested; the Episcopalian clergy were forbidden to act as schoolmasters or tutors, or to use the church service either in public or private; priests were ordered to quit the kingdom under pain of death; cavaliers and papists were not to come within less than twenty miles of the city. He finally "decimated" the royalists, that is, imposed an annual income-tax of ten per cent. on all possessing £100 a year and upwards in land, or £1,500 in personal property, who had ever borne arms for the king, or declared themselves to be of the royal party. He thus openly trampled on the Act of Oblivion, which, when it suited his purpose, he had pressed on so strenuously. The reason he assigned was, that as, by their obstinately keeping themselves separate from the rest of the nation, they were a continual cause of danger, it was but just that they should be made to defray the expenses incurred in guarding against it.

For the collection of this tax, and for carrying into effect his other arbitrary measures, he divided England into eleven districts, over each of which he set a major-general. These officers were furnished with most extensive authority; they were empowered to raise troops, levy the taxes, disarm cavaliers and papists, inquire into the conduct of ministers and schoolmasters, arrest and imprison dangerous and suspicious persons. When to these we add the arbitrary system of general taxation continued or imposed, the high courts of justice, the interference with the functions of judges and advocates, we have a picture of despotism before which that of the Stuarts almost sinks into insignificance.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NAVAL EXPEDITIONS

We now turn to the foreign affairs of the protector's government. France and Spain, we have seen, were rivals for his favour. Of all the states of Europe, Spain was, perhaps, the one with which there was least ground of quarrel: it had given no countenance whatever to the royal family; it had been the first to acknowledge the commonwealth. But on the other hand, Cromwell was a zealous Protestant, and Spain was Catholic, and the chief seat of the Inquisition; and the gold and silver which it drew from America were, moreover, tempting to the protector's cupidity. He did not see why Spain should monopolise the wealth of an immense country, the innocent people of which she had so barbarously massacred, and treat as pirates the crews of all ships which were found in those latitudes. The Spanish court, meantime, aware that Cromwell was equipping a fleet, and fearing that it might be intended for the West Indies, sent the marquis of Leyda to London; but after staying there five months, he returned without having effected anything.

Cromwell had, in fact, prepared two fleets, the one of thirty sail under Blake had sailed in the preceding month of October (1655) to the Mediterranean, to exact reparation for injuries done to the English trade by the states around that sea. Blake first cast anchor before the port of Leghorn, and he made the duke of Tuscany and the pope pay 60,000*l.* for the injuries done to the English nation [in permitting Prince Rupert to sell in their ports three English merchantmen captured in 1650]. He then sailed to Algiers (March 10th, 1656), and required the dey to deliver up the English ships and men taken by his piratic subjects. Having received a conciliatory reply, he proceeded to Tunis, and made a similar demand; but the dey bade him destroy the castles of Goletta and Porto Farina, and his fleet, if he was able. Blake speedily silenced the fire of these castles, and then entered the harbour and burned nine ships of war that were lying there. He sailed thence to Tripoli, whose dey submitted at once to his demands. Having thus chastised these pirates, Blake returned to England.

The other fleet, which consisted of thirty sail, commanded by Admiral Penn, and carrying four thousand land forces under General Venables, sailed about the end of December for the West Indies,[1] with sealed orders. When they reached Barbadoes January 29th, they opened their instructions, and having enlisted and regimented a good number of those who had been sent thither as slaves, and thus raised their forces to nine thousand men, to which they added twelve hundred at St. Christopher's, they sailed to Haiti; but instead of entering the port of Santo Domingo at once (April 14th), when the town would probably have submitted, they landed the troops at a distance of forty miles from it. Here a mutiny broke out in consequence of Commissioner Winslow's issuing a proclamation, stating, in Roman fashion, that all plunder should be public property. This being appeased by Venables, they advanced for three days under a burning sun, and living chiefly on unripe fruit, which caused diseases among the men. At length they joined a detachment which had landed within ten miles of the town. As they advanced they fell into an ambuscade; they drove off the enemy, but their success was of no avail, for the diseased condition of the troops made it necessary for them to fall back to the station of the detachment, where they remained for a week. When they

[1 Gardiner[c] notes that the mundane spirit of conquest now revealed marks a turning point in the Puritan attitude, and in Cromwell's soul. He also thinks that, whatever the provocation, the act of sending a fleet to attack Spanish colonies previous to any declaration of war was highly dishonourable.]

advanced again toward the town (on the 25th), the road, lying through a thick wood, was commanded by a battery, and the sides were lined with Spanish marksmen. The advance guard in disorder fell back on a regiment of foot, and they on a troop of horse; all was confusion till a body of seamen cleared the wood. But night then came on, and they returned once more to their former station. Here a council of war having decided that success was now hopeless, it was resolved to re-embark the troops. They therefore left Haiti (May 3rd); but as the commanders feared to return without having effected something, they made a descent on the 10th on the island of Jamaica, the people of which offered no resistance; but they had placed the greater part of their property in security, so that the plunder gained was trifling. By Cromwell and the nation, the acquisition of Jamaica was thought a matter of no importance; yet there were people who saw further into things, and regarded it as really of more value to England than Haiti would have been. Penn and Venables were, on their return, both committed to the Tower by the indignant and mortified protector. They had shown themselves inefficient commanders, and by their want of harmony they had almost ensured failure.

Cromwell at this time added to his reputation in the eyes of the world by his prompt and effectual interference in behalf of the Vaudois, or Protestant inhabitants of the valleys of Lucerne, Perusa, and San Martino in Piedmont, who were persecuted by their Catholic sovereign. There are of course conflicting statements on this subject; but it is a fair conclusion, where the Catholics were by far the stronger party, they were the aggressors. The Vaudois, it appears, were ordered to give up a part of the valley of Lucerne; they expressed their dissatisfaction, and the duke of Savoy forthwith quartered troops in their valleys. The soldiers acted with insolence and tyranny; the people resisted but were overpowered, and a massacre of about three hundred of the inhabitants of Lucerne was perpetrated (April 21st) with all the circumstances, we are assured, of the most revolting barbarity.[1] When the intelligence reached England, Cromwell lost no time in sending off Under-Secretary Morland as his envoy to Turin; he wrote letters to all the Protestant states of Europe, and he made the security of the Vaudois a *sine quâ non* in the treaty which was pending with the court of France. The duke was therefore obliged to allow his Protestant subjects to exercise the religion of their fathers, and Cromwell sent them a sum of money from himself in addition to what had by his permission been collected for them in the churches.

When the Spanish court was certified of the attempt on Haiti, it was thrown into great perplexity, being already engaged in a war with France. It could not, however, tamely pass over such an indignity; it was therefore resolved (September 1st) to lay an embargo on the English ships and property in Spain; and Cardenas also received orders to remonstrate, and if not satisfied, to withdraw. He accordingly left England (October 24th), and the day after his departure Cromwell put forth a declaration of the justice of the war on his part, and signed the treaty with France, by a secret article of which ten Frenchmen were to be excluded from the British dominions, and Charles II, the duke of York, Ormonde, Hyde, and fifteen others from those of France.


Among the events of this year may be noticed the return of the Jews to England, where they had not been settled since the reign of Edward I. Manasseh Ben Israel, a distinguished rabbi, came over to England to negotiate with

[1 On this atrocity Milton wrote his sonnet beginning:

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughter'd saints whose bones
Lie scatter'd on the Alpine mountains cold."]

the protector on this subject [and to offer a large sum for permission to settle and trade in England]; and though the bigotry of the committee appointed to consider his propositions did not allow Cromwell to go so far as he wished, he permitted them to come over, to build a synagogue, and to purchase ground for a cemetery.

Political parties are willing to join with those whom they most hate to overthrow an object of common aversion. In accordance with this principle, we now meet the sectarian levellers again in alliance with the royalists, and even with the court of Spain. Edward Sexby, a man who had risen from the ranks to the post of colonel, had been an admirer and an agent of Cromwell's in the army; he had been a leading agitator; he was a zealot for liberty, and when his former idol apostatised as he thought, he became his inveterate foe. After the arrest of Wildman and others, Sexby, who had not been taken, went through the country distributing pamphlets. In the May of this year he went over to Brussels, where he informed the count Fuensaldaña of the real destination of the fleet under Penn and Venables, and offered the aid of the levellers against the protector, if furnished with money Fuensaldaña sent him to Madrid, where he was well received, and he obtained 40,000 crowns, with which he returned to Antwerp, whence he sent various sums to his confederates in England; and though Cromwell had gotten information, and even seized a remittance of £800, Sexby crossed the channel, remained some time, and returned in safety.



SCYTHES USED AS WEAPONS IN CIVIL WARS, SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Charles had made an offer of alliance to the Spanish cabinet after the rupture with England. He engaged to recall to his standard the English and Irish regiments in the service of France; he boasted of his influence in the English navy, and, like Sexby, only asked for money. After a long period of the usual delay, the court of Spain resolved to accept both offers, and to effect a union between Charles and Sexby. The latter said that the wish of his friends was to have a free parliament, in which case there was no doubt that Charles would be restored, though with some limitations. The plan formed was, that Charles should raise four regiments out of his subjects in the service of France, that Spain should furnish a body of six thousand men, and that the levellers should secure for them a port and fortress not distant from London, where they might effect a landing.[i]

THE SECOND PROTECTORATE PARLIAMENT (1656 A.D.)

The equipment of the fleet had exhausted the treasury, and the protector dared not impose additional taxes on the country at a time when his right to levy the ordinary revenue was disputed in the courts of law. On the ground that the parliamentary grants were expired, Sir Peter Wentworth had refused to pay the assessment in the country, and Coney, a merchant, the duties on imports in London. The commissioners imposed fines, and distrained; the aggrieved brought actions against the collectors.[e]

[1656 A.D.]

Cromwell tried to soothe the sturdy citizen Coney who reminded him that he himself had said in the Long Parliament, that the subject who yields to an illegal impost is more the enemy of his country than the tyrant who imposes it. The protector sent the merchant to prison; and then more arbitrarily imprisoned the counsel, who had, in pleading for his writ of habeas corpus, used arguments which went to deny altogether the legality of the authority of the existing government. There was a compromise in which Coney at length withdrew his opposition to the impost, and his legal defenders were released. Sir Peter Wentworth was brought before Cromwell and his council. He was required to withdraw an action which he had commenced against the tax-collector. "If you command it I must submit," said Wentworth to the protector. He did command it, and the resistance was at an end.[k]

But the want of money daily increased, and by the advice of the council he consented to call a parliament to meet on the 17th of September. The result of the elections revealed to him the alarming secret, that the antipathy to his government was more deeply rooted, and more widely spread, than he had previously imagined. In Scotland and Ireland, indeed, the electors obsequiously chose the members recommended by the council; but these were conquered countries, bending under the yoke of military despotism. In England, the whole nation was in a ferment; pamphlets were clandestinely circulated, calling on the electors to make a last struggle in defence of their liberties; and though Vane, Ludlow, and Rich were taken into custody; though other republican leaders were excluded by criminal prosecutions, though the cavaliers, the Catholics, and all who had neglected to aid the cause of the parliament, were disqualified from voting by the "instrument"; though a military force was employed in London to overawe the proceedings, and the whole influence of the government and of the army was openly exerted in the country, yet in several counties the court candidates were wholly, and in most, partially, rejected. But Cromwell was aware of the error which he had committed in the last parliament. He resolved that none of his avowed opponents should be allowed to take possession of their seats. The returns were laid before the council; the major-generals received orders to inquire into the political and religious characters of the elected; the reports of these officers were carefully examined; and a list was made of nearly one hundred persons to be excluded under the pretext of immorality or delinquency.

On the appointed day, the protector, after divine service, addressed the new "representatives" in the Painted Chamber. His real object was to procure money, and with this view he sought to excite their alarm, and to inflame their religious antipathies.

From the Painted Chamber the members proceeded to the house. A military guard was stationed at the door, and a certificate from the council was required from each individual previously to his admission. The excluded members complained by letter of this breach of parliamentary privilege. A strong feeling of disapprobation was manifested in several parts of the house. Several members, to show their disapprobation, voluntarily seceded, and those, who had been excluded by force, published (September 22nd) in bold and indignant language an appeal to the justice of the people.

Having weeded out his enemies, Cromwell had no reason to fear opposition to his pleasure. The house passed a resolution declaratory of the justice and policy of the war against Spain, and two acts, by one of which were annulled all claims of Charles Stuart and his family to the crown, by the other were provided additional safeguards for the person of the chief governor. With

the same unanimity, a supply of four hundred thousand pounds was voted, but when the means of raising the money came under consideration, a great diversity of opinion prevailed. Week after week, month after month, was tediously and fruitlessly consumed; though the time limited by the "instrument" was past, still the money bill had made no progress; and, to add to the impatience of Cromwell, a new subject was accidentally introduced, which, as it strongly interested the passions, absorbed for some time the attention of the house.

At the age of nineteen, George Fox, the son of a weaver of Drayton, heard, or persuaded himself that he heard, an inward voice, calling on him to forsake his parents' house, and to make himself a stranger in his own country. Docile to the celestial admonition, he began to lead a solitary life, wandering from place to place, and clothed from head to foot in garments of leather. He found himself inebriated with spiritual delights, and received an assurance that his name was written in the Lamb's Book of Life. At the same time, he was forbidden by the Lord to employ the plural pronoun "you" in addressing a single person," to bid his neighbour good even or good morrow, or to uncover the head, or scrape with the leg to any mortal being. In 1647, he preached for the first time at Duckenfield, not far from Manchester; but the most fruitful scene of his labours was at Swarthmoor, near Ulverston. His disciples followed his example. Their refusal to uncover before the bench was usually punished with a fine, on the ground of contempt; their religious objection to take an oath, or to pay tithes, exposed them to protracted periods of imprisonment; and they were often and severely whipped as vagrants. Still, in defiance of punishment and calumny, the Quakers, or Friends, so they were called, persevered in their profession.

Of the severities so wantonly exercised against these religionists it is difficult to speak with temper. Of this, James Naylor furnished a striking instance. He accepted the worship which was paid to him, not as offered to James Naylor, but to Christ dwelling in James Naylor. Under this impression, during part of his progress to Bristol, and at his entrance into that city, he rode on horseback with a man walking bareheaded before him, two females holding his bridle on each side, and others attending him, one of whom, Dorcas Erbury, maintained that he had raised her to life after she had been dead the space of two days. These occasionally threw scarfs and handkerchiefs before him, and sang, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Hosts; Hosanna in the highest; holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Israel." The house voted that Naylor was guilty of blasphemy; the more zealous moved that he should be put to death. The punishment to which he was doomed ought to have satisfied the most bigoted of his adversaries. He stood with his neck in the pillory for two hours (December 18th) and was whipped from Palace Yard to the Old Exchange, receiving three hundred and ten lashes on the way. Some days later he was again placed in the pillory; and the letter B for blasphemer was burned on his forehead, and his tongue was bored with a red-hot iron. From London the house ordered him to be conducted to Bristol (January 13, 1657), the place of his offence. He entered at Lamford's Gate, riding on the bare back of a horse with his face to the tail; dismounted at Rockley Gate, and was successively whipped in five parts of the city. His admirers, however, were not ashamed of the martyr. On every occasion they attended him bareheaded; they kissed and sucked his wounds; and they chanted with him passages from the Scriptures. On his return to London, he was committed to solitary confinement, without pen, ink, or paper, or fire, or candle, and with no other sustenance than what

[1657 A.D.]

he might earn by his own industry. Here the delusion under which he laboured gradually wore away. By the Rump Parliament he was afterwards discharged. In 1660 he was found in a dying state in a field in Huntingdonshire, and shortly afterwards expired.

CROMWELL WOULD BE KING

While the parliament thus spent its time in the prosecution of an offence which concerned it not, Cromwell anxiously revolved in his own mind a secret project of the first importance to himself and the country. To his ambition, it was not sufficient that he actually possessed the supreme authority, and exercised it with more despotic sway than any of his legitimate predecessors; he still sought to mount a step higher, to encircle his brows with a diadem, and to be addressed with the title of majesty. It could not be, that vanity alone induced him to hazard the attachment of his friends for the sake of mere parade and empty sound. He had rendered the more modest title of protector as great and as formidable as that of king, and, though uncrowned, had treated on a footing of equality with the proudest of the crowned heads in Europe. It is more probable that he was led by considerations of interest. He knew that the nation was weary of change; he saw with what partiality men continued to cling to the old institutions; and he, perhaps, trusted that the establishment of an hereditary monarchy, with a house of peers, though under a new dynasty, and with various modifications, might secure the possession of the crown, not only to himself, but also to his posterity. However that may be, he now made the acquisition of the kingly dignity the object of his policy.

The first opportunity of preparing the public mind for this important alteration was furnished by the recent proceedings against Naylor, which had provoked considerable discontent on account of the judicial authority exercised by the house — an authority which appeared subversive of the national liberties.[e] Cromwell, as we have seen by what he said to Whitelocke, had had this idea in his mind for some time. He now consulted on the subject with Thurloe, Pierrepoint, and St. John; and to gain the good-will of the people, he resolved to commence with allowing the arbitrary rule of the major-generals to be terminated. A bill being brought in (January 7th, 1657), of which the object was to confirm their past acts, and invest them with legal authority for the future, it was opposed by Claypole, the protector's son-in-law, and by Lord Broghill his confidant. The debate was continued for ten successive days; the tyranny of the "bashaws," as they were called, was detailed and dwelt on; but, headed by Lambert, they defended themselves with spirit. One of their arguments amounting to this, that the whole body of the cavaliers should be punished for the offence of some, Henry Cromwell, the protector's nephew, replied, that on this principle, all the major-generals ought to be punished, because some of them had done ill, of which he could produce proofs. He was called on to name, and he professed himself ready to do so; but the debate was adjourned. It was hinted to him that his uncle would not be pleased with his conduct; but he went that very night and told the protector what he had done, and added, that he "had his black book and papers ready to make good what he had said." Cromwell replied in a jesting manner; and taking off a rich scarlet cloak and his gloves, gave them to Henry, who strutted into the house with them next day. The bill was finally lost (on the 29th) by a large majority, and

the major-generals remained exposed to actions at law for their previous conduct.

While this bill was pending, a plot to murder the protector was discovered. The agent was Miles Syndercomb, who had been a quartermaster in Monk's army, but had been dismissed for his share in Overton's plot. Sexby, when last in England, had arranged the plan with him, and there can be no doubt that Charles and his court knew and approved of it. The death of Cromwell was to be the signal for the rising of the levellers and royalists, and the invasion from Flanders. Syndercomb and another named Cecil bribed Tooke, a life-guardsman, to give them information of the places where Cromwell was to pass, intending to shoot him from a window; but something always occurred to frustrate them, and at Wildman's suggestion they altered their plan. One evening at six o'clock (January 9th, 1657), they entered the chapel at Whitehall, and having set a basket of combustibles in one of the pews, lighted a slow match, calculated for six hours; but as they were coming out they were all seized, for Tooke had betrayed them. Cecil told all he knew, which only amounted to this, that some persons in the palace were to kill Cromwell in the confusion. Syndercomb was tried and condemned for high treason (February 9th); he would give no information, and he was found dead in his bed a few hours before the time appointed for his execution (13th). The royalists and levellers maintained that he had been strangled by Cromwell's orders; the verdict of the jury was suicide by snuffing up a poisonous powder.

The pulse of the house on the subject of kingship having been felt after the discovery of this plot, about a month later (February 23rd), Alderman Pack rose and presented a paper, called "A Humble Address and Remonstrance," protesting against the present uncertain form of government, and calling on the protector to assume a higher title. The officers instantly rose in a great heat, and Pack was borne down to the bar; but order being restored, and Lord Broghill, with Glyn, Whitelocke, and the lawyers and dependents of the court supporting Pack, the paper was read, and it was resolved to take it into consideration. It was debated, article by article, and at length adopted under the title of "The Humble Petition and Advice."

The only opposition which Cromwell had to fear was that of the army, in which interest swayed some, fanaticism others, to oppose it. Lambert, in particular, was against it; for being the second person in the country and a vain ambitious man, he looked forward to being the next protector. His proposal to the officers was, to bring up five regiments of cavalry and compel the house to confirm the "instrument" and the establishment of major-generals. They hesitated however to adopt this bold measure, and he then withdrew from their councils. The inferior officers also held meetings, and they sent (on the 28th) one hundred of their number to inform the protector of their sentiments. He reminded them that at one time they had offered him the title of king; he said he had always been the drudge of the officers; that the parliament had been called contrary to his judgment, that it required to be controlled, which could only be done by enlarging the authority of the protector. Several were convinced by his reasons, but they had no effect on the majority. They, however, agreed that if the question of the title were kept to be last considered, they would make no opposition to those of his being empowered to name his successor, and of the parliament's consisting of two houses as he proposed.

On the 25th of March the title of king was voted, and six days after a committee waited on the protector with The Humble Petition and Advice. He spoke of the "consternation of his mind" at the offer, and requested time "to ask

[1657 A.D.]

counsel of God and his own heart"; at the same time approving of everything but the new title to be given to himself. At his desire, a committee was appointed to hear and resolve his scruples. After various conferences, he owned (Apr. 20th) that his doubts were removed, and at length he appointed a day (May 6th) to meet the parliament, when it was fully expected that he would accept the royal title.

Cromwell had vainly sought to gain his brother and son-in-law, Desborough and Fleetwood, over to his design. They now told him that they must resign their commissions; and Desborough having informed Pride of what Cromwell was about to do, the latter cried out, "He shall not." When asked how he could prevent it, he said by a petition signed by the officers: they approved of his plan, and went straight to Doctor Owen, and prevailed on him to draw up one without delay.

The 8th was the day finally fixed for the protector to meet the parliament. On the morning of that day, Colonel Mason and six-and-twenty other officers came and presented the petition, in which they asserted that the design of those who urged the general to take the title of king was to destroy him and bring the nation under the old servitude, and prayed the parliament to continue steady to the old cause, for which they themselves were willing to lay down their lives. *i*



CAVALIER OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

CROMWELL REFUSES THE TITLE AND IS INAUGURATED PROTECTOR

This bold step subdued the reluctance of the protector. He abandoned the lofty hopes to which he had so long, so pertinaciously clung, despatched Fleetwood to the house to prevent a debate, and shortly afterwards summoned the members to meet him at Whitehall. Addressing them with more than his usual embarrassment, he said, that neither his own reflections nor the reasoning of the committee had convinced him that he ought to accept the title of king. If he were to accept it, it would be doubtingly; if he did it doubtingly, it would not be of faith; and if it were not of faith, it would be a sin. "Wherefore," he concluded, "I cannot undertake this government with that title of king, and this is mine answer to this great and weighty business."

Thus ended the mighty farce which for more than two months held in suspense the hopes and fears of three nations. But the friends of Cromwell resumed the subject in parliament. It was observed that he had not refused to administer the government under any other title; the name of king was expunged for that of protector; and with this and a few more amendments, the Humble Petition and Advice received the sanction of the chief magistrate. The inauguration followed. On the platform, raised at the upper end of Westminster Hall, and in front of a magnificent chair of state, stood the protector; while the speaker, with his assistants, invested him with a purple mantle lined with ermine, presented him with a bible superbly gilt and embossed, girt a sword by his side, and placed a sceptre of massive gold in his hand. At a signal given, the trumpet sounded; the heralds proclaimed the

style of the new sovereign; and the spectators shouted, "Long live his highness; God save the lord-protector." He rose immediately, bowed to the ambassadors, and walked in state through the hall to his carriage. Most of the officers took the oath of fidelity to the protector. Lambert refused, and resigned his commissions, which brought him about six thousand pounds per annum. Cromwell, however, assigned to him a yearly pension of two thousand pounds.

That which distinguished the present from the late form of government was the return which it made towards the more ancient institutions of the country. That return, indeed, had wrung from Cromwell certain concessions repugnant to his feelings and ambition, but to which he probably was reconciled by the consideration that in the course of a few years they might be modified or repealed. The supreme authority was vested in the protector; but, instead of rendering it hereditary in his family, the most which he could obtain was the power of nominating his immediate successor. The two houses of parliament were restored; but, as if it were meant to allude to his past conduct, he was bound to leave to the house of commons the right of examining the qualifications and determining the claims of the several representatives.

To him was given the power of nominating the members of the "other house" (he dared not yet term it the house of lords); but, in the first instance, the persons so nominated were to be approved by the house of representatives, and afterwards by the other house itself. In the appointment of councillors, the great officers of state, and the commanders of the forces, many of the restrictions sought to be introduced by the Long Parliament were enforced. In point of religion, it was enacted that a confession of faith should be agreed upon between the protector and the two houses; but that dissenters from it should enjoy liberty of conscience, and the free exercise of their worship, unless they should reject the mystery of the Trinity, or the inspiration of the Scriptures, or profess prelatic, or popish, or blasphemous doctrines. The yearly revenue was fixed at one million three hundred thousand pounds, of which no part was to be raised by a land-tax; and of this sum one million was devoted to the support of the army and navy, and three hundred thousand pounds to the expenses of the civil list; but, on the remonstrance of the protector, that with so small a revenue it would be impossible to continue the war, an additional grant of six hundred thousand pounds was voted for the three following years. After the inauguration, the commons adjourned during six months, that time might be allowed for the formation of the "other house."[1]

The failure of the Syndercomb conspiracy would not have prevented the intended invasion by the royal army from Flanders, had not Charles been disappointed in his expectations from another quarter. No reasoning, no entreaty, could quicken the characteristic slowness of the Spanish ministers. But Sexby's impatience refused to submit to these delays; his fierce and implacable spirit could not be satisfied without the life of the protector. A tract had been recently printed in Holland, entitled *Killing No Murder*, which, from the powerful manner in which it was written, made a deeper impression on the public mind than any other literary production of the age. After an address to Cromwell, and another to the army, both conceived in a strain of the most poignant and sarcastic irony, it proceeds to discuss the three

[1] In a catalogue printed at the time, the names were given of one hundred and eighty-two members of this parliament, who, it was pretended, "were sons, kinsmen, servants, and otherwise engaged unto, and had places of profit, offices, salaries, and advantages, under the protector," sharing annually among them out of the public money the incredible sum of one million sixteen thousand three hundred and seventeen pounds, sixteen shillings, and eightpence.

[1657 A.D.]

questions: Whether the lord-protector be a tyrant? Whether it be lawful to do justice on him by killing him? and, Whether this, if it be lawful, will prove of benefit to the commonwealth? Having determined each question in the affirmative, it concludes with an eulogium on the bold and patriotic spirit of Syndercomb, the rival of Brutus and Cato, and a warning that the protector's own muster-roll contains the names of those who aspire to the honour of delivering their country; that his highness is not secure at his table or in his bed; that death is at his heels wherever he moves, and that though his head reaches the clouds, he shall perish like his own dung, and they that have seen him shall exclaim, Where is he?

Of this tract thousands of copies were sent by Sexby into England; and, though many were seized by the officers, yet many found their way into circulation. Having obtained a sum of one thousand four hundred crowns, he followed the books to organise new plots against the life of the protector. But by this time he was too well known. All his steps in Holland were watched; his departure for England was announced; emissaries were despatched in every direction; and within a few weeks he was apprehended and incarcerated in the Tower. There he discovered, probably feigned, symptoms of insanity. He was never brought to trial, but died, probably by violence, in the sixth month of his imprisonment.[1]

VICTORY AND DEATH OF BLAKE (1657 A.D.)

During the winter Blake continued to blockade Cadiz: in the spring he learned that the Plate fleet from Peru had sought an asylum in the harbour of Santa Cruz, in the island of Teneriffe. There the merchantmen, ten in number, were moored close to the shore, in the form of a crescent; while the six galleons in their front formed a parallel line at anchor in deeper water. The entrance of the bay was commanded by the guns of the castle; seven batteries erected at intervals along the beach protected the rest of the harbour; and these were connected with each other by covered ways lined with musketry. Blake examined the defences, and, according to custom, proclaimed a solemn fast. At eight on the morning of April 20th, 1657, Stayner took the lead in a frigate; the admiral followed in the larger ships; and the whole fleet availing itself of a favourable wind, entered the harbour under a tremendous shower of balls and shells. The Spaniards, though few in number of ships, were superior in that of men; their hopes were supported by the aid which they received from the land; and during four hours they fought with the most determined bravery. Driven from the galleons, the crews retreated to the second line of merchantmen, and renewed the contest till they were finally compelled to save themselves on the shore.

At two in the afternoon every Spanish ship was in possession of the English, and in flames. Still there remained the difficulty of working the fleet out of the harbour in the teeth of the gale. About sunset they were out of reach of the guns from the forts; the wind, by a miracle, as Blake persuaded himself, veered to the south-west, and the conquerors proceeded triumphantly out to sea. This gallant action, though it failed of securing the treasure which the protector chiefly sought, raised the reputation of Blake in every part of Europe. Unfortunately the hero himself lived not to receive the congratulations of his country. He had been during a great part of three years at sea;

[1] Clarendon [1] assures us that Sexby was an illiterate person, which is a sufficient proof that he was not the real author of the tract, though he acknowledged it for his own in the Tower, probably to deceive the protector. By most historians it has been attributed to Captain Titus.

the scurvy and dropsy wasted his constitution; and he expired August 7th, 1657, in his fifty-ninth year, as his ship, the *St. George*, entered the harbour of Plymouth.

Blake had served with distinction in the army during the civil war; and the knowledge of his talents and integrity induced the parliamentary leaders to entrust him with the command of the fleet. For maritime tactics he relied on the experience of others; his plans and his daring were exclusively his own. He may claim the peculiar praise of having dispelled an illusion which had hitherto cramped the operations of the British navy — a persuasion that it was little short of madness to expose a ship at sea to the fire from a battery on shore. Though Cromwell prized his services, he doubted his attachment. But he publicly acknowledged his merit, honouring his bones with a funeral at the national expense, and ordering them to be interred at Westminster, in Henry the Seventh's chapel.[1] In the next reign the coffin was taken from the vault, and deposited in the churchyard.

The reader is aware of Cromwell's anxiety to form a more intimate alliance with Louis XIV. For this purpose Lockhart, one of the Scottish judges, who had married his niece, and received knighthood at his hand, proceeded to France. After some discussion, a treaty, to last twelve months, was concluded. To avoid disputes, the treaty was written in the Latin language, and the precedency was given to Louis in one copy, to Cromwell in the other. Sir John Reynolds landed at Calais with an auxiliary force of six thousand men, one half in the pay of the king, the other half in that of the protector. But as an associate in the war, Cromwell demanded a share in the spoil, and that share was nothing less than the possession of Mardyke and Dunkirk, as soon as they could be reduced by the allies. To this proposal the strongest opposition had been made in the French cabinet. Louis was reminded of the injuries which the English, the natural enemies of France, had inflicted on the country in the reigns of his predecessors. Dunkirk would prove a second Calais; it would open to a foreign foe the way into the heart of his dominions. But he yielded to the superior wisdom or ascendancy of Mazarin, who replied that, if France refused the offer, it would be accepted with a similar sacrifice by Spain.[2]

The combined force was placed under the command of the celebrated Turenne, who was opposed by the Spaniards under Don John of Austria, with the British exiles, commanded by the duke of York, nd the French exiles, by the prince of Condé. The English auxiliaries, composed of veteran regiments, supported the reputation of their country by their martial appearance and exemplary discipline; but they had few opportunities of displaying their valour; and the summer was spent in a tedious succession of marches and countermarches, accompanied with no brilliant action nor important result. Cromwell viewed the operations of the army with distrust and impatience. At last he would brook no longer delay; the army marched into the neighbourhood of the town, and the fort of Mardyke capitulated (September 23) after a siege of three days. Mardyke received a garrison, partly of English and partly of French, under the command of Sir John Reynolds; but that officer in a short time incurred the suspicion of the protector.

[1 Keightley] says, "Our naval history properly begins with Blake and the first Dutch war."]

[2 Gardiner sees in this alliance of the French king and the protector that the seeds, which were ultimately to come to evil fruitage in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, ever being unwittingly sown by the self-constituted protector of the Protestant world.]

[1658 A.D.]

CROMWELL CALLS AND DISSOLVES HIS FOURTH PARLIAMENT

At home the public attention was absorbed by a new and most interesting spectacle. The parliament met on the day to which it had been adjourned (Jan. 20, 1658) but it was now divided according to the ancient form into two houses. Sixty-two individuals had been summoned to the upper house, and the writs, as they were copies of those formerly issued by the sovereign, were held to confer in like manner the privileges of an hereditary peerage, subject to certain exceptions specified in the Humble Petition and Advice. The commons, at the call of the usher of the black rod, proceeded to the house of lords, where they found his highness seated under a canopy of state. His speech began with the ancient address: "My lords and gentlemen of the house of commons." It was short, but its brevity was compensated by its piety, and after an exposition of the eighty-fifth psalm, he referred his two houses for other particulars to Fiennes, the lord-keeper. After the departure of the commons, the lords spent their time in inquiries into the privileges of their house. Cromwell had summoned his two sons, Richard and Henry, seven peers of royal creation, several members of his council, some gentlemen of fortune and family, with a due proportion of lawyers and officers, and a scanty sprinkling of persons known to be disaffected to his government. Of the ancient peers two only attended, the lords Eure and Fauconberg of whom the latter had recently married Mary, the protector's daughter; and of the other members, nine were absent through business or disinclination. As their journals have not been preserved, we have little knowledge of their proceedings.

In the lower house, the interest of the government had declined by the impolitic removal of the leading members to the house of lords, and by the introduction of those who, having formerly been excluded by order of Cromwell, now took their seats in virtue of the article which reserved to the house the right of inquiry into the qualifications of its members. The opposition was led by two men of considerable influence and undaunted resolution, Haslerig and Scott. Both had been excluded at the first meeting of this parliament, and both remembered the affront. To remove Haslerig from a place where his experience and eloquence rendered him a formidable adversary, Cromwell had called him to the upper house; but he refused to obey the writ, and took his seat among the commons. That a new house was to be called according to the articles of the Humble Petition and Advice, no one denied; but who, it was asked, made its members lords? Who gave them the privileges of the ancient peerage? Who empowered them to negative the acts of that house to which they owed their existence? Was it to be borne that the nominees of the protector should control the representatives of the people, the depositaries of the supreme power of the nation?

Cromwell sought to soothe these angry spirits. He read to them lectures on the benefit, the necessity, of unanimity. England was the only stay, the last hope of religion. But his advice, and entreaties, and menaces were useless.

Never, perhaps, during his extraordinary career, was Cromwell involved in difficulties equal to those which surrounded him at this moment. He could raise no money without the consent of parliament, and the pay of the army in England was five, and of that in Ireland seven months in arrear; the exiled king threatened a descent from the coast of Flanders, and the royalists throughout the kingdom were preparing to join his standard; the leaders of opposition in parliament had combined with several officers in the army to re-establish the commonwealth, "without a single person or house of 'lord'";

and a preparatory petition for the purpose of collecting signatures was circulated through the city.

The morning of February 4th Cromwell unexpectedly threw himself into a carriage with two horses standing at the gates of Whitehall; and, beckoning to six of his guards to follow, ordered the coachman to drive to the parliament house. Sending for the commons, he addressed them in an angry and expostulating tone. "They," he said, "had placed him in the high situation in which he stood; he sought it not; there was neither man nor woman treading on English ground who could say he did. God knew that he would rather have lived under a wood side, and have tended a flock of sheep, than have undertaken the government. But, having undertaken it at their request, he had a right to look to them for aid and support. Yet some among them, God was his witness, in violation of their oaths, were attempting to establish a commonwealth interest in the army; some had received commissions to enlist men for Charles Stuart; and both had their emissaries at that moment seeking to raise a tumult, or rather a rebellion, in the city. But he was bound before God to prevent such disasters; and, therefore," he concluded, "I think it high time that an end be put to your sitting; and I do dissolve this parliament; and let God judge between me and you." "Amen, amen," responded several voices from the ranks of the opposition.

This was the fourth parliament that Cromwell had broken. The republicans indulged their resentment in murmurs, and complaints, and menaces; but the protector, secure of the fidelity of the army, despised the feeble efforts of their vengeance, and encouraged by his vigour the timidity of his counsellors. Strong patrols of infantry and cavalry paraded the streets, dispersing every assemblage of people in the open air, in private houses, and even in conventicles and churches, for the purpose, or under the pretext, of devotion. The colonel-major and several captains of his own regiment were cashiered.

"I," says Hacker, "that had served him fourteen years, and had commanded a regiment seven years, without any trial or appeal, with the breath of his nostrils I was outed, and lost not only my place but a dear friend to boot. Five captains under my command were outed with me, because they could not say that was a house of lords."[c]

At the same time several arrests took place; for the conspiracies of which he spoke were no fictions. Ormonde was actually in London at this very time negotiating with the various political parties, and transports were collected at Ostend to carry over an invading force. But Cromwell had a source of intelligence which the royalists little suspected. There was a select band of six, named the Sealed Knot, who enjoyed the principal confidence of Charles and his court, and were the directors of the royalists in England. Sir Richard Willis had most influence in the Sealed Knot, and he was in the pay of Cromwell! For Willis having been arrested one time, Cromwell, it is said, undertook to prove to him that it was for the interest of the royalists themselves that their plots should be prevented; Willis was, or affected to be, convinced, and it was arranged that he should give information, but never be brought forward as a witness or required to name any person. For this service he had an annual stipend of 200*l*.

The protector, therefore, knew of Ormonde's being in London, and when it was thought that he had been there long enough, a hint was given him, and he hastened to Shoreham and embarked for France. Shortly after, some of the members of the Knot and other royalists were arrested, and Sir Henry Slingsby Doctor Hewit, John Mordaunt brother to Lord Peterborough, Sir Humphrey Bennet, and Captain Woodcock were brought to trial before a high court of

[1658 A.D.]

justice. Slingsby was a gentlemen of advanced age; he had been a prisoner at Hull ever since the rising in 1655, in which he had been engaged; the charge against him was his having given the officers of the garrison commissions from King Charles. Hewit was an Episcopalian clergyman and an active agent for the exiled king. Mordaunt also had distributed commissions. Hewit refused to plead, but that availed him not, and he and Slingsby were found guilty. Mordaunt was acquitted, the principal witness against him having been bribed to abscond. Slingsby was married to the aunt of Lord Fauconberg, and the lady Claypole strongly interested herself for Hewit; but the protector would hearken to neither daughter nor son-in-law in their favour: they were both beheaded (June 8). Bennet and Woodcock were acquitted. While Cromwell thus suppressed conspiracy at home, his arms prospered on the Continent.*j*

THE BATTLE OF THE DUNES: CAPTURE OF DUNKIRK (1658 A.D.)

During the winter, the gains and losses of the hostile armies in Flanders had been nearly balanced. If, on the one hand, the duke of York was repulsed with loss in his attempt to storm by night the works at Mardyke; on the other, the Marshal d'Aumont was made prisoner with fifteen hundred men by the Spanish governor of Ostend, who, under the pretence of delivering up the place, had decoyed him within the fortifications. In February, the offensive treaty between France and England was renewed for another year; three thousand men, drafted from different regiments, were sent by the protector to supply the deficiency in the number of his forces, and the combined army opened the campaign with the siege of Dunkirk. Don John, with the consent of his mentor, the marquis Caracena, resolved to hazard a battle; and, collecting a force of six thousand infantry and four thousand cavalry, encamped between the village of Zudcote and the lines of the besiegers. But Turenne, aware of the defective organisation of the Spanish armies, resolved to prevent the threatened attack; and on the morning of June 4, before the Spanish cannon and ammunition had reached the camp, the allied force was seen advancing in battle array. Don John hastily placed his men along a ridge of sand-hills which extended from the sea-coast to the canal, giving the command of the right wing to the duke of York, of the left to the prince of Condé, and reserving the centre to himself.

The battle was begun by the English, who found themselves opposed to their countryman, the duke of York. They were led by Major-General Morgan; for Lockhart, who acted both as ambassador and commander-in-chief, was confined by indisposition to his carriage. Their ardour to distinguish themselves in the presence of the two rival nations carried them considerably in advance of their allies; but, having halted to gain breath at the foot of the opposite sand-hill, they mounted with impetuosity, received the fire of the enemy, and, at the point of the pike, drove them from their position. The duke immediately charged at the head of the Spanish cavalry; but one-half of his men were mowed down by a well-directed fire of musketry; and James himself owed the preservation of his life to the temper of his armour. The advantage, however, was dearly purchased: in Lockhart's regiment scarcely an officer remained to take the command.

By this time the action had commenced on the left, where the prince of Condé, after some sharp fighting, was compelled to retreat by the bank of the canal. The centre was never engaged; for the regiment, on its extreme left, seeing itself flanked by the French in pursuit of Condé, precipitately

abandoned its position, and the example was successively imitated by the whole line. But, in the meanwhile, the duke of York had rallied his broken infantry, and while they faced the English, he charged the latter in flank at the head of his company of horse-guards. Though thrown into disorder, they continued to fight, employing the butt-ends of their muskets against the swords of their adversaries, and in a few minutes several squadrons of French cavalry arrived to their aid. James was surrounded; and, in despair of saving himself by flight, he boldly assumed the character of a French officer; rode at the head of twenty troopers toward the right of their army; and, carefully threading the different corps, arrived without exciting suspicion at the bank of the canal, by which he speedily effected his escape to Furnes. The victory on the part of the allies was complete. The Spanish cavalry made no effort to protect the retreat of their infantry; every regiment of which was successively surrounded by the pursuers, and compelled to surrender. By Turenne and his officers the chief merit of this brilliant success was cheerfully allotted to the courage and steadiness of the English regiments; at Whitehall it was attributed to the prayers of the lord-protector, who, on that very day, observed with his council a solemn fast to implore the blessing of heaven on the operations of the allied army.

Unable to oppose their enemies in the field, the Spanish generals proposed to retard their progress by the most obstinate defence of the different fortresses. The prince de Ligne undertook that of Ypres; the care of Newport, Bruges, and Ostend was committed to the duke of York; and Don John returned to Brussels to hasten new levies from the different provinces. Within a fortnight Dunkirk capitulated (June 17th), and the king of France, having taken possession, delivered the keys with his own hand to the English ambassador. Gravelines was soon afterwards reduced (Aug. 20th); the prince de Ligne suffered himself to be surprised by the superior activity of Turenne; Ypres opened its gates, and all the towns on the banks of the Lys successively submitted to the conquerors. Seldom, perhaps, had there occurred a campaign more disastrous to the Spanish arms.

CROMWELL'S MANY DISTRESSES AND DEATH (SEPTEMBER 3RD, 1658)

In the eyes of the superficial observer, Cromwell might now appear to have reached the zenith of power and greatness. At home he had discovered, defeated, and punished all the conspiracies against him; abroad, his army had gained laurels in the field; his fleets swept the seas; his friendship was sought by every power; and his mediation was employed in settling the differences between both Portugal and Holland, and the king of Sweden and the elector of Brandenburg. But, above all, he was now in possession of Dunkirk, the great object of his foreign policy for the last two years. The real fact, however, was that his authority in England never rested on a more precarious footing than at the present moment; while, on the other hand, the cares and anxieties of government, joined to his apprehensions of personal violence, and the pressure of domestic affliction, were rapidly undermining his constitution, and hurrying him from the gay and glittering visions of ambition to the darkness and silence of the tomb.

Cromwell was now reduced to that situation which, to the late unfortunate monarch, had proved the source of so many calamities. His expenditure far outran his income. Though the last parliament had made provision, ample provision, as it was then thought, for the splendour of his establishment, and for all the charges of the war, he had already contracted enormous

debts; his exchequer was frequently drained to the last shilling; and his ministers were compelled to go a-begging — such is the expression of the secretary of state — for the temporary loan of a few thousand pounds, with the cheerless anticipation of a refusal. He looked on the army, the greater part of which he had quartered in the neighbourhood of the metropolis, as his chief — his only support against his enemies; and while the soldiers were comfortably clothed and fed, he might with confidence rely on their attachment; but now that their pay was in arrear, he had reason to apprehend that discontent might induce them to listen to the suggestions of those officers who sought to subvert his power. On former occasions, indeed, he had relieved himself from similar embarrassments by the imposition of taxes by his own authority; but this practice was so strongly reprobated in the Humble Petition and Advice, and he had abjured it with so much solemnity, that he dared not repeat the experiment. He attempted to raise a loan among the merchants and capitalists in the city; but his credit and popularity were gone; he had, by plunging into war with Spain, cut off one of the most plentiful sources of profit, the Spanish trade; and the number of prizes made by the enemy, amounting to more than a thousand, had ruined many opulent houses.

There remained a third expedient — an application to parliament. But Cromwell, like the first Charles, had learned to dread the very name of a parliament.[1] Three of these assemblies he had moulded according to his own plan, and yet not one of them could he render obsequious to his will. Urged, however, by the ceaseless importunities of Thurloe, he appointed nine councillors (June 18) to inquire into the means of defeating the intrigues of the republicans in a future parliament; the manner of raising a permanent revenue from the estates of the royalists; and the best method of determining the succession to the protectorate. But among the nine were two who, aware of his increasing infirmities, began to cherish projects of their own aggrandisement, and who, therefore, made it their care to perplex and to prolong the deliberations. The committee sat three weeks. On the first two questions they came to no conclusion; with respect to the third, they voted, on a division, that the choice between an elective and an hereditary succession was a matter of indifference. Suspicious of their motives, Cromwell dissolved the committee (July 8th). But he substituted no council in its place; things were allowed to take their course; the embarrassment of the treasury increased; and the irresolution of the protector, joined to the dangers which threatened the government, shook the confidence of Thurloe himself. It was only when he looked up to heaven that he discovered a gleam of hope, in the persuasion that the God who had befriended Cromwell through life, would not desert him at the close of his career.

To the cares of government must be added his constant dread of assassination. It is certainly extraordinary that, while so many conspiracies are said to have been formed, no attempt was actually made against his person; but the fact that such designs had existed, and the knowledge that his death was of the first importance to his enemies, convinced him that he could never be secure from danger. He multiplied his precautions. We are told that he wore defensive armour under his clothes; carried loaded pistols in his pockets; sought to remain in privacy; and, when he found it necessary to give audience, sternly watched the eyes and gestures of those who addressed him. He was careful that his own motions should not be known beforehand.

[1 "It is a singular part of Cromwell's policy that he would neither reign with parliaments nor without them."]

His carriage was filled with attendants; a numerous escort accompanied him; and he proceeded at full speed, frequently diverging from the road to the right or left, and generally returning by a different route. In his palace he often inspected the nightly watch, changed his bed-chamber, and was careful that, besides the principal door, there should be some other egress, for the facility of escape. He had often faced death without flinching in the field; but his spirit broke under the continual fear of unknown and invisible foes. He passed the nights in a state of feverish anxiety; sleep fled from his pillow; and for more than a year before his death we always find the absence of rest assigned as either the cause which produced, or a circumstance which aggravated, his numerous ailments.

The selfishness of ambition does not exclude the more kindly feelings of domestic affection. Cromwell was sincerely attached to his children; but, among them, he gave the preference to his daughter Elizabeth Claypole. The meek disposition of the young woman possessed singular charms for the overbearing spirit of her father; and her timid piety readily received lessons on mystical theology from the superior experience of the lord-general. The following passage from one of Cromwell's letters to his daughter Ireton, will perhaps surprise the reader: "Your sister Claypole is (I trust in mercye) exercised with some perplexed thoughts, shee sees her owne vanitye and carnal minde, bewailinge itt, shee seeks after (as I hope alsoe) that wch will satisfie, and thus to bee a seeker, is to be of the best sect next a finder, and such an one shall every faythfull humble seeker bee at the end. Happie seeker, happie finder. Who ever tasted that the Lord is gracious, without some sense of self-vanitye and badness? Who ever tasted that graciousness of his, and could goe lesse in desier, and lesse than pressinge after full enjoyment? Deere hart presse on: lett not husband, lett not anythinge coole thy affections after Christ." But she was now dying of a most painful and internal complaint, imperfectly understood by her physicians; and her grief for the loss of her infant child added to the poignancy of her sufferings. Cromwell abandoned the business of state that he might hasten to Hampton Court, to console his favourite daughter. He frequently visited her, remained long in her apartment, and, whenever he quitted it, seemed to be absorbed in the deepest melancholy. It is not probable that the subject of their private conversation was exposed to the profane ears of strangers. We are, however, told by Clarendon[m] that she expressed to him her doubts of the justice of the good old cause, that she exhorted him to restore the sovereign authority to the rightful owner, and that, occasionally, when her mind was wandering, she alarmed him by uttering cries of "blood," and predictions of vengeance.

Elizabeth died August 6th. The protector was already confined to his bed with the gout, and, though he had anticipated the event, some days elapsed before he recovered from the shock. A slow fever still remained, which was pronounced a bastard tertian. One of his physicians whispered to another (Aug. 17th), that his pulse was intermittent; the words caught the ears of the sick man; he turned pale, a cold perspiration covered his face; and, requesting to be placed in bed, he executed his private will. The next morning he had recovered his usual composure; and when he received the visit of his physician, ordering all his attendants to quit the room but his wife, whom he held by the hand, he said to him: "Do not think that I shall die; I am sure of the contrary." Observing the surprise which those words excited, he continued: "Say not that I have lost my reason: I tell you the truth. I know it from better authority than any which you can have from

[1658 A.D.]

Galen or Hippocrates. It is the answer of God himself to our prayers; not to mine alone, but to those of others who have a more intimate interest in him than I have." The same communication was made to Thurloe, and to the different members of the protector's family; nor did it fail to obtain credit among men who believed that "in other instances he had been favoured with similar assurances, and that they had never deceived him." Hence his chaplain Goodwin exclaimed, "O Lord, we pray not for his recovery; that thou hast granted already; what we now beg is his *speedy* recovery."

In a few days, however, their confidence was shaken. For change of air he had removed to Whitehall, till the palace of St. James's should be ready for his reception. There on August 28th his fever became a double tertian, and his strength rapidly wasted away. Who, it was asked, was to succeed him? On the day of his inauguration he had written the name of his successor within a cover sealed with the protectorial arms; but that paper had been lost, or purloined, or destroyed. Thurloe undertook to suggest to him a second nomination; but the condition of the protector, who, if we believe him, was always insensible or delirious, afforded no opportunity. A suspicion, however, existed, that he had private reasons for declining to interfere in so delicate a business.

The 30th of August was a tempestuous day: during the night the violence of the wind increased till it blew a hurricane. Trees were torn from their roots in the park, and houses unroofed in the city. This extraordinary occurrence at a moment when it was thought that the protector was dying, could not fail of exciting remarks in a superstitious age; and, though the storm reached to the coasts of the Mediterranean, in England it was universally referred to the deathbed of the protector. His friends asserted that God would not remove so great a man from this world without previously warning the nation of its approaching loss; the cavaliers more maliciously maintained that the devils, "the princes of the air," were congregating over Whitehall, that they might pounce on the protector's soul.[1]

On the third night afterwards (Sept. 2nd), Cromwell had a lucid interval of considerable duration. It might have been expected that a man of his religious disposition would have felt some compunctious visitings, when from the bed of death he looked back on the strange, eventful career of his past life. But he had adopted a doctrine admirably calculated to lull and tranquillise the misgivings of conscience. "Tell me," said he to Sterry, one of his chaplains, "Is it possible to fall from grace?" "It is not possible," replied the minister. "Then," exclaimed the dying man, "I am safe; for I know that I was once in grace." Under this impression he prayed, not for himself, but for God's people. "Lord," he said, "though a miserable and wretched creature, I am in covenant with thee through thy grace, and may and will come to thee for thy people. Thou hast made me a mean instrument to do them some good, and thee service. Many of them set too high a value upon me, though others would be glad of my death. Lord, however thou disposest of me, continue, and go on to do good for them. Teach those who look too much upon thy instruments, to depend more upon thyself, and pardon such as desire to trample upon the dust of a poor worm, for they are thy people too."

Early in the following morning, he relapsed into a state of insensibility. It was his fortunate day, the 3rd of September, a circumstance from which his sorrowing relatives derived a new source of consolation. It was, they observed, on the 3rd of September that he overcame the Scots at Dunbar;

[1 Von Ranke[b] notes that when the news of Cromwell's death reached Amsterdam, people danced in the streets crying, "The devil is dead!"]

on that day, he also overcame the royalists at Worcester; and on the same day, he was destined to overcome his spiritual enemies, and to receive the crown of victory in heaven. About four in the afternoon he breathed his last, amidst the tears and lamentations of his attendants. "Cease to weep," exclaimed the fanatical Sterry, "you have more reason to rejoice. He was your protector here; he will prove a still more powerful protector, now that he is with Christ at the right hand of the Father." With a similar confidence in Cromwell's sanctity, though in a somewhat lower tone of enthusiasm, the grave and cautious Thurloe announced the event by letter to Henry Cromwell the deputy of Ireland. "Never was there any man so prayed for as he was during his sickness, solemn assemblies meeting every day to beseech the Lord for the continuance of his life; so that he is gone to heaven, embalmed with the tears of his people, and upon the wings of the prayers of the saints."

VARIOUS ESTIMATES OF CROMWELL; HIS DISSIMULATION: LINGARD

Till the commencement of the century, when that wonderful man arose, who, by the splendour of his victories and the extent of his empire, cast all preceding adventures into the shade, the name of Cromwell stood without a parallel in the history of civilised Europe. Men looked with a feeling of awe on the fortunate individual who, without the aid of birth, or wealth, or connections, was able to seize the government of three powerful kingdoms, and to impose the yoke of servitude on the necks of the very men who had fought in his company to emancipate themselves from the less arbitrary sway of their hereditary sovereign. That he who accomplished this was no ordinary personage, all must admit; and yet, on close investigation, we shall discover little that was sublime or dazzling in his character. Cromwell was not the meteor which surprises and astounds by the rapidity and brilliancy of its course. Cool, cautious, calculating, he stole on with slow and measured pace; and, while with secret pleasure he toiled up the ascent to greatness, laboured to persuade the spectators that he was reluctantly borne forward by an exterior and resistless force, by the march of events, the necessities of the state, the will of the army, and even the decree of the Almighty. He seems to have looked upon dissimulation as the perfection of human wisdom, and to have made it the keystone of the arch on which he built his fortunes. The aspirations of his ambition were concealed under the pretence of attachment to "the good old cause"; and his secret workings to acquire the sovereignty for himself and his family were represented as endeavours to secure for his former brethren in arms the blessings of civil and religious freedom, the two great objects which originally called them into the field.

Thus his whole conduct was made up of artifice and deceit. He laid his plans long beforehand; he studied the views and dispositions of all from whose influence he had any thing to hope or fear; and he employed every expedient to win their affections, and to make them the blind unconscious tools of his policy. For this purpose he asked questions, or threw out insinuations in their hearing; now kept them aloof with an air of reserve and dignity; now put them off their guard by condescension, perhaps by buffoonery; at one time, addressed himself to their vanity or avarice; at another, exposed to them with tears (for tears he had at will), the calamities of the nation; and then, when he found them moulded to his purpose, instead of assenting to the advice which he had himself suggested, feigned reluctance, urged objections, and pleaded scruples of conscience. At length he yielded; but it was not till he had acquired by his resistance the praise of moderation, and the

[1658 A.D.]

right of attributing his acquiescence to the importunity of others instead of his own ambition.

Exposed as he was to the continued machinations of the royalists and levellers, both equally eager to precipitate him from the height to which he had attained, Cromwell made it his great object to secure to himself the attachment of the army.[1] To it he owed the acquisition, through it alone could he ensure the permanence, of his power. Now, fortunately for this purpose, that army, composed as never was army before or since, revered in the lord-protector what it valued mostly in itself, the cant and practice of religious enthusiasm. The superior officers, the subalterns, the privates, all held themselves forth as professors of godliness. Among them every public breach of morality was severely punished; the exercises of religious worship were of as frequent recurrence as those of military duty; in council, the officers always opened the proceedings with extemporary prayer; and to implore with due solemnity the protection of the Lord of Hosts, was held an indispensable part of the preparation for battle. Their cause they considered the cause of God; if they fought, it was for his glory; if they conquered, it was by the might of his arm. Among these enthusiasts, Cromwell, as he held the first place in rank, was also pre-eminent in spiritual gifts. The fervour with which he prayed, the unction with which he preached, excited their admiration and tears. They looked on him as the favourite of God, under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, and honoured with communications from heaven; and he, on his part, was careful, by the piety of his language, by the strict decorum of his court, and by his zeal for the diffusion of godliness, to preserve and strengthen such impressions. In minds thus disposed, it was not difficult to create a persuasion that the final triumph of "their cause" depended on the authority of the general under whom they had conquered; while the full enjoyment of that religious freedom which they so highly prized rendered them less jealous of the arbitrary power which he occasionally assumed.

On the subject of civil freedom, the protector could not assume so bold a tone. He acknowledged, indeed, its importance; it was second only to religious freedom; but if second, then, in the event of competition, it ought to yield to the first. He contended that, under his government, every provision had been made for the preservation of the rights of individuals, so far as was consistent with the safety of the whole nation. He had reformed the chancery, he had laboured to abolish the abuses of the law, he had placed learned and upright judges on the bench, and he had been careful in all ordinary cases that impartial justice should be administered between the parties. This indeed was true; but it was also true that by his orders men were arrested and committed without lawful cause; that juries were packed; that prisoners, acquitted at their trial, were sent into confinement beyond the jurisdiction of the courts; that taxes had been raised without the authority of parliament; that a most unconstitutional tribunal, the high court of justice, had been established; and that the major-generals had been invested with powers the most arbitrary and oppressive. These acts of despotism put him on his defence; and in apology he pleaded, as every despot will plead, reasons of state, the necessity of sacrificing a part to preserve the whole, and his conviction, that a "people blessed by God, the regenerated ones of several judgments forming the flock and lambs of Christ, would prefer their safety to their passions, and their real security to forms." Nor was this reasoning addressed

[1 The Venetian ambassador Sagredo[d] observes that during the protectorate, London wore the appearance of a garrison town, where nothing was to be seen but the marching of soldiers, nothing to be heard but the sound of drums and trumpets.]

in vain to men who had surrendered their judgments into his keeping, and who felt little for the wrongs of others, as long as such wrongs were represented necessary for their own welfare.

Some writers have maintained that Cromwell dissembled in religion as well as in politics; and that, when he condescended to act the part of the saint, he assumed for interested purposes a character which he otherwise despised. But this supposition is contradicted by the uniform tenor of his life. Long before he turned his attention to the disputes between the king and the parliament, religious enthusiasm had made a deep impression on his mind; it continually manifested itself during his long career, both in the senate and the field; and it was strikingly displayed in his speeches and prayers on the last evening of his life. It should, however, be observed, that he made his religion harmonise with his ambition. If he believed that the cause in which he had embarked was the cause of God, he also believed that God had chosen him to be the successful champion of that cause. Thus the honour of God was identified with his own advancement, and the arts, which his policy suggested, were sanctified in his eyes by the ulterior object at which he aimed — the diffusion of godliness, and the establishment of the reign of Christ among mankind.[e]

The Opinion of a Contemporary Royalist, Lord Clarendon

He was one of those men, *quos vituperare ne inimici quidem possunt, nisi ut simul laudent;* "whom his very enemies could not condemn without commending him at the same time"; for he could never have done half that mischief without great parts of courage, industry, and judgment. He must have had a wonderful understanding in the natures and humours of men, and as great a dexterity in applying them; who, from a private and obscure birth (though of a good family) without interest or estate, alliance or friendship could raise himself to such a height, and compound and knead such opposite and contradictory tempers, humours, and interests into a consistence, that contributed to his designs, and to their own destruction; whilst himself grew insensibly powerful enough to cut off those by whom he had climbed, in the instant that they projected to demolish their own building. What was said of Cinna may very justly be said of him: "He attempted those things which no good man durst have ventured on; and achieved those in which none but a valiant and great man could have succeeded." Without doubt, no man with more wickedness ever attempted anything, or brought to pass what he desired more wickedly, more in the face and contempt of religion, and moral honesty; yet wickedness as great as his could never have accomplished those designs, without the assistance of a great spirit, an admirable circumspection, and sagacity, and a most magnanimous resolution.

When he appeared first in the parliament, he seemed to have a person in no degree gracious, no ornament of discourse, none of those talents which use to conciliate the affections of the stander by: yet as he grew into place and authority, his parts seemed to be raised, as if he had concealed faculties, till he had occasion to use them; and when he was to act the part of a great man, he did it without any indecency, notwithstanding the want of custom. In all other matters, which did not concern the life of his jurisdiction, he seemed to have great reverence for the law, rarely interposing between party and party. As he proceeded with this kind of indignation, and haughtiness, with those who were refractory, and durst contend with his greatness, so towards all who complied with his good pleasure, and courted his protection, he used great civility, generosity, and bounty.

[1658 A.D.]

To reduce three nations, which perfectly hated him, to an entire obedience to all his dictates; to awe, and govern those nations by an army that was indevoted to him, and wished his ruin, was an instance of a very prodigious address. But his greatness at home, was but a shadow of the glory he had abroad. It was hard to discover, which feared him most, France, or Spain, or the Low Countries, where his friendship was current at the value he put upon it. As they did all sacrifice their honour and their interest, to his pleasure, so there is nothing he could have demanded, that either of them would have denied him.

To conclude his character, Cromwell was not so far a man of blood, as to follow Machiavel's method; which prescribes upon a total alteration of government, as a thing absolutely necessary, to cut off all the heads of those, and extirpate their families, who are friends to the old one. It was confidently reported, that, in the council of officers, it was more than once proposed, "that there might be a general massacre of all the royal party, as the only expedient to secure the government, but that Cromwell would never consent to it"; it may be, out of too great a contempt of his enemies. In a word, as he was guilty of many crimes against which damnation is denounced, and for which hell-fire is prepared, so he had some good qualities which have caused the memory of some men in all ages to be celebrated; and he will be looked upon by posterity as a brave, wicked man.[m]

A German Estimate of Cromwell's Influence on Europe (Von Ranke)

The next generation execrated Cromwell as a monster of villainy: but posterity has declared him one of the greatest of the race of man. To him was given the marvellous honour of breaking through the sacred circle which restricts the common citizen of European countries. Clothed with royal authority, and needing no superior's approval — for unlike Richelieu he was not forced to persuade a royal master or burrow in cabinet plots — Cromwell forced his way into the history of the world. He had the self control to refuse the very crown. He felt the necessity of coercing all the forces of the nation into obedience to his will; yet the supreme power for its own sake was not his end. It was the means to establishment of those ideals of religious liberty as conceived by the Protestants, of civil order and national independence which filled his whole soul.

If we inquire what remained of Cromwell's work, we shall not find our answer in specific national and constitutional institutions. We are not sure that he planned the continuance of his own powers; neither his house of lords nor his commons was fated to survive: neither the army he organised nor the separatist movement he began. Time swept all this away. None the less his influence was rich in results of importance.

The dream of uniting the three kingdoms in Protestantism had floated before his predecessor, the earl of Somerset; Cromwell realised it brilliantly.

For general European history nothing is more important than Cromwell's direction of English energies against Spain. It was peculiarly his own idea: the commonwealth would hardly have done it. As a result the European system developed from the dynastic sway of the Burgundo-Austrian family dominant for nearly two centuries, was driven from their field. Thus the English people and their navy won a place of importance. Cromwell did not create the English navy; indeed its chiefs were opposed to him; yet he gave it its most powerful impulse. We have seen how stoutly it gained power in all parts of the world. The coasts of Europe felt the weight of English

weapons. Settlements were frequently suggested for the Italian and even the German coasts, and actually gained in the Netherlands. They said that the key of the continent hung at Cromwell's girdle. Holland against her will was forced to bow to English policy. Portugal yielded for the sake of her very existence. England could wait with calm any future developments on the continent. The influence of France had saved Protestantism from destruction, yet kept it subordinate. It was through Cromwell that Protestantism rose to independence among the world powers. Like most extraordinary natures Cromwell died little understood, and rather hated than loved.[b]

Cromwell as the Typical Englishman

Gardiner[n] ascribes to Cromwell practical universality of mind, comprising all the incongruities of human nature; but this very fact, he thinks, distinguishes the Protector as symbolising the traits of the English people. He does not hesitate to pronounce Cromwell, "with all his moral and physical audacity, with all his tenderness and spiritual yearnings, in the world of action what Shakespeare was in the world of thought, the greatest because the most typical Englishman of all time."

Nicholson,[o] speaking in similar vein, declares that "Cromwell's own prophetic hope is attaining fulfilment. 'I know God has been above all ill reports, and will in his own time vindicate me.'" He cites with approval the words of Milton: "In speaking of a man so great, and who has deserved so signally of this commonwealth, I shall have done nothing if I merely acquit him of having committed any crime, especially since it concerns, not only the commonwealth, but myself individually, as one so closely conjoined in the same infamy, to show to all nations and ages, as far as I can, the supreme excellence of his character, and his supreme worthiness of all praise." Modern estimates uphold this verdict of a contemporary. John Morley[o] is indeed disposed to regard the comparison of Cromwell with Charles V, or Louis XIV, or Napoleon, as "a hyperbole which does him both less than justice and more"; but he agrees with Guizot,[f] that we are near to the truth if we count "Cromwell, William III, and Washington as chiefs and representatives of sovereign crises that have settled the destinies of nations." And perhaps in all history it would be difficult to find three names better fitted to stand together than these.[a] There is no severer test of a man's character than the use he makes of absolute power. Tried by this test Cromwell bears comparison favourably with any of the greatest names in history. Elevated into supremacy, regal save only in name, he still preserved the plain simplicity of his former life. Armed with more than regal power, he limited himself within the strict bounds of necessity. Personally he cared little for the outward shows of royalty, but he stinted no pomp or ceremony so far as it seemed to involve the nation's dignity. Too great to be jealous or vindictive for himself, he was swift and stern in crushing the enemies of public tranquillity. He was truly a terror to all evil-doers, a praise to them that did well. He fostered learning, though himself not learned, and allied with some to whom learning was profanity. "If there was a man in England who excelled in any faculty or science, the Protector would find him out, and reward him according to his merit." The head of a triumphant cause, he was so little of a fanatic that he tolerated all sects, so long as they meddled not to disturb the state. His large and healthy spirit was bound by no party sympathies, but yearned towards all good men, of whatever name. At an era when toleration was looked upon by many as foolish in politics and criminal in religion, he stood out in

glorious prominence as the earnest advocate of the rights of conscience, and proclaimed all men answerable to God alone for their faith. Popery and prelacy he proscribed, on grounds political rather than religious; to the adherents of both he showed private lenity; under his rule men no more suffered at the stake or the pillory.

So far did his thoughts reach beyond his age, that he desired, and earnestly attempted, to extend the rights of citizenship to the outcast and persecuted Jews. Himself the greatest, "the most English of Englishmen" —he was determined that England should be the greatest of states. He encouraged trade, planted colonies, made wise peace with whom he would, or waged just and successful war. All Europe trembled at his voice, and the flag of Britain thenceforth waved triumphant over every sea. In fine, considering the comparative position of Britain in the times that preceded and followed him, the circumstances of his life and the difficulties with which he had to contend, making all allowance for his errors and his failings, he was a man for all ages to admire, for all Britons to honour in proud remembrance. No royal name, at least since Alfred's, is more worthy of our veneration than that of the "Usurper," Oliver Cromwell.[w]

Lord Macaulay's Comparison of Cromwell with Cæsar and Napoleon

At Naseby, in the very crisis of his fortune, Charles I's want of self-possession spread a fatal panic through his army. A Scotch nobleman, it seems, begged the king not to run upon his death, took hold of his bridle, and turned his horse round. No man who had much value for his life would have tried to perform the same friendly office on that day for Oliver Cromwell.

The death of Charles and the strong measures which led to it raised Cromwell to a height of power fatal to the infant commonwealth. No men occupy so splendid a place in history as those who have founded monarchies on the ruins of republican institutions. Their glory, if not of the purest, is assuredly of the most seductive and dazzling kind. In nations broken to the curb, in nations long accustomed to be transferred from one tyrant to another, a man without eminent qualities may easily gain supreme power. The defection of a troop of guards, a conspiracy of eunuchs, a popular tumult, might place an indolent senator or a brutal soldier on the throne of the Roman world. But a community which has heard the voice of truth and experienced the pleasures of liberty, in which the merits of statesmen and of systems are freely canvassed, in which obedience is paid, not to persons but to laws, in which magistrates are regarded, not as the lords, but as the servants of the public, in which the excitement of party is a necessary of life, in which political warfare is reduced to a system of tactics; such a community is not easily reduced to servitude. Beasts of burden may easily be managed by a new master. But will the wild ass submit to the bonds? Will the unicorn serve and abide by the crib? Will leviathan hold out his nostrils to the hook? The mythological conqueror of the east, whose enchantments reduced wild beasts to the tameness of domestic cattle, and who harnessed lions and tigers to his chariot, is but an imperfect type of those extraordinary minds which have thrown a spell on the fierce spirits of nations unaccustomed to control, and have compelled raging factions to obey their reins and swell their triumph. The enterprise, be it good or bad, is one which requires a truly great man. It demands courage, activity, energy, wisdom, firmness, conspicuous virtues, or vices so splendid and alluring as to resemble virtues.

Those who have succeeded in this arduous undertaking form a very small

and a very remarkable class. Parents of tyranny, heirs of freedom, kings among citizens, citizens among kings, they unite in themselves the characteristics of the system which springs from them, and those of the system from which they have sprung. Their reigns shine with a double light, the last and dearest ray of departing freedom mingled with the first and brightest glories of the empire in its dawn.

In this class three men stand pre-eminent, Cæsar, Cromwell, and Bonaparte. The highest place in this remarkable triumvirate belongs undoubtedly to Cæsar. He united the talents of Bonaparte to those of Cromwell; and he possessed also, what neither Cromwell nor Bonaparte possessed, learning, taste, wit, eloquence, the sentiments and the manners of an accomplished gentleman.

Between Cromwell and Napoleon Hallam[p] has instituted a parallel, scarcely less ingenious than that which Burke[q] has drawn between Richard Cœur de Lion and Charles XII of Sweden. In this parallel, however, and indeed throughout his work, we think that he hardly gives Cromwell fair measure. "Cromwell," says he, "far unlike his antitype, never showed any signs of a legislative mind, or any desire to place his renown on that noblest basis, the amelioration of social institutions." The difference in this respect, we conceive, was not in the character of the men, but in the character of the revolutions by means of which they rose to power. The civil war in England had been undertaken to defend and restore; the republicans of France set themselves to destroy. In England, the principles of the common law had never been disturbed, and most even of its forms had been held sacred. In France, the law and its ministers had been swept away together. In France, therefore, legislation necessarily became the first business of the first settled government which rose on the ruins of the old system. The admirers of Inigo Jones have always maintained that his works are inferior to those of Sir Christopher Wren, only because the great fire of London gave Wren such a field for the display of his powers as no architect in the history of the world ever possessed. Similar allowance must be made for Cromwell. If he erected little that was new, it was because there had been no general devastation to clear a space for him. As it was, he reformed the representative system in a most judicious manner. He rendered the administration of justice uniform throughout the island. We will quote a passage from his speech to the parliament in September, 1656, which contains, we think, simple and rude as the diction is, stronger indications of a legislative mind, than are to be found in the whole range of orations delivered on such occasions before or since.

"There is one general grievance in the nation. It is the law. I think, I may say it, I have as eminent judges in this land as have been had, or that the nation has had for these many years. Truly, I could be particular as to the executive part, to the administration; but that would trouble you. But the truth of it is, there are wicked and abominable laws that will be in your power to alter. To hang a man for sixpence, threepence, I know not what — to hang for a trifle, and pardon murder, is in the ministration of the law through the ill framing of it. I have known in my experience abominable murders quitted; and to see men lose their lives for petty matters! This is a thing that God will reckon for; and I wish it may not lie upon this nation a day longer than you have an opportunity to give a remedy; and I hope I shall cheerfully join with you in it."

Hallam truly says that, though it is impossible to rank Cromwell with Napoleon as a general, yet "his exploits were as much above the level of his contemporaries, and more the effects of an original uneducated capacity."

[1658 A.D.]

Bonaparte was trained in the best military schools; the army which he led to Italy was one of the finest that ever existed. Cromwell passed his youth and the prime of his manhood in a civil situation. He never looked on war till he was more than forty years old. He had first to form himself, and then to form his troops. Out of raw levies he created an army, the bravest and the best disciplined, the most orderly in peace, and the most terrible in war, that Europe had seen. He called this body into existence. He led it to conquest. He never fought a battle without gaining it. He never gained a battle without annihilating the force opposed to him. Yet his victories were not of the highest glory of his military system. The respect which his troops paid to property, their attachment to the laws and religion of their country, their submission to the civil power, their temperance, their intelligence, their industry, are without parallel. It was after the Restoration that the spirit which their great leader had infused into them was most signally displayed. At the command of the established government, an established government which had no means of enforcing obedience, fifty thousand soldiers, whose backs no enemy had ever seen, either in domestic or in continental war, laid down their arms, and retired into the mass of the people, thenceforward to be distinguished only by superior diligence, sobriety, and regularity in the pursuits of peace, from the other members of the community which they had saved.

In the general spirit and character of his administration, we think Cromwell far superior to Napoleon. "In civil government," says Hallam, "there can be no adequate parallel between one who had sucked only the dregs of a besotted fanaticism, and one to whom the stores of reason and philosophy were open." These expressions, it seems to us, convey the highest eulogium on our great countryman. Reason and philosophy did not teach the conqueror of Europe to command his passions, or to pursue, as a first object, the happiness of his people. They did not prevent him from risking his fame and his power in a frantic contest against the principles of human nature and the laws of the physical world, against the rage of the winter and the liberty of the sea. They did not exempt him from the influence of that most pernicious of superstitions, a presumptuous fatalism. They did not preserve him from the inebriation of prosperity, or restrain him from indecent querulousness in adversity. On the other hand, the fanaticism of Cromwell never urged him on impracticable undertakings, or confused his perception of the public good.

Our countryman, inferior to Bonaparte in invention, was far superior to him in wisdom. The French emperor is among conquerors what Voltaire is among writers, a miraculous child. His splendid genius was frequently clouded by fits of humour as absurdly perverse as those of the pet of the nursery, who quarrels with his food, and dashes his playthings to pieces. Cromwell was emphatically a man. He possessed, in an eminent degree, that masculine and full-grown robustness of mind, that equally diffused intellectual health, which, if our national partiality does not mislead us, has peculiarly characterised the great men of England.

Never was any ruler so conspicuously born for sovereignty. The cup which has intoxicated almost all others sobered him. His spirit, restless from its own buoyancy in a lower sphere, reposed in majestic placidity as soon as it had reached the level congenial to it. Rapidly as his fortunes grew, his mind expanded more rapidly still. Insignificant as a private citizen, he was a great general; he was a still greater prince. Napoleon had a theatrical manner, in which the coarseness of a revolutionary guard-room was blended with the ceremony of the old court of Versailles. Cromwell, by the confession even of his enemies, exhibited in his demeanour the simple and natural nobleness of a

man neither ashamed of his origin nor vain of his elevation, of a man who had found his proper place in society, and who felt secure that he was competent to fill it. Easy, even to familiarity, where his own dignity was concerned, he was punctilious only for his country. His own character he left to take care of itself; he felt it to be defended by his victories in war, and his reforms in peace. But he was a jealous and implacable guardian of the public honour. He suffered a crazy Quaker to insult him in the gallery of Whitehall, and revenged himself only by liberating him and giving him a dinner. But he was prepared to risk the chances of war to avenge the blood of a private Englishman.

No sovereign ever carried to the throne so large a portion of the best qualities of the middling orders, so strong a sympathy with the feelings and interests of his people. He was sometimes driven to arbitrary measures; but he had a high, stout, honest, English heart. Hence it was that he loved to surround his throne with such men as Hale and Blake. Hence it was that he allowed so large a share of political liberty to his subjects, and that, even when an opposition dangerous to his power and to his person almost compelled him to govern by the sword, he was still anxious to leave a germ from which, at a more favourable season, free institutions might spring. We firmly believe that, if his first parliament had not commenced its debates by disputing his title, his government would have been as mild at home as it was energetic and able abroad. He was a soldier; he had risen by war. Had his ambition been of an impure or selfish kind, it would have been easy for him to plunge his country into continental hostilities on a large scale, and to dazzle the restless factions which he ruled, by the splendour of his victories. Some of his enemies have sneeringly remarked, that in the successes obtained under his administration he had no personal share; as if a man who had raised himself from obscurity to empire solely by his military talents could have any unworthy reason for shrinking from military enterprise. This reproach is his highest glory. In the success of the English navy he could have no selfish interest. Its triumphs added nothing to his fame; its increase added nothing to his means of overawing his enemies; its great leader was not his friend. Yet he took a peculiar pleasure in encouraging that noble service which, of all the instruments employed by an English government, is the most impotent for mischief, and the most powerful for good. He placed England at the head of the Protestant interests, and in the first rank of Christian powers. But he did not squander her resources in a vain attempt to invest her with that supremacy which no power, in the modern system of Europe, can safely affect, or can long retain.

This noble and sober wisdom had its reward. If he did not carry the banners of the commonwealth in triumph to distant capitals, if he did not adorn Whitehall with the spoils of the Stadthouse and the Louvre, if he did not portion out Flanders and Germany into principalities for his kinsmen and his generals, he did not, on the other hand, see his country overrun by the armies of nations which his ambition had provoked. He did not drag out the last years of his life an exile and a prisoner, in an unhealthy climate and under an ungenerous gaoler, raging with the impotent desire of vengeance, and brooding over visions of departed glory. He went down to his grave in the fulness of power and fame; and he left to his son an authority which any man of ordinary firmness and prudence would have retained.

But for the weakness of that foolish Ishbosheth, the opinions which we have been expressing would, we believe, now have formed the orthodox creed of good Englishmen. We might now be writing under the government of his

[1658 A.D.]

highness Oliver the Fifth or Richard the Fourth, protector, by the grace of God, of the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging. The form of the great founder of the dynasty, on horseback, as when he led the charge at Naseby, or on foot, as when he took the mace from the table of the commons, would adorn our squares and overlook our public offices from Charing Cross; and sermons in his praise would be duly preached on his lucky day, the third of September, by court-chaplains, guiltless of the abomination of the surplice.

But, though his memory has not been taken under the patronage of any party, though every device has been used to blacken it, though to praise him would long have been a punishable crime, truth and merit at last prevail. Cowards who had trembled at the very sound of his name, tools of office who, like Downing, had been proud of the honour of lacqueying his coach, might insult him in loyal speeches and addresses. Venal poets might transfer to the king the same eulogies, little the worse for wear, which they had bestowed on the protector. A fickle multitude might crowd to shout and scoff round the gibbeted remains of the greatest prince and soldier of the age. But when the Dutch cannon startled an effeminate tyrant in his own palace, when the conquests which had been won by the armies of Cromwell were sold to pamper the harlots of Charles, when Englishmen were sent to fight under foreign banners, against the independence of Europe and the Protestant religion, many honest hearts swelled in secret at the thought of one who had never suffered his country to be ill used by any but himself. It must indeed have been difficult for any Englishman to see the salaried viceroy of France, at the most important crisis of his fate, sauntering through his harem, yawning and talking nonsense over a dispatch, or beslobbering his brother and his courtiers in a fit of maudlin affection, without a respectful and tender remembrance of him before whose genius the young pride of Louis and all the veteran craft of Mazarin had stood rebuked, who had humbled Spain on the land and Holland on the sea, and whose imperial voice had arrested the sails of the Libyan pirates and the persecuting fires of Rome.[r]

Carlyle's Eulogium

As things became gradually manifest, the character of the Puritans began to clear itself. Their memories were, one after another, taken down from the gibbet; nay a certain portion of them are now, in these days, as good as canonised. Eliot, Hampden, Pym, nay Ludlow, Hutchinson, Vane himself, are admitted to be a kind of Heroes; political Conscript Fathers, to whom in no small degree we owe what makes us a free England: it would not be safe for anybody to designate these men as wicked now. Few Puritans of note but find their apologists somewhere, and have a certain reverence paid them by earnest men. One Puritan, I think, and almost he alone, our poor Cromwell, seems to hang yet on the gibbet, and finds no hearty apologist anywhere. Him neither saint nor sinner will acquit of great wickedness. A man of ability, infinite talent, courage, and so forth; but he betrayed the Cause. Selfish ambition, dishonesty, duplicity; a fierce, coarse, hypocritical Tartuffe; turning all that noble Struggle for constitutional Liberty into a sorry farce played for his own benefit: this and worse is the character they give of Cromwell. And then there come contrasts with Washington and others; above all, with these noble Pyms and Hampdens, whose noble work he stole for himself, and ruined into a futility and deformity.

For my own share, far be it from me to say or insinuate a word of disparage-

ment against such characters as Hampden, Eliot, Pym; whom I believe to have been right worthy and useful men. They are very noble men, these; step along in their stately way, with their measured euphemisms, philosophies, parliamentary eloquences, Ship-moneys, *Monarchies of Man;* a most constitutional, unblamable, dignified set of men. But the heart remains cold before them; the fancy alone endeavours to get-up some worship of them. One leaves all these Nobilities standing in their niches of honour: the rugged outcast Cromwell, he is the man of them all in whom one still finds human stuff. The great savage Baresark: he could write no euphemistic *Monarchy of Man;* did not speak, did not work with glib regularity; had no straight story to tell for himself anywhere. But he stood bare, not cased in euphemistic coat-of-mail; he grappled like a giant, face to face, heart to heart, with the naked truth of things! That, after all, is the sort of man for one. I plead guilty to valuing such a man beyond all other sorts of men. Smoothshaven Respectabilities not a few one finds, that are not good for much. Small thanks to a man for keeping his hands clean, who would not touch the work but with gloves on!

From of old, I will confess, this theory of Cromwell's falsity has been incredible to me. Nay I cannot believe the like, of any Great Man whatever. Multitudes of Great Men figure in History as false, selfish men; but if we will consider it, they are but figures for us, unintelligible shadows; we do not see into them as men that could have existed at all. Can a great soul be possible without a conscience in it, the essence of all real souls, great or small? No, we cannot figure Cromwell as a Falsity and Fatuity; the longer I study him and his career, I believe this the less. Why should we? There is no evidence of it. Is it not strange that, after all the mountains of calumny this man has been subject to, after being represented as the very prince of liars, who never, or hardly ever, spoke truth, but always some cunning counterfeit of truth, there should not yet have been one falsehood brought clearly home to him? A prince of liars, and no lie spoken by him. Not one that I could yet get sight of.

Looking at the man's life with our own eyes, it seems to me, a very different hypothesis suggests itself. What little we know of his earlier obscure years, distorted as it has come down to us, does it not all betoken an earnest, affectionate, sincere kind of man? His nervous melancholic temperament indicates rather a seriousness too deep for him. His successes in Parliament, his successes through the war, are honest successes of a brave man; who has more resolution in the heart of him, more light in the head of him than other men. His prayers to God; his spoken thanks to the God of Victory, who had preserved him safe, and carried him forward so far, through the furious clash of a world all set in conflict, through desperate-looking envelopments at Dunbar; through the death-hail of so many battles; mercy after mercy; to the "crowning mercy" of Worcester fight: all this is good and genuine for a deep-hearted Calvinistic Cromwell. Only to vain unbelieving Cavaliers, worshipping not God but their own "lovelocks," frivolities and formalities, living quite apart from contemplations of God, living without God in the world, need it seem hypocritical.

Nor will his participation in the king's death involve him in condemnation with us. It is a stern business killing of a King! But if you once go to war with him, it lies there; this and all else lies there. Once at war, you have made wager of battle with him: it is he to die, or else you. Reconciliation is problematic; may be possible, or, far more likely, is impossible. It is now pretty generally admitted that the parliament, having vanquished Charles

[1658 A.D.]

First, had no way of making any tenable arrangement with him. The large Presbyterian party, apprehensive now of the Independents, were most anxious to do so; anxious indeed as for their own existence; but it could not be. The unhappy Charles, in those final Hampton Court negotiations, shows himself as a man fatally incapable of being dealt with.

The Presbyterians, in their despair, were still for believing Charles, though found false, unbelievable again and again. Not so Cromwell: "For all our fighting," says he, "we are to have a little bit of paper?" No!

In fact, everywhere we have to note the decisive practical eye of this man; how he drives towards the practical and practicable; has a genuine insight into what is fact. Such an intellect, I maintain, does not belong to a false man.

Cromwell's Ironsides were the embodiment of this insight of his; men fearing God; and without any other fear. No more conclusively genuine set of fighters ever trod the soil of England, or of any other land.

Neither will we blame greatly that word of Cromwell's to them; which was so blamed: "If the King should meet me in battle, I would kill the King." Why not? These words were spoken to men who stood as before a Higher than Kings. They had set more than their own lives on the cast.

Poor Cromwell — great Cromwell! The inarticulate Prophet; Prophet who could not speak. Rude, confused, struggling to utter himself, with his savage depth, with his wild sincerity; and he looked so strange, among the elegant Euphemisms, dainty little Falklands, didactic Chillingworths, diplomatic Clarendons! Consider him. An outer hull of chaotic confusion, visions of the Devil, nervous dreams, almost semi-madness; and yet such a clear determinate man's-energy in the heart of that. A kind of chaotic man. The ray as of pure starlight and fire, working in such an element of boundless hypochondria, unformed black of darkness! And yet withal this hypochondria, what was it but the very greatness of the man? The depth and tenderness of his wild affections: the quantity of sympathy he had with things — the quantity of insight he would yet get into the heart of things, the mastery he would yet get over things: this was his hypochondria. The man's misery, as man's misery always does, came of his greatness.

In fact there are two errors, widely prevalent, which pervert to the very basis our judgments formed about such men as Cromwell; about their "ambition," "falsity," and suchlike. The first is what I might call substituting the goal of their career for the course and starting-point of it. The vulgar Historian of a Cromwell fancies that he had determined on being Protector of England, at the time when he was ploughing the marsh lands of Cambridgeshire. His career lay all mapped-out: a program of the whole drama; which he then step by step dramatically unfolded, with all manner of cunning, deceptive dramaturgy, as he went on — the hollow, scheming ὑποκριτής or play-actor, that he was! This is a radical perversion; all but universal in such cases. And think for an instant how different the fact is! How much does one of us foresee of his own life? Short way ahead of us it is all dim; an unwound skein of possibilities, of apprehensions, attemptabilities, vague-looming hopes. This Cromwell had not his life lying all in that fashion of Program, which he needed then, with that unfathomable cunning of his, only to enact dramatically, scene after scene! Not so. We see it so; but to him it was in no measure so. What absurdities would fall away of themselves, were this one undeniable fact kept honestly in view by History!

But a second error, which I think the generality commit, refers to this same "ambition" itself. We exaggerate the ambition of great men; we mistake what the nature of it is. Great Men are not ambitious in that sense; he

is a small poor man that is ambitious so. Examine the man who lives in misery because he does not shine above other men; who goes about producing himself, pruriently anxious about his gifts and claims; struggling to force everybody, as it were begging everybody for God's sake, to acknowledge him a great man, and set him over the heads of men! Such a creature is among the wretchedest sights seen under this sun.


But with regard to Cromwell and his purposes: Hume,[s] and a multitude following him, come upon me here with an admission that Cromwell was sincere at first; a sincere "Fanatic" at first, but gradually became a "Hypocrite" as things opened round him. This of the Fanatic-Hypocrite is Hume's theory of it; extensively applied since — to Mahomet and many others. Think of it seriously, you will find something in it; not much, not all, very far from all. Sincere hero hearts do not sink in this miserable manner. I will venture to say that such never befell a great deep Cromwell; I think, never. Nature's own lion-hearted Son; Antæus-like, his strength is got by touching the Earth, his Mother; lift him up from the Earth, lift him up into Hypocrisy, Inanity, his strength is gone. We will not assert that Cromwell was an immaculate man; that he fell into no faults, no insincerities among the rest. He was no dilettante professor of "perfections," "immaculate conducts." He was a rugged Orson, rending his rough way through actual true work — doubtless with many a fall therein. Insincerities, faults, very many faults daily and hourly: it was too well known to him; known to God and him! Cromwell's last words, as he lay waiting for death, are those of a Christian heroic man. Broken prayers to God, that He would judge him and this Cause, He since man could not, in justice yet in pity. They are most touching words. He breathed out his wild, great soul, its toils and sins all ended now, into the presence of his Maker, in this manner.


I, for one, will not call the man a Hypocrite! Hypocrite, mummer, the life of him a mere theatricality; empty barren quack, hungry for the shouts of mobs? The man had made obscurity do very well for him till his head was gray; and now he was, there as he stood recognised unblamed, the virtual King of England. Cannot a man do without King's Coaches and Cloaks? Is it such a blessedness to have clerks forever pestering you with bundles of papers in red tape? A simple Diocletian prefers planting of cabbages; a George Washington, no very immeasurable man, does the like. One would say, it is what any genuine man could do; and would do. The instant his real work were out in the matter of Kingship — away with it!

One is sorry for Cromwell in his old days. His complaint is incessant of the heavy burden Providence has laid on him. Heavy; which he must bear till death. Old Colonel Hutchinson,[t] as his wife relates it, Hutchinson, his old battlemate, coming to see him on some indispensable business much against his will. Cromwell "follows him to the door," in a most fraternal, domestic, conciliatory style; begs that he would be reconciled to him, his old brother in arms; says how much it grieves him to be misunderstood, deserted by true fellow-soldiers, dear to him from old: the rigorous Hutchinson, cased in his Republican formula, sullenly goes his way. And the man's head now white; his strong arm growing weary with its long work! I think always too of his poor Mother, now very old, living in that Palace of his; a right, brave woman; as indeed they lived all an honest God-fearing Household there: if she heard a shot go-off, she thought it was her son killed. He had to come to her at least once a day, that she might see with her own eyes that he was yet living. The poor old Mother! What had this man gained; what had he gained? He had a life of sore strife and toil, to his last day. Fame,

[1658 A.D.]

ambition, place in History? His dead body was hung in chains; his "place in History" — place in History forsooth! has been a place of ignominy, accusation, blackness and disgrace; and here, this day, who knows if it is not rash in me to be among the first that ever ventured to pronounce him not a knave and liar, but a genuinely honest man! Peace to him. Did he not, in spite of all, accomplish much for us? We walk smoothly over his great rough heroic life; step-over his body sunk in the ditch there. We need not spurn it, as we step on it! Let the Hero rest. It was not to men's judgment that he appealed; nor have men judged him very well.[u]





CHAPTER VI

THE END OF THE COMMONWEALTH

[1658–1660 A.D.]

When revolutions are verging towards their decline, it is a melancholy, but most instructive study to watch the disappointment and anguish of those men who have long been powerful and triumphant, but have at length reached the period when, in just retribution of their faults, their dominion escapes from their grasp, leaving them still subject to the sway of their enlightened and invincible obstinacy. Not only are they divided among themselves, like all rivals who have once been accomplices, but they are detested as oppressors and decried as visionaries by the nation; and, stricken at once with powerlessness and bitter surprise, they burn with indignation against their country, which they accuse of cowardice and ingratitude. Such after the death of Cromwell, was the condition of all those parties which, since the execution of Charles I, had been contending for the government of England as established by the revolution: republicans and partisans of the protector, parliamentarians and soldiers, fanatics and political intriguers,—all, whether sincere or corrupt, were involved in the same fate.—GUIZOT.[b]

By his wife, Elizabeth Bourchier, Cromwell left two sons, Richard and Henry. There was a remarkable contrast in the opening career of these young men. During the civil war, Richard lived in the Temple, frequented the company of the cavaliers, and spent his time in gaiety and debauchery. Henry repaired to his father's quarters, and so rapid was his promotion, that at the age of twenty he held the commission of captain in the regiment of guards belonging to Fairfax, the lord-general. After the establishment of the commonwealth, Richard married, and, retiring to the house of his father-in-law, at Hursley in Hampshire, devoted himself to the usual pursuits of a country gentleman. Henry accompanied his father in the reduction of Ireland, which country he afterwards governed, first with the rank of major-general, afterwards with that of lord-deputy. It was not till the second year

[1658 A.D.]

of the protectorate that Cromwell seemed to recollect that he had an elder son. He made him a lord of trade, then chancellor of the university of Oxford, and lastly a member of the new house of peers. As these honours were far inferior to those which he lavished on other persons connected with his family, it was inferred that he entertained a mean opinion of Richard's abilities. A more probable conclusion is, that he feared to alarm the jealousy of his officers, and carefully abstained from doing that which might confirm the general suspicion, that he designed to make the protectorship hereditary in his family.

The moment he expired, the council assembled, and the result of their deliberation was an order to proclaim Richard Cromwell protector, on the ground that he had been declared by his late highness his successor in that dignity. Not a murmur of opposition was heard; the ceremony was performed in all places after the usual manner of announcing the accession of a new sovereign; and addresses of condolence and congratulation poured in from the army and navy, from one hundred congregational churches, and from the boroughs, cities, and counties. It seemed as if free-born Britons had been converted into a nation of slaves. These compositions were drawn up in the highest strain of adulation, adorned with forced allusions from Scripture, and with all the extravagance of oriental hyperbole. "Their sun was set, but no night had followed. They had lost the nursing father, by whose hand the yoke of bondage had been broken from the necks and consciences of the godly. Providence by one sad stroke had taken away the breath from their nostrils, and smitten the head from their shoulders; but had given them in return the noblest branch of that renowned stock, a prince distinguished by the lovely composition of his person, but still more by the eminent qualities of his mind. The late protector had been a Moses to lead God's people out of the land of Egypt; his son would be a Joshua to conduct them into a more full possession of truth and righteousness. Elijah had been taken into heaven: Elisha remained on earth, the inheritor of his mantle and his spirit!"

The royalists, who had persuaded themselves that the whole fabric of the protectorial power would fall in pieces on the death of Cromwell, beheld with amazement the general acquiescence in the succession of Richard, and the foreign princes, who had deemed it prudent to solicit the friendship of the father, now hastened to offer their congratulations to his son. Yet, fair and tranquil as the prospect appeared, an experienced eye might easily detect the elements of an approaching storm. Meetings were clandestinely held by the officers; doubts were whispered of the nomination of Richard by his father; and an opinion was encouraged among the military that, as the commonwealth was the work of the army, so the chief office in the commonwealth belonged to the commander of the army. On this account the protectorship had been bestowed on Cromwell; but his son was one who had never drawn his sword in the cause; and to suffer the supreme power to devolve on him was to disgrace, to disinherit, the men who had suffered so severely, and bled so profusely, in the contest. These complaints had probably been suggested, they were certainly fomented, by Cromwell's son-in-law, Fleetwood, and his friends, the colonels Cooper, Berry, and Sydenham. Fleetwood was brave in the field; but irresolute in council; eager for the acquisition of power, but continually checked by scruples of conscience; attached by principle to republicanism, but ready to acquiesce in every change, under the pretence of submission to the decrees of Providence. Cromwell, who knew the man, had raised him to the second command in the army, and fed his ambition with distant and delusive hopes of succeeding to the supreme magistracy.

The protector died, and Fleetwood, instead of acting, hesitated, prayed,

and consulted; the propitious moment was suffered to pass by; he assented to the opinion of the council in favour of Richard; and then, repenting of his weakness, sought to indemnify himself for the loss by confining the authority of the protector to the civil administration, and procuring for himself the sole, uncontrolled command of the army. Under the late government, the meetings of military officers had been discountenanced and forbidden; now they were encouraged to meet and consult; and, in a body of more than two hundred individuals, they presented to Richard a petition, by which they demanded that no officer should be deprived, but by sentence of a court-martial, and that the chief command of the forces, and the disposal of commissions, should be conferred on some person whose past services had proved his attachment to the cause. There were not wanting those who advised the protector to extinguish the hopes of the factious at once by arresting and imprisoning the chiefs; but more moderate counsels prevailed, and in a firm but conciliatory speech, the composition of Secretary Thurloe, he replied that, to gratify their wishes, he had appointed his relative, Fleetwood, lieutenant-general of all the forces; but that to divest himself of the chief command, and of the right of giving or resuming commissions, would be to act in defiance of the Humble Petition and Advice, the instrument by which he held the supreme authority.

For a short time they appeared satisfied; but the chief officers continued to hold meetings in the chapel at St. James's, ostensibly for the purpose of prayer, but in reality for the convenience of deliberation. Fresh jealousies were excited; it was said that another commander (Henry Cromwell was meant) would be placed above Fleetwood; Thurloe, Pierrepoint, and St. John were denounced as evil counsellors; and it became evident to all attentive observers that the two parties must soon come into collision. The protector could depend on the armies in Ireland and Scotland. In Ireland, his brother Henry governed without an opponent; in Scotland, Monk, by his judicious separation of the troops, and his vigilance in the enforcement of discipline, had deprived the discontented of the means of holding meetings and of corresponding with each other. In England he was assured of the services of eight colonels, and therefore, as it was erroneously supposed, of their respective regiments, forming one half of the regular force. But his opponents were masters of the other half, constituted the majority in the council, and daily augmented their numbers by the accession of men who secretly leaned to republican principles, or sought to make an interest in that party which they considered the more likely to prevail in the approaching struggle.

From the notice of these intrigues the public attention was withdrawn by the obsequies of the late protector. It was resolved that they should exceed in magnificence those of any former sovereign, and with that view they were conducted according to the ceremonial observed at the interment of Philip II of Spain. Somerset House was selected for the first part of the exhibition. The spectators, having passed through three rooms hung with black cloth, were admitted into the funereal chamber; where, surrounded with wax-lights, was seen an effigy of Cromwell clothed in royal robes, and lying on a bed of state, which covered, or was supposed to cover, the coffin. On each side lay different parts of his armour: in one hand was placed the sceptre, in the other the globe; and behind the head an imperial crown rested on a cushion in a chair of state. But, in defiance of every precaution it became necessary to inter the body before the appointed day; and the coffin was secretly deposited at night in a vault at the west end of the middle aisle of Westminster Abbey, under a gorgeous cenotaph which had recently been erected.

[1659 A.D.]

The effigy was now removed to a more spacious chamber; it rose from a recumbent to an erect posture; and stood before the spectators not only with the emblems of royalty in its hands, but with the crown upon its head. For eight weeks this pageant was exhibited to the public. Thus did Fortune sport with the ambitious prospects of Cromwell. The honours of royalty which she refused to him during his life, she lavished on his remains after death; and then, in the course of a few months, resuming her gifts, exchanged the crown for a halter, and the royal monument in the abbey for an ignominious grave at Tyburn.[1]

RICHARD CROMWELL AND HIS UNRULY PARLIAMENT

In a few days after the funeral of his father, to the surprise of the public, the protector summoned a parliament. How, it was asked, could Richard hope to control such an assembly, when the genius and authority of Oliver had proved unequal to the attempt? The difficulty was acknowledged; but the arrears of the army, the exhaustion of the treasury, and the necessity of seeking support against the designs of the officers, compelled him to hazard the experiment; and he flattered himself with the hope of success, by avoiding the rock on which, in the opinion of his advisers, the policy of his father had split. Oliver had adopted the plan of representation prepared by the Long Parliament before its dissolution, a plan which, by disfranchising the lesser boroughs, and multiplying the members of the counties, had rendered the elections more independent of the government: Richard, under the pretence of a boon to the nation, reverted to the ancient system[2]; and, if we may credit the calculation of his opponents, no fewer than one hundred and sixty members were returned from the boroughs by the interest of the court and its supporters. But to adopt the same plan in the conquered countries of Scotland and Ireland would have been dangerous; thirty representatives were therefore summoned from each; and, as the elections were conducted under the eyes of the commanders of the forces, the members, with one solitary exception, proved themselves the obsequious servants of government.

It was, however, taken as no favourable omen, that when the protector, at the opening of parliament (Jan. 27th, 1659), commanded the attendance of the commons in the house of lords, nearly one-half of the members refused to obey. They were unwilling to sanction by their presence the existence of an authority, the legality of which they intended to dispute: or to admit the superior rank of the new peers, the representatives of the protector, over themselves, the representatives of the people. As soon as the lower house was constituted, it divided itself into three distinct parties. 1. The protectorists formed about one-half of the members. They had received instructions to adhere inviolably to the provisions of the Humble Petition and Advice, and to consider the government by a single person, with the aid of two houses, as the unalterable basis of the constitution. 2. The republicans, who did not amount to fifty, but compensated for deficiency in number by their energy and eloquence. Vane, Haslerig, Lambert, Ludlow, Neville, Bradshaw, and Scott, were ready debaters. With them voted Fairfax, who, after a long

[1] The charge for black cloth alone on this occasion was six thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine pounds, six shillings, and fivepence.

[2] The old representative system was to be restored. Small and decayed boroughs, which had been disfranchised, were again to elect burgesses. Commercial towns, such as Manchester, which had grown into importance, were again to cease to have members. The loss of ancient privileges by petty communities had given more offence than the gain of new franchises by large sections of the people had afforded satisfaction. —KNIGHT.c]

retirement, appeared once more on the stage. So artfully did he act his part that, though a royalist at heart, he was designed by them for the office of lord-general, in the event of the expulsion or the abdication of Richard. 3. The "moderates or neuters" held in number the medium between the protectorists and republicans. Of these, some wavered between the two parties; but many were concealed cavaliers, who, in obedience to the command of Charles, had obtained seats in the house, or young men who, without any fixed political principles, suffered themselves to be guided by the suggestions of the cavaliers.

To the latter, Hyde had sent instructions that they should embarrass the plans of the protector, by denouncing to the house the illegal acts committed under the late administration; by impeaching Thurloe and the principal officers of state; by fomenting the dissension between the courtiers and the republicans; and by throwing their weight into the scale, sometimes in favour of one, sometimes of the other party, as might appear most conducive to the interests of the royal exile. The lords, aware of the insecure footing on which they stood, were careful not to provoke the hostility of the commons. They sent no messages; they passed no bills; but exchanging matters of state for questions of religion, contrived to spend their time in discussing the form of a national catechism, the sinfulness of theatrical entertainments, and the papal corruptions supposed to exist in the Book of Common Prayer.

In the lower house, the first subject which called forth the strength of the different parties was a bill which, under the pretence of recognising Richard Cromwell for the rightful successor to his father, would have pledged the parliament to an acquiescence in the existing form of government. The men of republican principles instantly took the alarm. Each day the debate grew more animated and personal; charges were made, and recriminations followed: the republicans enumerated the acts of misrule and oppression under the government of the late protector; the courtiers balanced the account with similar instances from the proceedings of their adversaries during the sway of the Long Parliament. Weariness at last induced the combatants to listen to a compromise, that the recognition of Richard as protector should form part of a future bill, but that at the same time, his prerogative should be so limited as to secure the liberties of the people. From the office of protector, the members proceeded to inquire into the constitution and powers of the other house; and this question, as it was intimately connected with the former, was debated with equal warmth and pertinacity.

The new lords had little reason to be gratified with the result. They were acknowledged, indeed, as a house of parliament for the present; but there was no admission of their claim of the peerage, or of a negative voice, or of a right to sit in subsequent parliaments. The commons consented "to transact business with them" (a new phrase of undefined meaning), pending the parliament, but with a saving of the rights of the ancient peers, who had been faithful to the cause; and, in addition, a few days later (April 8th), they resolved that, in the transaction of business, no superiority should be admitted in the other house, nor message received from it, unless brought by the members themselves. On all questions, whenever there was a prospect of throwing impediments in the way of the ministry, or of inflaming the discontent of the people, the royalists zealously lent their aid to the republican party. It was proved that, while the revenue had been doubled, the expenditure had grown in a greater proportion; complaints were made of oppression, waste, embezzlement, and tyranny in the collection of the excise: the inhumanity of selling obnoxious individuals for slaves to the West India planters was severely

[1659 A.D.]

reprobated; instances of extortion were daily announced to the house by the committee of grievances.

THE DISCONTENT IN THE ARMY

But, while these proceedings awakened the hopes and gratified the resentments of the people, they at the same time spread alarm through the army; every man conscious of having abused the power of the sword began to tremble for his own safety; and an unusual ferment, the sure presage of military violence, was observable at the head-quarters of the several regiments.

Hitherto the general officers had been divided between Whitehall and Wallingford House, the residences of Richard and of Fleetwood. At Whitehall, the Lord Fauconberg, brother-in-law to the protector, Charles Howard, whom Oliver had created a viscount, Ingoldsby, Whalley, Goffe, and a few others, formed a military council for the purpose of maintaining the ascendancy of Richard in the army. At Wallingford House, Fleetwood and his friends consulted how they might deprive him of the command, and reduce him to the situation of a civil magistrate; but now a third and more numerous council appeared at St. James's, consisting of most of the inferior officers, and guided by the secret intrigues of Lambert, who, holding no commission himself, abstained from sitting among them, and by the open influence of Desborough, a bold and reckless man, who began to despise the weak and wavering conduct of Fleetwood. Here originated the plan of a general council of officers, which was followed by the adoption of The Humble Representation and Petition, an instrument composed in language too moderate to give reasonable cause of offence, but intended to suggest much more than it was thought prudent to express. It made no allusion to the disputed claim of the protector, or the subjects of strife between the two houses; but it complained bitterly of the contempt into which the good old cause had sunk.

This paper, with six hundred signatures, was presented to Richard, who received it with an air of cheerfulness, and forwarded it to the lower house. There it was read, laid on the table, and scornfully neglected. But the military leaders treated the house with equal scorn; having obtained the consent of the protector, they established a permanent council of general officers; and then, instead of fulfilling the expectations with which they had lulled his jealousy, successively voted, that the common cause was in danger, that the command of the army ought to be vested in a person possessing its confidence, and that every officer should be called upon to testify his approbation of the death of Charles I, and of the subsequent proceedings of the military; a measure levelled against the meeting at Whitehall, of which the members were charged with a secret leaning to the cause of royalty. This was sufficiently alarming; but, in addition, the officers of the trained bands signified their adhesion to the Representation of the army; and more than six hundred privates of the regiment formerly commanded by Colonel Pride published their determination to stand by their officers in the maintenance "of the old cause."

The friends of the protector saw that it was time to act with energy; and, by their influence in the lower house, carried the following votes (April 18th): that no military meetings should be held without the joint consent of the protector and the parliament, and that every officer should forfeit his commission who would not promise, under his signature, never to disturb the sitting, or infringe the freedom of parliament. These votes met, indeed, with a violent opposition in the "other house," in which many of the members had

been chosen from the military; but the courtiers, anxious to secure the victory, proposed another and declaratory vote in the commons, that the command of the army was vested in the three estates, to be exercised by the protector. By the officers this motion was considered as an open declaration of war: they instantly met; and Desborough, in their name, informed Richard that the crisis was at last come; the parliament must be dissolved, either by the civil authority, or by the power of the sword. He might make his election. If he chose the first, the army would provide for his dignity and support; if he did not, he would be abandoned to his fate, and fall friendless and unpitied. The protector called a council of his confidential advisers. Whitelocke opposed the dissolution, on the ground that a grant of money might yet appease the discontent of the military. Thurloe, Broghill, Fiennes and Wolseley maintained, on the contrary, that the dissension between the parliament and the army was irreconcilable, and that on the first shock between them, the cavaliers would rise simultaneously in the cause of Charles Stuart.

A commission was accordingly signed by Richard, and the usher of the black rod repeatedly summoned the commons to attend in the other house. But true to their former vote of receiving no message brought by inferior officers, they refused to obey; some members proposed to declare it treason to put force on the representatives of the nation, others to pronounce all proceedings void whenever a portion of the members should be excluded by violence; at last they adjourned for three days, and accompanied the speaker to his carriage in the face of the soldiery assembled at the door. These proceedings, however, did not prevent Fiennes, the head commissioner, from dissolving the parliament; and the important intelligence was communicated to the three nations by proclamation in the same afternoon of April 22nd. Whether the consequences of this measure, so fatal to the interests of Richard, were foreseen by his advisers, may be doubted. By the dissolution Richard had signed his own deposition; though he continued to reside at Whitehall, the government fell into abeyance; even the officers, who had hitherto frequented his court, abandoned him, some to appease, by their attendance at Wallingford House, the resentment of their adversaries, the others, to provide by their absence, for their own safety. If the supreme authority resided any where, it was with Fleetwood, who now held the nominal command of the army; but he and his associates were controlled both by the meeting of officers at St. James's, and by the consultations of the republican party in the city; and therefore contented themselves with depriving the friends of Richard of their commissions, and with giving their regiments to the men who had been cashiered by his father.

Unable to agree on any form of government among themselves, they sought to come to an understanding with the republican leaders. These demanded the restoration of the Long Parliament, on the ground that, as its interruption by Cromwell had been illegal, it was still the supreme authority in the nation; and the officers, unwilling to forfeit the privileges of their new peerage, insisted on the reproduction of the other house, as a co-ordinate authority, under the less objectionable name of a senate. But the country was now in a state of anarchy; the intentions of the armies in Scotland and Ireland remained uncertain; and the royalists, both Presbyterians and cavaliers, were exerting themselves to improve the general confusion to the advantage of the exiled king. As a last resource, the officers, by an instrument in which they regretted their past errors and backsliding, invited the members of the Long Parliament to resume the trust of which they had been unrighteously deprived. With some difficulty, two-and-forty were privately collected in

the Painted Chamber; Lenthall, the former speaker, after much entreaty, put himself at their head, and the whole body passed into the house through two lines of officers, some of whom were the very individuals by whom, six years before, they had been ignominiously expelled.

THE RECALL OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT: THE RUMP (MAY 7TH, 1659)

The reader will recollect that, on a former occasion, in the year 1648, the Presbyterian members of the Long Parliament had been excluded by the army. Of these, one hundred and ninety-four were still alive, eighty of whom actually resided in the capital. That they had as good a right to resume their seats as the members who had been expelled by Cromwell could hardly be doubted; but they were royalists, still adhering to the principles which they professed during the treaty in the Isle of Wight, and from their number, had they been admitted, would have instantly outvoted the advocates of republicanism.

They assembled in Westminster Hall; and a deputation of fourteen, with Sir George Booth, Prynne, and Annesley at their head, proceeded to the house. The doors were closed in their faces; a company of soldiers, the keepers, as they were sarcastically called, of the liberties of England, filled the lobby; and a resolution was passed (May 9th) that no former member who had not subscribed the Engagement, should sit till further order of parliament. The attempt, however, though it failed of success, produced its effect. It served to countenance a belief that the sitting members were mere tools of the military, and supplied the royalists with the means of masking their real designs under the popular pretence of vindicating the freedom of parliament. By gradual additions, the house at last amounted to seventy members, who, while they were ridiculed by their adversaries with the appellation of the "Rump," constituted themselves the supreme authority in the three kingdoms. They appointed, first, a committee of safety, and then a council of state, notified the foreign ministers of restoration to power, and, to satisfy the people, promised by a printed declaration to establish a form of government, which should secure civil and religious liberty without a single person, or kingship, or house of lords. The farce of addresses was renewed; the "children of Zion," the asserters of the good old cause, clamorously displayed their joy; and heaven was fatigued with prayers for the prosperity and permanence of the new government.

That government at first depended for its existence on the good-will of the military in the neighbourhood of London; gradually it obtained promises of support from the forces at a distance. Monk, with his officers, wrote to the speaker, congratulating him and his colleagues on their restoration to power, and hypocritically thanking them for their condescension in taking up so heavy a burthen; but, at the same time, reminding them of the services of Oliver Cromwell, and of the debt of gratitude which the nation owed to his family. Lockhart hastened to tender the services of the regiments in Flanders, and received in return a renewal of his credentials as ambassador, with a commission to attend the conferences between the ministers of France and Spain at Fuenterrabia. Montague followed with a letter from the fleet; but his professions of attachment were received with distrust. To balance his influence with the seamen, Lawson received the command of a squadron destined to cruise in the Channel; and, to watch his conduct in the Baltic, three commissioners, with Algernon Sydney at their head, were joined with him in his mission to the two northern courts.

THE RETIREMENT OF THE CROMWELLS (1659 A.D.)

There still remained the army in Ireland. From Henry Cromwell, a soldier possessing the affections of the military, and believed to inherit the abilities of his father, an obstinate, and perhaps successful, resistance was anticipated. But he wanted decision. Three parties had presented themselves to his choice; to earn, by the promptitude of his acquiescence, the gratitude of the new government; or to maintain by arms the right of his deposed brother; or to declare, as he was strongly solicited to declare, in favour of Charles Stuart. Much time was lost in consultation. While he thus wavered from project to project, some of his officers ventured to profess their attachment to the commonwealth, the privates betrayed a disinclination to separate their cause from that of their comrades in England, and Sir Hardress Waller, in the interest of the parliament, surprised the castle of Dublin (June 15th). The last stroke reduced Henry at once to the condition of a suppliant; he signified his submission by a letter to the speaker, obeyed the commands of the house to appear before the council, and on July 6th, having explained to them the state of Ireland, was graciously permitted to retire into the obscurity of private life.[1] The civil administration of the island devolved on five commissioners, and (July 18th) the command of the army was given to Ludlow, with the rank of lieutenant-general of the horse.



ENGLISH HOUSE, FIFTEENTH CENTURY

But the republican leaders soon discovered that they had not been called to repose on a bed of roses. The officers at Wallingford House began to dictate to the men whom they had made their nominal masters, and forwarded to them fifteen demands, under the modest title of "the things which they had on their minds," when they restored the Long Parliament. The house took them successively into consideration. A committee was appointed to report the form of government the best calculated to secure the liberties of the people; the duration of the existing parliament was limited to twelve months; freedom of worship was extended to all believers in the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Trinity, with the usual exception of prelatists and papists; and an act of oblivion, after many debates, was passed, but so encumbered with provisoes and exceptions, that it served rather to irritate than appease. The officers had requested (July 12th) that lands of inheritance, to the annual value of £10,000, should be settled on Richard Cromwell, and a yearly pension of £8,000 on "her highness dowager," his mother. But it was observed in the house that, though Richard exercised no authority, he continued to occupy the state apartments at Whitehall; and a suspicion existed that he was kept

[1] Henry Cromwell resided on his estate of Swinney Abbey, near Soham, in Cambridgeshire, till his death in 1674.

[1659 A.D.]

there as an object of terror, to intimate to the members that the same power could again set him up, which had so recently brought him down.

By repeated messages, he was ordered to retire; and, on his promise to obey, the parliament granted him the privilege of freedom from arrest during six months; transferred his private debts, amounting to £29,640, to the account of the nation, gave him £2,000 as a relief to his present necessities, and voted that a yearly income of £10,000 should be settled on him and his heirs, a grant easily made on paper, but never carried into execution.

Ludlow[d] makes the present £20,000; but the sum of £2,000 is written at length in the Journals; May 25. While he was at Whitehall, he entertained proposals from the royalists according to Clarendon,[e] consented to accept a title and £20,000 a year, and designed to escape to the fleet under Montague, but was too strictly watched to effect his purpose.[f]

Of Richard Cromwell's character W. H. S. Aubrey has written:[a] "He was an amiable, accomplished, but somewhat indolent country gentleman; with no capacity for ruling, no special force of character, and no taste for public affairs; though he had been a member of parliament and of the upper house. Strictly speaking, he never possessed supreme authority; for he was supplanted before acquiring it. He could not bend the bow of Odysseus. If he was timid, inert, and irresolute, he was also disinterested and patriotic. He did not use his high position for his own advantage, nor secure a competence prior to his own retirement, as he might have done. He quietly stepped aside, May 29th, 1659, into the private life and the rural pursuits that he loved. The men who profited by his self-abnegation afterwards wrote of him as a milksop, a poor creature, a poltroon, and as Tumble-down Dick. In Dryden's trenchant satire of 'Absalom and Achitophel,' he stands for Ishbosheth; as his father is represented by Saul.

"Such epithets and such a characterisation of Richard are wholly undeserved. True, he had not a scintilla of his father's genius, nor any of his firmness of purpose and resolute action; but he was by no means a fool or a coward."[g]

After his quiet abdication, Richard retired to his family estate at Hursley, Hampshire; but the necessity of paying the enormous public funeral expenses of his father, which parliament had promised to defray, so embarrassed his resources that he withdrew to Paris where he spent most of his life until 1680, when he returned to England, and died at Cheshunt, in 1712, aged eighty-six. Dr. Isaac Watts, who was his intimate friend, said that he never alluded to his former glory but once, and then indirectly.[a]

THE COMMONWEALTH RESTORED

The great object of the parliament was now, as Ludlow[d] expresses it, to provide "that for the future no man might have an opportunity to pack an army to serve his ambition." For this purpose two bills were passed; the one nominating a committee of seven persons to recommend officers to the house; the other making Fleetwood commander-in-chief, but only for the present session, or till they should take further order therein, and directing that the officers approved of by the parliament should receive their commissions not from him but from the speaker. These restrictions were opposed by Ludlow, Vane, and Salloway, as needless and only tending to disgust the army, but the fervent zeal of Haslerig, Sidney, and Neville, would hearken to no suggestions of prudence. Notice being given to the officers that it was expected they would take new commissions from the speaker, a council was

held at Desborough's house, at which Ludlow and Haslerig, who now had regiments, attended. The officers were very high; Desborough even said, that he thought the commission he had as good as any the parliament could give, and that he would not take another. But the next morning (June 8th) Colonel Hacker and his officers came at the persuasion of Haslerig, and took their commissions from the speaker, and the ice being now broken, others followed. Fleetwood took his the day following, and Lambert soon after. It was voted at this time (June 6th) "that this parliament shall not continue longer than May 7th, 1660."

While the republican oligarchs were thus employed, the royalists were by no means idle. Negotiations had been carried on with the leading Presbyterians, and they were now all pledged to the royal cause. Richard Cromwell had been offered a title and 20,000*l.* a year; his brother was also solicited, and he at one time, as we have seen, is said to have meditated declaring for the king. Fleetwood, Lambert, and Monk also were applied to. A general rising on the 1st of August was arranged, and the king and his brothers were at the same time to pass over with the troops which they had assembled.

BOOTH'S RISING, AND THE WALLINGFORD HOUSE PETITIONS

Willis still kept up his correspondence with Thurloe, and the parliament was thus put in possession of their secrets. His treachery however was at this time discovered through Morland, the secretary of Thurloe, who forwarded to the court at Bruges some of Willis's communications in his own hand-writing. Willis, after his usual manner, when the government had been put on its guard by himself, represented to the Knot that the project was now hopeless, and persuaded them to write circulars forbidding the rising (July 29).

Accordingly, it was only in Cheshire that it took place, where Sir George Booth called on the people, without mentioning the king, to rise and demand a free parliament. He took possession of Chester, where he was joined by the earl of Derby, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Sir Thomas Middleton, and other royalists. But their spirits were damped when they learned that their friends all remained inactive, and that Lambert was advancing against them with four regiments of horse and three of foot. They moved to Nantwich, intending to dispute the passage of the Weever; but Lambert easily forced it, and their men broke and fled at his approach (Aug. 16). Colonel Morgan and about thirty men were killed, and three hundred were made prisoners. The earl of Derby was taken in the disguise of a servant, and Booth, as he was on his way to London, dressed as a woman, was discovered at Newport Pagnel in Buckinghamshire.

Lambert hastened up to London, leaving his army to follow by slow marches. A sum of 1,000*l.* which was voted him, he distributed among his officers, and shortly after (Sept. 14th) they sent up from Derby a petition (secretly transmitted to them from Wallingford House), requiring that there should be no limitation of time in Fleetwood's commission, that Lambert should be major-general, that no officer should be deprived of his commission except by sentence of a court-martial, etc. This petition having been shown to Haslerig by Fleetwood (22nd), he hastened into the house, and having caused the doors to be locked, moved that Lambert and two other officers should be taken into custody. But on Fleetwood's asserting that Lambert knew nothing of it, they contented themselves with passing a vote expressive of their dislike of the petition; and it was resolved "that to augment the number of general officers was needless, chargeable, and dangerous."

[1659 A.D.]

Several meetings were now held at Wallingford House, and another petition was drawn up, which was presented (Oct. 5th) by Desborough and other officers. It was in substance the same as the former, but it further demanded that those who groundlessly informed the house against their servants should be brought to justice. This was aimed at Haslerig and his friends. The house in the usual manner returned them thanks for their good expressions, but soon after (on the 11th) a vote was passed, making it treason to raise money without consent of parliament. Next day Lambert, Desborough, and seven other colonels were deprived of their commissions for having sent a copy of the petition to Colonel Okey, and by another vote Fleetwood's office was taken away, and he and six other persons were nominated to form a board for the direction of the forces. Haslerig having thus thrown down the gauntlet, prepared for defence. He reckoned on the armies of Scotland and Ireland, the regiments of Hacker, Morley, and Okey; and some others about London had assured him of their fidelity, and the parliament had a guard of chosen horse, under Major Evelyn. Orders were given for these troops to move to Westminster, and early in the morning of the 13th the regiments of Morley and Moss, with some troops of horse, occupied the palace-yard and the avenues of the house. Lambert, on the other hand, drew together his men, and posted them in King street and about the abbey.

The two parties faced each other, but the men were loath to fight against their brothers in arms, and their officers did not urge them. When Lenthall the speaker [who claimed to be the chief commander] came up in his coach, Lambert sneeringly ordered one of his officers to conduct the "lord-general" to Whitehall, but he was suffered to return to his own house. The council of state then met, and after a good deal of altercation it was agreed that the parliament was not to sit, that the council of officers should keep the public peace, and cause a form of government to be drawn up, which should be laid before a new parliament speedily to be summoned.[1] Fleetwood was declared to be commander-in-chief, with full powers, Lambert major-general, and a committee of safety was appointed. To ascertain the feelings of the armies in Ireland and Scotland, Colonel Barrow was sent to the former country, and Colonel Cobbet to the latter. Barrow found the officers and men wavering and divided; Cobbet was imprisoned by Monk, who declared for the parliament.

GENERAL MONK TAKES THE REINS

The conduct of Monk, who now becomes the principal object of attention, is ambiguous beyond example. He had early served under Goring in the Netherlands; he was in the royal army in Ireland, and was made a prisoner at Nantwich; he remained in the Tower till the end of the war, when he got a command in Ireland; he attached himself strongly to Cromwell, by whom the government of Scotland was confided to him; he continued his attachment to Cromwell's family, and he wrote to Richard a most judicious letter, pointing out the best modes of securing his power. Monk was no speculative republican, he was no fanatic in religion, though much influenced by his wife, who was a Presbyterian. He was a man of a phlegmatic temper, and of impenetrable secrecy. The royalists always had hopes of him; and it is not improbable, that now seeing the power of Cromwell's house gone, his secret

[1 "By an agreement between mutual weaknesses the Long Parliament retired noiselessly from that hall from which Cromwell six years before, had driven it so ignominiously; and Lambert, the paltry imitator of Cromwell, remained master of the field without having achieved a victory."— GUVOT.b]

plan was to aid, if it could be done with safety, in restoring the king. The first care of Monk was to secure Edinburgh castle and Leith fort, and to occupy Berwick. When this was known in London, it was resolved that Lambert should march against him; and he set out forthwith for the north (Nov. 3rd), having previously exacted a promise from Fleetwood, that he would come to no agreement with either the king or Haslerig without his approbation.

Monk meantime went on re-modelling his army: those of his officers who were of the Wallingford House party having resigned their commissions, he supplied their places with such as he could depend on; he also displaced many who had been put in by the parliament. As his treasury and magazines were well supplied, and he knew that his opponents wanted money, he sought to procrastinate; he therefore sent deputies to London, and on their return pretending that the agreement which they had concluded was somewhat obscure, he opened a negotiation with Lambert, who was at Newcastle, in order to have it explained. Meanwhile he went on re-forming his army, dismissing even the privates of whom he was not certain, and supplying their place with Scots. He held a convention of the Scottish estates at Berwick, and having commended the peace of the country to them during his absence, and obtained a grant of money (Dec. 6th), he fixed his headquarters at Coldstream, where he still continued to amuse Lambert with negotiations.

Meantime the cause of the army was losing ground in city and country. The apprentices in London had frequent scuffles with the soldiers; an attempt was made to seize the Tower; Admiral Lawson declared for the parliament, and brought his fleet up to Gravesend; Whetham, governor of Portsmouth, admitted Haslerig and Morley into the town, and the troops sent against them went over to them; the Isle of Wight declared for the parliament. At length the soldiers themselves abandoned their officers, and putting themselves under the command of Okey and Alured, they assembled (Dec. 24th) in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and having declared for the parliament, marched by Lenthall's house, in Chancery Lane, and saluted him as their general. On the 26th, the speaker and those members who were in town walked to the house, the soldiers shouting and cheering them as they passed. Haslerig returned in triumph, and the Rump once more flourished. Fleetwood had on his knees surrendered his commission to the speaker; Lambert, Desborough, and others, made their submissions in the humblest manner, but they were all confined to their houses at a distance from London. The army was re-modelled; not less than fifteen hundred officers being discharged. The Rump proceeded to punish such members as had been of the late committee of safety; Vane was expelled, and ordered to retire to his house at Raby; Salloway was sent to the Tower; Whitelocke had to resign the great seal, and narrowly escaped being committed also. Charges of treason were made against Ludlow and others.

A new council of state was appointed, and an oath, renouncing kingship and the Stuarts in the strongest terms, was imposed on all members of the parliament. Meantime, Lord Fairfax and Monk had arranged that on the same day (Jan. 1st, 1660), the latter should cross the Tweed, and the former should seize the city of York. The engagement was punctually performed; the royalists in York opened the gates and admitted Fairfax. Though the weather was severe, Monk continued his march; Lambert's troops having obeyed the orders sent to them to disperse, no opposition was encountered; and having stayed five days to consult with Fairfax at York, Monk resumed his march for the capital (16th), the invitation to do so being now arrived. It was Fairfax's advice that he should remain in the north, and there proclaim the king, but he said it would be dangerous in the present temper of his officers; in fact,

at York he caned one of them for charging him with this design. At Nottingham on the 21st they were near signing an engagement to obey the parliament in all things "except the bringing in of Charles Stuart." At Leicester, on the 23rd, Monk was obliged to sign an answer to a petition from his native county, Devon, giving it as his opinion, that monarchy could not be restored, that it would be dangerous to recall the secluded members, and advising submission to the present parliament. At this town he was joined by Scott and Robinson, two of the members sent, as it were, to do him honour, but in reality to discover his intentions. He treated them with great respect, and always referred to them the bearers of the numerous addresses that were presented to him, for the restoration of the secluded members and "a free parliament."

The troops which Monk had brought with him did not exceed five thousand men, and those in and about London were more numerous; he therefore wrote from St. Albans, on the 28th, requiring, to prevent quarrels or seduction, that five regiments should be removed. An order was made to that effect (Feb. 2nd), but the men refused to obey; the royalists of the city tried to gain them over; they remained, however, faithful to the parliament, and, on being promised their arrears, marched out quietly the next morning. Monk led in his troops the following day, and took up his quarters at Whitehall. On the 6th Monk received the thanks of the house. In his reply, he noticed the numerous addresses for a free and full parliament which he had received, expressed his dislike of oaths and engagements, and his hopes that neither cavaliers nor fanatics would be entrusted with civil or military power. By some his speech was thought too dictatorial. "The servant," said Scott, "has already learned to give directions to his masters." Monk also excited suspicion, by demurring to the oath abjuring the Stuarts to be taken by members of the council of state. Seven of the other members, he observed, had not yet taken it, and he should like to know their reasons; experience had shown that such oaths were of little force; he had proved his devotion to the parliament, and would do so again.

The tide of loyalty still continued to swell in the city. The secluded members held frequent meetings there, and some even of the king's judges who were in parliament entered into communications with them. The last elections had given a common council zealous for a full and free parliament; they set the present one at naught, refused to pay the taxes imposed by it, and received and answered addresses from the counties. To check these proceedings, it was resolved by the council of state that eleven of the common council should be arrested, the posts and chains which had been fixed in the streets be taken away, and the city gates be destroyed. In the dead of night of February 9th, Monk received orders to carry this resolution into effect. He obeyed, though his officers and soldiers murmured; the citizens received him with groans and hisses, but made no opposition. When the posts and chains were removed, Monk sent to say that he thought enough had been done; but he was directed to complete the demolition, and he therefore destroyed the gates and portcullises. He then led his men back to Whitehall, and, having there coolly considered the whole matter, he thought he saw a design to embroil him with the citizens, and, finally, lay him aside. In concert with his officers, he wrote next morning to the speaker, requiring that by the following Friday every vacancy in the house should be filled up, preparatory to a dissolution and the calling of a new parliament. He then marched his troops into Finsbury Fields, caused a common council to be summoned, and told them that he was come to join with them in procuring a full and free parliament.[k]


Monk went to the common council and told them what he had done. Guildhall resounded with cries of "God bless your excellency!" The soldiers were feasted. The cry went forth throughout London of "Down with the Rump." Pepys[h] has described, as none but an eye-witness could describe, the scene of that night: "In Cheapside there were a great many bonfires, and Bow bells and all the bells in all the churches as we went home were a-ringing. Hence we went homewards, it being about ten at night. But the common joy that was everywhere to be seen! The number of bonfires, there being fourteen between St. Dunstan's and Temple Bar, and at Strand Bridge I could at one time tell thirty-one fires. In King street seven or eight; and all along burning and roasting, and drinking for rumps. There being rumps tied upon sticks and carried up and down. The butchers at the May-pole in the Strand rang a peal with their knives when they were going to sacrifice their rump. On Ludgate Hill there was one turning of the spit that had a rump tied upon it, and another basting of it. Indeed it was past imagination, both the greatness and the suddenness of it. At one end of the street you would think there was a whole lane of fire, and so hot that we were fain to keep on the further side."

Charles and his court were at Brussels when the news reached them of these events in London. "They thought all their sufferings over," says Clarendon.[i] And yet the best informed men in London, whether republican or royalist, could not penetrate the thick veil of Monk's real intentions. Aubrey[j] who lived a gossiping life in places of public resort, and had access to persons of influence, says of certain friends, "they were satisfied that he [Monk] no more intended or designed the king's restoration, when he came into England, or first came to London, than his horse did." Sir Henry Vane, after the menacing letter had been written to the parliament, said to Ludlow,[d] that "unless he were much mistaken, Monk had yet several masks to put off." Ludlow went to see him in the city, and after much discourse Monk exclaimed, "Yea, we must live and die together for a commonwealth." Whatever were his real intentions, he maintained his ascendancy by the most earnest professions of fidelity to the republican party and their opinions. Yet his actions were more than doubtful. The house had twice resolved that the secluded members should not be admitted. Monk had determined the contrary. The infusion of so many of these who had been originally thrust out of parliament for the moderation of their opinions, was the surest way to neutralise the power of the republican faction, who clung to authority with a tenacity that indicated their real weakness.

Monk, on the 21st of February, sent an escort of his soldiers to accompany a body of the secluded members to the house of commons, he having previously read them a speech, in which he formally declared for a commonwealth. When they took their seats the greatest heats were exhibited; and some of the republicans withdrew from the house. Seventeen of them went in a body to Monk, to demand his reasons for these proceedings. He protested his zeal to a commonwealth government; "and they then pressed him more home by demanding, if he would join with them against Charles Stuart and his party?" He took off his glove, and putting his hand within Sir Arthur Haslerig's hand, he said, "I do here protest to you, in the presence of all these gentlemen, that I will oppose to the utmost the setting-up of Charles Stuart, a single person, or a house of peers." Ludlow[d] who records this, says that Monk then expostulated with them touching their suspicions, saying, "What is it that I have done in bringing these members into the house? Are they not the same that brought the king to the block? though others cut off his head, and that justly." The members thus restored by Monk were chiefly

of that great Presbyterian body who had been ejected by the Independents; and who now expected that they should be strong enough, in the event of the restoration of the monarchy, to make terms for the establishment of their form of church government.

They immediately became a majority in parliament; appointed Monk general-in-chief; formed a new council of state; and superseded sheriffs, justices of the peace and militia officers, who were supporters of republican institutions. The covenant was again to be promulgated; the confession of faith of the assembly of divines to be adopted; the penal laws against Catholics, which Cromwell rarely put in force, were to be called into full vigour. The tendencies of some of the members towards monarchy were still very feebly indicated. Uncertainty everywhere prevailed, whilst the man who had the power of the sword was well known to have no fixed principles of politics or religion — was more greedy of wealth than excited by any daring ambition — and would only declare himself by some irrevocable action when he had made up his mind as to the probable success and permanency of king or commonwealth. Admiral Montague had been apointed "general at sea," the republican admiral Lawson being put aside. He was the patron of Pepys, and told him, on the 6th of March, that there were great endeavours to bring in the protector again, but that he did not think it would last long if he were brought in. Montague added, "No, nor the king neither — though he seems to think he will come in — unless he carry himself very soberly and well."



PURSE AND DAGGER OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

How Charles carried himself was perfectly well known to his most zealous friends — even to those who themselves lived "soberly and well." When a proposal was made to Oliver Cromwell that Charles should marry his daughter, the protector objected his "debauched life" as an insuperable difficulty. The royalists, Presbyterian or Episcopalian, saw no such objection in the marriage of Charles with the state of England. Very curious combinations of men long separated were now forming. Old faithful friends of his house were flocking to the king at Breda. Amongst them now and then appeared some country gentleman, whose clothes were of a soberer hue and a more English cut, than those of Charles's habitual courtiers. These had discarded the lovelocks of the cavaliers, their slashed doublets and flowing mantles, for the hideous periwigs and embroidered surtouts of the Parisian fashion. Very tarnished were the gold and silver embroideries of the courtiers at Brussels, or Breda, or the Hague, in the early spring of 1660, when Englishmen from home gathered about them. "Their clothes were not worth forty shillings, the best of them," says Pepys. London soon sent money to the exiles, and Paris was ready to provide fineries of which the Louvre might have been proud. For there was a growing confidence that the commonwealth was fast coming to an end. Men, by a sort of instinctive feeling, were setting up the king's arms; and drinking the king's health, though Monk and his bands were still dominating in the City and at Whitehall.

END OF THE RUMP PARLIAMENT, MARCH 16, 1660

The Long Parliament was to terminate its sittings on the 16th of March. On the 13th, that once formidable republican assembly voted that the oath of a member of parliament — to be "true and faithful to the commonwealth of England, as the same is now established, without a king or house of lords," — should be abolished. On the 15th of March the popular sentiment was manifested at the royal exchange. A statue of Charles I had been removed after the tragedy of the 30th of January; and in the niche where it stood was written, "*Exit tyrannus, regum ultimus, anno libertatis Angliæ restitutæ primo, annoque Domini 1648.*" For twelve years few had ventured to affirm that "tyrant and the last of kings" were words of offence; or had asserted that the year 1648 was not the first year of the restored liberty of England. On the evening of the 15th of March, a ladder was placed against this niche; soldiers stood around; a house painter mounted the ladder, painted out the inscription, and waving his cap, shouted "God bless King Charles II!" Again bonfires blazed in the streets.

On the 16th of March, the parliament met to vote their own dissolution, and England hoped that a long term of rest and security had been earned by the sufferings and changes of twenty years. Some few uplifted their voices against the inevitable event; and still clung to their faith in a commonwealth; to their assured belief that liberty and peace would be best maintained by the absolute authority of a "grand or general council of the nation." This was Vane's opinion, having no misgiving for his past actions and no dread of his future lot, even though it were the hardest: "He had all possible satisfaction of mind as to those actions God had enabled him to do for the commonwealth, and hoped the same God would fortify him in his sufferings, how sharp soever, to bear a faithful and constant testimony thereto." This was also his friend Milton's[b] opinion: "What I have spoken is the language of that which is not called amiss, the good old cause: if it seem strange to any, it will not seem more strange, I hope, than convincing to backsliders: thus much I should, perhaps, have said, though I were sure I should have spoken only to trees and stones, and had none to cry to but with the prophet, 'O earth, earth, earth!' to tell the very soil itself what her perverse inhabitants are deaf to. Nay, though what I have spoke should happen (which Thou suffer not who didst create mankind free! nor Thou next who didst redeem us from being servants of men!) to be the last words of our expiring liberty."[c]

Nineteen years and a half had now elapsed since the Long Parliament first assembled — years of revolution and bloodshed, during which the nation had made the trial of almost every form of government, to return at last to that form from which it had previously departed. On the 16th of March, one day later than was originally fixed, its existence, which had been illegally prolonged since the death of Charles I, was terminated by its own act. The reader is already acquainted with its history. For the glorious stand which it made against the encroachments of the crown, it deserves both admiration and gratitude; its subsequent proceedings assumed a more ambiguous character; ultimately they led to anarchy and military despotism. But, whatever were its merits or demerits, of both posterity has reaped the benefit. To the first, the English are indebted for many of the rights which they now enjoy; by the second, they are warned of the evils which result from political changes effected by violence, and in opposition to the habits and predilections of the people.[d]

The clouded determinations of Monk were very soon becoming more trans-

[1660 A.D.]

parent. He had secretly received his cousin, Sir John Grenville, who had long sought an interview in vain, to deliver a letter from the king. He would send no letter in answer. [He wrote one, read it to Grenville, then burned it and told Grenville to remember the contents.] He entrusted Grenville to promise Charles that he would be his devoted servant. Monk made no conditions, but he tendered some advice — that there should be a general amnesty, with only four exceptions; that the possessors of confiscated property should not be disturbed; that there should be liberty of conscience. Grenville repaired to the king at Brussels, where they met in secret. A more formal body of envoys from England now presented themselves to the king — a deputation of Presbyterians, who came to offer the same terms which had been proposed to his father in the Isle of Wight. The parliament was to have the control of the army; the civil war was to be declared lawful; new patents of nobility were to be annulled. Charles laughed in his sleeve. "Little do they think," he said, "that General Monk and I are upon so good terms."

The Presbyterians believed that they alone had any chance of success. "Leave the game in our hands," they said to the cavaliers. They probably thought correctly that Charles was indifferent as to the form of worship under which England should be when he came to be king. But they knew that Hyde was devoted to the restoration of the Anglican church, as a necessary consequence of the restoration of the monarchy. They wished that Hyde should be expelled from power or influence, and used the strongest arguments to induce the belief that the restoration could not be accomplished whilst he was a royal counsellor. In spite of their conviction of Monk's adhesion to their cause, the few to whom Charles had entrusted the secret of his correspondence with him, still sometimes doubted. The French ambassador tried to obtain Monk's confidence. He would give no opinion as to the future government of England. That must be settled by the next parliament. Monk's real opinions were the less necessary to be disclosed; for all England was becoming impatient for the restoration. Old servants of the commonwealth — Broghill, and Thurloe, and Lenthall — offered to Charles their submission and their advice. The king, from mixed motives of indolence and prudence, suffered matters to proceed without committing himself to any party, or making any engagements for his future conduct. He yielded to Monk's advice in one particular. He left the Spanish Netherlands, and established himself at Breda.[1]

In the midst of the apparent certainty of the restoration being at hand, a new cause of alarm suddenly arose. Lambert had been committed to the Tower, when Monk's interest became predominant. He escaped on the 9th of April, and was speedily at the head of some soldiers, who had revolted; and, marching through the midland counties, he called upon all to join him who would preserve the commonwealth. Monk sent Ingoldsby to encounter Lambert; and declared to Grenville that, if Lambert met with any success, he would no longer have any reservation, but act in the king's name and under his commission, to summon the royalists to arms. On the 22nd of April, Lambert and his men were met at Daventry by Ingoldsby's troops. A parley was proposed; but Ingoldsby refused any accommodation. The two armies had advanced close to each other, and the conflict seemed imminent, when

[1 It is said to have been the intention of the Spaniards to detain Charles till Jamaica and Dunkirk should be restored. According to Clarendon[e] he narrowly escaped detention.[k]]

Lambert's cavalry threw away their pistols; and their leader was quickly a prisoner.

The last battle of the commonwealth had now to be fought at the hustings. The elections took place. A few of the old republicans were returned. Some members were elected who believed that the restoration of the monarchy could be effected, without losing any of the liberties which had been won since the days of Laud and Strafford. The greater number were men who were either led away by a fever of loyalty, or were indifferent to any re-action which would end the struggles and uncertainties of twenty years. It was impossible that a king thus restored amidst a conflict of passions and prejudices — of old hatreds and new ambitions — should be forward to make any professions of public duty, or cherish any deep affection for the people he was to govern. It was fortunate that Charles was only a heartless voluptuary, and was too selfish in his craving for ease and pleasure, to add the personal energy of the tyrant to the almost inevitable tyranny of those who believed that the king and the people could return to the same condition in which they were before Hampden refused to pay ship-money. The king's position with regard to the church was, in a similar degree, under the control of the same spirit of indifference. Secretly a papist, openly a scoffer, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Independent might harass each other, so that Charles was quiet. He fancied himself most safe with those who professed to believe that his authority was divine; and that "Render unto Cæsar" meant, if rightly interpreted, let Cæsar's will be the one law.

Five hundred and fifty-six members had been elected[1] to the house of commons, the greater number of whom took their seats on the 26th of April. Ten peers only met in the house of lords on that day. Presbyterians and cavaliers looked suspiciously at each other; but the Presbyterians, more accustomed to act in union, manœuvred that one of their party should be elected speaker. The first business of both houses was to return thanks to Monk for his services, and the lords voted that a statue should be erected in his honour. Colonel Ingoldsby also received the thanks of the commons for his prompt action against Lambert. The house was not yet in the humour to forget the sound advice of Monk to the lords when he returned them his thanks — "to look forward and not backward in transacting affairs." The cavaliers soon made the house and the nation understand that the day of a triumphant reaction was fast approaching. Their spirit spread amongst the moderate and independent: "Every one hoped in this change to change their condition, and disowned all things they had before advised," says Mrs. Hutchinson.[m] "Every ballad singer sang up and down the streets ribald rhymes, made in reproach of the late commonwealth."

The day after parliament met, Sir John Grenville went to the sitting of the council of state, and asked to speak with the lord general. To his hands he delivered a packet sealed with the royal arms. Monk affected surprise and alarm, and it was decided that Grenville should be called in. He said that the packet had been entrusted to him by the king, his master, at Breda. The council resolved that the letters which Grenville brought should be delivered to the parliament. On the first of May, Grenville appeared at the door of the lower house, and being called to the bar presented a letter addressed "To our

[1 If ever there was a parliament freely chosen, it was the present one: there was no court or army now to control the elections; the territorial aristocracy was enfeebled, and could use none but its legitimate influence; the royalists (the Catholics of course excepted) were no longer deprived of the right of voting; all parties therefore put forth their strength, and the royalists (the moderate Presbyterians included) had a most decided majority. The republicans obtained few seats, and their only hopes lay now in the army. — KEIGHTLEY.k]

[1660 A.D.]

trusty and well beloved the speaker of the house of commons." He then went through the same formality at the house of lords. With each letter was enclosed a document addressed to the whole nation — the Declaration from Breda. Grenville then proceeded to the city, and presented a letter from the king addressed to the lord mayor, aldermen, and common council, which also contained the Declaration.

CHARLES' DECLARATION FROM BREDA, AND THE AMNESTY (1660 A.D.)

In all these papers, the composition of Hyde, there was little to alarm, and much to propitiate, the prudent and peaceful. The commons were assured "upon our royal word — that none of our predecessors have had a greater esteem for parliaments than we have;" — parliaments were "so vital a part of the constitution of the kingdom, and so necessary for the government of it, that, we well know, neither prince nor people can be, in any tolerable degree, happy without them." The Declaration professed the king's desire "that all our subjects may enjoy what by law is theirs, by a full and entire administration of justice throughout the land." It declared "a free and general pardon to all our subjects" — excepting only such persons "as shall hereafter be excepted by act of parliament." All are invited to a perfect union amongst themselves.

Deploring the existence of religious animosities, "We do declare a liberty to tender consciences; and that no man shall be disquieted, or called in question, for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." All matters relating to the possession of estates "shall be determined in parliament." Both houses immediately applied themselves to prepare answers to the royal letters; declared that, "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by king, lords, and commons"; voted 50,000*l.* to the king as a gift; and presented Grenville with 500*l.* to buy a jewel. Commissioners from both houses were chosen to convey their answers to the king. Grenville preceded them with the best proof of loyalty and affection—4,500*l.* in gold, and a bill of exchange for 25,000*l.* Pepys[h] tells us that Charles, when Grenville brought him the money, was "so joyful, that he called the princess royal and duke of York, to look upon it, as it lay in the portmanteau before it was taken out."

On the 8th of May the two houses of parliament proclaimed Charles II king of England, Scotland, and Ireland, at Westminster, at Whitehall, and in the city. Although the king had not arrived, the restoration of the monarchy was completed. In a delirium of loyalty the Convention Parliament never thought of making conditions for the liberties of the country. Hale, the great judge, and Prynne, the learned lawyer, had ventured to propose a committee for considering what propositions should be made to Charles, before the destinies of the country were irrevocably committed to his guidance. Monk opposed this: "I cannot answer for the peace either of the nation or of the army, if any delay is put to the sending for the king. What need is there of sending propositions to him? Might we not as well prepare them, and offer them to him when he shall come over? He will bring neither army nor treasure with him, either to fright or corrupt us." The house assented by acclamation. It rested the conservancy of all that the nation had won since the opening of the Long Parliament upon the flimsy foundation of the Declaration from Breda. Bills were prepared, which were to be presented for the acceptance of the king, "when he shall come over."

Magna Charta and the Petition of Right; privilege of parliament; pardon, indemnity and oblivion, were words glibly used as if they were things of course. Bills were prepared for confirming purchases of property during the times of trouble; and for the abolition of knight service, the feudal tenure which was most obnoxious. But the real temper of this parliament was to be subjected to a severer test — the question of amnesty had yet to be settled. Monk had just protested that if he were to suffer any one to be excluded from such amnesty, he would be the arrantest rogue that ever lived. Ashley Cooper had said to Hutchinson, "If the violence of the people should bring the king upon us, let me be damned, body and soul, if ever I see a hair of any man's head touched, or a penny of any man's estate, upon this quarrel."

Ingoldsby had received the thanks of the commons for recent services. He, and others who had signed the warrant for the king's execution, were members of the commons. On the 9th of May, the debate on the Amnesty Bill came on in both houses. The earl of Northumberland said, that though he had no part in the death of the king, he was against questioning those concerned; "that the example may be more useful to posterity, and profitable to future kings, by deterring them from the like exorbitances." Fairfax, in a noble spirit of generosity, exclaimed, "If any man must be excepted, I know no man that deserves it more than myself; for I was general of the army at that time, and had power sufficient to prevent the proceedings against the king; but I did not think fit to make use of it to that end." Lenthall, the son of the famous speaker, provoked the house to tumult by boldly saying, "He that first drew his sword against the king committed as high an offence as he that cut off the king's head."

The house at last voted as to the number of regicides to be excluded from the amnesty, and decided that seven should be excepted. But it also resolved that every one should be arrested who had sat upon the king's trial, and their property seized. Other arrests took place. Some who had laboured best with Cromwell to uphold the honour of England, such as Thurloe, were impeached. The titles bestowed by the two protectors were annulled. Upon all great questions, political or religious, which affected the future safety and liberties of these nations, postponement was the ruling policy of the cavaliers. The Presbyterians, who were the first to aim at religious supremacy, began clearly to see that the day was fast approaching, when they would regret the tranquillity they had enjoyed under the toleration of that ruler whom they had now agreed to declare a traitor.

The fortunes of Charles had so decidedly changed in the course of a little month, that the foreign courts who had looked adversely or coldly upon him, now embarrassed him with their rival professions of friendship. He was wisely advised not to be too forward to receive such civilities from France or from Spain as might compromise him in the future policy of England. The states of Holland invited him to take his departure from the Hague; and he arrived there from Breda on the 15th of May. Thither came the commissioners of the parliament; the town-clerk of London, with aldermen and lesser dignitaries; deputations of the Presbyterian clergy; and a swarm of Englishmen of every variety of opinion, who wanted to prostrate themselves at the feet of power. Holles, who had been one of the earliest leaders, in the battle of the Long Parliament was the orator on the part of the house of commons. Their hearts, he said, were filled with veneration and confidence; their longings for their king, their desires to serve him, expressed the opinions of the whole nation — "lettings out of the soul, expressions of transported

[1660 A.D.]

minds." Other lords had had dominion over them; but their hearts and souls did abhor such rulers, and ever continued faithful to their king. Anthony Ashley Cooper had civil words from Charles. Fairfax was received with kindness.

The king made smooth speeches to the Presbyterians; but they obtained no satisfaction as to the future of England in the great question of religious union. No one, however, pressed hardly upon him. There were no strong words spoken, as the earlier race of Puritans would have spoken. Burnet,[n] describing the general character of Charles, says, "He was affable and easy, and loved to be made so by all about him. The great art of keeping him long, was the being easy, and the making everything easy to him." The modern phrase is "to make things pleasant"; and both phrases mean that there should be a large ingredient of falsehood in human affairs. Admiral Montague, who was to have the honour of receiving the king on board his ship, had long been in communication with him. The ship which carried the admiral's flag had an ugly name, the "*Naseby.*" On the 23rd, the king, with the dukes of York and Gloucester, and a large train, came on board. "After dinner," says Pepys,[h] who was now Montague's secretary, "the king and duke altered the name of some of the ships, viz.: the *Naseby* became the *Charles;* the *Richard, James;* the *Speaker, Mary,* the *Dunbar* (which was not in company with us), the *Henry.*"

Lady Fanshawe,[o] who was on board, is in ecstacies: "Who can express the joy and gallantry of that voyage; to see so many great ships, the best in the world; to hear the trumpets and all other music; to see near a hundred brave ships sail before the wind with vast cloths and streamers; the neatness and cleanness of the ships, the gallantry of the commanders, the vast plenty of all sorts of provisions; but, above all, the glorious majesties of the king and his two brothers, were so beyond man's expectation and expression." The sky was cloudless, the sea was calm, the moon was at the full. Charles walked up and down the quarter-deck, telling all the wonders of his escape from Worcester — his green coat and his country breeches — the miller stopping his night walk — the inn-keeper bidding God bless him. "He was an everlasting talker," writes Burnet,[n] and his gossip amongst his new friends in this moonlight voyage gave some better promise than the cold dignity of his father, which many must have remembered. It was a merry trip — and Pepys chuckles over "the brave discourse." On the morning of the 25th they were close to land at Dover, and every one was preparing to go ashore. "The king and the two dukes," says Pepys, "did eat their breakfast before they went, and there being set some ship's diet, they ate of nothing else but pease and pork, and boiled beef" — a politic appetite, which no doubt won the favour of Blake's old sailors.

When Charles landed at Dover, Monk was at hand to kneel before him — "to receive his majesty as a malefactor would his pardon,"—says Gumble,[p] a biographer of the wary general. With a feeling that belonged to another time the mayor of Dover presented the king with a Bible. "It is the thing that I love above all things in the world," said the ready actor who knew his part without much study. The royal train went on to Canterbury. There Monk ventured beyond his usual caution, by presenting the king a list of seventy persons that he recommended for employments — men whose names stunk in the nostrils of all cavaliers. Hyde, through Monk's confidential adviser, Morrice, made the general understand that such interference was unpleasant, and Monk quickly apologised after a very awkward attempt at explanation. Hyde was at Charles's side, and prevented him being too easy.

Monk received a lesson; but he was consoled by the order of the Garter being bestowed upon him.

On the 28th of May, King Charles set out from Canterbury, and slept that night at Rochester. At Blackheath the royal cavalcade had to pass the army of the commonwealth. Thirty thousand men were there marshalled. Many of these veterans had fought against the family and the cause which was now triumphant. The name of Charles Stuart had been with them a name of hatred and contempt. They had assisted in building up and pulling down governments, which had no unity but in their determination to resist him who was now called to command them, with no sympathy for their courage, no respect for their stern enthusiasm. The great soldier and prince who had led them to so many victories had now his memory profaned, by being proclaimed a traitor by a parliament that when he was living would have been humbled at his slightest frown. The procession passed on in safety; for the old discipline, that no enemy was ever able to prevail against in the battle-field, was still supreme in this pageant — this last harmless exhibition of that might through which the liberties of England had been won; through whose misdirection they were now imperilled.

Charles went on in the sight of all London to Whitehall — a wearisome procession, which lasted until nine at night, amidst streets strewn with flowers, past tapestried houses and wine-spouting fountains; with civic authorities wearing chains of gold, and nobles covered with embroidered velvets; trumpets braying, mobs huzzaing. In this delirium of joy there was something beyond the idle shouts of popular intoxication. It was the expression of the nation's opinion that the government of England had at length a solid foundation upon which peace and security, liberty and religion, might be established.[c] It was late in the evening before the ceremonies of this important day were concluded; when Charles observed to some of his confidants, "It must surely have been my fault that I did not come before; for I have met with no one to-day who did not protest that he always wished for my restoration." The re-establishment of royalty presented perhaps the only means of restoring public tranquillity amidst the confusion and distrust, the animosities and hatreds, the parties and interests, which had been generated by the events of the civil war, and by a rapid succession of opposite and ephemeral governments. "To Monk," says Lingard, *f* "belongs the merit of having, by his foresight, and caution, effected this o ject without bloodshed or violence; but to his dispraise it must also be recorded,[1] that he effected it without any previous stipulation on the part of the exiled monarch.

"Never had so fair an opportunity been offered of establishing a compact between the sovereign and the people, of determining, by mutual consent, the legal rights of the crown, and of securing from future encroachment the freedom of the people. That Charles would have consented to such conditions, we have sufficient evidence; but, when the measure was proposed, the lord-general declared himself its most determined opponent. It may have been, that his cautious mind figured to itself danger in delay; it is more probable that he sought to give additional value to his services in the eyes of the new sovereign. But, whatever were the motives of his conduct, the result was, that the king ascended the throne unfettered with conditions, and thence inferred that he was entitled to all the powers claimed by his father at the commencement of the civil war. In a few years the consequence became manifest. It was found that, by the negligence or perfidy of Monk, a door

[1 On the question of the possibility or desirability of such a stipulation, historians have differed radically. See the following chapter.]

[1660 A.D.]

had been left open to the recurrence of dissension between the crown and the people; and that very circumstance which Charles had hailed as the consummation of his good fortune, served only to prepare the way for a second revolution, which ended in the permanent exclusion of his family from the government of the kingdom."[f]

With the Restoration the historic interest of Monk's career ceases. The rude soldier of fortune had played the game with incomparable dexterity, and had won the stakes. He was made gentleman of the bedchamber, knight of the Garter, master of the horse, commander-in-chief, and duke of Albemarle, and had a pension of £7,000 a year allotted to him. His utmost desires were satisfied, and he made no attempt to compete further in a society in which neither he nor his vulgar wife could ever be at home, and which he heartily despised. As long as the army existed of which he was the idol, and of which the last service was to suppress Venner's revolt, he was a person not to be displeased. But he entirely concurred in the measure for disbanding it, and thenceforward his influence was small, though men's eyes turned naturally to him in emergency. In the trial of the regicides he was on the side of moderation, and his interposition saved Haslerig's life; but his action at the time of Argyll's trial will always be regarded as the most dishonourable episode in his career.[g]

COMMERCE AND LITERATURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

The most instructive period in English history is the interval from 1640 to 1660. Its various occurrences, however, are found to suggest very different lessons according to the political bias of the persons who make them an object of attention. Those who regard that struggle as assuming its more objectionable character, not so much from any love of change and spoliation incident to the people, as from the want of timely and amicable concessions on the part of their rulers, are naturally disposed to look with forbearance on a good deal in the temper and manners of the party deemed to have been least in the wrong. It is not to be doubted that the parliamentarians, particularly such as served in the army, were remarkable for the sobriety and regularity of their conduct. Profanity, drunkenness, debauchery of every description, may be said to have been unknown among them to a degree unparalleled in history; nor did they allow themselves to participate in any of those games or amusements which are the favourite relaxations of the people in most countries. Horse-racing, bear-baiting, the sport of the cockpit, and the representations of the theatre, all were condemned.

Instead of giving their leisure to such things, they sought their enjoyments in religious meetings, and in discussions on points of theology or civil government; and when such points were the matters contended for, whether by means of argument or of the sword, it became manifest that the roundhead, while despising the sensual riot of the cavalier, had a region of his own, where, in his turn, he became susceptible of the highest degree of excitement. As the difficulty of acquiring and maintaining this ascendancy of the mental over the physical sympathies of human nature must have been great, it was natural that it should be viewed with some feeling of pride; and it is not surprising that their enemies, obliged to acknowledge their freedom from the vices of the appetites, should accuse them of being much greater offenders than themselves in everything relating to the vices of the mind.

According to the cavalier, those habits of profane swearing, of drunkenness, and of sensual excess in all respects, by which not a few of his party

studied to testify their abhorrence of all Puritan grimace, and to proclaim their undoubted attachment to the church and the king, were only the vices of men — but spiritual pride, hypocrisy, rebellion, and tyranny, these were the vices of devils, and these were the chosen passions of his enemies. Concerning the charge of insincerity it is more difficult to speak, inasmuch as, from its connection with strong religious impressions, it would often be least suspected in the case of those persons who were most influenced by it. The suppression of all amusements considered as tending to produce dissoluteness among the populace, was a great object with the Presbyterians, and led to some impolitic interferences with popular feeling. It was no uncommon thing to see players conducted through the streets of the metropolis in their theatrical costume, having been seized by the police while in the act of strutting their hour away upon the stage.

We have had occasion to note the manner in which the Presbyterians and royalists obtained supplies of money during the period of the civil war. When that contest was decided, four sources remained from which aids of this nature were derived — the customs, the excise, the monthly assessments, and the estates of political delinquents. The two former branches of revenue were farmed in 1657 at £1,100,000 a year, and with monthly assessments made an income of somewhat more than £2,000,000. The church lands and the estates of delinquents were rarely sold at more than ten years' purchase. About £200,000 a year are supposed to have been obtained from these sources. During Richard's protectorate, the expenditure was declared to be above £2,200,000, the revenue falling short more than £300,000 of that amount.

In 1652 the army of the commonwealth was not less than fifty thousand. Cromwell subsequently reduced the number nearly one-half, but was obliged, on occasions, to increase it again. The general pay of the foot soldiers was a shilling a day, the cavalry, as of a superior order, and liable to greater expense, received two shillings and sixpence. When the army consisted of forty thousand, which was the case in 1648, its pay was estimated at £80,000 a month. Beside the regular force in the pay of the government, there was the volunteer corps, in every county, under the name of militia. At the time of the battle of Worcester, the militia appears to have been nearly as numerous as the standing army, and both together are said to have numbered about eighty thousand men.

Commerce, which made considerable progress during the early part of the reign of Charles I, experienced some check from the civil war, but assumed an importance under the commonwealth unknown in our previous history. This arose, principally, from the war carried on by the English republic with the Dutch, and from the new navigation laws. Families of pretension and long-standing began to direct the attention of their sons to commerce, and such pursuits became more reputable from that time in England than in any of the old monarchical states in Europe. The chartered companies, having derived their exclusive privileges from an exercise of the prerogative, which had often called forth the complaints of parliament, found their power of monopoly thus assigned to them of small value at this juncture, and the free competition which sprung up proved a great benefit to the community at large.

The fine arts obtained but small patronage during this period. Charles I possessed considerable taste in architecture, furniture, pictures, and music, and had the circumstances of his reign afforded him the means and the opportunities of bestowing encouragement on such pursuits, great advances would, no doubt, have been made in them. But the causes which prevented the

[1660 A.D.]

indulgence of such tastes on the part of the monarch, tended to prevent the formation of them on the part of his people. Both were called to engage in a struggle for existence, and both deemed it necessary that all matters having respect only to the luxury and ornament of life should be placed for a while in abeyance. So far was this spirit carried under the commonwealth, that some of the royal palaces were put up for sale, and not a few of the pictures and curiosities which had been collected by the king, with much taste and judgment, and at a great expense, were sold to foreigners.

It is hardly possible that an Englishman should glance at this barbarian conduct on the part of men possessing the supreme power in his country less than two centuries ago, and not blush at the remembrance. It is vain to say that these things were the baubles of royalty, and that this reason, beside the necessities of the government, concurred to make the disposal of them desirable — since nothing could be a greater libel on republican institutions, or a more manifest untruth, than to describe them as repugnant to the splendour of national edifices, or to the most costly adornment of them by the aid of the fine arts. But the feeling which consented to these acts of rude spoliation was not that of the nation, nor is it the only point to be considered in the character of the faction upon which this disgrace is certainly chargeable. In regard to the great interests of the community, their views were large and generous, and to the nature of the questions with which they were chiefly occupied, and to the earnestness and talent which they brought to the discussion of them, we have to attribute a marked improvement in the character of the literature.

In the literary character of the works on theology which belong to this period, the taste of the present age will find little to admire, and often much with which to be offended. But notwithstanding the tedious scholastic form in which divines continued to treat of the subjects within their province, and the frequent confusion and obscurity of thought observable in their lengthened and parenthetical sentences, an increasing mastery of the language may be perceived even in such works, particularly in the smaller controversial pieces of the age, which were generally characterised by a natural directness and earnestness suited to the immediate occasion. Baxter is a favourable specimen of this class of writers. We do not advert to the eloquence of Bishop Taylor, because his style, in whatever age he had lived, would have been more that of the man than of his times.

Prose Writers

The fault mentioned as belonging to the theological literature of this period attaches, in a great degree, to its prose literature generally. We find, for example, both in Mrs. Hutchinson[m] and in Clarendon,[i] a crowd of thoughts pressed together into one long sentence, which an author of a later period, with less power, but more skilled in the art of composition, would have separated into small lucid apportionments, and by giving completeness to the parts, and presenting them in succession, would have communicated the whole more clearly, and with much less demand on the reader's power of attention. The writers of this period moved the more slowly, in consequence of moving at every step amidst such a procession of ideas; but this stately march comported well with the expansion and vigour of their understanding. Such writers are fine examples of the majestic compass of our language in that age, but the best specimens of its lucid energy, and bounding capabilities, will be found in the smaller pieces called forth by the political strifes of the hour — productions in which the writers evidently intend to state their case

with a clearness not to be mistaken, and with a force not to be resisted. Ludlow,[d] though a soldier rather than an author, has less, perhaps, of the fault so observable in Clarendon, than any other considerable writer whose mind was formed during the period of the civil war.

But notwithstanding the frequent obscurity, from the cause mentioned, in the works of this period, and the weariness, in consequence, which is so often felt in reading them, they nearly all evince a singular degree of freedom from those pedantic allusions and studied conceits by which the literature of the age of Elizabeth and James had been so greatly disfigured. In this later period, every man was constrained to be more or less in earnest in regard to the great interests which were then at stake. The English language, accordingly, had never afforded such specimens of oratorical and argumentative efficiency as were produced during this period. The eloquence of strong partisan feeling will ever demand — as in the case of a Dante and a Milton — the loftiest forms of speech in which to express itself; and the language, in consequence, began to display new freedom, copiousness, and power.

The Poets

Cowley the poet flourished during this period, and died in 1667. Charles II, on hearing of his decease, said that England had not a better man; and the testimony of contemporaries to his character is uniformly favourable, notwithstanding his known attachment to the court, and the spirit of faction which continued to prevail to the end of his days. He has been described as the last, or nearly the last, in our old school of metaphysical poets — writers in whom there were stronger indications of pedantry than of the inspiration proper to their art, and who often appear to have mistaken verses for poetry, and singularity for excellence. They indulged much in the personification of the passions; but the general effect of their works is to produce reflection rather than emotion, their strength consisting in an occasional acuteness and playfulness of imagination, much more than in force or pathos of sentiment. Cowley was distinguished from his predecessors by more of the latter quality, by greater sprightliness when the subject was of a nature to demand it, and by a more frequent command of those thoughts which strike at once by their grandeur or their propriety. Suckling and Cleveland were contemporaries and imitators of Cowley, but did not disturb his sovereignty as the fashionable poet of his day.

Denham was three years older than Cowley, and his elegy on the death of that writer was his last performance. His *Cooper's Hill*, on which his fame principally rests, was published in 1643. Its subject, which was in a great degree a novelty in our literature, embraces a description of natural scenery, elevated by historical allusions, and reflections on human character. Pope commends the strength and majesty of this author, and he is generally regarded as one of the fathers of English poetry. His versification, in its smoothness, vigour, and harmony, makes a near approach to that which has been since made familiar to us by the pen of Dryden and his successors. Waller, who was contemporary with Cowley and Denham, survived them both. He is entitled to much of the praise bestowed on Denham. But though he discovers a similar independence of the old models, and even more refinement, his works have little of that compressed power of expression which characterised the *Cooper's Hill*. The polished dress, however, in which he clothed conceptions little removed from commonplace, possessed

the charm of novelty in his own age, and must be allowed to secure the name of Waller a conspicuous place in the history of English literature.

Concerning the genius of Milton, and the dignity conferred by him on his native tongue, and on the mind of his country, there is now little need to expatiate. Critics who know not how to pardon his republicanism, have in general extended their enmity to the character of the man, and the productions of the author. But when every fair concession shall have been made with regard to the imperfections of his temper and his writings, the excellence which remains will be found to place him so far above his assailants as to render their puny efforts to lower his pretensions a matter more calculated to amuse than irritate the friends of his memory. His attainments as a classical scholar were extensive and profound. In Latin composition he had scarcely a rival. Every European language possessing a literature to recommend it was known to him; and few divines possessed the same intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew scriptures and all rabbinical learning. Indications of these various acquisitions break upon us in almost every page of his works, imparting to his style a grace, a comprehensiveness, and a wonderful power, which must be perceived and felt in the greatest degree by those who have studied him the most.

It is true, in his prose works we are never allowed to forget that it is the prose of a poet, and some critics, whom the stars never destined to be poets, affect to regret that the author's taste with regard to the style proper to performances of that nature should have been so defective and erroneous. But the man who can read the *Areopagitica*, or the *Eikonoclastes*, and not feel a strange awe produced within him by the surpassing greatness of the spirit which has been in converse with his own, so as to be charmed out of all wish that the author had spoken otherwise than he has done, must be a person incapable of sympathising with great eloquence and lofty argument. His style, indeed, in those works is not to be recommended as a model. On the contrary, an attempt to imitate it must betray a want of judgment incompatible with real excellence in anything. It is a sort of costume, which, like that assumed by Jeremy Taylor, must always be peculiar to the individual, and can never become the badge of a class. Modes of expression and illustration which with such men have all the freshness and vigour of nature, become cold and feeble, or, at best, inflated by an artificial warmth, when produced by the mechanic process of the imitator.

In his poetry, the mind of Milton is found open to all the beauties and sublimities of nature, and seems to portray with equal truth the good and evil of the rational universe — the heavens above, and hell beneath. That upon a theme so difficult and so comprehensive, and prosecuted to so great an extent, he should sometimes fail, was perhaps inevitable. But if something less than one-third of the *Paradise Lost* be excepted, the remainder may be safely declared to consist of such poetry as the world had never before seen. In his happier moments, his descriptions of physical existence are the most perfect supplied by human language; but it is when employed in exhibiting the moral energies of the perfect or the fallen, that he rises most above all who preceded him.

WILLIAM HARVEY

Harvey, whose discovery with respect to the circulation of the blood effected so great a revolution in medical science, died in 1657. He was much encouraged in his experiments and studies by Charles I. But it was

remarked that no physician in Europe, who had reached forty years of age when Harvey's discovery was made public, was known to adopt it. His maintaining it is even said to have diminished his own practice and celebrity. So general is the force of prejudice even on matters of the most practical nature, and so liable is it to become fixed beyond all hope of removal after a certain period of life![r]

GUIZOT ON THE RESTORATION

On the 29th of May, 1660, the royalist party, which had not conquered, had not even fought, was nevertheless national and all-powerful. It was England. England might justly think herself entitled to trust in her hopes; she was not unreasonable in her requirements; weary of great ambitions and disgusted with innovations, she only asked for security for her religion, and for the enjoyment of her ancient rights under the rule of her old laws. This the king promised her. The advisers who then possessed his confidence — Hyde, Ormonde, Nicholas, Hertford, Southampton — were sincere Protestants and friends of legal government. They had defended the laws during the reign of the late king. They had taken no part in any excessive assumptions of power on the part of the crown. They had even co-operated in promoting the first salutary measures of reform which had been carried by the Long Parliament. They expressed themselves resolved, and so did the king, to govern in concert with the two houses of parliament. The great council of the nation would therefore be always by the side of royalty, to enlighten and, if necessary, to restrain its action. Everything seemed to promise England the future to which her desires were limited. But when great questions have strongly agitated human nature and society, it is not within the power of men to return, at their pleasure, into a state of repose; and the storm still lowers in their hearts, when the sky has again become serene over their heads. In the midst of this outburst of joy, confidence, and hope, in which England was indulging, two camps were already in process of formation, ardent in their hostility to each other, and destined ere long to renew, at first darkly, but soon openly, the war which seemed to be at an end.

During the exile of the sons of Charles I, one fear had constantly preyed upon the minds of their wisest counsellors and most faithful friends; and that was lest, led astray by example and seduced by pleasure, they might adopt a creed, ideas, and manners foreign to their country — the creed, ideas, and manners of the great courts of the Continent. This was a natural fear, and one fully justified by the events. Charles II and his brother the duke of York returned, in fact, into England, the one an infidel libertine, who falsely gave himself out to be a Protestant, and the other a blindly sincere Catholic; both imbued with the principles of absolute power; both dissolute in morals, the one with elegant and heartless cynicism, the other with shocking inconsistency; both addicted to those habits of mind and life, to those tastes and vices, which render a court a school of arrogant and frivolous corruption, which rapidly spreads its contagious influence through the higher and lower classes who hasten to the court to imitate or serve it.


Afar from the court, among the laborious citizens of the towns, and in the families of the landowners, farmers, and labourers of the country districts, the zealous and rigid Protestantism of the nation, with its severe strictness of manners, and that stern spirit of liberty which cares neither for obstacles nor consequences, hardens men towards themselves as well as towards their enemies, and leads them to disdain the evils which they suffer or inflict

[1660 A.D.]

provided they can perform their duty and satisfy their passion by maintaining their right, now took refuge.

The Restoration had scarcely given any glimpse of its tendencies, and yet the Puritans were already preparing to withstand it, feeling they were despised, and expecting soon to be proscribed, but earnestly devoted no matter at what risk or with what result, to the service of their faith and of their cause; unyielding and frequently factious sectaries, but indomitable defenders, even to martyrdom, of the Protestant religion, the moral austerity, and the liberties of their country. On the very day after the restoration, the court and the Puritans were the two hostile forces which appeared at the two opposite extremities of the political arena. Entirely monopolised by its joy, the nation either did not see this, or did not care to notice it. Because it had recovered the king and the parliament, it believed that it had reached the termination of its trials, and attained the summit of its wishes. Peoples are short-sighted. But their want of foresight changes neither their inmost hearts nor the course of their destiny; the national interests and feelings which in 1640 had caused the revolution, still subsisted in 1660, in the midst of the reaction against that revolution. The period of civil war was passed; that of parliamentary conflicts and compromises was beginning. The sway of the Protestant religion, and the decisive influence of the country in its own government — these were the objects which revolutionary England had pursued. Though cursing the revolution, and calling it the rebellion, royalist England nevertheless prepared still to pursue these objects, and not to rest until she had attained them.[b]





CHAPTER VII

THE RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS

[1660–1668 A.D.]

The history of the Stuart restoration is wearisome, nauseous, and disgraceful. The debauches of Commodus and of Heliogabalus were revived under the disguise of rustling silks and waving plumes. Painted harlots flaunted in the palace and squandered money for lack of which soldiers and sailors starved. By seventeen known mistresses, Charles was reputed to have had thirteen children; several of whom were created earls or dukes, with ample incomes, charged in perpetuity and still paid, where not recently commuted, on a generous scale. Defoe[b] satirises such results of the "lazy, long, lascivious reign." — W. H. S. AUBREY.[c]

MACAULAY'S PICTURE OF THE TIMES AND OF THE NEW KING

THE history of England, during the seventeenth century, is the history of the transformation of a limited monarchy, constituted after the fashion of the middle ages, into a limited monarchy suited to that more advanced state of society in which the public charges can no longer be borne by the estates of the crown, and in which the public defence can no longer be entrusted to a feudal militia.

It has been too much the practice of writers zealous for freedom to represent the restoration as a disastrous event, and to condemn the folly or baseness of that convention which recalled the royal family without exacting new securities against maladministration.[1] Those who hold this language do not

[1 Among those who have censured the lack of a stipulation stands Lingard[d] as cited in the previous chapter, but Hallam[e] says: "It has been a frequent reproach to the conductors of this great revolution, that the king was restored without those terms and limitations which might secure the nation against his abuse of their confidence; it has become almost regular to cast on the convention parliament, and more especially on Monk, the imputation of having

[1660 A.D.]

comprehend the real nature of the crisis which followed the deposition of Richard Cromwell. England was in imminent danger of sinking under the tyranny of a succession of small men raised up and pulled down by military caprice. To deliver the country from the domination of the soldiers was the first object of every enlightened patriot: but it was an object which, while the soldiers were united, the most sanguine could scarcely expect to attain. On a sudden a gleam of hope appeared. General was opposed to general, army to army. On the use which might be made of one auspicious moment depended the future destiny of the nation. Our ancestors used that moment well. They forgot old injuries, waved petty scruples, adjourned to a more convenient season all dispute about the reforms which our institutions needed, and stood together, cavaliers and roundheads, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, in firm union, for the old laws of the land against military despotism. The exact partition of power among king, lords, and commons, might well be postponed till it had been decided whether England should be governed by king, lords, and commons, or by cuirassiers and pikemen. Had the statesmen of the convention taken a different course, had they held long debates on the principles of government, had they drawn up a new constitution and sent it to Charles, had conferences been opened, had couriers been passing and repassing during some weeks between Westminster and the Netherlands, with projects and counterprojects, replies by Hyde and rejoinders by Prynne, the coalition on which the public safety depended would have been dissolved: the Presbyterians and royalists would certainly have quarrelled: the military factions might possibly have been reconciled: and the misjudging friends of liberty might long have regretted, under a rule worse than that of the worst Stuart, the golden opportunity which had been suffered to escape.

Abolition of Tenures by Knight Service and Disbanding of the Army

The old civil polity was, therefore, by the general consent of both the great parties, re-established. It was again exactly what it had been when Charles the First, eighteen years before, withdrew from his capital. All those acts of the Long Parliament which had received the royal assent were admitted to be still in full force. One fresh concession, a concession in which the cavaliers were even more deeply interested than the roundheads, was easily obtained from the restored king. The military tenure of land had been originally created as a means of national defence. But in the course of ages whatever was useful in the institution had disappeared; and nothing was left but ceremonies and grievances. A landed proprietor who held an estate under the crown by knight service — and it was thus that most of the soil of England was held — had to pay a large fine on coming to his property. He could not alienate one acre without purchasing a license. When he died, if his domains descended to an infant, the sovereign was guardian, and was not only entitled to great part of the rents during the minority, but could require the ward, under heavy penalties, to marry any person of suitable rank. The chief bait which attracted a needy sycophant to the court was the hope of obtaining as

abandoned public liberty, and brought on, by their inconsiderate loyalty, or self-interested treachery, the misgovernment of the two last Stuarts, and the necessity of their ultimate expulsion. We may remark, in the first place, that the unconditional restoration of Charles the Second is sometimes spoken of in too hyperbolical language, as if he had come in as a sort of conqueror, with the laws and liberties of the people at his discretion. Yet he was restored to nothing but the bounded prerogatives of a king of England; bounded by every ancient and modern statute, including those of the Long Parliament, which had been enacted for the subject's security."]

the reward of servility and flattery, a royal letter to an heiress. These abuses had perished with the monarchy. That they should not revive with it was the wish of every landed gentleman in the kingdom. They were, therefore, solemnly abolished by statute; and no relic of the ancient tenures in chivalry was suffered to remain, except those honorary services which are still, at a coronation, rendered to the person of the sovereign by some lords of manors.

The troops were now to be disbanded. Fifty thousand men, accustomed to the profession of arms, were at once thrown on the world; and experience seemed to warrant the belief that this change would produce much misery and crime, that the discharged veterans would be seen begging in every street, or that they would be driven by hunger to pillage. But no such result followed. In a few months there remained not a trace indicating that the most formidable army in the world had just been absorbed into the mass of the community. The royalists themselves confessed that, in every department of honest industry, the discarded warriors prospered beyond other men, that none was charged with any theft or robbery, that none was heard to ask an alms, and that, if a baker, a mason, or a waggoner attracted notice by his diligence and sobriety, he was in all probability one of Oliver's old soldiers.

The military tyranny passed away; but it left deep and enduring traces in the public mind. The name of a standing army was long held in abhorrence, and it is remarkable that this feeling was even stronger among the cavaliers than among the roundheads. It ought to be considered as a most fortunate circumstance that, when the country was, for the first and last time, ruled by the sword, the sword was in the hands, not of her legitimate princes, but of those rebels who slew the king and demolished the church. Had a prince, with a title as good as that of Charles, commanded an army as good as that of Cromwell, there would have been little hope indeed for the liberties of England. A century after the death of Cromwell, the tories still continued to clamour against every augmentation of the regular soldiery, and to sound the praise of a national militia. So late as the year 1786, a minister who enjoyed no common measure of their confidence found it impossible to overcome their aversion to his scheme of fortifying the coast; nor did they ever look with entire complacency on the standing army, till the French Revolution gave a new direction to their apprehensions.

Disputes between the Roundheads and Cavaliers Renewed

The coalition which had restored the king terminated with the danger from which it had sprung; and two hostile parties again appeared ready for conflict. Both indeed were agreed as to the propriety of inflicting punishment on some unhappy men who were, at that moment, objects of almost universal hatred. Cromwell was no more; and those who had fled before him were forced to content themselves with the miserable satisfaction of digging up, hanging, quartering, and burning the remains of the greatest prince that has ever ruled England. Other objects of vengeance, few indeed, yet too many, were found among the republican chiefs. Soon, however, the conquerors, glutted with the blood of the regicides, turned against each other. The roundheads, while admitting the virtues of the late king, and while condemning the sentence passed upon him by an illegal tribunal, yet maintained that his administration had been, in many things, unconstitutional, and that the houses had taken arms against him from good motives and on strong grounds. The monarchy, these politicians conceived, had no worse enemy than the flatterer who exalted the prerogative above the law, who condemned

all opposition to regal encroachments, and who reviled, not only Cromwell and Harrison, but Pym and Hampden, as traitors. If the king wished for a quiet and prosperous reign, he must confide in those who, though they had drawn the sword in defence of the invaded privileges of parliament, had yet exposed themselves to the rage of the soldiers in order to save his father, and had taken the chief part in bringing back the royal family.

The feeling of the cavaliers was widely different. During eighteen years they had, through all vicissitudes, been faithful to the crown. Having shared the distress of their prince, were they not to share his triumph? Was no distinction to be made between them and the disloyal subject who had fought against his rightful sovereign, who had adhered to Richard Cromwell, and who had never concurred in the restoration of the Stuarts, till it appeared that nothing else could save the nation from the tyranny of the army? Grant that such a man had, by his recent services, fairly earned his pardon. Yet were his services, rendered at the eleventh hour, to be put in comparison with the toils and sufferings of those who had borne the burden and heat of the day? Above all, was he to be suffered to retain a fortune raised out of the substance of the ruined defenders of the throne? Was it not enough that his head and his patrimonial estate, a hundred times forfeited to justice, were secure, and that he shared, with the rest of the nation, in the blessings of that mild government of which he had long been the foe? Some violent members of the party went further, and clamoured for large categories of proscription.

Religious Dissension

The political feud was, as usual, exasperated by a religious feud. The king found the church in a singular state. A short time before the commencement of the civil war, his father had given a reluctant assent to a bill, strongly supported by Falkland, which deprived the bishops of their seats in the house of lords: but Episcopacy and the liturgy had never been abolished by law. The Long Parliament, however, had passed ordinances which had made a complete revolution in church government and in public worship. The new system was, in principle, scarcely less Erastian than that which it displaced. The houses, guided chiefly by the counsels of the accomplished Selden, had determined to keep the spiritual power strictly subordinate to the temporal power. They had refused to declare that any form of ecclesiastical polity was of divine origin; and they had provided that, from all the church courts, an appeal should lie in the last resort to parliament. With this highly important reservation it had been resolved to set up in England a hierarchy closely resembling that of Scotland. The authority of councils, rising one above another in regular gradation, was substituted for the authority of bishops and archbishops. The liturgy gave place to the Presbyterian directory. But scarcely had the new regulations been framed, when the Independents rose to supreme influence in the state. The Independents had no disposition to enforce the ordinances touching classical, provincial, and national synods. Those ordinances, therefore, were never carried into full execution. The Presbyterian system was fully established nowhere but in Middlesex and Lancashire. In the other fifty counties, almost every parish seems to have been unconnected with the neighbouring parishes. In some districts, indeed, the ministers formed themselves into voluntary associations, for the purpose of mutual help and counsel; but these associations had no coercive power. The patrons of livings, being now checked by neither bishop nor Presbytery,

would have been at liberty to confide the cure of souls to the most scandalous of mankind, but for the arbitrary intervention of Oliver. He established, by his own authority, a board of commissioners, called triers. Most of these persons were Independent divines; but a few Presbyterian ministers and a few laymen had seats. The certificate of the triers stood in the place both of institution and of induction; and without such a certificate no person could hold a benefice. This was undoubtedly one of the most despotic acts ever done by any English ruler. Yet, as it was generally felt that, without some such precaution, the country would be overrun by ignorant and drunken reprobates bearing the name and receiving the pay of ministers, some highly respectable persons, who were not in general friendly to Cromwell, allowed that, on this occasion, he had been a public benefactor. The presentees whom the triers had approved took possession of the rectories, cultivated the glebe lands, collected the tithes, prayed without book or surplice, and administered the eucharist to communicants seated at long tables.



BRICK TOWER

Thus the ecclesiastical polity of the realm was in inextricable confusion. Episcopacy was the form of government prescribed by the old law which was still unrepealed. The form of government prescribed by parliamentary ordinance was Presbyterian. But neither the old law nor the parliamentary ordinance was practically in force. The church actually established may be described as an irregular body made up of a few Presbyteries, and of many Independent congregations, which were all held down and held together by the authority of the government.

Of those who had been active in bringing back the king, many were zealous for synods and for the directory, and many were desirous to terminate by a compromise the religious dissensions which had long agitated England. Between the bigoted followers of Laud and the bigoted followers of Calvin there could be neither peace nor truce: but it did not seem impossible to effect an accommodation between the moderate Episcopalians of the school of Usher and the moderate Presbyterians of the school of Baxter. The moderate Episcopalians would admit that a bishop might lawfully be assisted by a council. The moderate Presbyterians would not deny that each provincial assembly might lawfully have a permanent president, and that this president might lawfully be called a bishop. There might be a revised liturgy which should not exclude extemporaneous prayer, a baptismal service in which the sign of the cross might be used or omitted at discretion, a communion service at which the faithful might sit if their consciences forbade them to kneel.

But to no such plan could the great body of the cavaliers listen with patience. The religious members of that party were conscientiously attached to the whole system of their church. She had been dear to their murdered king. She had consoled them in defeat and penury. Her service, so often whispered

in an inner chamber during the season of trial, had such a charm for them that they were unwilling to part with a single response. Other royalists, who made little pretence to piety, yet loved the Episcopal church because she was the foe of their foes. They valued a prayer or a ceremony, not on account of the comfort which it conveyed to themselves, but on account of the vexation which it gave to the roundheads, and were so far from being disposed to purchase union by concession that they objected to concession chiefly because it tended to produce union.

Unpopularity of the Puritans

Such feelings, though blamable, were natural and not wholly inexcusable. The Puritans in the day of their power had undoubtedly given cruel provocation. They ought to have learned, if from nothing else, yet from their own discontents, from their own struggles, from their own victory, from the fall of that proud hierarchy by which they had been so heavily oppressed, that, in England, and in the seventeenth century, it was not in the power of the civil magistrate to drill the minds of men into conformity with his own system of theology. They proved, however, as intolerant and as meddling as ever Laud had been. They interdicted under heavy penalties the use of the Book of Common Prayer, not only in churches, but even in private houses. It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians. Severe punishments were denounced against such as should presume to blame the Calvinistic mode of worship. Clergymen of respectable character were not only ejected from their benefices by thousands, but were frequently exposed to the outrages of a fanatical rabble.

Churches and sepulchres, fine works of art, and curious remains of antiquity, were brutally defaced. The parliament resolved that all pictures in the royal collection which contained representations of Jesus or of the Virgin Mother should be burned. Sculpture fared as ill as painting. Nymphs and graces, the work of Ionian chisels, were delivered over to Puritan stonemasons to be made decent. Against the lighter vices the ruling faction waged war with a zeal little tempered by humanity or by common sense. Sharp laws were passed against betting. It was enacted that adultery should be punished with death. The illicit intercourse of the sexes, even where neither violence nor seduction was imputed, where no public scandal was given, where no conjugal right was violated, was made a misdemeanour. Public amusements, from the masques which were exhibited at the mansions of the great down to the wrestling matches and grinning matches on village greens, were vigorously attacked. One ordinance directed that all the May-poles in England should forthwith be hewn down. Another proscribed all theatrical diversions. The playhouses were to be dismantled, the spectators fined, the actors whipped at the cart's tail. Rope-dancing, puppet shows, bowls, horse-racing, were regarded with no friendly eye. But bear-baiting, then a favourite diversion of high and low, was the abomination which most strongly stirred the wrath of the austere sectaries. It is to be remarked that their antipathy to this sport had nothing in common with the feeling which has, in our own time, induced the legislature to interfere for the purpose of protecting beasts against the wanton cruelty of men. The Puritan hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Indeed, he generally contrived to enjoy the double pleasure of tormenting both spectators and bear.

Perhaps no single circumstance more strongly illustrates the temper of the precisians than their conduct respecting Christmas day. Christmas had been, from time immemorial, the season of joy and domestic affection, the season when families assembled, when children came home from school, when quarrels were made up, when carols were heard in every street, when every house was decorated with evergreens, and every table was loaded with good cheer. At that season all hearts not utterly destitute of kindness were enlarged and softened. At that season the poor were admitted to partake largely of the overflowings of the wealth of the rich, whose bounty was peculiarly acceptable on account of the shortness of the days and of the severity of the weather. At that season the interval between landlord and tenant, master and servant, was less marked than through the rest of the year. Where there is much enjoyment there will be some excess: yet, on the whole, the spirit in which the holiday was kept was not unworthy of a Christian festival. The Long Parliament gave orders, in 1644, that the twenty-fifth of December should be strictly observed as a fast, and that all men should pass it in humbly bemoaning the great national sin which they and their fathers had so often committed on that day by romping under the mistletoe, eating boar's head, and drinking ale flavoured with roasted apples.

No public act of that time seems to have irritated the common people more. On the next anniversary of the festival formidable riots broke out in many place. The constables were resisted, the magistrates insulted, the houses of noted zealots attacked, and the proscribed service of the day openly read in the churches.

Such was the spirit of the extreme Puritans, both Presbyterian and Independent. Oliver, indeed, was little disposed to be either a persecutor or a meddler. But Oliver, the head of a party, and consequently, to a great extent, the slave of a party, could not govern altogether according to his own inclinations. Even under his administration many magistrates, within their own jurisdiction, made themselves as odious as *Sir Hudibras*, interfered with all the pleasures of the neighbourhood, dispersed festive meetings, and put fiddlers in the stocks. Still more formidable was the zeal of the soldiers. In every village where they appeared there was an end of dancing, bell-ringing, and hockey. In London they several times interrupted theatrical performances at which the protector had the judgment and good nature to connive.

With the fear and hatred inspired by such a tyranny contempt was largely mingled. The peculiarities of the Puritan, his look, his dress, his dialect, his strange scruples, had been, ever since the time of Elizabeth, favourite subjects with mockers. But these peculiarities appeared far more grotesque in a faction which ruled a great empire than in obscure and persecuted congregations. The cant which had moved laughter when it was heard on the stage from Tribulation Wholesome, and Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, was still more laughable when it proceeded from the lips of generals and councillors of state.

It is also to be noted that during the civil troubles several sects had sprung into existence, whose eccentricities surpassed anything that had before been seen in England. A mad tailor, named Lodowick Muggleton, wandered from pothouse to pothouse, tippling ale, and denouncing eternal torments against those who refused to believe, on his testimony, that the Supreme Being was only six feet high, and that the sun was just four miles from the earth. George Fox had raised a tempest of derision by proclaiming that it was a violation of Christian sincerity to designate a single person by a plural pronoun, and that it was an idolatrous homage to Janus and Woden to talk about January and Wednesday. His doctrine, a few years later, was embraced by some eminent

men, and rose greatly in the public estimation. But at the time of the Restoration the Quakers were popularly regarded as the most despicable of fanatics. By the Puritans they were treated with severity here, and were persecuted to the death in New England. Nevertheless the public, which seldom makes nice distinctions, often confounded the Puritan with the Quaker. Both were schismatics. Both hated Episcopacy and the liturgy. Both had what seemed extravagant whimsies about dress, diversions, and postures. Widely as the two differed in opinion, they were popularly classed together as canting schismatics; and whatever was ridiculous or odious in either increased the scorn and aversion which the multitude felt for both.

Before the civil wars, even those who most disliked the opinions and manners of the Puritan were forced to admit that his moral conduct was generally, in essentials, blameless; but this praise was now no longer bestowed, and, unfortunately, was no longer deserved. The general fate of sects is to obtain a high reputation for sanctity while they are oppressed, and to lose it as soon as they become powerful: and the reason is obvious. It is seldom that a man enrolls himself in a proscribed body from any but conscientious motives. Such a body, therefore, is composed, with scarcely an exception, of sincere persons. The most rigid discipline that can be enforced within a religious society is a very feeble instrument of purification, when compared with a little sharp persecution from without. We may be certain that very few persons, not seriously impressed by religious convictions, applied for baptism while Diocletian was vexing the church, or joined themselves to Protestant congregations at the risk of being burned by Bonner. But, when a sect becomes powerful, when its favour is the road to riches and dignities, worldy and ambitious men crowd into it, talk its language, conform strictly to its ritual, mimic its peculiarities, and frequently go beyond its honest members in all the outward indications of zeal. No discernment, no watchfulness, on the part of ecclesiastical rulers, can prevent the intrusion of such false brethren. The tares and the wheat must grow together. Soon the world begins to find out that the godly are not better than other men, and argues, with some justice, that, if not better they must be much worse. In no long time all those signs which were formerly regarded as characteristic of a saint are regarded as characteristic of a knave.

Thus it was with the English nonconformists. They had been oppressed; and oppression had kept them a pure body. They then became supreme in the state. No man could hope to rise to eminence and command but by their favour. Their favour was to be gained only by exchanging with them the signs and passwords of spiritual fraternity. One of the first resolutions adopted by Barebone's Parliament, the most intensely Puritanical of all our political assemblies, was that no person should be admitted into the public service till the house should be satisfied of his real godliness. What were then considered as the signs of real godliness, the sad coloured dress, the sour look, the straight hair, the nasal whine, the speech interspersed with quaint texts, the abhorrence of comedies, cards, and hawking, were easily counterfeited by men to whom all religions were the same. The sincere Puritans soon found themselves lost in a multitude, not merely of men of the world, but of the very worst sort of men of the world. For the most notorious libertine who had fought under the royal standard might justly be thought virtuous when compared with some of those who, while they talked about sweet experiences and comfortable scriptures, lived in the constant practice of fraud, rapacity, and secret debauchery. The people, with a rashness which we may justly regret, but at which we cannot wonder, formed their estimate of the whole body from these hypocrites. The theology, the

manners, the dialect of the Puritan were thus associated in the public mind with the darkest and meanest vices. As soon as the Restoration had made it safe to avow enmity to the party which had so long been predominant in the state, a general outcry against Puritanism arose from every corner of the kingdom, and was often swollen by the voices of those very dissemblers whose villany had brought disgrace on the Puritan name.

Thus two great parties, which, after a long contest, had for a moment concurred in restoring monarchy, were, both in politics and in religion, again opposed to each other. The great body of the nation leaned to the royalists. The crimes of Strafford and Laud, the excesses of the Star Chamber and of the High Commission, the great services which the Long Parliament had, during the first year of its existence, rendered to the state, had faded from the minds of men. The execution of Charles the First, the sullen tyranny of the Rump, the violence of the army, were remembered with loathing; and the multitude was inclined to hold all who had withstood the late king responsible for his death and for the subsequent disasters.

The house of commons, having been elected while the Presbyterians were dominant, by no means represented the general sense of the people, and showed a strong disposition to check the intolerant loyalty of the cavaliers. One member, who ventured to declare that all who had drawn the sword against Charles the First were as much traitors as those who cut off his head, was called to order, placed at the bar, and reprimanded by the speaker. The general wish of the house undoubtedly was to settle the ecclesiastical disputes in a manner satisfactory to the moderate Puritans. But to such a settlement both the court and the nation were averse.

Character of Charles II

The restored king was at this time more loved by the people than any of his predecessors had ever been. The calamities of his house, the heroic death of his father, his own long sufferings and romantic adventures, made him an object of tender interest. His return had delivered the country from an intolerable bondage. Recalled by the voice of both the contending factions, he was in a position which enabled him to arbitrate between them; and in some respects he was well qualified for the task. He had received from nature excellent parts and a happy temper. His education had been such as might have been expected to develop his understanding, and to form him to the practise of every public and private virtue. He had passed through all varieties of fortune, and had seen both sides of human nature. He had, while very young, been driven forth from a palace to a life of exile, penury, and danger. He had, at the age when the mind and body are in their highest perfection, and when the first effervescence of boyish passions should have subsided, been recalled from his wanderings to wear a crown. He had been taught by bitter experience how much baseness, perfidy, and ingratitude may lie hid under the obsequious demeanour of courtiers. He had found, on the other hand, in the huts of the poorest, true nobility of soul. When wealth was offered to any who would betray him, when death was denounced against all who would shelter him, cottagers and serving men had kept his secret truly, and had kissed his hand under his mean disguises with as much reverence as if he had been seated on his ancestral throne. From such a school it might have been expected that a young man who wanted neither abilities nor amiable qualities would have come forth a great and good king.

Charles came forth from that school with social habits, with polite and

engaging manners, and with some talent for lively conversation, addicted beyond measure to sensual indulgence, fond of sauntering and of frivolous amusements, incapable of self-denial and of exertion, without faith in human virtue or in human attachment, without desire of renown, and without sensibility to reproach. According to him, every person was to be bought, but some people haggled more about their price than others; and when this haggling was very obstinate and very skilful it was called by some fine name. The chief trick by which clever men kept up the price of their abilities was called integrity. The chief trick by which handsome women kept up the price of their beauty was called modesty. The love of God, the love of country, the love of family, the love of friends, were phrases of the same sort, delicate and convenient synonyms for the love of self.[1] Thinking thus of mankind, Charles naturally cared very little what they thought of him. Honour and shame were scarcely more to him than light and darkness to the blind. His contempt of flattery has been highly commended, but seems, when viewed in connection with the rest of his character, to deserve no commendation. It is possible to be below flattery as well as above it. One who trusts nobody will not trust sycophants. One who does not value real glory will not value its counterfeit.

It is creditable to Charles's temper that, ill as he thought of his species, he never became a misanthrope. He saw little in men but what was hateful. Yet he did not hate them. Nay, he was so far humane that it was highly disagreeable to him to see their sufferings or to hear their complaints. This however is a sort of humanity which, though amiable and laudable in a private man whose power to help or hurt is bounded by a narrow circle, has in princes often been rather a vice than a virtue. More than one well disposed ruler has given up whole provinces to rapine and oppression, merely from a wish to see none but happy faces round his own board and in his own walks. No man is fit to govern great societies who hesitates about disobliging the few who have access to him for the sake of the many whom he will never see.

The facility of Charles was such as has perhaps never been found in any man of equal sense. He was a slave without being a dupe. Worthless men and women to the very bottom of whose hearts he saw, and whom he knew to be destitute of affection for him and undeserving of his confidence, could easily wheedle out of him titles, places, domains, state secrets and pardons. He bestowed much; yet he neither enjoyed the pleasure nor acquired the fame of beneficence. He never gave spontaneously; but it was painful to him to refuse. The consequence was that his bounty generally went, not to those who deserved it best, nor even to those whom he liked best, but to the most shameless and importunate suitor who could obtain an audience.

Charles, though incapable of love in the highest sense of the word, was the slave of any woman whose person excited his desires, and whose airs and prattle amused his leisure. Indeed a husband would be justly derided who

[1 The following character of this monarch is from a note on Burnet by Speaker Onslow: — "Charles had neither conscience, religion, honour, or justice, and he does not seem to have had even the feelings of them. He had no one truly public aim, as such, in the whole course of his reign. All he meant and sought, for which he tumbled and tossed from side to side, from one minister to another, and for which he was continually cheating his people, was to enjoy a lazy, thoughtless ease, in which the constant debauchery of amours, and in the pleasures of wit and laughter, with the most worthless, vicious, abandoned set of men that even that age afforded, and who often made him the subject of their jokes and mirth, sometimes to his face. He was corrupted in France, and had all the pleasantry and vices of his grandfather, Henry the Fourth, but not one of his virtues. Charles made the times here to be profligate; and, instead of ministers spoiling him, he spoiled most of his ministers, and did not love those whom he could not spoil."]

should bear from a wife of exalted rank and spotless virtue half the insolence which the king of England bore from concubines who, while they owed everything to his bounty, caressed his courtiers almost before his face. He patiently endured the termagant passions of Barbara Palmer and the pert vivacity of Eleanor Gwyn. Louis thought that the most useful envoy who could be sent to London, would be a handsome, licentious, and crafty Frenchwoman. Such a woman was Louisa, a lady of the house of Querouaille, whom our rude ancestors called Madam Carwell. She was soon triumphant over all her rivals, was created duchess of Portsmouth, was loaded with wealth, and obtained a dominion which ended only with the life of Charles.

The motives which governed the political conduct of Charles the Second differed widely from those by which his predecessor and his successor were actuated. He was not a man to be imposed upon by the patriarchal theory of government and the doctrine of divine right. He was utterly without ambition. He detested business, and would sooner have abdicated his crown than have undergone the trouble of really directing the administration. Such was his aversion to toil, and such his ignorance of affairs, that the very clerks who attended him when he sate in council could not refrain from sneering at his frivolous remarks, and at his childish impatience. Neither gratitude nor revenge had any share in determining his course; for never was there a mind on which both services and injuries left such faint and transitory impressions.

He wished merely to be a king such as Louis the Fifteenth of France afterwards was; a king who could draw without limit on the treasury for the gratification of his private tastes, who could hire with wealth and honours persons capable of assisting him to kill the time, and who, even when the state was brought by maladministration to the depths of humiliation and to the brink of ruin, could still exclude unwelcome truth from the purlieus of his own seraglio, and refuse to see and hear whatever might disturb his luxurious repose. For these ends, and for these ends alone, he wished to obtain arbitrary power, if it could be obtained without risk or trouble. In the religious disputes which divided his Protestant subjects his conscience was not at all interested. For his opinions oscillated in a state of contented suspense between infidelity and popery. But, though his conscience was neutral in the quarrel between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians, his taste was by no means so.

His favourite vices were precisely those to which the Puritans were least indulgent. He could not get through one day without the help of diversions which the Puritans regarded as sinful. As a man eminently well bred, and keenly sensible of the ridiculous,[1] he was moved to contemptuous mirth by the Puritan oddities. He had indeed some reason to dislike the rigid sect. He had, at the age when the passions are most impetuous and when levity is most pardonable, spent some months in Scotland, a king in name, but in fact a state prisoner in the hands of austere Presbyterians. Not content with requiring him to conform to their worship and to subscribe their covenant, they had watched all his motions, and lectured him on all his youthful

[1 White[g] says: "The witty epigram of his courtier may be quoted in serious faith as his epitaph:

'Here lies our sovereign lord, the king,
Whose word no man relies on;
Who never said a foolish thing,
And never did a wise one.'"

But it should be added that when Charles heard this epigram, he retorted that the explanation was easy; his discourse was his own, his actions were his ministry's.]

follies. He had been compelled to give reluctant attendance at endless prayers and sermons, and might think himself fortunate when he was not insolently reminded from the pulpit of his own frailities, of his father's tyranny, and of his mother's idolatry. Indeed he had been so miserable during this part of his life that the defeat which made him again a wanderer might be regarded as a deliverance rather than as a calamity. Under the influence of such feelings as these Charles was desirous to depress the party which had resisted his father.

Characters of the Duke of York, and Earl of Clarendon

The king's brother, James Duke of York, took the same side. Though a libertine, James was diligent, methodical, and fond of authority and business. His understanding was singularly slow and narrow, and his temper obstinate, harsh, and unforgiving. That such a prince should have looked with no good will on the free institutions of England, and on the party which was peculiarly zealous for those institutions, can excite no surprise. As yet the duke professed himself a member of the Anglican church: but he had already shown inclinations which had seriously alarmed good Protestants.

The person on whom devolved at this time the greatest part of the labour of governing was Edward Hyde, chancellor of the realm, who was soon created earl of Clarendon. The respect which we justly feel for Clarendon as a writer must not blind us to the faults which he committed as a statesman. Some of those faults, however, are explained and excused by the unfortunate position in which he stood. He had, during the first year of the Long Parliament, been honourably distinguished among the senators who laboured to redress the grievances of the nation. One of the most odious of those grievances, the council of York, had been removed in consequence chiefly of his exertions. When the great schism took place, when the reforming party and the conservative party first appeared marshalled against each other, he with many wise and good men took the conservative side. He thenceforward followed the fortunes of the court, enjoyed as large a share of the confidence of Charles the First as the reserved nature and tortuous policy of that prince allowed to any minister, and subsequently shared the exile and directed the political conduct of Charles the Second.

At the Restoration Hyde became chief minister. In a few months it was announced that he was closely related by affinity to the royal house. His daughter had become, by a secret marriage, duchess of York. His grandchildren might perhaps wear the crown. He was raised by this illustrious connection over the heads of the old nobility of the land, and was for a time supposed to be all powerful. In some respects he was well fitted for his great place. No man wrote abler state papers. No man spoke with more weight and dignity in council and in parliament. No man was better acquainted with general maxims of statecraft. No man observed the varieties of character with a more discriminating eye. It must be added that he had a strong sense of moral and religious obligations, a sincere reverence for the laws of his country, and a conscientious regard for the honour and interest of the crown. But his temper was sour, arrogant, and impatient of opposition. Above all, he had been long an exile; and this circumstance alone would have completely disqualified him for the supreme direction of affairs.

It is scarcely possible that a politician, who has been compelled by civil troubles to go into banishment, and to pass many of the best years of his life abroad, can be fit, on the day on which he returns to his native land, to be at

the head of the government. Clarendon was no exception to this rule. He had left England with a mind heated by a fierce conflict which had ended in the downfall of his party and of his own fortunes. From 1646 to 1660 he had lived beyond sea, looking on all that passed at home from a great distance, and through a false medium. His notions of public affairs were necessarily derived from the reports of plotters, many of whom were ruined and desperate men. Events naturally seemed to him auspicious, not in proportion as they increased the prosperity and glory of the nation, but in proportion as they tended to hasten the hour of his own return. His wish, a wish which he has not disguised, was that, till his countrymen brought back the old line, they might never enjoy quiet or freedom. At length he returned; and, without having a single week to look about him, to mix with society, to note the changes which fourteen eventful years had produced in the national character and feelings, he was at once set to rule the state.

In such circumstances, a minister of the greatest tact and docility would probably have fallen into serious errors. But tact and docility made no part of the character of Clarendon. To him England was still the England of his youth; and he sternly frowned down every theory and every practice which had sprung up during his own exile. Though he was far from meditating any attack on the ancient and undoubted power of the House of Commons, he saw with extreme uneasiness the growth of that power. The royal prerogative, for which he had long suffered, and by which he had at length been raised to wealth and dignity, was sacred in his eyes. The Roundheads he regarded both with political and with personal aversion. To the Anglican Church he had always been strongly attached, and had repeatedly, where her interests were concerned, separated himself with regret from his dearest friends. His zeal for Episcopacy and for the Book of Common Prayer was now more ardent than ever, and was mingled with a vindictive hatred of the Puritans, which did him little honour either as a statesman or as a Christian.[h]

THE CONVENTION PARLIAMENT (1660 A.D.)

After this review of the situation we may take up in detail the actual procedure.[a] The first care of the king had been to reward those who had been active in his restoration, and to form his council. Monk, as previously described, was created duke of Albemarle, and Montague, earl of Sandwich, and both had the Garter. Annesley was made earl of Anglesea; Denzil Holles, Lord Holles; and Ashley Cooper, Lord Ashley. The earl of Manchester was appointed lord chamberlain, and Lord Say, lord privy seal. Monk's friend Morrice was made one of the secretaries of state. Of the old royalists, Hyde, as we have seen, was made chancellor, Southampton, treasurer, Ormonde, steward of the household; Sir Edward Nicholas continued to be a secretary of state, and Lord Colpepper, master of the rolls.

The present parliament not having been summoned legally, was no more than a convention, and its Acts were therefore not binding. It, however, passed an Act declaring itself to be the parliament, and then proceeded to the consideration of the many weighty matters it had to determine.

The first was to provide a revenue for the crown. As it appeared that a chief cause of the late unhappy troubles had been the inadequacy of the revenue to the exigencies of the government, it was resolved to settle an income of 1,200,000*l.* a year on the king. In return, was required the abolition of tenures in chivalry, with all their incidents, such as wardships, marriages, etc., together with purveyance and pre-emption—all, for centuries, fruitful

sources of evil, and constant subjects of complaint and remonstrance. This being consented to, the next question was, whence the aforesaid revenue was to arise. A permanent tax on the lands thus relieved was the obvious and equitable course; but he knows little of parliaments, who thinks that this would be assented to by the owners of lands who sat in them, while any mode offered of shifting the burden. Some one mentioned the excise; the idea was at once embraced, and it was carried by a majority of two that a moiety of the excise on beer and other liquors should be settled on the crown; and thus this tax, originally so odious, was made permanent. By this Act (12 Car. II. ch. 24), a most important change was wrought in the constitution, the prerogative losing its most influential branch. We will here add that, at the close of the session, the remaining moiety of the excise was given also to the crown.

An army of fifty thousand men, whose pay required an assessment of £70,000 a month, was alike dangerous to the crown and burdensome to the nation. Symptoms of disaffection had already appeared among the soldiers, and Monk declared that he could no longer answer for the troops. It was therefore resolved to lose no time in disbanding them; money was procured to clear off their arrears, the regiments were reduced one after another, eulogies were lavished on the soldiers, and without mutiny or murmur they merged into the mass of peaceful citizens; and thus disappeared that wonderful army, only to be rivalled perhaps by those of the early days of the Roman republic and those of the first Khalifs, in the union of religion, discipline, and undaunted valour. The king was strongly urged by the duke of York to retain this army, or to raise another; to this course he was himself inclined, but he knew that it was useless to propose it to the parliament. Monk's regiment, named the Coldstream, was however retained, with one or two of horse, and one formed out of the troops at Dunkirk was afterwards added; the whole amounted to about five thousand men, and under the name of guards formed the germ of the present large standing army.

THE BILL OF INDEMNITY; THE REGICIDES

The Bill of Indemnity also occupied the attention of parliament. It had been engaged on this even before the arrival of the king. Monk had recommended the king not to except more than four persons; but the Commons at first (May 16th) excepted seven by name; they afterwards enumerated twenty persons, who, though not regicides, should for their share in the transactions of the last twelve years be affected with penalties short of death; they finally excepted such of the king's judges as had not surrendered themselves on the late proclamation. When the bill came to the Lords (July 11th), where the old royalists prevailed, it was judged to be far too lenient. They voted to except all the king's judges, and also Vane, Lambert, Haslerig, Hacker, and Axtel; they struck out the clause respecting the twenty persons, and then sent the bill back to the Commons. But here there were some feelings of honour and humanity. By the proclamation above-mentioned, the king's judges[1] were required to surrender themselves on pain of being excepted

[1] Five-and-twenty out of the original number had indeed been already removed by death beyond the reach of any earthly tribunal, and nineteen had crossed the sea to escape the fate which awaited them in their native country. Three of these, Whalley, Goff, and Dixwell, secreted themselves in New England, where they passed their lives in the constant fear of being discovered by the officers of government. There is an interesting account of their adventures by Hutchinson, and in the history of these "Most Illustrious and Heroic Defenders of Liberty," published by Ezra Stiles, S.T.D., LL.D., President of the Yale College, Hartford, U. S., 1794. Three others, Corbet, Okey, and Berkstead, were apprehended in Holland, at the

from any pardon or indemnity as to their lives or estates. The obvious construction of this was, that the lives of those who came in would be in no danger, and accordingly nineteen had surrendered. It was contended that these should be set at liberty, and suffered to make their escape if they could.

A compromise at length was effected. Most of the king's judges were excepted, as also were Hacker, Axtel, and Hugh Peters; but the nineteen were not to suffer death without an act of parliament for that purpose. Vane and Lambert were also excepted; but by an address of both houses, the king was requested to spare their lives if they should be attainted. Haslerig, Lord Monson, and five others were to lose liberty and property, and Lenthall, St. John, Hutchinson, and sixteen more, all members of the high courts of justice, were to be ineligible to any office whatever. In this form the Bill of Indemnity received the royal assent.

After sitting about three months, the parliament adjourned, and during the recess the twenty-nine regicides who were in custody were brought to trial before a court of thirty-four commissioners, of whom some were old royalists; others, such as Manchester, Say, Holles, and Annesley, members of the Long Parliament; with these sat Monk, Montague, and Cooper, the associates of Cromwell, whom a feeling of delicacy should, perhaps, have withheld from the tribunal.

Most of the prisoners expressed sorrow for their crime; others said that they had borne the king no malice, that they thought his death an act of national justice, and that they had acted under the supreme authority of the nation. They were all found guilty; those who had surrendered were respited, with one exception, namely, Scroop; his having, after his surrender, expressed his real sentiments on the execution of Charles I, in reply to an insidious question, was the pretext for this breach of faith; ten were executed. These were six of the king's judges, Harrison, Scott, Carew, Jones, Clements, and Scroop; Cook, one of the counsel on the trial; Axtel and Hacker, who had commanded the guards; and Hugh Peters, the fanatic preacher. The place of execution was Charing Cross, where a gallows was erected for the purpose. General Harrison suffered first (Oct. 13). Supported here, as on his trial, by that fervid spirit of enthusiasm so perfectly free from all alloy of worldly motives, he gloried in the act for which he was brought to die as performed in the cause of God and his country, and expressed his confidence in the revival of the good cause in happier times. Carew was the next who suffered (15th); his conduct was similar. Cook and Peters were executed on the same day (16th); the latter alone, according to Burnet,[f] is said, showed want of courage, and was obliged to have recourse to cordials. Scott, Clement, Scroop, and Jones, also suffered on the same day (17th). Hacker and Axtel closed the scene at Tyburn (19th). All died with the constancy of martyrs. It is very remarkable, that not a single man of those who had a share in the death of the late king seems to have voluntarily repented of the deed.

The narratives in the state trials were drawn up by the friends of the sufferers, and are evidently partial. Who can believe that "after Harrison's body was opened, he mounted himself and gave the executioner a box in the ear"? At the same time, it is evident, that they were treated with a degree of cruelty and barbarity, for which the conduct of their party, when in power, offered no precedent.

The lives of the remaining regicides were spared; they spent the rest of

instance of Downing, and given up by the states, as an atonement for their former treatment of the king during his exile. They suffered under the act of attainder, on the 19th of April, 1662. Others sought refuge in Switzerland. — LINGARD.[d]]

[1660 A.D.]

their days in different prisons. The witty and licentious Harry Marten died at the age of seventy-eight, in Chepstow Castle. They surely had no just reason to complain of their fate, if they recollected how many royalists they had, as far as in them lay, subjected to a similar destiny.

REVENGE ON THE CORPSES OF CROMWELL AND BLAKE

Though one must admire the constancy and magnanimity of the sufferers, most of whom were gentlemen by birth and education, the justice of their sentence is not to be denied, even on their own principles; and it was impossible for Charles to suffer such a heinous deed as the solemn execution of his father to go unpunished. But there was another part of the royal vengeance which can be regarded with no other feelings than those of abhorrence and disgust. The bodies of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, were taken from their tombs in the Abbey, drawn on hurdles to Tyburn on the anniversary of the death of Charles I, hung on the gallows till evening, then taken down, the heads cut off and fixed on Westminster Hall, and the trunks thrown into a pit. The bodies of about twenty persons (those of Blake, and Cromwell's respectable mother included) were afterwards taken out of the Abbey and buried in the adjoining church-yard. Yet Charles showed less enthusiasm for finding his father's body than for avenging the murder for, says Knight,[k] "Charles II caused a search to be made for the vault, when the parliament had voted a large sum for a public interment. The search was fruitless, and the king put the money in his pocket. George IV wished to gratify a reasonable curiosity, and the vault with its coffins was readily found. To our minds there is nothing in the whole course of this evil reign so prophetic of the coming national degradation, as the indignities offered to the remains of the greatest soldier and the greatest sailor that England had produced. Cromwell and Blake by their genius and their patriotism made their country the most honoured and dreaded of the nations. They bequeathed to the heir of the ancient kings, a national dignity which was more solid than the glories of the Edwards and Henries, and as dearly prized by the people as the triumphs of Elizabeth. This miserable heir of the grand English monarchy was utterly destitute of that nationality without which a sovereign is more degraded than the meanest of his subjects. The future pensioner of France was incapable of comprehending what England owed to the man whose corpse he hung up on the gallows at Tyburn."

Another important point for the parliament to decide on was the case of those who had purchased the crown and church lands and the estates of royalists, which had been sold by the public authority in the late times. A bill was introduced for an equitable adjustment, but it met with much opposition; and nothing having been done when the parliament was dissolved, the crown, the church, and the other proprietors entered on the lands in question, and the occupiers, having no legal titles to produce, were obliged to sit down contented with the loss of their purchase-money. But it was only the leading royalists that gained in this way; thousands of gentlemen who had sold their lands to support the royal cause, or to pay the sequestrations imposed on them for their loyalty, and had thus been reduced to poverty, remained without remedy. The sales having been legal, the present possessors were secured by the Bill of Indemnity, against which the disappointed cavaliers now exclaimed, saying it was indeed an act of oblivion and indemnity, but of indemnity for the king's enemies, and of oblivion for his friends. They taxed the king with ingratitude, and they conceived, on account of it, a mortal hatred to Hyde.

Their case was doubtless a severe one, but there was really no preventing it but at the risk of a civil war. It was observed that the most clamorous were those who had suffered least, and the petty services for which many claimed large rewards furnished matter for ridicule.

THE RESTORATION OF EPISCOPACY

The church was a difficult matter to arrange. Most of the livings were in the hands of the Presbyterians, and they had so mainly contributed to the restoration, that it would be both ungrateful and unsafe to attempt to disturb them. On the other hand, both the king and the chancellor were resolved to re-establish Episcopacy. There was also a difficulty about the livings, for such of the clergy as had been ejected for their loyalty, seemed now to have a just claim to recover what they had lost. This, however, was accommodated to a certain extent; but the vision of the jurisdiction of bishops, and the dreaded surplice, ring, and cross, alarmed the Presbyterians. They proposed Bishop Usher's model of Episcopacy, and prayed that the habits and ceremonies might not be imposed, and that the liturgy might be revised. The king issued a declaration, apparently granting all they required; but when an attempt was made to have this converted into a bill, it was frustrated by the efforts of the court party in the commons. It was quite plain from this that the royal declaration was only meant to be illusory.

At length (Dec. 29th) the Convention Parliament was dissolved, for it was urged that it was necessary to have a true parliament, to give the force of law to what it had enacted; and it was also expected that a new parliament would be more purely royalist.

In September of this year the duke of Gloucester died of small-pox, much lamented by the king his brother. Their sister, the princess of Orange, died of the same disorder in the winter. The king's other sister, the princess Henrietta, was married about this time to the duke of Orleans, brother to Louis XIV. Another marriage in the royal family was that of the duke of York to Anne Hyde, daughter of the chancellor, who had been maid of honour to the princess of Orange. She possessed wit and sense, though not beauty. The duke, whose taste on this last point was never very delicate, laid siege to her virtue, which was surrendered on a secret contract of marriage; when the consequences were becoming apparent, James kept his promise, and privately espoused her (Sept. 3rd). He informed the king and chancellor. The former, though annoyed, forgave him; the latter pretended the greatest rage against his daughter, advised the king to send her to the Tower, and that not being done, confined her to a room in his own house. The queen-mother and the princess of Orange were highly indignant; and Charles Berkeley, to recommend himself to favour, swore that Anne had been his mistress, and brought Lord Arran, Jermyn, Talbot, and Killegrew, as witnesses of her wantonness. The duke was shaken; but on the birth of her child, and her solemn assertion at that time, and Berkeley's confession of the falsehood of his story, he resolved to do her justice. He acknowledged her as his duchess, and she bore her new rank, it is said, as if she had been born in it.

THE PARLIAMENT OF 1661 AND THE CORPORATION ACT

The new year (1661) opened with a wild outbreak of the fanatics named fifth-monarchy men, under their leader, Venner, the wine-cooper. One Sunday (Jan. 6th), having heated their enthusiasm by a discourse on the speedy

coming of Jesus and the reign of the saints, he issued from his conventicle, in Colman street, at the head of sixty well-armed fanatics. They proceeded to St. Paul's, proclaiming King Jesus. They drove off a party of the trained bands that were sent against them, and in the evening they retired to Caenwood, between Hampstead and Highgate. Here some of them were taken: but on Wednesday morning (9th) they returned into the city, shouting as before, and dispersed some of the troops and of the trained bands. At length, some being killed, and Venner taken, they retired into a house at Cripplegate, which they defended, till a party, headed by one Lambert, a seaman, got in at the roof. Most of them were slain; Venner and the remainder were hanged. The attempt was purely an isolated act, but advantage was taken of it to issue a proclamation for suppressing the conventicles of the Quakers, Anabaptists, and other sectaries; it was also the occasion of the formation of the regiments of guards already noticed.

The king's coronation having been celebrated with great splendour (Apr. 23rd),[1] the new parliament met (May 8th). [It is sometimes called the Cavalier Parliament.] As was to be expected, it was most decidedly royalist, the Presbyterians not having more than sixty seats. Its temper soon appeared, by votes for obliging all the members to receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, and for having the Solemn League and Covenant burnt by the common hangman. It was declared that the negative and the command of the army[2] were rights inherent in the crown; and it was made treason to injure the king's person, or to distinguish between his person and his office. It required all the efforts of the king and Clarendon to have the Bill of Indemnity passed without further exceptions. A bill passed the commons for the immediate execution of the remaining regicides; but the lords, more humane or more honourable, rejected it, the king himself expressing his aversion to it. "I am weary of hanging," said he to Clarendon, "except for new offences. Let the bill settle in the houses, that it may not come to me, for you know that I cannot pardon them." The act depriving the bishops of their seats in parliament, which had been so violently extorted from the late king, was repealed, and the prelates were restored to their legislative functions. As a chief weapon in those times had been tumultuary bodies of petitioners, an act was passed that not more than ten persons should present any petition to the king or either house, nor should it be signed by more than twenty, unless with the order of three justices, or the major part of a grand jury.

While the parliament was thus replacing the constitution on its ancient basis, a conference (called the Savoy Conference) was going on at the bishop of London's lodgings, at the Savoy Palace, between twelve prelates and nine assistants, and an equal number of Presbyterian divines. The ostensible object was a revision of the Book of Common Prayer. It ended, of course, as all such conferences do. The bishops were predetermined to admit of none but very slight modifications, and to retain all the ceremonies. The Presbyterians, under the circumstances, required by far too much; yet surely the prelates might have conceded something to men at least as pious and as learned as themselves, and but for whom they would be probably still without

[1] Hyde was on this occasion created earl of Clarendon, and Arthur Lord Capel (son of him who had been executed in 1649) earl of Essex.

[2] The act for the command of the militia went rather beyond the constitutional principle of recognising the sole power of the crown to command the forces by land or sea. It declared not only that neither house of parliament could pretend to such power, but could not lawfully levy any war, offensive or defensive, against the king.* "These last words," says Hallam,* "appeared to go to a dangerous length, and to sanction the suicidal doctrine of absolute non-resistance."]

their sees. If it was puerile on the one side to object so vehemently to the cross, ring, and surplice, it was surely no proof of wisdom on the other to insist on them as if they were of the very essence of religion. So little were the prelates disposed to concession, that even the innovations of Laud were retained, and they remain to this day part of the service of the Church of England.

The strength of the Presbyterian party lay in the corporations, and in these, their strongholds, the church-party proceeded to attack them. By the Corporation Act now passed it was enacted, that any person holding office



BRIDGEWATER MOAT, ELTHAM

in a corporation might be removed, unless he would renounce the Solemn League and Covenant, and declare his belief of the unlawfulness of taking up arms against the king, etc.; and no future officer to be admitted unless he had previously taken the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England.

The revision of the Common Prayer was finally (Nov. 20) committed to the convocation. They made a number of alterations and additions; none, however, favourable to the Presbyterians. The amended book was presented to the king and council, and by them recommended to the house of lords.

THE EXECUTION OF SIR HARRY VANE (1662 A.D.)

Vane and Lambert still lay in prison. As they had had no immediate hand in the death of the late king, the convention had addressed the king in their behalf, and he had assured them that, if attainted, they should not be executed. They were now brought to trial, at the suit of the commons. Lambert, (June 9, 1662), who had never been an enthusiast, or even perhaps a republican, acted with great caution. He excused his opposing Booth and Monk by saying that he knew not that they were acting for the king, and he threw himself on the royal mercy. He was sentenced to die, but he was only confined for life in the isle of Guernsey. He lived there for thirty years, forgotten by the world, occupying his time in the cultivation of flowers and in the practise of the art of painting. It is said that he became a Catholic.

Very different was the conduct of the upright, fervid, enthusiast and

[1662 A.D.]

republican Vane (June 6). Far from suing for mercy, he asserted that "the decision by the sword was given [against the late king] by that God who, being the judge of the whole earth, does right, and cannot do otherwise"; and the parliament then became the government *de facto*, and, consequently, he was entitled to the benefit of the statute 11 Henry VII, for acting in obedience to it. The spirit of the law, if not the letter, was decidedly in his favour, and the judges could only get over the difficulty by the monstrous assertion, that Charles had been king *de facto* from the death of his father, though "kept out of the exercise of his royal authority by rebels and traitors." The prisoner's defence was most eloquent and able, but it had been determined not to let him escape. Sentence of death was passed on him, the judges refusing to sign a bill of exceptions, which he presented. He was beheaded on Tower Hill (14th). His demeanour was such as was to be expected from his known character. When he attempted to address the people in vindication of himself and the cause for which he suffered, his note-books were snatched from him, and the trumpeters were ordered to blow in his face. "It is a bad cause," said he, "which cannot bear the words of a dying man." One stroke terminated his mortal existence.

The character of Sir Henry Vane stands forth pre-eminent for purity among the republican chiefs. He was disinterested and incorrupt; willing to give to all others the liberty he claimed for himself; the enemy of oppression in all its forms. It is difficult to regard his death as anything but a judicial murder, yet surely there was in it something of retribution. Though taking no immediate share in the judicial proceedings against the late king, he had mainly contributed to his death by his conduct at the Treaty of Newport, and his speech in the house on his return. By the manner in which he furnished evidence against Strafford (whose sentence was little, if at all, less iniquitous than his own), he was a main cause of the civil war, and of all the bloodshed and misery which thence ensued. On the same spot on which Strafford fell one-and-twenty years before, Vane now underwent a similar fate. As the series of blood began with the one, it ended with the other. As Charles I forfeited his word and honour in the one case, so Charles II forfeited his in the other.

THE AFFAIRS OF SCOTLAND AND IRELAND

Having thus far carried on the affairs of England, it is now time that we should notice those of Scotland and Ireland [though they are treated at length in the next volume].

As Scotland had not been mentioned in the Declaration from Breda, the cavaliers of that country breathed nothing but blood and forfeitures.

The union which the commonwealth had laboured to effect was no longer thought of. The earl of Middleton was appointed commissioner for holding the parliament, Glencairn chancellor, and Lauderdale secretary. The fortresses built by Cromwell were demolished, and the garrisons disbanded. As the king had been thoroughly disgusted with Presbytery, and he and his chief counsellors regarded it as incompatible with monarchy, the restoration of Episcopacy was resolved on. The utmost efforts having been made to pack a parliament, that assembly, when it met (Jan. 1, 1661), proved to be suited to all the purposes of the court. It was known by the name of "The Drunken Parliament," on account of the continued inebriety of Middleton and his associates. Its first proceeding was to restore the prerogative in its fullest

extent. In one of Middleton's drunken bouts, it was resolved to adopt a measure which Primrose the clerk-register had proposed half in jest, which was, a general act "rescissory," annulling on various pretexts all the parliaments held since the year 1633. This, though vigorously opposed by the old covenanters, was carried by a large majority, and the Presbyterian discipline was left at the mercy of the crown.

Those who hungered after the large possessions of Argyll now hastened to shed his blood. The base treachery of Monk came to the aid of his enemies. He transmitted to the parliament some private letters in which Argyll expressed his attachment to the protector's government: his friends were silenced, and sentence was pronounced (May 25th). Argyll met his fate with piety and fortitude (27th).

The soil being thus watered with the blood of the covenanters Argyll and the clergyman Guthrey, it was resolved to replant Episcopacy. [The inhuman measures adopted in its re-establishment are detailed in the history of Scotland.]

Unhappy Ireland was also to be regulated anew. No blood was here to be shed, and the church, as a matter of course, resumed its former position; but the adjustment of property was a matter of tremendous difficulty. The tide of conquest had swept over the country, effacing all limits and landmarks. The greater part of the lands were now in the possession of the adventurers who had advanced their money on the faith of acts of parliament passed with the assent of the late king, and of the soldiers of Cromwell's army; but there were numerous other claimants, such as the Forty-nine men, or those who had served in the royal army previous to the year 1649, the Protestant loyalists whose estates had been confiscated, the innocent Catholics, those who had served under the king in Flanders, etc.

The king issued a declaration (Nov. 30, 1660) for the settlement of Ireland; but the Irish houses of parliament disagreeing with respect to it, they sent their deputies over to the king, and the Catholics at the same time despatched agents on their part. Charles was, for obvious reasons, disposed to favour these last, but, like true Irishmen, they seemed resolved that it should not be in his power. They justified their rebellion, denied their massacres, and finally the king ordered the doors of the council to be closed against them. The heads of a bill were then prepared and sent over to Dublin in May, 1662, but it was three years before the final settlement was effected. The soldiers and adventurers agreed to give up a third of their lands, to augment what was called "The Fund of Reprisals," or property still remaining at the disposal of the crown, and which had been shamefully diminished by lavish grants to the dukes of York, Ormonde, Albemarle, and others. Out of this the Forty-nine men were paid their arrears, fifty-four Catholics were restored to their houses, and two thousand acres of land; but there remained three thousand who had put in claims of innocence for whom no relief was provided. Previous to the rebellion, it is said the Catholics had possessed two-thirds of the lands of Ireland; there now remained to them not more than one-third. Sir W. Petty[w] says that only a sixth remained to the Catholics.

THE PROFLIGACY OF CHARLES: HIS MARRIAGE (1662 A.D.)

We now return to England, where the marriage of the king engaged the attention of his council. Charles was a notorious profligate with respect to women. While in France he had a son by a Mrs. Barlow or Walters, and imme-

diately on his coming to England, Barbara Villiers, daughter of Lord Grandison, and wife to a Catholic gentleman named Palmer, a woman of great beauty, but utterly devoid of virtue or principle, having thrown herself in his way, made a conquest of his heart, over which she long retained her empire, though only one sultana out of many. The scandal which the king gave by his amours, caused his ministers to urge him to marry; but he resolved not to espouse a Protestant, and his subjects he thought would object to a Catholic. At the suggestion of the French king, however, the Portuguese ambassador offered him the infanta Catherine, sister to the king of Portugal, with a dower of 500,000*l.*, the settlements of Tangier in Africa, and Bombay in the East Indies, and a free trade to Portugal and her colonies.

The money tempted the king; Clarendon and the other ministers approved of the match, but the Spanish ambassador now laboured to obstruct it. He represented that the infanta was incapable of bearing children; that it might cause a war with Spain, and the loss of the Spanish trade; and he offered, on the part of his master, a large portion with either of the princesses of Parma. Charles sent Lord Bristol secretly to Italy, where he saw the princesses as they were going to church. One glance sufficed; the one was hideously ugly, the other monstrously fat. Meantime Louis sent to urge the Portuguese match, offering Charles money to purchase votes in the parliament, promising to lend him 50,000*l.* whenever he should want it, and to aid him with money in case of a war with Spain. The Spaniard, on the other hand, proposed to the king different Protestant princesses, whom his master would portion equal to daughters of Spain. He also laboured to excite the Protestant feelings of the parliament and city, but to no purpose. The Portuguese match was approved of by the council and both houses, and (June, 1661) the earl of Sandwich was sent out with a fleet to convey the infanta, when ready, to England.

The prospect of her lover's marriage made Mrs. Palmer very uneasy. To reconcile her he made her costly presents, and created her husband earl of Castlemain in Ireland, with remainder to the issue male of his wife, who had just borne to her royal keeper a son at Hampton Court; and finally, lost to all sense of honour and delicacy, Charles pledged himself to make her lady of the bed-chamber to his queen.

On the 20th of May, 1662, the fleet which bore the infanta reached Spithead. Charles, quitting the embraces of the wanton Castlemain, hastened to Portsmouth to receive his bride. They were married privately, according to the rites of the church of Rome, by the Lord Aubigny, the queen's almoner. They then came forth and sat on chairs in the room where the company was assembled, and Sheldon bishop of London pronounced them man and wife. They thence proceeded to Hampton Court, where after some days Charles, taking "The Lady," as Castlemain was called, by the hand, presented her to the queen before the entire court. Catherine had so much command of herself as to give her a gracious reception, but in a few minutes her eyes filled with tears, blood gushed from her nose, and she fell into a fit. Charles now affected the tone of a man of honour; he had been, he said, the cause of Castlemain's disgrace, and he was bound to make her reparation, and he would not submit to the whims of his wife. Clarendon and Ormonde remonstrated, but were harshly reproved, and even required to lend their aid in the royal project; and who will not blush for Clarendon, when he reads that he actually did undertake the odious office? But Catherine would not listen to him. To break her spirit, Charles then sent away her Portuguese attendants, and the presence of Castlemain was continually obtruded on her. The queen long bore up against these studied insults; at length she most imprudently resolved to yield, and

she humbled herself so far as to admit that abandoned adulteress to her familiarity and friendship.

THE SALE OF DUNKIRK TO THE FRENCH (1662 A.D.)

The queen's portion was soon spent, and to raise money for the royal expenses, Clarendon, it is said, proposed the sale of Dunkirk to the French king: Louis was eager to treat. Clarendon demanded twelve millions of livres, he was offered two, and the bargain was finally concluded for five (Sept. 11th). But Charles wanted all the money, and Louis would only pay two millions down, and the remainder in two years. The treaty was nearly broken off, when it was suggested that Louis should give bills for the balance. This was agreed to (Oct. 17th), and a French banker came over and discounted them. The banker was an agent of Louis, who boasts that he made 500,000 livres on the transaction. Dunkirk was certainly of no direct use to England, but the possession of it gratified the national pride, and the people felt mortified at seeing it sold, and the price squandered away on the king's vices and pleasures.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS: THE CONVENTICLE ACT AND REPEAL OF THE TRIENNIAL ACT

But the sale of Dunkirk was a trifle to the cruel Act of Uniformity which now came into operation. It had been urged on by the united bigotry of the clergy, of Clarendon, and of the house of commons; the lords in vain attempted to mitigate its severity; the commons were inexorable. It provided that every minister should, before the feast of St. Bartholomew (Aug. 24th), publicly declare his assent and consent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or lose his benefice. The appointed day came, and about two thousand ministers, the far greater part of them men of extensive learning, sincere piety, and irreproachable life, laid down their preferments, and rather than do violence to their conscience, faced poverty and persecution. It may be said, that the Episcopal clergy had done as much in the late times, but those were times of civil war, and politics were so interwoven with religion, that it was difficult to separate them, and they had the prospect of ample reward in case of the king's success. But now all was peace; the king had been restored in a great measure through the exertions of these very men; there was no longer a political contest; conscience alone could have actuated them. Henry VIII assigned pensions to the ejected monks and friars; Elizabeth had reserved a fifth of the income of the benefices for those who scrupled to comply with her Act of Uniformity; the Long Parliament had done the same; but now no provision whatever was made, nay, care was taken that those who did not conform should lose the last year's income of their livings, as their tithes would not fall due till Michaelmas.

Petitions claiming the benefit of the Declaration from Breda being presented to the king, he took the occasion of setting forth a declaration, promising to exert his influence with parliament in its next session to have his dispensing power so regulated as to enable him to exercise it with more universal satisfaction. His secret object was to procure toleration for the Catholics; but on this head the commons were lynx-eyed; the Protestantism of the royal brothers was strongly suspected, and the Roman priests, in reliance on the court-favour, gave public offence by appearing in their habits. The com-

mons therefore (Feb. 1663) rejected the whole scheme of indulgence, and brought in bills to prevent the growth of Catholicism.

Rumours of conspiracies were now spread in order to cast odium on the ejected clergy, and a slight insurrection which did take place this summer in Yorkshire was taken advantage of to pass in the following session (May 16, 1664) the merciless Conventicle Act. By this any person above the age of sixteen, who was present at any religious meeting not held according to the practice of the Church of England, where there were five or more persons beside the household, was to be imprisoned three months for the first offence, six for the second, and be transported seven years for the third, on conviction before a single justice of the peace. This cruel statute speedily filled the prisons, especially with the Quakers. [Transportation meant a practical slavery and heavy toil under the blazing sun of the Barbadoes or some colony of the West Indies.]

The repeal of the Triennial Act of 1641 was effected in this session. The king had the audacity to declare that he would never suffer a parliament to come together by the means prescribed in it; and to please him, a bill was brought in to repeal it, and passed, with a provision, however, that parliaments should not be intermitted for more than three years at the most.

WAR WITH THE DUTCH (1664–1665 A.D.)

Another measure of this session was an address to the king, praying him to seek redress of the injuries inflicted by the Dutch on the English trade, and promising to stand by him with their lives and fortunes. The Dutch were more devoted to commerce than any people in Europe; and as the spirit of trade is jealous and monopolising, they had been guilty of many unjustifiable actions in their foreign settlements, such, for instance, as the massacre of the English at Amboyna in the reign of James I. These however were all past and gone; treaties had been since made with them, in which these deeds had been unnoticed, even so late as the year 1662. Charles himself, though he had a great dislike to the aristocratic or Louvestein party, as it was named, which now ruled in the states, and which had deprived the prince of Orange of the dignity of Stadholder, was little inclined to a war, and Clarendon and Southampton were decidedly adverse to it; but the duke of York, who was lord-admiral, was anxious to distinguish himself at the head of the navy, which his exertions had brought to a state of great perfection; he was also a diligent fosterer of trade, which he justly regarded as a main pillar of the national greatness. He therefore lent his powerful aid to the party desirous of war, and Downing, the resident at the Hague, a man of little principle, spared no labour to widen the breach between the two countries.

The duke of York was at the head of an African company for the purchase of gold-dust and for supplying the West Indies with slaves. The Dutch, who had long traded to Africa, thwarted them as much as possible, and even seized or demolished their factories. The duke had already sent out Sir Robert Holmes, in the name of the company, with some ships of war to the coast of Africa, and Holmes had recovered the castle of Cape Corse and taken that of Cape Verd, and established factories along the coast. The duke had also sent out Sir Richard Nicholas to North America, where the Dutch had settled on the tract of country between New England and Maryland, and named it New Amsterdam. The English claimed this by right of discovery, and the king had made a grant of it to his brother. The Dutch settlers offered

no resistance, and Nicholas named the country New York, and a fort up the river, Albany, from the titles of his patron.

When intelligence came of what Holmes had done, the Dutch ambassador remonstrated in strong terms. But the king denied all concern in the matter, said that Holmes had been sent out by the company on their own authority, and promised to bring him to trial on his return. Holmes accordingly was sent to the Tower; but his explanations were considered satisfactory, and he was soon released. De Witt was resolved to be avenged. A combined Dutch and English fleet, under De Ruyter and Lawson, was now in the Mediterranean acting against the piratic cruisers, and he sent secret orders to the former to proceed to the coast of Africa and retaliate on the English. Lawson, though aware of De Ruyter's object, did not feel himself authorised by his instructions to follow him; but he sent to inform the duke of his suspicions. The Dutch admiral having accomplished his mission on the African coast crossed over to the West Indies, where he captured about twenty sail of merchantmen. The duke meantime had two fleets out in the narrow seas, which seized and detained one hundred and thirty Dutch traders.

The war being now resolved on, the king called on parliament for the requisite supplies (Nov. 25). Their liberality was unprecedented; they voted two millions and a half. In the bill for this purpose, two remarkable deviations from ancient usage were effected; the old method of raising money by subsidies, tenths, and fifteenths, which had been returned to, was abandoned forever, and the mode of assessments introduced in the civil war was adopted in its stead; the clergy, who used to tax themselves in convocation, now consented to be taxed in the same manner as the laity by parliament; and in return they obtained the right of voting at elections. This measure put a total end to the influence and importance of the convocation; it became from that moment a mere shadow. It is remarkable, that this great change in the constitution was the effect of a mere verbal agreement between the chancellor and the primate.

On the 21st of April, 1665, the duke of York put to sea with a gallant fleet of ninety-eight ships of war and four fire ships. This prince had made wonderful improvements in the navy. Instead of committing the command of ships to noblemen of inexperienced valour, he placed them under Lawson and men who had long been familiar with the sea. He continued the practice of dividing the fleet into three squadrons; but he required it to form into line before action, and each captain to keep his place during the engagement; thus substituting the regularity of the land battle for the previous irregular mode of fighting used at sea. The duke himself, with Lawson for his vice-admiral, commanded the red, Prince Rupert the white, the earl of Sandwich the blue squadron.

For more than a month this fleet rode in triumph off the coast of Holland. At length, an easterly wind having blown it to its own coast, the Dutch fleet of one hundred and thirteen ships of war, commanded by Admiral Opdam, came out in seven squadrons. The fleets encountered (June 3) off the coast of Suffolk. The sea was calm, the sky cloudless; for four hours the fight was dubious; the duke displayed the greatest conduct and valour; one shot killed at his side his favourite the earl of Falmouth, the lord Muskerry, and a son of Lord Burlington, and covered him with their blood. At length, observing great confusion on board of Admiral Opdam's ship, he ordered all his guns to be fired into her successively, and she blew up, and Opdam and five hundred men perished in her. Dispirited by the loss of their admiral, the Dutch fled; the English pursued, but during the night, while the duke was taking some

repose, Mr. Brounker, groom of his bed-chamber, came to the master with pretended orders from the duke to shorten sail, and thus in the morning the Dutch got into the Texel. This was the greatest naval victory gained as yet by the English; the Dutch lost eighteen ships, they had four admirals killed, and seven thousand men slain or taken. The loss of the English was one ship and six hundred men; but among the slain were the admirals Lawson and Sampson, and the earls of Marlborough and Portland.

In other days the tidings of such a victory would have spread joy and festivity through all the streets of London; but now a gloom, not to be dispelled by the triumphs of war, sat brooding over the capital: the plague had visited it in its most appalling form.

During this desolation, the fleet, which was uninfected, kept the sea; and the Dutch Smyrna and East Indian fleets having taken shelter in the port of Bergen, in Norway, Lord Sandwich sailed thither. For a share of the spoil, it is said, the Danish court agreed to connive at the capture of the Dutch vessels. Owing, however, to some mismanagement, when the English ships entered the port and attacked the Dutch, they were fired on by the guns of the fort, and obliged to retire. De Witt now came with a strong fleet to convoy the merchantmen home, but they were dispersed by a storm (Sept. 4th), and Sandwich captured some ships of war and two of the Indiamen. As he plundered these last, and allowed his captains to do the same, he was deprived of his command, and sent as ambassador to Spain, as a cover to his disgrace.

The overthrow of the government in England by means of the discontented Presbyterians and republicans was one part of De Witt's plans, and he entered into correspondence with Ludlow, Sidney, and the other exiles, for this purpose. Lord Saye and some others formed a council at the Hague, and corresponded with their friends in England. An insignificant plot was discovered in London, during the height of the plague; and when the parliament met the following month, at Oxford, to grant supplies, an act was passed for attainting all British subjects who should continue in the service of the states.

The king of France, being bound by a treaty of alliance with the Dutch, was now required by them to share in the war. A French fleet being expected to join that of the Dutch, the English fleet, under the duke of Albemarle and Prince Rupert, put to sea. Rupert went, with twenty ships, in search of the French, who were said to be at Belle Isle; while Albemarle, with fifty-four, proceeded to the gun-fleet. To his surprise, he saw (June 1st, 1666) the Dutch fleet, of eighty sail, under De Ruyter and De Witt, lying off the North Foreland. Unequal as the numbers were, he resolved to fight, and bore down without any order. Most of the ships of the blue squadron, which led the van, were taken or disabled. Night ended the combat. Next morning (2nd) it was renewed. Sixteen fresh ships joined the Dutch, but the English again fought till night. Albemarle then burned a part of his disabled ships, and ordered the others to make for the nearest harbours. In the morning he had only sixteen ships to oppose to the enemy's pursuit. He had lost the *Prince Royal*, the finest ship in the navy, on the Galloper Sand, and the others were likely to share its fate, when Rupert, who had been recalled on the first day of the battle, at length came to his aid. The engagement was renewed the following morning (4th), but the hostile fleets were separated by a fog. Victory was with the Dutch, yet the English lost no honour. "They may be killed," said De Witt, "but they will not be conquered." The obstinacy and temerity of Albemarle were justly censured.

In July the fleets were again at sea; on the 25th an action was fought,

in which the advantage was on the side of the English, who now rode in triumph off the shores of Holland. Holmes, with a squadron of boats and fire-ships (Aug. 8th), entered the channel, where the Baltic traders lay, and burned one hundred and fifty of them, two men of war, and the adjoining town of Brandaris. De Witt, maddened at the sight, swore by almighty God that he would never sheath the sword till he had had revenge. He called on his French ally for prompt aid. Louis, who was exciting the discontented Irish Catholics to insurrection, and who had lately offered Algernon Sidney 20,000*l.* in aid of his project of raising the commonwealth party in England, would rather not put his fleet to hazard. He, however, ordered the duke de Beaufort, who was now at Rochelle, to advance and join De Ruyter. This admiral had already passed the strait of Dover, when Prince Rupert came in view. As De Ruyter himself was unwell and his men were little inclined to fight, he took shelter near Boulogne, and Rupert then sailed to engage Beaufort, who was coming up channel, but a violent wind forced him to take shelter at St. Helen's (Sept. 3), and Beaufort got into Dieppe.

The wind that blew the fleet to St. Helen's was a fatal wind to England. On the night of Sunday the 2nd, the great fire broke out.[l] And now, in Macaulay's words: "The discontent engendered by maladministration was heightened by calamities which the best administration could not have averted. While the ignominious war with Holland was raging, London suffered two great disasters, such as never, in so short a space of time, befel one city. A pestilence, surpassing in horror any that during three centuries had visited the island, swept away, in six months, more than a hundred thousand human beings. And scarcely had the dead cart ceased to go its rounds, when a fire, such as had not been known in Europe since the conflagration of Rome under Nero, laid in ruins the whole city, from the Tower to the Temple, and from the river to the purlieus of Smithfield."[h]

THE PLAGUE (1665 A.D.)

The June of 1665 came in with extraordinary heat. The previous winter and spring had been the driest that ever man knew. The summer was coming with the same cloudless sky. There was no grass in the meadows around London. "Strange comets, which filled the thoughts and writings of astronomers, did in the winter and spring a long time appear." The "great comet," says Burnet,[f] "raised the apprehensions of those who did not enter into just speculations concerning those matters." The boom of guns from the Norfolk coast is heard upon the Thames; and the merchants upon Change are anxiously waiting for letters from the fleet. In the coffee-houses, two subjects of news keep the gossipers in agitation — the Dutch fleet is off our coast, the plague is in the city. The 7th of June, writes Pepys,[m] was "the hottest day that ever I felt in my life. This day, much against my will, I did in Drury Lane see two or three houses marked with a red cross upon the doors, and 'Lord have mercy upon us' writ there; which was a sad sight to me, being the first of the kind that to my remembrance I ever saw."

The red cross upon the doors was too familiar to the elder population of London. In 1636, of twenty-three thousand deaths ten thousand were ascribed to the plague. The terrible visitor came to London, according to the ordinary belief, once in every twenty years, and then swept away a fifth of the inhabitants. From 1636 to 1647 there had been no cessation of the malady, which commonly carried off two or three thousand people annually. But after 1648 there had been no record of deaths from the plague amounting

[1665 A.D.]

to more than twenty, in any one year. In 1664 the bills of mortality only registered six deaths from this cause. The disease seemed almost to belong to another generation than that which had witnessed the triumph and the fall of Puritanism — which had passed from extreme formalism to extreme licentiousness.

How far the drunken revelries of the five years of the restoration might have predisposed the population to receive the disease, is as uncertain as any belief that the sobriety of the preceding time had warded it off. One condition of London was, however, unaltered. It was a city of narrow streets and of bad drainage. The greater number of houses were deficient in many of the accommodations upon which health, in a great degree, depends. The supply of water was far from sufficient for the wants of the poorer population; and with the richer classes the cost of water, supplied either by hand-labour or machinery, prevented its liberal use. The conduits, old or new, could only afford to fill a few water cans daily for household uses. There was much finery in the wealthy citizens' houses, but little cleanliness.

It is to be remarked, however, that the plague of 1665 was as fatal in the less crowded parts of Westminster and its suburbs, as in the City within the walls. Building had been going forward from the time of Elizabeth in St. Giles's-in-the-Fields, and in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; and we might conclude that the streets would be wider and the houses more commodious in these new parts than in the close thoroughfares, over which the projecting eaves had hung for many a year, shutting out air and light. But in these suburban liberties the plague of 1665 first raged, and then gradually extended eastward. On the 10th of June the disease broke out in the City, in the house of Dr. Burnett, a physician, in Fenchurch street.

Defoe's[n] famous *Journal of the Plague Year* has made this terrible season familiar to most readers. The spirit of accuracy is now more required than when the editor of a popular work informed his readers that Defoe continued in London during the whole time of the plague, and was one of the examiners appointed to shut up infected houses. Defoe, in 1665, was four years old. Yet the imaginary saddler of Whitechapel, who embodies the stories which this wonderful writer had treasured up from his childhood, relates nothing that is not supported by what we call authentic history. The "Citizen who continued all the while in London," as the title of Defoe's journal informs us, and whose dwelling was "without Aldgate, about midway between Aldgate church and Whitechapel bars," relates how, through May and June, the nobility and rich people from the west part of the city filled the broad street of Whitechapel with coaches and waggons and carts, all hurrying away with goods, women, servants, and children; how horsemen, with servants bearing their baggage, followed in this mournful cavalcade, from morning to night; how the lord mayor's doors were crowded with applicants for passes and certificates of health, for without these none would be allowed to enter the towns, or rest in any wayside inn. The citizen of Whitechapel thought "of the misery that was coming upon the city, and the unhappy condition of those who would be left in it." On the 21st of June, Pepys[m] writes, "I find all the town almost going out of town; the coaches and waggons being all full of people going into the country." In the country, the population dreaded to see the Londoners. Baxter[o] remarks, "How fearful people were thirty, or forty, if not an hundred miles from London, of anything that they bought from any mercer's or draper's shop; or of any goods that were brought to them; or of any persons that came to their houses. How they would shut their doors against their friends; and if a man passed over the fields, how one would avoid

another, as we did in the time of wars; and how every man was a terror to another." The Broadstone of East Retford, on which an exchange was made of money for goods, without personal communication, is an illustration of these rural terrors.

A panic very soon took possession of the population of London. They talked of the comet, "of a faint, dull, languid colour, and its motion very heavy, solemn, and slow." They read *Lilly's Almanac*," and *Gadbury's Astrological Predictions* and *Poor Robin's Almanac*, and these books "frightened them terribly." A man walked the streets day and night, at a swift pace, speaking to no one, but uttering only the words "O the great and the dreadful God!" These prognostications and threatenings came before the pestilence had become very serious; and they smote down the hearts of the people, and thus unfitted them for the duty of self-preservation, and the greater duty of affording help to others. Other impostors than the astrologers abounded. The mountebank was in the streets with his "infallible preventive pills," and "the only true plague-water." Pepys records that "my lady Carteret did this day give me a bottle of plague-water home with me." But gradually the astrologers and the quacks were left without customers, for London was almost wholly abandoned to the very poorest. Touchingly does Baxter say, "the calamities and cries of the diseased and impoverished are not to be conceived by those who are absent from them. The richer sort remaining out of the city, the greatest blow fell on the poor."

The court fled on the first appearance of the disease. Some few of the great remained, amongst others the stout old duke of Albemarle, who fearlessly chewed his tobacco at his mansion of the Cockpit. Marriages of the rich still went on.

The narrative of Defoe, and other relations, have familiarised most of us with the ordinary facts of this terrible calamity. We see the searchers, and nurses, and watchmen, and buryers marching in ominous silence through the empty streets, each bearing the red wand of office. We see them enter a suspected house, and upon coming out marking the door with the fatal red cross, a foot in length. If the sick within can pay, a nurse is left. We see the dead-cart going its rounds in the night, and hear the bell tinkling, and the buryers crying "Bring out your dead." Some of the infected were carried to the established pest houses, where the dead-cart duly received its ghastly load. The saddler of Whitechapel describes what he beheld at "the great pit of the churchyard of our parish at Aldgate:"

"I saw two links come over from the end of the Minories, and heard the bellman, and then appeared a dead-cart, as they called it, coming over the streets, so I could no longer resist my desire of seeing it, and went in. It had in it sixteen or seventeen bodies; some were wrapt up in linen sheets, some in rugs, some little other than naked, or so loose that what covering they had fell from them in the shooting out of the cart, and they fell quite naked amongst the rest; but the matter was not much to them, nor the indecency to any one else, seeing they were all dead, and were to be huddled together into the common grave of mankind, as we may call it, for here is no difference made, but poor and rich went together; there was no other way of burials, neither was it possible there should, for coffins were not to be had for the prodigious numbers that fell in such a calamity as this."

Soon, as Pepys tells us on the 12th of August, "the people die so, that now it seems they are fain to carry the dead to be buried by daylight, the night not sufficing to do it in."

The Reverend Thomas Vincent,[p] one of the non-conforming clergy who remained in the city, has thus described the scenes of August:

"Now people fall as thick as the leaves in autumn when they are shaken by a mighty wind. Now there is a dismal solitude in London streets; every day looks with the face of

[1665 A.D.]

a Sabbath-day, observed with a greater solemnity than it used to be in the city. Now shops are shut in, people rare and very few that walk about, insomuch that the grass begins to spring up in some places, and a deep silence in every place, especially within the walls. No prancing horses, no rattling coaches, no calling in customers nor offering wares, no London cries sounding in the ears. If any voice be heard it is the groans of dying persons breathing forth their last, and the funeral knells of them that are ready to be carried to their graves. Now shutting up of visited houses (there being so many) is at an end, and most of the well are mingled among the sick, which otherwise would have got no help. Now, in some places, where the people did generally stay, not one house in a hundred but what is affected; and in many houses half the family is swept away; in some, from the oldest to the youngest: few escape, but with the death of one or two. Never did so many husbands and wives die together; never did so many parents carry their children with them to the grave, and go together into the same house under earth who had lived together in the same house upon it. Now the nights are too short to bury the dead; the whole day, though at so great a length, is hardly sufficient to light the dead that fall thereon into their graves."

At the beginning of September the empty streets put on another aspect, equally fearful. The bonfire, which was the exhibition of gladness, was now the token of desolation. Every six houses on each side of the way were to be assessed towards the expense of maintaining one great fire in the middle of the street for the purification of the air — fires which were not to be extinguished by night or by day. A heavy rain put out these death-fires, and perhaps did far more good than this expedient.

As winter approached, the disease began rapidly to decrease.[1] Confidence a little revived. A few shops were again opened. The York waggon again ventured to go to London with passengers. At the beginning of 1666 "the town fills again." "Pray God," says Pepys, "continue the plague's decrease; for that keeps the court away from the place of business, and so all goes to rack as to public matters." He rides in Lord Brouncker's coach to Covent Garden: "What staring to see a nobleman's coach come to town. And porters everywhere bow to us: and such begging of beggars." The sordid and self-indulgent now began to come back: "January 22nd. The first meeting of Gresham College since the plague. Dr. Goddard did fill us with talk, in defence of his and his fellow-physicians' going out of town in the plague-time; saying that their particular patients were most gone out of town, and they left at liberty, and a great deal more." This is Pepys' entry of the 4th of February: "Lord's day: and my wife and I the first time together at church since the plague, and now only because of Mr. Mills his coming home to preach his first sermon; expecting a great excuse for his leaving the parish before anybody went, and now staying till all are come home: but he made but a very poor and short excuse, and a bad sermon." Defoe[n] tells, with the strictest accuracy, the mode in which the spiritual condition of the plague-struck city was attended to: "Though it is true that a great many of the clergy did shut up their churches, and fled, as other people did, for the safety of their lives, yet all did not do so; some ventured to officiate, and to keep up the assemblies of the people by constant prayers, and sometimes sermons, or brief exhortations to repentance and reformation, and this as long as they

[1 The decrease was as follows: 6,460, 5,720, 5,068, 1,806, 1,388, 1,787, 1,359, 905, 544. There was not a week in the year in which some cases of plague were not returned. Clarendon[q] with his usual inaccuracy, makes the number of dead, according to the weekly bills, to amount to 160,000, which, he says, ought, in the opinion of well-informed persons, to be doubled. The number of burials, according to the bills, was only 97,306. See the table prefixed to Hodges'[r] *Loimologia*. If we add one-third for omissions, the amount will be about 130,000; but from these must be deducted the deaths from other causes than the plague. In the tables themselves the deaths from the plague in this year are 68,596; in 1666 the are 1,996; in 1667, they fall to thirty-five, to fourteen in 1668, and after that seldom reach to half-a-dozen. In August of the following year it raged with violence in Colchester, Norwich, Winchester, Cambridge, and Salisbury.— LINGARD.[q]]

would hear them. And dissenters did the like also, and even in the very churches where the parish ministers were either dead or fled; nor was there any room for making any difference at such a time as this was." Baxter[o] also relates that, when "most of the conformable ministers fled, and left their flocks in the time of their extremity," the non-conforming ministers, who, since 1662, had done their work very privately, "resolved to stay with the people; and to go into the forsaken pulpits, though prohibited; and to preach to the poor people before they died; and also to visit the sick, and get what relief they could for the poor, especially those that were shut up." The reward which the non-conforming ministers received for their good work was The Five Mile Act.

The statute which popularly bore this name is entitled "An Act for restraining Non-conformists from inhabiting in Corporations." In consequence of the plague raging in London, the parliament met at Oxford on the 9th of October. Their first act was for a supply of 1,250,000*l*. Their second was what Hallam[e] calls this "new and more inevitable blow aimed at the fallen church of Calvin." All persons in holy orders who had not subscribed the Act of Uniformity were required to take the following oath: "I, A. B., do swear, that it is not lawful, under any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king; and that I do abhor the traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissionated by him, in pursuance of such commissions; and that I will not at any time endeavour any alteration of government either in church or state." In default of taking this oath they were forbidden to dwell, or come, unless upon the road, within five miles of any corporate town, or any other place where they had been ministers, or had preached, under a penalty of forty pounds and six months' imprisonment. They were also declared incapable of teaching in schools, or of receiving boarders. This act had for its object wholly to deprive the conscientious Puritans of any means of subsistence[1] connected with their former vocation of Christian ministers or instructors of youth. Hallam[e] truly says, "The Church of England had doubtless her provocations; but she made the retaliation much more than commensurate to the injury. No severity comparable to this cold-blooded persecution had been inflicted by the late powers, even in the ferment and fury of a civil war." An attempt was made to impose the non-resisting oath upon the whole nation; but it was defeated by a small majority.

The extent of the miseries inflicted by the plague in London was probably diminished by The Settlement Act of 1662. This was entitled An Act for the better relief of the Poor. The preamble of the statute declares the continual increase of the poor, not only within the cities of London and Westminster, but also through the whole kingdom; but there is little reason to doubt that the main object of the bill was to thrust out from the parishes of the metropolis, all chargeable persons occupying tenements under the yearly value of ten pounds. By this act the power of removal was first established — a measure which, however modified, has done as much evil to the labouring population in destroying their habits of self-dependence, as a legal provision for their support, prudently administered, has been a national blessing. The Settlement Act was carried by the metropolitan members, with little resistance from the country members. In 1675, in a debate on a bill for restraint of building near London, one member said that "by the late act the poor are hunted like foxes out of parishes, and whither must they go but where there

[1 Keightley[l] says it might almost be called a "bill of starvation."]

are houses?" Another declared that "the act for the settlement of the poor does, indeed, thrust all people out of the country to London." The intent of the framers of the act had probably been defeated by the reprisals of the rural magistrates and overseers. The system of hunting the poor went on amidst the perpetual litigation of nearly two centuries; and it is not yet come to an end.

The plague-year has passed; the "Year of Wonders" is come. Dryden[x] called his *Annus Mirabilis* "an historical poem." In his preface he says, "I have taken upon me to describe the motives, the beginning, progress, and successes, of a most just and necessary war; in it, the care, management, and prudence of our king; the conduct and valour of a royal admiral, and of two incomparable generals; the invincible courage of our captains and seamen; and three glorious victories, the result of all. After this, I have, in the fire, the most deplorable, but withal the greatest, argument that can be imagined: the destruction being so swift, so sudden, so vast and miserable, as nothing can parallel in story." The year 1666 is, indeed, an eventful year; and the relation of its miseries, so closely following upon the calamity of the plague, carries with it the consolation that the spirit of the English people, founded upon their industrious habits and their passion for liberty, has always been able to surmount the greatest political evils, and to acquire, even under the severest dispensations of providence, the courage and perseverance which convert chastisements into blessings.

THE GREAT LONDON FIRE OF 1666

The story of the great fire of London has been related with minuteness by many trustworthy observers. We can place ourselves in the midst of this extraordinary scene, and make ourselves as familiar with its details as if the age of newspapers had arrived, and a host of reporters had been engaged in collecting every striking incident. But it is not in the then published narratives that we find those graphic touches which constitute the chief interest of this event at the present time. Half a century ago the materials for a faithful record of the great fire were to be sought in the report of a committee of the house of commons, in the state trials, and in various tracts issued at the period. There are also several striking passages of Baxter's[o] *Life*, which relate to the fire. But such notices are meagre compared with the personal records in the two remarkable diaries which have been rescued from obscurity during our own day.

We are with Mr. Pepys[m] in his nightgown at three o'clock in the morning of Sunday, the 2nd of September, looking out of his window in Seething Lane, at the east end of the city, and, thinking the fire far enough off, going to sleep again. We accompany him later in the morning to a high place in the Tower, and see the houses near London Bridge on fire. The weather is hot and dry, and a furious east wind is blowing. The active Mr. Pepys takes a boat from the Tower stairs; and slowly sculling up stream, looks upon the burning houses in the streets near the Thames; distracted people getting their goods on board lighters; and the inhabitants of the houses at the water's edge not leaving till the fire actually reached them. He has time to look at the pigeons — of which the Londoners generally were then as fond as the Spitalfields weavers of our time — hovering about the windows and balconies till they burned their wings and fell down.

There is nobody attempting to quench the fire in that high wind. Everything is combustible after the long drought. Human strength seems in vain,

and the people give themselves up to despair. The busy secretary of the navy reaches Whitehall, and tells his story to the king; and he entreats his majesty to order houses to be pulled down, for nothing less would stop the fire. The king desires Pepys to go to the lord mayor, and give him this command. In Cannon street he encounters the lord mayor, who cries, like a fainting woman, "Lord! what can I do? I am spent. People will not obey me." He had been pulling down houses. He did not want any soldiers. He had been up all night, and must go home and refresh himself. There is no service in the churches, for the people are crowding them with their goods. He walks through the streets; and again he takes boat at Paul's wharf. He now meets the king and the duke of York in their barge. They ordered that houses should be pulled down apace; but the fire came on so fast that little could be done. We get glimpses in this confusion of the domestic habits of the citizens. "The river full of lighters and boats taking in goods; and good goods swimming about in the water; and I observed that hardly one lighter or boat in three that had the goods of a house in, but there was a pair of virginals in it." The severer Puritans had not driven out the old English love of music; the citizens' wives and daughters still had the imperfect spinet upon which Elizabeth and her maids of honour played.

That hot September evening is spent by our observer upon the water. Showers of fire-drops are driving in his face. He sees the fiery flakes shooting up from one burning house, and then dropping upon another five or six houses off, and setting that on flame. The roofs were in many streets only thatched: the walls were mostly timber. Warehouses in Thames street were stored with pitch, and tar, and oil, and brandy. The night came on; and then Pepys, from a little alehouse on the Bankside, saw the fire grow, and shoot out between churches and houses, "in a most horrid, malicious, bloody flame, not like the fire flame of an ordinary fire." And then, as it grew darker, he saw the fire up the hill in an arch of above a mile long. Then rose the moon shedding a soft light over the doomed city; and amidst the terrible glare and the gentle radiance the whole world of London was awake, gazing upon the conflagration, or labouring to save something from its fury.

We turn to the diary of Evelyn[8] — a more elegant writer than Pepys, but scarcely so curious an observer of those minute points that give life to a picture. He has seen the fire from the Bankside on Sunday afternoon; and on Monday he returns to see the whole south part of the city burning. It was now taking hold of the great cathedral, which was surrounded by scaffolds for its repair. "The noise and cracking and thunder of the impetuous flames, the shrieking of women and children, the hurry of people, the fall of towers, houses, and churches, was like a hideous storm; and the air all about so hot and inflamed, that at the last one was not able to approach it, so that they were forced to stand still, and let the flames burn on, which they did, for near two miles in length and one in breadth. The clouds, also, of smoke were dismal, and reached, upon computation, near fifty miles in length. Thus I left it this afternoon burning, a resemblance of Sodom, or the last day. The ruins resembled the picture of Troy. London was, but is no more."

On Tuesday, the 4th, Evelyn saw that the fire had reached as far as the Inner Temple. "All Fleet street, the Old Bailey, Ludgate Hill, Warwick lane, Newgate, Paul's chain, Watling street, now flaming, and most of it reduced to ashes; the stones of Paul's flew like grenados, the melting lead running down the streets in a stream, and the very pavements glowing with fiery redness, so as no horse, nor man, was able to tread on them, and the demolition had stopped all the passages, so that no help could be applied: the eastern

[1666 A.D.]

wind still more impetuously driving the flames forward." On that day the houses near the Tower were blown up; and the same judicious plan was pursued in other places. On the 5th the court at Whitehall was in unwonted bustle. The king and his brother had set an excellent example of personal activity; and gentlemen now took charge of particular streets, and directed the means of extinguishing the flames. The people now began to bestir themselves. The civic authorities no longer rejected the advice, which some seamen had given at first, to blow up the houses before the flames reached them, instead of attempting to pull them down. The wind abated. Large gaps were made in the streets. The desolation did not reach beyond the Temple westward, nor beyond Smithfield on the north. On Wednesday, the 5th, the mighty devourer was arrested in his course. Three days and three nights of agony had been passed; but not more than eight lives had been lost. Mr. Pepys at last lies down and sleeps soundly. He has one natural remark: "It is a strange thing to see how long this time did look since Sunday, having been always full of variety of actions, and little sleep, that it looked like a week or more, and I had forgot almost the day of the week."

Whilst indifferent spectators were gazing on the fire from Bankside, and the high grounds on the south of the Thames, the fields on the north were filled with houseless men, women, and children. "I went," says Evelyn,[s] "towards Islington and Highgate, where one might have seen two hundred thousand people, of all ranks and degrees, dispersed and lying along by their heaps of what they could save from the fire, deploring their loss; and, though ready to perish for hunger and destitution, yet not asking one penny for relief." There were liberal contributions from the king, and the nobility, and the clergy. Collections were made and distributed in alms to the most needy. But the real difficulty must have been to ensure a supply of food, when all the usual channels of interchange were choked up. Proclamations were made for the country people to bring in provisions. Facilities were offered to the people to leave the ruins, by a command that they should be received in all cities and towns to pursue their occupations: and that such reception should entail no eventual burthen on parishes. No doubt it was necessary to strive against the selfishness that vast calamities too often produce in the sufferers and the lookers-on. The country people for miles around had gazed upon the flames. There was an immense destruction of books; and their half-burnt leaves were carried by the wind even as far as Windsor. The dense cloud of smoke shut out the bright autumn sun from the harvest-fields, and upon distant roads men travelled in the shade. The extent of the calamity was apparant. Yet it may be doubted if many of the great ones received the visitation in a right spirit. Pepys says, "none of the nobility came out of the country at all, to help the king, or comfort him, or prevent commotions at this fire." Some of the insolent courtiers exulted in the destruction, saying according to Baxter[o]: "Now the rebellious city is ruined, the king is absolute, and was never king indeed till now." One profligate "young commander" of the fleet "made mighty sport of it;" and rejoiced that the corruption of the citizens' wives might be effected at a very reduced cost.

The monument erected in commemoration of the fire has an elaborate Latin inscription, in which it is set forth that the destruction comprised eighty-nine churches, the city gates, Guildhall, many public structures, hospitals, schools, libraries; a vast number of stately edifices; thirteen thousand two hundred dwelling-houses, four hundred streets. An account, which estimates the houses burnt at twelve thousand, values them at an average rent of 25*l.* a

year, and their value, at twelve years' purchase, at £3,600,000. The public buildings destroyed are valued at £1,800,000: the private goods at the same rate. With other items, the total amount of the loss is estimated at £7,335,000.

But the interruption to industry must have involved even a more serious loss of the national capital. We have stated, on the authority of Clarendon [q] how the plague had rendered it difficult to collect the revenue. He says of the necessities of the crown in 1666, "Now this deluge by fire had dissipated the persons, and destroyed the houses, which were liable to the re-imbursement of all arrears; and the very stocks were consumed which should carry on and revive the trade."

The monument, which was erected on the spot where the fire first broke out, recorded that the burning of this Protestant city was begun and carried on by the treachery and malice of a popish faction. [In Pope's phrase the monument, "Like a tall bully, lifts its head and lies." This was true for a century and three quarters until December 6, 1830.] Then the corporation of London wisely obliterated the offensive record. In the examinations before the committee of the house of commons, there was nothing beyond the most vague babble of the frightened and credulous, except the self-accusation of one Hubert, a French working-silversmith, who maintained that he was the incendiary. He was hanged, much to the disgrace of the administration of justice. "Neither the judges," says Clarendon, [q] "nor any present at the trial did believe him guilty; but that he was a poor distracted wretch, weary of his life, and chose to part with it this way."

A medal was struck in commemoration of the plague and fire. The eye of God is in the centre; one comet is showering down pestilence and another flame. The east wind is driving on the flames. Death in the foreground is encountering an armed horseman. The legend is "*Sic punit*" — So he punishes.

WREN'S PLAN FOR REBUILDING THE CITY

The noble cathedral of St. Paul's, and many churches which exhibit the genius of Sir Christopher Wren in many graceful original forms of towers and spires, grew out of the great fire. But the occasion was lost for a nobler city to arise, of wide streets, and handsome quays. The old wooden fabrics were replaced by those of brick; but the same narrow thoroughfares were preserved as of old. The owners of property could not be brought to unite in any common plan; and each built his house up again, upon his own spot of ground. The constant labour of succeeding times, has been to clear away, at enormous cost, what the fire had cleared away in three days and nights. This want of co-operative action was not the result of any ignorance of what required to be done. Wren's [t] labours and wishes are thus recorded: "In order to a proper reformation, Wren, pursuant to the royal command, immediately after the fire, took an exact survey of the whole area and confines of the burning, having traced over with great trouble and hazard the great plain of ashes and ruins; and designed a plan or model of a new city, in which the deformity and inconveniences of the old town were remedied, by the enlarging the streets and lanes, and carrying them as near parallel to one another as might be; avoiding, if compatible with greater conveniences, all acute angles; by seating all the parochial churches conspicuous and insular; by forming the most public places into large piazzas, the centre of six or eight ways; by uniting the halls of the twelve chief companies into one regular square annexed to Guildhall;

[1666 A.D.]

by making a quay on the whole bank of the river, from Blackfriars to the Tower. . . . . The streets to be of three magnitudes; the three principal leading straight through the city, and one or two cross streets, to be at least ninety feet wide; others sixty feet; and lanes about thirty feet, excluding all narrow dark alleys without thoroughfares, and courts. . . . . The practicability of this scheme, without loss to any man or infringement of any property, was at that time demonstrated, and all material objections fully weighed and answered. The only, and as it happened insurmountable, difficulty remaining, was the obstinate averseness of great part of the citizens to alter their old properties, and to recede from building their houses again on the old ground and foundations; as also the distrust in many and unwillingness to give up their properties, though for a time only, into the hands of public trustees, or commissioners, till they might be dispensed to them again, with more advantage to themselves than otherwise was possible to be effected. . . . The opportunity in a great degree was lost of making the new city the most magnificent, as well as commodious for health and trade, of any upon earth."



SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN
(1632–1723)

The flames of London were still smouldering when the parliament met at Westminster on the 21st of September. The king said, "Little time hath passed, since we were almost in despair of having this place left us to meet in; you see the dismal ruins the fire hath made." There had been a prorogation for ten months. But money was wanting. "I desire," said Charles, "to put you to as little trouble as I can; and I can tell you truly, I desire to put you to as little cost as is possible. I wish with all my heart that I could have the whole charge of this war myself, and that my subjects should reap the benefit of it to themselves." No doubt it was very disagreeable that the king's subjects, being called upon to pay largely, should by any possibility take the liberty of asking what they were to pay for. Clarendon[q] tells us of the somewhat dangerous temper which was spreading after the experience of six years and a half of the happy restoration. "Though they made the same professions of affection and duty to the king they had ever done, they did not conceal the very ill opinion they had of the court and the continual riotings there." They were tending to the accomplishment of Harrington's prophecy as quoted by Aubrey:[u] "Well! The king will come in. Let him come in, and call a parliament of the greatest cavaliers in England, so they be men of estates, and let them sit but for seven years, and they will all turn commonwealth's men."

A bill was brought in for the appointment of commissioners "to examine all accounts of those who had received or issued out any moneys for this war;

and where they found any persons faulty, and who had broken their trust, they should be liable to such punishment as the parliament should think fit." To such a bill the king was resolved never to give the royal assent. This is Clarendon's relation of the matter; and yet he is not ashamed to say that he urged the king "to prevent the excesses in parliament, and not to suffer them to extend their jurisdiction to cases they have nothing to do with." Hallam[e] says, "Such a slave was Clarendon to his narrow prepossessions, that he would rather see the dissolute excesses which he abhorred suck nourishment from that revenue which had been allotted to maintain the national honour and interests, and which, by its deficiencies thus aggravated, had caused even in this very year the navy to be laid up, and the coasts to be left defenceless, than suffer them to be restrained by the only power to which thoughtless luxury would submit." Every effort was made to oppose the bill; and the parliament was prorogued in 1667 without its being passed. Next year, 1668, the parliament carried its salutary measure of control. A supply of £1,800,000 was granted; and at the prorogation the king said, "I assure you the money shall be laid out for the ends it is given."

The calamities which London had endured of pestilence and conflagration were not wholly unacceptable to the corrupt court. Clarendon[q] informs us that there were those about the king, who assured him that the fire "was the greatest blessing that God had ever conferred on him, his restoration only excepted; for the walls and gates being now burned and thrown down of that rebellious city, which was always an enemy to the crown, his majesty would never suffer them to repair and build them up again, to be a bit in his mouth, and a bridle upon his neck; but would keep all open, that his troops might enter upon them whenever he thought it necessary for his service, there being no other way to govern that rude multitude but by force." Charles was not pleased with these suggestions, adds Clarendon. Desirable as it might be to have the Londoners under his feet at this time of their desolation, there was still the old spirit abroad in England. The indiscretion of the king, to apply the least offensive term to his conduct, was sufficient to alienate the affection which had been so lavishly bestowed upon him, even if the people, with their bitter experience, stopped short of rebellion. There were large numbers of the humbler retainers of the royal household who, when Lady Castlemain ordered of her tradesmen every jewel and service of plate that she fancied, and told her servant to send a note of their cost to the privy purse, were themselves absolutely starving.

It sounds very like exaggeration when we read that one of the king's musicians, "Evans, the famous man upon the harp, having not his equal in the world, did the other day die for mere want, and was fain to be buried by the alms of the parish." But this is not idle gossip of Pepys. There is an account in existence of "The state of the Treasurer of the Chamber, his office, at Midsummer, 1665," which shows the yearly payments due to officers of the king's household, and of the sums "behind unpaid." There were forty-two musicians, to whom their salaries had been due for three years and one quarter. High and low, the Bishop Almoner and the rat-killer, the Justice in Oyer beyond Trent and the bird-keeper, footmen, falconers, huntsmen, bear-warders, wardrobe officers, watermen, messengers, yeomen of the guard, and many others, useful or useless, had been "behind unpaid," some for five years, some for four years, some for three or two years, very few only for one year. To three apothecaries, more than 5,000*l.* was due. That these persons, frequenting the coffee-houses or ale-houses of London, did not spread abroad their griefs, cannot reasonably be imagined.

[1666 A.D.]

A sullen discontent, a silent indignation, settled deep into the hearts of the whole community. If a sword had been drawn against the English people, there would have been another civil war, with one certain result. Men were satisfied for twenty years longer to endure and murmur. "It is strange how everybody do now-a-days reflect upon Oliver, and commend him, what brave things he did, and made all the neighbour princes fear him; while here a prince, come in with all the love and prayers and good-liking of his people, who have given greater signs of loyalty and willingness to serve him with their estates than ever was done by any people, hath lost all so soon, that it is a miracle what way a man could devise to lose so much in so little time." Not at all strange, Mr. Pepys, that the people looked back upon Oliver, and what brave things he did. But the vicissitudes of nearly twenty years — the dread of property becoming insecure — the religious divisions — the respect for the monarchical principle, however degraded in the immediate wearer of the crown — the love for the ancient church, amidst all its pride and intolerance — these considerations kept the Englishmen quiet.

On the 31st of December, 1666, Pepys, the official person who had the most intimate knowledge of the affairs of the navy thus writes in his diary: "Thus ends this year of public wonder and mischief to this nation. Public matters in a most sad condition; seamen discouraged for want of pay, and are become not to be governed: nor, as matters are now, can any fleet go out next year. A sad, vicious, negligent court, and all sober men there fearful of the ruin of the whole kingdom this next year; from which, good God deliver us." Such ships as were in commission were commanded by haughty young nobles, wholly ignorant of naval affairs. One of these fair-weather captains, a son of Lord Bristol, was heard to say that he hoped not to see "a tarpawlin" in command of a ship for a twelvemonth. The honest tarpawlins confessed that "the true English valour we talk of is almost spent and worn out."

Direful calamities had not broken the national spirit; but the infamous corruption of the higher classes was eating into the foundation of England's greatness. Her people were losing that masculine simplicity, that healthy devotion to public and private duties, that religious earnestness — intolerant, no doubt, but rarely simulated by the followers of Calvin or the followers of Arminius in the greatest heat of their conflicts — the English were losing that nationality, whose excess may be ludicrous, but whose utter want is despicable. Their high intellect was being emasculated by a corrupt literature. Science was groping in the dark under the auspices of the Royal Society; and divinity was holding forth from orthodox pulpits on the excesses of the early reformers, and the duty of non-resistance to kings deriving their power direct from heaven. These follies probably did little harm; and men gradually shook off their delusions, and went forward to seek for experimental science that had useful ends, and for practical theology that would make them wiser and happier.

But the corruptions of the court soon worked upon the principles of the people, through a debasing popular literature. The drama had come back after an exile of twenty years. When the drama was banished, tragedy was still a queen wearing her purple and her pall; and the "wood-notes wild" of comedy were as fresh and joyous as those of the lark in spring. The drama came back in the shameless garb, and with the brazen look, and the drunken voice, of the lowest strumpet. The people were to be taught that Shakespeare was a barbarian, and not to be tolerated in his own simplicity. He was, if heard at all, to furnish the *libretto* of an opera, to be got up with dresses and decorations by Sir William D'Avenant. "I saw," says Evelyn[s] in 1662,

"*Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, played; but now the old plays began to disgust this refined age, since his majesty being so long abroad." This refined age when it brought women to personate female characters, heard from the lips of Nell Gwyn and Mary Davis, the foulest verses, which they were selected to speak to furnish additional relish to the licentiousness of the poet.

The theatre was at the very height of fashion when it was most shameless. The actresses were removed from "The King's House," to become the mistresses of the king, by their gradual promotion from being the mistresses of the king's servants. Nell threw up her parts, and would act no more when Lord Buckhurst gave her a hundred a year, in 1667. In 1671, when Mr. Evelyn walked with the king through St. James's Park, Mrs. Nell looked out of her garden on a terrace at the top of the wall, and there was "familiar discourse" between his majesty and the "impudent comedian," at which scene Mr. Evelyn was "heartily sorry." It was well for England that her salt had not wholly lost its savour; that the middle class of London, though they rushed to the savage bull-baitings of the bear-garden, which had been shut up during the time of the Long Parliament, were too indignant at the costliness of the court to be enamoured of its gilded profligacy. It was better still for England that some little of the old Puritan spirit was left amongst the humblest classes — that the Bible was read by the poor, and Rochester and Shadwell were to them unknown.

Amidst the abandonment of the court to its pleasures — the rapacity of the royal favourites, who received gratuities and pensions not to be counted by hundreds but by thousands of pounds — the jealousy of the parliament in granting money which they knew would be wasted — the spring of 1667 arrived, without any preparations for carrying on the naval war. When the king's treasurer had got some of the money which the house of commons tardily voted, there were more pressing necessities to be supplied than the pay of sailors, or the fitting out of ships.

On the 23rd of January, the sailors were in mutiny at Wapping, and the Horse Guards were going to quell them. They were in insurrection for the want of pay. When the money was obtained from parliament they still mutinied, for they were still unpaid. On the 5th of June the Portuguese ambassador had gone on board *The Happy Return*, in the Hope, ordered to sail for Holland; but the crew refused to go until they were paid. Other ships were in mutiny the same day. On the 8th of June the Dutch fleet of eighty sail was off Harwich. It was time to stir. The king sent Lord Oxford to raise the militia of the eastern counties; and "my Lord Barkeley is going down to Harwich also to look after the militia there; and there is also the duke of Monmouth, and with him a great many young Hectors, the Lord Chesterfield, my Lord Mandeville, and others"; but, adds Pepys,[m] "to little purpose, I fear, but to debauch the country women thereabouts."

On the 10th of June the Dutch were at the Nore. Then, indeed, the matter was past the skill of the "young Hectors." The enemy had advanced almost as high as the Hope. Monk has rushed down to Gravesend — "in his shirt," writes Andrew Marvell.[n] Money is now forthcoming to pay the revolted seamen; but, sighs Pepys, "people that have been used to be deceived by us as to money won't believe us; and we know not, though we have it, how almost to promise it." The Dutch fleet has dropped down to Sheerness. "The alarm was so great," writes Evelyn,[o] "that it put both country and city into fear — a panic and consternation, such as I hope I shall never see more; everybody was flying, none knew why or whither." Monk was at Gravesend, "with a great many idle lords and gentlemen." Opposite them was Tilbury.

[1667 A.D.]

Did any of these "idle lords and gentlemen, with their pistols and fooleries," think of the time when the great queen stood like a rock upon that shore; and her people gathered round her with invincible confidence; and the greatest armament that ever threatened England was scattered by her true gentlemen — the Raleighs and Carews, who loved their country with a filial love, and hurled foul scorn at the invader? Charles, if not belied by the Dutch, was deliberating in council on the propriety of a flight to Windsor, by way of example to his terrified people.

On the 11th, news came to London that Sheerness was taken. The drums were beating all night for the trained-bands to be in arms in the morning, with bullets and powder, and a fortnight's victuals. The Londoners were momentarily relieved of their panic; for the Dutch fleet had sailed up the Medway. Chatham was safe, the courtiers said. Monk had stopped the river with chains and booms; and Upnor Castle was fortified. Chains and booms, and Upnor Castle, availed not long against the resolution of Ruyter and De Witt, who were about to exact the penalty for the wanton desolation of the coasts of the Texel. They went about their work in a manly way — not burning Gravesend, which was really defenceless, but breaking through the defences of the Medway, behind which our ships lay unrigged. They were quickly set on fire. In Upnor Castle and the forts at Chatham, there was little ammunition; and the Dutch "made no more of Upnor Castle's shooting, than of a fly."

The proud ship which bore the king to England, *The Royal Charles*, was secured by the invaders as a trophy; and when they had made their strength sufficiently manifest to the panic-stricken sycophants of the depraved court, they quietly sailed back to the Thames, and enforced a real blockade of London for many weeks.

The spirit of patriotism was trodden out of the sailors by neglect and oppression. There were many of them on board the Dutch ships, who called out to their countrymen on the river, "We did heretofore fight for tickets; now we fight for dollars." The sailors' wives went up and down the streets of Wapping, crying "This comes of your not paying our husbands." Mobs assembled at Westminster, shouting for "a parliament, a parliament." They broke the Lord Chancellor's windows, and set up a gibbet before his gate. Had the Dutch gone up the Thames beyond Deptford, it is not impossible that the iniquities of the Stuarts might have more quickly come to an end. Such a consummation was not to be desired. The English people had to endure two more decades of misrule, that they might gather strength to fit themselves for constitutional government. Besides the disgrace and humiliation, England suffered little from the Dutch in the Thames and the Medway. The Londoners were cut off from their supply of sea-borne coal — no irremediable evil in summer, but one that probably hastened a peace. On the 28th the Dutch fleet was lying triumphantly at the Nore — "a dreadful spectacle," says Evelyn,[8] "as every Englishman saw, and a dishonour never to be wiped off." It was a spectacle of dishonour which has never been seen since, and will never be seen again, unless there should again be such a combination of anti-national elements as in the days of Charles the Second — a profligate and corrupt court, avaricious and selfish ministers, a bribed parliament, an intolerant church, a slavish bench of justice. The disgrace of 1667 will not have been in vain, if it teach the great lesson that the corruption of the high is the corruption of the national honour at its fountain head. On the 29th of July a treaty of peace between England, Holland, and France, was concluded at Breda.

THE FALL OF CLARENDON (1667 A.D.)

The fall of Lord Clarendon from power, in 1667, is one of those events whose causes can only be adequately developed, if they can ever be fully and satisfactorily set forth, through an intimate acquaintance with the public documents and private memorials of the period. A faint outline of these combinations, in connection with an estimate of the character of the fallen man, is all that we can pretend to offer.

Sir Edward Hyde, of all the companions of the adversity of Charles, was by far the fittest minister to guide him through the extreme difficulties of his altered position. He was hated by the queen-mother. His habits of thought and action were diametrically opposed to the levities and vices of the king and the younger courtiers. He had many early associations with the struggle for civil rights, which made him a stumbling-block in the way of any broad attempts to emulate the despotisms of other European monarchies. He was by principle and education devotedly attached to the Protestantism of the Church of England. He was thus no object of affection amongst many whose poverty he had shared, but from whose habits he was altogether alien. But his great abilities were indispensable to Charles; and thus Sir Edward Hyde became the earl of Clarendon, lord chancellor, and the real minister of England, all other administrative functionaries being subordinate to him. It was necessary to govern through parliaments; and Clarendon, by his experience, his dignified carriage, his rhetorical and literary powers, was eminently fitted for the duties of a parliamentary minister.

He was for a while all-successful. The rooted dislike of the queen-mother was neutralised, even to the point of her graciously receiving the plebeian duchess of York. The king and his associates were compelled to manifest respect to the decorous chancellor, and to compensate their submission to his wisdom by their ridicule of his manners. He was hated by the king and the favourites because he had not, when the parliament was lavish and the nation mad, extracted from the temper of the hour a far greater fixed revenue, such as would have made parliaments less necessary for the king. But when parliament had the presumption to ask for an account of the disposal of the sums that had been voted, then Clarendon's opposition to any interference with the old power of the crown made his conscientious scruples about the limits of prerogative less obnoxious. The principles of the man were not fitted for the retrogressive objects of the crown, or the progressive movement of the nation. The triumphs of statesmanship are not to be accomplished like the victory of the deliverers of Gideon, whilst the sun remains in the same place of the heavens.

As early as 1663, the earl of Bristol, a Catholic peer, in his seat in parliament, attributing to the lord chancellor all the evils under which the country laboured, impeached him of high-treason. The opinion of the judges was required; and they answered, that by the laws of the realm no articles of high-treason could be originally exhibited in the house of peers, by any one peer against another; and that the matters alleged in the charge against the lord chancellor did not amount to treason. Personal hostility appears to have provoked this ill-judged attack. Four years afterwards it was pretty well known that the king was alienated from his grave adviser. Clarendon had made enemies all around him by his faults as well as by his virtues. He was haughty and passionate. He was grasping and ostentatious. He had returned from exile in the deepest poverty. In seven years he had acquired a sufficient fortune to build a mansion superior to ducal palaces, and to fur-

[1667 A.D.]

nish it with the most costly objects of taste and luxury. He was envied by the nobility. He was hated by the people; for in the grandeur of what they called "Dunkirk House" they saw what they believed to be the evidence of foreign bribery

The duke of Buckingham had been banished from court through a quarrel with Lady Castlemain; and revenge threw him into the ranks of those to whom the government was obnoxious. He became the advocate of the sectaries; he became the avowed and especial enemy of the chancellor. For a short time he was sent to the Tower, upon the supposed discovery of some treasonable intrigues; but he soon regained his liberty, and his royal master was propitiated when the duke had made his peace with "the lady." She interceded for Buckingham; but at first was unsuccessful. The court tattle said that the king had called Castlemain a jade that meddled with things she had nothing to do with; and that Castlemain called the king a fool, who suffered his businesses to be carried on by those who did not understand them. But very soon "the lady" carried her point; Buckingham was restored to favour; Clarendon was sacrificed.

Charges of the most serious nature were got up against him. The imputation of having sold Dunkirk for his private advantage was confidently maintained. Charles, through the duke of York, asked Clarendon to resign. He indignantly refused, saying, that his resignation would amount to a confession of guilt. After a conference of two hours the great minister saw that his disgrace was resolved upon — disgrace which "had been certainly designed in my lady Castlemain's chamber." On the 15th of October, the two houses voted an address of thanks to the throne for the removal of the chancellor, and the king in his reply pledged himself never to employ Lord Clarendon again in any capacity. This was not enough. Seventeen charges were prepared against him by a committee of the commons; and on the 12th of November the house impeached him of high-treason at the bar of the peers. There were animated debates in that house, in which Clarendon had many supporters. The two houses got angry. The court became alarmed. Clarendon was advised to leave the kingdom clandestinely, but he refused. Then the king sent him an express command to retire to the Continent. He obeyed; addressing a letter, vindicating himself, to the house of peers. An act was passed on the 29th of December, banishing him for life, unless he should return by the following 1st of February.

The close of the political career of Clarendon, under circumstances of punishment and disgrace so disproportioned to his public or private demerits, has left no stain upon his memory. Whatever were his faults as a statesman, he stands upon a far higher elevation than the men who accomplished his ruin. As to the king, his parasites and his mistresses, who were in raptures to be freed from his observation and censure, their dislike was Clarendon's high praise. In the encouragement which Charles indirectly gave to attacks upon the minister who had saved him from many of the worst consequences of the rashness of the royalists, and had laboured in the service of his father and himself for twenty-seven years, either in war, or in exile, or in triumph, with a zeal and ability which no other possessed, we see only the heartless ingratitude of the king, and his utterly selfish notions of the duties of a sovereign. Clarendon had become disagreeable to him through the very qualities which made the government endurable to high-minded and sober men. Clarendon went into exile. It was some time before he was permitted to find a resting place; but he found it at last at Montpelier. He was probably never sincerely reconciled to the loss of power and grandeur; but he

believed that he was reconciled; and in dedicating himself to a renewal of that literary employment which has given him the best title to the respectful remembrance of mankind, he found that consolation which industry never failed to bestow upon a robust understanding, that was also open to religious impressions.

BUCKINGHAM AND THE CABAL MINISTRY

When the seals were taken away from Clarendon they were given to Sir Orlando Bridgman. The conduct of affairs fell into new hands. Southampton, the most respectable of Charles' first advisers was dead. Monk was worn out. Buckingham first came into power with Arlington as secretary of state, and Sir William Coventry. But soon the ministry comprised the five persons known as "The Cabal" — a name which signified what we now call the cabinet; but which name was supposed incorrectly to have been formed out of the initial letters of the names of the members — Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, Lauderdale. The word cabal had been used long before, to indicate a secret council.

Of the new advisers of Charles, Buckingham was the most influential at court, and he made great efforts to be at the same time the most popular. When Buckingham was taken to the Tower, Clarendon was depressed by the acclamations of the people, who shouted round the prisoner. As Clarendon had supported the church, Buckingham was the champion of the sectaries. Baxter[o] says, "As the chancellor had made himself the head of the prelatical party, who were all for setting up themselves by force, and suffering none that were against them, so Buckingham would now be the head of all those parties that were for liberty of conscience." The candid non-conformist adds, "For the man was of no religion, but notoriously and professedly lustful"; but he qualifies his censure with this somewhat high praise — "and yet of greater wit and parts, and sounder principles as to the interests of humanity and the common good, than most lords in the court." The duke lived in York House, the temporary palace which his father had built, of which nothing now remains but the Water Gate. Here he dwelt during the four or five years of the Cabal administration, affording, as he always continued to afford, abundant materials for the immortal character of Zimri in Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel":

> "A man so various, that he seem'd to be
> Not one, but all mankind's epitome:
> Stiff in opinion, always in the wrong,
> Was every thing by starts and nothing long;
> But, in the course of one revolving moon,
> Was chemist, fiddler, statesman, and buffoon:
> Then all for women, painting, rhyming, drinking,
> Besides ten thousand freaks that died in thinking."

Ashley, afterwards earl of Shaftesbury — the Antony Ashley Cooper of the protectorate, who clung to the Rump Parliament till he saw that Monk had sealed its fate, and then made his peace with Charles with surprising readiness — the ablest, and in some respects the most incomprehensible of the statesmen of his time — has had the double immortality of the satire of Butler as well as of Dryden. In Thanet House, in Aldersgate street, Ashley was at hand to influence the politics of the city. When the mob were roasting rumps in the streets, and were about to handle him roughly as he passed in his carriage, he turned their anger into mirth by his jokes. When the king

[1667 A.D.]

frowned upon him he went straight from office to opposition, and made the court disfavour as serviceable to his ambition as the court's honours and rewards.

The history of the Cabal ministry, which extends over a period of six years, is not the history of a cabinet united by a common principle of agreement upon great questions of domestic and foreign policy. Nor is it the history of a sovereign asserting his own opinions, and watching over the administration of affairs, under the advice of a council, and through the agency of the great officers of state. Charles I, whether aiming to be despotic, or struggling for his crown and his life, was zealous, active, and self-confident. Charles II was absolutely indifferent to any higher objects than personal gratification; and to this circumstance we must refer some of the extraordinary anomalies of the government after the fall of Clarendon. He was neither honest nor able, with reference to any aptitude for the condition of life to which he was called. He did not desire, he said, to sit like a Turkish sultan, and sentence men to the bowstring; but he could not endure that a set of fellows should inquire into his conduct. Always professing his love of parliaments, he was always impatient of their interference. With such a sovereign, as utterly indifferent to the proprieties of his public station as to the decencies of his private life, we can scarcely expect that there should have been any consistent principle of administration. The terrible experience of thirty years imposed upon Charles some caution in the manifestation of his secret desire to be as absolute as his brother Louis of France. The great Bourbon was encumbered with no parliament; he had not to humble himself to beg for supplies of insolent commons; he was not troubled with any set of fellows to inquire into his conduct, and ask for accounts of expenditure; he had the gabelle and other imposts which fell upon the prostrate poor, without exciting the animosity of the dangerous rich; he was indeed a king, whose shoe-latchet nobles were proud to unloose, and whose transcendent genius and virtue prelates rejoiced to compare with the divine attributes. Such a blissful destiny as that of the Bourbon could not befall the Stuart by ordinary means. Charles would become as great as Louis, as far as his notion of greatness went, by becoming the tributary of Louis. He would sell his country's honour — he would renounce the religion he had sworn to uphold — for an adequate price. But this bargain should be a secret one. It should be secret even from a majority of his own ministers. Upon this point hinges the disgraceful history of the Cabal.

The story of the next twenty years, which brings us to the great era of our modern history, would be incomprehensible, if we did not constantly bear in mind, that public opinion had become a real element in national progress. The crown was constantly dreaming of the revival of despotism, to be accomplished by force and by corruption. Yet the crown, almost without a struggle, was bereft of the power of imprisoning without trial, by the passing of the Habeas Corpus Act; and it lost its control over the freedom of the press by the expiration of the licensing system. The church thought it possible to destroy non-conformity by fines and fetters. In its earlier liturgy it prayed to be delivered from "false doctrine, heresy, and schism." Yet when it had ejected the Puritans from the churches, and had shut up the conventicles, it laid the foundation of schisms which, in a few years, made dissent a principle which churchmen could not hope to crush and statesmen could not dare to despise. How can we account for the striking anomaly, that with a profligate court, a corrupt administration, a venal house of commons, a tyrannous church, the nation during the reign of Charles II was manifestly

progressing in the essentials of freedom, unless we keep in view that from the beginning of the century there had been an incessant struggle of the national mind against every form of despotic power? The desire for liberty, civil and spiritual, had become almost an instinct. The great leaders in this battle had passed away. The men who by fits aspired to be tribunes of the people were treacherous or inconstant. But the spirit of the nation was not dead. It made itself heard in parliament, with a voice that grew louder and louder, till the torrent was once again dammed up. A few more years of tyranny without disguise — and then the end.

The first movements of the Cabal ministry were towards a high and liberal policy — toleration for non-conformists, and an alliance with free Protestant states. A greater liberty to dissenters from the church followed the fall of Clarendon. We see transient and accidental motives for this passing toleration, rather than the assertion of a fixed principle. But when the parliament met, the active prelates and prelatists prevailed to prevent any bill of comprehension or indulgence to be brought in.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE (1668 A.D.)

At the opening of the session of parliament in 1668, the king announced that he had made a league defensive with the states-general of the United Provinces, to which Sweden had become a party. This was the Triple Alliance. The nation saw with reasonable apprehension the development of the vast schemes of ambition of Louis XIV. He was at war with Spain; but the great empire upon which the sun never set was fast falling to pieces — not perishing like a grand old house, overthrown by a hurricane's fury, but mouldering away with the dry-rot in every timber. France, on the contrary, was rising into the position of the greatest power in Europe. Her able but vainglorious king already looked upon the Spanish Netherlands as his certain prey. The United Provinces were hateful to him as the seat of religious and civil liberty.

The crisis was come when England, by a return to the policy of Cromwell, might have taken her place again at the head of the free Protestant states of Europe. When Charles announced to parliament this league with the United Provinces and Sweden, it was thought to be, says Pepys, "the only good public thing that hath been done since the king came into England." It was a marvel of diplomacy. De Witt and Sir William Temple met at the Hague as two honest men, without any finesse; and they quickly concluded a treaty which they believed to be for the honour and safety of both their countries. This treaty, says Burnet,[j] "was certainly the masterpiece of King Charles' life; and if he had stuck to it, it would have been both the strength and glory of his reign. This disposed the people to forgive all that was past, and to renew their confidence in him, which was shaken by the whole conduct of the Dutch war."

At the very time when the ambassador of England was negotiating the treaty which promised to be "the strength and glory of his reign," the king was making proposals to Louis for a clandestine treaty, by which England was to be "leased out" to France, "Like a tenement or pelting farm."[k].

MACAULAY'S CONTRAST OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE AT THAT PERIOD

We have now reached a point at which the history of the great English Revolution begins to be complicated with the history of foreign politics. The

[1685 A.D.]

power of Spain had, during many years, been declining. She still, it is true, held in Europe the Milanese and the two Sicilies, Belgium, and Franche Comté. In America her dominions still spread, on both sides of the equator, far beyond the limits of the torrid zone. But this great body had been smitten with palsy, and was not only incapable of giving molestation to other states, but could not, without assistance, repel aggression.


France was now, beyond all doubt, the greatest power in Europe. Her resources have, since those days, absolutely increased, but have not increased so fast as the resources of England. It must also be remembered that, a hundred and eighty years ago, the empire of Russia, now a monarchy of the first class, was as entirely out of the system of European politics as Abyssinia or Siam, that the house of Brandenburg was then hardly more powerful than the house of Saxony, and that the republic of the United States had not then begun to exist. The weight of France, therefore, though still very considerable, has relatively diminished. Her territory was not in the days of Louis the Fourteenth quite so extensive as at present: but it was large, compact, fertile, well placed both for attack and for defence, situated in a happy climate, and inhabited by a grave, active, and ingenious people. The state implicitly obeyed the direction of a single mind. The great fiefs which, three hundred years before, had been, in all but name, independent principalities, had been annexed to the crown. Only a few old men could remember the last meeting of the states-general. The resistance which the Huguenots, the nobles, and the parliaments had offered to the kingly power, had been put down by the two great cardinals who had ruled the nation during forty years. The government was now a despotism, but, at least in its dealings with the upper classes, a mild and generous despotism, tempered by courteous manners and chivalrous sentiments. The means at the disposal of the sovereign were, for that age, truly formidable. His revenue, raised, it is true, by a severe and unequal taxation which pressed heavily on the cultivators of the soil, far exceeded that of any other potentate. His army, excellently disciplined, and commanded by the greatest generals then living, already consisted of more than a hundred and twenty thousand men. Such an array of regular troops had not been seen in Europe since the downfall of the Roman Empire. Of maritime powers France was not the first. But, though she had rivals on the sea, she had not yet a superior. Such was her strength during the last forty years of the seventeenth century, that no enemy could singly withstand her, and that two great coalitions, in which half Christendom was united against her, failed of success.

In England, however, the whole stock of popularity, great as it was, with which the king had commenced his administration, had long been expended. To loyal enthusiasm had succeeded profound disaffection. The public mind had now measured back again the space over which it had passed between 1640 and 1660, and was once more in the state in which it had been when the Long Parliament met.

The prevailing discontent was compounded of many feelings. One of these was wounded national pride. That generation had seen England, during a few years, allied on equal terms with France, victorious over Holland and Spain, the mistress of the sea, the terror of Rome, the head of the Protestant interest. Her resources had not diminished; and it might have been expected that she would have been at least as highly considered in Europe under a legitimate king, strong in the affection and willing obedience of his subjects, as she had been under an usurper whose utmost vigilance and energy were required to keep down a mutinous people. Yet she had, in

consequence of the imbecility and meanness of her rulers, sunk so low that any German or Italian principality which brought five thousand men into the field was a more important member of the commonwealth of nations.

With the sense of national humiliation was mingled anxiety for civil liberty. Rumours, indistinct indeed, but perhaps the more alarming by reason of their indistinctness, imputed to the court a deliberate design against all the constitutional rights of Englishmen. It had even been whispered that this design was to be carried into effect by the intervention of foreign arms. The thought of such intervention made the blood, even of the cavaliers, boil in their veins. [h]





CHAPTER VIII

THE LATTER PART OF CHARLES II'S REIGN

[1668–1685 A.D.]

> It may seem rather an extraordinary position yet is strictly true, that the fundamental privileges of the subject were less invaded, the prerogative swerved into fewer excesses, during the reign of Charles II than in any former period of equal length. The frequent session of parliament, and its high estimation of its own privileges, furnished a security against illegal taxation. And as the nation happily escaped the attempts that were made after the restoration to revive the Star-Chamber and high commission courts, there were no means of chastising political delinquencies except through the regular tribunals of justice and through the verdict of a jury. Ill as the one were often constituted and submissive as the other might often be found, they afforded something more of a guarantee, were it only by the publicity of their proceedings, than the dark and silent divan of courtiers and prelates who sat in judgment under the two former kings of the house of Stuart. Though the bench was frequently subservient, the bar contained high-spirited advocates whose firm defence of their clients the judges often reproved, but no longer affected to punish. The press, above all, was in continual service.— HENRY HALLAM.[b]

FEW things in English history are more curious than the origin and growth of the power now possessed by the cabinet. From an early period the kings of England had been assisted by a privy council to which the law assigned many important functions and duties. During several centuries this body deliberated on the gravest and most delicate affairs. But by degrees its character changed. It became too large for despatch and secrecy. The rank of privy councillor was often bestowed as an honorary distinction on persons to whom nothing was confided, and whose opinion was never asked. The sovereign, on the most important occasions, resorted for advice to a small knot of leading ministers. The advantages and disadvantages of this course were early pointed out by Bacon, with his usual judgment and sagacity: but it was not till after the restoration that the interior council began to attract general notice. During many years old fashioned politicians continued to regard the cabinet as an unconstitutional and dangerous board. Nevertheless, it constantly became more and more important. It at length drew to itself the chief executive power, and has now been regarded, during several generations, as an essential part of English polity. Yet, strange to say, it still continues to be altogether unknown to the law. The names of the noblemen and gentlemen who compose it are never officially announced to

the public. No record is kept of its meetings and resolutions; nor has its existence ever been recognised by any act of parliament.

During some years the word cabal was popularly used as synonymous with cabinet. But, as we have seen, it happened by a whimsical coincidence that, in 1671, the cabinet consisted of five persons the initial letters of whose names made up the word cabal, Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. These ministers[1] were therefore emphatically called the Cabal; and they soon made that appellation so infamous that it has never since their time been used except as a term of reproach.[c]

Buckingham, without any ostensible post, was now in fact the prime minister, and one so profligate in morals has rarely been seen in England. He was living in open adultery with Lady Shrewsbury, which led at this very time (January 16th) to a duel, in which the injured husband was mortally wounded. The abandoned countess, it is said, dressed as a page, held the horse of her paramour while he was fighting with her husband. It served the cause of the non-conformists but little to be advocated, as it was, by a man of such a character; the commons, therefore, negatived by a large majority a bill introduced for their relief. They also voted only one-half of the sum demanded for the navy, and instituted a rigid inquiry into the conduct of various persons in the late war.

As money for the supply of the royal mistresses and the other profligacies of the court was not to be obtained from the parliament, Buckingham began to form other projects. The first was to reduce the royal expenditure below the revenues, but with a prince of Charles' character that was impracticable. It was then resolved to have recourse to the king of France; Buckingham therefore entered into a negotiation with the duchess of Orleans, and Charles himself apologised to the French resident for his share in the Triple Alliance. Louis, as usual, affected indifference, but the communications gradually became more confidential, and by the end of the year Louis had the leading English ministers in his pay.

It was not the mere gratification of his pleasures that Charles now looked to; he wished to be absolute. Not, however, that, like his father, he believed despotic power to be his right, or that he felt any pleasure in the exercise of it: what he wanted was freedom from restraint; he could not endure that his private life should be publicly criticised, or that parliaments should presume to inquire what had been done with the money they had granted. All this might be obviated by a standing army, which he might make it the interest of Louis to furnish him with the means of maintaining. But there was another motive operating on the mind of Charles, which, from the tenor of his life, one would be little apt to suspect.

THE KING AND THE DUKE OF YORK BECOME CATHOLICS (1668 A.D.)

The duke of York was at this time become a Catholic. His own account of his conversion is as follows. When he was in Flanders he read, at the request of a bishop of the Church of England, a treatise by that prelate, written to clear that church from the guilt of schism in separating from the church of Rome. He also, at the bishop's desire, read a reply which had been made to it, and the effect produced on his mind was the contrary of what was intended. After the restoration he read Heylin's *History of the Reforma-*

[1 Gardiner, [d] however, insists that it is wrong to speak of the Cabal as a "ministry" in the modern sense, since they formed no council meeting, agreed on nothing but toleration, and were never consulted as a body by the king.]

tion, and the preface to Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and the result was a persuasion that none of the reformers "had power to do what they did." He went on inquiring, and gradually gave his assent to all the Roman doctrines. It must be observed that the duke, while thus solicitous about his religion, was leading a life nearly, if not altogether, as profligate as that of his brother. All this time he continued outwardly to conform to the Church of England. At length he consulted a Jesuit named Simons, on the subject of being reconciled, expressing his hope, that on account of the singularity of his case, he might have a dispensation to continue his outward conformity to the Church of England. To his surprise, the good father assured him that the pope had not the power to grant it, "for it was an unalterable doctrine of the Catholic church, not to do evil that good might follow." The duke wrote to the pope, and the reply which he received was to the same effect. Thinking it dangerous to delay any longer, he resolved to open his mind to the king, whom he knew to be of the same way of thinking. He found his brother equally sensible with himself as to the danger of his condition. It was agreed that the royal brothers should consult with the lords Arundel of Wardour and Arlington, and Sir Thomas Clifford (all in the royal secret), on the best mode of advancing the Catholic religion in the king's dominions.

On the 25th of January, 1669, the feast of the conversion of St. Paul, the meeting was held in the duke's closet. The king spoke with great earnestness, and with tears in his eyes, describing his uneasiness at not being able to profess the faith he believed; as he knew, he said, that he should meet with great difficulties in what he proposed to do, no time was to be lost, and it should be undertaken while he and his brother were in full strength and vigour, and able to undergo any fatigue. It was resolved to apply to the French king for aid, for which purpose his ambassador was to be let into the secret, and Lord Arundel, with Sir Richard Bellings, an Irish Catholic, for his secretary, was to go to the court of France. Arundel, when at Paris, required from Louis a large sum of money, to enable the king to suppress any insurrection that might break out, offering in return to aid him in his intended invasion of Holland. Louis was willing to assent to these terms; the only question was, which should be first, the war or the king's declaration of his religion. Charles, urged by his brother, was for the last; Louis more wisely recommended the former. The year passed away in discussions: at Christmas the king received the sacrament as usual in public, but it was observed that the duke of York did not accompany him.

The Conventicle Act was now near expiring. The lord keeper and Chief Justice Hale had, with the aid of bishops Wilkins and Reynolds, and of Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Burton, and other divines, been engaged in forming a scheme of comprehension, which was communicated to Baxter, Bates, and Morton, and by them to their non-conforming brethren. Nothing could be more reasonable than the alterations proposed, and an equally rational plan was devised. But Sheldon and the other intolerants took the alarm; the commons had not abated in their hostility, and the Conventicle Act was renewed[1] with the addition of a proviso, "that all clauses in it shall be construed most largely and beneficially for the suppressing conventicles, and for the justification and encouragement of all persons to be employed in the execution thereof." Could anything be more barbarous than this? The vile crew of informers was now unkennelled, houses were broken open, ministers and other persons were dragged to prison. Sheldon and those prelates,

[1 According to Gardiner *d* Charles sold his consent to this renewal for a grant of £300,000 a year for eight years.]

such as Ward and Lamplugh, who resembled himself, were zealous in causing the act to be enforced, and the court secretly encouraged them, in the hopes of driving the dissenters to look to a Catholic government for relief.

It is said that Buckingham was most anxious to prevent the succession of the duke of York. According to this prince's own account, his first project was to get the king to acknowledge the legitimacy of his son by Lucy Walters, whom he had created duke of Monmouth, and given him in marriage the countess of Buccleuch, the wealthiest heiress in Scotland; lords Carlisle and Ashley, he adds, had the boldness to hint to the king, that if he was desirous of doing so, it would not be difficult to procure witnesses of his marriage, but Charles replied, "that well as he loved the duke, he had rather see him hanged at Tyburn than own him for his legitimate son." To get rid of the sterile queen in some way, in order to enable the king to marry again, was the next plan. Buckingham proposed to seize her and convey her away secretly to the plantations, so that she might be no more heard of; but Charles rejected this course with horror. The next project was to deal with the queen's confessor, to induce her to go into a convent; but she had no mind to be a nun, and means, it is said, were employed to cause the pope to forbid her. Some talked of the king's taking another wife, but the public feeling was adverse to polygamy. A divorce was then proposed, and to this the king hearkened; but spiritual divorces were only from bed and board, and a precedent was wanting for the legal marriage of the innocent party. Lord Roos, therefore, whose wife was living in open adultery, got a bill to be moved in the upper house (March 5th, 1670) to enable him to marry again. The duke, seeing whither this tended, opposed it with all his might; all the bishops but Cosins and Wilkins were on his side, and all the Catholic and several Protestant peers. The king employed his influence in favour of it, and on the morning of the third reading (21st) he came and sat on the throne, saying, he was come to renew an old custom of attending at their debates, and desired them to go on as if he were not present. The bill was carried by a small majority, and became a precedent for bills of the same kind, but the king took no advantage of it. He continued for some time the practice of attending the debates; "it was as good," he said, "as going to a play," and his presence was some check on the opposition.

THE SECRET TREATY OF DOVER AND THE FRENCH ALLIANCE (1670 A.D.)

In the month of May Louis took occasion of a progress he was making through his lately acquired possessions to let the duchess of Orleans cross the sea to Dover to visit her brother, over whose mind she possessed great influence. Louis hoped that she would be able to prevail with him to commence with the war against the states instead of the declaration of religion, but Charles was immoveable on this head. The famous secret treaty was now concluded. Charles was to declare himself when he judged it expedient, and then to join Louis in a war with the Dutch; Louis was to give him two millions of livres, and a force of six thousand men; all the expenses of the war by land were to be borne by Louis, and he was to pay three millions of livres annually toward the charge of the English navy; the combined fleet to be commanded by the duke of York; if the states were conquered, Charles was to have Walcheren, Sluys, and Cadsand, and the prince of Orange to be provided for. It was further agreed, that if any new rights to the Spanish monarchy should accrue to Louis (by the death of the king, a puny boy), Charles should aid him in asserting them with all his power, and to get

in return Ostend, Minorca, and such parts of South America as he could conquer.

Such was the conspiracy that was formed against the Protestant faith and the liberties of Europe; but many difficulties stood in the way of its success. Charles, when he reflected coolly, became aware of the Protestant spirit of his subjects: he did not venture to communicate the secret treaty to his Protestant ministers, and to blink them he let Buckingham [1] conclude one (the counterpart of it except as to the article of religion) with France (January 23rd, 1671). When urged by Louis to declare his religion, he hung back and made various objections, and the course of events soon caused Louis to cease from pressing him.

THE ACCESSION OF NELL GWYN; COVENTRY ACT

Charles had latterly recruited his harem from the theatre, where now, in imitation of the Continent, women performed. He had taken off no less than two actresses, the one named Moll Davies a dancer, the other the wild and witty Nell Gwyn. He soon grew tired of Davies, who had borne him a daughter, Mary Tudor, married in 1687 to Francis Ratcliffe, afterwards created earl of Derwentwater. But Nell, whom he appointed of the bed-chamber to his insulted queen, retained her hold on his affections through life, and the noble house of St. Albans derive their pedigree from this union of royalty with the stage. With the aid of Shaftesbury, it is said, he seduced the daughter of a clergyman named Roberts; but her early principles retained their hold on her mind, and Burnet [e] says that she died a sincere penitent. A further accession to the royal mistresses was Mademoiselle de Querouaille, a favourite maid of the duchess of Orleans, on whose sudden and mysterious death shortly after the interview at Dover, Charles invited her maid over to England, appointed her of the queen's bed-chamber, and added her to the roll of his mistresses. He afterwards (1672) created her duchess of Portsmouth, and Louis conferred on her the royal domain of Aubigni, which went to her son the duke of Richmond. As to Castlemain (now duchess of Cleveland), she still retained her place as a royal mistress; and if Charles was faithless to her, she was equally so to him. Her children by the king, named Fitzroy, were the dukes of Southampton and Grafton, the earl of Northumberland, and a daughter married to Sir Henry Lee of Ditchley, Oxon, afterwards earl of Litchfield.

In the debate on the supplies in the commons, it was proposed to lay a tax on the play-houses. To this it was objected, that the players were the king's servants and a part of his pleasure. Sir John Coventry asked, whether "his majesty's pleasure lay among the men or the women players?" This was reported at court, and the king, though earnestly dissuaded by the duke, resolved on a base and cowardly vengeance. The duke of Monmouth was the chief agent, with his lieutenant Sands and O'Brien, son of Lord Inchiquin; and as Coventry was returning one night (December 21st) to his lodgings, Sands and O'Brien, with thirteen of the guards, fell on him in the Haymarket. Coventry snatched the flambeau from his servant, and with it in one hand and his sword in the other, and placing his back against the wall, he defended himself stoutly. He wounded O'Brien in the arm; but they overpowered him, threw him on the ground, and slit his nose with a penknife. They then repaired to the duke of Monmouth to boast of what they had done.

[1 Gardiner [d] says that "Charles particularly enjoyed making a fool of Buckingham, who imagined himself to be exceedingly clever."]

When the commons re-assembled, they were outrageous at this base assault on one of their members, and they passed an act banishing the perpetrators without pardon, unless they surrendered, and making it felony, without benefit of clergy, to maim or disfigure the person. This act is named the Coventry Act.

A still more atrocious attempt had lately been made on a more illustrious person. As the duke of Ormonde was returning in the dark (December 6th) from a dinner given by the city, his coach was stopped in St. James' street, he was dragged out of it, set behind a man on horseback and fastened to him by a belt. The man urged his horse and proceeded toward Hyde Park; but on the way the duke put his foot under the rider's, and leaning to the other side they both fell to the ground; the sound of footsteps being heard, the assassin loosed the belt and fired a pair of pistols at the duke, but without effect; he then fled away and escaped. An inquiry was instituted by the house of lords, a reward of 1,000*l.* and a pardon to any of the party who would turn informer, was offered by the king, but to no purpose.

Some time after, a person wearing a cassock formed an acquaintance with Edwards, the keeper of the regalia in the Tower. He proposed a match between a nephew of his and Edwards' daughter. At seven in the morning of the 9th of May, the pretended clergyman came with two companions and asked to see the regalia. While they were in the room they suddenly threw a cloak over Edwards' head and then put a gag in his mouth, and when he struggled they knocked him down and wounded him in the belly. The clergyman then placed the crown under his cloak, another put the globe in his breeches, and the third began to file the sceptre in two to put it into a bag. Edwards' son happening to come by, the alarm was given; the robbers ran, and had nearly reached their horses at St. Catherine's gate, when they were secured.

From curiosity, or some other motive, the king himself attended their examination. The chief said that his name was Colonel Blood; that it was he that had seized the duke of Ormonde, with the intention of hanging him at Tyburn; that he was one of a band of three hundred sworn to avenge each other's death; that he and others had resolved to kill the king for his severity to the godly, and that he had one time taken his station among the reeds at Battersea to shoot him as he was bathing, but the awe of majesty overcame him, and he relented; the king might now take his life if he pleased, but it would be at the risk of his own; whereas if he pardoned him, he would secure the gratitude of a band of faithful and resolute spirits. Charles pardoned him, nay, more, gave him an estate of 500*l.* a year in Ireland, of which country he was a native, and kept him at court, where he rose to the possession of much influence: he also requested Ormonde to pardon him, saying that he had certain reasons for asking it. The duke replied that his majesty's command was a sufficient reason. What are we to infer from all this? Was Charles a coward? or was some one of those who were in his confidence the secret instigator of the attempt on the life of the duke?

The next event was the death of the duchess of York (May 31st). She died a Catholic; the secret efforts of her husband had had their effect, and she had been reconciled in the preceding month of August. Her father wrote, her brother remonstrated; but their efforts were fruitless; she received the last sacrament from the hands of a Franciscan friar. Her conversion was known, it is said, to but five persons; but the secret gradually transpired and caused the religion of the duke to be suspected. She had borne him eight children, of whom two daughters, Mary and Anne, alone survived.

[1672 A.D.]

During the last year the young prince of Orange had come over to visit his royal uncle. Charles, who had really a regard for him, wished to draw him into his projects; but he found him, as the French ambassador says, too zealous a Dutchman and Protestant to be trusted with the secret. It is curious enough that, as the prince told Burnet, the king gave him to understand that he was himself a Catholic.

THE STOP OF THE EXCHEQUER; THE DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE; THE DUTCH WAR (1672 A.D.)

The war with the states being decided on, the Cabal prepared to commence it with robbery at home and piracy abroad. To have a good supply of money to begin with, the fertile brain of Ashley,[1] it is said (but he always denied it), suggested to shut up the exchequer. To understand this, we must observe that since the time of Cromwell the bankers and others had been in the habit of advancing money at eight per cent. to the government, receiving in return an assignment of some branch of the revenue till principal and interest should be discharged. The new plan was to suspend all payments for twelve months, and to add the interest now due to the capital, allowing six per cent. interest on this new stock.[2] This was approved of by the privy-council, and the public was informed of it by proclamation (January 2nd, 1672). The consequences were, the ministers had a sum of 1,300,000*l.* at their disposal; many of the bankers failed; trade in general received a severe shock; numbers of widows, orphans, and other annuitants were reduced to misery.

There had been no declaration of war against the Dutch, with whom Charles was actually in alliance; but their Smyrna fleet would be coming up channel in March, and it was known to be wealthy, and it was supposed would suspect no danger. Holmes was therefore sent to intercept it; he was desired to take with him all the ships of war he should meet; but anxious to have all the glory and profit to himself, he let Sir Edward Spragge's squadron, returning from the Mediterranean, pass him by. Next morning (March 3rd) the Smyrna fleet of sixty sail came in sight. But the states had suspected the designs of their royal neighbours, and put their naval commanders on their guard. Many of these ships were well armed, and Van Nesse, who was convoying them with seven men-of-war, disposed his force so well as completely to baffle the English. Holmes being reinforced during the night, renewed the attack next day, and he succeeded in capturing one ship of war and four merchantmen, two of which were very valuable. This piratic enterprise (of which the disgrace was aggravated by its failure) was condemned both at home and abroad.

The next measure was to issue a Declaration of Indulgence (15th), in order to gain over the dissenters to the side of the court and to pave the way for a general toleration. The measure itself, which was suggested by Shaftesbury, was beneficent, had it originated in good motives; but it proceeded on the principle of an arbitrary dispensing power in the crown that might be carried to a dangerous extent. A portion of the dissenters received it with gratitude, and presented an address of thanks to the king; but the orthodox

[1 Gardiner[d] credits Clifford with the suggestion, since he was shortly afterward made a peer and Lord High Treasurer. Ashley was made the first earl of Shaftesbury in reward for his support of the Declaration of Indulgence. When later he joined the opposition, North[f] says the wags called him Shiftsbury.]

[2 "This," says Hallam[b] "was never paid till the latter part of William's reign; it may be considered as the beginning of our national debt."

took alarm, and the pulpits resounded with arguments and declamation against popery.

Both kings now formally declared war against the states. Louis merely said that it did not consist with his reputation to put up any longer with insult from them. Charles (17th) enumerated several petty causes of hostility, "and surely," says Hume, "reasons more false and frivolous never were employed to justify a flagrant breach of treaty." The king of Sweden, the bishop of Münster, and the elector of Cologne were drawn into the confederacy against the states.

While preparations were being made to put the land forces of the states into a condition to resist the troops of France, De Ruyter got to sea with seventy-five men-of-war and a number of fire ships to prevent the junction of the French and English fleets; this, however, he was unable to effect, and the combined fleet having vainly tried to bring him to action off Ostend, returned to Southwold bay. De Ruyter, learning that they were occupied taking in men and provisions, resolved to fall on them while thus engaged. He was near surprising them (May 28th); but though the wind and tide were adverse, the duke of York, who commanded, got about twenty of his ships in line of battle, being part of the red squadron under himself and of the blue under the earl of Sandwich. D'Estrées, with the French fleet, was to the southward, opposed to the ships of Zealand. Though the disparity of numbers was great, the battle was obstinate. Sandwich, in the *Royal James*, took a ship of seventy guns and killed Admiral Van Ghent; but his own vessel having been much damaged, a fire ship grappled on her larboard and set her in flames, and the earl and all on board but two or three hundred perished. The duke, when his ship, *The Prince*, was disabled, shifted his flag to the *St. Michael:* and this vessel being also disabled, he finally hoisted it in *The London*. In the afternoon the other ships came into the action, and the Dutch finally fled with the loss of three ships; the English lost but one: the French had taken no part in the action.

Meantime Louis, at the head of one hundred thousand men, had burst like a flood over the frontiers. His disciplined legions were directed by the genius of Condé and Turenne, while the Dutch troops were raw levies and ill-officered. Fortress after fortress opened their gates, making hardly a show of resistance. The season happening to be very dry, the rivers were low, the passage of the Rhine offered no difficulty (June 2nd), and in the space of three weeks the French monarch reduced three of the provinces, and had advanced within three leagues of Amsterdam. Resistance appearing nearly hopeless, ambassadors were sent to learn on what terms peace might be obtained. Buckingham, Arlington, and Lord Saville (now earl of Halifax) were sent on the part of Charles to Utrecht, where Louis had fixed his quarters, and the demands of the two sovereigns were there communicated to the Dutch ministers. Louis required large cessions of forts and territory; seventeen millions of livres; a gold medal every year; the churches in the towns to be shared with the Catholics, and a provision for their clergy. Charles demanded the honour of the flag in the narrow seas; £10,000 a year for the liberty of fishing; a million sterling for the expenses of the war; the dignity of Stadholder for William III the prince of Orange.

This prince, though only in his twenty-second year, had been made general and admiral of the commonwealth; De Witt, who was his guardian, had, though hostile to his family, given him an excellent education; and the character of the prince himself was such as, joined with the remembrance of the services of his family, enabled him to gain the popular favour. The peo-

ple were clamorous for the repeal of the Perpetual Edict, which had been framed for his exclusion; they rose in arms at Dordrecht (June 30th), and then in the other towns, and everywhere established the unlimited authority of the prince. An attempt was made to assassinate Jan De Witt; and his brother Cornelius being charged by an infamous wretch, named Tichelaer, with an endeavour to induce him to poison the prince, was put to the torture. A sentence of banishment was passed on him; his brother, the pensionary, came to the prison to convey him to his place of exile in his coach; instantly an infuriated rabble surrounded the prison, burst open the doors, seized the two brothers, despatched them by a multitude of wounds, and offered every species of indignity to their dead bodies. Such is the rabble in every country—brutal, bloody, and unreflecting: against their sudden fury neither private virtue nor the greatest public services are a protection.

The prince, by means of an atrocity which he abhorred, was now left uncontrolled. He urged the people not to despair, but to reject the humiliating conditions offered to them, and to resist to the uttermost. Their patriotic ardour revived; the sluices had already been opened, and the generous resolution was taken to fly, if all should fail, to their settlements in the east, and there to found a new empire. When Buckingham urged the prince to abandon the cause of the provinces, as their ruin was inevitable, "There is one certain means," he replied, "by which I can be sure never to see my country's ruin; I will die on the last dyke." The affairs of the provinces, under the guidance of their young hero, soon assumed a brighter aspect. A combined English and French fleet, with a land force on board, approached the coast; but winds and tide acted so opportunely to keep them off, that it was regarded as a special interference of Providence. Louis, weary of the toils of war, returned to the pleasures of Versailles, and the French arms became inactive. Spain had sent some forces to the aid of the prince, and the emperor and the elector of Brandenburg were preparing to impede the progress of the French monarch.

Charles, however, adhered firmly to his engagements with Louis; he also gave his own ministers proofs of his satisfaction with their conduct by bestowing honours on them: Buckingham and Arlington had the Garter and the latter an earldom; Clifford was made Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, and Ashley earl of Shaftesbury. This last, on the Lord-keeper Bridgeman's hesitating in some matter, represented him to the king as a mere old dotard, and the seals with the title of lord-chancellor were transferred to himself (November 17th). In his new office he displayed the levity and eccentricity of his character. He rode himself, and made the judges and law-officers ride in ancient-wise in procession to Westminister; he sat on the bench in "an ash-coloured gown, silver-laced"; he prided himself on his despatch of business; made his orders with rapidity and after his own fancy; but so many applications were made to him by counsel for explanations, that he soon became quite tame and humble in his court. Clifford at this time was made lord-treasurer.

PARLIAMENT BESTS THE KING; THE TEST ACT (1673 A.D.)

It was now nearly two years since parliament had met; the king, however willing, could no longer dispense with its services, as the only means of obtaining money. When it assembled (February 5th, 1673), he addressed it himself. He spoke of the war as just and necessary; and as to his Declara-

tion of Indulgence, at which some cavilled, he told them plainly that he was resolved to stick to it; he also mentioned the army, which with their aid he intended to augment. Shaftesbury then spoke. He told them that the Dutch aimed at an empire as extensive as that of ancient Rome; that they were the eternal enemy of this country; that "*Delenda est Carthago*" was the maxim of the parliament, and a wise one; and that he had no doubt but that they would be liberal in their supplies.

Though the members were the same, the house was now different from what it had been. The fervour of their loyalty had cooled, and they saw clearly whither the court was tending. Their first care was therefore to vindicate their own authority. Ever since 1604 it had been the practice in case of a vacancy in the house for the speaker to issue a writ for a new election; but Shaftesbury had taken on him, as chancellor, to issue the writs, and thus to introduce his dependents into the house. The legality of these was questioned (February 6th); the elections were voted void, and the speaker was directed to issue new writs. As the king made no opposition, Shaftesbury saw plainly that he could not be relied on, and he took his measures accordingly.

The very next day the commons voted a supply of no less a sum than 1,260,000*l*. They then proceeded to their grand attack on the Declaration of Indulgence, to which Charles had affirmed he would "stick," and after a long and adjourned debate, in spite of all the efforts of the courtiers, it was resolved on the 10th, by a majority of 168 to 116, that "penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended but by act of parliament." An address to this effect was presented to the king; he replied on the 24th, asserting his ecclesiastical authority, but expressing his willingness to assent to any bill for carrying the intents of his declaration into effect. This was voted insufficient, and in a second address they assured him that he was mistaken in supposing himself to possess that power. Charles was indignant, and talked of a dissolution; the duke, Clifford, Shaftesbury, and the more violent applauded his spirit; now was his time or never, they said — concessions had ruined his father and would ruin him. Ormonde and Arlington in vain advised him to yield. It was resolved to oppose the lords to the commons. The king solicited the advice of the peers (March 1st); Clifford addressed them with his usual violence; but Shaftesbury said that though his own opinion was in favour of the prerogative, he would not presume to set it against that of the house of commons. The lords resolved on the 4th that the king's was a good and gracious answer. Charles' resolution, however, had already begun to give way; the French ambassador counselled him to yield for the present; the women too, it is said, interfered. He sent for the declaration, and in the presence of his ministers broke off the seal, and on the morning of the 8th assured the two houses, that "what had been done should never be drawn into consequence." Acclamation followed, and at night bonfires flamed all through the city.

A few days after (12th) the Test Act, as it is named, passed the commons. In the lords, the earl of Bristol, though avowing himself a Catholic, spoke in favour of it; the king gave a ready consent to it; and what is most strange, it is said to have originated with Arlington. Its object was to exclude the Catholics from places of honour and profit. It required that every person holding any office of trust or profit should, beside taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England, and subscribe a declaration against transubstantiation. Immediately the duke of York waited on the king, and with tears resigned to

him his commission as lord high admiral: his example was followed by Clifford, the lord high treasurer, Lord Bellasis, and others.

It is remarkable that the dissenters actually supported this bill, which excluded themselves as completely as the papists; but they willingly joined to oppose the common enemy; and in return a bill for their relief was passed and sent up to the lords on the 17th. Here however it received amendments to which the commons would not agree; Sheldon and his party too, it is said, exerted themselves to defeat it; a sudden prorogation on the 29th put an end to it, and the patriotic disinterestedness of the dissenters[1] was thus ill-rewarded.[h]

By the retirement of James, duke of York, the command of the combined fleet, amounting to ninety sail of the line, was given to Prince Rupert. With so formidable a force, it was expected that he would sweep the Dutch navy from the face of the ocean; but he performed nothing worthy of his reputation; and, though he fought three actions with De Ruyter, neither received nor inflicted considerable injury.[2] His friends complained that his powers were limited by unusual restrictions, and that his ships wanted stores and provisions; an officer who was present asserts that he was too closely leagued with the country party to obtain a victory, which might render their opponents lords of the ascendant. He was ordered to take under his protection the army commanded by Schomberg, and to land it on the coast of Holland. Schomberg, unacquainted with naval etiquette, affixed the colours of his regiment to the mast of his vessel, as a signal to the officers in the other transports; but Rupert considered his conduct as an act of insubordination or insult; two shots were fired through the rigging; and orders were given to sink the general's vessel unless the flag were immediately struck. Schomberg reluctantly submitted, and the armament proceeded to the Dutch coast (July 23rd), but no landing was effected. Rupert, having alarmed the inhabitants on several points, from the mouth of the Maese to that of the Ems, ordered the military force to return to Yarmouth (August 2nd), where it remained encamped during the rest of the season. Schomberg, attributing both the violence of the prince with respect to the flag, and his refusal to land the army in Holland, to personal dislike, sent him a challenge; but Charles interfered to prevent the meeting, and the general quitted the English service.[c]

A congress for peace was meantime sitting at Cologne, under the mediation of Sweden; but the states, now backed by the house of Austria, spurned at the conditions offered by the allied monarchs.

THE FALL OF THE CABAL (1674 A.D.); NEW OPPOSITION TO THE KING

The first question that engaged the attention of parliament when it reassembled in the latter end of October was the marriage of the duke of York, who had lately (September 30th) espoused, by proxy, Maria D'Este, sister to the duke of Modena, a princess only fifteen years of age, but a Catholic. They addressed the king, praying him not to allow the marriage to be consummated. [Her son would be reared as a Catholic and would be heir to the

[1 Thus from 1673 to 1828, the Protestant dissenters of England were proscribed by the constitution, as a people not to be trusted with any office that might be betrayed by them to the injury of their country. This stigma was somewhat diminished, but by no means removed, by the annual indemnity bill, which preceded the abolition of the Test Act. — VAUGHAN.g]

[2 The first action on May 28 and the second on June 4, though fought in conjunction with the French under D'Estrées were undecisive. The third off the mouth of the Texel on Aug. 11, is called by Gardiner[d] a defeat as the French would not assist.]

throne.] Charles pleaded his honour. They forthwith passed votes for refusing supplies, imposing a severer test, etc., when the king came to the house of lords and prorogued the parliament (November 4th). As he considered that Shaftesbury had played him false, he took the great seal from him on the 9th, and committed it to Sir Heneage Finch. Sir Thomas Osborne (now Lord Latimer and later created earl of Danby) had obtained the white staff resigned by Clifford. Shaftesbury now assumed the character of a patriot, and became the secret leader of the opposition.

When the parliament met (January 7th, 1674) the king addressed them with his usual affability; the lord-keeper then followed, in a long speech, the object of which was to obtain an immediate supply. The commons first passed an address, praying the king to enjoin a public fast, that the nation might implore heaven to preserve "the church and state against the undermining practices of popish recusants," and to adopt certain measures of precaution against them; they then voted the removal from office of persons "popishly inclined, or otherwise obnoxious or dangerous"; and, following up this vote, they proceeded to assail the individual members of the Cabal.

The first attacked was the duke of Lauderdale. He was charged with having raised an army in Scotland to be employed in setting up arbitrary power in England, and with having said to the king in council, "Your majesty's edicts are equal with the laws, and ought to be observed in the first place." Buckingham, aware that his own turn would come next, asked leave to address the house. His defence was feeble; his chief object was to shift the blame from himself to Arlington; one expression which he used seemed to go higher: "Hunting," he said, "is a good diversion; but if a man will hunt with a brace of lobsters he will have but ill sport." An address was voted for his removal from the royal presence and councils. Arlington defended himself before the commons with more spirit than was expected; and the motion for an address against him was lost.

All this time the commons were silent on the subject of a supply; and as the states just then made, through the Spanish ambassador, an offer of peace, which Charles, with the advice of both houses, resolved to accept, Sir William Temple was appointed to negotiate, and in three days the affair was brought to a conclusion (February 19th). The honour of the flag was yielded to England; colonial and commercial questions were to be settled by arbitration; and the Dutch agreed to pay 800,000 crowns in four annual instalments. The parliament was then prorogued on the 24th.

Two further attempts at weakening the influence of the duke were made; the one in the commons, by a more comprehensive test; the other in the lords, by an amendment to a bill brought in for restraining popery. This last was lost, and the prorogation stopped the other. The duke took alarm; his first thought was a dissolution, but to that course the king was very adverse, and the result of it was quite uncertain. He then bent his thoughts to delay the meeting of parliament; but for this purpose it was necessary that the king should be supplied with money. Fortunately for him, Louis XIV was as anxious as himself to keep the king and parliament asunder, for he feared that England might now join the confederacy against him. The duke therefore proposed that Louis should give the king £400,000; the usual chaffering took place, and Charles was obliged to be content with 500,000 crowns. The parliament was then prorogued from November till the April of the following year.

Of the persons who had been accused by the commons, Buckingham alone was abandoned by the king, and he forthwith, as a matter of course, joined

[1675 A.D.]

Shaftesbury and the opposition. Arlington, who saw his influence fading before that of the treasurer (the earl of Danby), sold, by the royal command, his place of secretary to Sir Joseph Williamson for £6,000, and was raised to the higher but less influential post of lord chamberlain. To prop his falling power, he proposed to the king to negotiate a match between the prince of Orange and Mary the eldest daughter of the duke of York. As the prince was well known to be a stanch Protestant, this measure, he said, would eminently serve to allay the apprehensions of the nation on the subject of religion, and be in fact advantageous in many respects. The king approved warmly of the project, but the proposition, when made to the prince by Lord Ossory, was coldly received; he said that, as circumstances were at present, he was not in a condition to think of taking a wife.

THE COUNTRY PARTY: THE NON-RESISTANCE BILL FAILS (1675 A.D.)

During the winter, the court and country parties were busily engaged in preparing their plans for the ensuing campaign in parliament. In the house of lords the crown had a decided majority; but the minority, headed by Shaftesbury, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Wharton, was formidable from its talent and union. The country party was strong in the commons, where it possessed Lord William Russell, esteemed for his probity and integrity; Lord Cavendish, less correct in morals, but far superior in parts; Sir William Coventry, deeply skilled in affairs, and free from passion and private resentments; Powle (Powell), learned in precedents and parliamentary usages; Littleton, the ablest in debate; and Birch, rough and bold and powerful above all men of the day to sway a popular assembly [1]; the veteran senators Lee and Garroway, together with Vaughan, Sacheverell, and many other able debaters. Their plan was, to urge the king to join the allies against France; to impeach the earl of Danby; and to refuse the supplies while he remained in office.

The plan of the court was to unite with the church, and thus deprive their opponents of their advantage in appearing as the champions of religion. A council was held at Lambeth, at which several prelates attended; they were assured of the king's attachment to the church, and called upon to give him their support; measures were devised for crushing popery, and a severe proclamation against recusants and non-conformists was forthwith issued. The duke of York remonstrated in vain; in contempt of his parental authority, the princesses Mary and Anne were led to church by their preceptor Compton, bishop of London, and confirmed.

When parliament met (April 13, 1675), the address against Lauderdale, of which the king had taken no notice, was renewed, but to as little effect. Seven articles of impeachment were then exhibited against the earl of Danby. He had however, like his predecessors, made large purchases of votes in the house, but on a more economical plan, we are told; for while they bought leading men at high prices, he looked out for those who had only their votes to sell, and consequently disposed of them more cheaply. The articles were therefore all thrown out. The grand attempt of the ministers was made in

[1 The country party at this period consisted for the most part, of men who were distinguished by their attachment to the constitution, and to the Church of England. It embraced a considerable number who were decidedly favourable to a toleration of the Protestant dissenters, being themselves Presbyterians or old parliamentarians; but a much greater number, especially if we include the two houses, who were stanch churchmen, or discontented cavaliers, and whose prepossessions in favour of the Church of England were not sufficiently modified by the slowly improving spirit of the times, to prevent their looking on the proposed concessions to dissenters with a degree of sullen distrust. — VAUGHAN.]

the lords, where a bill for a new test [called the Non-Resistance Bill] was introduced. By this, every member of either house, and every person holding any office, was required to swear, that it is unlawful on any pretence whatsoever to take up arms against the king; that it is traitorous to take up arms by the king's authority against his person; and that he will not endeavour the alteration of the government either in church or state. The debate on this bill lasted seventeen days; the king occupied his usual place at the fire-side; but Shaftesbury and the other opponents of the measure, heedless of his presence, employed all their eloquence and all their powers of reason against it. It was carried by a majority of only two; had it come to the commons, it had probably been rejected by a much larger majority; but a question of privilege happening just then to arise between the two houses, the king took advantage of it to prorogue the parliament (June 9th).

CHARLES II ACCEPTS A PENSION FROM LOUIS XIV

When parliament met (October 13th), the king required money for the navy, and also a sum of £800,000 which had been borrowed on the revenue. This last was refused, but a sum of £300,000 was voted for the building of twenty ships of war, to which it was strictly appropriated. The contest with the lords was renewed; and such was the heat with which it was carried on, that it was moved in the lords to address the king to dissolve the parliament. This was opposed by the ministers, but supported by the duke of York and his friends. A prorogation for the long period of fifteen months was the result (November 22nd), for which Charles received 500,000 crowns from the king of France.[1]

The campaign of 1675 was favourable to the allies [as described in the histories of France and of the Netherlands]. The king of England, when he had concluded peace with the states, made an offer of his mediation to the other powers. The place fixed on for the congress was Nimeguen, whither the lord Berkeley, Sir William Temple, and Sir Leoline Jenkins repaired as the English ministers. After many delays the congress met in the summer of this year; but the ministers were more anxious to raise than to remove difficulties. The great object of the allies was to prevail on Charles to join them against France; but to this course he had many objections, of which not the least was the state of dependence on his parliament to which it would reduce him. Louis took advantage of this feeling; the ambassador Ruvigni received directions to offer the same amount of pension as before for his neutrality. An agreement was made between Charles and Ruvigni for a pension of 100,000*l.* a year to be paid to the former; in return for which he was to sign a treaty, by which the two monarchs were to bind themselves to enter into no engagements but by mutual consent, and to aid each other in case of any rebellion in their respective dominions. This was communicated to no one but the duke of York, Lauderdale, and Danby. The two former approved of it of course; Danby hesitated and advised to consult the privy council; but the king removed all difficulty, by writing out the treaty with his own hand and setting his private seal to it (February 17th, 1676). He then delivered it to Ruvigni, who forthwith set out for Paris in order to have it signed by Louis.[h]

By this secret proceeding both princes obtained their objects; Charles the money which had been refused by parliament, Louis security that Charles, for some time at least, would not make common cause with his enemies. But

[1 Louis who feared lest parliament should drive Charles into joining the alliance against him was so pleased to see its sittings interrupted for so long a time that he granted Charles a pension of £100,000 a year, to make him independent of his subjects. — GARDINER.[d]]

the English king, if he possessed the spirit of a man, must have keenly felt the degradation. He was become the yearly pensioner of another monarch; he was no longer the arbiter of his own conduct; he had bound himself to consult, with respect to foreign powers, the master whose money he received. Perhaps he might console himself with the notion, that it was less disgraceful to depend on a powerful monarch, from whose alliance he could disengage himself at pleasure, than on the party among his own subjects, which constantly opposed him in parliament: perhaps he felt a malicious pleasure in defeating the machinations of his adversaries, whom he knew to be, in pecuniary transactions, not more immaculate than himself; for it is a fact, that several among those who claimed the praise of patriotism for their opposition to the court, were accustomed to sell their services for money. It seemed as if the votes of the members of parliament were exposed for sale to all the powers of Europe. Some received bribes from the lord treasurer on account of the king; some from the Dutch, Spanish, and imperial ambassadors in favour of the confederates; some even from Louis at the very time when they loudly declaimed against Louis as the great enemy of their religion and liberties; for that prince, notwithstanding the recent treaty, did not implicitly rely on the faith of Charles; he sought in addition to secure the good will of those who, by their influence in parliament, might have it in their power to withdraw the king from his promise of neutrality. Ruvigni was recalled; Courtin succeeded him, and the accounts of Courtin will reveal the names of the patriots who sold themselves to France, and of the price at which their services were valued.

During the long prorogation, and with the aid of his foreign pension, the necessitous monarch enjoyed a seasonable relief from the cares and agitation in which he had lived for several years. Age and satiety had blunted his appetite for pleasure, and the enjoyment of ease was become the chief object of his wishes. He retired to Windsor, where he spent his time in the superintendence of improvements, the amusement of fishing, and the company and conversation of his friends. His neutrality in the great contest which divided the powers of the continent, whatever might be its real motive, found a sufficient justification in the numerous benefits which it conferred on the country.

While almost every other nation in Europe complained of the privations and charges of war, England enjoyed the blessings of peace. She was free from the pressure of additional taxation, and knew nothing of those evils which necessarily accompany the operations of armies. Her mariners monopolised the carrying trade of Europe; new channels of commerce were daily opened by the enterprise of her merchants; and their increasing prosperity gave a fresh stimulus to the industry of her inhabitants. It was, however, the care of the popular leaders to keep alive, as far as they were able, the spirit of discontent. Political clubs were established; pamphlets, renewing the old charges against the government, were published; the ears of men were perpetually assailed with complaints of the growth of popery, and of the progress of arbitrary power; their eyes were directed to the theatre of war on the Continent, as the great arena on which the fate of their liberty and religion was to be decided; and the preservation of these was described as depending on the humiliation of France, though France was aided in the contest by the Protestant state of Sweden, and opposed by the two great Catholic powers, Austria and Spain.[1]

Charles thus enjoyed the pension, the price of his dishonour; lived on indolently till the time came for the meeting of parliament (February 5, 1677). The opposition had discovered what they regarded as a vantage point against

the court. There were two statutes of Edward III, which ordained that a parliament should be held "once a year or oftener if need be," and as fifteen months had elapsed since the last meeting, the parliament, they asserted, had in fact ceased to exist. This view was maintained with much boldness and ingenuity in the lords by Buckingham, supported by Shaftesbury, Salisbury, and Wharton; but Finch (now lord-chancellor and earl of Nottingham), showed, in opposition to them, that the Triennial Act of the 16th of the late king, and the act, had extended the term to three years. Buckingham's motion was negatived by a large majority; the four lords were required to acknowledge that their conduct was "ill-advised," and to beg pardon of the king and the house, and on their refusal they were committed to the Tower.

They remained there till the meeting of parliament in the following year, when the others took their seats, merely asking pardon. Shaftesbury, who had had himself brought before the court of king's bench by *habeas corpus*, was obliged to ask pardon for it on his knees.

In consequence, it is said, of the bribes which he liberally bestowed, the minister had a majority on finance questions in the commons. Money therefore was granted for the navy; but it was appropriated, and none of it came into the treasury, so that the king had still need of his pension. The parliament now began to urge him to war; for Louis had entered Flanders at the head of a large army, taken Valenciennes, Cambray, and St. Omer, and defeated the prince of Orange at Cassel. The king, in order to do so, demanded an additional £600,000, pledging his royal word [1] not to break trust with them, or employ the money for any other purposes but those for which it was granted. But the commons knew him too well to trust him. They voted an address (May 25), praying him to enter into an alliance with the states-general and other powers for the preservation of the Spanish Netherlands. Charles affected great anger at this, as an encroachment on his prerogative, and he commanded both houses to adjourn till July. [When the Dutch ambassador advised Charles to yield, he tossed his handkerchief in the air and sneered, "I care just that for parliament."] The court of France was still uneasy, and its envoy Courtin was urgent for a dissolution, or at least a prorogation till the following April. For this service Charles demanded an addition of £100,000 a year to his pension. The usual chaffering took place, but the French were finally obliged to come to his terms, and also to consent that the increased pension should be reckoned from the commencement of the current year. The parliament was therefore prorogued from July to December, with a promise to Courtin that if the money was regularly paid it should then be further adjourned to April. What Englishman can refrain from blushing at this disgraceful bargain? yet Charles, though the highest, was not the only criminal at this time; Courtin also bribed sundry members of the parliament to engage to forward the views of the two monarchs.

WILLIAM III OF ORANGE VISITS ENGLAND AND MARRIES THE PRINCESS MARY (1677 A.D.)

The prince of Orange had long looked forward to a union with his cousin the princess Mary; but the opposition party in England, who feared that this match might unite him more closely with his uncles, had endeavoured to divert him from it. Now however, seeing the necessity of an effort to induce

[1] Hume having noticed the secret treaty with Louis which Charles had signed, calls his pledging of his word on the present occasion "one of the most dishonourable and most scandalous acts that ever proceeded from a throne."

the king of England to aid in checking the career of the French monarch, he resolved to seek the hand of the princess.

The prince does not seem to have taken any further steps till the present year, when, having obtained the king's permission, he set out at the end of the campaign, and landing at Harwich proceeded to Newmarket, where his uncles then were (October 9th). He was very kindly received by the king, to whose surprise, however, he seemed disinclined to enter on discourse of business. Charles desired Temple to try to find out the cause, and the prince told him that he was resolved to see the princess before he proceeded any further, and also to settle the affair of his marriage previously to entering on that of the peace. The king, when informed of this, very kindly left Newmarket sooner than usual; the prince, on seeing the lady Mary in London, was so pleased with her, that he made his proposals at once to her father and uncle, by whom they were well received; but they insisted that the terms of the peace must be previously settled. The prince would not give way on this point; he said that "his allies, who were like to have hard terms of the peace as things then stood, would be apt to believe that he had made this match at their cost; and for his part he would never sell his honour for a wife." On the 4th of November this auspicious marriage was solemnised by the bishop of London.

INTRIGUES OF THE FRENCH AND VENALITY OF THE ENGLISH

The king, the duke, the prince, and Danby and Temple, now took into consideration the question of the peace. The prince, convinced that Louis would never abstain from war, insisted on a strong frontier on both sides of Flanders; the king was of opinion that Louis was weary of war, and would devote himself to ease and pleasure; Temple thought with the prince. They were, however, obliged to give way a little, and it was agreed that Louis should be obliged to resign all his conquests from the empire, and restore Lorraine to its duke; that France and Holland should mutually give back the places they had taken, but that Louis should retain all his conquests in Flanders, except Aeth, Charleroi, Oudenarde, Courtrai, Tournai, and Valenciennes, which would form a frontier between the French dominions and the United Provinces. The lord Duras, a Frenchman and attached to the duke (later created earl of Feversham), was sent over to Paris with this treaty. He was to demand a positive answer in two days, but pretexts were made for detaining him, and meantime the prince was obliged to return to the Continent. Louis was in fact highly indignant at the marriage of the princess Mary.

Louis seemed resolved to listen to no terms but such as he should dictate, and though the winter had commenced his army forthwith took the field. Charles then (December 3rd) appointed the parliament to meet on the 15th of January; Louis on the 17th stopped the payment of his pension, offering at the same time, if he would consent to his retention of Condé, Valenciennes, and Tournai, to send him the value of them in bars of gold, concealed in silk; and Danby was promised, if he would give his influence, any reward he should name in diamonds and pearls. Danby, however, was not to be bought; the king and duke were also displeased with Louis, and the duke looked forward to the command of an army and the acquisition of military fame. It is also likely, that the royal brothers thought their schemes of arbitrary power would be more likely to be effected by the force of a native army, than by the insidious aid of Louis.

When the parliament met (January 28th, 1678), Charles informed them that he had concluded an alliance offensive and defensive with the states for

the protection of Flanders, and that he should require a fleet of ninety sail, and an army of from thirty to forty thousand men. After a good deal of opposition, a supply for that purpose was voted on February 5th. The king, however, was still desirous of peace; but the success of Louis, who had now reduced Ypres and Ghent, exasperated the English nation, and the commons hastened to pass a bill for a part of the supply. Charles forthwith sent a body of three thousand men to the defence of Ostend, and he issued money for raising twenty thousand more, to be accomplished within six weeks.

The troops when raised were, King James assures us, "as good as anywhere were to be seen." The commons, who, as the same prince tells us, "were in reality more jealous of the king's power than of the power of France," took alarm, and passed a resolution April 29th not to grant any more supplies till full satisfaction was given on the subject of religion. Charles, enraged at this disappointment, forthwith prorogued the parliament and commenced negotiations with Louis, with whom he subscribed on May 17th a secret treaty, engaging, in case the states would not accept the terms offered at Nimeguen, to withdraw his troops from the Continent, for which he was to receive from Louis £450,000 in four quarterly payments. When parliament met on the 23rd, an address was made that war should be declared or the army be disbanded. The king's reply was evasive, and the commons resolved that all the forces raised within the last seven months, "ought to be paid off and disbanded forthwith," and voted money for the purpose. The king, however, was not willing to part with his army. Urged by the duke of York, the council resolved to enter on the war; a corps of four thousand men was sent over to Flanders, and four thousand more, to be commanded by the duke, were in readiness for embarkation. At the same time on July 16th, a new treaty was concluded with the states, unless Louis should abandon some pretensions which he had lately made in favour of Sweden.

Louis knew when to recede as well as advance. During a fortnight his ministers employed all the resources of diplomatic tactics against those of the states, and then, when all men looked for a renewal of war, suddenly yielded on July 31st, and the peace between France and the states was signed the same day before midnight. Four days after the prince of Orange attacked the French army at St. Denis, near Mons, which town they were besieging. As it is not very likely that he could be ignorant of the actual signature of the Treaty of Nimeguen, the blood of the five thousand men who were slain in the action may be said to rest on his head. He probably hoped that a victory would prevent the ratification of the treaty, to which he was strongly opposed.

Spain and the emperor found it necessary to agree to the Peace of Nimeguen which left to Louis a large proportion of his conquests, and put it in his power to renew the war when he pleased with every advantage.

It is not to be denied, that the opposition in parliament this year played the game of the king of France, and thwarted all the efforts of Temple and Danby to urge the king into a war which was equally for the honour and interest of England. It is also well known, that the lords Hollis and Russell, and the other leaders of the country party, were in actual communication with Barillon and Ruvigni, and arranged with them the plan of operations in parliament.

The country party had a violent distrust of the king, who they well knew was bent on making himself absolute, and perhaps on changing the religion of the nation; they also knew that he looked to the money or the arms of Louis for aid in accomplishing his designs: it was therefore their object to deprive him of this support, and they probably thought that a few fortresses

in Flanders were not to be put in the balance with the British constitution. On the other hand, Louis acted on the usual maxims of state policy, and he wished to see his neighbours weak rather than strong; he had therefore no vehement desire that Charles should be absolute or the nation Catholic: he was of course as little desirous of beholding a republic in England. What he wanted was, jealousy and disunion between the king and people, so that he might be able to play the two parties against each other, and thus be free from interruption from England in this project of extending the frontier of France to the Rhine, and establishing a dictatorship over the rest of Europe. For this purpose he had, in the beginning of the reign of Charles, kept up a communication with the commonwealth men; then, seeing a prospect of the king's becoming his stipendiary and vassal, he entered into close relations with him; but the marriage of the princess Mary having proved to him that no reliance could be placed on Charles, he resolved to try to form a connection with the popular leaders.

For this purpose, Ruvigni, who was a Protestant and first-cousin to Lady Russell, came over in the month of March, and he took occasion to assure Russell and Hollis, that his master did not at all conceive it to be for his interest that the king should be absolute, and that he was ready to aid in causing a dissolution of the parliament. They agreed, on their side, to take care that the grants of supplies should be clogged with such conditions as to be so disagreeable to the king that he would prefer a reunion with France to accepting them. Ruvigni offered to spend a considerable sum in the purchase of members' votes, and begged of Russell to name those who might be gained over. He replied, that he should be sorry to have to do with people who could be bought. He at the same time gave it as his opinion, that there was no chance of a dissolution but through the king of France, whose aid for that purpose Ruvigni freely promised.[h]

TITUS OATES AND THE ALLEGED "POPISH PLOT" (1678 A.D.)

Neither national pride nor anxiety for public liberty had so great an influence on the popular mind as hatred of the Roman Catholic religion. That hatred had become one of the ruling passions of the community, and was as strong in the ignorant and profane as in those who were Protestants from conviction. The cruelties of Mary's reign, cruelties which even in the most accurate and sober narrative excite just detestation, and which were neither accurately nor soberly related in the popular martyrologies, the conspiracies against Elizabeth, and above all the Gunpowder Plot, had left in the minds of the vulgar a deep and bitter feeling which was kept up by annual commemorations, prayers, bonfires, and processions. It should be added that those classes which were peculiarly distinguished by attachment to the throne, the clergy and the landed gentry, had peculiar reasons for regarding the church of Rome with aversion. The clergy trembled for their benefices; the landed gentry for their abbeys and great tithes. While the memory of the reign of the saints was still recent, hatred of popery had in some degree given place to hatred of Puritanism: but, during the eighteen years which had elapsed since the restoration, the hatred of Puritanism had abated, and the hatred of popery had increased. The stipulations of the Treaty of Dover were accurately known to very few: but some hints had got abroad. The general impression was that a great blow was about to be aimed at the Protestant religion. The king was suspected by many of a leaning towards Rome. His brother and heir presumptive was known to be a bigoted Roman Catholic. The first

duchess of York had died a Roman Catholic. James had then, in defiance of the remonstrances of the house of commons, taken to wife the princess Mary of Modena, another Roman Catholic. If there should be sons by this marriage, there was reason to fear that they might be bred Roman Catholics, and that a long succession of princes, hostile to the established faith, might sit on the English throne. The constitution had recently been violated for the purpose of protecting the Roman Catholics from the penal laws. The ally by whom the policy of England had, during many years, been chiefly governed was not only a Roman Catholic, but a persecutor of the reformed churches. Under such circumstances it is not strange that the common people should have been inclined to apprehend a return of the times of her whom they called Bloody Mary.

Thus the nation was in such a temper that the smallest spark might raise a flame. At this conjuncture fire was set in two places at once to the vast mass of combustible matter; and in a moment the whole was in a blaze.

The French court, which knew Danby to be its mortal enemy, artfully contrived to ruin him by making him pass for its friend. Louis, by the instrumentality of Ralph Montague, a faithless and shameless man who had resided in France as minister from England, laid before the house of commons proofs that the treasurer had been concerned in an application made by the court of Whitehall to the court of Versailles for a sum of money. This discovery produced its natural effect. The treasurer was, in truth, exposed to vengeance of parliament, not on account of his delinquencies, but on account of his merits; not because he had been an accomplice in a criminal transaction, but because he had been a most unwilling and unserviceable accomplice. But of the circumstances, which have, in the judgment of posterity, greatly extenuated his fault, his contemporaries were ignorant. In their view he was the broker who had sold England to France. It seemed clear that his greatness was at an end, and doubtful whether his head could be saved.

Yet was the ferment excited by this discovery slight, when compared with the commotion which arose when it was noised abroad that a great popish plot had been detected. One Titus Oates, a clergyman of the Church of England, had, by his disorderly life and heterodox doctrine, drawn on himself the censure of his spiritual superiors, had been compelled to quit his benefice, and had ever since led an infamous and vagrant life. He had once professed himself a Roman Catholic, and had passed some time on the Continent in English colleges of the order of Jesus. In those seminaries he had heard much wild talk about the best means of bringing England back to the true church. From hints thus furnished he constructed a hideous romance, resembling rather the dream of a sick man than any transaction which ever took place in the real world. The pope, he said, had entrusted the government of England to the Jesuits. The Jesuits had, by commissions under the seal of their society, appointed Catholic clergymen, noblemen, and gentlemen, to all the highest offices in church and state. The papists had burned down London once. They had tried to burn it down again. They were at that moment planning a scheme for setting fire to all the shipping in the Thames. They were to rise at a signal and massacre all the Protestant neighbours. A French army was at the same time to land in Ireland. All the leading statesmen and divines of England were to be murdered. Three or four schemes had been formed for assassinating the king. He was to be stabbed. He was to be poisoned in his medicine. He was to be shot with silver bullets. The public mind was so sore and excitable that these lies

readily found credit with the vulgar; and two events which speedily took place led even some reflecting men to suspect that the tale, though evidently distorted and exaggerated, might have some foundation.

Edward Coleman, a very busy, and not very honest, Roman Catholic intriguer, had been among the persons accused. Search was made for his papers. It was found that he had just destroyed the greater part of them. But a few which had escaped contained some passages which, to minds strongly prepossessed, might seem to confirm the evidence of Oates. Those passages indeed, when candidly construed, appear to express little more than the hopes which the posture of affairs, the predilections of Charles, the still stronger predilections of James, and the relations existing between the French and English courts, might naturally excite in the mind of a Roman Catholic strongly attached to the interests of his church. But the country was not then inclined to construe the letters of papists candidly; and it was urged, with some show of reason, that, if papers which had been passed over as unimportant were filled with matter so suspicious, some great mystery of iniquity must have been contained in those documents which had been carefully committed to the flames.

A few days later it was known that Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, an eminent justice of the peace who had taken the depositions of Oates against Coleman, had disappeared. Search was made; and Godfrey's corpse was found in a field near London. It was clear that he had died by violence. It was equally clear that he had not been set upon by robbers. His fate is to this day a secret. Some think that he perished by his own hand; others that he was slain by a private enemy.

The capital and the whole nation went mad with hatred and fear. The penal laws, which had begun to lose something of their edge, were sharpened anew. Everywhere justices were busied in searching houses and seizing papers. All the gaols were filled with papists. London had the aspect of a city in a state of siege. The trainbands were under arms all night. Preparations were made for barricading the great thoroughfares. Patrols marched up and down the streets. Cannon were planted round Whitehall. No citizen thought himself safe unless he carried under his coat a small flail loaded with lead to brain the popish assassins. The corpse of the murdered magistrate was exhibited during several days to the gaze of great multitudes, and was then committed to the grave with strange and terrible ceremonies, which indicated rather fear and the thirst of vengeance than sorrow or religious hope. The houses insisted that a guard should be placed in the vaults over which they sat, in order to secure them against a second gunpowder plot. All their proceedings were of a piece with this demand.

Ever since the reign of Elizabeth the oath of supremacy had been exacted from members of the house of commons. Some Roman Catholics, however, had contrived so to interpret this oath that they could take it without scruple. A more stringent test was now added, and the Roman Catholic lords were for the first time excluded from their seats in parliament [October, 30, 1678. By this bill twenty Catholic peers lost their seats and for a hundred and fifty years their descendants were unable to sit]. Strong resolutions were adopted against the queen. The commons threw one of the secretaries of state into prison for having countersigned commissions directed to gentlemen who were not good Protestants. They impeached the lord treasurer of high treason. Nay, they so far forgot the doctrine which, while the memory of the civil war was still recent, they had loudly professed, that they even attempted to wrest the command of the militia out of the king's hands. To such a temper

had eighteen years of misgovernment brought the most loyal parliament that had ever met in England.

Yet it may seem strange that, even in that extremity, the king should have ventured to appeal to the people; for the people were more excited than their representatives. The lower house, discontented as it was, contained a larger number of cavaliers than were likely to find seats again. But it was thought that a dissolution would put a stop to the prosecution of the lord treasurer, a prosecution which might probably bring to light all the guilty mysteries of the French alliance, and might thus cause extreme personal annoyance and embarrassment to Charles. Accordingly, in January 1679, the parliament, which had been in existence ever since the beginning of the year 1661, was dissolved; and writs were issued for a general election. [This was the second and last Long Parliament.]

During some weeks the contention over the whole country was fierce and obstinate beyond example. Unprecedented sums were expended. New tactics were employed. It was remarked by the pamphleteers of that time as something extraordinary that horses were hired at a great charge for the conveyance of electors. The practice of splitting freeholds for the purpose of multiplying votes dates from this memorable struggle. Dissenting preachers, who had long hidden themselves in quiet nooks from persecution, now emerged from their retreats, and rode from village to village, for the purpose of rekindling the zeal of the scattered people of God. The tide ran strong against the government. Most of the new members came up to Westminster in a mood little differing from that of their predecessors who had sent Strafford and Laud to the tower.[1]

Meanwhile the courts of justice, which ought to be, in the midst of political commotions, sure places of refuge for the innocent of every party, were disgraced by wilder passions and fouler corruptions than were to be found even on the hustings. The tale of Oates, though it had sufficed to convulse the whole realm, would not, until confirmed by other evidence, suffice to destroy the humblest of those whom he had accused. For, by the old law of England, two witnesses are necessary to establish a charge of treason. But the success of the first impostor produced its natural consequences. In a few weeks he had been raised from penury and obscurity to opulence, to power which made him the dread of princes and nobles, and to notoriety such as has for low and bad minds all the attractions of glory. He was not long without coadjutors and rivals. A wretch named Carstairs, who had earned a living in Scotland by going disguised to conventicles and then informing against the preachers, led the way. Bedloe, a noted swindler, followed; and soon, from all the brothels, gambling houses, and spunging houses of London, false witnesses poured forth to swear away the lives of Roman Catholics. One came with a story about an army of thirty thousand men who were to muster in the disguise of pilgrims at Corunna, and to sail thence to Wales. Another had been promised canonisation and five hundred pounds to murder the king. A third had stepped into an eating house in Covent Garden and had there heard a great Roman Catholic banker vow, in the hearing of all the guests and drawers, to kill the heretical tyrant. Oates, that he might not be eclipsed by his imitators, soon added a large supplement to his original narrative. He had the portentous impudence to affirm, among other things, that he had

[1 Seymour, the former speaker, was re-chosen; the king rejected him, and proposed another; the commons insisted on their right, the king on his: the dispute was terminated by appointing a third person. Henceforth it became a principle, that the house should choose, but that the crown may reject the speaker presented to it.— KEIGHTLEY.h]

once stood behind a door which was ajar, and had there overheard the queen declare that she had resolved to give her consent to the assassination of her husband.[1] The vulgar believed, and the highest magistrates pretended to believe, even such fictions as these. The chief judges of the realm were corrupt, cruel, and timid. The leaders of the country party encouraged the prevailing delusion. The most respectable among them, indeed, were themselves so far deluded as to believe the greater part of the evidence of the plot to be true. Such men as Shaftesbury and Buckingham doubtless perceived that the whole was a romance. But it was a romance which served their turn; and to their seared consciences the death of an innocent man gave no more uneasiness than the death of a partridge. The juries partook of the feelings then common throughout the nation, and were encouraged by the bench to indulge those feelings without restraint. The multitude applauded Oates and his confederates, hooted and pelted the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the accused, and shouted with joy when the verdict of guilty was pronounced. It was in vain that the sufferers appealed to the respectability of their past lives: for the public mind was possessed with a belief that the more conscientious a papist was, the more likely he must be to plot against a Protestant government. It was in vain that, just before the cart passed from under their feet, they resolutely affirmed their innocence: for the general opinion was that a good papist considered all lies which were serviceable to his church as not only excusable but meritorious.

While innocent blood was shedding under the forms of justice, the new parliament met: and such was the violence of the predominant party that even men whose youth had been passed amidst revolutions, men who remembered the attainder of Strafford, the attempt on the five members, the abolition of the house of lords, the execution of the king, stood aghast at the aspect of public affairs. The impeachment of Danby was resumed. He pleaded the royal pardon. But the commons treated the plea with contempt, and insisted that the trial should proceed. Danby, however, was not their chief object. They were convinced that the only effectual way of securing the liberties and religion of the nation was to exclude the duke of York from the throne.

The king was in great perplexity. He had insisted that his brother, the sight of whom inflamed the populace to madness, should retire for a time to Brussels: but this concession did not seem to have produced any favourable effect. The roundhead party was now decidedly preponderant. Towards that party leaned millions who had, at the time of the restoration, leaned towards the side of prerogative. Of the old cavaliers many participated in the prevailing fear of popery, and many, bitterly resenting the ingratitude of the prince for whom they had sacrificed so much, looked on his distress as carelessly as he had looked on theirs. Even the Anglican clergy, mortified and alarmed by the apostasy of the duke of York, so far countenanced the opposition as to join cordially in the outcry against the Roman Catholics.

SIR WILLIAM TEMPLE'S PLAN OF GOVERNMENT

The king in this extremity had recourse to Sir William Temple. Of all the official men of that age Temple had preserved the fairest character. The Triple Alliance had been his work. He had refused to take any part in the politics of the Cabal, and had, while that administration directed affairs, lived in strict privacy. He had quitted his retreat at the call of Danby, had made

[1 When taken to the palace he could not find the room where he claimed to have stood.]

peace between England and Holland, and had borne a chief part in bringing about the marriage of the lady Mary to her cousin the prince of Orange. Thus he had the credit of every one of the few good things which had been done by the government since the Restoration. Of the numerous crimes and blunders of the last eighteen years none could be imputed to him. His private life, though not austere, was decorous: his manners were popular; and he was not to be corrupted either by titles or by money. Something, however, was wanting to the character of this respectable statesman. The temperature of his patriotism was lukewarm. He prized his ease and his personal dignity too much, and shrank from responsibility with a pusillanimous fear. Nor indeed had his habits fitted him to bear a part in the conflicts of our domestic factions. He had reached his fiftieth year without having sat in the English parliament; and his official experience had been almost entirely acquired at foreign courts. He was justly esteemed one of the first diplomatists in Europe: but the talents and accomplishments of a diplomatist are widely different from those which qualify a politician to lead the house of commons in agitated times.

The scheme which he proposed showed considerable ingenuity. Though not a profound philosopher, he had thought more than most busy men of the world on the general principles of government; and his mind had been enlarged by historical studies and foreign travel. He seems to have discerned more clearly than most of his contemporaries one cause of the difficulties by which the government was beset. The character of the English polity was gradually changing. The parliament was slowly, but constantly, gaining ground on the prerogative. The line between the legislative and executive powers was in theory as strongly marked as ever, but in practice was daily becoming fainter and fainter. The theory of the constitution was that the king might name his own ministers. But the house of commons had driven Clarendon, the Cabal, and Danby successively from the direction of affairs. The theory of the constitution was that the king alone had the power of making peace and war. But the house of commons had forced him to make peace with Holland, and had all but forced him to make war with France. The theory of the constitution was that the king was the sole judge of the cases in which it might be proper to pardon offenders. Yet he was so much in dread of the house of commons that, at that moment, he could not venture to rescue from the gallows men whom he well knew to be the innocent victims of perjury.

Temple, it should seem, was desirous to secure to the legislature its undoubted constitutional powers, and yet to prevent it, if possible, from encroaching further on the province of the executive administration. With this view he determined to interpose between the sovereign and the parliament a body which might break the shock of their collision. There was a body, ancient, highly honourable, and recognised by the law, which, he thought, might be so remodelled as to serve this purpose. He determined to give to the privy council a new character and office in the government. The number of councillors he fixed at thirty. Fifteen of them were to be the chief ministers of state, of law, and of religion. The other fifteen were to be unplaced noblemen and gentlemen of ample fortune and high character. There was to be no interior cabinet. All the thirty were to be entrusted with every political secret, and summoned to every meeting; and the king was to declare that he would, on every occasion, be guided by their advice.

This plan, though in some respects not unworthy of the abilities of its author, was in principle vicious. The new board was half a cabinet and half a parliament, and, like almost every other contrivance, whether mechanical

or political, which is meant to serve two purposes altogether different, failed of accomplishing either. It was too large and too divided to be a good administrative body. It was too closely connected with the crown to be a good checking body. It contained just enough of popular ingredients to make it a bad council of state, unfit for the keeping of secrets, for the conducting of delicate negotiations, and for the administration of war. The plan, even if it had been fairly tried, could scarcely have succeeded; and it was not fairly tried. The king was fickle and perfidious: the parliament was excited and unreasonable; and the materials out of which the new council was made, though perhaps the best which that age afforded, were still bad.

The commencement of the new system was, however, hailed with general delight; for the people were in a temper to think any change an improvement. They were also pleased by some of the new nominations. Shaftesbury, now their favourite, was appointed lord-president. Russell and some other distinguished members of the country party were sworn of the council. But in a few days all was again in confusion. The inconveniences of having so numerous a cabinet were such that Temple himself consented to infringe one of the fundamental rules which he had laid down, and to become one of a small knot which really directed everything. With him were joined three other ministers, Arthur Capel, earl of Essex, George Savile, viscount Halifax, and Robert Spencer, earl of Sunderland.

THE CHARACTER OF HALIFAX

Among the statesmen of that age Halifax was, in genius, the first. His intellect was fertile, subtle, and capacious. His polished, luminous, and animated eloquence, set off by the silver tones of his voice, was the delight of the house of lords. His conversation overflowed with thought, fancy, and wit. His political tracts well deserve to be studied for their literary merit, and fully entitle him to a place among English classics. To the weight derived from talents so great and various he united all the influence which belongs to rank and ample possessions. Yet he was less successful in politics than many who enjoyed smaller advantages. Indeed, those intellectual peculiarities which make his writings valuable frequently impeded him in the contests of active life. For he always saw passing events, not in the point of view in which they commonly appear to one who bears a part in them, but in the point of view in which, after the lapse of many years, they appear to the philosophic historian. With such a turn of mind, he could not long continue to act cordially with any body of men. All the prejudices, all the exaggerations of both the great parties in the state moved his scorn. He despised the mean arts and unreasonable clamours of demagogues. He despised still more the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience. He sneered impartially at the bigotry of the churchman and at the bigotry of the Puritan. He was equally unable to comprehend how any man should object to saints' days and surplices, and how any man should persecute any other man for objecting to them. In temper he was what, in our time, is called a conservative. In theory he was a republican. Even when his dread of anarchy and his disdain for vulgar delusions led him to side for a time with the defenders of arbitrary power, his intellect was always with Locke and Milton.

He was the chief of those politicians whom the two great parties contemptuously called trimmers. Instead of quarrelling with this nickname, he assumed it as a title of honour, and vindicated, with great vivacity, the dignity of the appellation. Everything good, he said, trims between extremes. Every

faction in the day of its insolent and vindictive triumph incurred his censure; and every faction, when vanquished and persecuted, found in him a protector.

THE HABEAS CORPUS ACT (1679 A.D.)

The four confidential advisers of the crown soon found that their position was embarrassing and invidious. The other members of the council murmured at a distinction inconsistent with the king's promises; and some of them, with Shaftesbury at their head, again betook themselves to strenuous opposition in parliament. The agitation, which had been suspended by the late changes, speedily became more violent than ever. It was in vain that Charles offered to grant to the commons any security for the Protestant religion which they could devise, provided only that they would not touch the order of succession. They would hear of no compromise. They would have the Exclusion Bill and nothing but the Exclusion Bill. The king, therefore, a few weeks after he had publicly promised to take no step without the advice of his new council, went down to the house of lords without mentioning his intention in council, and prorogued the parliament.

The day of that prorogation, the twenty-sixth of May, 1679, is a great era in English history. For on that day the Habeas Corpus Act received the royal assent. From the time of the Great Charter, the substantive law respecting the personal liberty of Englishmen had been nearly the same as at present: but it had been inefficacious for want of a stringent system of procedure. What was needed was not a new right, but a prompt and searching remedy; and such a remedy the Habeas Corpus Act supplied. The king would gladly have refused his consent to that measure: but he was about to appeal from his parliament to his people on the question of the succession; and he could not venture, at so critical a moment, to reject a bill which was in the highest degree popular.

On the same day, the press of England became for a short time free. In old times printers had been strictly controlled by the court of Star Chamber. The Long Parliament had abolished the Star Chamber, but had, in spite of the philosophical and eloquent expostulation of Milton [in his *Areopagitica*], established and maintained a censorship. Soon after the Restoration, an act had been passed which prohibited the printing of unlicensed books; and it had been provided that this act should continue in force till the end of the first session of the next parliament. That moment had now arrived; and the king in the very act of dismissing the houses, emancipated the press.

THE EXCLUSION BILL AND THE DUKE OF MONMOUTH

Shortly after the prorogation came a dissolution and another general election. The zeal and strength of the opposition were at their height. The cry for the Exclusion Bill was louder than ever; and with this cry was mingled another cry, which fired the blood of the multitude, but which was heard with regret and alarm by all judicious friends of freedom. Not only the rights of the duke of York, an avowed papist, but those of his two daughters, sincere and zealous Protestants, were assailed. It was confidently affirmed that the eldest natural son of the king had been born in wedlock, and was lawful heir to the crown.

Charles, while a wanderer on the continent, had fallen in at the Hague with

Lucy Walters, a Welsh girl of great beauty, but of weak understanding and dissolute manners. She became his mistress, and presented him with a son [as we have seen in an earlier page]. A suspicious lover might have had his doubts; for the lady had several admirers, and was not supposed to be cruel to any. Charles, however, readily took her word, and poured forth on little James Crofts, as the boy was then called, an overflowing fondness, such as seemed hardly to belong to that cool and careless nature. Soon after the Restoration, the young favourite, who had learned in France the exercises then considered necessary to a fine gentleman, made his appearance at Whitehall. He was lodged in the palace, attended by pages, and permitted to enjoy several distinctions which had till then been confined to princes of the blood royal. He was married, while still in tender youth, to Anne Scott, heiress of the noble house of Buccleuch. He took her name, and received with her hand possession of her ample domains. The estate which he acquired by this match was popularly estimated at not less than ten thousand pounds a year.

Titles, and favours more substantial than titles, were lavished on him. He was made duke of Monmouth in England, duke of Buccleuch in Scotland, a knight of the Garter, master of the Horse, commander of the first troop of life guards, chief justice of Eyre south of Trent, and chancellor of the University of Cambridge. Nor did he appear to the public unworthy of his high fortunes. His countenance was eminently handsome and engaging, his temper sweet, his manners polite and affable. Though a libertine, he won the hearts of the Puritans. Though he was known to have been privy to the shameful attack on Sir John Coventry, he easily obtained the forgiveness of the country party. Even austere moralists owned that, in such a court, strict conjugal fidelity was scarcely to be expected from one who, while a child, had been married to another child. Even patriots were willing to excuse a headstrong boy for visiting with immoderate vengeance an insult offered to his father.

And soon the stain left by loose amours and midnight brawls was effaced by honourable exploits. When Charles and Louis united their forces against Holland, Monmouth commanded the English auxiliaries who were sent to the Continent, and approved himself a gallant soldier and a not unintelligent officer. On his return he found himself the most popular man in the kingdom. Nothing was withheld from him but the crown; nor did even the crown seem to be absolutely beyond his reach. The distinction which had most injudiciously been made between him and the highest nobles had produced evil consequences. When a boy he had been invited to put on his hat in the presence chamber, while Howards and Seymours stood uncovered round him. When foreign princes died, he had mourned for them in the long purple cloak, which no other subject, except the duke of York and Prince Rupert, was permitted to wear.

It was natural that these things should lead him to regard himself as a legitimate prince of the house of Stuart. Charles, even at a ripe age, was devoted to his pleasures and regardless of his dignity. It could hardly be thought incredible that he should at twenty have secretly gone through the form of espousing a lady whose beauty had fascinated him, and who was not to be won on easier terms. While Monmouth was still a child, and while the duke of York still passed for a Protestant, it was rumoured throughout the country, and even in circles which ought to have been well informed, that the king had made Lucy Walters his wife, and that, if every one had his right, her son would be prince of Wales.

Much was said of a certain "black box" which, according to the vulgar belief, contained the contract of marriage. When Monmouth had returned

from the Low Countries with a high character for valour and conduct, and when the duke of York was known to be a member of a church detested by the great majority of the nation, this idle story became important. For it there was not the slightest evidence. Against it there was the solemn asseveration of the king, made before his council, and by his order communicated to his people. But the multitude, always fond of romantic adventures, drank in eagerly the tale of the secret espousals and the black box. Some chiefs of the opposition acted on this occasion as they acted with respect to the more odious fable of Oates, and countenanced a story which they must have despised.

The interest which the populace took in him whom they regarded as the champion of the true religion, and the rightful heir of the British throne, was kept up by every artifice. When Monmouth arrived in London at midnight, the watchmen were ordered by the magistrates to proclaim the joyful event through the streets of the city: the people left their beds: bonfires were lighted: the windows were illuminated: the churches were opened; and a merry peal rose from all the steeples. When he travelled, he was everywhere received with not less pomp, and with far more enthusiasm, than had been displayed when kings had made progresses through the realm. To such a height were his pretensions carried, that he not only exhibited on his escutcheon the lions of England and the lilies of France without the *bâton sinistre* under which, according to the law of heraldry, they were debruised in token of his illegitimate birth, but ventured to touch for the "king's evil." At the same time, he neglected no art of condescension by which the love of the multitude could be conciliated. He stood godfather to the children of the peasantry, mingled in every rustic sport, wrestled, played at quarterstaff, and won footraces in his boots against fleet runners in shoes.

It is a curious circumstance that, at two of the greatest conjunctures in English history, the chiefs of the Protestant party should have committed the same error, and should by that error have greatly endangered their country and their religion. At the death of Edward VI they set up the lady Jane, without any show of birthright, in opposition, not only to their enemy Mary, but also to Elizabeth, the true hope of England and of the Reformation. Thus the most respectable Protestants, with Elizabeth at their head, were forced to make common cause with the papists. In the same manner, a hundred and thirty years later, a part of the opposition, by setting up Monmouth as a claimant of the crown, attacked the rights, not only of James, whom they justly regarded as an implacable foe of their faith and their liberties, but also of the prince and princess of Orange, who were eminently marked out, both by situation and by personal qualities, as the defenders of all free governments and of all reformed churches.

In a few years the folly of this course became manifest. At present the popularity of Monmouth constituted a great part of the strength of the opposition. The elections went against the court; the day fixed for the meeting of the houses drew near; and it was necessary that the king should determine on some line of conduct. Those who advised him discerned the first faint signs of a change of public feeling, and hoped that, by merely postponing the conflict, he would be able to secure the victory. He therefore, without even asking the opinion of the Council of the Thirty, resolved to prorogue the new parliament before it entered on business. At the same time the duke of York, who had returned from Brussels, was ordered to retire to Scotland, and was placed at the head of the administration of that kingdom.

Temple's plan of government was now avowedly abandoned and very soon

forgotten. The privy council again became what it had been. Shaftesbury and those who were connected with him in politics resigned their seats. Temple himself, as was his wont in unquiet times, retired to his garden and his library. Essex quitted the board of treasury, and cast in his lot with the opposition. But Halifax, disgusted and alarmed by the violence of his old associates, and Sunderland, who never quitted place while he could hold it, remained in the king's service.

In consequence of the resignations which took place at this conjuncture, the way to greatness was left clear to a new set of aspirants. Two statesmen, who subsequently rose to the highest eminence which a British subject can reach, soon began to attract a large share of the public attention. These were Lawrence Hyde and Sidney Godolphin. Lawrence Hyde was the second son of the chancellor Clarendon, and was brother of the first duchess of York.

Unlike most of the leading politicians of that generation he was a consistent, dogged, and rancorous party man, a cavalier of the old school, a zealous champion of the crown and of the church, and a hater of republicans and nonconformists. He had consequently a great body of personal adherents. The clergy especially looked on him as their own man, and extended to his foibles an indulgence of which, to say the truth, he stood in some need.

He now succeeded Essex at the treasury. It is to be observed that the place of first lord of the treasury had not then the importance and dignity which now belong to it. When there was a lord treasurer, that great officer was generally prime minister: but, when the white staff was in commission, the chief commissioner did not rank so high as a secretary of state. It was not till the time of Walpole that the first lord of the treasury was considered as the head of the executive administration.

VIOLENCE OF FACTIONS; WHIG AND TORY

Before the new parliament was suffered to meet for despatch of business, a whole year elapsed, an eventful year, which has left lasting traces in English manners and language. Never before had political controversy been carried on with so much freedom. Never before had political clubs existed with so elaborate an organisation, or so formidable an influence. The one question of the exclusion occupied the public mind. All the presses and pulpits of the realm took part in the conflict. On one side it was maintained that the constitution and religion of the state would never be secure under a popish king; on the other, that the right of James to wear the crown in his turn was derived from God, and could not be annulled, even by the consent of all the branches of the legislature. Every county, every town, every family, was in agitation. The civilities and hospitalities of neighbourhood were interrupted. The dearest ties of friendship and of blood were sundered. Even schoolboys were divided into angry parties; and the duke of York and the earl of Shaftesbury had zealous adherents on all the forms of Westminster and Eton. The theatres shook with the roar of the contending factions. Pope Joan was brought on the stage by the zealous Protestants. Pensioned poets filled their prologues and epilogues with eulogies on the king and the duke. The malcontents besieged the throne with petitions, demanding that parliament might be forthwith convened. The loyalists sent up addresses, expressing the utmost abhorrence of all who presumed to dictate to the sovereign.

The citizens of London assembled by tens of thousands to burn the pope in effigy. The government posted cavalry at Temple Bar, and placed ordnance round Whitehall. In that year the English tongue was enriched with

two words, "mob" and "sham," remarkable memorials of a season of tumult and imposture. Opponents of the court were called Birminghams, petitioners,[1] and exclusionists. Those who took the king's side were Anti-birminghams, abhorrers, and tantivies. These appellations soon became obsolete: but at this time were first heard two nicknames which, though originally given in insult, were soon assumed with pride, which are still in daily use, which have spread as widely as the English race, and which will last as long as the English literature. It is a curious circumstance that one of these nicknames was of Scotch, and the other of Irish, origin. Both in Scotland and in Ireland, misgovernment had called into existence bands of desperate men whose ferocity was heightened by religious enthusiasm. In Scotland, some of the persecuted covenanters, driven mad by oppression, had lately murdered the primate, had taken arms against the government, had obtained some advantages against the king's forces, and had not been put down till Monmouth, at the head of some troops from England, had routed them at Bothwell Bridge. These zealots were most numerous among the rustics of the western lowlands, who were vulgarly called Whigs.[2] Thus the appellation of whig was fastened on the Presbyterian zealots of Scotland, and was transferred to those English politicians who showed a disposition to oppose the court, and to treat Protestant non-conformists with indulgence. The bogs of Ireland, at the same time, afforded a refuge to popish outlaws, much resembling those who were afterwards known as whiteboys. These men were then called Tories. The name of tory was therefore given to Englishmen who refused to concur in excluding a Roman Catholic prince from the throne.

THE SECOND SHORT PARLIAMENT FAILS TO PASS THE EXCLUSION BILL (1680–1681 A.D.)

The rage of the hostile factions would have been sufficiently violent, if it had been left to itself. But it was studiously exasperated by the common enemy of both. Louis still continued to bribe and flatter both court and opposition. He exhorted Charles to be firm: he exhorted James to raise a civil war in Scotland: he exhorted the whigs not to flinch, and to rely with confidence on the protection of France.

Through all this agitation a discerning eye might have perceived that the public opinion was gradually changing. The persecution of the Roman Catholics went on. [Six Jesuits were executed in 1679; and six or eight priests.] But convictions were no longer matters of course. A new brood of false witnesses, among whom a villain named Dangerfield was the most conspicious, infested the courts: but the stories of these men, though better constructed than that of Oates, found less credit. Juries were no longer so easy of belief as during the panic which had followed the murder of Godfrey; and judges who, while the popular frenzy was at its height, had been its most obsequious instruments, now ventured to express some part of what they had from the first thought.

[1 The Petitioners were so called from their sending petitions to the king to allow parliament to convene; the Abhorrers, from their counter-petitions expressing "abhorrence" at such interference with the king.]

[2 In the history of Scotland it is stated that the same have devised the name "Whig," from "Whiggamore" or "Whig," *i.e.*, "a large whip," claiming that it was first applied to those engaged in the dash known as the Whiggamore Raid in 1649. Others have traced the word to an original "Whig," meaning corrupt or sour whey. Gardiner[d] says it came from a cry "Whiggain" used to urge on a horse.]

At length, in October, 1680, the parliament met. The whigs had so great a majority in the commons that the Exclusion Bill went through all its stages there without difficulty. The king scarcely knew on what members of his own cabinet he could reckon. The duchess of Portsmouth implored her royal lover not to rush headlong to destruction. If there were any point on which he had a scruple of conscience or of honour, it was the question of the succession; but during some days it seemed that he would submit. He wavered, asked what sum the commons would give him if he yielded, and suffered a negotiation to be opened with the leading whigs. But a deep mutual distrust which had been many years growing, and which had been carefully nursed by the arts of France, made a treaty impossible. Neither side would place confidence in the other. The whole nation now looked with breathless anxiety to the house of lords. The assemblage of peers was large. The king himself was present. The debate was long, earnest, and occasionally furious. Some hands were laid on the pommels of swords, in a manner which revived the recollection of the stormy parliaments of Henry III and Richard II. Shaftesbury and Essex were joined by the treacherous Sunderland.

But the genius of Halifax bore down all opposition. Deserted by his most important colleagues, and opposed to a crowd of able antagonists, he defended the cause of the duke of York, in a succession of speeches which, many years later, were remembered as masterpieces of reasoning, of wit, and of eloquence. It is seldom that oratory changes votes. Yet the attestation of contemporaries leaves no doubt that, on this occasion, votes were changed by the oratory of Halifax. The bishops, true to their doctrines, supported the principle of hereditary right, and the bill was rejected by a great majority. The party which preponderated in the house of commons, bitterly mortified by this defeat, found some consolation in shedding the blood of Roman Catholics. William Howard, viscount Stafford, one of the unhappy men who had been accused of a share in the plot, was brought before the bar of his peers: and on the testimony of Oates and of two other false witnesses, Dugdale and Turberville, was found guilty of high treason, and suffered death, December 29th, 1680. But the circumstances of his trial and execution ought to have given an useful warning to the whig leaders. A large and respectable minority of the house of lords pronounced the prisoner not guilty. The multitude, which a few months before had received the dying declarations of Oates' victims with mockery and execrations, now loudly expressed a belief that Stafford was a murdered man. When he with his last breath protested his innocence, the cry was, "God bless you, my lord! We believe you, my lord." A judicious observer might easily have predicted that the blood then shed would shortly have blood.

THE OXFORD PARLIAMENT OF 1681

The king determined to try once more the experiment of a dissolution. A new parliament was summoned to meet at Oxford, in March, 1681. Since the days of the Plantagenets the houses had constantly sat at Westminster, except when the plague was raging in the capital: but so extraordinary a conjecture seemed to require extraordinary precautions. If the parliament were held in its usual place of assembling, the house of commons might declare itself permanent, and might call for aid on the magistrates and citizens of London. The train bands might rise to defend Shaftesbury as they had risen forty years before to defend Pym and Hampden. The guards might be overpowered, the palace forced, the king a prisoner in the hands of his mutinous

subjects. At Oxford there was no such danger. The university was devoted to the crown; and the gentry of the neighbourhood were generally tories. Here, therefore, the opposition had more reason than the king to apprehend violence.

The elections were sharply contested. The whigs still composed a majority of the house of commons: but it was plain that the tory spirit was fast rising throughout the country. It should seem that the sagacious and versatile Shaftesbury ought to have foreseen the coming change, and to have consented to the compromise which the court offered, but he appears to have utterly forgotten his old tactics. Instead of making dispositions which, in the worst event, would have secured his retreat, he took up a position in which it was necessary that he should either conquer or perish. Perhaps his head, strong as it was, had been turned by popularity, by success, and by the excitement of conflict. Perhaps he had spurred his party till he could no longer curb it, and was really hurried on headlong by those whom he seemed to guide.

The eventful day arrived. The meeting at Oxford resembled rather that of a Polish diet than that of an English parliament. The whig members were escorted by great numbers of their armed and mounted tenants and serving men, who exchanged looks of defiance with the royal guards. The slightest provocation might, under such circumstances, have produced a civil war; but neither side dared to strike the first blow. The king again offered to consent to anything but the Exclusion Bill. The commons were determined to accept nothing but the Exclusion Bill. In a few days the parliament was again dissolved.

THE TORY REACTION AND PERSECUTION OF THE WHIGS

The king had triumphed. The reaction, which had begun some months before the meeting of the houses at Oxford, now went rapidly on. The nation, indeed, was still hostile to popery; but, when men reviewed the whole history of the plot, they felt that their Protestant zeal had hurried them into folly and crime, and could scarcely believe that they had been induced by nursery tales to clamour for the blood of fellow subjects and fellow Christians. The most loyal, indeed, could not deny that the administration of Charles had often been highly blamable. But men who had not the full information which we possess touching his dealings with France, and who were disgusted by the violence of the whigs, enumerated the large concessions which, during the last few years, he had made to his parliaments, and the still larger concessions which he had declared himself willing to make. He had consented to the laws which excluded Roman Catholics from the house of lords, from the privy council, and from all civil and military offices. He had passed the Habeas Corpus Act. If securities yet stronger had not been provided against the dangers to which the constitution and the church might be exposed under a Roman Catholic sovereign, the fault lay, not with Charles, who had invited the parliament to propose such securities, but with those whigs who had refused to hear of any substitute for the Exclusion Bill.

One thing only had the king denied to his people. He had refused to take away his brother's birthright. And was there not good reason to believe that this refusal was prompted by laudable feelings? What selfish motive could faction itself impute to the royal mind? The Exclusion Bill did not curtail the reigning king's prerogatives, or diminish his income. Indeed, by passing it, he might easily have obtained an ample addition to his own revenue. And what was it to him who ruled after him? Nay, if he had personal

predilections, they were known to be rather in favour of the duke of Monmouth than the duke of York. The most natural explanation of the king's conduct therefore seemed to be that, careless as was his temper, and loose as were his morals, he had, on this occasion, acted from a sense of duty and honour. And, if so, would the nation compel him to do what he thought criminal and disgraceful? To apply, even by strictly constitutional means, a violent pressure to his conscience, seemed to zealous royalists ungenerous and undutiful.

But strictly constitutional means were not the only means which the whigs were disposed to employ. Signs were already discernible which portended the approach of great troubles. Men, who in the time of the civil war and of the commonwealth had acquired an odious notoriety, had emerged from the obscurity in which, after the restoration, they had hidden themselves from the general hatred, showed their confident and busy faces everywhere, and appeared to anticipate a second reign of the saints. Another Naseby, another high court of justice, another usurper on the throne, the lords again ejected from their hall by violence, the universities again purged, the church again robbed and persecuted, the Puritans again dominant, to such results did the desperate policy of the opposition seem to tend.

Animated by such feelings, the majority of the upper and middle classes hastened to rally round the throne. The situation of the king bore, at this time, a great resemblance to that in which his father stood just after the Remonstrance had been voted. But the reaction of 1641 had not been suffered to run its course. Charles I, at the very moment when his people, long estranged, were returning to him with hearts disposed to reconciliation, had, by a perfidious violation of the fundamental laws of the realm, forfeited their confidence forever. Had Charles II taken a similar course, had he arrested the whig leaders in an irregular manner, and impeached them of high treason before a tribunal which had no legal jurisdiction over them, it is highly probable that they would speedily have regained the ascendency which they had lost. Fortunately for himself he was induced, at this crisis, to adopt a policy which, for his ends, was singularly judicious. He determined to conform to the law, but at the same time to make vigorous and unsparing use of the law against his adversaries. He was not bound to convoke a parliament till three years should have elapsed. He was not much distressed for money. The produce of the taxes which had been settled on him for life exceeded the estimate. He was at peace with all the world. He could retrench his expenses by giving up the costly and useless settlement of Tangier; and he might hope for pecuniary aid from France. He had, therefore, ample time and means for a systematic attack on the opposition under the forms of the constitution. The judges were removable at his pleasure: the juries were nominated by the sheriffs; and, in almost all the counties of England, the sheriffs were nominated by himself. Witnesses, of the same class with those who had recently sworn away the lives of papists, were ready to swear away the lives of whigs.

The first victim was College, a noisy and violent demagogue of mean birth and education. He was by trade a joiner, and was celebrated as the inventor of the Protestant flail. He had been at Oxford when the parliament sat there, and was accused of having planned a rising and an attack on the king's guards. Evidence was given against him by Dugdale and Turberville, the same infamous men who had, a few months earlier, borne false witness against Stafford. In the sight of a jury of country squires no exclusionist was likely to find favour. College was convicted. The crowd which filled the court

house of Oxford received the verdict with a roar of exultation, as barbarous as that which he and his friends had been in the habit of raising when innocent papists were doomed to the gallows. His execution was the beginning of a new judicial massacre, not less atrocious than that in which he had himself borne a share.

The government emboldened by this first victory, now aimed a blow at an enemy of a very different class. It was resolved that Shaftesbury should be brought to trial for his life. Evidence was collected which, it was thought, would support a charge of treason.[1] But the facts which it was necessary to prove were alleged to have been committed in London. The sheriffs of London, chosen by the citizens, were zealous whigs. They named a whig grand jury, which threw out the bill, November 24, 1681. This defeat, far from discouraging those who advised the king, suggested to them a new and daring scheme. Since the charter of the capital was in their way, that charter must be annulled. It was pretended, therefore, that the city of London had by some irregularities forfeited its municipal privileges; and proceedings were instituted against the corporation in the court of King's Bench. At the same time those laws which had, soon after the Restoration, been enacted against non-conformists, and which had remained dormant during the ascendency of the whigs, were enforced all over the kingdom with extreme rigour.

Yet the spirit of the whigs was not subdued. Though in evil plight, they were still a numerous and powerful party; and, as they mustered strong in the large towns, and especially in the capital, they made a noise and a show more than proportioned to their real force. Animated by the recollection of past triumphs, and by the sense of present oppression, they overrated both their strength and their wrongs. It was not in their power to make out that clear and overwhelming case which can alone justify so violent a remedy as resistance to an established government. Whatever they might suspect, they could not prove that their sovereign had entered into a treaty with France against the religion and liberties of England. What was apparent was not sufficient to warrant an appeal to the sword. If the Exclusion Bill had been thrown out, it had been thrown out by the lords in the exercise of a right coeval with the constitution. If the king had dissolved the Oxford Parliament, he had done so by virtue of a prerogative which had never been questioned. If the court had, since the dissolution, done some harsh things, still those things were in strict conformity with the letter of the law, and with the recent practice of the malecontents themselves. If the king had prosecuted his opponents, he had prosecuted them according to the proper forms, and before the proper tribunals. The evidence now produced for the crown was at least as worthy of credit as the evidence on which the noblest blood of England had lately been shed by the opposition. The treatment which an accused whig had now to expect from judges, advocates, sheriffs, juries, and spectators, was no worse than the treatment which had been thought by the whigs good enough for an accused papist. If the privileges of the city of London were attacked, they were attacked, not by military violence or by any disputable exercise of prerogative, but according to the regular practice of Westminster Hall. No tax was imposed by royal authority. No law was suspended. The Habeas Corpus Act was respected. Even the Test Act was enforced. The opposition therefore could not bring home to the king that species of misgovernment which alone could justify insurrection. And, even had his misgov-

[1 While Shaftesbury was in prison Dryden issued his famous satire *Absalom and Achitophel* against Shaftesbury who is represented as the tempter Achitophel and Monmouth as the misguided Absalom.]

ernment been more flagrant than it was, insurrection would still have been criminal, because it was almost certain to be unsuccessful.

The situation of the whigs in 1682 differed widely from that of the roundheads forty years before. Those who took up arms against Charles I acted under the authority of a parliament which had been legally assembled, and which could not, without its own consent, be legally dissolved. The opponents of Charles II were private men. Almost all the military and naval resources of the kingdom had been at the disposal of those who resisted Charles I. All the military and naval resources of the kingdom were at the disposal of Charles II. The house of commons had been supported by at least half the nation against Charles I. But those who were disposed to levy war against Charles II were certainly a minority. It could not reasonably be doubted, therefore, that, if they attempted a rising, they would fail. Still less could it be doubted that their failure would aggravate every evil of which they complained.

THE RYEHOUSE PLOT: THE DEATH OF SHAFTESBURY, RUSSELL, AND OTHERS (1683 A.D.)

The true policy of the whigs was to submit with patience to adversity which was the natural consequence and the just punishment of their errors, to wait patiently for that turn of public feeling which must inevitably come, to observe the law, and to avail themselves of the protection, imperfect indeed, but by no means nugatory, which the law afforded to innocence. Unhappily they took a very different course. Unscrupulous and hotheaded chiefs of the party formed and discussed schemes of resistance, and were heard, if not with approbation, yet with the show of acquiescence, by much better men than themselves. It was proposed that there should be simultaneous insurrections in London, in Cheshire, at Bristol, and at Newcastle. Communications were opened with the discontented Presbyterians of Scotland, who were suffering under a tyranny such as England, in the worst times, had never known.[1] While the leaders of the opposition thus revolved plans of open rebellion, but were still restrained by fears or scruples from taking any decisive step, a design of a very different kind was meditated by some of their accomplices.

To fierce spirits, unrestrained by principle, or maddened by fanaticism, it seemed that to waylay and murder the king and his brother was the shortest and surest way of vindicating the Protestant religion and the liberties of England. A place and a time were named; and the details of the butchery were frequently discussed, if not definitively arranged. This scheme was known but to few, and was concealed with especial care from the upright and humane Russell, and from Monmouth, who, though not a man of delicate conscience, would have recoiled with horror from the guilt of parricide. Thus there were two plots, one within the other. The object of the great whig plot was to raise the nation in arms against the government. The lesser plot, commonly called the Rye House Plot, in which only a few desperate men were concerned, had for its object the assassination of the king and of the heir presumptive [as they passed the Rye House].

Both plots were soon discovered. Cowardly traitors hastened to save themselves, by divulging all, and more than all, that had passed in the deliberations of the party. That only a small minority of those who meditated resistance had admitted into their minds the thought of assassination is fully

[1 For the account of the dramatic events in Scotland under Charles II's representatives we must again refer the reader to our history of Scotland.]

established. but, as the two conspiracies ran into each other, it was not difficult for the government to confound them together. The just indignation excited by the Rye House Plot was extended for a time to the whole whig body. The king was now at liberty to exact full vengeance for years of restraint and humiliation.

Shaftesbury, indeed, had escaped the fate which his manifold perfidy had well deserved.[1] He had seen that the ruin of his party was at hand, had in vain endeavoured to make his peace with the royal brothers, had fled to Holland, and had died there, January 22, 1683, under the generous protection of a government which he had cruelly wronged. Monmouth threw himself at his father's feet and found mercy, but soon gave new offence, and thought it prudent to go into voluntary exile. Essex perished by his own hand in the tower. Russell, who appears to have been guilty of no offence falling within the definition of high treason, and Sidney, of whose guilt no legal evidence could be produced, were beheaded in defiance of law and justice. Russell died with the fortitude of a Christian, Sidney with the fortitude of a stoic. Some active politicians of meaner rank were sent to the gallows. Many quitted the country. Numerous prosecutions for misprision of treason, for libel, and for conspiracy were instituted.

Convictions were obtained without difficulty from tory juries, and rigorous punishments were inflicted by courtly judges. With these criminal proceedings were joined civil proceedings scarcely less formidable. Actions were brought against persons who had defamed the duke of York; and damages tantamount to a sentence of perpetual imprisonment were demanded by the plaintiff, and without difficulty obtained.

SEIZURE OF CHARTERS AND OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

The court of King's Bench pronounced that the franchises of the city of London were forfeited to the crown. Flushed with this great victory the government proceeded to attack the constitutions of other corporations which were governed by whig officers, and which had been in the habit of returning whig members to parliament. Borough after borough was compelled to surrender its privileges; and new charters were granted which gave the ascendency everywhere to the tories.

These proceedings, however reprehensible, had yet the semblance of legality. They were also accompanied by an act intended to quiet the uneasiness with which many loyal men looked forward to the accession of a popish sovereign. The lady Anne, younger daughter of the duke of York by his first wife, was married to George, a prince of the orthodox house of Denmark. The tory gentry and clergy might now flatter themselves that the Church of England had been effectually secured without any violation of the order of succession. The king and his heir were nearly of the same age. Both were approaching the decline of life. The king's health was good. It was therefore probable that James, if he ever came to the throne, would have but a short reign. Beyond his reign there was the gratifying prospect of a long series of Protestant sovereigns.

The liberty of unlicensed printing was of little or no use to the vanquished party; for the temper of judges and juries was such that no writer whom the government prosecuted for a libel had any chance of escaping. The dread of punishment therefore did all that a censorship could have done. Meanwhile,

[1 But Gardiner[d] says, "With all his faults he had led the way on that path in which the English nation was, before long, to walk."]

the pulpits resounded with harangues against the sin of rebellion. The treatises in which Filmer maintained that hereditary despotism was the form of government ordained by God, and that limited monarchy was a pernicious absurdity, had recently appeared, and had been favourably received by a large section of the tory party. The university of Oxford, on the very day on which Russell was put to death, adopted by a solemn public act these strange doctrines, and ordered the political works of Buchanan, Milton, and Baxter to be publicly burned in the court of the schools.

Thus emboldened, the king at length ventured to overstep the bounds which he had during some years observed, and to violate the plain letter of the law. The law was that not more than three years should pass between the dissolving of one parliament and the convoking of another. But, when three years had elapsed after the dissolution of the parliament which sat at Oxford, no writs were issued for an election. This infraction of the constitution was the more reprehensible, because the king had little reason to fear a meeting with a new house of commons. The counties were generally on his side; and many boroughs in which the whigs had lately held sway had been so remodelled that they were certain to return none but courtiers.



DUKE OF MONMOUTH
(1649–1685)

In a short time the law was again violated in order to gratify the duke of York. That prince was, partly on account of his religion, and partly on account of the sternness and harshness of his nature, so unpopular that it had been thought necessary to keep him out of sight while the Exclusion Bill was before parliament, lest his public appearance should give an advantage to the party which was struggling to deprive him of his birthright. He had therefore been sent to govern Scotland, where the savage old tyrant Lauderdale was sinking into the grave. Even Lauderdale was now outdone. The administration of James was marked by odious laws, by barbarous punishments, and by judgments to the iniquity of which even that age furnished no parallel. The Scottish privy council had power to put state prisoners to the question. But the sight was so dreadful that, as soon as the boots appeared, even the most servile and hardhearted courtiers hastened out of the chamber. The board was sometimes quite deserted: and it was at length found necessary to make an order that the members should keep their seats on such occasions. The duke of York, it was remarked, seemed to take pleasure in the spectacle which some of the worst men then living were unable to contemplate without pity and horror. He not only came to council when the torture was to be

inflicted, but watched the agonies of the sufferers with that sort of interest and complacency with which men observe a curious experiment in science. Thus he employed himself at Edinburgh, till the event of the conflict between the court and the whigs was no longer doubtful. He then returned to England, but he was still excluded by the Test Act from all public employment; nor did the king at first think it safe to violate a statute which the great majority of his most loyal subjects regarded as one of the chief securities of their religion and of their civil rights. When, however, it appeared, from a succession of trials, that the nation had patience to endure almost anything that the government had courage to do, Charles ventured to dispense with the law in his brother's favour. The duke again took his seat in the council, and resumed the direction of naval affairs.



FRANCIS NORTH
(1637–1685)

These breaches of the constitution excited, it is true, some murmurs among the moderate tories, and were not unanimously approved even by the king's ministers. Halifax in particular, now a marquis and lord privy seal, had, from the very day on which the tories had by his help gained the ascendent, begun to turn whig. As soon as the Exclusion Bill had been thrown out, he had pressed the house of lords to make provision against the danger to which in the next reign, the liberties and religion of the nation might be exposed. He now saw with alarm the violence of that reaction which was, in no small measure, his own work. He did not try to conceal the scorn which he felt for the servile doctrines of the university of Oxford. He detested the French alliance. He disapproved of the long intermission of parliaments. He regretted the severity with which the vanquished party was treated. He who, when the whigs were predominant, had ventured to pronounce Stafford not guilty, ventured, when they were vanquished and helpless, to intercede for Russell.

At one of the last councils which Charles held a remarkable scene took place. The charter of Massachusetts had been forfeited. A question arose how, for the future, the colony should be governed. The general opinion of the board was that the whole power, legislative as well as executive, should abide in the crown Halifax took the opposite side, and argued with great energy against

absolute monarchy, and in favour of representative government. It was vain, he said, to think that a population, sprung from the English stock, and animated by English feelings, would long bear to be deprived of English institutions. Life, he exclaimed, would not be worth having in a country where liberty and property were at the mercy of one despotic master. The duke of York was greatly incensed by this language, and represented to his brother the danger of retaining in office a man who appeared to be infected with all the worst notions of Marvell and Sidney.

Some modern writers have blamed Halifax for continuing in the ministry while he disapproved of the manner in which both domestic and foreign affairs were conducted. But this censure is unjust. Indeed it is to be remarked that the word ministry, in the sense in which we use it, was then unknown. The thing itself did not exist; for it belongs to an age in which parliamentary government is fully established. At present the chief servants of the crown form one body. They are understood to be on terms of friendly confidence with each other, and to agree as to the main principles on which the executive administration ought to be conducted. If a slight difference of opinion arises among them, it is easily compromised; but, if one of them differs from the rest on a vital point, it is his duty to resign. While he retains his office, he is held responsible even for steps which he has tried to dissuade his colleagues from taking.

In the seventeenth century, the heads of the various branches of the administration were bound together in no such partnership. Each of them was accountable for his own acts, for the use which he made of his own official seal, for the documents which he signed, for the counsel which he gave to the king. No statesman was held answerable for what he had not himself done, or induced others to do. If he took care not to be the agent in what was wrong, and if, when consulted, he recommended what was right, he was blameless. It would have been thought strange scrupulosity in him to quit his post, because his advice as to matters not strictly within his own department was not taken by his master; to leave the board of admiralty, for example, because the finances were in disorder, or the board of treasury because the foreign relations of the kingdom were in an unsatisfactory state. It was, therefore, by no means unusual to see in high office, at the same time, men who avowedly differed from one another as widely as ever Pulteney differed from Walpole, Fox from Pitt.

The moderate and constitutional counsels of Halifax were timidly and feebly seconded by Francis North, Lord Guildford, who had lately been made keeper of the great seal. The character of Guildford has been drawn at full length by his brother Roger North, a most intolerant tory, a most affected and pedantic writer, but a vigilant observer of all those minute circumstances which throw light on the dispositions of men. It is remarkable that the biographer, though he was under the influence of the strongest fraternal partiality and though he was evidently anxious to produce a flattering likeness, was yet unable to portray the lord keeper otherwise than as the most ignoble of mankind. Yet the intellect of Guildford was clear, his industry great, his proficiency in letters and science respectable, and his legal learning more than respectable. His faults were selfishness, cowardice, and meanness. He was not insensible to the power of female beauty, nor averse from excess in wine. Yet neither wine nor beauty could ever seduce the cautious and frugal libertine, even in his earliest youth, into one fit of indiscreet generosity.

The chief opponent of Halifax was Lawrence Hyde, who had recently been created earl of Rochester. Of all tories, Rochester was the most intolerant and

inflicted, but watched the agonies of the sufferers with that sort of interest and complacency with which men observe a curious experiment in science. Thus he employed himself at Edinburgh, till the event of the conflict between the court and the whigs was no longer doubtful. He then returned to England, but he was still excluded by the Test Act from all public employment; nor did the king at first think it safe to violate a statute which the great majority of his most loyal subjects regarded as one of the chief securities of their religion and of their civil rights. When, however, it appeared, from a succession of trials, that the nation had patience to endure almost anything that the government had courage to do, Charles ventured to dispense with the law in his brother's favour. The duke again took his seat in the council, and resumed the direction of naval affairs.



FRANCIS NORTH
(1637–1685)

These breaches of the constitution excited, it is true, some murmurs among the moderate tories, and were not unanimously approved even by the king's ministers. Halifax in particular, now a marquis and lord privy seal, had, from the very day on which the tories had by his help gained the ascendent, begun to turn whig. As soon as the Exclusion Bill had been thrown out, he had pressed the house of lords to make provision against the danger to which in the next reign, the liberties and religion of the nation might be exposed. He now saw with alarm the violence of that reaction which was, in no small measure, his own work. He did not try to conceal the scorn which he felt for the servile doctrines of the university of Oxford. He detested the French alliance. He disapproved of the long intermission of parliaments. He regretted the severity with which the vanquished party was treated. He who, when the whigs were predominant, had ventured to pronounce Stafford not guilty, ventured, when they were vanquished and helpless, to intercede for Russell.

At one of the last councils which Charles held a remarkable scene took place. The charter of Massachusetts had been forfeited. A question arose how, for the future, the colony should be governed. The general opinion of the board was that the whole power, legislative as well as executive, should abide in the crown Halifax took the opposite side, and argued with great energy against

absolute monarchy, and in favour of representative government. It was vain, he said, to think that a population, sprung from the English stock, and animated by English feelings, would long bear to be deprived of English institutions. Life, he exclaimed, would not be worth having in a country where liberty and property were at the mercy of one despotic master. The duke of York was greatly incensed by this language, and represented to his brother the danger of retaining in office a man who appeared to be infected with all the worst notions of Marvell and Sidney.

Some modern writers have blamed Halifax for continuing in the ministry while he disapproved of the manner in which both domestic and foreign affairs were conducted. But this censure is unjust. Indeed it is to be remarked that the word ministry, in the sense in which we use it, was then unknown. The thing itself did not exist; for it belongs to an age in which parliamentary government is fully established. At present the chief servants of the crown form one body. They are understood to be on terms of friendly confidence with each other, and to agree as to the main principles on which the executive administration ought to be conducted. If a slight difference of opinion arises among them, it is easily compromised; but, if one of them differs from the rest on a vital point, it is his duty to resign. While he retains his office, he is held responsible even for steps which he has tried to dissuade his colleagues from taking.

In the seventeenth century, the heads of the various branches of the administration were bound together in no such partnership. Each of them was accountable for his own acts, for the use which he made of his own official seal, for the documents which he signed, for the counsel which he gave to the king. No statesman was held answerable for what he had not himself done, or induced others to do. If he took care not to be the agent in what was wrong, and if, when consulted, he recommended what was right, he was blameless. It would have been thought strange scrupulosity in him to quit his post, because his advice as to matters not strictly within his own department was not taken by his master; to leave the board of admiralty, for example, because the finances were in disorder, or the board of treasury because the foreign relations of the kingdom were in an unsatisfactory state. It was, therefore, by no means unusual to see in high office, at the same time, men who avowedly differed from one another as widely as ever Pulteney differed from Walpole, Fox from Pitt.

The moderate and constitutional counsels of Halifax were timidly and feebly seconded by Francis North, Lord Guildford, who had lately been made keeper of the great seal. The character of Guildford has been drawn at full length by his brother Roger North, a most intolerant tory, a most affected and pedantic writer, but a vigilant observer of all those minute circumstances which throw light on the dispositions of men. It is remarkable that the biographer, though he was under the influence of the strongest fraternal partiality and though he was evidently anxious to produce a flattering likeness, was yet unable to portray the lord keeper otherwise than as the most ignoble of mankind. Yet the intellect of Guildford was clear, his industry great, his proficiency in letters and science respectable, and his legal learning more than respectable. His faults were selfishness, cowardice, and meanness. He was not insensible to the power of female beauty, nor averse from excess in wine. Yet neither wine nor beauty could ever seduce the cautious and frugal libertine, even in his earliest youth, into one fit of indiscreet generosity.

The chief opponent of Halifax was Lawrence Hyde, who had recently been created earl of Rochester. Of all tories, Rochester was the most intolerant and

uncompromising. The moderate members of his party complained that the whole patronage of the treasury, while he was first commissioner there, went to noisy zealots, whose only claim to promotion was that they were always drinking confusion to whiggery, and lighting bonfires to burn the Exclusion Bill. The duke of York, pleased with a spirit which so much resembled his own, supported his brother-in-law passionately and obstinately.

The attempts of the rival ministers to surmount and supplant each other kept the court in incessant agitation. Halifax pressed the king to summon a parliament, to grant a general amnesty, to deprive the duke of York of all share in the government, to recall Monmouth from banishment, to break with Louis, and to form a close union with Holland on the principles of the Triple Alliance. The duke of York, on the other hand, dreaded the meeting of a parliament, regarded the vanquished whigs with undiminished hatred, still flattered himself that the design formed fourteen years before at Dover might be accomplished, daily represented to his brother the impropriety of suffering one who was at heart a republican to hold the privy seal, and strongly recommended Rochester for the great place of lord treasurer.

Nor was Louis negligent or inactive. Everything at that moment favoured his designs. He had nothing to apprehend from the German empire, which was then contending against the Turks on the Danube. Holland could not, unsupported, venture to oppose him. He was therefore at liberty to indulge his ambition and insolence without restraint. He seized Dixmude and Courtray. He bombarded Luxemburg. He exacted from the republic of Genoa the most humiliating submissions.

The power of France at that time reached a higher point than it ever before or ever after attained, during the ten centuries which separated the reign of Charlemagne and the reign of Napoleon. It was not easy to say where her acquisitions would stop, if only England could be kept in a state of vassalage. The first object of the court of Versailles was therefore to prevent the calling of a parliament and the reconciliation of English parties. To this end bribes, promises, and menaces were unsparingly employed. Charles was sometimes allured by the hope of a subsidy, and sometimes frightened by being told that, if he convoked the houses, the secret articles of the Treaty of Dover should be published. Several privy councillors were bought; and attempts were made to buy Halifax, but in vain. When he had been found incorruptible, all the art and influence of the French embassy were employed to drive him from office: but his polished wit and his various accomplishments had made him so agreeable to his master, that the design failed.

Halifax was not content with standing on the defensive. He openly accused Rochester of malversation. An inquiry took place. It appeared that forty thousand pounds had been lost to the public by the mismanagement of the first lord of the treasury. In consequence of this discovery he was not only forced to relinquish his hopes of the white staff, but was removed from the direction of the finances to the more dignified but less lucrative and important post of lord president. "I have seen people kicked down stairs," said Halifax; "but my lord Rochester is the first person that I ever saw kicked up stairs." Godolphin, now a peer, became first commissioner of the treasury.

Still, however, the contest continued. The event depended wholly on the will of Charles; and Charles could not come to a decision. In his perplexity he promised everything to everybody. He would stand by France: he would break with France: he would never meet another parliament: he would order writs for a parliament to be issued without delay. He assured the duke of

[1685 A.D.]

York that Halifax should be dismissed from office, and Halifax that the duke should be sent to Scotland. In public he affected implacable resentment against Monmouth, and in private conveyed to Monmouth assurances of unalterable affection. How long, if the king's life had been protracted, his hesitation might have lasted, and what would have been his resolve, can only be conjectured.

THE DEATH OF CHARLES II (FEBRUARY 6TH, 1685)

The palace had seldom presented a gayer or a more scandalous appearance than on the evening of Sunday, the 1st of February, 1685. The great gallery of Whitehall, an admirable relic of the magnificence of the Tudors, was crowded with revellers and gamblers. The king sat there chatting and toying with three women, whose charms were the boast, and whose vices were the disgrace, of three nations. Barbara Palmer, duchess of Cleveland, was there, no longer young, but still retaining some traces of that superb and voluptuous loveliness which twenty years before overcame the hearts of all men. There, too, was the duchess of Portsmouth, whose soft and infantine features were lighted up with the vivacity of France. Hortensia Mancini, duchess of Mazarin, and niece of the great cardinal, completed the group. Charles himself, during his exile, had sought her hand in vain. No gift of nature or of fortune seemed to be wanting to her. But her diseased mind required stronger stimulants, and sought them in gallantry, in basset, and in usquebaugh. While Charles flirted with his three sultanas, Hortensia's French page, a handsome boy, whose vocal performances were the delight of Whitehall, and were rewarded by numerous presents of rich clothes, ponies, and guineas, warbled some amorous verses. A party of twenty courtiers was seated at cards round a large table on which gold was heaped in mountains. Even then the king had complained that he did not feel quite well. He had no appetite for his supper: his rest that night was broken; but on the following morning he rose as usual, early.

To that morning the contending factions in his council had, during some days, looked forward with anxiety. The struggle between Halifax and Rochester seemed to be approaching a decisive crisis. Halifax, not content with having already driven his rival from the board of treasury, had undertaken to prove him guilty of such dishonesty or neglect in the conduct of the finances as ought to be punished by dismission from the public service. It was even whispered that the lord president would probably be sent to the Tower. The king had promised to inquire into the matter. The 2nd of February had been fixed for the investigation; and several officers of the revenue had been ordered to attend with their books on that day. But a great turn of fortune was at hand.

Scarcely had Charles risen from his bed when his attendants perceived that his utterance was indistinct, and that his thoughts seemed to be wandering. Several men of rank had, as usual, assembled to see their sovereign shaved and dressed. He made an effort to converse with them in his usual gay style; but his ghastly look surprised and alarmed them. Soon his face grew black; his eyes turned in his head; he uttered a cry, staggered, and fell into the arms of Thomas, lord Bruce, son of the earl of Ailesbury. A physician who had charge of the royal retorts and crucibles happened to be present. He had no lancet; but he opened a vein with a penknife. The blood flowed freely; but the king was still insensible.

He was laid on his bed, where, during a short time, the duchess of Ports-

mouth hung over him with the familiarity of a wife. But the alarm had been given. The queen and the duchess of York were hastening to the room. The favourite concubine was forced to retire to her own apartments. Those apartments had been thrice pulled down and thrice rebuilt by her lover to gratify her caprice. The very furniture of the chimney was massive silver. Several fine paintings, which properly belonged to the queen, had been transferred to the dwelling of the mistress. The sideboards were piled with richly wrought plate. In the midst of this splendour, purchased by guilt and shame, the unhappy woman gave herself up to an agony of grief, which, to do her justice, was not wholly selfish.

All the medical men of note in London were summoned. So high did political animosities run that the presence of some whig physicians was regarded as an extraordinary circumstance. One Roman Catholic whose skill was then widely renowned, Doctor Thomas Short, was in attendance. Several of the prescriptions have been preserved. One of them is signed by fourteen doctors. The patient was bled largely. Hot iron was applied to his head. A loathsome volatile salt, extracted from human skulls, was forced into his mouth. He recovered his senses; but he was evidently in a situation of extreme danger.

The queen was for a time assiduous in her attendance. The duke of York scarcely left his brother's bedside.

On the morning of Thursday, the 5th of February, the *London Gazette* announced that his majesty was going on well, and was thought by the physicians to be out of danger. The bells of all the churches rang merrily; and preparations for bonfires were made in the streets. But in the evening it was known that a relapse had taken place, and that the medical attendants had given up all hope.

The king was in great pain, and complained that he felt as if a fire was burning within him. Yet he bore up against his sufferings with a fortitude which did not seem to belong to his soft and luxurious nature. The sight of his misery affected his wife so much that she fainted, and was carried senseless to her chamber. The prelates who were in waiting had from the first exhorted him to prepare for his end. They now thought it their duty to address him in a still more urgent manner. William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, used great freedom. "It is time," he said, "to speak out; for, Sir, you are about to appear before a judge who is no respecter of persons." The king answered not a word. Thomas Ken, bishop of Bath and Wells, then tried his powers of persuasion. His solemn and pathetic exhortation awed and melted the bystanders to such a degree that some among them believed him to be filled with the same spirit which, in the old time, had, by the mouths of Nathan and Elias, called sinful princes to repentance. Charles however was unmoved. He made no objection indeed when the Service for the Visitation of the Sick was read. In reply to the pressing questions of the divines, he said that he was sorry for what he had done amiss; and he suffered the absolution to be pronounced over him according to the forms of the Church of England: but, when he was urged to declare that he died in the communion of that church, he seemed not to hear what was said; and nothing could induce him to take the eucharist from the hands of the bishops. A table with bread and wine was brought to his bedside, but in vain. Sometimes he said that there was no hurry, and sometimes that he was too weak.

Many attributed this apathy to contempt for divine things, and many to the stupor which often precedes death. But there were in the palace a few persons who knew better. Charles had never been a sincere member of the

established church. His mind had long oscillated between Hobbism and popery. When his health was good and his spirits high, he was a scoffer. In his few serious moments he was a Roman Catholic. The duke of York was aware of this, but was entirely occupied with the care of his own interests. He had ordered the outports to be closed. He had posted detachments of the guards in different parts of the city. He had also procured the feeble signature of the dying king to an instrument by which some duties, granted only till the demise of the crown, were let to farm for a term of three years. These things occupied the attention of James to such a degree that, though, on ordinary occasions, he was indiscreetly and unseasonably eager to bring over proselytes to his church, he never reflected that his brother was in danger of dying without the last sacraments.

A life of frivolity and vice had not extinguished in the duchess of Portsmouth all sentiments of religion. The French ambassador Barillon, found her in an agony of sorrow. She took him into a secret room, and poured out her whole heart to him. "I have," she said, "a thing of great moment to tell you. If it were known, my head would be in danger. The king is really and truly a Catholic; but he will die without being reconciled to the church. His bedchamber is full of Protestant clergymen. I cannot enter it without giving scandal. The duke is thinking only of himself. Speak to him. Remind him that there is a soul at stake. He is master now. He can clear the room. Go this instant, or it will be too late."

Barillon hastened to the bedchamber, took the duke aside, and delivered the message of the mistress. The conscience of James smote him. The duke commanded the crowd to stand aloof, went to the bed, stooped down, and whispered something which none of the spectators could hear, but which they supposed to be some question about affairs of state. Charles answered in an audible voice, "Yes, yes, with all my heart." None of the bystanders, except the French ambassador, guessed that the king was declaring his wish to be admitted into the bosom of the church of Rome.

"Shall I bring a priest?" said the duke. "Do, brother," replied the sick man. "For God's sake do, and lose no time. But no; you will get into trouble." "If it costs me my life," said the duke, "I will fetch a priest."

To find a priest, however, for such a purpose, at a moment's notice, was not easy. They heard that a Benedictine monk, named John Huddleston, happened to be at Whitehall. This man had, with great risk to himself, saved the king's life after the battle of Worcester, and had, on that account, been, ever since the Restoration, a privileged person. In the sharpest proclamations which had been put forth against popish priests, when false witnesses had inflamed the nation to fury, Huddleston had been excepted by name. He readily consented to put his life a second time in peril for his prince; but there was still a difficulty. The honest monk was so illiterate that he did not know what he ought to say on an occasion of such importance. He however obtained some hints from a Portuguese ecclesiastic, and, thus instructed, was brought up the back stairs by Chiffinch, a confidential servant, who, if the satires of that age are to be credited, had often introduced visitors of a very different description by the same entrance.

The duke's orders were obeyed, and even the physicians withdrew. The back door was then opened, and Father Huddleston entered. A cloak had been thrown over his sacred vestments, and his shaven crown was concealed by a flowing wig. "Sir," said the duke, "this good man once saved your life. He now comes to save your soul." Charles faintly answered, "He is welcome." Huddleston went through his part better than had been expected. He knelt

by the bed, listened to the confession, pronounced the absolution, and administered extreme unction. He asked if the king wished to receive the Lord's Supper. "Surely," said Charles, "if I am not unworthy." The host was brought in. Charles feebly strove to rise and kneel before it. The priest bade him lie still, and assured him that God would accept the humiliation of the soul, and would not require the humiliation of the body. The king found so much difficulty in swallowing the bread that it was necessary to open the door and to procure a glass of water. This rite ended, the monk held up a crucifix before the penitent, charged him to fix his last thoughts on the sufferings of the Redeemer, and withdrew. The whole ceremony had occupied about three-quarters of an hour; and, during that time, the courtiers who filled the outer room had communicated their suspicions to each other by whispers and significant glances. The door was at length thrown open, and the crowd again filled the chamber of death.

It was now late in the evening. The king seemed much relieved by what had passed. His natural children were brought to his bedside, the dukes of Grafton, Southampton, and Northumberland, sons of the duchess of Cleveland, the duke of Saint Albans, son of Eleanor Gwyn, and the duke of Richmond, son of the duchess of Portsmouth. Charles blessed them all, but spoke with peculiar tenderness to Richmond. One face which should have been there was wanting. Monmouth, the eldest and best beloved child was an exile and a wanderer. His name was not once mentioned by his father.

During the night Charles earnestly recommended the duchess of Portsmouth and her boy to the care of James, "And do not," he good-naturedly added, "let poor Nelly starve." The queen sent her excuses for her absence by Halifax. She said that she was too much disordered to resume her post by the couch, and implored pardon for any offence which she might unwittingly have given. "She ask my pardon, poor woman!" cried Charles; "I ask hers with all my heart."

The morning light began to peep through the windows of Whitehall; and Charles desired the attendants to pull aside the curtains, that he might have one more look at the day. He remarked that it was time to wind up a clock which stood near his bed. These little circumstances were long remembered, because they proved beyond dispute that, when he declared himself a Roman Catholic, he was in full possession of his faculties. He apologised to those who had stood round him all night for the trouble which he had caused. He had been, he said, a most unconscionable time dying, but he hoped that they would excuse it. This was the last glimpse of that exquisite urbanity, so often found potent to charm away the resentment of a justly incensed nation. Soon after dawn the speech of the dying man failed. Before ten his senses were gone. Great numbers had repaired to the churches at the hour of morning service. When the prayer for the king was read, loud groans and sobs showed how deeply his people felt for him. At noon on Friday, the 6th of February, he passed away without a struggle.[c]

BUCKLE'S WEIGHING OF THE GOOD AND EVIL OF THE REIGN

If we look only at the characters of the rulers, and at their foreign policy we must pronounce the reign of Charles II to be the worst that has ever been seen in England. If, on the other hand, we confine our observations to the laws which were passed, and to the principles which were established, we shall be obliged to confess that this same reign forms one of the brightest epochs in our national annals.

[1685 A.D.]

Politically and morally, there were to be found in the government all the elements of confusion, of weakness, and of crime. The king himself was a mean and spiritless voluptuary, without the morals of a Christian, and almost without the feelings of a man.[1] His ministers, with the exception of Clarendon, whom he hated for his virtues, had not one of the attributes of statesmen, and nearly all of them were pensioned by the crown of France. The weight of taxation was increased, while the security of the kingdom was diminished.[2] By the forced surrender of the charters of the towns, our municipal rights were endangered.[3] By shutting the exchequer, our national credit was destroyed.[4] Though immense sums were spent in maintaining our naval and military power, we were left so defenceless, that when a war broke out, which had long been preparing, we seemed suddenly to be taken by surprise. Such was the miserable incapacity of the government, that the fleets of Holland were able, not only to ride triumphant round our coasts, but to sail up the Thames, attack our arsenals, burn our ships and insult the metropolis of England.

Yet, notwithstanding all these things, it is an undoubted fact, that in this same reign of Charles II more steps were taken in the right direction than had been taken, in any period of equal length, during the twelve centuries we had occupied the soil of Britain. By the mere force of that intellectual movement, which was unwittingly supported by the crown, there were effected, in the course of a few years, reforms which changed the face of society. The most important of these reforms were carried, as is nearly always the case, in opposition to the real wishes of the ruling classes. Charles II and James II often said of the Habeas Corpus Act, "that a government could not subsist with such a law." The two great obstacles by which the nation had long been embarrassed, consisted of a spiritual tyranny and a territorial tyranny: the tyranny of the church and the tyranny of the nobles. An attempt was now made to remedy these evils; not by palliatives, but by striking at the power of the classes who did the mischief. For now it was that a law was placed on the statute-book, taking away that celebrated writ, which enabled the bishops or their delegates to cause those men to be burned whose religion was different to their own. This destruction of the writ *De Hæretico comburendo* was in 1667. Now it was that the clergy were deprived of the privilege of taxing themselves, and were forced to submit to an assessment made by the ordinary legislature. Now, too, there was enacted a law forbidding any bishop, or any ecclesiastical court, to tender the *ex-officio* oath, by which the church had hitherto enjoyed the power of compelling a suspected person to criminate himself. In regard to the nobles, it was also during the reign of Charles II that the house of lords, after a sharp struggle, was obliged to abandon its pretensions to an original jurisdiction in civil suits, and thus lost for ever an important resource for extending its own influence.

It was in the same reign that there was settled the right of the people to be taxed entirely by their representatives; the house of commons having ever since retained the sole power of proposing money bills, and regulating the amount of imposts, merely leaving to the peers the form of consenting to what

[1] His treatment of his young wife immediately after marriage is perhaps the worst thing recorded of this base and contemptible prince.

[2] Immediately after the Restoration, the custom began of appointing to naval commands incompetent youths of birth, to the discouragement of those able officers who had been employed under Cromwell.

[3] The court was so bent on abrogating the charter of the city of London, that Saunders was made chief-justice for the express purpose.

[4] The panic caused by this scandalous robbery is described by De Foe.

has been already determined. These were the attempts which were made to bridle the clergy and the nobles. But there were also effected other things of equal importance.

By the destruction of the scandalous prerogatives of purveyance and pre-emption, a limit was set to the power of the sovereign to vex his refractory subjects. By the Habeas Corpus Act, the liberty of every Englishman was made as certain as law could make it; it being guaranteed to him, that if accused of crime, he, instead of languishing in prison, as had often been the case, should be brought to a fair and speedy trial. By the Statute of Frauds and Perjuries, a security hitherto unknown was conferred upon private property. By the abolition of general impeachments, an end was put to a great engine of tyranny, with which powerful and unscrupulous men had frequently ruined their political adversaries.

By the cessation of those laws which restricted the liberty of printing, there was laid the foundation of that great public press, which, more than any other single cause, has diffused among the people a knowledge of their own power, and has thus, to an almost incredible extent, aided the progress of English civilisation. And, to complete this noble picture, there were finally destroyed those feudal incidents, which our Norman conquerors had imposed — the military tenures; the court of wards; the fines for alienation; the right of forfeiture for marriage by reason of tenure; the aids, the homages, the escuages, the primer seisins, and all those mischievous subtleties, of which the mere names sound in modern ears as a wild and barbarous jargon, but which pressed upon our ancestors as real and serious evils.

These were the things which were done in the reign of Charles II; and if we consider the miserable incompetence of the king, the idle profligacy of his court, the unblushing venality of his ministers, the constant conspiracies to which the country was exposed from within, and the unprecedented insults to which it was subjected from without; if we, moreover, consider that to all this there were added two natural calamities of the most grievous description — a great plague, which thinned society in all its ranks, and scattered confusion through the kingdom, and a great fire, which, besides increasing the mortality from the pestilence, destroyed in a moment those accumulations of industry by which industry itself is nourished — if we put all these things together, how can we reconcile inconsistencies apparently so gross? How could so wonderful a progress be made in the face of these unparalleled disasters? How could such men, under such circumstances, effect such improvements? These are questions which our political compilers are unable to answer; because they look too much at the peculiarities of individuals, and too little at the temper of the age in which those individuals live.

Such writers do not perceive that the history of every civilised country is the history of its intellectual development, which kings, statesmen, and legislators are more likely to retard than to hasten; because, however great their power may be, they are at best the accidental and insufficient representatives of the spirit of their time; and because, so far from being able to regulate the movements of the national mind, they themselves form the smallest part of it, and, in a general view of the progress of man, are only to be regarded as the puppets who strut and fret their hour upon a little stage; while, beyond them, and on every side of them, are forming opinions and principles which they can scarcely perceive, but by which alone the whole course of human affairs is ultimately governed.

The truth is, that the vast legislative reforms, for which the reign of Charles II is so remarkable, merely form a part of that movement, which,

though traceable to a much earlier period, had only for three generations been in undisguised operation. These important improvements were the result of that bold, sceptical, inquiring, and reforming spirit, which had now seized the three great departments of theology, of science, and of politics. The old principles of tradition, of authority, and of dogma, were gradually becoming weaker; and of course, in the same proportion, there was diminished the influence of the classes by whom those principles were chiefly upheld. As the power of particular sections of society thus declined, the power of the people at large increased. The real interests of the nation began to be perceived, so soon as the superstitions were dispersed by which those interests had long been obscured. This, I believe, is the real solution of what at first seems a curious problem — namely, how it was that such comprehensive reforms should have been accomplished in so bad, and in many respects so infamous, a reign.

It is, no doubt, true, that those reforms were essentially the result of the intellectual march of the age; but, so far from being made in spite of the vices of the sovereign, they were actually aided by them. With the exception of the needy profligates who thronged his court, all classes of men soon learned to despise a king who was a drunkard, a libertine, and a hypocrite; who had neither shame nor sensibility; and who, in point of honour, was unworthy to enter the presence of the meanest of his subjects. To have the throne filled for a quarter of a century by such a man as this, was the surest way of weakening that ignorant and indiscriminate loyalty, to which the people have often sacrificed their dearest rights. Thus, the character of the king, merely considered from this point of view, was eminently favourable to the growth of national liberty.[1]

But the advantage did not stop there. The reckless debaucheries of Charles made him abhor everything approaching to restraint; and this gave him a dislike to a class, whose profession, at least, pre-supposes a conduct of more than ordinary purity. The consequence was, that he, not from views of enlightened policy, but merely from a love of vicious indulgence, always had a distaste for the clergy; and, so far from advancing their power, frequently expressed for them an open contempt. His most intimate friends directed against them those coarse and profligate jokes which are preserved in the literature of the time; and which, in the opinion of the courtiers, were to be ranked among the noblest specimens of human wit. From men of this sort the church had, indeed, little to apprehend; but their language, and the favour with which it was received, are part of the symptoms by which we may study the temper of that age. Many other illustrations will occur to most readers; I may, however, mention one, which is interesting on account of the eminence of the philosopher concerned in it.

The most dangerous opponent of the clergy in the seventeenth century, was certainly Hobbes, the subtlest dialectician of his time; a writer, too, of singular clearness, and among British metaphysicians, inferior only to Berkeley. This profound thinker published several speculations very unfavourable to the church, and directly opposed to principles which are essential to ecclesiastical authority. As a natural consequence, he was hated by the clergy;

[1] Mr. Hallam[b] has a noble passage on the services rendered to English civilisation by the vices of the English court: "We are, however, much indebted to the memory of Barbara duchess of Cleveland, Louisa duchess of Portsmouth, and Mrs. Eleanor Gwyn. We owe a tribute of gratitude to the Mays, the Killigrews, the Chiffinches, and the Grammonts. They played a serviceable part in ridding the kingdom of its besotted loyalty. They saved our forefathers from the Star Chamber and the High-commission court; they laboured in their vocation against standing armies and corruption; they pressed forward the great ultimate security of English freedom — the expulsion of the House of Stuart."

his doctrines were declared to be highly pernicious; and he was accused of wishing to subvert the national religion, and corrupt the national morals. So far did this proceed, that, during his life, and for several years after his death, every man who ventured to think for himself was stigmatised as a Hobbist, or, as it was sometimes called, a Hobbian. This marked hostility on the part of the clergy was a sufficient recommendation to the favour of Charles. The king, even before his accession, had imbibed many of his principles; and, after the Restoration, he treated the author with what was deemed a scandalous respect.

If we look for a moment at the ecclesiastical appointments of Charles, we shall find evidence of the same tendency. In his reign, the highest dignities in the church were invariably conferred upon men who were deficient either in ability or in honesty. It would perhaps be an over-refinement to ascribe to the king a deliberate plan for lowering the reputation of the Episcopal bench; but it is certain, that if he had such a plan, he followed the course most likely to effect his purpose. For it is no exaggeration to say, that, during his life, the leading English prelates were, without exception, either incapable or insincere; they were unable to defend what they really believed, or else they did not believe what they openly professed. Never before were the interests of the Anglican church so feebly guarded.

The truth seems to be, that Charles was unwilling to confer ecclesiastical promotion upon any one who had ability enough to increase the authority of the church, and restore it to its former pre-eminence. At his accession, the two ablest of the clergy were undoubtedly Jeremy Taylor and Isaac Barrow. Both of them were notorious for their loyalty; both of them were men of unspotted virtue; and both of them have left a reputation which will hardly perish while the English language is remembered. But Taylor, though he had married the king's sister, was treated with marked neglect; and, being exiled to an Irish bishopric, had to pass the remainder of his life in what, at that time, was truly called a barbarous country. As to Barrow, who, in point of genius, was probably superior to Taylor, he had the mortification of seeing the most incapable men raised to the highest posts in the church, while he himself was unnoticed.

It is hardly necessary to point out how all this must have tended to weaken the church, and accelerate that great movement for which the reign of Charles II is remarkable. At the same time, there were many other circumstances which it is impossible to notice, but which were stamped with the general character of revolt against ancient authority. Enough, however, has been stated, to indicate the general march of the English mind, and supply the reader with a clue by which he may understand those still more complicated events, which, as the seventeenth century advanced, began to thicken upon us.[k]



CHAPTER IX

THE STATE OF ENGLAND IN 1685

POPULATION; TAXATION

ONE of the first objects of an inquirer, who wishes to form a correct notion of the state of a community at a given time, must be to ascertain of how many persons that community then consisted. Unfortunately the populaiton of England in 1685 cannot be ascertained with perfect accuracy. For no great state had then adopted the wise course of periodically numbering the people. All men were left to conjecture for themselves; and, as they generally conjectured without examining facts, and under the influence of strong passions and prejudices, their guesses were often ludicrously absurd. Even intelligent Londoners ordinarily talked of London as containing several millions of souls. It was confidently asserted by many that, during the thirty-five years which had elapsed between the accession of Charles I and the Restoration, the population of the city had increased by two millions. Even while the ravages of the plague and fire were recent, it was the fashion to say that the capital still had a million and a half of inhabitants. Some persons, disgusted by these exaggerations, ran violently into the opposite extreme. Thus Isaac Vossius, a man of undoubted parts and learning, strenuously maintained that there were only two millions of human beings in England, Scotland, and Ireland taken together.

We are not, however, left without the means of correcting the wild blunders into which some minds were hurried by national vanity and others by a morbid love of paradox. There are extant three computations which seem to be entitled to peculiar attention. They are entirely independent of each other: they proceed on different principles; and yet there is little difference in the results.

One of these computations was made in the year 1696 by Gregory King, Lancaster herald, a political arithmetician of great acuteness and judgment. The basis of his calculations was the number of houses returned in 1690 by the officers who made the last collection of the hearth money. The conclusion at which he arrived was that the population of England was nearly five millions and a half.

About the same time King William III was desirous to ascertain the com-

parative strength of the religious sects into which the community was divided. An inquiry was instituted; and reports were laid before him from all the dioceses of the realm. According to these reports the number of his English subjects must have been about five million two hundred thousand. Lastly, Mr. Finlaison, an actuary of eminent skill, subjected the ancient parochial registers to all the tests which the modern improvements in statistical science enabled him to apply. His opinion was, that, at the close of the seventeenth century, the population of England was a little under five million two hundred thousand souls.

Of these three estimates, framed without concert by different persons from different sets of materials, the highest, which is that of King, does not exceed the lowest, which is that of Finlaison, by one-twelfth. We may, therefore, with confidence pronounce that, when James II reigned, England contained between five million and five million five hundred thousand inhabitants.

Of the taxation we can speak with more confidence and precision than of the population. The revenue of England, when Charles II died, was small, when compared with the resources which she even then possessed, or with the sums which were raised by the governments of the neighbouring countries. It had, from the time of the Restoration, been almost constantly increasing: yet it was little more than three-fourths of the revenue of the United Provinces, and was hardly one-fifth of the revenue of France.

The most important head of receipt was the excise, which, in the last year of the reign of Charles, produced 585,000 pounds, clear of all deductions. The net proceeds of the customs amounted in the same year to five hundred and thirty thousand pounds. These burdens did not lie very heavy on the nation. The tax on chimneys, though less productive, raised far louder murmurs. The discontent excited by direct imposts is, indeed, almost always out of proportion to the quantity of money which they bring into the exchequer; and the tax on chimneys was, even among direct imposts, peculiarly odious: for it could be levied only by means of domiciliary visits; and of such visits the English have always been impatient to a degree which the people of other countries can but faintly conceive. The poorer householders were frequently unable to pay their hearth money to the day. When this happened, their furniture was distrained without mercy: for the tax was farmed; and a farmer of taxes is, of all creditors, proverbially the most rapacious. The collectors were loudly accused of performing their unpopular duty with harshness and insolence. It was said that, as soon as they appeared at the threshold of a cottage, the children began to wail, and the old women ran to hide their earthenware. Nay, the single bed of a poor family had sometimes been carried away and sold. The net annual receipt from this tax was two hundred thousand pounds.

When to the three great sources of income which have been mentioned we add the royal domains, then far more extensive than at present, the first fruits and tenths, which had not yet been surrendered to the church, the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, the forfeitures and the fines, we shall find that the whole annual revenue of the crown may be fairly estimated at about fourteen hundred thousand pounds. Of this revenue part was hereditary: the rest had been granted to Charles for life; and he was at liberty to lay out the whole exactly as he thought fit. Whatever he could save by retrenching the expenditure of the public departments was an addition to his privy purse. Of the post office, more will hereafter be said. The profits of that establishment had been appropriated by parliament to the duke of York.

[1685 A.D.]

The king's revenue was, or rather ought to have been, charged with the payment of about eighty thousand pounds a year, the interest of the sum fraudulently detained in the exchequer by the Cabal. While Danby was at the head of the finances, the creditors had received their dividends, though not with the strict punctuality of modern times: but those who had succeeded him at the treasury had been less expert, or less solicitous to maintain public faith. Since the victory won by the court over the whigs, not a farthing had been paid; and no redress was granted to the sufferers till a new dynasty had established a new system. There can be no greater error than to imagine that the device of meeting the exigencies of the state by loans was imported into our island by William III. From a period of immemorial antiquity it had been the practice of every English government to contract debts. What the Revolution introduced was the practice of honestly paying them.

THE MILITARY SYSTEM

By plundering the public creditor, it was possible to make an income of about fourteen hundred thousand pounds, with some occasional help from France, support the necessary charges of the government and the wasteful expenditure of the court. For that load which pressed most heavily on the finances of the great continental states was here scarcely felt. In France, Germany, and the Netherlands, armies, such as Henry IV and Philip II had never employed in time of war, were kept up in the midst of peace. Bastions and ravelins were everywhere rising, constructed on principles unknown to Parma or Spinola. Stores of artillery and ammunition were accumulated, such as even Richelieu, whom the preceding generation had regarded as a worker of prodigies, would have pronounced fabulous. No man could journey many leagues in those countries without hearing the drums of a regiment on march, or being challenged by the sentinels on the drawbridge of a fortress. In our island, on the contrary, it was possible to live long and to travel far, without being once reminded, by any martial sight or sound, that the defence of nations had become a science and a calling. The majority of Englishmen who were under twenty-five years of age had probably never seen a company of regular soldiers. Of the cities which, in the civil war, had valiantly repelled hostile armies, scarce one was now capable of sustaining a siege. The gates stood open night and day. The ditches were dry. The ramparts had been suffered to fall into decay, or were repaired only that the townsfolk might have a pleasant walk on summer evenings. Of the old baronial keeps many had been shattered by the cannon of Fairfax and Cromwell, and lay in heaps of ruin, overgrown with ivy. Those which remained had lost their martial character, and were now rural palaces of the aristocracy. The moats were turned into preserves of carp and pike. The mounds were planted with fragrant shrubs, through which spiral walks ran up to summer houses adorned with mirrors and paintings.

The only army which the law recognised was the militia. That force had been remodelled by two acts of parliament passed shortly after the Restoration. Every man who possessed five hundred pounds a year derived from land, or six thousand pounds of personal estate was bound to provide, equip, and pay, at his own charge, one horseman. Every man who had fifty pounds a year derived from land, or six hundred pounds of personal estate, was charged in like manner with one pikeman or musketeer. Smaller proprietors were joined together in a kind of society, for which our language does not afford a special name, but which an Athenian would have called a *Syntéleia;*

and each society was required to furnish, according to its means, a horse soldier or a foot soldier. The whole number of cavalry and infantry thus maintained was popularly estimated at a hundred and thirty thousand men.

There were those who looked on the militia with no friendly eye. Men who had travelled much on the Continent, who had marvelled at the stern precision with which every sentinel moved and spoke in the citadels built by Vauban, who had seen the mighty armies which poured along all the roads of Germany to chase the Ottoman from the gates of Vienna, and who had been dazzled by the well ordered pomp of the household troops of Louis, sneered much at the way in which the peasants of Devonshire and Yorkshire marched and wheeled, shouldered muskets and ported pikes. The enemies of the liberties and religion of England looked with aversion on a force which could not, without extreme risk, be employed against those liberties and that religion, and missed no opportunity of throwing ridicule on the rustic soldiery. Enlightened patriots, when they contrasted these rude levies with the battalions which, in time of war, a few hours might bring to the coast of Kent or Sussex, were forced to acknowledge that, dangerous as it might be to keep up a permanent military establishment, it might be more dangerous still to stake the honour and independence of the country on the result of a contest between ploughmen officered by justices of the peace, and veteran warriors led by marshals of France.

In parliament, however, it was necessary to express such opinions with some reserve; for the militia was an institution eminently popular. Every reflection thrown on it excited the indignation of both the great parties in the state, and especially of that party which was distinguished by peculiar zeal for monarchy and for the Anglican church. The array of the counties was commanded almost exclusively by tory noblemen and gentlemen. They were proud of their military rank, and considered an insult offered to the service to which they belonged as offered to themselves. They were also perfectly aware that whatever was said against a militia was said in favour of a standing army; and the name of standing army was hateful to them. One such army had held dominion in England; and under that dominion the king had been murdered, the nobility degraded, the landed gentry plundered, the church persecuted. There was scarce a rural grandee who could not tell a story of wrongs and insults suffered by himself, or by his father, at the hands of the parliamentary soldiers. One old cavalier had seen half his manor house blown up. The hereditary elms of another had been hewn down. A third could never go into his parish church without being reminded by the defaced scutcheons and headless statues of his ancestry, that Oliver's redcoats had once stabled their horses there. The consequence was that those very royalists, who were most ready to fight for the king themselves, were the last persons who he could venture to ask for the means of hiring regular troops.

Charles, however, had, a few months after his restoration, begun to form a small standing army. He felt that, without some better protection than that of the trainbands and beefeaters, his palace and person would hardly be secure, in the vicinity of a great city swarming with warlike fifth-monarchy men who had just been disbanded. He therefore, careless and profuse as he was, contrived to spare from his pleasures a sum sufficient to keep up a body of guards. With the increase of trade and of public wealth his revenues increased; and he was thus enabled, in spite of the occasional murmurs of the commons, to make gradual additions to his regular forces. One considerable addition was made a few months before the close of his reign. The costly, useless, and pestilential settlement of Tangier was abandoned to the

barbarians who dwelt around it; and the garrison, consisting of one regiment of horse and two regiments of foot, was brought to England.

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century a great change had taken place in the arms of the infantry. The pike had been gradually giving place to the musket; and, at the close of the reign of Charles II, most of his foot were musketeers. Still, however, there was a large intermixture of pikemen. Each class of troops was occasionally instructed in the use of the weapon which peculiarly belonged to the other class. Every foot soldier had at his side a sword for close fight. The dragoon was armed like a musketeer, and was also provided with a weapon which had, during many years, been gradually coming into use, and which the English then called a dagger, but which, from the time of our Revolution, has been known among us by the French name of bayonet. The bayonet seems not to have been so formidable an instrument of destruction as it has since become; for it was inserted in the muzzle of the gun; and in action much time was lost while the soldier unfixed his bayonet in order to fire, and fixed it again in order to charge.

The regular army which was kept up in England at the beginning of the year 1685 consisted, all ranks included, of about seven thousand foot, and about seventeen hundred cavalry and dragoons. The whole charge amounted to about two hundred and ninety thousand pounds a year, less than a tenth part of what the military establishment of France then cost in time of peace. The daily pay of a private in the life-guards was four shillings, in the Blues two shillings and sixpence, in the dragoons eighteenpence, in the foot-guards tenpence, and in the line eightpence. The discipline was lax, and indeed could not be otherwise. The common law of England knew nothing of courts martial, and made no distinction, in time of peace, between a soldier and any other subject; nor could the government then venture to ask even the most loyal parliament for a mutiny bill. A soldier, therefore, by knocking down his colonel, incurred only the ordinary penalties of assault and battery, and by refusing to obey orders, by sleeping on guard, or by deserting his colours, incurred no legal penalty at all. Military punishments were doubtless inflicted during the reign of Charles II; but they were inflicted very sparingly, and in such a manner as not to attract public notice, or to produce an appeal to the courts of Westminister Hall.

THE NAVY

If the jealousy of the parliament and of the nation made it impossible for the king to maintain a formidable standing army, no similar impediment prevented him from making England the first of maritime powers. Both whigs and tories were ready to applaud every step tending to increase the efficiency of that force which, while it was the best protection of the island against foreign enemies, was powerless against civil liberty. All the greatest exploits achieved within the memory of that generation by English soldiers had been achieved in war against English princes. The victories of our sailors had been won over foreign foes, and had averted havoc and rapine from our own soil. By at least half the nation the battle of Naseby was remembered with horror, and the battle of Dunbar with pride chequered by many painful feelings: but the defeat of the Armada, and the encounters of Blake with the Hollanders and Spaniards, were recollected with unmixed exultation by all parties. Ever since the Restoration, the commons, even when most discontented and most parsimonious, had always been bountiful even to profusion where the interest of the navy was concerned. It had been represented to

them, while Danby was minister, that many of the vessels in the royal fleet were old and unfit for sea; and, although the house was, at that time, in no giving mood, an aid of near six hundred thousand pounds had been granted for the building of thirty new men-of-war.

But the liberality of the nation had been made fruitless by the vices of the government. The list of the king's ships, it is true, looked well. There were nine first rates, fourteen second rates, thirty-nine third rates, and many smaller vessels. This force, however, if it had been efficient, would in those days have been regarded by the greatest potentate as formidable. But it existed only on paper. When the reign of Charles terminated, his navy had sunk into degradation and decay, such as would be almost incredible if it was not certified to us by the independent and concurring evidence of witnesses whose authority is beyond exception. Pepys, the ablest man in the English admiralty, drew up, in the year 1684, a memorial on the state of his department, for the information of Charles. A few months later Bonrepaux, the ablest man in the French admiralty, having visited England for the especial purpose of ascertaining her maritime strength, laid the result of his inquiries before Louis. The two reports are to the same effect. Bonrepaux declared that he found everything in disorder and in miserable condition, that the superiority of the French marine was acknowledged with shame and envy at Whitehall, and that the state of our shipping and dockyards was of itself sufficient guarantee that we should not meddle in the disputes of Europe. Pepys informed his master that the naval administration was a prodigy of wastefulness, corruption, ignorance, and indolence, that no estimate could be trusted, that no contract was performed, that no check was enforced. The vessels which the recent liberality of parliament had enabled the government to build, and which had never been out of harbour, had been made of such wretched timber that they were more unfit to go to sea than the old hulls which had been battered thirty years before by Dutch and Spanish broadsides. Some of the new men of war, indeed, were so rotten that, unless speedily repaired, they would go down at their moorings. The sailors were paid with so little punctuality that they were glad to find some usurer who would purchase their tickets at forty per cent. discount. The commanders who had not powerful friends at court were even worse treated. Some officers, to whom large arrears were due, after vainly importuning the government during many years, had died for want of a morsel of bread.

Most of the ships which were afloat were commanded by men who had not been bred to the sea. This, it is true, was not an abuse introduced by the government of Charles. No state, ancient or modern, had, before that time, made a complete separation between the naval and military services. In the great civilised nations of the old world, Cimon and Lysander, Pompey and Agrippa, had fought battles by sea as well as by land. Nor had the impulse which nautical science received at the close of the fifteenth century produced any material improvement in the division of labour. At Flodden the right wing of the victorious army was led by the admiral of England. At Jarnac and Moncontour the Huguenot ranks were marshalled by the admiral of France. Neither John of Austria, the conqueror of Lepanto, nor Lord Howard of Effingham, to whose direction the marine of England was entrusted when the Spanish invaders were approaching our shores, had received the education of a sailor. Raleigh, highly celebrated as a naval commander, had served during many years as a soldier in France, the Netherlands, and Ireland. Blake had distinguished himself by his skilful and valiant defence of an inland town before he humbled the pride of Holland and of Castile on the

ocean. Since the Restoration the same system had been followed. Great fleets had been entrusted to the direction of Rupert and Monk: Rupert, who was renowned chiefly as a hot and daring cavalry officer; and Monk, who, when he wished his ship to change her course, moved the mirth of his crew by calling out, "Wheel to the left!"

But about this time wise men began to perceive that the rapid improvement, both of the art of war and of the art of navigation, made it necessary to draw a line between two professions which had hitherto been confounded. Either the command of a regiment or the command of a ship was now a matter quite sufficient to occupy the attention of a single mind. In the year 1672 the French government determined to educate young men of good family from a very early age specially for the sea service. But the English government, instead of following this excellent example, not only continued to distribute high naval commands among landsmen, but selected for such commands landsmen who, even on land, could not safely have been put in any important trust. Any lad of noble birth, any dissolute courtier for whom one of the king's mistresses would speak a word, might hope that a ship of the line, and with it the honour of the country and the lives of hundreds of brave men, would be committed to his care. It mattered not that he had never in his life taken a voyage except on the Thames, that he could not keep his feet in a breeze, that he did not know the difference between latitude and longitude. No previous training was thought necessary; or, at most, he was sent to make a short trip in a man-of-war, where he was subjected to no discipline, where he was treated with marked respect, and where he lived in a round of revels and amusements. If, in the intervals of feasting, drinking, and gambling, he succeeded in learning the meaning of a few technical phrases and the names of the points of the compass, he was fully qualified to take charge of a threedecker.

Such was the ordinary character of those who were then called gentlemen captains. Mingled with them were to be found, happily for our country, naval commanders of a very different description, men whose whole life had been passed on the deep, and who had worked and fought their way from the lowest offices of the forecastle to rank and distinction. One of the most eminent of these officers was Sir Christopher Mings, who entered the service as a cabin boy, who fell fighting bravely against the Dutch, and whom his crew, weeping and vowing vengeance, carried to the grave. From him sprang, by a singular kind of descent, a line of valiant and expert sailors. His cabin boy was Sir John Narborough; and the cabin boy of Sir John Narborough was Sir Cloudesley Shovel. To the strong natural sense and dauntless courage of this class of men England owes a debt never to be forgotten. It was by such resolute hearts that, in spite of much maladministration, and in spite of the blunders of more courtly admirals, our coasts were protected and the reputation of our flag upheld during many gloomy and perilous years.

But to a landsman these tarpaulins, as they were called, seemed a strange and half savage race. All their knowledge was professional; and their professional knowledge was practical rather than scientific. Off their own element they were as simple as children. Their deportment was uncouth. There was roughness in their very good nature; and their talk, where it was not made up of nautical phrases, was too commonly made up of oaths and curses. Such were the chiefs in whose rude school were formed those sturdy warriors from whom Smollet, in the next age, drew Lieutenant Bowling and Commodore Trunnion. But it does not appear that there was in the service of any of the Stuarts a single naval officer such as, according to the notions of our

times, a naval officer ought to be — that is to say, a man versed in the theory and practice of his calling, and steeled against all the dangers of battle and tempest, yet of cultivated mind and polished manners. There were gentlemen and there were seamen in the navy of Charles II. But the seamen were not gentlemen; and the gentlemen were not seamen.

The English navy at that time might, according to the most exact estimates which have come down to us, have been kept in an efficient state for £380,000 a year. Four hundred thousand pounds a year was the sum actually expended, but expended, as we have seen, to very little purpose. The cost of the French marine was nearly the same; the cost of the Dutch marine considerably more.

CHARGE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

Of the expense of civil government only a small portion was defrayed by the crown. The great majority of the functionaries whose business was to administer justice and preserve order either gave their services to the public gratuitously, or were remunerated in a manner which caused no drain on the revenue of the state. The sheriffs, mayors, and aldermen of the towns, the country gentlemen who were in the commission of the peace, the head boroughs, bailiffs, and petty constables, cost the king nothing. The superior courts of law were chiefly supported by fees.

Our relations with foreign courts had been put on the most economical footing. The only diplomatic agent who had the title of ambassador resided at Constantinople, and was partly supported by the Turkey Company. Even at the court of Versailles, England had only an envoy; and she had not even an envoy at the Spanish, Swedish, and Danish courts. The whole expense under this head cannot, in the last year of the reign of Charles II, have much exceeded £20,000.

In this frugality there was nothing laudable. Charles was, as usual, niggardly in the wrong place, and munificent in the wrong place. The public service was starved that courtiers might be pampered. The expense of the navy, of the ordnance, of pensions to needy old officers, of missions to foreign courts, must seem small indeed to the present generation. But the personal favourites of the sovereign, his ministers, and the creatures of those ministers, were gorged with public money. Their salaries and pensions, when compared with the incomes of the nobility, the gentry, the commercial and professional men of that age, will appear enormous. The greatest estates in the kingdom then very little exceeded £20,000 a year. The duke of Ormonde had £22,000 a year. The duke of Buckingham, before his extravagance had impaired his great property, had nineteen thousand six hundred a year. George Monk, duke of Albemarle, who had been rewarded for his eminent services with immense grants of crown land, and who had been notorious both for covetousness and for parsimony, left £15,000 a year of real estate, and £60,000 in money which probably yielded seven per cent. These three dukes were supposed to be three of the richest subjects in England. The archbishop of Canterbury can hardly have had £5,000 a year. The average income of a temporal peer was estimated, by the best informed persons, at about £3,000 a year, the average income of a baronet at £900 a year, the average income of a member of the house of commons at less than £800 a year. A thousand a year was thought a large revenue for a barrister. Two thousand a year was hardly to be made in the court of King's Bench, except by the crown lawyers.

It is evident, therefore, that an official man would have been well paid if

he had received a fourth or fifth part of what would now be an adequate stipend. In fact, however, the stipends of the higher class of official men were as large as at present, and not seldom larger. The lord treasurer, for example, had £8,000 a year, and, when the treasury was in commission, the junior lords had £1,600 a year each. The paymaster of the forces had a poundage, amounting to about £5,000 a year, on all the money which passed through his hands. The groom of the stole had £5,000 a year, the commissioners of the customs £1,200 a year each, the lords of the bed chamber £1,000 a year each. The regular salary, however, was the smallest part of the gains of an official man of that age. From the noblemen who held the white staff and the great seal, down to the humblest tidewaiter and gauger, what would now be called gross corruption was practised without disguise and without reproach. Titles, places, commissions, pardons were daily sold in market overt by the great dignitaries of the realm; and every clerk in every department imitated, to the best of his power, the evil example.

During the last century no prime minister, however powerful, has become rich in office; and several prime ministers have impaired their private fortune in sustaining their public character. In the seventeenth century, a statesman who was at the head of affairs might easily, and without giving scandal, accumulate in no long time an estate amply sufficient to support a dukedom. It is probable that the income of the prime minister, during his tenure of power, far exceeded that of any other subject. The place of lord lieutenant of Ireland was supposed to be worth £40,000 a year. The gains of the chancellor Clarendon, of Arlington, of Lauderdale, and of Danby were enormous. The sumptuous palace to which the populace of London gave the name of Dunkirk House, the stately pavilions, the fish ponds, the deer park and the orangery of Euston, the more than Italian luxury of Ham, with its busts, fountains, and aviaries, were among the many signs which indicated what was the shortest road to boundless wealth.

This is the true explanation of the unscrupulous violence with which the statesmen of that day struggled for office, of the tenacity with which, in spite of vexations, humiliations, and dangers, they clung to it, and of the scandalous compliances to which they stooped in order to retain it. Even in our own age, formidable as is the power of opinion, and high as is the standard of integrity, there would be great risk of a lamentable change in the character of our public men, if the place of first lord of the treasury or secretary of state were worth £100,000 a year. Happily for our country the emoluments of the highest class of functionaries have not only not grown in proportion to the general growth of our opulence, but have positively diminished.

STATE OF AGRICULTURE

The fact that the sum raised in England by taxation has, in a time not exceeding two long lives, been multiplied thirtyfold, is strange, and may at first sight seem appalling. But those who are alarmed by the increase of the public burdens may perhaps be reassured when they have considered the increase of the public resources. In the year 1685, the value of the produce of the soil far exceeded the value of all the other fruits of human industry. Yet agriculture was in what would now be considered as a very rude and imperfect state. The arable land and pasture land were not supposed by the best political arithmeticians of that age to amount to much more than half the area of the kingdom. The remainder was believed to consist of

moor, forest, and fen. These computations are strongly confirmed by the road books and maps of the seventeenth century. From those books and maps it is clear that many routes which now pass through an endless succession of orchards, hayfields, and beanfields, then ran through nothing but heath, swamp, and warren. In the drawings of English landscapes made in that age for the grand duke Cosmo, scarce a hedgerow is to be seen, and numerous tracts, now rich with cultivation, appear as bare as Salisbury Plain. At Enfield, hardly out of sight of the smoke of the capital, was a region of five and twenty miles in circumference, which contained only three houses and scarcely any enclosed fields. Deer, as free as in an American forest, wandered there by thousands.

It is to be remarked that wild animals of large size were then far more numerous than at present. The last wild boars, indeed, which had been preserved for the royal diversion, and had been allowed to ravage the cultivated land with their tusks, had been slaughtered by the exasperated rustics during the license of the civil war. The last wolf that has roamed our island had been slain in Scotland a short time before the close of the reign of Charles II. But many breeds, now extinct or rare, both of quadrupeds and birds, were still common. The fox, whose life is, in many counties, held almost as sacred as that of a human being, was considered as a mere nuisance. Oliver Saint John told the Long Parliament that Strafford was to be regarded, not as a stag or a hare, to whom some law was to be given, but as a fox, who was to be snared by any means, and knocked on the head without pity. This illustration would be by no means a happy one, if addressed to country gentlemen of our time; but in Saint John's days there were not seldom great massacres of foxes to which the peasantry thronged with all the dogs that could be mustered: traps were set; nets were spread; no quarter was given; and to shoot a female with cub was considered as a feat which merited the gratitude of the neighbourhood. The red deer were then as common in Gloucestershire and Hampshire as they now are among the Grampian Hills. On one occasion Queen Anne, on her way to Portsmouth, saw a herd of no less than five hundred. The wild bull with his white mane was still to be found wandering in a few of the southern forests. The badger made his dark and tortuous hole on the side of every hill where the copsewood grew thick. The wild cats were frequently heard by night wailing round the lodges of the rangers of Whittlebury and Needwood. The yellow-breasted marten was still pursued in Cranbourne Chase for his fur, reputed inferior only to that of the sable. Fen eagles, measuring more than nine feet between the extremities of the wings, preyed on fish along the coast of Norfolk. On all the downs, from the British Channel to Yorkshire, huge bustards strayed in troops of fifty or sixty, and were often hunted with greyhounds. The marshes of Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire were covered during some months of every year by immense clouds of cranes. Some of these races the progress of cultivation has extirpated. Of others the numbers are so much diminished that men crowd to gaze at a specimen as at a Bengal tiger or a Polar bear.

Even in those parts of the kingdom which at the close of the reign of Charles II were the best cultivated, the farming, though greatly improved since the civil war, was not such as would now be thought skilful. To this day no effectual steps have been taken by public authority for the purpose of obtaining accurate accounts of the produce of the English soil. The historian must therefore follow, with some misgivings, the guidance of those writers on statistics whose reputation for diligence and fidelity stands highest. At present an average crop of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and beans, is supposed

considerably to exceed thirty millions of quarters. The crop of wheat would be thought wretched if it did not exceed twelve millions of quarters. According to the computation made in the year 1696 by Gregory King, the whole quantity of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and beans, then annually grown in the kingdom, was somewhat less than ten millions of quarters. The wheat, which was then cultivated only on the strongest clay, and consumed only by those who were in easy circumstances, he estimated at less than two millions of quarters. Charles Davenant, an acute and well informed though most unprincipled and rancorous politician, differed from King as to some of the items of the account, but came to nearly the same general conclusions.

The rotation of crops was very imperfectly understood. It was known, indeed, that some vegetables lately introduced into our island, particularly the turnip, afforded excellent nutriment in winter to sheep and oxen: but it was not yet the practice to feed cattle in this manner. It was therefore by no means easy to keep them alive during the season when the grass is scanty. They were killed and salted in great numbers at the beginning of the cold weather; and, during several months, even the gentry tasted scarcely any fresh animal food, except game and river fish, which were consequently much more important articles in housekeeping than at present. It appears from the *Northumberland Household Book* that, in the reign of Henry VII, fresh meat was never eaten even by the gentlemen attendant on a great earl, except during the short interval between Midsummer and Michaelmas. But in the course of two centuries an improvement had taken place; and under Charles II it was not till the beginning of November that families laid in their stock of salt provisions, then called Martinmas beef.

The sheep and the oxen of that time were diminutive when compared with the sheep and oxen which are now driven to our markets. Our native horses, though serviceable, were held in small esteem, and fetched low prices. They were valued, one with another, by the ablest of those who computed the national wealth, at not more than fifty shillings each. Foreign breeds were greatly preferred. Spanish jennets were regarded as the finest chargers, and were imported for purposes of pageantry and war. The coaches of the aristocracy were drawn by grey Flemish mares, which trotted, as it was thought, with a peculiar grace, and endured better than any cattle reared in our island the work of dragging a ponderous equipage over the rugged pavement of London. Neither the modern dray horse nor the modern race horse was then known.

MINERAL WEALTH OF THE COUNTRY

The increase of vegetable and animal produce, though great, seems small when compared with the increase of our mineral wealth. In 1685 the tin of Cornwall, which had, more than two thousand years before, attracted the Tyrian sails beyond the pillars of Hercules, was still one of the most valuable subterranean productions of the island. The quantity annually extracted from the earth was found to be, some years later, sixteen hundred tons, probably about a third of what it now is. But the veins of copper which lie in the same region were, in the time of Charles II, altogether neglected, nor did any landowner take them into the account in estimating the value of his property. Cornwall and Wales at present yield annually near fifteen thousand tons of copper, worth near a million and a half sterling; that is to say, worth about twice as much as the annual produce of all English mines of all descriptions in the seventeenth century. The first bed of rock salt had been

discovered not long after the Restoration in Cheshire, but does not appear to have been worked in that age. The salt which was obtained by a rude process from brine pits was held in no high estimation. The pans in which the manufacture was carried on exhaled a sulphurous stench; and, when the evaporation was complete, the substance which was left was scarcely fit to be used with food. Physicians attributed the scorbutic and pulmonary complaints which were common among the English to this unwholesome condiment. It was therefore seldom used by the upper and middle classes; and there was a regular and considerable importation from France. At present our springs and mines not only supply our own immense demand, but send annually more than seven hundred millions of pounds of excellent salt to foreign countries.

Far more important has been the improvement of our iron works. Such works had long existed in our island, but had not prospered, and had been regarded with no favourable eye by the government and by the public. It was not then the practice to employ coal for smelting the ore; and the rapid consumption of wood excited the alarm of politicians. As early as the reign of Elizabeth there had been loud complaints that whole forests were cut down for the purpose of feeding the furnaces: and the parliament had interfered to prohibit the manufacturers from burning timber. The manufacture consequently languished. At the close of the reign of Charles II, great part of the iron which was used in the country was imported from abroad; and the whole quantity cast here annually seems not to have exceeded ten thousand tons.

One mineral, perhaps more important than iron itself, remains to be mentioned. Coal, though very little used in any species of manufacture, was already the ordinary fuel in some districts which were fortunate enough to possess large beds, and in the capital, which could easily be supplied by water carriage It seems reasonable to believe that at least one-half of the quantity then extracted from the pits was consumed in London. The consumption of London seemed to the writers of that age enormous, and was often mentioned by them as a proof of the greatness of the imperial city. They scarcely hoped to be believed when they affirmed that two hundred and eighty thousand chaldrons, that is to say, about three hundred and fifty thousand tons, were, in the last year of the reign of Charles II, brought to the Thames.

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMEN; THE CLERGY

While these great changes have been in progress, the rent of land has, as might be expected, been almost constantly rising. A country gentleman who witnessed the Revolution was probably in receipt of about a fourth part of the rent which his acres now yield to his posterity. He was, therefore, as compared with his posterity, a poor man, and was generally under the necessity of residing, with little interruption, on his estate. To travel on the Continent, to maintain an establishment in London, or even to visit London frequently were pleasures in which only the great proprietors could indulge. It may be confidently affirmed that of the squires whose names were then in the commissons of peace and lieutenancy not one in twenty went to town once in five years, or had ever in his life wandered so far as Paris. Many lords of manors had received an education differing little from that of their menial servants. The heir of an estate often passed his boyhood and youth at the seat of his family with no better tutors than grooms and game-

keepers, and scarce attained learning enough to sign his name to a mittimus. If he went to school and to college, he generally returned before he was twenty to the seclusion of the old hall, and there, unless his mind were very happily constituted by nature, soon forgot his academical pursuits in rural business and pleasures.

His chief serious employment was the care of his property. He examined samples of grain, handled pigs, and, on market days, made bargains over a tankard with drovers and hop merchants. His chief pleasures were commonly derived from field sports and from an unrefined sensuality. His language and pronunciation were such as we should now expect to hear only from the most ignorant clowns. His oaths, coarse jests, and scurrilous terms of abuse were uttered with the broadest accent of his province. It was easy to discern, from the first words which he spoke, whether he came from Somersetshire or Yorkshire. He troubled himself little about decorating his abode, and, if he attempted decoration, seldom produced anything but deformity. The litter of a farmyard gathered under the windows of his bedchamber, and the cabbages and gooseberry bushes grew close to his hall door. His table was loaded with coarse plenty; and guests were cordially welcomed to it. But, as the habit of drinking to excess was general in the class to which he belonged, and as his fortune did not enable him to intoxicate large assemblies daily with claret or canary, strong beer was the ordinary beverage. The quantity of beer consumed in those days was indeed enormous. For beer then was to the middle and lower classes not only all that beer now is, but all that wine, tea, and ardent spirits now are. It was only at great houses, or on great occasions, that foreign drink was placed on the board. The ladies of the house, whose business it had commonly been to cook the repast, retired as soon as the dishes had been devoured, and left the gentlemen to their ale and tobacco. The coarse jollity of the afternoon was often prolonged till the revellers were laid under the table.

The place of the clergyman in society had been completely changed by the Reformation. Before that event, ecclesiastics had formed the majority of the house of lords, had, in wealth and splendour, equalled, and sometimes outshone, the greatest of the temporal barons, and had generally held the highest civil offices. The lord treasurer was often a bishop. The lord chancellor was almost always so. The lord keeper of the privy seal and the master of the rolls were ordinarily churchmen. Churchmen transacted the most important diplomatic business. Indeed, almost all that large portion of the administration which rude and warlike nobles were incompetent to conduct was considered as especially belonging to divines. Men, therefore, who were averse to the life of camps, and who were, at the same time, desirous to rise in the state, ordinarily received the tonsure. Among them were sons of all the most illustrious families, and near kinsmen of the throne, Scroops, and Nevilles, Bourchiers, Staffords, and Poles.

To the religious houses belonged the rents of immense domains, and all that large portion of the tithe which is now in the hands of laymen. Down to the middle of the reign of Henry VIII, therefore, no line of life bore so inviting an aspect to ambitious and covetous natures as the priesthood. Then came a violent revolution. The abolition of the monasteries deprived the church at once of the greater part of her wealth, and of her predominance in the upper house of parliament. There was no longer an abbot of Glastonbury or an abbot of Reading seated among the peers, and possessed of revenues equal to those of a powerful earl. The princely splendour of William of Wykeham and of William of Waynflete had disappeared. The scarlet hat

of the cardinal, the silver cross of the legate were no more. The clergy had also lost the ascendency which is the natural reward of superior mental cultivation. Once the circumstance that a man could read had raised a presumption that he was in orders. But, in an age which produced such laymen as William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon, Roger Ascham and Thomas Smith, Walter Mildmay and Francis Walsingham, there was no reason for calling away prelates from their dioceses to negotiate treaties, to superintend the finances, or to administer justice. The spiritual character not only ceased to be a qualification for high civil office, but began to be regarded as a disqualification. Those worldly motives, therefore, which had formerly induced so many able, aspiring, and high born youths to assume the ecclesiastical habit, ceased to operate. Not one parish in two hundred then afforded what a man of family considered as a maintenance.

There were still indeed prizes in the church: but they were few; and even the highest were mean, when compared with the glory which had once surrounded the princes of the hierarchy. Thus the sacerdotal office lost its attraction for the higher classes. During the century which followed the accession of Elizabeth, scarce a single person of noble descent took orders. At the close of the reign of Charles II, two sons of peers were bishops; four or five sons of peers were priests, and held valuable preferment: but these rare exceptions did not take away the reproach which lay on the body. The clergy were regarded as, on the whole, a plebeian class. And, indeed, for one who made the figure of a gentleman, ten were mere menial servants. A large proportion of those divines who had no benefices, or whose benefices were too small to afford a comfortable revenue, lived in the houses of laymen. It had long been evident that this practice tended to degrade the priestly character. Laud had exerted himself to effect a change; and Charles I had repeatedly issued positive orders that none but men of high rank should presume to keep domestic chaplains. But these injunctions had become obsolete.

Indeed, during the domination of the Puritans, many of the ejected ministers of the Church of England could obtain bread and shelter only by attaching themselves to the households of royalist gentlemen; and the habits which had been formed in those times of trouble continued long after the re-establishment of monarchy and Episcopacy. In the mansions of men of liberal sentiments and cultivated understandings, the chaplain was doubtless treated with urbanity and kindness. His conversation, his literary assistance, his spiritual advice, were considered as an ample return for his food, his lodging, and his stipend. But this was not the general feeling of the country gentlemen. The coarse and ignorant squire, who thought that it belonged to his dignity to have grace said every day at his table by an ecclesiastic in full canonicals, found means to reconcile dignity with economy. A young Levite —such was the phrase then in use—might be had for his board, a small garret, and ten pounds a year, and might not only perform his own professional functions, might not only be the most patient of butts and of listeners, might not only be always ready in fine weather for bowls, and in rainy weather for shovelboard, but might also save the expense of a gardener or of a groom. Sometimes the reverend man nailed up the apricots, and sometimes he curried the coach horses. He cast up the farrier's bills. He walked ten miles with a message or a parcel. He was permitted to dine with the family; but he was expected to content himself with the plainest fare. He might fill himself with the corned beef and the carrots: but, as soon as the tarts and cheesecakes made their appearance, he quitted his seat, and stood aloof till he

[1685 A.D.]

was summoned to return thanks for the repast, from a great part of which he had been excluded.

Perhaps, after some years of service, he was presented to a living sufficient to support him: but he often found it necessary to purchase his preferment by a species of simony, which furnished an inexhaustible subject of pleasantry to three or four generations of scoffers. With his cure he was expected to take a wife. The wife had ordinarily been in the patron's service; and it was well if she was not suspected of standing too high in the patron's favour. Indeed, the nature of the matrimonial connections which the clergymen of that age were in the habit of forming is the most certain indication of the place which the order held in the social system. An Oxonian, writing a few months after the death of Charles II, complained bitterly not only that the country attorney and country apothecary looked down with disdain on the country clergyman but that one of the lessons most earnestly inculcated on every girl of honourable family was to give no encouragement to a lover in orders, and that, if any young lady forgot this precept, she was almost as much disgraced as by an illicit amour. Clarendon, who assuredly bore no ill will to the church, mentions it as a sign of the confusion of ranks which the great rebellion had produced that some damsels of noble families had bestowed themselves on divines.

A waiting woman was generally considered as the most suitable helpmate for a parson. Queen Elizabeth, as head of the church, had given what seemed to be a formal sanction to this prejudice, by issuing special orders that no clergyman should presume to marry a servant girl without the consent of the master or mistress. During several generations accordingly the relation between priests and handmaidens was a theme for endless jest; nor would it be easy to find, in the comedy of the seventeeth century, a single instance of a clergyman who wins a spouse above the rank of a cook. Even so late as the time of George II, the keenest of all observers of life and manners, himself a priest, remarked that, in a great household, the chaplain was the resource of a lady's maid whose character had been blown upon, and who was therefore forced to give up hopes of catching the steward.

In general the divine who quitted his chaplainship for a benefice and a wife found that he had only exchanged one class of vexations for another. Not one living in fifty enabled the incumbent to bring up a family comfortably. As children multiplied and grew, the household of the priest became more and more beggarly. Holes appeared more and more plainly in the thatch of his parsonage and in his single cassock. Often it was only by toiling on his glebe, by feeding swine, and by loading dungcarts, that he could obtain daily bread; nor did his utmost exertions always prevent the bailiffs from taking his concordance and his inkstand in execution. It was a white day on which he was admitted into the kitchen of a great house, and regaled by the servants with cold meat and ale. His children were brought up like the children of the neighbouring peasantry. His boys followed the plough; and his girls went out to service. Study he found impossible: for the advowson of his living would hardly have sold for a sum sufficient to purchase a good theological library; and he might be considered as unusually lucky if he had ten or twelve dogeared volumes among the pots and pans on his shelves. Even a keen and strong intellect might be expected to rust in so unfavourable a situation.

Assuredly there was at that time no lack in the English church of ministers distinguished by abilities and learning. But it is to be observed that these ministers were not scattered among the rural population. They were

brought together at a few places where the means of acquiring knowledge were abundant, and where the opportunities of vigorous intellectual exercise were frequent. At such places were to be found divines qualified by parts, by eloquence, by wide knowledge of literature, of science, and of life, to defend their church victoriously against heretics and sceptics, to command the attention of frivolous and worldly congregations, to guide the deliberations of senates, and to make religion respectable, even in the most dissolute of courts. Some laboured to fathom the abysses of metaphysical theology; some were deeply versed in biblical criticism; and some threw light on the darkest parts of ecclesiastical history. Some proved themselves consummate masters of logic. Some cultivated rhetoric with such assiduity and success that their discourses are still justly valued as models of style. These eminent men were to be found, with scarce a single exception, at the universities, at the great cathedrals, or in the capital.

Thus the Anglican priesthood was divided into two sections, which, in requirements, in manners, and in social position, differed widely from each other. One section, trained for cities and courts, comprised men familiar with all ancient and modern learning; men able to encounter Hobbes or Bossuet at all the weapons of controversy; men who could, in their sermons, set forth the majesty and beauty of Christianity with such justness of thought and such energy of language that the indolent Charles roused himself to listen, and the fastidious Buckingham forgot to sneer; men whose address, politeness, and knowledge of the world qualified them to manage the consciences of the wealthy and noble; men with whom Halifax loved to discuss the interests of empires, and from whom Dryden was not ashamed to own that he had learned to write.

The other section was destined to ruder and humbler service. It was dispersed over the country, and consisted chiefly of persons not at all wealthier, and not much more refined, than small farmers or upper servants. Yet it was in these rustic priests, who derived but a scanty subsistence from their tithe sheaves and tithe pigs, and who had not the smallest chance of ever attaining high professional honours, that the professional spirit was strongest. Among those divines who were the boast of the universities and the delight of the capital, and who had attained, or might reasonably expect to attain, opulence and lordly rank, a party, respectable in numbers, and more respectable in character, leaned towards constitutional principles of government, lived on friendly terms with Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, would gladly have seen a full toleration granted to all Protestant sects, and would even have consented to make alterations in the liturgy, for the purpose of conciliating honest and candid non-conformists. But such latitudinarianism was held in horror by the country parson. He was, indeed, prouder of his ragged gown than his superiors of their lawn and of their scarlet hoods. The very consciousness that there was little in his worldly circumstances to distinguish him from the villagers to whom he preached led him to hold immoderately high the dignity of that sacerdotal office which was his single title to reverence. Having lived in seclusion, and having had little opportunity of correcting his opinions by reading or conversation, he held and taught the doctrines of indefeasible hereditary right, of passive obedience, and of nonresistance in all their crude absurdity. Having been long engaged in a petty war against the neighbouring dissenters, he too often hated them for the wrongs which he had done them, and found no fault with the Five Mile Act and the Conventicle Act, except that those odious laws had not a sharper edge. Whatever influence his office gave him was

exerted with passionate zeal on the tory side; and that influence was immense.

It would be a great error to imagine, because the country rector was in general not regarded as a gentleman, because he could not dare to aspire to the hand of one of the young ladies at the manor house, because he was not asked into the parlours of the great, but was left to drink and smoke with grooms and butlers, that the power of the clerical body was smaller than at present. The influence of a class is by no means proportioned to the consideration which the members of that class enjoy in their individual capacity. A cardinal is a much more exalted personage than a begging friar: but it would be a grievous mistake to suppose that the college of cardinals has exercised a greater dominion over the public mind of Europe than the order of Saint Francis. In Ireland, at present, a peer holds a far higher station in society than a Roman Catholic priest: yet there are in Munster and Connaught few counties where a combination of priests would not carry an election against a combination of peers. In the seventeenth century the pulpit was to a large portion of the population what the periodical press now is. Scarcely any of the clowns who came to the parish church ever saw a gazette or a political pamphlet. Ill informed as their spiritual pastor might be, he was yet better informed than themselves: he had every week an opportunity of haranguing them; and his harangues were never answered. At every important conjuncture, invectives against the whigs and exhortations to obey the Lord's annointed resounded at once from many thousands of pulpits; and the effect was formidable indeed. Of all the causes which, after the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, produced the violent reaction against the exclusionists, the most potent seems to have been the oratory of the country clergy.

The power which the country gentlemen and the country clergymen exercised in the rural districts was in some measure counterbalanced by the power of the yeomanry, an eminently manly and truehearted race. The petty proprietors who cultivated their own fields with their own hands, and enjoyed a modest competence, without affecting to have scutcheons and crests, or aspiring to sit on the bench of justice, then formed a much more important part of the nation than at present. If we may trust the best statistical writers of that age, not less than a hundred and sixty thousand proprietors, who with their families must have made up more than a seventh of the whole population, derived their subsistence from little freehold estates. The average income of these small landholders, an income made up of rent, profit, and wages, was estimated at between sixty and seventy pounds a year. It was computed that the number of persons who tilled their own land was greater than the number of those who farmed the land of others. A large portion of the yeomanry had, from the time of the Reformation, leaned towards Puritanism, had, in the civil war, taken the side of the parliament, had, after the Restoration, persisted in hearing Presbyterian and Independent preachers, had, at elections, strenuously supported the exclusionists, and had continued, even after the discovery of the Rye House Plot and the proscription of the whig leaders, to regard popery and arbitrary power with unmitigated hostility.

GROWTH OF THE TOWNS

Great as has been the change in the rural life of England since the Revolution, the change which has come to pass in the cities is still more amazing.

In the reign of Charles II no provincial town in the kingdom contained thirty thousand inhabitants; and only four provincial towns contained so many as ten thousand inhabitants.

Next to the capital, but next at an immense distance, stood Bristol, then the first English seaport, and Norwich, then the first English manufacturing town. Pepys, who visited Bristol eight years after the Restoration, was struck by the splendour of the city. But his standard was not high; for he noted down as a wonder the circumstance that, in Bristol, a man might look round him and see nothing but houses. It seems that, in no other place with which he was acquainted, except London, did the buildings completely shut out the woods and fields. Large as Bristol might then appear, it occupied but a very small portion of the area on which it now stands. A few churches of eminent beauty rose out of a labyrinth of narrow lanes built upon vaults of no great solidity. If a coach or a cart entered those alleys, there was danger that it would be wedged between the houses, and danger also that it would break in the cellars. Goods were therefore conveyed about the town almost exclusively in trucks drawn by dogs; and the richest inhabitants exhibited their wealth, not by riding in gilded carriages, but by walking the streets with trains of servants in rich liveries, and by keeping tables loaded with good cheer. The pomp of the christenings and burials far exceeded what was seen at any other place in England.

The hospitality of the city was widely renowned, and especially the collations with which the sugar refiners regaled their visitors. The repast was dressed in the furnace, and was accompanied by a rich brewage made of the best Spanish wine, and celebrated over the whole kingdom as Bristol milk. This luxury was supported by a thriving trade with the North American plantations and with the West Indies. The passion for colonial traffic was so strong that there was scarce a small shopkeeper in Bristol who had not a venture on board of some ship bound for Virginia or the Antilles. Some of these ventures indeed were not of the most honourable kind. There was, in the transatlantic possessions of the crown a great demand for labour; and this demand was partly supplied by a system of crimping and kidnapping at the principal English seaports. Nowhere was this system found in such active and extensive operation as at Bristol. Even the first magistrates of that city were not ashamed to enrich themselves by so odious a commerce. The number of houses appears, from the returns of the hearth money, to have been, in the year 1685, just five thousand three hundred. We can hardly suppose the number of persons in a house to have been greater than in the city of London; and in the city of London we learn from the best authority that there were then fifty-five persons to ten houses. The population of Bristol must therefore have been about twenty-nine thousand souls.

The population of London was more than seventeen times the population of Bristol. It may be doubted whether any other instance can be mentioned of a great kingdom in which the first city was more than seventeen times as large as the second. There is reason to believe that, in 1685, London had been, during about half a century, the most populous capital in Europe. The inhabitants were probably little more than half a million. London had in the world only one commercial rival, the mighty and opulent Amsterdam. English writers boasted of the forest of masts and yardarms which covered the river from the bridge to the Tower, and of the stupendous sums which were collected at the custom house in Thames street. The customs of London amounted, in 1685, to about £330,000 a year.

Whoever examines the maps of London which were published towards

the close of the reign of Charles II will see that only the nucleus of the present capital then existed. The town did not, as now, fade by imperceptible degrees into the country. No long avenues of villas, embowered in lilacs and laburnums, extended from the great centre of wealth and civilisation almost to the boundaries of Middlesex and far into the heart of Kent and Surrey. In the east, no part of the immense line of warehouses and artificial lakes which now spreads from the Tower to Blackwall had even been projected. On the west, scarcely one of those stately piles of building which are inhabited by the noble and wealthy was in existence; and Chelsea, which is now peopled by more than forty thousand human beings, was a quiet country village with about a thousand inhabitants. On the north cattle fed, and sportsmen wandered with dogs and guns over the site of the borough of Marylebone, and over far the greater part of the space now covered by the boroughs of Finsbury and of the Tower Hamlets. Islington was almost a solitude; and poets loved to contrast its silence and repose with the din and turmoil of the monster London. On the south the capital is now connected with its suburb by several bridges, not inferior in magnificence and solidity to the noblest works of the Cæsars. In 1685 a single line of irregular arches, overhung by piles of mean and crazy houses, and garnished, after a fashion worthy of the naked barbarians of Dahomey, with scores of mouldering heads, impeded the navigation of the river.

The City

Of the metropolis, the City, properly so called, was the most important division. At the time of the Restoration it had been built, for the most part, of wood and plaster; the few bricks that were used were ill baked; the booths where goods were exposed to sale projected far into the streets, and were overhung by the upper stories. A few specimens of this architecture may still be seen in those districts which were not reached by the great fire. That fire had, in a few days, covered a space of little less than a square mile with the ruins of eighty-nine churches and of thirteen thousand houses. But the City had risen again with a celerity which had excited the admiration of neighbouring countries. Unfortunately, the old lines of the streets had been to a great extent preserved; and those lines, originally traced in an age when even princesses performed their journeys on horseback, were often too narrow to allow wheeled carriages to pass each other with ease, and were therefore ill adapted for the residence of wealthy persons in an age when a coach and six was a fashionable luxury. The style of building was, however, far superior to that of the City which had perished. The ordinary material was brick, of much better quality than had formerly been used. On the sites of the ancient parish churches had arisen a multitude of new domes, towers, and spires which bore the mark of the fertile genius of Wren. In every place save one the traces of the great devastation had been completely effaced. But the crowds of workmen, the scaffolds and the masses of hewn stone were still to be seen where the noblest of Protestant temples was slowly rising on the ruins of the old cathedral of St. Paul.

In the seventeenth century the City was the merchant's residence. Those mansions of the great old burghers which still exist have been turned into counting houses and warehouses: but it is evident that they were originally not inferior in magnificence to the dwellings which were then inhabited by the nobility. They sometimes stand in retired and gloomy courts, and are accessible only by inconvenient passages: but their dimensions are ample,

and their aspect stately. The entrances are decorated with richly carved pillars and canopies. The staircases and landing places are not wanting in grandeur. The floors are sometimes of wood, tessellated after the fashion of France. The palace of Sir Robert Clayton, in the Old Jewry, contained a superb banqueting room wainscotted with cedar, and adorned with battles of gods and giants in fresco. Sir Dudley North expended £4,000, a sum which would then have been important to a duke, on the rich furniture of his reception rooms in Basinghall street. In such abodes, under the last Stuarts, the heads of the great firms lived splendidly and hospitably. To their dwelling place they were bound by the strongest ties of interest and affection. There they had passed their youth, had made their friendships, had courted their wives, had seen their children grow up, had laid the remains of their parents in the earth, and expected that their own remains would be laid. That intense patriotism which is peculiar to the members of societies congregated within a narrow space was, in such circumstances, strongly developed. London was, to the Londoner, what Athens was to the Athenian of the age of Pericles, what Florence was to the Florentine of the fifteenth century. The citizen was proud of the grandeur of his city, punctilious about her claims to respect, ambitious of her offices, and zealous for her franchises.

The magnificence displayed by the first civic magistrate was almost regal. The gilded coach, indeed, which is now annually admired by the crowd, was not yet a part of his state. On great occasions he appeared on horseback, attended by a long cavalcade inferior in magnificence only to that which, before a coronation, escorted the sovereign from the Tower to Westminister. The lord mayor was never seen in public without his rich robe, his hood of black velvet, his gold chain, his jewel, and a great attendance of harbingers and guards. Nor did the world find anything ludicrous in the pomp which constantly surrounded him. For it was not more than proportioned to the place which, as wielding the strength and representing the dignity of the city of London, he was entitled to occupy in the state. That city, being then not only without equal in the country, but without second, had, during five and forty years, exercised almost as great an influence on the politics of England as Paris has, in our own time, exercised on the politics of France. In intelligence London was greatly in advance of every other part of the kingdom. A government, supported and trusted by London, could in a day obtain such pecuniary means as it would have taken months to collect from the rest of the island.

Nor were the military resources of the capital to be despised. The power which the lord lieutenants exercised in other parts of the kingdom was in London entrusted to a commission of eminent citizens. Under the orders of this commission were twelve regiments of foot and two regiments of horse. An army of drapers' apprentices and journeymen tailors,with common councilmen for captains and aldermen for colonels, might not indeed have been able to stand its ground against regular troops; but there were then very few regular troops in the kingdom. A town, therefore, which could send forth, at an hour's notice, twenty thousand men, abounding in natural courage, provided with tolerable weapons, and not altogether untinctured with martial discipline, could not but be a valuable ally and a formidable enemy. It was not forgotten that Hampden and Pym had been protected from lawless tyranny by the London trainbands; that, in the great crisis of the civil war, the London trainbands had marched to raise the siege of Gloucester; or that, in the movement against the military tyrants which followed the downfall of Richard Cromwell, the London trainbands had borne a signal part.

[1685 A.D.]

In truth, it is no exaggeraton to say that, but for the hostility of the City, Charles I would never have been vanquished, and that, without the help of the City, Charles II could scarcely have been restored.

These considerations may serve to explain why, in spite of that attraction which had, during a long course of years, gradually drawn the aristocracy westward, a few men of high rank had continued, till a very recent period, to dwell in the vicinity of the Exchange and of the Guildhall. Shaftesbury and Buckingham, while engaged in bitter and unscrupulous opposition to the government, had thought that they could nowhere carry on their intrigues so conveniently or so securely as under the protection of the City magistrates and the City militia. Shaftesbury had therefore lived in Aldersgate street, at a house which may still easily be known by pilasters and wreaths, the graceful work of Inigo Jones. Buckingham had ordered his mansion near Charing Cross, once the abode of the archbishops of York, to be pulled down; and, while streets and alleys which are still named after him were rising on that site, chose to reside in Dowgate. These, however, were rare exceptions. Almost all the noble families of England had long migrated beyond the walls.

Condition of the Streets

We should greatly err if we were to suppose that any of the streets and squares then bore the same aspect as at present. The great majority of the houses, indeed, have, since that time, been wholly, or in great part, rebuilt. If the most fashionable parts of the capital could be placed before us, such as they then were, we should be disgusted by their squalid appearance, and poisoned by their noisome atmosphere. In Covent Garden a filthy and noisy market was held close to the dwellings of the great. Fruit women screamed, carters fought, cabbage stalks and rotten apples accumulated in heaps at the thresholds of the countess of Berkshire and of the bishop of Durham.

The centre of Lincoln's Inn Fields was an open space where the rabble congregated every evening, within a few yards of Cardigan House and Winchester House, to hear mountebanks harangue, to see bears dance, and to set dogs at oxen. Rubbish was shot in every part of the area. Horses were exercised there. The beggars were as noisy and importunate as in the worst governed cities of the continent. A Lincoln's Inn mumper was a proverb. The whole fraternity knew the arms and liveries of every charitably disposed grandee in the neighbourhood, and, as soon as his lordship's coach and six appeared, came hopping and crawling in crowds to persecute him. These disorders lasted, in spite of many accidents, and of some legal proceedings, till, in the reign of George II, Sir Joseph Jekyll, master of the rolls, was knocked down and nearly killed in the middle of the square. Then at length palisades were set up, and a pleasant garden laid out.

St. James' square was a receptacle for all the offal and cinders, for all the dead cats and dead dogs of Westminster. At one time a cudgel player kept the ring there. At another time an impudent squatter settled himself there, and built a shed for rubbish under the windows of the gilded saloons in which the first magnates of the realm, Norfolks, Ormondes, Kents, and Pembrokes, gave banquets and balls. It was not till these nuisances had lasted through a whole generation, and till much had been written about them, that the inhabitants applied to parliament for permission to put up rails, and to plant trees.

When such was the state of the region inhabited by the most luxurious portion of society, we may easily believe that the great body of the population suffered what would now be considered as insupportable grievances. The pavement was detestable; all foreigners cried shame upon it. The drainage was so bad that in rainy weather the gutters soon became torrents. Several facetious poets have commemorated the fury with which these black rivulets roared down Snow Hill and Ludgate Hill, bearing to Fleet Ditch a vast tribute of animal and vegetable filth from the stalls of butchers and greengrocers. This flood was profusely thrown to right and left by coaches and carts. To keep as far from the carriage road as possible was therefore the wish of every pedestrian. The mild and timid gave the wall. The bold and athletic took it. If two roisterers met, they cocked their hats in each other's faces, and pushed each other about till the weaker was shoved towards the kennel. If he was a mere bully he sneaked off, muttering that he should find a time. If he was pugnacious, the encounter probably ended in a duel behind Montague House.

The houses were not numbered. There would indeed have been little advantage in numbering them; for of the coachmen, chairmen, porters, and errand boys of London, a very small proportion could read. It was necessary to use marks which the most ignorant could understand. The shops were therefore distinguished by painted signs, which gave a gay and grotesque aspect to the streets. The walk from Charing Cross to Whitechapel lay through an endless succession of saracens' heads, royal oaks, blue bears, and golden lambs, which disappeared when they were no longer required for the direction of the common people.

When the evening closed in, the difficulty and danger of walking about London became serious indeed. The garret windows were opened, and pails were emptied, with little regard to those who were passing below. Falls, bruises, and broken bones were of constant occurrence. For, till the last year of the reign of Charles II, most of the streets were left in profound darkness. Thieves and robbers plied their trade with impunity: yet they were hardly so terrible to peaceable citizens as another class of ruffians. It was a favourite amusement of dissolute young gentlemen to swagger by night about the town, breaking windows, upsetting sedans, beating quiet men, and offering rude caresses to pretty women.

Lighting of London

It ought to be noticed that, in the last year of the reign of Charles II, began a great change in the police of London, a change which has perhaps added as much to the happiness of the body of the people as revolutions of much greater fame. An ingenious projector, named Edward Heming, obtained letters patent conveying to him, for a term of years, the exclusive right of lighting up London. He undertook, for a moderate consideration, to place a light before every tenth door, on moonless nights, from Michaelmas to Lady Day, and from six to twelve of the clock. Those who now see the capital all the year round, from dusk to dawn, blazing with a splendour compared with which the illuminations for La Hogue and Blenheim would have looked pale, may perhaps smile to think of Heming's lanterns, which glimmered feebly before one house in ten during a small part of one night in three. But such was not the feeling of his contemporaries. His scheme was enthusiastically applauded, and furiously attacked. The friends of improvement extolled him as the greatest of all the benefactors of his city. What, they asked, were the

boasted inventions of Archimedes, when compared with the achievement of the man who had turned the nocturnal shades into noonday? In spite of these eloquent eulogies the cause of darkness was not left undefended. There were fools in that age who opposed the introduction of what was called the new light as strenuously as fools in a later age opposed the introduction of vaccination and railroads, as strenuously as the fools of an age anterior to the dawn of history doubtless opposed the introduction of the plough and of alphabetical writing. Many years after the date of Heming's patent there were extensive districts in which no lamp was seen.

We may easily imagine what, in such times, must have been the state of the quarters of London which were peopled by the outcasts of society. Among those quarters one had attained a scandalous pre-eminence. On the confines of the City and the Temple had been founded, in the thirteenth century, a house of Carmelite friars, distinguished by their white hoods. The precinct of this house had, before the Reformation, been a sanctuary for criminals, and still retained the privilege of protecting debtors from arrest. Insolvents consequently were to be found in every dwelling, from cellar to garret. Of these a large proportion were knaves and libertines, and were followed to their asylum by women more abandoned than themselves. The civil power was unable to keep order in a district swarming with such inhabitants; and thus Whitefriars became the favourite resort of all who wished to be emancipated from the restraints of the law. Though the immunities legally belonging to the place extended only to cases of debt, cheats, false witnesses, forgers, and highwaymen found refuge there. For amidst a rabble so desperate no peace officer's life was in safety. At the cry of "Rescue!" bullies with swords and cudgels, and termagant hags with spits and broomsticks poured forth by hundreds; and the intruder was fortunate if he escaped back into Fleet street, hustled, stripped, and pumped upon. Even the warrant of the chief justice of England could not be executed without the help of a company of musketeers. Such relics of the barbarism of the darkest ages were to be found within a short walk of the chambers where Somers was studying history and law, of the chapel where Tillotson was preaching, of the coffee-house where Dryden was passing judgment on poems and plays, and of the hall where the Royal Society was examining the astronomical system of Isaac Newton.

DIFFICULTY OF TRAVELLING

The chief cause which made the fusion of the different elements of society so imperfect was the extreme difficulty which our ancestors found in passing from place to place. Of all inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilisation of our species. Every improvement of the means of locomotion benefits mankind morally and intellectually as well as materially, and not only facilitates the interchange of the various productions of nature and art, but tends to remove national and provincial antipathies, and to bind together all the branches of the great human family. In the seventeenth century the inhabitants of London were, for almost every practical purpose, farther from Reading than they now are from Edinburgh, and farther from Edinburgh than they are now from Vienna.

The subjects of Charles II were not, it is true, quite unacquainted with that principle which has, in our own time, produced an unprecedented revolution in human affairs, which has enabled navies to advance in the face of wind and tide, and battalions, attended by all their baggage and artillery, to

traverse kingdoms at a pace equal to that of the fleetest race horse. The marquis of Worcester had recently observed the expansive power of moisture rarefied by heat. After many experiments he had succeeded in constructing a rude steam engine, which he called a fire water work, and which he pronounced to be an admirable and most forcible instrument of propulsion. But the marquis was suspected to be a madman, and known to be a papist. His inventions, therefore, found no favourable reception. His fire water work might, perhaps, furnish matter for conversation at a meeting of the Royal Society, but was not applied to any practical purpose. There were no railways, except a few made of timber, from the mouths of the Northumbrian coalpits to the banks of the Tyne. There was very little internal communication by water. A few attempts had been made to deepen and embank the natural streams, but with slender success. Hardly a single navigable canal had been even projected. The English of that day were in the habit of talking with mingled admiration and despair of the immense trench by which Louis XIV had made a junction between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. They little thought that their country would, in the course of a few generations, be intersected, at the cost of private adventurers, by artificial rivers making up more than four times the length of the Thames, the Severn, and the Trent together.

It was by the highways that both travellers and goods generally passed from place to place. And those highways appear to have been far worse than might have been expected from the degree of wealth and civilisation which the nation had even then attained. On the best lines of communication the ruts were deep, the descents precipitous, and the way often such as it was hardly possible to distinguish, in the dusk, from the uninclosed heath and fen which lay on both sides. Ralph Thoresby, the antiquary, was in danger of losing his way on the great North road, between Barnby Moor and Tuxford, and actually lost his way between Doncaster and York. Pepys and his wife, travelling in their coach, lost their way between Newbury and Reading. In the course of the same tour they lost their way near Salisbury, and were in danger of having to pass the night on the plain. It was only in fine weather that the whole breadth of the road was available for wheeled vehicles. Often the mud lay deep on the right and the left; and only a narrow track of firm ground rose above the quagmire. At such times obstructions and quarrels were frequent, and the path was sometimes blocked up during a long time by carriers, neither of whom would break the way. It happened, almost every day, that coaches stuck fast, until a team of cattle could be procured from some neighbouring farm, to tug them out of the slough. But in bad seasons the traveller had to encounter inconveniences still more serious.

Thoresby, who was in the habit of travelling between Leeds and the capital, has recorded, in his *Diary*, such a series of perils and disasters as might suffice for a journey to the Frozen Ocean or to the desert of Sahara. On one occasion he learned that the floods were out between Ware and London, that passengers had to swim for their lives, and that a higgler had perished in the attempt to cross. In consequence of these tidings he turned out of the high road and was conducted across some meadows, where it was necessary for him to ride to the saddle skirts in water. In the course of another journey he narrowly escaped being swept away by an inundation of the Trent. He was afterwards detained at Stamford four days, on account of the state of the roads, and then ventured to proceed only because fourteen members of the house of commons, who were going up in a body to parliament with guides and numerous attendants, took him into their company.

[1685 A.D.]

One chief cause of the badness of the roads seems to have been the defective state of the law. Every parish was bound to repair the highways which passed through it. The peasantry were forced to give their gratuitous labour six days in the year. If this was not sufficient, hired labour was employed, and the expense was met by a parochial rate. That a route connecting two great towns, which have a large and thriving trade with each other, should be maintained at the cost of the rural population scattered between them is obviously unjust; and this injustice was peculiarly glaring in the case of the great North road, which traversed very poor and thinly inhabited districts, and joined very rich and populous districts. Indeed it was not in the power of the parishes of Huntingdonshire to mend a highway worn by the constant traffic between the West Riding of Yorkshire and London. Soon after the Restoration this grievance attracted the notice of parliament; and an act, the first of our many turnpike acts, was passed, imposing a small toll on travellers and goods, for the purpose of keeping some parts of this important line of communication in good repair. This innovation, however, excited many murmurs; and the other great avenues to the capital were long left under the old system.

On the best highways heavy articles were, in the time of Charles II, generally conveyed from place to place by stage waggons. In the straw of these vehicles nestled a crowd of passengers, who could not afford to travel by coach or on horseback, and who were prevented by infirmity, or by the weight of their luggage, from going on foot. The expense of transmitting heavy goods in this way was enormous. From London to Birmingham the charge was seven pounds a ton; from London to Exeter twelve pounds a ton. This was about fifteen pence a ton for every mile, more by a third than was afterwards charged on turnpike roads, and fifteen times what is now demanded by railway companies. The cost of conveyance amounted to a prohibitory tax on many useful articles. Coal in particular was never seen except in the districts where it was produced, or in the districts to which it could be carried by sea, and was indeed always known in the south of England by the name of sea coal.

On byroads, and generally throughout the country north of York and west of Exeter, goods were carried by long trains of packhorses. These strong and patient beasts, the breed of which is now extinct, were attended by a class of men who seem to have borne much resemblance to the Spanish muleteers. A traveller of humble condition often found it convenient to perform a journey mounted on a packsaddle between two baskets, under the care of these hardy guides. The expense of this mode of conveyance was small. But the caravan moved at a foot's pace; and in winter the cold was often insupportable.

The rich commonly travelled in their own carriages, with at least four horses. Cotton, the facetious poet, attempted to go from London to the Peak with a single pair, but found at St. Albans that the journey would be insupportably tedious, and altered his plan. A coach and six is in our time never seen, except as part of some pageant. The frequent mention therefore of such equipages in old books is likely to mislead us. We attribute to magnificence what was really the effect of a very disagreeable necessity. People, in the time of Charles II, travelled with six horses, because with a smaller number there was great danger of sticking fast in the mire. Nor were even six horses always sufficient. Vanbrugh, in the succeeding generation, described with great humour the way in which a country gentleman, newly chosen a member of parliament, went up to London. On that occasion all the exertions of six beasts, two of which had been taken from the plough, could not save the family coach from being imbedded in a quagmire.

Stage Coaches

Public carriages had recently been much improved. During the years which immediately followed the Restoration, a diligence ran between London and Oxford in two days. The passengers slept at Beaconsfield. At length, in the spring of 1669, a great and daring innovation was attempted. It was announced that a vehicle, described as the flying coach, would perform the whole journey between sunrise and sunset. This spirited undertaking was solemnly considered and sanctioned by the heads of the university, and appears to have excited the same sort of interest which is excited in our own time by the opening of a new railway. The vice-chancellor, by a notice affixed in all public places, prescribed the hour and place of departure. The success of the experiment was complete. At six in the morning the carriage began to move from before the ancient front of All Souls college; and at seven in the evening the adventurous gentlemen who had run the first risk were safely deposited at their inn in London. The emulation of the sister university was moved; and soon a diligence was set up which in one day carried passengers from Cambridge to the capital. At the close of the reign of Charles II, flying carriages ran thrice a week from London to the chief towns. But no stage coach, indeed no stage wagon, appears to have proceeded further north than York, or further west than Exeter. The ordinary day's journey of a flying coach was about fifty miles in the summer; but in winter, when the ways were bad and the nights long, little more than thirty. The Chester coach, the York coach, and the Exeter coach generally reached London in four days during the fine season, but at Christmas not till the sixth day. The passengers, six in number, were all seated in the carriage. For accidents were so frequent that it would have been most perilous to mount the roof. The ordinary fare was about twopence halfpenny a mile in summer, and somewhat more in winter.

This mode of travelling seemed to our ancestors wonderfully and indeed alarmingly rapid. In a work published a few months before the death of Charles II, the flying coaches are extolled as far superior to any similar vehicles ever known in the world. Their velocity is the subject of special commendation, and is triumphantly contrasted with the sluggish pace of the continental posts. But with boasts like these was mingled the sound of complaint and invective. The interests of large classes had been unfavourably affected by the establishment of the new diligences; and, as usual, many persons were, from mere stupidity and obstinacy, disposed to clamour against the innovation, simply because it was an innovation. It was vehemently argued that this mode of conveyance would be fatal to the breed of horses and to the noble art of horsemanship; that the Thames, which had long been an important nursery of seamen, would cease to be the chief thoroughfare from London up to Windsor and down to Gravesend; that saddlers and spurriers would be ruined by hundreds; that numerous inns, at which mounted travellers had been in the habit of stopping, would be deserted, and would no longer pay any rent; that the new carriages were too hot in summer and too cold in winter; that the passengers were grievously annoyed by invalids and crying children; that the coach sometimes reached the inn so late that it was impossible to get supper and sometimes started so early that it was impossible to get breakfast. On these grounds it was gravely recommended that no public carriage should be permitted to have more than four horses, to start oftener than once a week, or to go more than thirty miles a day. It was hoped that, if this regulation were adopted, all except the sick and the lame

would return to the old mode of travelling. Petitions embodying such opinions as these were presented to the king in council from several companies of the city of London, from several provincial towns, and from the justices of several counties. We smile at these things. It is not impossible that our descendants, when they read the history of the opposition offered by cupidity and prejudice to the improvements of the nineteenth century, may smile in their turn.

Highwaymen

Whatever might be the way in which a journey was performed, the travellers, unless they were numerous and well armed, ran considerable risk of being stopped and plundered. The mounted highwayman, a marauder known to our generation only from books, was to be found on every main road. The waste tracts which lay on the great routes near London were especially haunted by plunderers of this class. Hounslow heath, on the great Western road, and Finchley common, on the great Northern road, were perhaps the most celebrated of these spots. The Cambridge scholars trembled when they approached Epping Forest, even in broad daylight. Seamen who had just been paid off at Chatham were often compelled to deliver their purses on Gadshill, celebrated near a hundred years earlier by the greatest of poets as the scene of the depredations of Poins and Falstaff. The public authorities seem to have been often at a loss how to deal with the plunderers. At one time it was announced in the *Gazette* that several persons, who were strongly suspected of being highwaymen, but against whom there was not sufficient evidence, would be paraded at Newgate in riding dresses: their horses would also be shown: and all gentlemen who had been robbed were invited to inspect this singular exhibition. On another occasion a pardon was publicly offered to a robber if he would give up some rough diamonds, of immense value, which he had taken when he stopped the Harwich mail. A short time after appeared another proclamation, warning the innkeepers that the eye of the government was upon them. Their criminal connivance, it was affirmed, enabled banditti to infest the roads with impunity. That these suspicions were not without foundation, is proved by the dying speeches of some penitent robbers of that age, who appear to have received from the innkeepers services much resembling those which Farquhar's Boniface rendered to Gibbet.

It was necessary to the success and even to the safety of the highwayman that he should be a bold and skilful rider, and that his manners and appearance should be such as suited the master of a fine horse. He therefore held an aristocratical position in the community of thieves, appeared at fashionable coffee houses and gaming houses, and betted with men of quality on the race ground. Sometimes, indeed, he was a man of good family and education. A romantic interest there attached, and perhaps still attaches, to the names of freebooters of this class. The vulgar eagerly drank in tales of their ferocity and audacity, of their occasional acts of generosity and good nature, of their amours, of their miraculous escapes, of their desperate struggles, and of their manly bearing at the bar and in the cart. Thus it was related of William Nevison, the great robber of Yorkshire, that he levied a quarterly tribute on all the northern drovers, and, in return, not only spared them himself, but protected them against all other thieves; that he demanded purses in the most courteous manner; that he gave largely to the poor what he had taken from the rich; that his life was once spared by the royal clemency, but that he again tempted his fate, and at length died, in 1685, on the gallows of York.

It was related how Claude Duval, the French page of the duke of Richmond, took to the road, became captain of a formidable gang, and had the honour to be named first in a royal proclamation against notorious offenders; how at the head of his troop he stopped a lady's coach, in which there was a booty of £400; how he took only one hundred, and suffered the fair owner to ransom the rest by dancing a coranto with him on the heath; how his vivacious gallantry stole away the hearts of all women; how his dexterity at sword and pistol made him a terror to all men; how, at length, in the year 1670, he was seized when overcome by wine; how dames of high rank visited him in prison, and with tears interceded for his life; how the king would have granted a pardon, but for the interference of Judge Morton, the terror of highwaymen, who threatened to resign his office unless the law were carried into full effect; and how, after the execution, the corpse lay in state with all the pomp of scutcheons, wax lights, black hangings and mutes, till the same cruel judge, who had intercepted the mercy of the crown, sent officers to disturb the obsequies. In these anecdotes there is doubtless a large mixture of fable; but they are not on that account unworthy of being recorded; for it is both an authentic and an important fact that such tales, whether false or true, were heard by our ancestors with eagerness and faith.

Inns

All the various dangers by which the traveller was beset were greatly increased by darkness. He was therefore commonly desirous of having the shelter of a roof during the night; and such shelter it was not difficult to obtain. From a very early period the inns of England had been renowned. Our first great poet had described the excellent accommodation which they afforded to the pilgrims of the fourteenth century. Nine and twenty persons, with their horses, found room in the wide chambers and stables of the Tabard in Southwark. The food was of the best, and the wines such as drew the company on to drink largely. Two hundred years later, under the reign of Elizabeth, William Harrison gave a lively description of the plenty and comfort of the great hostelries. The Continent of Europe, he said, could show nothing like them. There were some in which two or three hundred people, with their horses, could without difficulty be lodged and fed. The bedding, the tapestry, above all the abundance of clean and fine linen was matter of wonder. Valuable plate was often set on the tables. Nay, there were signs which had cost thirty or forty pounds.

In the seventeenth century England abounded with excellent inns of every rank. The traveller sometimes, in a small village, lighted on a public house such as Walton has described, where the brick floor was swept clean, where the walls were stuck round with ballads, where the sheets smelt of lavender, and where a blazing fire, a cup of good ale, and a dish of trout fresh from the neighbouring brook, were to be procured at small charge. At the larger houses of entertainment were to be found beds hung with silk, choice cookery, and claret equal to the best which was drunk in London. The innkeepers too, it was said, were not like other innkeepers. On the Continent the landlord was the tyrant of those who crossed the threshold. In England he was a servant. Never was an Englishman more at home than when he took his ease in his inn. Even men of fortune, who might in their own mansions have enjoyed every luxury, were often in the habit of passing their evenings in the parlour of some neighbouring house of public entertainment. They seem to

have thought that comfort and freedom could in no other place be enjoyed in equal perfection. This feeling continued during many generations to be a national peculiarity. The liberty and jollity of inns long furnished matter to our novelists and dramatists. Johnson declared that a tavern chair was the throne of human felicity; and Shenstone gently complained that no private roof, however friendly, gave the wanderer so warm a welcome as that which was to be found at an inn.

POST OFFICE; NEWSPAPERS

The mode in which correspondence was carried on between distant places may excite the scorn of the present generation; yet it was such as might have moved the admiration and envy of the polished nations of antiquity, or of the contemporaries of Raleigh and Cecil. A rude and imperfect establishment of posts for the conveyance of letters had been set up by Charles I, and had been swept away by the civil war. Under the commonwealth the design was resumed. At the Restoration the proceeds of the post office, after all expenses had been paid, were settled on the duke of York. On most lines of road the mails went out and came in only on the alternate days. In Cornwall, in the fens of Lincolnshire, and among the hills and lakes of Cumberland, letters were received only once a week. During a royal progress a daily post was despatched from the capital to the place where the court sojourned. There was also daily communication between London and the Downs; and the same privilege was sometimes extended to Tunbridge Wells and Bath at the seasons when those places were crowded by the great. The bags were carried on horseback day and night at the rate of about five miles an hour.

To facilitate correspondence between one part of London and another was not originally one of the objects of the post office. But, in the reign of Charles II, an enterprising citizen of London, William Dockwray, set up, at great expense a penny post, which delivered letters and parcels six or eight times a day in the busy and crowded streets near the Exchange, and four times a day in the outskirts of the capital. This improvement was, as usual, strenuously resisted. The porters complained that their interests were attacked, and tore down the placards in which the scheme was announced to the public. The excitement caused by Godfrey's death, and by the discovery of Coleman's papers, was then at its height. A cry was therefore raised that the penny post was a popish contrivance. The great Doctor Oates, it was affirmed, had hinted a suspicion that the Jesuits were at the bottom of the scheme, and that the bags, if examined, would be found full of treason. The utility of the enterprise was, however, so great and obvious that all opposition proved fruitless. As soon as it became clear that the speculation would be lucrative, the duke of York complained of it as an infraction of his monopoly, and the courts of law decided in his favour.

No part of the load which the old mails carried out was more important than the new letters. In 1685 nothing like the London daily paper of our time existed, or could exist. Neither the necessary capital nor the necessary skill was to be found. Freedom too was wanting, a want as fatal as that of either capital or skill. The press was not indeed at that moment under a general censorship. The licencing act, which had been passed soon after the Restoration, had expired in 1679. Any person might therefore print, at his own risk, a history, a sermon, or a poem, without the previous approbation of any public officer; but the judges were unanimously of opinion that this liberty did not extend to gazettes, and that, by the common law of England,

no man, not authorised by the crown, had a right to publish political news. While the whig party was still formidable, the government thought it expedient occasionally to connive at the violation of this rule. During the great battle of the Exclusion Bill, many newspapers were suffered to appear, the *Protestant Intelligence*, the *Current Intelligence*, the *Domestic Intelligence*, the *True News*, the *London Mercury*. None of these was published oftener than twice a week. None exceeded in size a single small leaf. The quantity of matter which one of them contained in a year was not more than is often found in two numbers of the *Times*. After the defeat of the whigs it was no longer necessary for the king to be sparing in the use of that which all his judges had pronounced to be his undoubted prerogative. At the close of his reign no newspaper was suffered to appear without his allowance: and his allowance was given exclusively to the *London Gazette*.

The *London Gazette* came out only on Mondays and Thursdays. The contents generally were a royal proclamation, two or three tory addresses, notices of two or three promotions, an account of a skirmish between the imperial troops and the janissaries on the Danube, a description of a highwayman, an announcement of a grand cockfight between two persons of honour, and an advertisement offering a reward for a strayed dog. The whole made up two pages of moderate size. Whatever was communicated respecting matters of the highest moment was communicated in the most meagre and formal style. Sometimes, indeed, when the government was disposed to gratify the public curiosity respecting an important transaction, a broadside was put forth giving fuller details than could be found in the *Gazette:* but neither the *Gazette* nor any supplementary broadside printed by authority ever contained any intelligence which it did not suit the purposes of the court to publish. The most important parliamentary debates, the most important state trials, recorded in our history, were passed over in profound silence.

In the capital the coffee houses supplied in some measure the place of a journal. Thither the Londoners flocked, as the Athenians of old flocked to the market place, to hear whether there was any news. There men might learn how brutally a whig had been treated the day before in Westminster Hall, what horrible accounts the letters from Edinburgh gave of the torturing of covenanters, how grossly the navy board had cheated the crown in the victualling of the fleet, and what grave charges the lord privy seal had brought against the treasury in the matter of the hearth money. But people who lived at a distance from the great theatre of political contention could be kept regularly informed of what was passing there only by means of news-letters. To prepare such letters became a calling in London, as it now is among the natives of India. The news-writer rambled from coffee room to coffee room, collecting reports, squeezed himself into the sessions house at the Old Bailey if there was an interesting trial, nay, perhaps obtained admission to the gallery of Whitehall, and noticed how the king and duke looked. In this way he gathered materials for weekly epistles destined to enlighten some county town or some bench of rustic magistrates.

Such were the sources from which the inhabitants of the largest provincial cities, and the great body of the gentry and clergy, learned almost all that they knew of the history of their own time. We must suppose that at Cambridge there were as many persons curious to know what was passing in the world as at almost any place in the kingdom, out of London. Yet at Cambridge, during a great part of the reign of Charles II, the doctors of laws and the masters of arts had no regular supply of news except through the *London Gazette*. At length the services of one of the collectors of intelligence in the

capital were employed. That was a memorable day on which the first newsletter from London was laid on the table of the only coffee room in Cambridge.

SCARCITY OF BOOKS IN COUNTRY PLACES; FEMALE EDUCATION

Literature which could be carried by the post bag then formed the greater part of the intellectual nutriment ruminated by the country divines and country justices. The difficulty and expense of conveying large packets from place to place was so great, that an extensive work was longer in making its way from Paternoster Row to Devonshire or Lancashire than it now is in reaching Kentucky. How scantily a rural parsonage was then furnished, even with books the most necessary to a theologian, has already been remarked. The houses of the gentry were not more plentifully supplied. Few knights of the shire had libraries so good as may now perpetually be found in a servants' hall, or in the back parlour of a small shopkeeper. An esquire passed among his neighbours for a great scholar, if *Hudibras* and Baker's *Chronicle*, Tarlton's *Jests* and the *Seven Champions of Christendom*, lay in his hall window among the fishing rods and fowling pieces. No circulating library, no book society then existed even in the capital: but in the capital those students who could not afford to purchase largely had a resource. The shops of the great booksellers, near St. Paul's churchyard, were crowded every day and all day long with readers; and a known customer was often permitted to carry a volume home. In the country there was no such accommodation; and every man was under the necessity of buying whatever he wished to read.

As to the lady of the manor and her daughters, their literary stores generally consisted of a prayer book and a receipt book. But in truth they lost little by living in rural seclusion. For, even in the highest ranks, and in those situations which afforded the greatest facilities for mental improvement, the English women of that generation were decidedly worse educated than they have been at any other time since the revival of learning. At an earlier period they had studied the masterpieces of ancient genius. In the present day they seldom bestow much attention on the dead languages; but they are familiar with the tongue of Pascal and Molière, with the tongue of Dante and Tasso, with the tongue of Goethe and Schiller; nor is there any purer or more graceful English than that which accomplished women now speak and write. But, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, the culture of the female mind seems to have been almost entirely neglected. If a damsel had the least smattering of literature she was regarded as a prodigy. Ladies highly born, highly bred, and naturally quick witted, were unable to write a line in their mother tongue without solecisms and faults of spelling such as a charity girl would now be ashamed to commit.

The explanation may easily be found. Extravagant licentiousness, the natural effect of extravagant austerity, was now the mode; and licentiousness had produced its ordinary effect, the moral and intellectual degradation of women. To their personal beauty, it was the fashion to pay rude and impudent homage. But the admiration and desire which they inspired were seldom mingled with respect, with affection, or with any chivalrous sentiment. The qualities which fit them to be companions, advisers, confidential friends, rather repelled than attracted the libertines of Whitehall. In that court a maid of honour, who dressed in such a manner as to do full justice to a white bosom, who ogled significantly, who danced voluptuously, who excelled in pert repartee, who was not ashamed to romp with lords of the bedchamber

and captains of the guards, to sing sly verses with sly expression, or to put on a page's dress for a frolic, was more likely to be followed and admired, more likely to be honoured with royal attentions, more likely to win a rich and noble husband than Jane Grey or Lucy Hutchinson would have been. In such circumstances the standard of female attainments was necessarily low; and it was more dangerous to be above that standard than to be beneath it. Extreme ignorance and frivolity were thought less unbecoming in a lady than the slightest tincture of pedantry. Of the too celebrated women whose faces we still admire on the walls of Hampton Court, few indeed were in the habit of reading anything more valuable than acrostics, lampoons, and translations of the *Clelia* and the *Grand Cyrus*.

LITERARY ATTAINMENTS OF GENTLEMEN

The literary acquirements, even of the accomplished gentlemen of that generation, seem to have been somewhat less solid and profound than at an earlier or a later period. Greek learning, at least, did not flourish among us in the days of Charles II, as it had flourished before the civil war, or as it again flourished long after the Revolution. There were undoubtedly scholars to whom the whole Greek literature, from Homer to Photius, was familiar: but such scholars were to be found almost exclusively among the clergy resident at the universities, and even at the universities were few, and were not fully appreciated. At Cambridge it was not thought by any means necessary that a divine should be able to read the Gospels in the original. Nor was the standard at Oxford higher. When, in the reign of William III, Christ church rose up as one man to defend the genuineness of the epistles of Phalaris, that great college, then considered as the first seat of philology in the kingdom, could not muster such a stock of Attic learning as is now possessed by several youths at every great public school. It may easily be supposed that a dead language, neglected at the universities, was not much studied by men of the world. In a former age the poetry and eloquence of Greece had been the delight of Raleigh and Falkland. In a later age the poetry and eloquence of Greece were the delight of Pitt and Fox, of Windham and Grenville. But during the latter part of the seventeenth century there was in England scarcely one eminent statesman who could read with enjoyment a page of Sophocles or Plato.

Good Latin scholars were numerous. The language of Rome, indeed, had not altogether lost its imperial character, and was still, in many parts of Europe, almost indispensable to a traveller or a negotiator. To speak it well was therefore a much more common accomplishment than in our time; and neither Oxford nor Cambridge wanted poets who, on a great occasion, could lay at the foot of the throne happy imitations of the verses in which Virgil and Ovid had celebrated the greatness of Augustus.

INFLUENCE OF FRENCH LITERATURE

Yet even the Latin was giving way to a younger rival. France united at that time almost every species of ascendency. Her military glory was at the height. She had vanquished mighty coalitions. She had dictated treaties. She had subjugated great cities and provinces. She had forced the Castilian pride to yield her the precedence. She had summoned Italian princes to prostrate themselves at her footstool. Her authority was supreme in all matters of good breeding, from a duel to a minuet. She determined how a

gentleman's coat must be cut, how long his peruke must be, whether his heels must be high or low, and whether the lace on his hat must be broad or narrow. In literature she gave law to the world. The fame of her great writers filled Europe. No other country could produce a tragic poet equal to Racine, a comic poet equal to Molière, a trifler so agreeable as La Fontaine, a rhetorician so skilful as Bossuet. The literary glory of Italy and of Spain had set; that of Germany had not yet dawned. The genius, therefore, of the eminent men who adorned Paris shone forth with a splendour which was set off to full advantage by contrast. France, indeed, had at that time an empire over mankind, such as even the Roman republic never attained. For, when Rome was politically dominant, she was in arts and letters the humble pupil of Greece. France had, over the surrounding countries, at once the ascendency which Rome had over Greece, and the ascendency which Greece had over Rome. French was fast becoming the universal language, the language of fashionable society, the language of diplomacy. At several courts princes and nobles spoke it more accurately and politely than their mother tongue.

In our island there was less of this servility than on the Continent. Neither our good nor our bad qualities were those of imitators. Yet even here homage was paid, awkwardly indeed and sullenly, to the literary supremacy of our neighbours. The melodious Tuscan, so familiar to the gallants and ladies of the court of Elizabeth, sank into contempt. A gentleman who quoted Horace or Terence was considered in good company as a pompous pedant. But to garnish his conversation with scraps of French was the best proof which he could give of his parts and attainments. New canons of criticism, new models of style came into fashion. The quaint ingenuity which had deformed the verses of Donne, and had been a blemish on those of Cowley, disappeared from our poetry. Our prose became less majestic, less artfully involved, less variously musical than that of an earlier age, but more lucid, more easy, and better fitted for controversy and narrative. In these changes it is impossible not to recognise the influence of French precept and of French example. Great masters of our language, in their most dignified compositions, affected to use French words, when English words, quite as expressive and melodious, were at hand: and from France was imported the tragedy in rhyme, an exotic which, in our soil, drooped, and speedily died.

IMMORALITY OF THE POLITE LITERATURE OF ENGLAND

It would have been well if our writers had also copied the decorum which their great French contemporaries, with few exceptions, preserved; for the profligacy of the English plays, satires, songs, and novels of that age is a deep blot on our national fame. The evil may easily be traced to its source. The wits and the Puritans had never been on friendly terms. There was no sympathy between the two classes. They looked on the whole system of human life from different points and in different lights. The earnestness of each was the jest of the other. The pleasures of each were the torments of the other. To the stern precisian even the innocent sport of the fancy seemed a crime. To light and festive natures the solemnity of the zealous brethren furnished copious matter of ridicule.

The war between wit and Puritanism soon became a war between wit and morality. The hostility excited by a grotesque caricature of virtue did not spare virtue herself. Whatever the canting roundhead had regarded with reverence was insulted. Whatever he had proscribed was favoured. Because he had been scrupulous about trifles, all scruples were treated with derision.

Because he had covered his failings with the mask of devotion, men were encouraged to obtrude with cynic impudence all their most scandalous vices on the public eye. Because he had punished illicit love with barbarous severity, virgin purity, and conjugal fidelity were to be made a jest. To that sanctimonious jargon which was his shibboleth, was opposed another jargon not less absurd and much more odious. As he never opened his mouth except in Scriptural phrase, the new breeds of wits and fine gentlemen never opened their mouths without uttering ribaldry of which a porter would now be ashamed, and without calling on their Maker to curse them, sink them, confound them, blast them, and damn them.

The spirit of the anti-Puritan reaction pervades almost the whole polite literature of the reign of Charles II. But the very quintessence of that spirit will be found in the comic drama. The playhouses, shut by the meddling fanatic in the day of his power, were again crowded. To their old attractions new and more powerful attractions had been added. Scenery, dresses, and decorations such as would now be thought mean or absurd, but such as would have been esteemed incredibly magnificent by those who, early in the seventeenth century, sat on the filthy benches of the Hope, or under the thatched roof of the Rose, dazzled the eyes of the multitude. The fascination of sex was called in to aid the fascination of art: and the young spectator saw, with emotions unknown to the contemporaries of Shakespeare and Jonson, tender and sprightly heroines personated by lovely women. From the day on which the theatres were reopened they became seminaries of vice; and the evil propagated itself. The profligacy of the representations soon drove away sober people. The frivolous and dissolute who remained required every year stronger and stronger stimulants. Thus the artists corrupted the spectators, and the spectators the artists, till the turpitude of the drama became such as must astonish all who are not aware that extreme relaxation is the natural effect of extreme restraint, and that an age of hypocrisy is, in the regular course of things, followed by an age of impudence.

Such was the state of the drama; and the drama was the department of polite literature in which a poet had the best chance of obtaining a subsistence by his pen. The sale of books was so small that a man of the greatest name could expect only a pittance for the copyright of the best performance. There cannot be a stronger instance than the fate of Dryden's last production, the *Fables*. That volume was published when he was universally admitted to be the chief of living English poets. It contains about twelve thousand lines. The versification is admirable; the narratives and descriptions full of life. To this day Palamon and Arcite, Cymon and Iphigenia, Theodore and Honoria are the delight both of critics and of schoolboys. The collection includes *Alexander's Feast*, the noblest ode in our language. For the copyright Dryden received £250, less than in our days has sometimes been paid for two articles in a review. Nor does the bargain seem to have been a hard one. For the book went off slowly; and the second edition was not required till the author had been ten years in his grave.

By writing for the theatre it was possible to earn a much larger sum with much less trouble. Southern made £700 by one play. Otway was raised from beggary to temporary affluence by the success of his *Don Carlos*. Shadwell cleared £130 by a single representation of the *Squire of Alsatia*. The consequence was that every man who had to live by his wit wrote plays, whether he had any internal vocation to write plays or not. It was thus with Dryden. As a satirist he has rivalled Juvenal. As a didactic poet he perhaps might, with care and meditation, have rivalled Lucretius. Of lyric poets

he is, if not the most sublime, the most brilliant and spirit-stirring. But nature, profuse to him of many rare gifts, had denied him the dramatic faculty. Nevertheless all the energies of his best years were wasted on dramatic composition. He had too much judgment not to be aware that in the power of exhibiting character by means of dialogue he was deficient. That deficiency he did his best to conceal, sometimes by surprising and amusing incidents, sometimes by stately declamation, sometimes by harmonious numbers, sometimes by ribaldry but too well suited to the taste of a profane and licentious pit. Yet he never obtained any theatrical success equal to that which rewarded the exertions of some men far inferior to him in general powers. He thought himself fortunate if he cleared a hundred guineas by a play; a scanty remuneration, yet apparently larger than he could have earned in any other way by the same quantity of labour.

The recompense which the wits of that age could obtain from the public was so small that they were under the necessity of eking out their incomes by levying contributions on the great. Every rich and good-natured lord was pestered by authors with a mendicancy so importunate and a flattery so abject as may in our time seem incredible. The patron to whom a work was inscribed was expected to reward the writer with a purse of gold. The fee paid for the dedication of a book was often much larger than the sum which any publisher would give for the copyright. Books were therefore frequently printed merely that they might be dedicated. This traffic in praise produced the effect which might have been expected. Adulation pushed to the verge, sometimes of nonsense and sometimes of impiety, was not thought to disgrace a poet. Independence, veracity, self respect were things not required by the world from him. In truth, he was in morals something between a pandar and a beggar.

STATE OF SCIENCE IN ENGLAND

It is a remarkable fact that, while the lighter literature of England was thus becoming a nuisance and a national disgrace, the English genius was effecting in science a revolution which will, to the end of time, be reckoned among the highest achievements of the human intellect. Bacon had sown the good seed in a sluggish soil and an ungenial season. He had not expected an early crop, and in his last testament had solemnly bequeathed his fame to the next age. During a whole generation his philosophy had, amidst tumults, wars, and proscriptions, been slowly ripening in a few well constituted minds. While factions were struggling for dominion over each other, a small body of sages had turned away with benevolent disdain from the conflict, and had devoted themselves to the nobler work of extending the dominion of man over matter. As soon as tranquillity was restored, these teachers easily found attentive audience. For the discipline through which the nation had passed had brought the public mind to a temper well fitted for the reception of the Verulamian doctrine. The year 1660, the era of the restoration of the old constitution, is also the era from which dates the ascendency of the new philosophy. In that year the Royal Society, destined to be a chief agent in a long series of glorious and salutary reforms, began to exist. In a few months experimental science became all the mode. The transfusion of blood, the ponderation of air, the fixation of mercury, succeeded to that place in the public mind which had been lately occupied by the controversies of the Rota. Dreams of perfect forms of government made way for dreams of wings with which men were to fly from the Tower to the

Abbey, and of double-keeled ships which were never to founder in the fiercest storm. All classes were hurried along by the prevailing sentiment. Cavalier and roundhead, churchman and Puritan were for once allied. Divines, jurists, statesmen, nobles, princes, swelled the triumph of the Baconian philosophy. Poets sang with emulous fervour the approach of the golden age. Cowley, in lines weighty with thought and resplendent with wit, urged the chosen seed to take possession of the promised land flowing with milk and honey, that land which their great deliverer and lawgiver had seen, as from the summit of Pisgah, but had not been permitted to enter. Dryden, with more zeal than knowledge, joined his voice to the general acclamation, and foretold things which neither he nor anybody else understood. The Royal Society, he predicted, would soon lead us to the extreme verge of the globe, and there delight us with a better view of the moon.

The spirit of Francis Bacon was abroad, a spirit admirably compounded of audacity and sobriety. There was a strong persuasion that the whole world was full of secrets of high moment to the happiness of man, and that man had, by his Maker, been entrusted with the key which, rightly used, would give access to them. There was at the same time a conviction that in physics it was impossible to arrive at the knowledge of general laws except by the careful observation of particular facts. Deeply impressed with these great truths, the professors of the new philosophy applied themselves to their task, and, before a quarter of a century had expired, they had given ample earnest of what has since been achieved. Already a reform of agriculture had been commenced. New vegetables were cultivated. New implements of husbandry were employed. New manures were applied to the soil. Evelyn had, under the formal sanction of the Royal Society, given instruction to his countrymen in planting. Temple, in his intervals of leisure, had tried many experiments in horticulture, and had proved that many delicate fruits, the natives of more favoured climates, might, with the help of art, be grown on English ground. Medicine, which in France was still in abject bondage, and afforded an inexhaustible subject of just ridicule to Molière, had in England become an experimental and progressive science, and every day made some new advance, in defiance of Hippocrates and Galen. The attention of speculative men had been, for the first time, directed to the important subject of sanitary police. The great plague of 1665 induced them to consider with care the defective architecture, draining, and ventilation of the capital. The great fire of 1666 afforded an opportunity for effecting extensive improvements. The whole matter was diligently examined by the Royal Society; and to the suggestions of that body must be partly attributed the changes which, though far short of what the public welfare required, yet made a wide difference between the new and the old London, and probably put a final close to the ravages of pestilence in our country.

At the same time one of the founders of the society, Sir William Petty, created the science of political arithmetic, the humble but indispensable handmaid of political philosophy. No kingdom of nature was left unexplored. To that period belong the chemical discoveries of Boyle, and the earliest botanical researches of Sloane. It was then that Ray made a new classification of birds and fishes, and that the attention of Woodward was first drawn towards fossils and shells. One after another phantoms which had haunted the world through ages of darkness fled before the light. Astrology and alchemy became jests. Soon there was scarcely a county in which some of the quorum did not smile contemptuously when an old woman was brought before them for riding on broomsticks or giving cattle the murrain. But it

was in those noblest and most arduous departments of knowledge in which induction and mathematical demonstration co-operate for the discovery of truth, that the English genius won in that age the most memorable triumphs. John Wallis placed the whole system of statics on a new foundation. Edmund Halley investigated the properties of the atmosphere, the ebb and flow of the sea, the laws of magnetism, and the course of the comets; nor did he shrink from toil, peril, and exile in the course of science. While he, on the rock of St. Helena, mapped the constellations of the southern hemisphere, our national observatory was rising at Greenwich; and John Flamsteed, the first astronomer royal, was commencing that long series of observations which is never mentioned without respect and gratitude in any part of the globe.

But the glory of these men, eminent as they were, is cast into the shade by the transcendent lustre of one immortal name. In Isaac Newton two kinds of intellectual power, which have little in common, and which are not often found together in a very high degree of vigour, but which nevertheless are equally necessary in the most sublime departments of physics, were united as they have never been united before or since. There may have been minds as happily constituted as his for the cultivation of pure mathematical science; there may have been minds as happily constituted for the cultivation of science purely experimental: but in no other mind have the demonstrative faculty and the inductive faculty coexisted in such extreme excellence and perfect harmony. Perhaps in an age of Scotists and Thomists even his intellect might have run to waste, as many intellects ran to waste which were inferior only to his. Happily the spirit of the age on which his lot was cast, gave the right direction to his mind; and his mind reacted with tenfold force on the spirit of the age. In the year 1685 his fame, though splendid, was only dawning; but his genius was in the meridian. His great work, that work which effected a revolution in the most important provinces of natural philosophy, had been completed, but was not yet published, and was just about to be submitted to the consideration of the Royal Society.

STATE OF THE FINE ARTS

It is not very easy to explain why the nation which was so far before its neighbours in science should in art have been far behind them all. Yet such was the fact. It is true that in architecture, an art which is half a science, an art in which none but a geometrician can excel, an art which has no standard of grace but what is directly or indirectly dependent on utility, an art of which the creations derive a part, at least, of their majesty from mere bulk, our country could boast of one truly great man, Christopher Wren; and the fire which laid London in ruins had given him an opportunity, unprecedented in modern history, of displaying his powers. The austere beauty of the Athenian portico, the gloomy sublimity of the Gothic arcade, he was, like almost all his contemporaries, incapable of emulating, and perhaps incapable of appreciating: but no man, born on our side of the Alps, has imitated with so much success the magnificence of the palace-like churches of Italy. Even the superb Louis has left to posterity no work which can bear a comparison with Saint Paul's.

But at the close of the reign of Charles II there was not a single English painter or statuary whose name is now remembered.

It is time that this description of the England which Charles II governed should draw to a close. Yet one subject of the highest moment still remains

untouched. Nothing has as yet been said of the great body of the people, of those who held the ploughs, who tended the oxen, who toiled at the looms of Norwich and squared the Portland stone for St. Paul's. Nor can very much be said. The most numerous class is precisely the class respecting which we have the most meagre information. In those times philanthropists did not yet regard it as a sacred duty, nor had demagogues yet found it a lucrative trade, to expatiate on the distress of the labourer. History was too much occupied with courts and camps to spare a line for the hut of the peasant or for the garret of the mechanic. The press now often sends forth in a day a greater quantity of discussion and declamation about the condition of the working man than was published during the twenty-eight years which elapsed between the Restoration and the Revolution. But it would be a great error to infer from the increase of complaint that there has been any increase of misery.

STATE OF THE COMMON PEOPLE

The great criterion of the state of the common people is the amount of their wages; and, as four-fifths of the common people were, in the seventeenth century, employed in agriculture, it is especially important to ascertain what were then the wages of agricultural industry. On this subject we have the means of arriving at conclusions sufficiently exact for our purpose.

Sir William Petty, whose mere assertion carries great weight, informs us that a labourer was by no means in the lowest state who received for a day's work fourpence with food, or eightpence without food. Four shillings a week therefore were, according to Petty's calculation, fair agricultural wages. That this calculation was not remote from the truth we have abundant proof. About the beginning of the year 1685 the justices of Warwickshire, in the exercise of a power entrusted to them by an act of Elizabeth, fixed, at their quarter sessions, a scale of wages for the county, and notified that every employer who gave more than the authorised sum, and every working man who received more, would be liable to punishment. The wages of the common agricultural labourer, from March to September, were fixed at the precise sum mentioned by Petty, namely four shillings a week without food. From September to March the wages were to be only three and sixpence a week.

But in that age, as in ours, the earnings of the peasant were very different in different parts of the kingdom. The wages of Warwickshire were probably about the average, and those of the counties near the Scottish border below it: but there were more favoured districts. In the same year, 1685, a gentleman of Devonshire, named Richard Dunning, published a small tract, in which he described the condition of the poor of that county. That he understood his subject well it is impossible to doubt; for a few months later his work was reprinted, and was, by the magistrates assembled in quarter sessions at Exeter, strongly recommended to the attention of all parochial officers. According to him, the wages of the Devonshire peasant were, without food, about five shillings a week. Still better was the condition of the labourer in the neighbourhood of Bury St. Edmund's. The magistrates of Suffolk met there in the spring of 1682 to fix a rate of wages, and resolved that, where the labourer was not boarded, he should have five shillings a week in winter, and six in summer.

In 1661 the justices at Chelmsford had fixed the wages of the Essex labourer, who was not boarded, at six shillings in winter and seven in summer.

[1685 A.D.]

This seems to have been the highest remuneration given in the kingdom for agricultural labour between the Restoration and the Revolution; and it is to be observed that, in the year in which this order was made, the necessaries of life were immoderately dear. Wheat was at seventy shillings the quarter, which would even now be considered as almost a famine price.

These facts are in perfect accordance with another fact which seems to deserve consideration. It is evident that, in a country where no man can be compelled to become a soldier, the ranks of an army cannot be filled if the government offers much less than the wages of common rustic labour. At present the pay and beer money of a private in a regiment of the line amount to seven shillings and sevenpence a week. This stipend, coupled with the hope of a pension, does not attract the English youth in sufficient numbers; and it is found necessary to supply the deficiency by enlisting largely from among the poorer population of Munster and Connaught. The pay of the private foot soldier in 1685 was only four shillings and eightpence a week; yet it is certain that the government in that year found no difficulty in obtaining many thousands of English recruits at very short notice. The pay of the private foot soldier in the army of the Commonwealth had been seven shillings a week, that is to say as much as a corporal received under Charles II; and seven shillings a week had been found sufficient to fill the ranks with men decidedly superior to the generality of the people. On the whole, therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that, in the reign of Charles II, the ordinary wages of the peasant did not exceed four shillings a week; but that, in some parts of the kingdom, five shillings, six shillings, and, during the summer months, even seven shillings were paid. At present a district where a labouring man earns only seven shillings a week is thought to be in a state shocking to humanity. The average is very much higher; and, in prosperous counties, the weekly wages of husbandmen amount to twelve, fourteen, and even sixteen shillings.

The remuneration of workmen employed in manufactures has always been higher than that of the tillers of the soil. In the year 1680 a member of the house of commons remarked that the high wages paid in this country made it impossible for our textures to maintain a competition with the products of the Indian looms. An English mechanic, he said, instead of slaving like a native of Bengal for a piece of copper, exacted a shilling a day. Other evidence is extant, which proves that a shilling a day was the pay to which the English workman then thought himself entitled, but that he was often forced to work for less. The common people of that age were not in the habit of meeting for public discussion, of haranguing, or of petitioning parliament. No newspaper pleaded their cause. It was in rude rhyme that their love and hatred, their exultation and their distress found utterance. A great part of their history is to be learned only from their ballads. One of the most remarkable of the popular lays chaunted about the streets of Norwich and Leeds in the time of Charles II may still be read on the original broadside. It is the vehement and bitter cry of labour against capital. It describes the good old times when every artisan employed in the woollen manufacture lived as well as a farmer. But those times were past. Sixpence a day was now all that could be earned by hard labour at the loom. If the poor complained that they could not live on such a pittance, they were told that they were free to take it or leave it. For so miserable a recompense were the producers of wealth compelled to toil, rising early and lying down late, while the master clothier, eating, sleeping, and idling, became rich by their exertions. A shilling a day, the poet declares, is what the weaver would have,

if justice were done. We may therefore conclude that, in the generation which preceded the Revolution, a workman employed in the great staple manufacture of England thought himself fairly paid if he gained six shillings a week.

It may here be noticed that the practice of setting children prematurely to work, a practice which the state, the legitimate protector of those who cannot protect themselves, has, in our time, wisely and humanely interdicted, prevailed in the seventeenth century to an extent which, when compared with the extent of the manufacturing system, seems almost incredible. At Norwich, the chief seat of the clothing trade, a little creature of six years old was thought fit for labour. Several writers of that time, and among them some who were considered as eminently benevolent, mention, with exultation, the fact that in that single city boys and girls of very tender age created wealth exceeding what was necessary for their own subsistence by twelve thousand pounds a year. The more carefully we examine the history of the past, the more reason shall we find to dissent from those who imagine that our age has been fruitful of new social evils. The truth is that the evils are, with scarcely an exception, old. That which is new is the intelligence which discerns and the humanity which remedies them.

When we pass from the weavers of cloth to a different class of artisans, our inquiries will still lead us to nearly the same conclusions. During several generations, the commissioners of Greenwich hospital have kept a register of the wages paid to different classes of workmen who have been employed in the repairs of the building. From this valuable record it appears that, in the course of a hundred and twenty years, the daily earnings of the bricklayer have risen from half a crown to four and tenpence, those of the mason from half a crown to five and threepence, those of the carpenter from half a crown to five and five pence, and those of the plumber from three shillings to five and sixpence.

It must be remembered that those labourers who were able to maintain themselves and their families by means of wages were not the most necessitous members of the community. Beneath them lay a large class which could not subsist without some aid from the parish. There can hardly be a more important test of the condition of the common people than the ratio which this class bears to the whole society. At present the men, women, and children who receive relief appear from the official returns to be, in bad years, one-tenth of the inhabitants of England, and, in good years, one-thirteenth. Gregory King estimated them in his time at more than a fifth; and this estimate, which all our respect for his authority will scarcely prevent us from calling extravagant, was pronounced by Davenant eminently judicious.

We are not quite without the means of forming an estimate for ourselves. The poor rate was undoubtedly the heaviest tax borne by our ancestors in those days. It was computed, in the reign of Charles II, at near seven hundred thousand pounds a year, much more than the produce either of the excise or of the customs, and little less than half the entire revenue of the crown. The poor rate went on increasing rapidly, and appears to have risen in a short time to between eight and nine hundred thousand a year, that is to say, to one-sixth of what it now is. The population was then less than a third of what it now is. The minimum of wages, estimated in money, was half of what it now is; and we can therefore hardly suppose that the average allowance made to a pauper can have been more than half of what it now is. It seems to follow that the proportion of the English people which received parochial relief then must have been larger than the proportion which receives

[1685 A. D.]
relief now. It is good to speak on such questions with diffidence: but it has certainly never yet been proved that pauperism was a less heavy burden or a less serious social evil during the last quarter of the seventeenth century than it is in our own time.

In one respect it must be admitted that the progress of civilisation has diminished the physical comforts of a portion of the poorest class. It has already been mentioned that, before the Revolution, many thousands of square miles, now enclosed and cultivated, were marsh, forest, and heath. Of this wild land much was, by law, common, and much of what was not common by law was worth so little that the proprietors suffered it to be common in fact. In such a tract, squatters and trespassers were tolerated to an extent now unknown. The peasant who dwelt there could, at little or no charge, procure occasionally some palatable addition to his hard fare, and provide himself with fuel for the winter. He kept a flock of geese on what is now an orchard rich with apple blossoms. He snared wild fowl on the fen which has long since been drained and divided into corn fields and turnip fields. He cut turf among the furze bushes on the moor which is now a meadow bright with clover and renowned for butter and cheese. The progress of agriculture and the increase of population necessarily deprived him of these privileges.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRESS OF CIVILISATION

But against this disadvantage a long list of advantages is to be set off. Of the blessings which civilisation and philosophy bring with them a large proportion is common to all ranks, and would, if withdrawn, be missed as painfully by the labourer as by the peer. The market place which the rustic can now reach with his cart in an hour was, a hundred and sixty years ago, a day's journey from him. The street which now affords to the artisan, during the whole night, a secure, a convenient, and a brilliantly lighted walk was, a hundred and sixty years ago, so dark after sunset that he would not have been able to see his hand, so ill paved that he would have run constant risk of breaking his neck, and so ill watched that he would have been in imminent danger of being knocked down and plundered of his small earnings. Every bricklayer who falls from a scaffold, every sweeper of a crossing who is run over by a carriage, may now have his wounds dressed and his limbs set with a skill such as, a hundred and sixty years ago, all the wealth of a great lord like Ormonde, or of a merchant prince like Clayton, could not have purchased. Some frightful diseases have been extirpated by science; and some have been banished by police. The term of human life has been lengthened over the whole kingdom, and especially in the towns. The year 1685 was not accounted sickly; yet in the year 1685 more than one in twenty-three of the inhabitants of the capital died. The difference in salubrity between London of the nineteenth century and the London of the seventeenth century is very far greater than the difference between London in an ordinary season and London in the cholera.

Still more important is the benefit which all orders of society, and especially the lower orders, have derived from the mollifying influence of civilisation on the national character. The groundwork of that character has indeed been the same through many generations, in the sense in which the groundwork of the character of an individual may be said to be the same when he is a rude and thoughtless schoolboy and when he is a refined and accomplished man. It is pleasing to reflect that the public mind of England has softened

while it has ripened, and that we have, in the course of ages, become, not only a wiser, but also a kinder people. There is scarcely a page of the history or lighter literature of the seventeenth century which does not contain some proof that our ancestors were less humane than their posterity. The discipline of workshops, of schools, of private families, though not more efficient than at present, was infinitely harsher. Masters, well born and bred, were in the habit of beating their servants. Pedagogues knew no way of imparting knowledge but by beating their pupils. Husbands, of decent station, were not ashamed to beat their wives.

The implacability of hostile factions was such as we can scarcely conceive. Whigs were disposed to murmur because Stafford was suffered to die without seeing his bowels burned before his face. Tories reviled and insulted Russell as his coach passed from the Tower to the scaffold in Lincoln's Inn Fields. As little mercy was shown by the populace to sufferers of a humbler rank. If an offender was put into the pillory, it was well if he escaped with life from the shower of brick bats and paving stones. If he was tied to the cart's tail, the crowd pressed round him, imploring the hangman to give it the fellow well, and make him howl. Gentlemen arranged parties of pleasure to Bridewell on court days, for the purpose of seeing the wretched women who beat hemp there whipped. A man pressed to death for refusing to plead, a woman burned for coining, excited less sympathy than is now felt for a galled horse or an overdriven ox. Fights compared with which a boxing match is a refined and humane spectacle were among the favourite diversions of a large part of the town. Multitudes assembled to see gladiators hack each other to pieces with deadly weapons, and shouted with delight when one of the combatants lost a finger or an eye. The prisons were hells on earth, seminaries of every crime and of every disease.

But on all this misery society looked with profound indifference. Nowhere could be found that sensitive and restless compassion which has, in our time, extended a powerful protection to the factory child, to the Hindoo widow, to the negro slave, which pries into the stores and watercasks of every emigrant ship, which winces at every lash laid on the back of a drunken soldier, which will not suffer the thief in the hulks to be ill fed or overworked, and which has repeatedly endeavoured to save the life even of the murderer. It is true that compassion ought, like all other feelings, to be under the government of reason, and has, for want of such government, produced some ridiculous and some deplorable effects. But the more we study the annals of the past the more shall we rejoice that we live in a merciful age, in an age in which cruelty is abhorred, and in which pain, even when deserved, is inflicted reluctantly and from a sense of duty. Every class doubtless has gained largely by this great moral change; but the class which has gained most is the poorest, the most dependent, and the most defenceless.[b]



CHAPTER X

JAMES II AND THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

[1685-1689 A.D.]

> The government of James II will lose little by comparison with that of his father. It is indeed amusing to observe that many who scarcely put bounds to their eulogies of Charles I have been content to abandon the cause of one who had no faults in his public conduct but such as seemed to have come by inheritance The characters of the father and son were very closely similar, both proud of their judgment as well as their station, and still more obstinate in their understanding than in their purpose; both scrupulously conscientious in certain great points of conduct, to the sacrifice of that power which they had preferred to everything else; the one far superior in relish for the arts and for polite letters, the other more diligent and indefatigable in business; the father exempt from those vices of a court to which the son was too long addicted; not so harsh, perhaps, or prone to severity in his temper, but inferior in general sincerity and adherence to his word. They were both equally unfitted for the condition in which they were meant to stand — the limited kings of a wise and free people, the chiefs of the English commonwealth. — HALLAM.P

IMMEDIATELY on the demise of King Charles, the privy council assembled, and the new monarch addressed them, assuring them of his determination to follow the example of his late brother, "especially in that of his great clemency and tenderness to his people"; that "he would make it his endeavour to preserve this government, both in church and state, as it is by law established"; and, "that he would always take care to defend and support the church." His brother-in-law, Lord Rochester, requested that this address, which had filled them all with joy, might be made public. The king said he had no copy, but one of the council wrote it down from memory, and the king, who had not expected this result, found it necessary to consent to its publication. He was forthwith proclaimed, amid the loud acclamations of the populace.

The king's speech gave great satisfaction to those who called themselves the loyal part of the nation. It was regarded as a security greater than any law. "We have now the word of a king, and a word never broken," was the common phrase. The pulpits resounded as usual, loyal addresses poured in from all sides; the University of Oxford promised obedience, "without limitations or restrictions"; the London clergy, more sincere, said, "our religion established by law is dearer to us than our lives"; and this expression gave offence at court, a proof of what was the real feeling in the royal bosom.

The funeral of the late king was private (May 14th), for the successor was unwilling, as he says himself, to communicate with the Church of England in spiritual things, as he must have done had it been public.[c]

The funeral called forth much censure. It would, indeed, hardly have been accounted worthy of a noble and opulent subject. The tories gently blamed the new king's parsimony; the whigs sneered at his want of natural affection; and the fiery covenanters of Scotland exultingly proclaimed that the curse denounced of old against wicked princes had been signally fulfilled, and that the departed tyrant had been buried with the burial of an ass. Yet James commenced his administration with a large measure of public good will.[b]

JAMES ILLEGALLY LEVIES CUSTOMS; AND RELEASES CATHOLIC PRISONERS

James had not been more than three days king, when his government committed an illegal act. The grant of customs for the life of the king expired on the death of Charles. A proclamation was issued ordering that the duties on merchandise should be levied as usual, till the royal revenue had been settled by parliament. This was against the advice of the lord keeper, Guilford, who recommended that the duties should be collected and kept apart in the exchequer, till the parliament should dispose of them. But, says North,[d] "the temper of the public was, then, so propitious to the crown that almost anything would be borne with, which, in other times, would have raised a flame." The counsellors chosen by the king for his especial confidence were his brother-in-law, Rochester; Sunderland, who had been Charles' secretary of state; and Godolphin, who had been first lord of the treasury: Halifax, who had held the privy seal, was appointed to the unimportant office of president of the council. It was nominally a higher office, and therefore a witticism which he had used on the promotion of Rochester was applied to himself — he was kicked up-stairs. The king's other brother-in-law, Clarendon, was made privy seal. Sunderland had voted for the Exclusion Bill, and therefore his continuance in office was a matter of surprise. But, if we are to credit the king's own assertion, this crafty minister saw the policy of connecting himself, however secretly, with the Roman Catholic party. James, in his so-called *Memoirs*,[e] says that in a consultation soon after his accession to the throne between Lord Sunderland, Father Petre, Mr. Jermyn, and Lord Tyrconnel, "it was agreed that Father Petre should be a cardinal, Lord Sunderland lord treasurer, Lord Tyrconnel lord lieutenant of Ireland (who engaged to procure my lord Sunderland £5,000 per annum out of that kingdom, or £50,000 in money), and that Mr. Henry Jermyn should be made a lord, and captain of the horse guards." Tyrconnel and Jermyn were Roman Catholics. The king did not stand alone in his inclination to tread a path beset with dangers.

The apologists of James have endeavoured to induce a belief that, soon after his accession, "he limited his views to the accomplishment of two objects, which he called liberty of conscience and freedom of worship, and which, had he been successful, would have benefited not the Catholics only but every class of religionists." Doctor Lingard[f] expresses this opinion, after having stated that James "gave it in charge to the judges to discourage prosecutions in matters of religion, and ordered by proclamation the discharge of all persons confined for the refusal of the oaths of allegiance and supremacy."

It is implied that the "dissenters" were relieved by this tolerant disposition. The relief extended only to Roman Catholics and Quakers. The Puritan

[1685 A. D.]

dissenters—Presbyterians, or Independents, or Baptists—had evinced no objection to the oath which renounced the authority of the pope. Those who continued in prison were there for offences under the Conventicle Acts and the Five Mile Act. The Roman Catholics would not take the oath of supremacy; the Quakers would not take any oath. "I have not been able," says Macaulay,[b] "to find any proof that any person, not a Roman Catholic or a Quaker, regained his freedom under these orders." The orders, signed by Sunderland, were issued on the 19th of April. The relief to the Roman Catholics was a natural manifestation of the disposition of the government. The relief to Quakers was the result of a conviction that they were a harmless sect, who carefully abstained from all political action, and avoided even political conversation. The influence of William Penn, who had returned home from Pennsylvania, was laudably exercised to obtain this relief for the society of which he was a member.

The number of Quakers liberated was estimated at above fourteen hundred. Roman Catholics were liberated, says Lingard,[f] "to the amount of some thousands." The real disposition of the government towards Protestant dissenters was at that period amply manifested by the proceedings in the Scottish parliament. The meeting of the estates preceded that of the English parliament by nearly a month. In obedience to a special letter from the king, calling for new penal laws against the covenanters, it was enacted on the 8th of May, that the punishment of death, and confiscation of land and goods, should be awarded against those who should preach in a conventicle under a roof, or should attend a conventicle in the open air, either as preacher or auditor.

The persecution of the times of Charles II was continued with increased fury. The soldiery were let loose upon the districts where the covenanters were still unsubdued, to kill and plunder. The tale of two unhappy women who were condemned to be drowned, and were tied to stakes when the tide had receded, there to await the lingering but certain death that would follow its return, is not a fiction.[g]

The king was resolved to make no secret of his own, or his brother's religion. With respect to the latter, he caused Huddleston to publish an account of the late king's reconcilement, and he gave to the world two papers in favour of popery found in that monarch's strong box, and written by his own hand. For himself, on the second Sunday of his reign, he caused the folding doors of the queen's private chapel to be thrown open while he was at mass, that his presence there might be seen. On Holy Thursday (April 16th) he was attended to the door of the chapel by his guards and the pensioners, and on Easter Sunday by the knights of the Garter and several of the nobility — a proceeding which caused great uneasiness in the minds of zealous Protestants. Their suspicions were further excited by a proclamation for the discharge of all recusants. They saw in this a manifest advance to the establishment of popery, which was in reality the object nearest to the king's heart. Meantime every effort was made to get Louis to continue the pension, in order that James might be independent of his parliament.

On the 3rd of May the king and queen were crowned with the usual ceremonies, the only part omitted being the communion. The king of course solemnly swore to maintain the true profession of the Gospel, and the rights and privileges of the church and clergy. Like a true Stuart, he told Barillon that he did so, as these rights and privileges were those which had been granted by King Edward the Confessor, of whose being a Catholic there was not the slightest doubt. During the whole ceremony he had been under apprehensions for his personal safety, though without any just cause.

On the 19th the parliament met. In consequence of the power which the surrender of charters had given to the crown, the returns had been so much to the royal satisfaction that James declared there were not forty members whom he would not have nominated himself. In his speech from the throne, he repeated his address to the privy council; he then called on them to give him a revenue for life such as his brother had enjoyed, and hinting that nothing else would content him, he added, "the best way to engage me to meet you often, is always to use me well": he concluded by informing them of the news he had just received of the landing of Argyll in Scotland, and again calling on them to give him his revenue as he desired it without delay.[g]

THE CONVICTION OF OATES AND BAXTER

There were two remarkable trials at this period, which must have had a considerable influence upon public opinion. The one was the prosecution of Titus Oates for perjury; the other the prosecution of Richard Baxter for libel. Of the justice of the conviction of Oates there can be little doubt. The atrocious severity of his punishment was to gratify the revenge of the Roman Catholics, who crowded Westminster Hall on his trial, on the 7th of May. The chief witness to the popish plot had long been lying in prison, heavily ironed, in default of payment of the excessive fine imposed upon him on his conviction for libelling the duke of York. He had been accustomed to browbeat juries, and to be lauded to the skies by judges. He had now to bear all the tyrannous invective which judges thought it decent to use in state prosecutions; and, what to his unabashed impudence was far more terrible, he was to be pilloried in Palace Yard, and at the Royal Exchange. He was to be whipped from Aldgate to Newgate on one day, and then again to be whipped from Newgate to Tyburn. He was to be imprisoned for life. He was to stand in the pillory five times every year. His conviction, says Reresby,[h] "was a grateful hearing to the king." His Majesty said that, Oates being thus convicted, the popish plot was dead.



JAMES II
(1633–1701)

Oates was tortured in a way which even the haters of his perjuries must have thought excessive. He was flogged at the cart's tail on the first day, almost to death. Intercession was made to the king to remit the second flogging. The answer was, "He shall go through with it, if he has breath in his body." He did go through with it, and survived even seventeen hundred lashes. It is clear that the judges meant him to be flogged to death. He could not be executed for his offence; but he could be subjected to the torments of a lingering execution. Flogging, under the government of James II, became a favourite punishment. Another of the plot witnesses, Dangerfield, was scourged for a libel, and he died. His death was laid upon a violent man who struck him with a cane, injuring his eye, as he was carried in a coach back to Newgate after his flogging; and that man, Francis, was hanged for murder. The lacerated body of Dangerfield showed that the brutal assault of Francis was a secondary cause of Dangerfield's death.

If Titus Oates was unmercifully scourged for the satisfaction of the papists, Richard Baxter was harassed, insulted, fined, and imprisoned, for the terror of the Puritans. Baxter was tried for a seditious libel, contained in his *Paraphrase on the New Testament*, in which he somewhat bitterly complained of the wrongs of the dissenters. Baxter's counsel moved for a postponement of the trial. "I would not give him a minute more to save his life," exclaimed the brutal Chief-justice Jeffreys: "Yonder stands Oates in the pillory, and if Baxter stood by his side the two greatest rogues and rascals in England would be there." The trial, if trial it could be called, went on. The barristers who defended the venerable man, now in his seventieth year, were insulted by the ermined slave of the crown. Baxter himself attempted to speak, and he was thus met by Jeffreys: "Richard, Richard! dost thou think we will hear thee poison the court? Richard, thou art an old fellow, an old knave; thou hast written books enough to load a cart; every one is as full of sedition (I might say treason), as an egg is full of meat; hadst thou been whipt out of thy writing trade forty years ago it had been happy. Thou pretendest to be a preacher of the gospel of peace, and thou hast one foot in the grave; it is time for thee to begin to think what account thou intendest to give; but leave thee to thyself, and I see thou wilt go on as thou hast begun; but, by the grace of God, I'll look after thee. I know thou hast a mighty party, and I see a great many of the brotherhood in corners, waiting to see what will become of the mighty don; but by the grace of Almighty God I will crush you all." The famous non-conformist — he who, in the earnestness of his piety and the purity of his life, was unsurpassed by the greatest of the great divines of the English church from which he differed so little — was of course found guilty. He was surrounded by friends and admirers, who wept aloud. "Sniveling calves!" exclaimed Jeffreys. He was anxious, it was said, that the prisoner should be whipped at the cart's tail, but that was overruled by the three other judges. Baxter was unable to pay his fine of 500 marks; and he remained in prison for eighteen months; when his pardon was obtained.[9]

MONMOUTH'S REBELLION (1685 A.D.)

In most respects the commons proved as dutiful as the king could have desired. By a unanimous vote, they settled on him for life the same revenue that the late king had enjoyed. They accompanied it with a declaration that they had implicit confidence in his promise to support the church, which, they added, was dearer to them than their lives. On the intelligence of the land-

ing of Monmouth, they made an additional grant of 400,000*l.* and passed a bill for the security of the king's person, in which they enlarged the original statute of treason. In the midst of this exuberant loyalty, however, it was manifest that the parliament, with all its servility, was jealous on the subject of religion.

Immediately on the accession of James, the English and Scottish exiles began to consult on the mode of delivering their country from the yoke of popery and despotism which they were persuaded the new monarch would endeavour to impose upon it. They met at Rotterdam, whither Argyll and Monmouth, who were at Brussels, repaired at their invitation, and it was arranged that these noblemen should simultaneously head expeditions to England and Scotland: to keep up the union between them, Argyll was to be attended by two Englishmen, Ayloffe and Rumbold; and Monmouth by two Scots, Ferguson and Fletcher of Saltoun.

Argyll sailed on May 2nd, 1685. He stopped at Orkney Isles, where two of his party were captured, and the government thus got information of his strength and destination. He landed in his own country on the 17th, and forthwith issued two declarations, and sent the fiery cross, according to Highland usage to summon his clansmen to arms.[c] The ill success of his adventure, his capture and brave death on the scaffold are described in the history of Scotland, where one must seek the account of the remarkable events of this reign.[a]

Various circumstances detained Monmouth so long, that it was the 11th of June when he landed at Lyme in Dorset. He was attended by Lord Grey of Werk, and about eighty other exiles and their attendants. He forthwith raised his standard, and published a declaration styling James a usurper and charging him with the burning of London and every atrocity which had been laid to the account of the papists, adding that of poisoning the late king. This declaration drew numbers of the people to his standard, and on the fourth day (June 15th) he marched from Lyme at the head of four thousand men. At Taunton he was received with acclamations and presented with a splendid stand of colours; and twenty young ladies in their best attire came to offer him a naked sword and a pocket Bible. He here caused himself to be proclaimed king on the 20th; and, in proof of his royalty, touched for the king's evil. He thence proceeded to Bridgewater, where he was also well received. The militia everywhere retired before him, and he proposed to cross the Avon near Bath and advance against Bristol.

But it was now ascertained that the royal troops, under the earl of Feversham, were at hand; that project therefore was abandoned, and it was debated in his council whether to march for Salop and Cheshire, where he expected good support, or to direct their course into Wiltshire, where he was led to hope for powerful assistance. This last was preferred, and the army arrived on the 26th at Philip's-Norton on the confines of that county, where they had an encounter with a part of the royal forces in which they had rather the advantage. They fell back however to Frome, and here Monmouth first learned of the defeat of Argyll.

He had been for some time desponding; for he saw that none of the nobility or gentry, without whose aid no civil movements have ever succeeded in England, had declared in his favour, and he therefore had begun to view his cause as hopeless. It was proposed that the army should be disbanded, and Monmouth and his friends should endeavour to escape by sea; but this course was vehemently opposed by Lord Grey and others, and the army was led back to Bridgewater, July 1st.

[1685 A.D.]

As the royal forces were reported to be encamped at no great distance on the edge of a morass named Sedgemoor, it was resolved to try the effect of a nocturnal attack. The duke led out his forces, the horse being commanded by Lord Grey, whose courage was very dubious. They reached the moor at about one in the morning of the 6th, but found themselves stopped by a deep drain in front of the royal camp. Grey, on coming to the ditch and perceiving the troops to be on the alert, turned after a brief stand and led his men off the field. The whole plan was now disconcerted; a firing was kept up till daylight, when Feversham ordered his infantry to cross the drain, while his horse took the insurgents in flank. The half-armed peasants made a gallant but ineffectual resistance, then broke and fled in all directions. Their loss was five hundred slain and fifteen hundred taken; the victors had three hundred killed and wounded.



ARMOUR OF JAMES II

Monmouth fled, it is not known at what time: his first thought was to get over to Wales; but Grey, who was his evil genius, dissuaded him from it, and with him and a German named Busse he directed his course toward the New Forest. As a reward had been set on his head, an active search was kept up for them. Early the next morning Grey was captured, and though Monmouth and Busse then escaped, the latter was taken the following morning; and as he owned that he had parted only four hours before from the duke, the search for him was made with redoubled activity. In a couple of hours that unfortunate prince was found in a ditch, covered with fern and nettles. He was in the dress of a peasant, and in his pockets were some green peas, the only sustenance he appears to have had. Broken in mind and body, he wrote a most humble letter to the king, entreating a personal interview and promising to make some important discovery. He was therefore, the very evening he reached London (July 13th), led into the royal presence with his arms pinioned. He threw himself on his knees, confessed his guilt, casting the blame on others, and implored for mercy in the humblest terms, but made no discovery. James, reminding him of his early education, asked him if he would have a priest. "Is there then no hope?" said he. The king made no reply, but ordered him to be taken away to the Tower, where he was told to prepare for death on the second day. When Monmouth was gone, Grey was brought into the royal presence, and he behaved with more spirit than the unfortunate duke.

James is usually condemned for inhumanity on this occasion. It is said that he should not have seen Monmouth, if he was resolved not to pardon him; but there is no proof of this resolution; he saw the prisoner at his own desire, and was led to expect disclosures which he did not receive. Surely Monmouth, after his invasion, his declaration, and his assumption of the title of king, had no claims to mercy. As to his being the king's nephew, this was a dubious

point, and James appears to have always doubted his being his brother's son.

The next morning (July 14th) Monmouth was visited by his duchess, the heiress of Buccleuch, whom he had abandoned to live with Lady Harriet Wentworth. The meeting was a cold one; her object was, for the sake of herself and children, to get him to declare that she was ignorant of his projects. On this subject he gave her ample satisfaction, and she then withdrew. He wrote again to the king and to the queen and the queen-dowager (which last kindhearted princess earnestly interceded for him), and to others, but with no effect. The bishops Ken and Turner came to prepare him for death. When they were announced he was overwhelmed with terror; but it passed away, and henceforth his mind was serene and composed. They found him in a religious frame of mind in general; but on two points he proved immovable; he strenuously maintained the right of resistance to oppression, and he would not allow that there was anything morally wrong in the connection between him and Lady Harriet Wentworth, though she had borne him a child: she, he said, was his real, the duchess was only his legal wife; his love for her had weaned him from vice; both had prayed to God to root out their affection if displeasing to him, but it had only increased with time. The prelates therefore declined giving him the sacrament.

In the morning of the 15th they returned with doctors Hooper and Tenison; but none could make any impression on his mind. The duchess and his children came to take their final leave of him: he was kinder than before; she sank to the ground, and was carried away in a swoon. At ten o'clock he entered the carriage which was to convey him to Tower Hill. The concourse was immense; tears, sighs, and groans were succeeded by an awful silence. On the scaffold the divines conscientiously but cruelly pressed him on the two above-named points: he was still inflexible. He made no speech, but gave a paper to the sheriff. He laid down his head, telling the executioner to do his work better than in the case of Lord Russell. The man, unnerved, it would seem, by the charge, gave but a feeble stroke; the duke raised himself, and turned his head as if to upbraid him; he struck twice more, and then flung down the axe, swearing that his heart failed him. The sheriff made him resume it, and at the fifth blow the head was severed; and thus perished, in his thirty-sixth year, James duke of Monmouth.[c]

CRUELTIES OF THE SOLDIERS IN THE WEST; KIRKE'S "LAMBS" (1685 A.D.)

While the execution of Monmouth occupied the thoughts of the Londoners, the counties which had risen against the government were enduring all that a ferocious soldiery could inflict. Feversham had been summoned to the court, where honours and rewards which he little deserved awaited him. He was made a knight of the Garter and captain of the first and most lucrative troop of life guards: but court and city laughed at his military exploits; and the wit of Buckingham gave forth its last feeble flash at the expense of the general who had won a battle in bed. Feversham left in command at Bridgewater Colonel Percy Kirke, a military adventurer whose vices had been developed by the worst of all schools, Tangier. Kirke had during some years commanded the garrison of that town, and had been constantly employed in hostilities against tribes of foreign barbarians, ignorant of the laws which regulate the warfare of civilised and Christian nations. Within the ramparts of his fortress he was a despotic prince. The only check on his tyranny was the fear of being called to account by a distant and a careless government. He

might therefore safely proceed to the most audacious excesses of rapacity, licentiousness, and cruelty. He lived with boundless dissoluteness, and procured by extortion the means of indulgence. No goods could be sold till Kirke had had the refusal of them. No question of right could be decided till Kirke had been bribed. Once, merely from a malignant whim, he staved all the wine in a vintner's cellar. On another occasion he drove all the Jews from Tangier. Two of them he sent to the Spanish Inquisition, which forthwith burned them. Under this iron domination scarce a complaint was heard; for hatred was effectually kept down by terror. Two persons who had been refractory were found murdered; and it was universally believed that they had been slain by Kirke's order. When his soldiers displeased him he flogged them with merciless severity: but he indemnified them by permitting them to sleep on watch, to reel drunk about the streets, to rob, beat, and insult the merchants and the labourers.

When Tangier was abandoned, Kirke returned to England. He still continued to command his old soldiers, who were designated sometimes as the 1st Tangier regiment, and sometimes as Queen Catharine's regiment. As they had been levied for the purpose of waging war on an infidel nation, they bore on their flag a Christian emblem, the Paschal Lamb. In allusion to this device, and with a bitterly ironical meaning, these men, the rudest and most ferocious in the English army, were called Kirke's Lambs. The regiment, now the second of the line, still retains this ancient badge, which is however thrown into the shade by decorations honourably earned in Egypt, in Spain, and in the heart of Asia.

Such was the captain and such were the soldiers who were now let loose on the people of Somersetshire. From Bridgewater Kirke marched to Taunton. He was accompanied by two carts filled with wounded rebels whose gashes had not been dressed, and by a long drove of prisoners on foot, who were chained two and two. Several of these he hanged as soon as he reached Taunton, without the form of a trial. They were not suffered even to take leave of their nearest relations. The sign post of the White Hart inn served for a gallows. It is said that the work of death went on in sight of the windows where the officers of the Tangier regiment were carousing, and that at every health a wretch was turned off. When the legs of the dying men quivered in the last agony, the colonel ordered the drums to strike up. He would give the rebels, he said, music to their dancing. The tradition runs that one of the captives was not even allowed the indulgence of a speedy death. Twice he was suspended from the sign post, and twice cut down. Twice he was asked if he repented of his treason; and twice he replied that, if the thing were to do again, he would do it. Then he was tied up for the last time.

So many dead bodies were quartered that the executioner stood ankle deep in blood. He was assisted by a poor man whose loyalty was suspected, and who was compelled to ransom his own life by seething the remains of his friends in pitch. The peasant who had consented to perform this hideous office afterwards returned to his plough. But a mark like that of Cain was upon him. He was known through his village by the horrible name of Tom Boilman. The rustics long continued to relate that, though he had, by his sinful and shameful deed, saved himself from the vengeance of the Lambs, he had not escaped the vengeance of a higher power. In a great storm he fled for shelter under an oak, and was there struck dead by lightning.

The number of those who were thus butchered cannot now be ascertained. Nine were entered in the parish registers of Taunton: but those registers contain the names of such only as had Christian burial. Those who were hanged

in chains, and those whose heads and limbs were sent to the neighbouring villages, must have been much more numerous. It was believed in London, at the time, that Kirke put a hundred captives to death during the week which followed the battle.

Cruelty, however, was not this man's only passion. He loved money and was no novice in the arts of extortion. A safe conduct might be bought of him for thirty or forty pounds; and such a safe conduct, though of no value in law, enabled the purchaser to pass the posts of the Lambs without molestation, to reach a seaport, and to fly to a foreign country. The ships which were bound for New England were crowded at this juncture with so many fugitives from Sedgemoor that there was great danger lest the water and provisions should fail.

Kirke was also, in his own coarse and ferocious way, a man of pleasure; and nothing is more probable than that he employed his power for the purpose of gratifying his licentious appetite. It was reported that he conquered the virtue of a beautiful woman by promising to spare the life of one to whom she was strongly attached, and that, after she had yielded, he showed her suspended on the gallows the lifeless remains of him for whose sake she had sacrificed her honour. This tale an impartial judge must reject. It is unsupported by proof. The earliest authority for it is a poem written by Pomfret. The respectable historians of that age, while they expatiate on the crimes of Kirke, either omit all mention of this most atrocious crime, or mention it as a thing rumoured but not proved. Those who tell the story tell it with such variations as deprive it of all title to credit. Some lay the scene at Taunton, some at Exeter. Some make the heroine of the tale a maiden, some a married woman. The relation for whom the shameful ransom was paid is described by some as her father, by some as her brother, and by some as her husband.

Lastly the story is one which, long before Kirke was born, had been told of many other oppressors, and had become a favourite theme of novelists and dramatists. Two politicians of the fifteenth century, Rhynsault, the favourite of Charles the Bold of Burgundy, and Oliver le Dain, the favourite of Louis XI of France, had been accused of the same crime. Cintio had taken it for the subject of a romance; Whetstone had made out of Cintio's narrative the rude play of *Promos and Cassandra;* and Shakespeare had borrowed from Whetstone the plot of the noble tragi-comedy of *Measure for Measure.* As Kirke was not the first, so he was not the last to whom this excess of wickedness was popularly imputed. During the reaction which followed the Jacobin tyranny in France, a very similar charge was brought against Joseph Lebon, one of the most odious agents of the committee of Public Safety, and, after inquiry, was admitted even by his prosecutors to be unfounded.

The government was dissatisfied with Kirke, not on account of the barbarity with which he had treated his needy prisoners, but on account of the interested lenity which he had shown to rich delinquents. He was soon recalled from the west. A less irregular and at the same time a more cruel massacre was about to be perpetrated. The vengeance was deferred during some weeks. It was thought desirable that the western circuit should not begin till the other circuits had terminated. In the meantime the jails of Somersetshire and Dorsetshire were filled with thousands of captives. The chief friend and protector of these unhappy men in their extremity was one who abhorred their religious and political opinions, one whose order they hated, and to whom they had done unprovoked wrong, Bishop Ken. That good prelate used all his influence to soften the gaolers, and retrenched from his own Episcopal state that he might be able to make some addition to the

coarse and scanty fare of those who had defaced his beloved cathedral. His conduct on this occasion was of a piece with his whole life. His intellect was indeed darkened by many superstitions and prejudices: but his moral character, when impartially reviewed, sustains a comparison with any in ecclesiastical history, and seems to approach, as near as human infirmity permits, to the ideal perfection of Christian virtue.

His labour of love was of no long duration. A rapid and effectual jail delivery was at hand. Early in September, Jeffreys, accompanied by four other judges, set out on that circuit of which the memory will last as long as our race and language. The officers who commanded the troops in the districts through which his course lay had orders to furnish him with whatever military aid he might require. His ferocious temper needed no spur.[b]

To Jeffreys, who now enters into his full infamy, it will be well to devote some attention. Lord Campbell,[i] the biographer of the lord chancellors, says of him: "It is hardly known to the multitude that this infamous person ever held the great seal of England; as, from the almost exclusive recollection of his presiding on criminal trials, he has been execrated under the designation of Judge Jeffreys — which is as familiar in our mouths as household words. Yet was he chancellor a considerably longer time than chief justice — and in the former capacity, as well as the latter, he did many things to astonish and horrify mankind.

"He has been so much abused that I began my critical examination of his history in the hope and belief that I should find that his misdeeds had been exaggerated, and that I might be able to rescue his memory from some portion of the obloquy under which it labours; but I am sorry to say that, in my matured opinion, although he appears to have been a man of high talents, of singularly agreeable manners, and entirely free from hypocrisy, his cruelty and his political profligacy have not been sufficiently exposed or reprobated; and that he was not redeemed from his vices by one single solid virtue."[a]

MACAULAY'S ACCOUNT OF JUDGE JEFFREYS AND THE BLOODY ASSIZES

The depravity of Sir George Jeffreys[1] has passed into a proverb. Both the great English parties have attacked his memory with emulous violence: for the whigs considered him their most barbarous enemy; and the tories found it convenient to throw on him the blame of all the crimes which had sullied their triumph. A diligent and candid inquiry will show that some frightful stories which have been told concerning him are false or exaggerated. Yet the dispassionate historian will be able to make very little deduction from the vast mass of infamy with which the memory of the wicked judge has been loaded.

He was a man of quick and vigorous parts, but constitutionally prone to insolence and to the angry passions. When just emerging from boyhood he had risen into practice at the Old Bailey bar, a bar where advocates have always used a license of tongue unknown in Westminster Hall. Here, during many years, his chief business was to examine and cross-examine the most hardened miscreants of a great capital. Daily conflicts with prostitutes and thieves called out and exercised his powers so effectually that be became the

[1 The name is spelled no fewer than eight different ways: "Jeffries," "Jefferies," "Jefferys," "Jeffereys," "Jefferyes," "Jeffrys," "Jeffryes," and "Jeffreys," and he himself spelled it differently at different times of his life; but the last spelling is that which is found in his patent of peerage, and which he always used afterwards. — LORD CAMPBELL. ']

most consummate bully ever known in his profession. All tenderness for the feelings of others, all self respect, all sense of the becoming were obliterated from his mind. He acquired a boundless command of the rhetoric in which the vulgar express hatred and contempt. The profusion of maledictions and vituperative epithets which composed his vocabulary could hardly have been rivalled in the fish market or the bear garden. His countenance and his voice must always have been unamiable. But these natural advantages — for such he seems to have thought them — he had improved to such a degree that there were few who, in his paroxysms of rage, could see or hear him without emotion. Impudence and ferocity sat upon his brow. The glare of his eyes had a fascination for the unhappy victim on whom they were fixed. Yet his brow and his eye were said to be less terrible than the savage lines of his mouth. His yell of fury, as was said by one who had often heard it, sounded like the thunder of the judgment day.

These qualifications he carried, while still a young man, from the bar to the bench. He early became common sergeant and then recorder of London. As a judge at the city sessions he exhibited the same propensities which afterwards, in a higher post, gained for him an unenviable immortality. Already might be remarked in him the most odious vice which is incident to human nature, a delight in misery merely as misery. There was a fiendish exultation in the way in which he pronounced sentence on offenders. Their weeping and imploring seemed to titillate him voluptuously; and he loved to scare them into fits by dilating with luxuriant amplification on all the details of what they were to suffer. Thus, when he had an opportunity of ordering an unlucky adventuress to be whipped at the cart's tail: "Hangman," he would exclaim, "I charge you to pay particular attention to this lady! Scourge her soundly, man. Scourge her till the blood runs down! It is Christmas, a cold time for madam to strip in! See that you warm her shoulders thoroughly!" He was hardly less facetious when he passed judgment on poor Lodowick Muggleton, the drunken tailor who fancied himself a prophet. "Impudent rogue!" roared Jeffreys, "thou shalt have an easy, easy, easy punishment!" One part of this easy punishment was the pillory, in which the wretched fanatic was almost killed with brickbats.

By this time the heart of Jeffreys had been hardened to that temper which tyrants require in their worst implements. He had hitherto looked for professional advancement to the corporation of London. He had therefore professed himself a roundhead, and had always appeared to be in a higher state of exhilaration when he explained to popish priests that they were to be cut down alive and were to see their own bowels burned, than when he passed ordinary sentences of death. But, as soon as he had got all that the city could give, he made haste to sell his forehead of brass and his tongue of venom to the court. Chiffinch, who was accustomed to act as broker in infamous contracts of more than one kind, lent his aid. He had conducted many amorous and many political intrigues; but he assuredly never rendered a more scandalous service to his masters than when he introduced Jeffreys to Whitehall.

The renegade soon found a patron in the obdurate and revengeful James, but was always regarded with scorn and disgust by Charles, whose faults, great as they were, had no affinity with insolence and cruelty. "That man," said the king, "has no learning, no sense, no manners, and more impudence than ten carted streetwalkers." Work was to be done, however, which could be trusted to no man who reverenced law or was sensible of shame; and thus Jeffreys, at an age at which a barrister thinks himself fortunate if he is em-

ployed to conduct an important cause, was made chief justice of the King's Bench.

His enemies could not deny that he posessed some of the qualities of a great judge. His legal knowledge, indeed, was merely such as he had picked up in practice of no very high kind. But he had one of those happily constituted intellects which, across labyrinths of sophistry, and through masses of immaterial facts, go straight to the true point. Of his intellect, however, he seldom had the full use. Even in civil causes his malevolent and despotic temper perpetually disordered his judgment. To enter his court was to enter the den of a wild beast, which none could tame, and which was as likely to be roused to rage by caresses as by attacks. He frequently poured forth on plaintiffs and defendants, barristers and attorneys, witnesses and jurymen torrents of frantic abuse, intermixed with oaths and curses. His looks and tones had inspired terror when he was merely a young advocate struggling into practice. Now that he was at the head of the most formidable tribunal in the realm, there were few indeed who did not tremble before him. Even when he was sober, his violence was sufficiently frightful. But in general his reason was overclouded and his evil passions stimulated by the fumes of intoxication.

His evenings were ordinarily given to revelry. People who saw him only over his bottle would have supposed him to be a man gross indeed, sottish, and addicted to low company and low merriment, but social and good humoured. He was constantly surrounded on such occasions by buffoons selected, for the most part, from among the vilest pettifoggers who practised before him. These men bantered and abused each other for his entertainment. He joined in their ribald talk, sang catches with them, and, when his head grew hot, hugged and kissed them in an ecstacy of drunken fondness. But, though wine at first seemed to soften his heart, the effect a few hours later was very different. He often came to the judgment seat, having kept the court waiting long, and yet having but half slept off his debauch, his cheeks on fire, his eyes staring like those of a maniac. When he was in this state, his boon companions of the preceding night, if they were wise, kept out of his way; for the recollection of the familiarity to which he had admitted them inflamed his malignity; and he was sure to take every opportunity of overwhelming them with execration and invective. Not the least odious of his many odious peculiarities was the pleasure which he took in publicly browbeating and mortifying those whom, in his fits of maudlin tenderness, he had encouraged to presume on his favour.

The services which the government had expected from him were performed, not merely without flinching, but eagerly and triumphantly. His first exploit was the judicial murder of Algernon Sidney. What followed was in perfect harmony with this beginning. Respectable tories lamented the disgrace which the barbarity and indecency of so great a functionary brought upon the administration of justice. But the excesses which filled such men with horror were titles to the esteem of James. Jeffreys, therefore, after the death of Charles, obtained a seat in the cabinet and a peerage. This last honour was a signal mark of royal approbation. For, since the judicial system of the realm had been remodelled in the thirteenth century, no chief justice had been a lord of parliament.

Guilford now found himself superseded in all his political functions, and restricted to his business as a judge in equity. At council he was treated by Jeffreys with marked incivility. The whole legal patronage was in the hands of the chief justice; and it was well known by the bar that the surest way to

propitiate the chief-justice was to treat the lord keeper with disrespect. So deeply was Guilford humbled that, when he appeared for the last time in Westminster Hall in 1685 after the failure of Monmouth's rebellion, he took with him a nosegay to hide his face, because, as he afterwards owned, he could not bear the eyes of the bar and of the audience. The prospect of his approaching end seems to have inspired him with unwonted courage. He determined to discharge his conscience, requested an audience of the king, spoke earnestly of the dangers inseparable from violent and arbitrary counsels, and condemned the lawless cruelties which the soldiers had committed in Somersetshire. He soon after retired from London to die. He breathed his last a few days after the judges set out for the west. It was immediately notified to Jeffreys that he might expect the great seal as the reward of faithful and vigorous service.

Trial of Alice Lisle

At Winchester the chief-justice first opened his commission. Hampshire had not been the theatre of war; but many of the vanquished rebels had, like their leader, fled thither. Two of them, John Hickes, a non-conformist divine, and Richard Nelthorpe, a lawyer who had been outlawed for his share in the Rye House Plot, had sought refuge at the house of Alice, widow of John Lisle. John Lisle had sat in the Long Parliament and in the high court of justice, had been a commissioner of the great seal in the days of the commonwealth, and had been created a lord by Cromwell. The titles given by the protector had not been recognised by any government which had ruled England since the downfall of his house; but they appear to have been often used in conversation even by royalists. John Lisle's widow was therefore commonly known as the lady Alice.

The same womanly kindness which had led her to befriend the royalists in their time of trouble would not suffer her to refuse a meal and a hiding place to the wretched men who now entreated her to protect them. She took them into her house, set meat and drink before them, and showed them where they might take rest. The next morning her dwelling was surrounded by soldiers. Strict search was made. Hickes was found concealed in the malt house, and Nelthorpe in the chimney. If Lady Alice knew her guests to have been concerned in the insurrection, she was undoubtedly guilty of what in strictness is a capital crime. For the law of principal and accessory as respects high treason, then was, and is to this day, in a state disgraceful to English jurisprudence. The feeling which makes the most loyal subject shrink from the thought of giving up to a shameful death the rebel who, vanquished, hunted down, and in mortal agony, begs for a morsel of bread and a cup of water, may be a weakness: but it is surely a weakness very nearly allied to virtue. No English ruler, the savage and implacable James alone excepted, has had the barbarity even to think of putting a lady to a cruel and shameful death for so venial and amiable a transgression.

Odious as the law was, it was strained for the purpose of destroying Alice Lisle. She could not, according to the doctrine laid down by the highest authority, be convicted till after the conviction of the rebels whom she had harboured. She was, however, set to the bar before either Hickes or Nelthorpe had been tried. It was no easy matter in such a case to obtain a verdict for the crown. The witnesses prevaricated. The jury, consisting of the principal gentlemen of Hampshire, shrank from the thought of sending a fellow creature to the stake for conduct which seemed deserving rather of

praise than of blame. Jeffreys was beside himself with fury. This was the first case of treason on the circuit; and there seemed to be a strong probability that his prey would escape him. He stormed, cursed, and swore in language which no well bred man would have used at a race or a cockfight.

After the witnesses had been thus handled, the lady Alice was called on for her defence. She began by saying, what may possibly have been true, that, though she knew Hickes to be in trouble when she took him in, she did not know or suspect that he had been concerned in the rebellion. He was a divine, a man of peace. It had, therefore, never occurred to her that he could have borne arms against the government; and she had supposed that he wished to conceal himself because warrants were out against him for field preaching. The chief justice began to storm: "But I will tell you. There is not one of those lying, snivelling, canting Presbyterians but, one way or another, had a hand in the rebellion. Presbytery has all manner of villany in it. Nothing but Presbytery could have made Dunne such a rogue. Show me a Presbyterian; and I'll show thee a lying knave." He summed up in the same style, declaimed during an hour against whigs and dissenters, and reminded the jury that the prisoner's husband had borne a part in the death of Charles I, a fact which was not proved by any testimony, and which, if it had been proved, would have been utterly irrelevant to the issue. The jury retired, and remained long in consultation. The judge grew impatient. He could not conceive, he said, how, in so plain a case, they should even have left the box. He sent a messenger to tell them that, if they did not instantly return, he would adjourn the court and lock them up all night. Thus put to the torture, they came, but came to say that they doubted whether the charge had been made out. Jeffreys expostulated with them vehemently, and, after another consultation, they gave a reluctant verdict of guilty.

On the following morning sentence was pronounced. Jeffreys gave directions that Alice Lisle should be burned alive that very afternoon. This excess of barbarity moved the pity and indignation even of the class which was most devoted to the crown. The clergy of Winchester cathedral remonstrated with the chief justice, who, brutal as he was, was not mad enough to risk a quarrel on such a subject with a body so much respected by the tory party. He consented to put off the execution five days. During that time the friends of the prisoner besought James to show her mercy. Ladies of high rank interceded for her. Clarendon, the king's brother-in-law, pleaded her cause. But all was vain. The utmost that could be obtained was that her sentence should be commuted from burning to beheading. She was put to death on a scaffold in the market-place of Winchester, and underwent her fate with serene courage.

The Bloody Assizes

In Hampshire Alice Lisle was the only victim, but, on the day following her execution, Jeffreys reached Dorchester, the principal town of the county in which Monmouth had landed, and the judicial massacre began. The court was hung, by order of the chief justice, with scarlet; and this innovation seemed to the multitude to indicate a bloody purpose. It was also rumoured that, when the clergyman who preached the assize sermon enforced the duty of mercy, the ferocious mouth of the judge was distorted by an ominous grin. These things made men augur ill of what was to follow.

More than three hundred prisoners were to be tried. The work seemed heavy; but Jeffreys had a contrivance for making it light. He let it be under-

stood that the only chance of obtaining pardon or respite was to plead guilty. Twenty-nine persons, who put themselves on their country and were convicted, were ordered to be tied up without delay. The remaining prisoners pleaded guilty by scores. Two hundred and ninety-two received sentence of death. The whole number hanged in Dorsetshire amounted to seventy-four.

From Dorchester Jeffreys proceeded to Exeter. The civil war had barely grazed the frontier of Devonshire. Here, therefore, comparatively few persons were capitally punished. Somersetshire, the chief seat of the rebellion, had been reserved for the last and most fearful vengeance. In this county two hundred and thirty-three prisoners were in a few days hanged, drawn, and quartered. At every spot where two roads met, on every market place, on the green of every large village which had furnished Monmouth with soldiers, ironed corpses clattering in the wind, or heads and quarters stuck on poles, poisoned the air, and made the traveller sick with horror. In many parishes the peasantry could not assemble in the house of God without seeing the ghastly face of a neighbour grinning at them over the porch.

The chief-justice was all himself. His spirits rose higher and higher as the work went on. He laughed, shouted, joked, and swore in such a way that many thought him drunk from morning to night. But in him it was not easy to distinguish the madness produced by evil passions from the madness produced by brandy. A prisoner affirmed that the witnesses who appeared against him were not entitled to credit. One of them, he said, was a papist, and another a prostitute. "Thou impudent rebel," exclaimed the judge, "to reflect on the king's evidence! I see thee, villain, I see thee already with the halter round thy neck." Another produced testimony that he was a good Protestant. "Protestant!" said Jeffreys; "you mean Presbyterian. I'll hold you a wager of it. I can smell a Presbyterian forty miles." One wretched man moved the pity even of bitter tories. "My lord," they said, "this poor creature is on the parish." "Do not trouble yourselves," said the judge, "I will ease the parish of the burden."

It was not only on the prisoners that his fury broke forth. Gentlemen and noblemen of high consideration and stainless loyalty, who ventured to bring to his notice any extenuating circumstance, were almost sure to receive what he called, in the coarse dialect which he had learned in the pot-houses of Whitechapel, "a lick with the rough side of his tongue." Lord Stawell, a tory peer, who could not conceal his horror at the remorseless manner in which his poor neighbours were butchered, was punished by having a corpse suspened in chains at his park gate. In such spectacles originated many tales of terror, which were long told over the cider by the Christmas fires of the farmers of Somersetshire. Within the last forty years peasants, in some districts, well knew the accursed spots, and passed them unwillingly after sunset.

Jeffreys boasted that he had hanged more traitors than all his predecessors together since the conquest. It is certain that the number of persons whom he executed in one month, and in one shire, very much exceeded the number of all the political offenders who have been executed in our island since the Revolution. The rebellions of 1715 and 1745 were of longer duration, of wider extent, and of more formidable aspect than that which was put down at Sedgemoor. It has not been generally thought that, either after the rebellion of 1715, or after the rebellion of 1745, the house of Hanover erred on the side of clemency. Yet all the executions of 1715 and 1745 added together will appear to have been few indeed when compared with those which disgraced the Bloody Assizes. The number of the rebels whom Jeffreys hanged

on this circuit was three hundred and twenty. Lord Lonsdale[i] says seven hundred: Burnet[k] six hundred. We have followed the list which the judges sent to the treasury, and which may still be seen there in the letter book of 1685.

Such havoc must have excited disgust even if the sufferers had been generally odious. But they were, for the most part, men of blameless life and of high religious profession. They were regarded by themselves, and by a large proportion of their neighbours, not as wrongdoers, but as martyrs who sealed with blood the truth of the Protestant religion. Very few of the convicts professed any repentance for what they had done. Many, animated by the old Puritan spirit, met death, not merely with fortitude but with exultation. It was in vain that the ministers of the established church lectured them on the guilt of rebellion and on the importance of priestly absolution. The claim of the king to unbounded authority in things temporal, and the claim of the clergy to the spiritual power of binding and loosing, moved the bitter scorn of the intrepid sectaries. Some of them composed hymns in the dungeon, and chanted them on the fatal sledge. Christ, they sang while they were undressing for the butchery, would soon come to rescue Zion and to make war on Babylon, would set up his standard, would blow his trumpet, and would requite his foes tenfold for all the evil which had been inflicted on his servants. The dying words of these men were noted down; their farewell letters were kept as treasures; and, in this way, with the help of some invention and exaggeration, was formed a copious supplement to the Marian martyrology.

Yet those rebels who were doomed to death were less to be pitied than some of the survivors. Several prisoners to whom Jeffreys was unable to bring home the charge of high treason were convicted of misdemeanours, and were sentenced to scourging not less terrible than that which Oates had undergone. A woman for some idle words, such as had been uttered by half the women in the districts where the war had raged, was condemned to be whipped through all the market towns in the county of Dorset. She suffered part of her punishment before Jeffreys returned to London: but, when he was no longer in the west, the gaolers, with the humane connivance of the magistrates, took on themselves the responsibility of sparing her any further torture.

A still more frightful sentence was passed on a lad named Tutchin, who was tried for seditious words. He was, as usual, interrupted in his defence by ribaldry and scurrility from the judgment seat. "You are a rebel; and all your family have been rebels since Adam. They tell me that you are a poet. I'll cap verses with you." The sentence was that the boy should be imprisoned seven years, and should, during that period, be flogged through every market town in Dorsetshire every year. The women in the galleries burst into tears. The clerk of the arraigns stood up in great disorder. "My lord," said he, "the prisoner is very young. There are many market towns in our county. The sentence amounts to whipping once a fortnight for seven years." "If he is a young man," said Jeffreys, "he is an old rogue. Ladies, you do not know the villain as well as I do. The punishment is not half bad enough for him. All the interest in England shall not alter it." Tutchin in his despair petitioned, and probably with sincerity, that he might be hanged. Fortunately for him he was, just at this conjuncture, taken ill of the smallpox and given over. As it seemed highly improbable that the sentence would ever be executed, the chief justice consented to remit it, in return for a bribe which reduced the prisoner to poverty. The temper of Tutchin, not originally very mild, was exasperated to madness by what he had undergone. He lived to be known as one of the most acrimonious and pertinacious enemies of the house of Stuart and of the tory party.

Rebels Transported

The number of prisoners whom Jeffreys transported was eight hundred and forty-one. These men, more wretched than their associates who suffered death, were distributed into gangs, and bestowed on persons who enjoyed favour at court. The conditions of the gift were that the convicts should be carried beyond sea as slaves, that they should not be emancipated for ten years, and that the place of their banishment should be some West Indian island. This last article was studiously framed for the purpose of aggravating the misery of the exiles. In New England or New Jersey they would have found a population kindly disposed to them and a climate not unfavourable to their health and vigour. It was therefore determined that they should be sent to colonies where a Puritan could hope to inspire little sympathy, and where a labourer born in the temperate zone could hope to enjoy little health. Such was the state of the slave market that these bondmen, long as was the passage, and sickly as they were likely to prove, were still very valuable. It was estimated by Jeffreys that, on an average, each of them, after all charges were paid, would be worth from ten to fifteen pounds. There was therefore much angry competition for grants. Some tories in the west conceived that they had, by their exertions and sufferings during the insurrection, earned a right to share in the profits which had been eagerly snatched up by the sycophants of Whitehall. The courtiers, however, were victorious.

The misery of the exiles fully equalled that of the negroes who in the nineteenth century were carried from Congo to Brazil. It appears from the best information which is at present accessible that more than one-fifth of those who were shipped were flung to the sharks before the end of the voyage. The human cargoes were stowed close in the holds of small vessels. So little space was allowed that the wretches, many of whom were still tormented by unhealed wounds, could not all lie down at once without lying on one another. They were never suffered to go on deck. The hatchway was constantly watched by sentinels armed with hangers and blunderbusses. In the dungeon below all was darkness, stench, lamentation, disease, and death.

Of ninety-nine convicts who were carried out in one vessel, twenty-one died before they reached Jamaica, although the voyage was performed with unusual speed. The survivors when they arrived at their house of bondage were mere skeletons. During some weeks coarse biscuit and fetid water had been doled out to them in such scanty measure that any one of them could easily have consumed the ration which was assigned to five. They were, therefore, in such a state that the merchant to whom they had been consigned found it expedient to fatten them before selling them.

Confiscation and Extortion

Meanwhile the property, both of the rebels who had suffered death and of those more unfortunate men who were withering under the tropical sun, was fought for and torn in pieces by a crowd of greedy informers. By law a subject attainted of treason forfeits all his substance; and this law was enforced after the Bloody Assizes with a rigour at once cruel and ludicrous. The broken-hearted widows and destitute orphans of the labouring men whose corpses hung at the cross roads were called upon by the agents of the treasury to explain what had become of a basket, of a goose, of a flitch of bacon, of a keg of cider, of a sack of beans, of a truss of hay. While the humbler retainers of the government were pillaging the families of the slaughtered peasants, the

chief justice was fast accumulating a fortune out of the plunder of a higher class of whigs. He traded largely in pardons. His most lucrative transaction of this kind was with a gentleman named Edmund Prideaux. The unfortunate man lay long in gaol, and at length, overcome by fear of the gallows, consented to pay £15,000 for his liberation. This great sum was received by Jeffreys. He bought with it an estate, to which the people gave the name of Aceldama, from that accursed field which was purchased with the price of innocent blood.

Some courtiers contrived to obtain a small share of this traffic. The ladies of the queen's household distinguished themselves pre-eminently by rapacity and hard-heartedness. Part of the disgrace which they incurred falls on their mistress: for it was solely on account of the relation in which they stood to her that they were able to enrich themselves by so odious a trade; and there can be no question that she might with a word or a look have restrained them. But in truth she encouraged them by her evil example, if not by her express approbation. She seems to have been one of that large class of persons who bear adversity better than prosperity. While her husband was a subject and an exile, shut out from public employment, and in imminent danger of being deprived of his birthright, the suavity and humility of her manners conciliated the kindness even of those who most abhorred her religion. But when her good fortune came her good nature disappeared. The meek and affable duchess turned out an ungracious and haughty queen. The misfortunes which she subsequently endured have made her an object of some interest; but that interest would be not a little heightened if it could be shown that, in the season of her greatness, she saved, or even tried to save, one single victim from the most frightful proscription that England has ever seen. Unhappily the only request that she is known to have preferred touching the rebels was that a hundred of those who were sentenced to transportation might be given to her.

The profit which she cleared on the cargo, after making large allowance for those who died of hunger and fever during the passage, cannot be estimated at less than a thousand guineas. We cannot wonder that her attendants should have imitated her unprincely greediness and her unwomanly cruelty. They exacted a thousand pounds from Roger Hoare, a merchant of Bridgewater, who had contributed to the military chest of the rebel army. But the prey on which they pounced most eagerly was one which it might have been thought that even the most ungentle natures would have spared. Already some of the girls who had presented the standard to Monmouth at Taunton had cruelly expiated their offence. One of them had been thrown into a prison where an infectious malady was raging. She had sickened and died there. Another had presented herself at the bar before Jeffreys to beg for mercy. "Take her, gaoler," vociferated the judge, with one of those frowns which had often struck terror into stouter hearts than hers. She burst into tears, drew her hood over her face, followed the gaoler out of court, fell ill of fright, and in a few hours was a corpse.

Most of the young ladies, however, who had walked in the procession, were still alive. Some of them were under ten years of age. All had acted under the orders of their schoolmistress, without knowing that they were committing a crime. The queen's maids of honour asked the royal permission to wring money out of the parents of the poor children; and the permission was granted. An order was sent down to Taunton that all these little girls should be seized and imprisoned. The maids of honour were at last forced to content themselves with less than a third part of what they had demanded.

"Odious Mercy"

No English sovereign has ever given stronger proofs of a cruel nature than James II. Yet his cruelty was not more odious than his mercy. Or perhaps it may be more correct to say that his mercy and his cruelty were such that each reflects infamy on the other. Our horror at the fate of the simple clowns, the young lads, the delicate women, to whom he was inexorably severe, is increased when we find to whom and for what considerations he granted his pardon.

The rule by which a prince ought, after a rebellion, to be guided in selecting rebels for punishment is perfectly obvious. The ringleaders, the men of rank, fortune, and education, whose power and whose artifices have led the multitude into error, are the proper objects of severity. The deluded populace, when once the slaughter on the field of battle is over, can scarcely be treated too leniently. This rule, so evidently agreeable to justice and humanity, was not only not observed, it was inverted. While those who ought to have been spared were slaughtered by hundreds, the few who might with propriety have been left to the utmost rigour of the law were spared. This eccentric clemency has perplexed some writers, and has drawn forth ludicrous eulogies from others. It was neither at all mysterious nor at all praiseworthy. It may be distinctly traced in every case either to a sordid or to a malignant motive, either to thirst for money or to thirst for blood.

In the case of Grey there was no mitigating circumstance. He was suffered to redeem himself by giving a bond for £40,000 to the lord treasurer, and smaller sums to other courtiers. Sir John Cochrane had held among the Scotch rebels the same rank which had been held by Grey in the west of England. His father, Lord Dundonald, offered a bribe of £5,000 to the priests of the royal household; and a pardon was granted.

None of the traitors had less right to expect favour than Wade, Goodenough, and Ferguson. These three chiefs of the rebellion had fled together from the field of Sedgemoor, and had reached the coast in safety. But they had found a frigate cruising near the spot where they had hoped to embark. They had then separated. Wade and Goodenough were soon discovered and brought up to London. Deeply as they had been implicated in the Rye House Plot, conspicuous as they had been among the chiefs of the western insurrection, they were suffered to live, because they had it in their power to give information which enabled the king to slaughter and plunder some persons whom he hated, but to whom he had never yet been able to bring home any crime.

How Ferguson escaped was, and still is, a mystery. Of all the enemies of the government he was, without doubt, the most deeply criminal. He was the original author of the plot for assassinating the royal brothers. He had written that declaration which, for insolence, malignity, and mendacity, stands unrivalled even among the libels of those stormy times. He had instigated Monmouth first to invade the kingdom and then to usurp the crown. It was reasonable to expect that a strict search would be made for the arch traitor, as he was often called; and such a search a man of so singular an aspect and dialect could scarcely have eluded. It was confidently reported in the coffee houses of London that Ferguson was taken, and this report found credit with men who had excellent opportunities of knowing the truth. The next thing that was heard of him was that he was safe on the Continent. It was strongly suspected that he had been in constant communication with the government against which he was constantly plotting, that he had, while

urging his associates to every excess of rashness, sent to Whitehall just so much information about their proceedings as might suffice to save his own neck, and that therefore orders had been given to let him escape.

JEFFREYS MADE LORD CHANCELLOR

And now Jeffreys had done his work, and returned to claim his reward. He arrived at Windsor from the west, leaving carnage, mourning, and terror behind him. The hatred with which he was regarded by the people of Somersetshire has no parallel in our history. It was not to be quenched by time or by political changes, was long transmitted from generation to generation, and raged fiercely against his innocent progeny. When he had been many years dead, when his name and title were extinct, his granddaughter the countess of Pomfret, travelling along the western road, was insulted by the populace, and found that she could not safely venture herself among the descendants of those who had witnessed the Bloody Assizes.

But at the court Jeffreys was cordially welcomed. He was a judge after his master's own heart. James had watched the circuit with interest and delight. In his drawing-room and at his table he had frequently talked of the havoc which was making among his disaffected subjects with a glee at which the foreign ministers stood aghast. With his own hand he had penned accounts of what he facetiously called his lord chief justice's campaign in the west. Some hundreds of rebels, his majesty wrote to the Hague, had been condemned. Some of them had been hanged, more should be so; and the rest should be sent to the plantations. It was to no purpose that Ken wrote to implore mercy for the misguided people, and described with pathetic eloquence the frightful state of his diocese. He complained that it was impossible to walk along the highways without seeing some terrible spectacle, and that the whole air of Somersetshire was tainted with death. The king read, and remained, according to the saying of Churchill, hard as the marble chimney pieces of Whitehall.

At Windsor the great seal of England was put into the hands of Jeffreys, and in the next *London Gazette* it was solemnly notified that this honour was the reward of the many eminent and faithful services which he had rendered to the crown. At a later period, when all men of all parties spoke with horror of the Bloody Assizes, the wicked judge and the wicked king attempted to vindicate themselves by throwing the blame on each other. Jeffreys, in the Tower, protested that, in his utmost cruelty, he had not gone beyond his master's express orders, nay, that he had fallen short of them. James, at St. Germain, would willingly have had it believed that his own inclinations had been on the side of clemency, and that unmerited obloquy had been brought on him by the violence of his minister. But neither of these hard-hearted men must be absolved at the expense of the other. The plea set up for James can be proved under his own hand to be false in fact. The plea of Jeffreys even if it be true in fact, is utterly worthless.

THE SLAUGHTER IN LONDON

The slaughter in the west was over. The slaughter in London was about to begin. The government was peculiarly desirous to find victims among the great whig merchants of the city. They had, in the last reign, been a formidable part of the strength of the opposition. They were wealthy; and their wealth was not, like that of many noblemen and country gentlemen, protected

by entail against forfeiture. One of the most considerable among them was Henry Cornish. He had been an alderman under the old charter of the city, and had filled the office of sheriff when the question of the Exclusion Bill occupied the public mind. In politics he was a whig: his religious opinions leaned towards Presbyterianism: but his temper was cautious and moderate. It is not proved by trustworthy evidence that he ever approached the verge of treason. He had, indeed, when sheriff, been very unwilling to employ as his deputy a man so violent and unprincipled as Goodenough. When the Rye House Plot was discovered, great hopes were entertained at Whitehall that Cornish would appear to have been concerned: but these hopes were disappointed. One of the conspirators, indeed, John Rumsey, was ready to swear anything: but a single witness was not sufficient; and no second witness could be found. More than two years had since elapsed. Cornish thought himself safe: but the eye of the tyrant was upon him. Goodenough, terrified by the near prospect of death, and still harbouring malice on account of the unfavourable opinion which had always been entertained of him by his old master, consented to supply the testimony which had hitherto been wanting. Cornish was arrested while transacting business on the exchange, was hurried to jail, was kept there some days in solitary confinement, and was brought altogether unprepared to the bar of the Old Bailey. The case against him rested wholly on the evidence of Rumsey and Goodenough. Both were, by their own confession, accomplices in the plot with which they charged the prisoner. Both were impelled by the strongest pressure of hope and fear to criminate him. Evidence was produced which proved that Goodenough was also under the influence of personal enmity. Rumsey's story was inconsistent with the story which he had told when he appeared as a witness against Lord Russell. But these things were urged in vain. On the bench sat three judges who had been with Jeffreys in the west; and it was remarked by those who watched their deportment that they had come back from the carnage of Taunton in a fierce and excited state. It is indeed but too true that the taste for blood is a taste which even men not naturally cruel may, by habit, speedily acquire. The bar and the bench united to browbeat the unfortunate whig. The jury, named by a courtly sheriff, readily found a verdict of guilty; and, in spite of the indignant murmurs of the public, Cornish suffered death within ten days after he had been arrested. That no circumstance of degradation might be wanting, the gibbet was set up where King street meets Cheapside, in sight of the house where he had long lived in general respect, of the exchange where his credit had always stood high, and of the Guildhall where he had distinguished himself as a popular leader.

Black as this case was, it was not the blackest which disgraced the sessions of that autumn at the Old Bailey. Among the persons concerned in the Rye House Plot was a man named James Burton. By his own confession he had been present when the design of assassination was discussed by his accomplices. When the conspiracy was detected, a reward was offered for his apprehension. He was saved from death by an ancient matron of the Baptist persuasion, named Elizabeth Gaunt. This woman, with the peculiar manners and phraseology which then distinguished her sect, had a large charity. Her life was passed in relieving the unhappy of all religious denominations, and she was well known as a constant visitor of the gaols. Her political and theological opinions, as well as her compassionate disposition, led her to do everything in her power for Burton. She procured a boat which took him to Gravesend, where he got on board of a ship bound for Amsterdam. At the moment of parting she put into his hand a sum of money which, for her means,

was very large. Burton, after living some time in exile, returned to England with Monmouth, fought at Sedgemoor, fled to London, and took refuge in the house of John Fernley, a barber in Whitechapel. Fernley was very poor. He was besieged by creditors. He knew that a reward of £100 had been offered by the government for the apprehension of Burton. But the honest man was incapable of betraying one who, in extreme peril, had come under the shadow of his roof. Unhappily it was soon noised abroad that the anger of James was more strongly excited against those who harboured rebels than against the rebels themselves. James had publicly declared that of all forms of treason the hiding of traitors from his vengeance was the most unpardonable. Burton knew this. He delivered himself up to the government; and he gave information against Fernley and Elizabeth Gaunt. They were brought to trial. The villain whose life they had preserved had the heart and the forehead to appear as the principal witness against them. They were convicted. Fernley was sentenced to the gallows, Elizabeth Gaunt to the stake. Even after all the horrors of that year, many thought it impossible that these judgments should be carried into execution. But the king was without pity. Fernley was hanged. Elizabeth Gaunt was burned alive at Tyburn on the same day on which Cornish suffered death in Cheapside. She left a paper written, indeed, in no graceful style, yet such as was read by many thousands with compassion and horror. "My fault," she said, "was one which a prince might well have forgiven. I did but relieve a poor family, and lo! I must die for it." To the last she preserved a tranquil courage, which reminded the spectators of the most heroic deaths of which they had read in Foxe. When she calmly disposed the straw about her in such a manner as to shorten her sufferings, all the bystanders burst into tears. It was much noticed that, while the foulest judicial murder which had disgraced even those times was perpetrating, a tempest burst forth, such as had not been known since that great hurricane which had raged round the death bed of Oliver. The oppressed Puritans reckoned up, not without a gloomy satisfaction, the houses which had been blown down, and the ships which had been cast away, and derived some consolation from thinking that heaven was bearing awful testimony against the iniquity which afflicted the earth. Since that terrible day no woman has suffered death in England for any political offence.

CRUEL PERSECUTION OF THE PROTESTANT DISSENTERS

Never, not even under the tyranny of Laud, had the condition of the Puritans been so deplorable as at that time. Never had spies been so actively employed in detecting congregations. Never had magistrates, grand jurors, rectors, and churchwardens been so much on the alert. Many dissenters were cited before the ecclesiastical courts. Others found it necessary to purchase the connivance of the agents of the government by presents of hogsheads of wine, and of gloves stuffed with guineas. It was impossible for the separatists to pray together without precautions such as are employed by coiners and receivers of stolen goods. The places of meeting were frequently changed. Worship was performed sometimes just before break of day and sometimes at dead of night. Round the building where the little flock was gathered together sentinels were posted to give the alarm if a stranger drew near. The minister in disguise was introduced through the garden and the back yard. In some houses there were trap doors through which, in case of danger, he might descend. Where non-conformists lived next door to each other, the walls were often broken open, and secret passages were made from dwelling

to dwelling. No psalm was sung; and many contrivances were used to prevent the voice of the preacher, in his moments of fervour, from being heard beyond the walls. Yet, with all this care, it was often found impossible to elude the vigilance of informers. In the suburbs of London, especially, the law was enforced with the utmost rigour. Several opulent gentlemen were accused of holding conventicles. Their houses were strictly searched, and distresses were levied to the amount of many thousands of pounds.

Through many years the autumn of 1685 was remembered by the nonconformists as a time of misery and terror. Yet in that autumn might be discerned the first faint indications of a great turn of fortune; and before eighteen months had elapsed, the intolerant king and the intolerant church were eagerly bidding against each other for the support of the party which both had so deeply injured.[b]

THE KING AT ODDS WITH PARLIAMENT (1685 A.D.)

The suppression of the rebellion had elated James, and led him to think that nothing now could oppose his will. He had three objects in view as the means of establishing despotism; these were, the abolition of the Test, which would enable him to fill all offices with papists; the repeal of the Habeas Corpus Act, which the late king and himself had often declared to be subversive of government, *i.e.* of despotism; to keep up the army, which now amounted to nearly twenty thousand men, and in which there were several Catholic officers, as a permanent force. As he knew that Halifax was opposed to all these projects, he lost no time in dismissing him from the council.

When the parliament met (November 9th, 1685) James addressed them from the throne. Late events, he said, had shown that the militia was inadequate to the defence of the country, and that a permanent force was necessary; he had, therefore, increased the regular army, and he now called on them for the funds for maintaining it. He then noticed the employment of Catholics. "And I will deal plainly with you," said he: "after having had the benefit of their services in such a time of need and danger, I will not expose them to disgrace, nor myself to the want of them, if there should be another rebellion."

From this haughty tone, it is plain that James reckoned on absolute submission, and that the parliament would simply register his edicts; but here, as on most occasions, his blind fatuity led him astray. The dread and the hatred of popery were implanted in every Protestant bosom; and, in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis, at this very time, they had had a specimen of good faith and tolerance. The commons, therefore, when voting a supply of 700,000*l.*, coupled with it a bill for the improvement of the militia; and while offering to pass a bill of indemnity for the Catholic officers, prayed that they might be discharged. The danger of a standing army and the employment of Catholic officers was also strongly exposed in the house of peers by lords Halifax, Nottingham, Anglesea, Mordaunt, Compton, bishop of London, and others and, in spite of the opposition of Jeffreys, it was resolved to take the king's speech into consideration.[c]

James now saw that to proceed cordially with either house of parliament it would be necessary he should retreat from the position which he had taken in regard both to the army and the Test Act. But mistaking obstinacy of purpose for vigour of understanding, he resisted every thought tending to such a surrender. He prorogued the parliament, and resolved that it should not meet again except under some better auspices. The king, as his manner

[1685 A.D.]

was, had been present in the house of lords during the debate on the nineteenth, and had expressed himself much displeased with the speeches then made. On the following morning, he suddenly presented himself, in his usual state, and declared, by the chancellor, to both houses, that, for certain weighty reasons, he had determined to prorogue the parliament to the 10th of February. By this act, the incomplete money bill, which, in the time specified, would have yielded £700,000, was lost to the exchequer; nor could James conceal from himself that it was a proceeding which would increase the suspicion and irritation of the discontented everywhere; but looking at the general posture of affairs, it was the course attended, in his judgment, with the least degree of evil. It was hardly possible he should hope ever to convene another house of commons so subservient; and it was difficult accordingly to imagine by what means, short of a complete abeyance of the constitution, he could expect to carry on the government of the country.

France and the allies were equally watchful of these proceedings, and equally prepared to purchase the assistance of the crown, the court, or the opposition, as circumstances might suggest. At present the scale turned in favour of France. James assured his parliament in July that he had "a true English heart"; but only six weeks before, he had written to Louis, entreating a secret subsidy, and declaring, with the same emphasis, that his heart was French. Having come to this rupture with his parliament, his views were naturally directed to Versailles.[l]

Parliament met no more during his reign, except to be prorogued anew. It was fortunate for the country that James's bigotry led him to assail the Test Act first, for in all probability this subservient assembly would have surrendered the Habeas Corpus Act without a struggle.

James was resolved, come what might, not to part with his army. The annual cost of it was £600,000; and, by frugality, by neglecting the navy, by putting off the payment of his brother's debts, and by other expedients, he could defray it without the aid of parliament. To put the chief commands into the hands of Catholics was necessary for his ulterior projects, and to effect this he had recourse to the following plan.

JAMES TAMPERS WITH THE BENCH AND USURPS THE DISPENSING POWER

It had from very ancient times been a part of the prerogative to grant dispensations from the penalties of particular laws. This had, as usual, been spoken of in exaggerated terms by courtiers and lawyers, even Coke saying that no act of parliament can restrain it. Practice, however, had for many years confined it to merely trifling cases; but Sir Edward Herbert, the present chief-justice, had formerly suggested to the king, when duke of York, that by means of it the Test Act might be eluded, and James now resolved to bring it into action through a legal decision. Of Herbert himself he was sure, and, as he could dismiss the judges at his pleasure, he reckoned on the obedience of the others, but, on privately asking their opinions he found four refractory: these he dismissed forthwith, and appointed others; and the bench being now adjusted, a sham action was brought for their decision. Sir Edward Hales, a recent convert, was appointed to the command of a regiment, and his coachman was directed to bring an action for the penalty of £500 incurred by his holding a command without having qualified. Hales pleaded a dispensation under the great seal. The case was tried before the twelve judges, and eleven decided, June 21, 1686, in favour of the dispensation.[c]

The language in which the judges expressed their decision was of the most

absolute description, and went to show that the whole fabric of English liberty was a matter of royal sufferance. "The kings of England," they said, "are sovereign princes; the laws of England are the king's laws; therefore it is an inseparable prerogative in the king of England to dispense with penal laws in particular cases, and for particular necessary reasons, of which reasons and necessities he is the sole judge; and this is not a trust vested in the king, but the ancient remains of the sovereign power of the kings of England, which never yet was taken from them, nor can be." This decision, and the manner in which it was obtained, filled all good men with a mixture of sorrow and indignation, and to the government which it was designed to uphold it became a new occasion of weakness.[l]

This decision was not, properly speaking, illegal, but it was highly unconstitutional; and, as it declared that no restraint could be placed on the monarch, and that acts of parliament were mere cobwebs, there being a power paramount to them, men plainly saw that there was no alternative between a tame submission to the overthrow of their religion and liberties and a bold effort to maintain them. In effect, this decision sealed the doom of the house of Stuart.

THE KING INTERFERES WITH THE CHURCH

James little thought so; he had gained, he considered, a complete victory; the Test Act and all other barriers against popery could no longer impede him, and the army, the council, and every department of the state might now be filled with Catholics. He had even, as he conceived, the power of gradually making the church itself Catholic. Early in this year, Obadiah Walker, master of University College, Oxford, and three of the fellows, had declared themselves Catholics, as also had Sclater, the curate of Esher and Putney, and a royal dispensation allowed them still to enjoy the emoluments of their situations; Sclater, however, being enjoined to provide for the performance of divine service in his churches. Walker was allowed to have a Catholic chapel in his college, and a press for printing Catholic books of theology. But the spirit of Compton, bishop of London, gave occasion to a further mode of bridling the church, or rather of accelerating the downfall of the monarch.

Compton, brother to the earl of Northampton, had been a soldier. He was a man of a bold spirit, and a zealous Protestant. To punish his late opposition in parliament, the king struck him out of the list of the privy council, and deprived him of his office of dean of the chapel. This only increased his popularity and the suspicion of the king's designs, and the London pulpits thundered with controversy. The king, as head of the church, issued orders for the clergy to abstain from controversy in the pulpit. Few obeyed; it was therefore resolved to make an example. Doctor Sharp, dean of Norwich and rector of St. Giles, was fixed on, and Compton was ordered to suspend him, but he replied that he must hear him first in his defence. It was now determined to make the bishop himself the victim.

The odious court of high commission had been abolished in 1641. A part of the act of abolition was repealed at the Restoration, but a clause of it, prohibiting the erection of any similar court, had been retained. James, however, issued a commission, in nearly the very words of that of Elizabeth, to certain persons to act as a court of commissioners in ecclesiastical causes. These were the primate, chancellor, bishops of Durham and Rochester, the earls of Rochester and Sunderland, and Chief Justice Herbert. Three were to form a *quorum*, of whom Jeffreys was always to be one. "God," said James

to Barillon, "has permitted that all the laws made to establish Protestantism now serve as a foundation for my measures to re-establish true religion."

Before this court Compton was summoned. He defended himself with much address. The primate Sancroft was not there to uphold the interests of the church, for he had timidly obtained leave to be absent on the plea of age and infirmity; but the earl and the bishop of Rochester and the chief justice took the side of Compton, and even Jeffreys, who, in the midst of his excesses, clung to the Protestant faith, supported them. The presence, however, and the influence of the king prevailed, and Compton was suspended by a commission, three-fourths of whose members had declared in his favour. The people soon nick-named the commission the *Congregatio de propaganda fide.*

Of the royal advisers there were two classes, the Protestant and the Catholic. The former, headed by the earl of Rochester, seem to have been willing to aid the king in all his projects against liberty, but they were steadfast in their adherence to the church. The Catholics were divided into two parties: most of the laymen, such as Bellasis and Powis, were for moderation; they saw the difficulties in the way of establishing their faith, and they would have been content with the repeal of the penal statutes, and security for their religion under a Protestant successor. The queen herself was inclined to this party; but the king was under the influence of Father Petre and the Jesuits; and these, with the usual heat and imprudence of political churchmen, urged him on to extreme measures. Sunderland, an ambitious, unprincipled statesman, though still professing himself a Protestant, allied himself closely with this party, in the hope of supplanting Rochester; and the influence of Father Petre, when all other applications had failed, raised him to the post of president of the council, in the room of Halifax, with which he still retained his post of secretary.

But the Protestant party had a supporter who they thought might counterbalance the queen and the priests. James, with all his zeal for his religion, and his anxiety to diffuse it, made no scruple of violating one of its most important precepts. His amours had always been notorious, and neither of his wives could boast of his fidelity. Arabella Churchill, maid of honour to his first duchess, had borne him two children. She was a sister to Lord Churchill, afterwards duke of Marlborough. One of her children by James was the celebrated duke of Berwick. She afterwards married Colonel Godfrey. His present mistress, Catherine, daughter of the witty, profligate Sir Charles Sedley, was a woman so devoid of personal attractions that King Charles used to say his brother kept her by way of penance; but she had a coarse, roystering kind of humour, which pleased her lover, who was a man of no delicacy whatever, though she did not spare to employ it even on his religion and his priests. In the beginning of his reign he had been induced to break off his intercourse with her, but he afterwards renewed it, and, at the suggestion, it is said, of Rochester, created her countess of Dorchester.

The queen, who was a woman of spirit, testified the utmost indignation, and, by Sunderland's advice, she assembled one day in her apartments the chancellor and himself, with the priests and the Catholic nobles; and when the king entered it, he was assailed by their united reproaches and remonstrances. He promised to separate from the countess, and he sent her orders to retire to the Continent; but she asserted her rights as a free-born English woman, and appealed to Magna Charta. She at length consented to go to Ireland, where Rochester's brother, Clarendon, was lord-lieutenant. She returned, however, within six months, and the king renewed his intercourse

with her: but it was of no political effect, as the Jesuits "had got the advowson of his conscience."

ADVANCES TOWARD CATHOLICISM

It might be supposed that the court of Rome would have co-operated zealously with James in his project of re-establishing the Catholic faith; but so adverse were all things to this prince that even there he found no support. The reigning pontiff, Innocent XI, who had been a soldier, was a man who knew or cared nothing about the disputes and differences of theologians, but he was an able temporal prince and statesman; he was on ill-terms with Louis XIV, on account of that monarch's insolence; and he regarded with little complacency both the Jesuits and the king of England, whom he looked on as partisans of Louis. James, on his accession, had sent Mr. Caryl as his private minister to Rome to solicit the purple for the queen's uncle, the title of bishop for one Doctor Leyburn, and the appointment of a nuncio to the court of St. James. Caryl succeeded in the two last points; and the count d'Adda came over in November, 1685, but did not assume any public character. The zeal of the king, however, was not to be restrained, and the following February he insisted on d'Adda's taking the title of nuncio, to which the papal court gave a reluctant consent. The nuncio, a prudent, clear-sighted man, viewed with concern the rate at which the king and his advisers were disposed to drive matters, and he gave the weight of his authority to the moderate Catholic party.

James, being resolved to have a resident minister at the papal court, chose for this purpose, with his usual infelicity, the earl of Castlemain, the husband of the duchess of Cleveland, a man who owed his title to the infamy of his wife. Castlemain behaved at Rome with such indiscretion [and familiarity toward the pope] that the nuncio was directed to make a formal complaint of his conduct. All the influence of James failed to procure a nominal bishopric for Petre, whom he is thought to have designed to place in the see of York, which he kept vacant. He was equally unsuccessful in his efforts to procure for him a cardinal's hat.

If the pontiff was more swayed by politics than religion, we may easily believe the same to have been the case with the courts of Madrid and Vienna; and accordingly we find the Spanish and imperial ministers co-operating with the Dutch and opposing the French ambassador. James, who, to his misfortune, had some vague ideas of the dignity belonging to a king of England, and of the line of policy which, as such, he should adopt, irritated Louis by vain assumptions of independence, at the very time that he was receiving his money and relying on him for aid in his projects.

To accustom the public eye to the view of papacy, convents were established in various parts of London: that of the Carmelites was in the city, that of the Franciscans in Lincoln's Inn Fields, while the Benedictines were at St. James' and the Jesuits opened a school at the Savoy. They all went about publicly in their habits, and London was gradually assuming the appearance of a Catholic city. To awe the tumultuous, the army, of fifteen thousand men, was encamped on Hounslow heath; and in the tent of Lord Dumbarton, the second in command, mass was openly celebrated, and missionaries laboured to convert the soldiers. A paper calling on them to adhere to their religion being circulated through the camp, Johnson, its author, the chaplain of the late Lord Russell, was tried, found guilty, and sentenced to stand thrice in the pillory and to be whipped from Newgate to Tyburn,

A.D.]

which sentence was executed with the utmost rigour and cruelty, he being previously degraded from his sacred character.

In the laxity of principle which may be supposed to have prevailed in a court for five-and-twenty years the abode of profligacy and corruption, conversions, real or pretended, might be expected to be abundant; yet the failures of the king were numerous and mortifying. Lady Dorchester, as we have seen, stuck to her religion, reconciling it, like her royal paramour, with the breach of its duties. A priest came to convert Secretary Middleton: "Your lordship believes the Trinity?" began he. "Who told you so? You are come here to prove your own opinions, not to ask about mine," was the reply, and the priest retired in confusion. Sheffield, earl of Mulgrave, is said to have replied to a monk, "I have convinced myself, by much reflection, that God made man, but I cannot believe that man can make God."

Colonel Kirke is reported to have told the king that he was pre-engaged, having promised the emperor of Morocco to become a Mohammedan, if ever he changed. But the great object was to gain the princess Anne, and for this purpose the lure of the succession was held out to her; but, though of weak disposition, she was firm. The bishop of London had been her tutor; Lord and Lady Churchill,[1] who ruled her, were zealous for Protestantism; and all the efforts made on her proved abortive. Lord Dartmouth, though sincerely attached to James, refused to abandon his religion. When Admiral Herbert, a man of loose life and laden with the royal favours, refused him, James said to Barillon that he never could put confidence in any man, however attached to him, who affected the character of a zealous Protestant.

The year 1686 closed with an act which convinced the people that the overthrow of their religion was the object really proposed by the king. This was the dismissal of Rochester from his office of treasurer, effected by the secret influence of Petre and Sunderland. The king was really attached to his brother-in-law, but he now told him that he must either go to mass or go out of office. Rochester's friends and the Spanish and Dutch ambassadors were desirous that he should keep office at any rate. A conference, it was agreed, should be held in his presence on the points in dispute between the two churches. At the end of it he desired a further delay to consider, but, as his object evidently was to gain time, the king consented to dismiss him. The treasury was then managed by a board, of which Lord Bellasis [or Bellasys], a Catholic, was the head; and he, Powis, and Dover were now members of the privy council. The king was also about to appoint Father Petre to a seat in it, and he was only withheld from doing it by the entreaties of the queen.

A dismissal of Protestants from office and a resignation of commissions in the army soon followed. The king, previous to the meeting of parliament, wishing to ascertain the opinions of the members who held offices, summoned them separately to his closet in order to confer with them. The result of these "closetings," as they were named, proving unsatisfactory, they were either dismissed from their offices or they resigned. Their places were generally supplied with Catholics.

[1] John eldest son of Sir Winston Churchill of Devon; at twelve years of age he was made one of the royal pages, but showing a preference for a military life, he got an ensigncy. He served in the auxiliary force under Monmouth in 1672, when he attracted the notice of the great Turenne. He attached himself to the duke of York, through whose influence he obtained a regiment and a Scottish barony; and when that prince came to the throne, he created him an English baron. Churchill married in 1681 the beautiful Sarah Jennings, maid of honour to the princess Anne. [Churchill, when urged to change his religion, said that he had never lived as a saint, but that he could die as a martyr.]

THE ATTACK ON THE UNIVERSITIES (1687 A.D.)

It being now evident that a sufficient number of the members of the established church could not be induced to betray it, the king was advised to endeavour to gain the non-conformists; not but that there were even on the Episcopal bench men who set little value on religion as compared with their interest: such were Crew of Durham, Cartwright, and Parker, to whom the king had lately given the sees of Chester and Oxford, knowing them to be men for his purpose, to whom may perhaps be added Sprate of Rochester, and one or two more. A Declaration of Indulgence was issued accordingly, suspending the penal laws and forbidding the imposition of tests. Of this the dissenters took advantage, though dubious of the motives whence it proceeded; and many addresses of thanks were presented from them at court. The king in his self-delusion congratulated himself on the success of this measure in weakening the church party, and he now thought he might venture to attack them in their strongholds, the universities. [The power of these institutions had always been great, but it reached its height in this century.]

As Oxford had so strongly asserted the doctrine of passive obedience, James commenced his attack on the church in that university. He appointed Massey, a fellow of Merton and a recent convert, to the deanery of Christ Church, and, true to its principles, the university made no opposition. The king next made trial of Cambridge University. He wrote (February 7th, 1687) to the vice-chancellor, Doctor Peachell, commanding him to admit to the degree of master of arts, without the usual oaths, a Benedictine monk, named Alban Francis, who was acting as a missionary in that neighbourhood. Peachell refused, and he was summarily summoned before the ecclesiastical commission; the university supported him, and it ended in the compromise of the appointment of a new vice-chancellor and the withdrawal of the claim of Francis.

Shamed or emboldened by the example of Cambridge, Oxford soon began to shake off its slavish trammels. On the death of the president of Magdalen College, letters mandatory were sent (April 4th); recommending Mr. Anthony Farmer, a man of low, dissolute habits, but a recent proselyte. The fellows petitioned the king, but to no purpose; they then proceeded to the election, and chose Mr. Hough. They were summoned before the ecclesiastical commission, and the election was pronounced void. But Farmer was withdrawn, his character being too notorious, and they were directed to choose Parker bishop of Oxford. They still refused, and when the king came to Oxford the following month on his progress, he chid them severely and insisted on their obedience. Still they would not yield. A commission was then issued, appointing extraordinary visitors of their college (October 21st), and Hough and twenty-five of the fellows were expelled and declared incapable of holding any clerical preferment (December 10th). The king thus gained a victory, but, as Lingard *f* justly observes, "he had no reason to be proud of it, for it betrayed the hollowness of his pretensions to good faith and sincerity, and earned him the enmity of the great body of the clergy, and of all who were devoted to the interests of the church."

In the summer the king had given another intimation of his designs, by publicly receiving D'Adda as the papal nuncio, a measure to which the pope had yielded an unwilling consent. He now advanced a step further, and by the royal command Father Petre took his seat among the privy councillors, to the grief and dismay of the moderate Catholics and the astonishment and vexation of the people.

THE KING AND THE PARLIAMENT (1687 A.D.)

The king had also dissolved the parliament (July 2nd). It was represented to him in vain that in all points but that of religion this was a more compliant assembly than he could ever again expect to obtain; religion was with him the point, and he resolved to make the trial. In order to get a more complete control over the corporations, he appointed a board of seven regulators, all Catholics except the chancellor, with powers to appoint and remove officers and freemen at their discretion. To obtain county members to his purpose the lords-lieutenant were directed to inquire of their deputies and the magistrates whether, if elected to parliament, they would vote for the repeal of the Test Act and the penal laws; whether they would support candidates who would promise to do so; and whether they would support the declaration. Loss of office was to be the penalty of non-compliance. This measure however did not succeed. Fourteen lords-lieutenant were removed, and their places supplied with Catholics; a like change was made among the sheriffs and in the magistracy; yet, after all, James saw that he could not have a parliament to his mind, and of the house of lords there was no hope. Sunderland, however, had conceived the then unknown project of "swamping," as it is termed, this house by a large creation. "O Silly!" cried he to Lord Churchill, when the opposition of the peers was spoken of, "why your troop of guards shall be called to the house of lords." This bold measure was not ventured on; the king seemed inclined, if he could not get a pliant house of commons, to continue to rule by prerogative.

The Scottish parliament had proved as uncomplying as the English on the subject of religion. The king had there in like manner issued a proclamation, granting toleration to sectaries and suspending all laws against Catholics, "by his sovereign authority, prerogative, royal and absolute power" — words which he did not as yet venture to employ in England.

THE KING AND IRELAND (1687 A.D.)

In Ireland the lord-lieutenancy had been given to Lord Clarendon, but the command of the forces was separated from it for the first time, and entrusted to Richard Talbot, now earl of Tyrconnel, an Irish Catholic of the English race, a man of some talent but hardly any judgment; rude and boisterous in manners, with no control over his passions and appetites; handsome and showy in his person: he was in effect a genuine Anglo-Irishman of that day. Being in the confidence of the king, he treated the viceroy with insolence and contempt, and though the object for which he was sent was to raise the Catholic interest, he could not refrain from insulting the native Irish by calling them the O's and Mac's. Having aided Sunderland in overthrowing the Hydes [Rochester and Clarendon] he bullied him out of the chief government of Ireland, though he was known to be the enemy of the Act of Settlement, and the devoted slave of Louis XIV. He was appointed lord deputy (February 1687).

The Protestants now began to emigrate in great numbers; the officers sold their commissions for little or nothing, and sought service with the prince of Orange. The object of the king was to make Ireland an asylum for the Catholics, and for himself if needful; but Tyrconnel had a deeper design, and he proposed to the French envoy, Bonrepaux, that in case of the succession of the prince of Orange, Ireland should become an independent state under the protection of France. To this project Louis gave a most willing consent, but it was studiously concealed from James, and even from Barillon. Yet suspi-

cion was afloat; and it was one of the objects of Dyckveldt, whom the prince of Orange sent over in the beginning of the year, to ascertain the king's designs with respect to Ireland.[c]

Tyrconnel went about his work in a wild way. He displaced the Protestant judges, and filled their seats with Catholics. He terrified the cities and towns into surrender of their charters, and gave them new charters which made parliamentary representation a mockery. He had a scheme for dispossessing the English settlers of the property which they had acquired in the forfeitures of half a century previous. His projects were opposed by grave Catholic peers, who said that the lord deputy was fool and madman enough to ruin ten kingdoms. His character and that of his master were ridiculed in the famous ballad of *Lillibullero:*

> Dare was an old prophecy found in a bog,
> Lilli burlero, bullen a-la;
> Ireland shall be ruled by an ass and a dog,
> Lilli burlero, bullen a-la.

James was the ass and Tyrconnel the dog. This ribaldry of Lord Wharton was adapted to a spirited air of Purcell, published ten years before. "The whole army," says Burnet,[k] "and at last the people both in city and country, were singing it perpetually." Wharton afterwards boasted that he had rhymed James out of his dominions. He had produced a song, like many other songs, of wondrous popularity with littl intrinsic merit. But those whose conviviality, even in our own days, has been stirred by its fascinating melody, may well believe that it was whistled and sung in every street in 1688.[g]

Concerning the fall of the Hydes, Rochester and Clarendon, Macaulay says: "The dismission of the two brothers is a great epoch in the reign of James. From that time it was clear that what he really wanted was not liberty of conscience for the members of his own church, but liberty to persecute the members of other churches. Pretending to abhor tests, he had himself imposed a test. He thought it hard, he thought it monstrous, that able and loyal men should be excluded from the public service solely for being Roman Catholics. Yet he had himself turned out of office a treasurer, whom he admitted to be both loyal and able, solely for being a Protestant. The cry was that a general proscription was at hand, and that every public functionary must make up his mind to lose his soul or to lose his place. Who indeed could hope to stand where the Hydes had fallen? They were the brothers-in-law of the king, the uncles and natural guardians of his children, his friends from early youth, his steady adherents in adversity and peril, his obsequious servants since he had been on the throne. Their sole crime was their religion; and for this crime they had been discarded. In great perturbation men began to look round for help; and soon all eyes were fixed on one whom a rare concurrence both of personal qualities and of fortuitous circumstances pointed out as the deliverer — William of Orange."[b]

THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM

James now fondly deemed that the overthrow of the Protestant church was nearly certain. The steadfastness of his daughters in their religion had been to him a source of anxiety, as they might undo all his work; but an event had occurred which promised to relieve him from all apprehension. The queen, who had ceased from child-bearing for five years, announced that she was pregnant. This event, which the king and his friends ascribed to the

efficacy of his prayers at St. Winifred's Well, which he had lately visited, or to the prayers on earth and intercession in heaven of the late duchess of Modena, was hailed by the whole Catholic party with transports of joy, and they even, as formerly in the case of Queen Mary, ventured to assign the sex of the embryo. The Protestants, on the other hand, openly expressed their doubts, and hesitated not to assert that those whose interest it was to have a prince of Wales would be at no loss to procure one.

We now enter on the year 1688, a year ever memorable in the annals of England, and even in those of the world. To the royal view the whole political horizon seemed calm and unclouded. The king had triumphed in his contest with the church; in his late progress he had been greeted and cheered by bodies of the dissenters, whom he took for the nation; he had the prospect of the birth of a son to exclude his heretical daughters, and to go on with the good work of spreading the true faith; London was even already, as he said, putting on the appearance of a Catholic city; monks and friars in their appropriate habits were to be seen parading the streets; a papal nuncio sanctified the court by his presence; and Corker, a Benedictine, who had been tried for his life during the Popish Plot, being appointed envoy by the elector of Cologne, the king insisted that he and his attendant monks should come to court in the habit of their order — a piece of folly which the more sagacious Louis XIV strongly condemned. Finally, James had filled Magdalen College with Catholic fellows; and on the death of Bishop Parker (March 23rd), Doctor Giffard, one of the four Catholic prelates whom he had induced the pontiff to consecrate for England, was by the royal mandate chosen to succeed him.

But all this triumph and all this security was fallacious; the tempest was secretly brewing which was to level the fabric in the dust. The tories, who had long been restrained by their notions of unlimited obedience, now alarmed for their religion by the queen's pregnancy, began to unite with the whigs; several influential noblemen were in secret correspondence with the prince of Orange, and an armed resistance to the crown with his aid was contemplated. In this state of the national feeling, the king made his final and fatal step.[c]

MACAULAY ON THE DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE (1687 A.D.)

It was now evident that all hope of an alliance between the churches of England and of Rome, for the purpose of sharing offices and emoluments and of crushing the Puritan sects, must be abandoned. Nothing remained but to try a coalition between the church of Rome and the Puritan sects against the Church of England. On the 18th of March, 1687, the king had informed the privy council that he had determined to prorogue the parliament till the end of November, and to grant, by his own authority, entire liberty of conscience to all his subjects. On the 4th of April had appeared the memorable Declaration of Indulgence.

In this declaration the king avowed that it was his earnest wish to see his people members of that church to which he himself belonged. But, since that could not be, he announced his intention to protect them in the free exercise of their religion. He repeated all those phrases which, eight years before, when he was himself an oppressed man, had been familiar to his lips, but which he had ceased to use from the day on which a turn of fortune had put it into his power to be an oppressor. He had long been convinced, he said, that conscience was not to be forced, that persecution was unfavourable to

population and to trade, and that it never attained the ends which persecutors had in view. He repeated his promise, already often repeated and often violated, that he would protect the established church in the enjoyment of her legal rights. He then proceeded to annul, by his own sole authority, a long series of statutes. He suspended all penal laws against all classes of non-conformists. He authorised both Roman Catholics and Protestant dissenters to perform their worship publicly. He forbade his subjects, on pain of his highest displeasure, to molest any religious assembly. He also abrogated all those acts which imposed any religious test as a qualification for any civil or military office.

That the Declaration of Indulgence was unconstitutional is a point on which both the great English parties have always been entirely agreed. Every person capable of reasoning on a political question must perceive that a monarch who is competent to issue such a declaration is nothing less than an absolute monarch. Fifteen years before that time, a declaration of indulgence had been put forth by his brother with the advice of the Cabal. That declaration, when compared with the declaration of James, might be called modest and cautious. Yet the declaration of Charles had been pronounced illegal in the most formal manner. The commons had resolved that the king had no power to dispense with statutes in matters ecclesiastical. Charles had ordered the obnoxious instrument to be cancelled in his presence, had torn off the seal with his own hand, and had, both by message under his sign manual, and with his own lips from his throne in full parliament, distinctly promised the two houses that the step which had given so much offence should never be drawn into precedent. The two houses had then, without one dissentient voice, joined in thanking him for this compliance with their wishes. No constitutional question had ever been decided more deliberately, more clearly, or with more harmonious consent. That the sovereign could by one sweeping edict authorise all his subjects to disobey whole volumes of laws, no tribunal had ventured, in the face of the solemn parliamentary decision of 1673, to affirm.

Such, however, was the position of parties that James' Declaration of Indulgence, though the most audacious of all the attacks made by the Stuarts on public freedom, was well calculated to please that very portion of the community by which all the other attacks of the Stuarts on public freedom had been most strenuously resisted. It could scarcely be hoped that the Protestant non-conformist, separated from his countrymen by a harsh code harshly enforced, would be inclined to dispute the validity of a decree which relieved him from intolerable grievances. A cool and philosophical observer would undoubtedly have pronounced that all the evil arising from all the intolerant laws which parliaments had framed was not to be compared to the evil which would be produced by a transfer of the legislative power from the parliament to the sovereign. But such coolness and philosophy are not to be expected from men who are smarting under present pain, and who are tempted by the offer of immediate ease.

A Puritan divine could not indeed deny that the dispensing power now claimed by the crown was inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the constitution. But he might perhaps be excused if he asked. What was the constitution to him? The Act of Uniformity had ejected him, in spite of royal promises, from a benefice which was his freehold, and had reduced him to beggary and dependence. The Five Mile Act had banished him from his dwelling, from his relations, from his friends, from almost all places of public resort. Under the Conventicle Act his goods had been distrained; and he

had been flung into one noisome gaol after another among highwaymen and housebreakers. Out of prison he had constantly had the officers of justice on his track; he had been forced to pay hush money to informers; he had stolen, in ignominious disguises, through windows and trapdoors, to meet his flock, and had, while pouring the baptismal water, or distributing the eucharistic bread, been anxiously listening for the signal that the tipstaves were approaching. Was it not mockery to call on a man thus plundered and oppressed to suffer martyrdom for the property and liberty of his plunderers and oppressors? The declaration, despotic as it might seem to his prosperous neighbours, brought deliverance to him. He was called upon to make his choice, not between freedom and slavery, but between two yokes; and he might not unnaturally think the yoke of the king lighter than that of the church.

While thoughts like these were working in the minds of many dissenters, the Anglican party was in amazement and terror. This new turn in affairs was indeed alarming. The house of Stuart leagued with republican and regicide sects against the old cavaliers of England; popery leagued with Puritanism against an ecclesiastical system with which the Puritans had no quarrel, except that it had retained too much that was popish; these were portents which confounded all the calculations of statesmen. The church was then to be attacked at once on every side; and the attack was to be under the direction of him who, by her constitution, was her head. She might well be struck with surprise and dismay. And mingled with surprise and dismay came other bitter feelings; resentment against the perjured prince whom she had served too well, and remorse for the cruelties in which he had been her accomplice, and for which he was now, as it seemed, about to be her punisher.

Her chastisement was just. She reaped that which she had sown. After the Restoration, when her power was at the height, she had breathed nothing but vengeance. She had encouraged, urged, almost compelled the Stuarts to requite with perfidious ingratitude the recent services of the Presbyterians. Had she, in that season of her prosperity, pleaded, as became her, for her enemies, she might now, in her distress, have found them her friends. Perhaps it was not yet too late. Perhaps she might still be able to turn the tactics of her faithless oppressor against himself. There was among the Anglican clergy a moderate party which had always felt kindly towards the Protestant dissenters. That party was not large; but the abilities, acquirements, and virtues of those who belonged to it made it respectable. It had been regarded with little favour by the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries, and had been mercilessly reviled by bigots of the school of Laud: but, from the day on which the Declaration of Indulgence appeared to the day on which the power of James ceased to inspire terror, the whole church seemed to be animated by the spirit, and guided by the counsels, of the calumniated Latitudinarians.

Then followed an auction, the strangest that history has recorded. On one side the king, on the other the church, began to bid eagerly against each other for the favour of those whom up to that time king and church had combined to oppress. The Protestant dissenters, who, a few months before, had been a despised and proscribed class, now held the balance of power. The harshness with which they had been treated was universally condemned. The court tried to throw all the blame on the hierarchy. The hierarchy flung it back on the court. The king declared that he had unwillingly persecuted the separatists only because his affairs had been in such a state that he could not venture to disoblige the established clergy. The established clergy protested that they had borne a part in severity uncongenial to their feelings only

from deference to the authority of the king. The king got together a collection of stories about rectors and vicars who had by threats of prosecution wrung money out of Protestant dissenters. He talked on this subject much and publicly, threatened to institute an inquiry which would exhibit the parsons in their true character to the whole world, and actually issued several commissions empowering agents on whom he thought that he could depend to ascertain the amount of the sums extorted in different parts of the country by professors of the dominant religion from sectaries. The advocates of the church, on the other hand, cited instances of honest parish priests who had been reprimanded and menaced by the court for recommending toleration in the pulpit, and for refusing to spy out and hunt down little congregations of non-conformists. The king asserted that some of the churchmen whom he had closeted had offered to make large concessions to the Catholics, on condition that the persecution of the Puritans might go on. The accused churchmen vehemently denied the truth of this charge.[b]

THE CLERGY RESIST THE DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE (1688 A.D.)

In the popular conception, the Catholic religion and intolerance were identical; and the conduct of James, while commissioner of Scotland, had done more than any other occurrence in recent history to confirm that impression. It is now also well known that the king of England, while discoursing to his subjects in this manner concerning the justice and expediency of allowing men a full liberty of conscience in matters of religion, was secretly applauding the king of France in prosecuting his barbarous measures against the Protestants of that kingdom.

On the 27th of April, 1688, James re-published the Declaration of Indulgence which he had issued the year before, adding to it the assurance that a parliament should be assembled "at farthest" in the following November. Some days afterwards, an order in council required the clergy, both in the metropolis and through the kingdom, to read the Declaration from the pulpit at the usual time of service. This measure, so important in its consequences, appears to have been precipitated by the influence of Father Petre, and by the less considerate party with whom he acted. James had assigned as a reason of again issuing the Declaration, that his purpose as expressed in it had been greatly confirmed by the many addresses which had been presented to him, showing that its purport was generally approved by his subjects. The clergy, moreover, had not only indulged since the king's accession in the strongest expressions of unlimited obedience to the civil power, but in conformity with the usage of the times of Charles I, had read to their congregations the lengthened paper made public by the late king after dismissing the Oxford Parliament, and other documents of the same partial and inflammatory character still more recently. It is highly probable, accordingly, that this order was issued without the slightest expectation that any material opposition would be made to it, though when its consequences began to assume so formidable a shape, Sunderland and others were concerned to have it understood that they had not been parties to it. The Rubric, however, which declared that nothing should be published in the church, except as prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, "or enjoined by the king," might have been pleaded by the privy council as a plausible, if not a sufficient authority for what they had done.

The order was published in the *Gazette*, and devolved upon the bishops the responsibility of sending the Declaration to the clergy of their respective

dioceses to be read in their churches. This novel method of proceeding was regarded as a studied exposure of the subjection of the prelates, not only to the pleasure of the king, but to the secret influence of those members of the Catholic priesthood who were always about his person. Sixteen days only were allowed to intervene between the publication of the Declaration and the obedience demanded; and after fourteen days of that interval had been variously occupied in partial or general conferences among the bishops and the clergy of London, six of the prelates obtained audience of the king, and presented to him a paper headed "The petition of the archbishop of Canterbury, with divers suffragan bishops of his province, in behalf of themselves and several of their absent brethren, and of the clergy of their respective dioceses." James received their lordships with much apparent cordialty, supposing the extent of their petition to be, that he would command the chancellors and archdeacons, according to ancient practice, to send the Declaration to the clergy, and not require that service from themselves. The king then opened the petition, and observed that he recognised in it the handwriting of Archbishop Sancroft. In it the bishops stated that their averseness to read the king's Declaration arose neither from want of the duty and obedience which the Church of England had always practised, nor from want of tenderness to dissenters, to whom they were willing to come to such a temper as might be thought fit in parliament and convocation, but because it is founded in a dispensing power declared illegal in parliament; and that they could not in prudence or conscience make themselves so far parties to it as the publication of it in the church at the time of divine service must amount to in common and reasonable construction. The petitioners concluded accordingly with "humbly and earnestly beseeching his majesty not to insist on their distributing and reading the said Declaration."

As the king read these sentences his countenance changed: having folded up the paper, he glanced angrily at the prelates and said, "This is a great surprise to me. These are strange words. I did not expect this from you; this is a standard of rebellion." The bishops deprecated his majesty's displeasure in the most earnest terms, assuring him that in all matters not affecting their conscience toward God, their loyalty would be found unimpeachable.

But this exception was of large import; it had been the great plea of the Puritans and non-conformists in their contentions with the ruling clergy and the civil power, and though little respected, for the most part, when so employed, was as valid in that connection as in the present. James had given sufficient attention to the bearing of such exceptions to perceive at once that the ground taken by the prelates was the most hostile to his plans that they could possibly have chosen, and he concluded his angry and incoherent expressions by saying, "If I think fit to alter my mind I will send to you. God has given me this dispensing power, and I will maintain it. I tell you there are seven thousand men, and of the Church of England too, that have not bowed the knee to Baal."

The Clergy in General Refuse to Read the Declaration

The Episcopal body at this time consisted of twenty-two persons, three-fourths of whom approved in whole or in part of the petition presented to the king. The chief persons in the minority were Sprat, Cartwright, Crew, and Watson. Sprat had written a history of the Rye House Plot, and owed his distinction to the readiness with which he had prostituted his talents to

the service of the court; Cartwright and Crew were men governed by servility and selfishness; and Watson disgraced his office by so many vices that he was at length deprived of his see. The bishops presented themselves to the king with their petition on May 18th, late in the evening; that night the petition was printed, and the next morning it was in considerable circulation. The prelates were no parties to this proceeding, nor do we know to whom it should be attributed. But this was on the Saturday morning, and on the following day, according to the order in council, the Declaration should be read in all the churches of London.

Among the London clergy the names of three only are preserved as those of persons who were obedient to the command of the king in this particular; no account exhibits more than seven, out of nearly a hundred, as being thus compliant. On that day Sprat chose to officiate as dean in Westminister abbey, but when the moment came for reading the Declaration, his trepidation was such that he could scarcely hold the document in his hands; the people rose from their seats with loud murmuring, so that nothing could be heard, and before the reading was concluded, the only persons remaining in the church were the Westminister scholars, the choristers, and some of the prebendaries. Over the kingdom the same spirit prevailed, so much so that among ten thousand clergymen, not more it appears than two hundred could be induced to read the obnoxious proclamation. D'Adda, the papal nuncio, declared accordingly: "The whole church espouses the cause of the bishops. There is no reasonable expectation of a division among the Anglicans, and our hopes from the non-conformists are vanished." Baxter[1] applauded the conduct of the bishops from the pulpit, and the dissenters in general followed his example.

The difficulties with which the king had thus surrounded himself were in every view almost equally perilous. To proceed was to augment the spirit of resistance everywhere manifested, and to a degree that might be fatal to his sovereignty; while to retreat, would be to make a confession of weakness, and to invite aggression, the limits of which no mind could foresee. The method of proceeding agreed upon, after much discussion and wavering, was meant to be a middle course, but was in fact open to as much objection as were the extremes which it was framed to avoid.

THE BISHOPS PROSECUTED, AND SENT TO THE TOWER

The archbishop of Canterbury was summoned to appear before the king in council, to answer charges of misdemeanour. At the appointed time the primate, and the six bishops who had signed the petition, Lloyd of St. Asaph, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, Ken of Bath and Wells, White of Peterborough, and Trelawney of Bristol, all made their appearance in the council chamber. Jeffreys then took a paper from the table and inquired of the archbishop whether that was the petition which he had signed, and which the bishops had presented. Sancroft, addressing himself to the king, said that, since it was his unhappiness to appear before his majesty as a criminal, he hoped that he should not be obliged to answer questions which might tend to the accusing of himself. James censured this hesitation as chicanery, and,

[1 On the very 20th of May, the venerable Richard Baxter, the renowned non-conformist who had been so often persecuted by the church, praised from his pulpit the bishops for their resistance to that declaration by virtue of which he was then able to preach publicly. It was thus plain that all hopes from the dissenters were vanished. The whole church party were firm to the prelates, and the king must now either yield at discretion or engage in a contest with all his Protestant subjects.—KEIGHTLEY.c]

still pressed, the bishops were required by the chancellor, and by the king, to answer the questions which had been put to them, and tney did so, confessing that the signatures were in their writing, and that they had delivered the petition. The lord chancellor then informed them that it was the king's pleasure they should be proceeded against for their petition; and that the proceedings should be with all fairness in Westminster Hall, by information, and that in the mean time they must enter into a recognisance. The bishops declined entering into recognisance, pleading that it was contrary to precedent, and to the privilege of parliament, for peers of the realm to be so bound. James stated that his offer to release them on such terms was intended as a favour, and bid them think of the consequences which might attend the refusal; but the accused were not to be moved from their purpose on that point; and it was in consequence agreed, after some deliberation, that they should all be sent to the Tower, as the writers and publishers of a seditious libel against the king and the government.

The summons of the bishops to attend at Whitehall being publicly known, great crowds of people thronged about the palace, waiting with anxiety the result of the examination. At length the petitioners made their appearance, but it was in the condition of culprits, under a guard of soldiers. The people were moved greatly at this sight; alarm, grief, and indignation, took possession of them as the rumours passed from one to another that the prelates were on their way to imprisonment in the Tower. The boldness of such a proceeding seemed to realise their worst fears concerning the intentions of the government, and the prisoners moved before them as a procession of confessors and martyrs — as the holy men whose piety and patriotism had prompted them to take their stand in the breach for the protection of the faith and liberty of their country. It was altogether a new thing to see such persons in such circumstances; it was a picture of injury and subjection made peculiarly affecting, as allied with exalted station, eminent piety, and generous virtue.

The crowd, accordingly, followed the sufferers from the palace toward the river, many throwing themselves at their feet to implore their benediction, and others weeping aloud, or exclaiming, "God save the bishops! God save the church!" When the procession reached the side of the river, and the prelates had taken their place in the barge provided to convey them to the stairs of their prison, numbers of the people rushed into the water to express their sympathy, and to beseech some parting word from them. In the midst of this excitement the bishops conducted themselves with great self-possession and dignity, exhorting the people to patience and loyalty. As the royal barge floated down the river, the banks of the Thames were seen crowded with people, many of whom cast themselves upon their knees and raised their hands towards heaven, in token of their earnest prayer for the safety of the good men who were regarded as hazarding so much in their behalf. By the time the prisoners had reached the entrance to the Tower the impulse had become so general, that the men on guard, and even some of the officers, received them kneeling, and entreated their benediction.

On the following day crowds were constantly assembled in the open space near the Tower; numbers, of both sexes, and in the highest station, visited the prisoners. In the words of Reresby,[h] "Among the rest were ten nonconformist ministers, which the king took so heinously, that he sent for four of them to reprimand them; but their answer was that they could not but adhere to the prisoners, as men constant to the Protestant faith; nay, what is more extraordinary, the very soldiers who kept guard in the Tower would

frequently drink good health to the bishops, which being understood by Sir Edward Hales, the constable, he sent orders by the captain of the guard to see that it was done no more; but the answer he received was, that they were doing it at the very instant, and would drink that health, and no other so long as the bishops were there."

On finding himself thus opposed by the clergy and the populace, and thus completely deserted by the nobility, the gentry, and the non-conformists, the councils of the monarch became more than ever unsteady. He had once resolved to let these proceedings fall, and to make the birth of the prince of Wales, which had occurred a few days since, on June 10th, the apparent cause of doing so; but, in the language of Jeffreys, "some men would hurry him to destruction." Accordingly, on the fifteenth of June, the bishops were brought before the court of King's Bench, by a writ of *habeas corpus*. On landing from the barge at Westminster, they passed along an extended avenue opened for them by the crowds assembled to do them honour. The greater part of the people, covering the whole space from the place of landing to the entrance of Westminster Hall, were upon their knees, and with tears commended them to the Divine protection, or implored a passing benediction from them. The bishops laid their hands on many as they moved along, and exhorted them to be loyal subjects and steadfast in their faith. On taking their place in the court, they were attended by twenty-nine peers, who had previously offered themselves as sureties for their appearance, if such should be demanded; along with these noblemen were numbers of gentlemen deeply interested in the expected proceedings, while the populace not only filled every corner and avenue of the court, but the whole of the great hall, and the open street to a considerable distance in its neighbourhood. The proceedings of this day, however, were only preliminary to the day of trial.

THE ACQUITTAL OF THE BISHOPS (1688 A.D.)

The prelates being obliged to plead, pleaded "Not Guilty," and the 29th of the month was fixed upon for their trial. They were not reconducted to the Tower, but released on their own recognisance. This temporary liberation seems to have been regarded by the people as an omen of triumph. It was hailed with loud shouts in the court, and everywhere among the populace; the bells of Westminster were rung, until silenced by an order from the dean, and bonfires in the evening testified the general delight.

The counsel for the bishops consisted of the most able men at the bar, including Sawyer, and Somers, who was then young and little known, but who was soon to become a much greater man than the greatest of his colleagues. It was unfortunate that some of these distinguished persons did not appear in the cause of justice and liberty on this occasion with clean hands.

When the bishops appeared in the court on the appointed day of trial, the attorney-general, Sir Thomas Powis, opened the case on the part of the crown. In stating the law of libel, he observed: "The bishops are prosecuted for censuring his majesty and his government, and for giving their opinions in matters wholly relating to government and to law. And I cannot omit to take notice that there is not any one thing of which the law is so jealous, or for the prosecution and punishment of which the law more carefully provides, than all accusations and arraignments of the government. No man may say of the great men of the nation, much less of the great officers of the kingdom, that they act unreasonably or unjustly, least of all may any man say such a thing of the king.

For these matters tend to possess the people that the government is ill administered; and the consequence of that is, to set them upon desiring a reformation; and what that tends to, and will end in, we have all had a sad and a too dear-bought experience. The last age will abundantly satisfy us whither such a thing does tend." Thus the law of libel was to be in England what the law of leasing-making had long been in Scotland — an instrument exposing all persons to the peril of a criminal information who should venture to utter the slightest or the most guarded censure upon the government, or concerning the persons whom it might include.[l]

The king had taken pains to have a jury returned that he could rely on; and at court there was not a doubt felt of the result. The speech of the attorney-general was timid, and there was great difficulty in proving the signatures; a question then arose, whether the petition which had been written in Surrey, and not proved to have been published in Middlesex, could be tried in the latter county. At every failure of the crown-lawyers, the audience set up a laugh or a shout which the court was unable to repress. Wright began to sum up; but he was interrupted by Finch, one of the prisoners' counsel. Williams, the solicitor-general, then requested the court to wait for the appearance of a person of great quality. After a delay of an hour, Lord Sunderland arrived in a chair, amid the hootings of the populace. He proved that the bishops came to him with a petition, and that he introduced them to the king.

But now the counsel for the accused took new ground, and assumed a bolder tone; they arraigned the dispensing power; they maintained the right of the subject to petition. Wright and Allibone charged against, Holloway and Powell in favour of, the prisoners. The jury retired at seven in the evening; the obstinacy of Arnold, the king's brewer, one of their number, kept them in debate till the morning, when at nine o'clock they came into court and pronounced their verdict, Not Guilty. Instantly a peal of joy arose; it was taken up without; it spread over the city; it reached the camp at Hounslow, and was repeated by the soldiers. The king, who was dining with Lord Feversham, on inquiring, was told it was nothing but their joy for the acquittal of the bishops: "Call you that nothing? It is so much the worse for them," was his reply.[c]

When the jury left the court they were hailed with the most enthusiastic cheers, as the defenders of Protestantism and the deliverers of their country; while, upon Bishop Cartwright, and Williams, the solicitor-general, the crowd heaped every expression of reproach and derision. In the city all business was suspended for some hours, and men seemed to exist but to congratulate each other with tears of delight on what had happened. In the evening the bells were rung, and bonfires kindled, in all parts of the metropolis. Before the windows of the royal palace the pope was burned in effigy, and the toast everywhere went round — health to the bishops and the jury, and confusion to the papists. The principal towns through the country vied with the capital in these expressions of feeling; the proudest churchmen, and every class of dissenters, seemed to be of one mind; and the parties who had done most towards urging the king to prosecute his obnoxious measures, began to express their utter despair of seeing a people whose heresy partook of so much "rancour and malignity" ever brought within the fold of the church. Nor was it at all surprising that so much feeling should have been evinced in relation to this struggle on both sides; for in the words of Sir James Mackintosh[m]: "it was the prosecution of men of the most venerable character and manifestly innocent intention, after the success of which no good man could have been secure.

It was an experiment of some measure, to ascertain the means and probabilities of deliverance. The government was on its trial; and by the verdict of acquittal, the king was justly convicted of a conspiracy to maintain usurpation by oppression."

One of the first acts of the king, in consequence of these proceedings, was to create Williams a baronet, and to punish the integrity of Powell, and the scruples of Holloway, by removing them from the bench. The manner of the king also was much changed. He was observed to be more thoughtful and abstracted, and less disposed to talk on public affairs.[l]

BUCKLE ON THE INTOLERANCE OF THE CLERGY

The heroism of the bishops has not seemed so noble to the philosophical historian, Buckle,[n] as to the majority of writers. Without sympathy for either Catholic or Protestant bigotry, he sees in the resistance to the Declaration of Indulgence much more of hypocrisy and intolerance than of consistent humanity. We will quote his powerful comments, and follow them by the words of another historian who adduces reasons for discounting the value of the Declaration of Indulgence.[a]

The sudden death of Charles II placed on the throne a prince whose most earnest desire was to restore the Catholic church. This change in affairs was, if we consider it in its ultimate results, the most fortunate circumstance which could have happened to our country. In spite of the difference of their religion, the English clergy had always displayed an affection towards James, whose reverence for the priesthood they greatly admired; though they were anxious that the warmth of his affections should be lavished on the Church of England and not on the church of Rome. They were sensible of the advantages which would accrue to their own order, if his piety could be turned into a new channel. They saw that it was for his interest to abandon his religion; and they thought that to a man so cruel and so vicious his own interest would be the sole consideration.

The consequence was, that in one of the most critical moments of his life, they made in his favour a great and successful effort; and they not only used all their strength to defeat the bill by which it was proposed to exclude him from the succession, but when the measure was rejected, they presented an address to Charles II, congratulating him on the result. When James actually mounted the throne, they continued to display the same spirit. Whether they still hoped for his conversion, or whether, in their eagerness to persecute the dissenters, they overlooked the danger to their own church, is uncertain; but it is one of the most singular and unquestionable facts in English history, that for some time there existed a strict alliance between a Protestant hierarchy and a popish king.

The terrible crimes which were the result of this compact are but too notorious. But what is more worthy of attention is, the circumstance that caused the dissolution of this conspiracy between the crown and the church. The ground of the quarrel was an attempt made by the king to effect, in some degree, a religious toleration. By the celebrated Test and Corporation acts, it had been ordered, that all persons who were employed by government should be compelled, under a heavy penalty, to receive the sacrament according to the rites of the English church. The offence of James was that he now issued what was called a Declaration of Indulgence, in which he announced his intention of suspending the execution of these laws. From this moment, the position of the two great parties was entirely changed. The bishops clearly per-

ceived that the statutes which it was thus attempted to abrogate, were highly favourable to their own power; and hence, in their opinion, formed an essential part of the constitution of a Christian country.

They had willingly combined with James, while he assisted them in persecuting men who worshipped God in a manner different from themselves.[1] So long as this compact held good, they were indifferent as to matters which they considered to be of minor importance. They looked on in silence, while the king was amassing the materials with which he hoped to turn a free government into an absolute monarchy. They saw Jeffreys and Kirke torturing their fellow-subjects; they saw the gaols crowded with prisoners, and all the scaffold streaming with blood. They were well pleased that some of the best and ablest men in the kingdom should be barbarously persecuted; that Baxter should be thrown into prison, and that Howe should be forced into exile.

They witnessed with composure the most revolting cruelties, because the victims of them were the opponents of the English church. Although the minds of men were filled with terror and with loathing, the bishops made no complaint. They preserved their loyalty unimpaired, and insisted on the necessity of humble submission to the Lord's anointed. But the moment James proposed to protect against persecution those who were hostile to the church; the moment he announced his intention of breaking down that monopoly of offices and of honours which the bishops had long secured for their own party; — the moment this took place, the hierarchy became alive to the dangers with which the country was threatened from the violence of so arbitrary a prince. The king had laid his hand on the ark, and the guardians of the temple flew to arms. How could they tolerate a prince who would not allow them to persecute their enemies? How could they support a sovereign who sought to favour those who differed from the national church? They soon determined on the line of conduct it behooved them to take. With an almost unanimous voice, they refused to obey the order by which the king commanded them to read in their churches the edict for religious toleration. Nor did they stop there. So great was their enmity against him they had recently cherished, that they actually applied for aid to those very dissenters whom, only a few weeks before, they had hotly persecuted; seeking by magnificent promises to win over to their side men they had hitherto hunted even to the death. The most eminent of the non-conformists were far from being duped by this sudden affection. But their hatred of popery, and their fear of the ulterior designs of the king, prevailed over every other consideration; and there arose that singular combination between churchmen and dissenters, which has never since been repeated. This coalition, backed by the general voice of the people, soon overturned the throne, and gave rise to what is justly deemed one of the most important events in the history of England.

Thus it was, that the proximate cause of that great revolution which cost James his crown, was the publication by the king of an edict of religious toleration, and the consequent indignation of the clergy at seeing so audacious an act performed by a Christian prince. It is true, that if other things had not conspired, this alone could never have effected so great a change. But it was the immediate cause of it, because it was the cause of the schism between the church and the throne, and of the alliance between the church and the dis-

[1] It was in the autumn of 1685, that the clergy and the government persecuted the dissenters with the greatest virulence. It is said, by Bishop Burnet,[k] that on many occasions the church party made use of the ecclesiastical courts to extort money from the non-conformists; and for confirmation of this, see Mackintosh.[m]

senters. This is a fact never to be forgotten. We ought never to forget that the first and only time the Church of England has made war upon the crown was when the crown had declared its intention of tolerating, and in some degree protecting, the rival religions.[n]

FAILURE OF THE THEORY OF TOLERANCE

While the words of Buckle have much to justify them, it is only fair that they should be qualified by certain considerations of historical perspective. These Knight has vigorously set forth.[o] There is no error [he says] more common, even amongst educated persons, than to pronounce upon the opinions of a past age according to the lights of their own age. In February, 1687, James issued in Scotland a Declaration for Liberty of Conscience. In April, 1687, he issued a Declaration for Liberty of Conscience in England. Why, it is asked, were these declarations regarded with suspicion by churchmen and by dissenters? Why could not all sincere Christians, of whatever persuasion, have accepted the king's noble measures for the adoption of that tolerant principle which is now found to be perfectly compatible with the security of an established church.

It was precisely because the principle has been slowly making its way during the contests of a hundred and fifty years, that it is now all but universally recognised as a safe and wholesome principle. It is out of the convictions resulting from our slow historical experience that all tests for admission to civil offices are now abolished for ever. Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Quaker, Methodist, Independent, Unitarian, Jew, all stand upon the same common ground as the churchman, of suffering no religious disqualification for the service of their country. But to imagine that such a result could have been effected by the interested will of a papist king, who had himself been the fiercest of persecutors — who had adopted, to their fullest extent, the hatred of his family to every species of non-conformity — is to imagine that the channels in which the great floods and little rills of religious opinion had long been flowing were to be suddenly diverted into one mighty stream, for which time and wisdom had prepared no bed.[p]

The acquittal of the bishops was not the only event which makes the 30th of June, 1688, a great epoch in history. On that day, while the bells of a hundred churches were ringing, while multitudes were busied, from Hyde Park to Mile End, in piling faggots and dressing popes for the rejoicings of the night, was despatched from London to the Hague an instrument scarcely less important to the liberties of England than the Great Charter.

The prosecution of the bishops and the birth of the prince of Wales had produced a great revolution in the feelings of many tories. At the very moment at which their church was suffering the last excess of injury and insult, they were compelled to renounce the hope of peaceful deliverance. Hitherto they had flattered themselves that the trial to which their loyalty was subjected would, though severe, be temporary, and that their wrongs would shortly be redressed without any violation of the ordinary rule of succession. A very different prospect was now before them.

One remedy there was, quick, sharp, and decisive, a remedy which the whigs had been but too ready to employ, but which had always been regarded by the tories as, in all cases, unlawful. The greatest Anglican doctors of that age had maintained that no breach of law or contract, no excess of cruelty, rapacity, or licentiousness, on the part of a rightful king, could justify his people in withstanding him by force. Some of them had delighted to exhibit

the doctrine of non-resistance in a form so exaggerated as to shock common sense and humanity. They frequently and emphatically remarked that Nero was at the head of the Roman government when St. Paul inculcated the duty of obeying magistrates. The inference which they drew was that, if an English king should, without any law but his own pleasure, persecute his subjects for not worshipping idols, should fling them to the lions in the Tower, should wrap them up in pitched cloth and set them on fire to light up St. James' park, and should go on with these massacres till whole towns and shires were left without one inhabitant, the survivors would still be bound meekly to submit, and to be torn in pieces or roasted alive without a struggle.

The arguments in favour of this proposition were futile indeed, but the place of sound argument was amply supplied by the omnipotent sophistry of interest and of passion. Many writers have expressed wonder that the high-spirited cavaliers of England should have been zealous for the most slavish theory that has ever been known among men. The truth is that this theory at first presented itself to the cavalier as the very opposite of slavish. Its tendency was to make him not a slave but a freeman and a master. It exalted him by exalting one whom he regarded as his protector, as his friend, as the head of his beloved party and of his more beloved church. When republicans were dominant the royalist had endured wrongs and insults which the restoration of the legitimate government had enabled him to retaliate. Rebellion was therefore associated in his imagination with subjection and degradation, and monarchical authority with liberty and ascendency. It had never crossed his imagination that a time might come when a king, a Stuart, would persecute the most loyal of the clergy and gentry with more than the animosity of the Rump or the protector. That time had however arrived. It was now to be seen how the patience which churchmen professed to have learned from the writings of Paul would stand the test of a persecution by no means so severe as that of Nero. The event was such as everybody who knew anything of human nature would have predicted. Oppression speedily did what philosophy and eloquence would have failed to do. The system of Filmer might have survived the attacks of Locke: but it never recovered from the death-blow given by James.

That logic, which, while it was used to prove that Presbyterians and Independents ought to bear imprisonment and confiscation with meekness, had been pronounced unanswerable, seemed to be of very little force when the question was whether Anglican bishops should be imprisoned and the revenues of Anglican colleges confiscated. It had been often repeated, from the pulpits of all the cathedrals in the land, that the apostolical injunction to obey the civil magistrate was absolute and universal, and that it was impious presumption in man to limit a precept which had been promulgated without any limitation in the word of God. Now, however, divines, whose sagacity had been sharpened by the imminent danger in which they stood of being turned out of their livings and prebends to make room for papists, discovered flaws in the reasoning which had formerly seemed so convincing. The ethical parts of Scripture were not to be construed like acts of parliament, or like the casuistical treatises of the schoolmen. What Christian really turned the left cheek to the ruffian who had smitten the right? What Christian really gave his cloak to the thieves who had taken his coat away? Both in the Old and in the New Testament general rules were perpetually laid down unaccompanied by the exceptions. Thus there was a general command not to kill, unaccompanied by any reservation in favour of the warrior who kills in defence of his king and country. There was a general

command not to swear, unaccompanied by any reservation in favour of the witness who swears to speak the truth before a judge. Yet the lawfulness of defensive war, and of judicial oaths, was disputed only by a few obscure sectaries, and was positively affirmed in the articles of the Church of England.[b]

THE KING'S ISOLATION: THE PRINCE OF WALES

Thus, during the short interval since his accession, James had severed himself from the Church of England and from the Protestant non-conformists. His only remaining dependence was on the navy and army, both of which had already given alarming indications of participation in the popular feeling. The intrusion of several monks and Catholic priests into the fleet at the Nore, called forth strong signs of insubordination among the seamen, which even the presence and affabilities of the king did not suffice to allay, until the obnoxious persons were ordered on shore.

But the army was regarded by the monarch as his grand instrument. He had taken great pains to place it in such hands as might best secure it to his service, and he sometimes boasted of the number of Catholics to be found in that body, not only among the officers, but in the ranks. The royal condescension displayed at the Nore, was more studiously exhibited in the camp at Hounslow. At length, to place the fidelity of this great stay of his power beyond doubt, James ventured to issue a test, which required both officers and men to pledge their assistance for a repeal of the penal laws.

This ill-advised experiment was first tried on the regiment under the command of Lord Litchfield, which was regarded as the most manageable. Those who were not prepared to take the test were called upon to lay down their arms; and the whole regiment, with the exception of two captains and a few Catholic soldiers, placed their arms on the ground. The disclosure of this dreadful secret filled the unhappy monarch with astonishment and dismay. He looked for a moment in silence and ill-concealed anguish on the scene before him; he then commanded the disobedient to take up their weapons, adding, that he should not again do them the honour to consult them on such matters. An attempt was afterwards made to infuse a mixture of Irish Catholic recruits into the regiment which garrisoned Portsmouth. Ten of these strangers were to be incorporated with each company, but the five captains and the lieutenant-colonel openly refused to receive them; these officers were summoned to Windsor and cashiered, but with such manifest reluctance and trepidation, as rendered the proceeding a display of the weakness more than of the strength of the government.

To so feeble a condition had James reduced himself from the height of that power in which he had revelled on the death of Argyll and Monmouth only three years before. Ireland, indeed, was still, on the whole, in his interest; and the established church in Scotland was governed by men incapable of manifesting any sympathy with the better spirit which had begun to display itself among the clergy of the Church of England. Louis and his ambassadors also, still spoke of the military aid which his majesty might obtain from France, should the exigency of his affairs become such as to need it. But James appears to have regarded the power of France with a new feeling of jealousy, as his own was seen to be everywhere declining; and while Scotland had long been too much injured to be relied upon in a time of weakness, the attempts which had been made to derive assistance from the Catholics of Ireland, had served to awaken a degree of suspicion and disaffection which no help from that quarter could be expected to subdue.[l]

The birth of his son might seem a sufficient consolation to the king under this defeat; but here too his usual ill-fortune pursued him. If ever there was a prince about whose birth there would seem to be no possibility of doubt, it was this prince of Wales. His mother had long since spoken of her pregnancy; the birth took place in the morning, in the presence of the queen-dowager, most of the privy council, and several ladies of quality, many of whom were Protestants — yet not one in a thousand of the Protestants believed in its reality. Some maintained that the queen had never been pregnant; others, that she had miscarried at Easter, and that one child, or even two successive children, had been substituted. The princess Anne remained incredulous; so did the learned bishop Lloyd for many years. It was in fact a general delusion, from which neither reason nor good sense preserved men; it was most certainly no party fiction, though party might, and did, take advantage of it.

The birth of the prince seems to have decided the unprincipled Lord Sunderland to make public at this time his apostasy from the Protestant faith. He and the earl of Mulgrave, a man as devoid of principle as himself, had been privately reconciled by Father Petre a year before.

THE PRINCE OF ORANGE, AND HIS RELATIONS TO THE THRONE

On the other hand, the birth of the prince decided those who were in communication with the prince of Orange. While the next heir was a Protestant, the attempts of James might be borne with patience, as they could only continue for a few years; but now there was born a successor who would be nurtured in Catholicism, and a papal regency under the queen would be formed in case of the king's demise. No time was therefore to be lost; an invitation to the prince to come to the relief of the country was drawn out and signed in cipher (June 30th), by the earls of Shrewsbury, Danby, and Devonshire, Lord Lumley, the bishop of London, Admiral Russell, and Colonel Sidney. The bearer of it to Holland is supposed to have been Admiral Herbert, in the disguise of a common sailor.[c]

The position of the United Provinces, with regard both to France and England, rendered it imperative that the statesmen of that republic should be constant observers of public affairs, and studious to defeat political intrigue in those quarters. In the case of the prince of Orange, many circumstances contributed to render this policy as necessary to his self-preservation as to the attainment of those higher objects on which his honourable ambition had been long fixed. In 1672, when in the twenty-second year of his age, a popular revolution raised the prince to the possession of the supreme authority in the United Provinces under the title Stadholder. The courage and the transcendent skill and perseverance with which the prince resisted the concentrated power of France has been already narrated. No struggle in the history of ancient or modern warfare has called forth a greater display of those qualities which command and deserve admiration. When the prince who had thus kept the great despot of Europe at bay became the husband of the princess Mary, the fact that in the event of the death of Charles and James without children his consort would become queen of England, of necessity brought his name into more frequent and much nearer connection with English politics, and naturally disposed him to watch the course of events in this country with a new feeling of interest. Until the recent birth of the prince of Wales, the only life between the princess Mary and the throne was that of her father; and it was only a little before the birth of the prince

that the extreme Catholic party in the court, despairing of so happy an event, had devised their scheme for thrusting aside the claim of the princess Mary and William, in favour of her younger sister the princess Anne, and Prince George, who, as we have seen, were regarded as much less fixed in their principles as Protestants. James is described as being greatly incensed by this project, and as declaring that much as he might deplore leaving his unfinished plans to be wholly frustrated by a Protestant successor, even such an evil was not to be guarded against by such means.[l]

The prince of Orange, by far the greatest man of his time, had for many years devoted all his thoughts and energies to the humbling of the power of Louis XIV. In 1686 he had succeeded in engaging the emperor, the kings of Spain and Sweden, and several of the German princes to subscribe the league of Augsburg, or Grand Alliance, of which this was the real object. The following year, some of the Italian states, the pope himself included, joined the league, and the greater part of Europe was thus banded, under the prince of Orange, to check the ambition of Louis. The proper place of England was in this confederation; but the policy of her king withheld her from it: hence the prince aspired to the power of directing her councils and adding her means to the great cause of national independence.

The death of the elector of Cologne in the spring of this year proved most favourable to the designs of the prince, as it brought Louis and the confederacy into collision. This elector, who also held the bishopries of Liège, Münster, and Hildesheim, had proved a most useful ally to Louis in 1672; and all the efforts of this monarch were directed to procure the election of the coadjutor, the cardinal of Fürstenberg, who was his creature, and to whom he had given the bishopric of Strasburg, of which it was requisite that he should previously divest himself. The pope however, out of hostility to Louis, refused to accept his resignation; and at the election (July 9th), though Fürstenberg had a majority of votes over his competitor, Prince Clement of Bavaria, he did not obtain the requisite two-thirds. The appointment then fell to the pope, and he named Clement, who was only a youth of seventeen years of age. The candidates of the allies were equally successful at Liège, Münster, and Hildesheim, and both sides now began to prepare for war.

This gave the prince of Orange an opportunity of making his preparations for the invasion of England, under colour of providing for the defence of his own country and the empire. A large force was encamped near Nimeguen; cannon and ammunition were taken from the arsenals to be sent to it; soldiers and sailors were engaged; the Dutch navy was augmented, and the different fleets were placed in adjoining ports. These mighty preparations naturally awakened the suspicions of D'Avaux, the French minister at the Hague; but it was long before he could get certain information of their object. When at length he ascertained that they were destined for the invasion of England, and had informed his court, Louis lost no time in communicating the intelligence to James, making at the same time an offer of his aid; but that infatuated prince refused to give credit to it. Skelton, the English minister at Paris, then proposed to Louis that D'Avaux should declare to the states that there was an alliance between his master and James, and that Louis would regard as a breach of peace any attempt against his ally. This manœuvre disconcerted the friends of the prince of Orange; but James, instead of seeking to derive advantage from it, in his silly pride took offence at it, denied the alliance, recalled Skelton, and committed him to the Tower. Had he owned the alliance, Louis would perhaps have made war on Holland, and thus have prevented the expedition of the prince; whereas he now declared war against

the emperor alone, put his troops in motion, and laid siege to Philippsburg on the Upper Rhine (September 14th). All was now tranquil on the side of Holland; the prince found his motions unimpeded; and having arranged with his German allies for the defence of the republic during his absence, he lost no time in preparing for the invasion of England.

The eyes of James at length were opened to his danger, and he attempted to retrace his steps. Almost every day of the month of October was marked by some concession. He asked and graciously received the advice of the bishops; he restored the bishop of London and the president and fellows of Magdalen College; he gave the city of London and the towns and boroughs back their charters; recalled the writs he had issued for a parliament, etc. Meantime he was active in preparing the means of resistance; a fleet of thirty-seven sail, with seventeen fire-ships, was stationed at the gun-fleet under Lord Dartmouth, whose fidelity was beyond suspicion; he called out the militia; gave commissions for raising regiments and companies; recalled troops from Scotland and Ireland; and the army, under the command of Lord Feversham, soon amounted to forty thousand men.

WILLIAM OF ORANGE INVADES ENGLAND (1688 A.D.)

The prince of Orange had declarations prepared, addressed to the people of England and Scotland, stating the motives of his coming over: namely, to procure a free parliament; the redress of grievances; the security of the church; a comprehension for dissenters who desired it, and toleration for all others; and to inquire into the birth of the prince of Wales. He also wrote to his Catholic allies, disclaiming all intention of injuring the king or his rightful heirs, and assuring them that he would employ all his influence to secure toleration for the Catholics.[1] The states issued a circular letter to the same effect.

The fleet collected for the invasion consisted of sixty men of war and seven hundred transports; the troops were four thousand five hundred horse and eleven thousand foot [with arms for a much greater number]. Marshal Schomberg and the counts of Nassau and Solms, with General Ginkel and other able Dutch officers; a band of eight hundred French refugees; the English exiles, such as Lord Macclesfield, Doctor Burnet, and others, and those recently arrived, namely, the earl of Shrewsbury, who had raised £40,000 for the expedition, the sons of the marquises of Winchester and Halifax, and of Lord Danby, admirals Russell and Herbert — all prepared to share the fortunes of the prince.

The first full moon after the equinox was the time appointed for sailing; but for the first half of October the wind blew tempestuously from the west. Public prayers to heaven were made in all the churches; on the 13th the storm abated, and William then (October 15th) took a solemn leave of the states, commending to them the princess if anything should happen to himself. The aged pensionary Fagel replied in their name. The whole audience were deeply affected; William alone remained apparently unmoved. A solemn fast was held on the 17th, and two days after the expedition sailed from Hellevoetsluis; but during the night a storm came on and dispersed the

[1 The great point at issue between James and William at this moment, was the repeal of the Test laws. William declared himself willing to tolerate the Catholic worship, but spoke of being immovably opposed to the admission of Catholics into parliament and places of trust. Whatever his private convictions may have been concerning the utility or the justice of such intolerant restrictions, the prince knew that tories and whigs, churchmen and dissenters, were all agreed in insisting on their continuance.— VAUGHAN.]

fleet, and next day the ships were obliged to return to the different ports to repair and to lay in additional stores. At length the "Protestant east-wind," as it was termed, came, and the prince again put to sea (November 1st). He first sailed northwards, intending to land in Yorkshire; but then changing his course he passed (on the 3rd) between Dover and Calais; wind and tide prevented Lord Dartmouth from attacking; the people of the opposite coasts gazed with various emotions on the magnificent spectacle of a fleet extending twenty miles in length and laden with the fate of empires. On Monday the 5th of November the fleet safely anchored at Tor Bay in Devon.

The king had in the interim been making new efforts to sustain his sinking power. He caused a solemn investigation to be made into the birth of the prince of Wales, and the numerous depositions to be enrolled in chancery, in order that his title, in case of his own death, might be put beyond doubt. He dismissed from his council (October 27th) Sunderland, whose fidelity, after all the lengths he had gone, was now suspected, and not wholly without reason. Father Petre had already ceased to appear at the council-board. As the prince had stated in his declaration that "he had been invited by divers lords spiritual and temporal," the king called upon the prelates and peers in the capital to admit or deny the truth of this assertion. They all denied it; for none of them had signed the invitation but Bishop Compton, who adroitly evaded the question by saying, "I am confident the rest of the bishops will as readily answer in the negative as myself." The king insisted on having their denial in writing, with an "abhorrence" of the designs of the prince; but this they declined to give (November 6th). He then left them in anger, telling them that he would trust to his army.

The prince was now at Exeter, but hardly anyone as yet had joined him, for the memory of [Monmouth's failure and] Jeffrey's campaign was still fresh in the minds of the people of Devon. He suspected that he was deceived and he began to think of reimbarking, being resolved on his return to Holland to publish the names of those who had invited him. At length Sir Edward Seymour and some of the western gentry came in to him; and at the suggestion of Seymour, a bond of association was drawn out, engaging the subscribers to support one another in defence of the laws and liberties of the three kingdoms, the Protestant religion, and the prince of Orange. They were followed by Lord Colchester, Lord Wharton, Mr. Russell, and the earl of Abingdon. Soon after on the 10th, Lord Cornbury, son of the earl of Clarendon, attempted to carry over three regiments of horse that were stationed at Salisbury; but the far greater part of the officers and men proving loyal, he led but a small party to join the army of the prince. The ice was now broken; distrust spread through the whole army; the friends of the prince were emboldened; the lords Danby and Lumley began to raise men in Yorkshire, Lord Delamere in Cheshire, and Lord Devonshire in Derbyshire and the adjoining counties.

James was strongly urged to seek an accommodation with the prince, but he still confided in the loyalty of his troops, and he resolved to put himself at their head. Father Petre, anxious perhaps for his own safety, pressed him to remain in London, as quitting it had been the ruin of his father. At his suggestion the infant prince was sent to Portsmouth, and he himself made his escape to France after the king's departure for the army.

On reaching Salisbury on the 20th, James reviewed the troops that were there. He was to go the next day to Warminster, to inspect the division of General Kirke, but a violent bleeding of the nose came on him, which continued, with intervals, for three days. During this time a council of war was held. Lord Churchill, the lieutenant-general, advised to remain at Salisbury;

Feversham and his brother, the count de Roye, proposed to retire behind the Thames. This last course was approved of by the king; and that very night Churchill, the duke of Grafton, and others went over to the prince, and they were followed by several of their officers in the morning. It is even said that Churchill, Kirke, and some other officers had conspired to seize the king at Warminster, and deliver him up to the prince.

The king on his return to London stopped the first night (November 24th) at Andover. He invited Prince George of Denmark to sup with him. After supper, that prince, the duke of Ormonde, and two others mounted their horses and rode off to the prince of Orange. When James reached London, the first news that met him was that of the flight of his daughter Anne.[1] He burst into tears: "God help me," he cried; "my very children have forsaken me." The princess had left her bed-chamber in the night of the 25th with Lady Churchill and Mrs. Berkeley; the bishop of London and Lord Dorset had a carriage ready for her, and she was conveyed to the bishop's house, and thence to Northampton. Disaffection now spread rapidly over the whole kingdom. Bristol, Hull, York, and other towns, were occupied by the adherents of the prince. The University of Oxford sent him its adhesion and an offer of its plate.

The first act of the king was to hold a great council of the peers who were in London, and by their advice he issued writs for a parliament, and sent lords Halifax, Nottingham, and Godolphin, as his commissioners, to treat with the prince; but some days elapsed before they were admitted to his presence, and meantime a spurious proclamation in his name, menacing all papists bearing arms or holding office, was circulated in London.

JAMES II TAKES FLIGHT AND IS RECAPTURED

James was now resolved on placing himself and his family under the protection of the king of France. He had his son brought back from Portsmouth, whence he could not now be conveyed; and, on a dark and stormy night (December 9th), the queen, with her babe and his nurse, crossed the river in an open boat to Lambeth; but the expected carriage was not there, and they had to stand for some time, only sheltered by an old wall from the torrents of rain. At length the coach arrived, and the queen proceeded to Gravesend where she got on board a yacht which conveyed her to Calais.

The king had promised the queen to follow her in twenty-four hours. The letter which he received next day (December 10th) from his commissioners, stating the prince's terms, made no change in his resolution. He wrote to Lord Feversham, dispensing with the further services of the troops; and he called for and burned the writs for a parliament, and then retired to rest. At one in the morning he rose, and telling Lord Northumberland, who lay on a

[1 The desertion of his own family gave a severe blow to the unhappy James. De Foe, alluding to the event, gives the following account of the sensation which it produced in the metropolis. "I cannot but remember the consternation among the people, when it was first noised abroad that the princess was missing; it being at first warm among the people that they had murdered or made away with her. I want words to express the compassion that appeared in the countenances of the people: and so much was she then beloved that the very soldiers talked of setting Whitehall on fire, and cutting the throats of all the papists about the court. The people ran raving up and down, and the confused crowds thronged into the apartments of Whitehall, inquiring of everyone they met if they had seen the princess. Had it not presently been made public that she was withdrawn; nay, had not the letters she left behind her been made public, some fatal disturbance had been seen in the very palace, and that within a very few hours." It was the occurrence of such scenes as these that contributed to the alarm of the king for the safety of his person and family. — WILSON.]

pallet in his chamber, not to open the door till the usual hour in the morning, he went down the back stairs, and being joined by Sir Edward Hales, got into a hackney coach and drove to the horse ferry, and there getting into a small boat crossed over to Vauxhall, throwing the great seal into the river on his way. Horses were there ready for them, and at ten in the morning they reached Feversham, where they got on board a custom house hoy which had been engaged for the purpose.

As soon as the news of the king's flight was known in London, the mob attacked the Catholic chapels and the residences of the Catholic ambassadors. Those who felt themselves to be obnoxious attempted to fly to the coast, but several were taken and committed to prison. Jeffreys was discovered at Wapping, in the disguise of a common sailor. It was with difficulty that he was saved from the rage of the mob. At his own desire he was committed to the Tower, where he died shortly afterwards. The nuncio, disguised as a footman of the ambassador of Savoy, was seized at Gravesend, but the prince sent him a passport without delay.[c] It is honourable to the English character that, notwithstanding the aversion with which the Roman Catholic religion and the Irish race were then regarded, notwithstanding the anarchy which was the effect of the flight of James, notwithstanding the artful machinations which were employed to scare the multitude into cruelty, no atrocious crime was perpetrated at this conjuncture. Much property, indeed, was destroyed and carried away. The houses of many Roman Catholic gentlemen were attacked. Parks were ravaged. Deer were slain and stolen. But in all this confusion, which lasted several days and extended over many counties, not a single Roman Catholic lost his life. The mob showed no inclination to blood, except in the case of Jeffreys; and the hatred which that bad man inspired had more affinity with humanity than with cruelty.[b]

The government meantime was exercised by a council of peers, with the lord mayor and alderman. They sent a declaration of adhesion to the prince, on condition of his procuring a free parliament: but their deliberations were soon disturbed by tidings of the detention of the king. The hoy having stopped to get in more ballast, was surrounded by three boats, and the crews, taking the king and his companions for Jesuits, brought it back to Feversham. The king, being recognised, sent for Lord Winchelsea, the lord-lieutenant of the county, and he was placed at the house of the mayor, whence he wrote to the supreme council at London, who forthwith ordered Lord Feversham to take two hundred of the guards for the protection of the royal person.[c]

Had the monarch succeeded in making his escape to France, the course open to the prince of Orange would have been much less difficult than it now proved, and the powerful jacobite party would, perhaps, scarcely have been heard of in our history. On the flight of the king, the most scrupulous began to conclude, that to invite the prince to take the government upon him was the only just and safe method of proceeding. By this act the throne was vacated, and might be filled by the most eligible successor from the royal family at the pleasure of parliament. But the arrest of the monarch at Feversham on Wednesday was followed by an order of the privy council, commanding that his carriage and the royal guards should be sent to reconduct him to the capital, which took place accordingly on the Saturday, when many of the people, touched with compassion toward him, appeared to hail his return with great delight — "so slight and unstable a thing," says Burnet,[k] "is a multitude, and so soon altered." The difficult question now was, how to dispose of the king's person, it being deemed impossible that the king and the prince should be together in London, with their respective forces, without great danger to both.[l]

James now resolved to return to the capital. He sent Lord Feversham to the prince, who was now at Windsor, to propose a personal conference; but the envoy was placed under arrest, on the pretext of his having come without a passport. The king on reaching London, was received with every demonstration of popular joy: the crowds shouted, the bells were rung, and the bonfires were kindled, in the usual manner. Next day he held a court, met his council, and exercised other acts of sovereignty. But the prince and his council had decided that James should not remain at Whitehall; and the following evening Count Solms came with a body of the Dutch guards, and, having occupied St. James', led them to Whitehall. Lord Craven, who commanded the English guards, was preparing to resist; but James, knowing opposition to be useless, repressed the ardour of the veteran of eighty, and the Dutch guards took the place of the English. A little before midnight the king went to rest, but he had not been long asleep when he was waked to receive the lords Halifax, Shrewsbury, and Delamere, who were come with a message from the prince. He had them admitted. They told him it was the prince's wish that, for the safety of his person, he should go to Ham House in Surrey, where he would be attended by his own guards, and that he must depart at ten in the morning, as the prince would arrive by noon. James objected to Ham, as damp and cold, and proposed Rochester. They departed, and returned at nine next morning with the requisite permission.

JAMES II LEAVES ENGLAND FOREVER (1688 A.D.)

At noon the king took leave of the nobility and entered the royal barge, and went down the river, followed by a party of the Dutch guards in boats. The assembled crowds viewed with mournful looks this final departure of their sovereign, a captive in the hands of foreigners. James slept that night at Gravesend, and next day came to Rochester, where he remained for four days, deliberating on his further course. His friends in general urged him not to think of quitting the kingdom, as it was the very course his enemies seemed to wish him to adopt; for, though the front of the house in which he resided was guarded, the rear was neglected. He sent, offering to place himself in the hands of the prelates, if they would answer for his safety; but they declined so delicate a charge. He then resolved on flight, to which he was moreover urged by a letter from the queen; and, having written a declaration explanatory of his motives, and informed some friends of his design, he went to bed as usual. After midnight he rose, and, with his natural son the duke of Berwick and three other persons, he went out through the garden. A fishing smack had been hired to convey him to France, but the weather was so rough that he could not reach it. He got on board the *Eagle* fire-ship, where he was received with all marks of respect by the crew, and next morning he embarked on the smack. On Christmas Day he landed at Ambleteuse in Picardy, and he hastened to join his queen at St. Germain. His reception by Louis was cordial and generous.

As the reign of this ill-judging prince had now reached its close, we will here insert his character as drawn in true but more favourable colours than one might have expected by the pen of Bishop Burnet[k]: "He was a prince that seemed made for greater things than will be found in the course of his life, more particularly of his reign. He was esteemed in the former parts of his life a man of great courage, as he was, quite through it, a man of great application to business. He had no vivacity of thought, invention or expression, but he had a good judgment where his religion or his education gave him not a bias, which

it did very often. He was bred with strange notions of the obedience due to princes, and came to take up as strange ones of the obedience due to priests. He was naturally a man of truth, fidelity and justice, but his religion was so infused in him and he was so managed in it by his priests, that the principles which nature had laid in him had little power over him when the concerns of his church stood in the way. He was a gentle master, and was very easy to all who came near him, yet he was not so apt to pardon as one ought to be that is the viceregent of that God who is slow to anger and ready to forgive. He had no personal vices but of one sort; he was still wandering from one amour to another; yet he had a real sense of sin, and was ashamed of it. In a word, if it had not been for his popery, he would have been, if not a great, yet a good prince."

THE INTERREGNUM; THE CONVENTION PARLIAMENT (1689 A.D.)

To resume our narrative. At two o'clock on the day of the king's departure from the capital, the prince of Orange came to St. James. All classes crowded to do him homage. He summoned the lords spiritual and temporal to meet on the 21st, to consider the state of the nation. They came on the appointed day, to the number of about seventy: five lawyers, in the absence of the judges, were appointed to assist them. It was proposed that they should previously sign the Exeter Association: the temporal peers, with four exceptions, subscribed; the prelates, all but Compton, refused. Next day (the 22nd) they met in the house of peers, and, having chosen Lord Halifax their speaker, issued an order for all papists, except householders and some others, to remove ten miles from London. On Christmas Day they resolved that the prince should be requested to take on him the administration [1] of all public affairs till the 22nd of January, and to issue letters for persons to be elected to meet as a convention on that day. The following day all those who had served in any of the parliaments of Charles II, and were in town, with the aldermen and fifty common-council-men, waited on the prince by invitation, and thence went to the house of commons, where next day they voted an address similar to that of the peers. The prince accepted the charge, and issued the letters of summons for the convention. Next day, being Sunday, he received the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England.

On the 22nd of January, 1689, the memorable convention met. A joint address of thanks, praying him to continue the administration of affairs was presented to the prince. After a few days' necessary delay, the commons entered on the great question of the state of the nation; and it was resolved, "That king James II having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom by breaking the original contract between king and people; and, by the advice of jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of this kingdom, has abdicated the government, and that the throne is thereby become vacant." Next day it was resolved, "That it hath been found by experience to be inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince." It is remarkable that this is the very principle of the Exclusion Bill which had brought such odium on its supporters.

In the lords, this last vote was unanimously agreed to, but various questions arose on the former. The first was, supposing the throne vacant, whether they would have a regent or a king. It was decided in favour of the

[1] The so-called Interregnum is usually dated from December 23rd, 1688, to February 13th, 1689.]

latter by a majority of only two. It was then carried, that there was an original contract between king and people. For the word "abdicated" they substituted "deserted"; and they struck out the clause declaring the throne to be vacant, as it was maintained that the crown devolved to the princess of Orange. To these amendments the commons refused to agree. Two conferences took place between committees of the houses, which terminated in the lords giving way to the firmness of the commons; the cogent motive was political necessity. The wholesome regard for the forms of the constitution certainly involved the whigs in apparent absurdity, for the word "abdicated" it was acknowledged was used in an improper sense; "deserted" was in truth no better, but it sounded softer; the proper word was "forfeited," but all parties shrank from employing it.

The throne being vacant, the next question was, by whom it should be filled. The young prince of Wales was passed over by common consent; for his birth should be previously inquired into; and should his legitimacy be proved, as there was no doubt but that he would be brought up a Catholic, it would be necessary to appoint a Protestant regent, and then the strange appearance might be presented of a succession of kings with the rights and title of the crown, and of regents exercising all its power. The simple course seemed to be to make the princess of Orange queen; but the prince signified his dislike of that; the princess had also strongly expressed her disapprobation of it.[c]

William, who had carefully abstained from everything that might have borne the appearance of effort to influence the late elections, observed the same silent and cautious neutrality in regard to the deliberations of the two houses when assembled. But when the points adverted to had been debated for some time with much warmth, and with little prospect of any desirable issue, the prince sent for Halifax, Shrewsbury, and Nottingham, and told them that he wished to have avoided making any disclosure of his own sentiments in relation to the matters which were now occupying so much of the public attention, but that he thought it might expedite affairs, and prevent mischiefs, to inform them that he could not accept the office of regent, nor take any share in the English government merely by courtesy, as the husband of the princess ["he would not hold anything by apron-strings"]; that the condition indispensable was that sovereignty should be vested in his person; that, should it be the pleasure of the parliament to come to some other settlement, he should not oppose its proceedings, but willingly return to Holland and meddle no more with English affairs; that, whatever others might think of a crown, it was no such thing in his eyes but that he could be well content without it.

This manly avowal — in present circumstances the only one that became him — was made with the intention of its being generally known. It conduced to the settlement which followed. The contest about words had led to learned conferences between the two houses, in which the commons prevailed, and the throne was at length declared "vacant." The way was thus prepared for the Declaration of Right (February 12th, 1689), proclaiming William and Mary as conjoint sovereigns, the administration, to prevent distractions, being placed singly in the prince.

It may be added, also, that the former was chargeable with a violence of conduct towards the representatives of the people that cannot be urged against the latter; and that he manifested a less doubtful inclination to rule without the intervention of parliaments. The contest, therefore, which has rendered the year 1688 so memorable, was the same that had been maintained, with greater violence indeed, but also with greater intelligence, and a much larger

measure of public spirit, in 1641; in both cases the same great principles were involved, and the same character, in many of its leading features, was observable in the men who filled the throne.

Nor was this right of parliament to alter the succession the most remarkable or the most important doctrine involved in the revolution thus accomplished, inasmuch as this had been often asserted, and sometimes exercised, in the course of English history. The main principle and effect of this proceeding resulted, as a consequence, from its great act in relation to the throne, *viz.*, the practical subjection of the king to the laws, instead of the total, or even partial, subjection of the laws to the king. It at once annihilated the doctrines of divine right and non-resistance, brought into easy and undisturbed practice those ancient rights and liberties, which the Plantagenets had attempted in vain to subvert, which the Tudors had often been allowed to trample upon, and which the Stuarts sacrificed their throne to destroy.[1]

MACAULAY'S REVIEW OF THE DECLARATION OF RIGHT, AND THE REVOLUTION

The commons wisely determined to postpone all reforms till the ancient constitution of the kingdom should have been restored in all its parts, and forthwith to fill the throne without imposing on William and Mary any other obligations than that of governing according to the existing laws of England. In order that the questions which had been in dispute between the Stuarts and the nation might never again be stirred, it was determined that the instrument by which the prince and princess of Orange were called to the throne, and by which the order of succession was settled, should set forth, in the most distinct and solemn manner, the fundamental principles of the constitution. This instrument, known by the name of the Declaration of Right, was prepared by a committee, of which Somers was chairman. The fact that the low born young barrister was appointed to so honourable and important a post in a parliament filled with able and experienced men, only ten days after he had spoken in the house of commons for the first time, sufficiently proves the superiority of his abilities. In a few hours the declaration was framed and approved by the commons. The lords assented to it with some amendments of no great importance.

The declaration began by recapitulating the crimes and errors which had made a revolution necessary. James had invaded the province of the legislature; had treated modest petitioning as a crime; had oppressed the church by means of an illegal tribunal; had, without the consent of parliament, levied taxes and maintained a standing army in time of peace; had violated the freedom of election, and perverted the course of justice. Proceedings which could lawfully be questioned only in parliament had been made the subjects of prosecution in the King's Bench. Partial and corrupt juries had been returned: excessive bail had been required from prisoners: excessive fines had been imposed: barbarous and unusual punishments had been inflicted: the estates of accused persons had been granted away before conviction. He, by whose authority these things had been done, had abdicated the government. The prince of Orange, whom God had made the glorious instrument of delivering the nation from superstition and tyranny, had invited the estates of the realm to meet and to take counsel together for the securing of religion, of law, and of freedom.

The lords and commons, having deliberated, had resolved that they would first, after the example of their ancestors, assert the ancient rights and liber-

ties of England. Therefore it was declared that the dispensing power, lately assumed and exercised, had no legal existence; that, without grant of parliament, no money could be exacted by the sovereign from the subject; that, without consent of parliament, no standing army could be kept up in time of peace. The right of subjects to petition, the right of electors to choose representatives freely, the right of parliaments to freedom of debate, the right of the nation to a pure and merciful administration of justice according to the spirit of its own mild laws, were solemnly affirmed. All these things the convention claimed, in the name of the whole nation, as the undoubted inheritance of Englishmen. Having thus vindicated the principles of the constitution, the lords and commons, in the entire confidence that the deliverer would hold sacred the laws and liberties which he had saved, resolved that William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, should be declared king and queen of England for their joint and separate lives, and that, during their joint lives, the administration of the government should be in the prince alone. After them the crown was settled on the posterity of Mary, then on Anne and her posterity, and then on the posterity of William.

On the morning of Wednesday, the 13th of February, the court of Whitehall and all the neighbouring streets were filled with gazers. The magnificent banqueting house, the masterpiece of Inigo, embellished by masterpieces of Rubens, had been prepared for a great ceremony. The walls were lined by the yeomen of the guard. Near the northern door, on the right hand, a large number of peers had assembled. On the left were the commons with their speaker, attended by the mace. The southern door opened: and the prince and princess of Orange, side by side, entered, and took their place under the canopy of state.

Both houses approached bowing low. William and Mary advanced a few steps. Halifax on the right, and Powle on the left, stood forth; and Halifax spoke. The convention, he said, had agreed to a resolution which he prayed their highnesses to hear. They signified their assent; and the clerk of the house of lords read, in a loud voice, the Declaration of Right. When he had concluded, Halifax, in the name of all the estates of the realm, requested the prince and princess to accept the crown.

William, in his own name and in that of his wife, answered that the crown was, in their estimation, the more valuable because it was presented to them as a token of the confidence of the nation. "We thankfully accept," he said, "what you have offered us." Then, for himself, he assured them that the laws of England, which he had once already vindicated, should be the rules of his conduct, that it should be his study to promote the welfare of the kingdom, and that, as to the means of doing so, he should constantly recur to the advice of the houses, and should be disposed to trust their judgment rather than his own.

These words were received with a shout of joy which was heard in the streets below, and was instantly answered by huzzas from many thousands of voices. The lords and commons then reverently retired from the banqueting house and went in procession to the great gate of Whitehall, where the heralds and pursuivants were waiting in their gorgeous tabards. All the space as far as Charing Cross was one sea of heads. The kettle-drums struck up; the trumpets pealed: and garter king-at-arms, in a loud voice, proclaimed the prince and princess of Orange king and queen of England, charged all Englishmen to pay, from that moment, faith and true allegiance to the new sovereigns, and besought God, who had already wrought so signal a deliverance for our church and nation, to bless William and Mary with a long and happy reign.

Thus was consummated the English Revolution. When we compare it with those revolutions which have recently overthrown so many ancient governments, we cannot but be struck by its peculiar character. Why that character was so peculiar is sufficiently obvious, and yet seems not to have been always understood either by eulogists or by censors.

The continental revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries took place in countries where all trace of the limited monarchy of the middle ages had long been effaced. The right of the prince to make laws and to levy money had, during many generations, been undisputed. His throne was guarded by a great regular army. His administration could not, without extreme peril, be blamed even in the mildest terms. His subjects held their personal liberty by no other tenure than his pleasure. Not a single institution was left which had, within the memory of the oldest man, afforded efficient protection to the subject against the utmost excess of tyranny. Those great councils which had once curbed th regal power had sunk into oblivion. Their composition and their privileges were known only to antiquaries. We cannot wonder, therefore, that, when men who had been thus ruled succeeded in wresting supreme power from a government which they had long in secret hated, they should have been impatient to demolish and unable to construct, that they should have been fascinated by every specious novelty, that they should have proscribed every title, ceremony, and phrase associated with the old system, and that, turning away with disgust from their own national precedents and traditions, they should have sought for principles of government in the writings of theorists, or aped, with ignorant and ungraceful affectation, the patriots of Athens and Rome. As little can we wonder that the violent action of the revolutionary spirit should have been followed by reaction equally violent, and that confusion should speedily have engendered despotism sterner than that from which it had sprung.

Had we been in the same situation; had Strafford succeeded in his favourite scheme of Thorough; had he formed an army as numerous and as well disciplined as that which, a few years later, was formed by Cromwell; had a series of judicial decisions, similar to that which was pronounced by the Exchequer Chamber in the case of shipmoney, transferred to the crown the right of taxing the people; had the Star Chamber and the high commission continued to fine, mutilate, and imprison every man who dared to raise his voice against the government; had the press been as completely enslaved here as at Vienna or at Naples; had our kings gradually drawn to themselves the whole legislative power; had six generations of Englishmen passed away without a single session of parliament; and had we then at length risen up in some moment of wild excitement against our masters — what an outbreak would that have been! With what a crash, heard and felt to the farthest ends of the world, would the whole vast fabric of society have fallen! How many thousands of exiles, once the most prosperous and the most refined members of this great community, would have begged their bread in continental cities, or have sheltered their heads under huts of bark in the uncleared forests of America! How often should we have seen the pavement of London piled up in barricades, the houses dinted with bullets, the gutters foaming with blood! How many times should we have rushed wildly from extreme to extreme, sought refuge from anarchy in despotism, and been again driven by despotism into anarchy! How many years of blood and confusion would it have cost us to learn the very rudiments of political science! How many childish theories would have duped us! How many rude and ill poised constitutions should we have set up, only to see them tumble down! Happy would it have been for us if a sharp disci-

pline of half a century had sufficed to educate us into a capacity of enjoying true freedom.

These calamities our Revolution averted. It was a revolution strictly defensive, and had prescription and legitimacy on its side. Here, and here only, a limited monarchy of the thirteenth century had come down unimpaired to the seventeenth century. Our parliamentary institutions were in full vigour. The main principles of our government were excellent. They were not, indeed, formally and exactly set forth in a single written instrument; but they were to be found scattered over our ancient and noble statutes; and, what was of far greater moment, they had been engraven on the hearts of Englishmen during four hundred years. That, without the consent of the representatives of the nation, no legislative act could be passed, no tax imposed, no regular soldiery kept up, that no man could be imprisoned, even for a day, by the arbitrary will of the sovereign, that no tool of power could plead the royal command as a justification for violating any right of the humblest subject, were held, both by whigs and tories, to be fundamental laws of the realm. A realm of which these were the fundamental laws stood in no need of a new constitution.

But, though a new constitution was not needed, it was plain that changes were required. The misgovernment of the Stuarts, and the troubles which that misgovernment had produced, sufficiently proved that there was somewhere a defect in our polity; and that defect it was the duty of the convention to discover and to supply.

Some questions of great moment were still open to dispute. Our constitution had begun to exist in times when statesmen were not much accustomed to frame exact definitions. Anomalies, therefore, inconsistent with its principles and dangerous to its very existence, had sprung up almost imperceptibly, and, not having, during many years, caused any serious inconvenience, had gradually acquired the force of prescription. The remedy for these evils was to assert the rights of the people in such language as should terminate all controversy, and to declare that no precedent could justify any violation of those rights.

When this had been done it would be impossible for our rulers to misunderstand the law: but, unless something more were done, it was by no means improbable that they might violate it. Unhappily the church had long taught the nation that hereditary monarchy, alone among our institutions, was divine and inviolable; that the right of the house of commons to a share in the legislative power was a right merely human, but that the right of the king to the obedience of his people was from above; that the Great Charter was a statute which might be repealed by those who had made it, but that the rule which called the princes of the blood royal to the throne in order of succession was of celestial origin, and that any act of parliament inconsistent with that rule was a nullity.

It is evident that, in a society in which such superstitions prevail, constitutional freedom must ever be insecure. A power which is regarded merely as the ordinance of man cannot be an efficient check on a power which is regarded as the ordinance of God. It is vain to hope that laws, however excellent, will permanently restrain a king who, in his own opinion, and in that of a great part of his people, has an authority infinitely higher in kind than the authority which belongs to those laws. To deprive royalty of these mysterious attributes, and to establish the principle that kings reigned by a right in no respect differing from the right by which freeholders chose knights of the shire, or from the right by which judges granted writs of *habeas corpus*, was absolutely necessary to the security of our liberties.

Thus the convention had two great duties to perform. The first was to clear the fundamental laws of the realm from ambiguity. The second was to eradicate from the minds, both of the governors and of the governed, the false and pernicious notion that the royal prerogative was something more sublime and holy than those fundamental laws. The former object was attained by the solemn recital and claim with which the Declaration of Right commences; the latter by the resolution which pronounced the throne vacant, and invited William and Mary to fill it.

The change seems small. Not a single flower of the crown was touched. Not a single new right was given to the people. The whole English law, substantive and adjective, was, in the judgment of all the greatest lawyers, of Holt and Treby, of Maynard and Somers, exactly the same after the Revolution as before it. Some controverted points had been decided according to the sense of the best jurists; and there had been a slight deviation from the ordinary course of succession. This was all; and this was enough.


As our Revolution was a vindication of ancient rights, so it was conducted with strict attention to ancient formalities. In almost every word and act may be discerned a profound reverence for the past. The estates of the realm deliberated in the old halls and according to the old rules. Powle was conducted to his chair between his mover and his seconder with the accustomed forms. The sergeant with his mace brought up the messengers of the lords to the table of the commons; and the three obeisances were duly made. The conference was held with all the antique ceremonial. On one side of the table, in the Painted Chamber, the managers of the lords sat covered and robed in ermine and gold. The managers of the commons stood bareheaded on the other side. The speeches presented an almost ludicrous contrast to the revolutionary oratory of every other country. Both the English parties agreed in treating with solemn respect the ancient constitutional traditions of the state. The only question was, in what sense those traditions were to be understood. The assertors of liberty said not a word about the natural equality of men and the inalienable sovereignty of the people, about Harmodius or Timoleon, Brutus the elder or Brutus the younger. When they were told that, by the English law, the crown, at the moment of a demise, must descend to the next heir, they answered that, by the English law, a living man could have no heir. When they were told that there was no precedent for declaring the throne vacant, they produced from among the records in the Tower a roll of parchment, near three hundred years old, on which, in quaint characters and barbarous Latin, it was recorded that the estates of the realm had declared vacant the throne of a perfidious and tyrannical Plantagenet. When at length the dispute had been accommodated, the new sovereigns were proclaimed with the old pageantry. All the fantastic pomp of heraldry was there, Clarencieux and Norroy, Portcullis and Rouge Dragon, the trumpets, the banners, the grotesque coats embroidered with lions and lilies. The title King of France, assumed by the conqueror of Cressy, was not omitted in the royal style. To us, who have lived in the year 1848, it may seem almost an abuse of terms to call a proceeding, conducted with so much deliberation, with so much sobriety, and with such minute attention to prescriptive etiquette, by the terrible name of Revolution.


And yet this Revolution of all revolutions the least violent, has been of all revolutions the most beneficent. It finally decided the great question whether the popular element which had, ever since the age of Fitzwalter and De Montfort, been found in the English polity, should be destroyed by the monarchical element, or should be suffered to develope itself freely, and to become

dominant. The strife between the two principles had been long, fierce, and doubtful. It had lasted through four reigns. It had produced seditions, impeachments, rebellions, battles, sieges, proscriptions, judicial massacres. Sometimes liberty, sometimes royalty, had seemed to be on the point of perishing. During many years one half of the energy of England had been employed in counteracting the other half. The executive power and the legislative power had so effectually impeded each other that the state had been of no account in Europe. The king-at-arms, who proclaimed William and Mary before Whitehall Gate, did in truth announce that this great struggle was over; that there was entire union between the throne and the parliament; that England, long dependent and degraded, was again a power of the first rank; that the ancient laws by which the prerogative was bounded would thenceforth be held as sacred as the prerogative itself, and would be followed out to all their consequences; that the executive administration would be conducted in conformity with the sense of the representatives of the nation; and that no reform, which the two houses should, after mature deliberation, propose, would be obstinately withstood by the sovereign.

The Declaration of Right, though it made nothing law which had not been law before, contained the germ of the law which gave religious freedom to the dissenter, of the law which secured the independence of the judges, of the law which limited the duration of parliaments, of the law which placed the liberty of the press under the protection of juries, of the law which prohibited the slave trade, of the law which abolished the sacramental test, of the law which relieved the Roman Catholics from civil disabilities, of the law which reformed the representative system, of every good law which has been passed during a hundred and sixty years, of every good law which may hereafter, in the course of ages, be found necessary to promote the public weal, and to satisfy the demands of public opinion.

The highest eulogy which can be pronounced on the Revolution of 1688 is this, that it was our last revolution. Several generations have now passed away since any wise and patriotic Englishman has meditated resistance to the established government. In all honest and reflecting minds there is a conviction, daily strengthened by experience, that the means of effecting every improvement which the constitution requires may be found within the constitution itself.[b]





CHAPTER XI

WILLIAM AND MARY

[1689-1702 A.D.]

It is, indeed, difficult to conceive the full amount of the impetus given to English civilisation by the expulsion of the house of Stuart. Among the most immediate results, may be mentioned the limits that were set to the royal prerogative; the important steps that were taken towards religious toleration; the remarkable and permanent improvement in the administration of justice; the final abolition of a censorship over the press; and, what has not excited sufficient attention, the rapid growth of those great monetary interests by which, as we shall hereafter see, the prejudices of the superstitious classes have in no small degree been counterbalanced. These are the main characteristics of the reign of William III; a reign often aspersed, and little understood, but of which it may be truly said, that, taking its difficulties into due consideration, it is the most successful and the most splendid recorded in the history of any country.— BUCKLE.[b]

PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS: THE BILL OF RIGHTS

THE new reign was commenced (February 14th) with a proclamation confirming all Protestants in the offices which they held. The king then nominated the privy-council and appointed to the offices of state; in both cases selecting from the ranks of whigs and tories, with a preponderance however of the former. Danby was made president of the council; Halifax, privy-seal; Nottingham and Shrewsbury, secretaries of state. The treasury, admiralty, and chancery, were put into commission.

Judging it inexpedient, under the present circumstances of the country, to risk the experiment of a new election, the king and council resolved to convert the convention into a parliament. This was effected by the simple expedient of the king's going in state to the house of peers on the 18th, and

addressing both houses from the throne. A bill declaring the lords and commons assembled at Westminster to be the two houses of parliament was then passed, and the royal assent being given on the 23rd, the convention became a parliament. In this act a new oath to be taken on the first of March was substituted for the old ones of allegiance and supremacy. It was refused by the primate and seven of his suffragans; and among the temporal peers, by the duke of Newcastle, the earls of Litchfield, Exeter, Yarmouth, and Stafford, and the lords Griffin and Stawell. Hence the party of which they were the heads derived the name of nonjurors; their principle was a blind, stupid veneration for absolute power, and for the hereditary divine rights of princes — a principle, if followed out, utterly subversive of every kind of liberty.

The pernicious distinction between a king *de jure* and a king *de facto*, now first came into operation. It answers no purpose but to foster disloyalty and occasion rebellion. A Bill of Rights the same in substance with the Declaration of Right was passed. One of its provisions was, that all persons holding communion with the church of Rome, or marrying a papist, should be excluded from the crown and government, and that in such cases the people should be absolved from their allegiance, and the crown should descend to the next heir being a Protestant.

The settlement of the revenue was an important question. The courtiers maintained that the revenue settled on the late king for life came of course to the present king; but the commons could only be induced to grant it for one year. They readily granted a sum of £600,000 to remunerate the states for the expense they had been at; and on information of King James having landed in Ireland, they voted funds for an army and navy. *g*

William looked upon many unsettled questions with a wider range of view than his own council, or the grand council of the nation. He was confident in the justice and necessity of the objects for which he desired to have his hands strengthened. The parliament refused its confidence. The king desired to carry out the fullest principles of religious liberty that were consistent with the public safety. The parliament thought that there was a very strict limit even for toleration. And yet, out of these differences, resulted much practical good. The king wished to have ample means for maintaining the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, for the pacification of Scotland, for giving efficiency to the confederacy against the ambition of the French. The commons manifested a greater jealousy of entrusting the supplies to their deliverer than they had manifested towards their oppressor. There were immediate evil consequences. The Roman Catholic adherents of James devastated the Protestant settlements in Ireland; the standard of resistance was successfuly reared in Scotland; Louis threatened England with invasion, and was marching a great army upon Holland.

But the benefits of the jealousy of the commons are felt to this day. Those whigs who carried their confidence in the intentions of William to an extreme, were of opinion that the revenue which had been settled upon King James for life should revert to the sovereign who had taken his place. Some tories, who were adverse to the government, but were eager to secure power by a simulated confidence in the king, agreed in this view. The majority in parliament successfully resisted it. To abolish the hearth-money, or chimney-tax, an especial tax upon the poor, was a duty to which William was called by the earnest solicitations of the crowds who followed his march from Tor Bay to London. But he frankly said to parliament, "as in this his majesty doth consider the ease of the subject, so he doth not doubt but you will be careful of the support of the crown." The official biographer of James II sneers at

William's self-denial; "He wheedled them [the commons] with a remission of chimney-money, when he was well assured he should be no loser by his generosity, and that it would be only like throwing water into a dry pump to make it suck better below, and cast it out with more abundance above." This was not exactly the best mode of wheedling the rich country gentlemen by removing a tax from the cottage to put it in some shape upon the mansion. Yet the commons respected the motive of the king, and substituted less oppressive taxes. But they declined to grant the temporary revenue for the lives of the king and queen. The hereditary revenue they did not touch. Moreover they resolved that whatever sums they voted should be appropriated to particular services, according to estimates.



WILLIAM III
(1650–1702)

This principle, partially adhered to in the time of Charles II, but wholly disregarded by the parliament of his successor, has from the time of the revolution been the great security of the nation against the wanton and corrupt expenditure of the crown. Parliament may make lavish votes; but there must be a distinct vote in every case for the service of a particular department which renders the legislative power so really supreme in England; it is this which renders it impossible that an executive can subsist except in concord with the representatives of the people. England therefore owes a debt of gratitude to the parliament of the revolution, that they clung to a principle and established a practice which have never since been departed from. A temporary vote of credit is sometimes asked under extraordinary circumstances; but the constitutional right of appropriation, always secured in the express words of a grant of supply, is the general rule which no minister would dare to ask the representatives of the people to forego.

But if the parliament of William and Mary is to be commended for their jealousy of the king in the matter of revenue, we may doubt if they were equally wise in halting far short of his known wishes in the great questions of religious liberty and religious union. If the king's abstract sense of what was due to the consciences of men could have been carried out, England might have been saved from a century and a quarter of bitter animosities; and the Church of England might have been more secure and more influential, than during the long period when the Test Act remained in force against Protestants, and Roman Catholics were not only ineligible to civil offices, but

had to undergo what we now justly regard as persecution. But in this, as in all other cases, no reform can be permanent which is premature.[c]

The coronation took place on the 11th of April; the bishop of London officiating in place of the nonjuring primate. Several titles and honours had previously been conferred. The marquis of Winchester was made duke of Bolton; lords Mordaunt and Churchill, earls of Monmouth and Marlborough; Henry Sidney, Viscount Sidney; the king's Dutch favourite Bentinck, earl of Portland, etc. Shortly after (24th), the earl of Danby was created marquis of Carmarthen. The celebrated Dr. Burnet was also rewarded for his exertions in the cause of civil and religious liberty by being raised to the see of Salisbury. The judicial bench was purified and filled with men of sound constitutional principles; Holt, Pollexfen, and Atkins being placed at the head of the three law-courts: Treby was made attorney- and Somers solicitor-general. Somers was the son of a highly respectable attorney at Worcester, and having graduated at Oxford he went to the bar. He distinguished himself as one of the counsel for the seven bishops, and he was one of the managers in the conference between the two houses at the time of the Revolution. He was henceforth regarded as a leader of the whig party.

THE ACT OF TOLERATION

It was the earnest wish of the king and of the more liberal statesmen, to reward the dissenters for their meritorious conduct during the late crisis by removing all disqualifications under which they laboured. It was first attempted to have the sacramental test omitted in the new oaths; but that failing, a bill was brought in to exempt them from the penalties of certain laws. This, named the Act of Toleration, was passed: though the Catholics were not included in it, they felt the benefit of it, and William always treated them with lenity. A bill of comprehension passed the lords, but miscarried in the commons. The attainders of Lord Russell, Algernon Sidney, Alderman Cornish, and Mrs. Lisle, were reversed. Johnson's sentence was annulled, and he received 1,000*l.* and a pension. Among those rewarded at this time was the notorious Titus Oates.

William's main object, as we have seen, was to engage England in the great confederacy lately formed against the French king. As Louis was now openly assisting King James, the commons presented an address (April 26th) assuring the king of their support in case he should think fit to engage in the war with France. William required no more; he declared war without delay (May 7th).

We must now take a view of the state of affairs in Scotland and Ireland at this time [leaving the reader to find fuller details in the separate histories of those countries]. As Scotland had been the victim of a civil and religious despotism such as the Stuarts had never dared to exercise in England, the friends of William were necessarily the majority in that country. After the flight of James, such of the Scottish nobility and gentry as were in London presented an address to the prince, vesting in him the administration and the revenue, and requesting him to call a convention of the states of Scotland. With this request he of course complied; and when the convention met (March 14th), the whigs had a decided majority. It was voted, that King James "had forfaulted [forfeited] the right of the crown, and the throne was become vacant." On the 11th of April William and Mary were proclaimed king and queen of Scotland, and three deputies were sent to London to admin-

ister to them the coronation-oath. The convention was converted into a parliament as in England.

The adherents of the late king, foiled in the convention, resolved to appeal to force; the duke of Gordon, a Catholic, refused to surrender the castle of Edinburgh, of which he was governor; and Graham of Claverhouse (later Viscount Dundee), the ruthless persecutor of the Cameronians, fired with the idea of emulating the fame of Montrose, quitted Edinburgh with a party of fifty horse and directed his course toward the Highlands. General Mackay, who had been sent with five regiments from England, was despatched in pursuit of him. [At the battle of Killiecrankie, May 26th, Dundee received a mortal wound.] There was no one to take his place; the clans gradually laid down their arms and took advantage of the pardon offered by King William. The duke of Gordon also submitted and delivered up the castle of Edinburgh (June 13th), and the cause of James became hopeless in Scotland. The abolition of Episcopacy and the re-establishment of Presbytery took place soon after; and thus finally terminated the struggle between the crown and the people of Scotland on the subject of religion.

THE TWO ENGLISH KINGS IN IRELAND (1689–1690 A.D.)

It was different in Ireland, where the whole power of the state was in the hands of the Catholics. Tyrconnel had at first signified an inclination to submit to William, who had sent over General Hamilton, one of the officers of James's army, with proposals to him; but Hamilton proved a traitor and advised against submission; and Tyrconnel, whose only object had been to gain time, had already sent to assure James of his fidelity. He also disarmed the Protestants in Dublin, and he augmented his Catholic army. It has always been the fate of the Irish Protestants to have their interests postponed to those of party in England; and they were now neglected by William. It is said by some, that Halifax suggested this course to him, as if Ireland submitted he would have no pretext for keeping up an army, on which his retention of England depended; but in truth he does not seem to have had an army to send at that time; he could not rely on the English troops, and he therefore could not venture to part with the foreigners. In the month of March two Scottish regiments actually mutinied, and having disarmed some of their officers, and seized the money provided for their pay, set out for their own country. This gave occasion for passing the first Mutiny Bill, which has ever since been annually renewed. *g*

Hallam thus characterises the importance of the Mutiny Bill: "The annual assembly of parliament was rendered necessary, in the first place, by the strict appropriation of the revenue according to votes of supply. It was secured, next, by passing the Mutiny Bill, under which the army is held together, and subjected to military discipline, for a short term, seldom or never exceeding twelve months. These are the two effectual securities against military power: that no pay can be issued to the troops without a previous authorisation by the commons in a committee of supply, and by both houses in an act of appropriation; and that no officer or soldier can be punished for disobedience, nor any court-martial held, without the annual re-enactment of the Mutiny Bill. Thus it is strictly true that, if the king were not to summon parliament every year, his army would cease to have a legal existence; and the refusal of either house to concur in the Mutiny Bill would at once wrest the sword out of his grasp. By the Bill of Rights it is declared unlawful to keep any forces in time of peace without consent of parliament. This

consent, by an invariable and wholesome usage, is given only from year to year: and its necessity may be considered perhaps the most powerful of those causes which have transferred so much even of the executive power into the management of the two houses of parliament." [d]

James embraced a resolution worthy of a sovereign. Having obtained from Louis a supply of arms, ammunition and money, with some officers, and collected about twelve hundred of his own subjects, he hastened to Brest, and embarking in a French fleet of twenty-one sail, proceeded to Ireland. He landed in safety at Kinsale (March 12th). At Cork he was met by Tyrconnel, who gave him an account of the state of affairs. He described the army as numerous, but ill-armed; and the Protestants as being in possession of Ulster alone. On the 24th the king made his solemn entrance into Dublin amid the acclamations of the Catholics. He forthwith removed all the Protestant members of the council. He issued proclamations; by one raising the value of the current coin; by another summoning a parliament for the 7th of May; and having created Tyrconnel a duke, he set out for his army in the north.

The only towns that offered resistance were Londonderry and Enniskillen. On July 31st the besieging army retired from Londonderry, having lost between eight and nine thousand men before the heroic town. The besieged had lost three thousand — nearly the half of their original number. The Enniskilleners showed equal courage, and defeated the papists wherever they encountered them.

The houses of parliament which met in Dublin were filled with Catholic members, the Protestants not exceeding half a dozen in either house. James, in his speech, made his usual parade of respect for the rights of conscience; and in a subsequent declaration he expatiated on his regard and favour to his Protestant subjects. One of his earliest measures, however, was to give his assent to an act for robbing them of their properties. The bill passed; in vain the purchasers under the Act of Settlement petitioned the king; he replied, "that he would not do evil that good might come of it"; yet he gave his assent to the bill. Even the Protestant worship was suppressed, for an order was issued forbidding more than five Protestants to meet together for any purpose on pain of death.

While James was thus exemplifying his notions of religious liberty, William was preparing the means of recovering Ireland. A force consisting of eighteen regiments of foot and five of horse having been levied, the command was given to Duke Schomberg. But various delays occurred, and it was late in the summer (August 13th) when the duke landed at Bangor in Down, with a body of ten thousand men, leaving the remainder to follow. He invested Carrickfergus, which surrendered after a siege of a few days. The enemy continually retired before him, and he reached Dundalk on his way to Dublin. At length, after losing one-half of his men by disease, Schomberg placed his army in winter-quarters in the northern towns.

This year was marked by only one naval engagement. Louis had sent a squadron under Count Chateau-Renault, to convoy some transports with supplies to Ireland. Herbert, who had been sent to intercept them, having been driven by stress of weather into Milford haven, they got safe into Bantry Bay. When Herbert found them there (May 1st), he stood in to attack them though he was much inferior in force. The French weighed and stood out; Herbert tried in vain to get the weather-gauge, and after a running fight of some hours he bore away, leaving the honour of the day to the French. On his return to Portsmouth, as the crews were discontented with their want of success, King William came down, dined aboard the admiral's ship, knighted

captains Ashby and Shovel, and gave the men ten shillings each. Herbert was soon after created earl of Torrington.

William meantime, aware of the importance of reducing Ireland, had resolved to conduct the war there in person. He landed at Carrickfergus (June 14th), and declaring that "he was not come to let the grass grow under his feet," summoned all his troops to his standard. On reviewing them at Loughbrickland, he found himself at the head of thirty-six thousand effective men. He moved southwards without delay: James, who had left Dublin for his army (16th), advanced to Dundalk, but not thinking that post tenable, he fell back and took a position near Oldbridge, on the right bank of the river Boyne, near Drogheda, with a bog on his left and the pass of Duleek in his rear. His army is said to have numbered thirty-three thousand men. On the morning of the last day of June the English army reached the Boyne. William rode out to reconnoitre the enemy; he was recognised, and two pieces of cannon were secretly planted behind a hedge opposite an eminence where he had sat down to rest. As he was mounting his horse, they were fired, and one of the balls having touched the bank of the river, rose and grazed his right shoulder, tearing his coat and flesh. His attendants gathered round him, a cry of joy rose in the Irish camp, the report of his death flew to Dublin, and thence to Paris, where the firing of cannon and lighting of bonfires testified the exultation of Louis.

The armies cannonaded each other during the remainder of the day. At nine o'clock at night William held a council, and gave his orders for the battle next day; at twelve he rode by torchlight through the camp; the word given was "Westminster"; each soldier was directed to wear a green bough in his hat, as the enemy was observed to wear white paper. The army was to pass the river in three divisions; the right, led by young Schomberg and General Douglas, at the ford of Slane; the centre, under Schomberg himself, in front of the camp; and the left, under the king, lower down toward Drogheda.

Early next morning (Tuesday, July 1st) the right division set out for Slane, where it forced the passage, and passing the bog, drove off the troops opposed to it. The centre crossed unopposed; on the further bank they met a vigorous resistance, but they finally forced the enemy to fall back to the village of Donor, where James stood, a spectator of the battle. William meantime had crossed at the head of his cavalry; the Irish horse, led by Hamilton, fought gallantly, but they were broken at length, and their commander made a prisoner.[1] Lausun now urged James to remain no longer, but to retire with all speed to Dublin before he was surrounded. He forthwith quitted the field; his army then poured through the pass of Duleek, and forming on the other side, retreated in good order. Their loss had been fifteen hundred men, that of the victors was only a third of that number, among whom were Duke Schomberg, and Walker, the brave governor of Derry.*g*

Macaulay has this comment on the flight of James II: "Whether James had owed his early reputation for valour to accident and flattery, or whether, as he advanced in life, his character underwent a change, may be doubted. But it is certain that, in his youth, he was generally believed to possess, not merely that average measure of fortitude which qualifies a soldier to go through a campaign without disgrace, but that high and serene intrepidity which is

[1] William asked Hamilton, the traitorous messenger to Tyrconnel, if he thought the Irish would fight any more. "Upon my honour," said he, "I believe they will; for they have yet a good body of horse." "Honour!" said William: "your honour!" This Hamilton is said to be the author of "The Memoirs of the Count de Gramont."

the virtue of great commanders. It is equally certain that, in his later years, he repeatedly, at conjunctures such as have often inspired timorous and delicate women with heroic courage, showed a pusillanimous anxiety about his personal safety. Of the most powerful motives which can induce human beings to encounter peril none was wanting to him on the day of the Boyne. The eyes of his contemporaries and of posterity, of friends devoted to his cause, and of enemies eager to witness his humiliation were fixed upon him. He had, in his own opinion, sacred rights to maintain and cruel wrongs to revenge. He was a king come to fight for three kingdoms. He was a father come to fight for the birthright of his child. He was a zealous Roman Catholic, come to fight in his 'holiest of crusades.' If all this was not enough, he saw, from the secure position which he occupied on the height of Donor, a sight which, it might have been thought, would have roused the most torpid of mankind to emulation. He saw William, his rival, weak, sickly, wounded, swimming the river, struggling through the mud, leading the charge, stopping the flight, grasping the sword with the left hand, managing the bridle with a bandaged arm. But none of these things moved that sluggish and ignoble nature. He watched, from a safe distance, the beginning of the battle on which his fate and the fate of his race depended. When it became clear that the day was going against Ireland, he was seized with an apprehension that his flight might be intercepted, and galloped towards Dublin."[e] James stopped only one night in Dublin; he fled to Duncannon, where, finding a French vessel, he got on board and landed safely at Brest (10th).

William reached Dublin on the third day after his victory (4th). He issued a proclamation promising pardon to all the inferior people engaged in the war, but excepting the leaders. He then advanced southwards and reduced Waterford; but hearing of a victory gained by the French fleet and a descent on the coast of England, he returned to Dublin, deeming his presence necessary in England. Finding, however, the danger not to be so great as he had apprehended, he resolved to remain and finish the war. He advanced, and laid siege to Limerick (August 9th), but his artillery was intercepted on its way from Dublin and destroyed by General Sarsfield, and an attempt to storm (27th) having failed with great loss, he raised the siege and retiring to Waterford embarked for England (September 5th), leaving the command with Count Solms and General Ginkel.

The earl of Marlborough [formerly John Churchill[1]], who had commanded the British troops in the Netherlands this year, having proposed the reduction of Cork and Kinsale, landed at the former place (21st) with five thousand men, and being joined by the prince of Wurtemburg with an equal number of his Danes, he in the space of twenty-three days obliged both places to surrender. The French troops in Ireland now returned home, leaving the Irish to their fate.

We now return to England to notice the state of affairs there for the last twelvemonth.

PARLIAMENT AND THE KING: THE SETTLEMENT OF THE REVENUE

The parliament which had been prorogued having met again (October 19th), the king in his speech pressed on them the necessity of a supply for

[1 The new commander gave the first specimen on a great scale of the genius which afterwards immortalised his name. In thirty days he secured the ports of embarkation where the French had established their communications; and with Cork and Kinsale in his hands he rendered the position of Louis' troops untenable, and kept the native army in a half famished condition in the wasted province of Ulster.— WHITE.]

carrying on the war; he also strongly urged the passing of a bill of indemnity. They readily voted a supply of two millions; but the whigs, with the natural jealousy of power, wishing to keep the lash over the heads of their rivals the tories, threw every possible obstruction in the way of the indemnity; impeachments were menaced against those who had turned papists; a committee was appointed to inquire who were the advisers, etc., in the "murders" of Russell, Sidney, and others; and as Halifax, who had been then in the ministry, saw that he was aimed at, he retired from office and joined the tories. A bill was brought in for restoring corporations, by a clause of which all who had acted or concurred in the surrender of charters were to be excluded from office for seven years. As there could be no doubt of the object of this clause, the tories put forth their whole strength, and having gained the court to their side, the clause was defeated in the commons and the bill itself was lost in the lords.

The refusal of the whigs to grant him a revenue for life had greatly alienated the mind of the king from them. He was in fact so disgusted with the ungenerous treatment, as he conceived it, that he met with, that he seriously meditated a return to Holland, leaving the queen to reign in England. From this he was diverted by the entreaties of Carmarthen and Shrewsbury; and the tories having promised him lavish supplies if he would dissolve the parliament, he resolved on that measure, and on conducting the Irish war in person. He therefore prorogued the parliament (January 27th, 1690), and a few days after (February 6th), he issued a proclamation dissolving it, and summoning a new one to meet on March 20th.

In the new house of commons the tories had the preponderance; but the whigs were notwithstanding very formidable. This appeared in the settlement of the revenue, as, though the hereditary excise was given to the king for life, the customs were granted only for four years. The great struggle of parties took place on a bill brought into the lords by the whigs for recognising their majesties as the "rightful and lawful" sovereigns of these realms, and declaring all the acts of the Convention Parliament to be good and valid. This was obviously contrary to the principles and professions of the tories; they caused the words "rightful and lawful" to be omitted as superfluous, and they would only consent that the laws of the late parliament should be valid for the time to come. The bill was committed, but the declaratory clause was lost on the report. A vigorous protest of some of the leading whigs caused it to be restored. The tories now protested in their turn, but the whigs caused the protest to be expunged from the journals. The bill passed the commons without opposition, as the influence of the crown was exerted in its favour. As the tories were thus instrumental in putting the last hand to the settlement of the crown, they had no excuse for ever again opposing it.

A bill requiring every person holding any office to "abjure" the late king and his title was rejected by the commons at the express desire of the king. An act was passed for investing the queen with the administration during the absence of the king, and one for reversing the judgment against the city of London, and finally the Bill of Indemnity, which contained the names of thirty excepted persons, none of whom however were ever molested in consequence of it. The session was then closed (May 21st), and the king soon after set out for Ireland.

The situation of the queen was by no means an easy one. Her mind was distracted with anxiety for the fate of both her father and her husband in Ireland; the "Jacobites," as the adherents of James were now called, were

[1690 A.D.]

preparing an insurrection in England and Scotland, and the French were ready to assist them; she had to hold the balance between the two parties in her cabinet. Her difficulties, however, gave occasion to the display of the nobler parts of her character, and she acquired by her firmness, mildness, and prudence, the applause of all.[g]

THE NAVAL DEFEAT AT BEACHY HEAD (1690 A.D.)

There was another battle being fought on the southeastern coast of England, at the very hour when the shot that was fired across the Boyne had very nearly settled the question whether the revolution of 1688 should be a starting-point in a race of honour and prosperity, or a broken trophy of one brief and useless effort for liberty and the rights of conscience. The departure of William for Ireland was the signal for an attack upon the English coasts, which was to be accompanied with an insurrection of the jacobites. A fleet sailed from Brest under the count de Tourville. The English fleet was in the Downs, under the command of the earl of Torrington [formerly Admiral Herbert]. He sailed to the back of the Isle of Wight, and was there joined by a squadron of Dutch vessels under a skilful commander, Evertsen. Queen Mary and her council were aware that the French fleet had left Brest. It soon became known that the English admiral had quitted his position off St. Helen's, and had sailed for the straits of Dover upon the approach of the French. The council determined to send Torrington positive orders to fight. The French fleet was superior in vessels and guns to the combined English and Dutch fleet; but the inequality was not so great that a man of the old stamp of Blake would have feared to risk a battle.

Torrington did something even worse than hesitate to fight. He let the brunt of the conflict fall upon the Dutch. He put Evertsen in the van, and brought very few of his own squadron into action. The Dutch fought with indomitable courage and obstinacy, but were at length compelled to draw off. The gazers from the high downs of Beachy Head witnessed the shameful flight of a British admiral to seek the safety of the Thames. When the news came to London that Torrington had left the Channel to a triumphant enemy — when an invasion was imminent, for England was without regular troops — when plotters were all around, and arrests of men of rank, even of Clarendon, the queen's kinsman, were taking place — then, indeed, there was an hour almost of despair such as was felt when De Ruyter sailed up the Medway.

But the very humiliation roused the spirit of the people. The queen was universally beloved; and, although studiously avoiding, when the king was at hand, any interference in public affairs, she took at once a kingly part in this great crisis. "The queen balanced all things with an extraordinary temper," writes Burnet.[o] She sent for the lord mayor of London; and inquired what the citizens would do, should the enemy effect a landing. The lord mayor returned to the queen with an offer of a hundred thousand pounds; of nine thousand men of the city trainbands, ready instantly to march wherever ordered; and a proposal for the lieutenancy to provide and maintain six additional regiments of foot; and of the mayor, aldermen, and common council to raise a regiment of horse, and a thousand dragoons, by voluntary contributions. The same spirit was manifested throughout the land. The people might grumble against the Dutch; they might feel some commiseration for an exiled prince; they might be divided about the questions of church government; they might complain that the Revolution had brought them increased taxation: but they would have no government thrust upon them by the

French king. They would not undo the work of their own hands. The gloom for the disaster of Beachy Head was quickly forgotten. On July 4th a messenger had brought letters to the queen which told that a great victory had been won in Ireland, and that the king was safe.[c]

JACOBITE PLOTS TO RESTORE JAMES (1691 A.D.)

Torrington having brought his fleet into the Thames, repaired to London, where he was deprived of his command and committed to the Tower. He was afterwards tried by a court-martial and acquitted, but he was never again employed.

As an invasion was apprehended, the queen issued commissions for raising troops, directed a camp to be formed at Tor Bay, and caused several suspected persons to be arrested. But the French, after burning the fishing-village of Teignmouth, returned to Brest, and the news of the victory at the Boyne soon dispelled all alarm.

On the return of the king, the greatest harmony prevailed between him and his parliament. They granted four millions for the war, and William having put an end to the session, embarked at Gravesend (January 16th, 1691) in order to be present at a congress of the allies at the Hague. All there acceded to his wishes, it being unanimously resolved to prosecute the war with vigour. He stayed a few weeks in Holland and then returned to England (April 13th).

A conspiracy in favour of James had been discovered before the king left England. About the end of December, a boat-owner of Barking in Essex, having informed Lord Carmarthen that one of his boats had been engaged to convey some persons to France, it was boarded at Gravesend, and Lord Preston, Mr. Ashton, a servant of the late queen, and a Mr. Elliot, were found in it. A parcel of papers of a suspicious nature was taken on the person of Ashton. Preston and Ashton were both tried and found guilty; the latter was executed; he died a Protestant. Preston[1] obtained a pardon by revealing all he knew. Lord Clarendon was committed to the Tower; Bishop Turner, Lord Preston's brother Graham, and Penn the Quaker, being implicated, went out of the way.

It was now beyond doubt that there was a very extensive conspiracy organised for bringing back the late king. Untaught by the experience of his whole reign, and of his late doings in Ireland, men were so infatuated as to suppose that he could be content to reign the king of a Protestant people. Preston and Ashton were to propose to him to make the majority of his council even in France, Protestant; to assure him that though he might live a Catholic, he must reign as a Protestant, giving all offices of state to those of this religion, and seeking nothing but liberty of conscience for his own. They were also to require that the French force, which they wished him to bring over, should be so moderate as to give no alarm for the liberties of the nation. A wilder project than this never was conceived, yet in a memorandum of Lord Preston's

[1 In connection with Somers' honorable conduct of Preston's trial Lord Campbell[h] says: "Macaulay[e] justly observes, that the earlier volumes of the State Trials are the most frightful record of baseness and depravity in the world. Our hatred is altogether turned away from the crimes and the criminals, and directed against the law and its ministers. We see villanies as black as ever were imputed to any prisoner, at any bar, daily committed on the bench and in the jury box. It is difficult to believe, that little more than three years had elapsed between the prosecution of the Seven Bishops and the prosecution of Lord Preston, as we seem suddenly transferred to another age, or to a distant country, where the principles of justice were held sacred instead of being violated and despised."]

were found the names of Shrewsbury, Monmouth, Devonshire, and other whig lords, as if they were participators in it. It is certain that Halifax, Godolphin, and Marlborough were at this time in communication with the jacobite agents, though the second was actually at the head of the treasury, and the last had lately done James all the injury he could in Ireland.

But Marlborough did not find his ambition sufficiently gratified, and he thought it probable that James might be restored. He resolved in that case to secure his pardon, and therefore pretending the greatest remorse for his base ingratitude, he gave an exact account of the numbers and condition of the army and navy, and of the plans of King William as far as he knew them; he promised, if the king desired it, to bring over the troops that were in Flanders, but thought it better that he and the rest of the king's friends in parliament should strive to have the foreign troops sent away, in which case the English should be brought back, and the king's restoration might then be easily effected.

William now resolved to keep measures no longer with the nonjuring prelates, for they had refused to perform their functions, even if excused from their oaths. He therefore proceeded to fill up the vacant sees. Tillotson (a name with which that of Sancroft will ill bear comparison) was selected for Canterbury. The names of Cumberland, Fowler, Patrick, Beveridge, and others, do equal honour to the discernment of the king and his advisers. As Sancroft and his brethren gave the most decisive proof of their sincerity, we must respect them as honest men; but at the same time it is difficult not to feel contempt for those who were willing to sacrifice the civil (and consequently the religious) liberties of their country on the altar of their false god, passive obedience. If too, as they maintained, this was the principle of Christianity, that perfect law of liberty, they should have submitted with the meekness of martyrs, and not have poured through the press, from the pens of themselves and their adherents, a continued stream of virulent pamphlets against their opponents.

On May 2nd King William, attended among others by the earl of Marlborough, sailed for Holland in order to take the field in person against the French. The war was carried on simultaneously in Flanders, on the Rhine, in Savoy, and Piedmont, but no battle of any note signalised this campaign. At the end of it William returned to England (October 19th), where the cheering intelligence of the complete reduction of Ireland awaited him. Owing to the want of the needful supplies, Ginkel had not been able to take the field till the month of June. He then advanced to lay siege to Athlone, which was soon taken.

On the 10th Ginkel marched from Athlone to engage the Irish army. He found them on the 12th posted on Kilcommoden Hill, where he defeated them with great loss.

Galway surrendered (on the 20th) on honourable terms, and Ginkel now prepared to end the war by the reduction of Limerick, the last stronghold of the Irish. On his coming before the town (August 25th) the batteries were opened in the usual manner. The garrison, on September 22nd, proposed a cessation, in order to adjust the terms of surrender. The terms which they required were extravagant; but Ginkel, who knew how much it was for his master's interest to have the war concluded, agreed to give very favourable ones. The Irish were to exercise their religion as in the time of Charles II; all included in the capitulation were to enjoy their estates and follow their professions as in the same reign; their gentry were to have the use of arms, and no oaths were to be required but that of allegiance; all persons wishing

to retire to the Continent should be conveyed thither, with their families and effects, at the expense of the government. These articles were drawn up and signed (October 3rd), and the war in Ireland, after having inflicted three years of calamity on the country, was at length terminated. Sarsfield and about twelve thousand men passed over to France, and were taken into the pay of the French monarch.[g]

For the breaking of the agreements which led to the calling of Limerick "the city of the violated treaty," we refer the reader to our history of Ireland. Green[i] has characterised the departure of Sarsfield and the aftermath of the conquest with scathing words. He implies that the man did well to go into exile rather than remain in a land that had lost all hope of national freedom. He pictures the women as crying out in despair over the departure of their husbands and brothers. The silence that then settled down upon Ireland betokened, he urges, not contentment, but the depths of despair. He declares that "the most terrible legal tyranny under which a nation has ever groaned avenged the rising under Tyrconnel"; and he quotes with approval the bitter words of Swift that the conquered people became "hewers of wood and drawers of water"—abject menials in the hands of their conquerors. Not until about the times of the French revolution was Ireland again to be a menace to the peace and development of England.[a]

A barbarous deed enacted in the Highlands of Scotland opens the occurrences of the following year (1692). An order had been issued for the Highlanders to submit and take the oath of allegiance before the 1st of January. The chiefs all obeyed; the last was MacDonald of Glencoe, and the snows and other impediments prevented him from reaching Inverary, the county-town, till the day was past. The sheriffs, however, administered the oath, and certified the cause of delay. But the earl of Breadalbane was MacDonald's bitter enemy, and the Dalrymples of Stair, the president and secretary, thirsted for blood. Both the oath and certificate were suppressed, and William was assured that Glencoe was the great obstacle to the pacification of the Highlands. An order, countersigned by the king, was obtained "to extirpate that sect of thieves," and Dalrymple forthwith wrote to the commander-in-chief ample directions how to perpetrate the massacre in the most barbarous manner.

The houses were all burned to the ground, the cattle driven off or destroyed, the women and children stripped naked, and left to perish in the snow [as described in detail in the history of Scotland].

Certainly the great offenders here were those two detestable men, Breadalbane and Dalrymple, but the king himself was not guiltless; he should have inquired more accurately before he signed such an order. Judging, however, by his general character, there can be little doubt that he was deceived, and that he thought he was only sanctioning a wholesome act of severity. Political necessity will perhaps account for, though not justify, his not punishing the authors of the massacre. A great outcry at this deed was raised all over Europe by James and his adherents, which certainly came with a good grace from the party which had to boast of Jeffrey's campaign, and the torturings and massacres of the Cameronians!

JAMES ISSUES A DECLARATION (1692 A.D.)

Early in the spring (March 5th, 1692) the king returned to Holland to prepare for the ensuing campaign. The exiled monarch meantime had made his arrangements for the invasion of England. The jacobites and Catholics

secretly enlisted men and formed regiments; the princess Anne had lately written to implore her father's forgiveness, which he regarded as a proof of the inclination of the church-party; Marlborough continued to give him assurances of his fidelity; and even Russell, out of pride and pique, became a traitor to the cause of the revolution. Louis gave James some troops, which, with the regiments from Ireland and the Scotch and English exiles, forming a force of from fifteen to twenty thousand men, were encamped at La Hogue, where a large fleet was assembled to convey them to England. At the same time James issued a declaration, offering pardon and indemnity to his subjects (with, however, a long list of exceptions), and promising to protect the church.*g*

MACAULAY'S ACCOUNT OF THE BATTLE OF LA HOGUE (1692 A.D.)

It seems strange that even James should have chosen, at such a conjuncture, to proclaim to the world that the men whom his people most abhorred were the men whom he most delighted to honour. Still more injurious to his interests was the Declaration in which he announced his intentions to his subjects. Of all the state papers which were put forth even by him it was the most elaborately and ostentatiously injudicious. Not a word was to be found indicating that three years of banishment had made the king wiser, that he had repented of a single error, that he took to himself even the smallest part of the blame of that revolution which had dethroned him, or that he purposed to follow a course in any respect differing from that which had already been fatal to him. All the charges which had been brought against him he pronounced to be utterly unfounded. Wicked men had put forth calumnies. Weak men had believed those calumnies. He alone had been faultless. He held out no hope that he would consent to any restriction of that vast dispensing power to which he had formerly laid claim, that he would not again, in defiance of the plainest statutes, fill the privy council, the bench of justice, the public offices, the army, the navy, with papists, that he would not re-establish the high commission, that he would not appoint a new set of regulators to remodel all the constituent bodies of the kingdom. He did indeed condescend to say that he would maintain the legal rights of the Church of England: but he had said this before; and all men knew what those words meant in his mouth. Instead of assuring his people of his forgiveness, he menaced them with a proscription more terrible than any which our island had ever seen. He published a list of persons who had no mercy to expect. Among these were Ormonde, Carmarthen, Nottingham, Tillotson, and Burnet. After the roll of those who were doomed to death by name, came a series of categories. First stood all the crowd of rustics who had been rude to his majesty when he was stopped at Sheerness in his flight. These poor ignorant wretches, some hundreds in number, were reserved for another bloody circuit. Then came all persons who had in any manner borne a part in the punishment of any jacobite conspirator; judges, counsel, witnesses, grand jurymen, petty jurymen, sheriffs and under-sheriffs, constables and turnkeys, in short, all the ministers of justice from Holt down to Ketch. Then vengeance was denounced against all spies and all informers who had divulged to the usurpers the designs of the court of Saint Germain. All justices of the peace who should not declare for their rightful sovereign the moment that they heard of his landing, all gaolers who should not instantly set political prisoners at liberty, were to be left to the extreme rigour of the law. No exception was made in favour of a justice or of a gaoler who might be within

a hundred yards of one of William's regiments, and a hundred miles from the nearest place where there was a single jacobite in arms. Of general amnesty he said not a word. The offenders, hundreds of thousands in number, were merely informed that their fate should be decided in parliament.

The agents of James speedily dispersed his Declaration over every part of the kingdom, and by doing so rendered a great service to William. The general cry was that the banished oppressor had at least given Englishmen fair warning, and that, if, after such a warning, they welcomed him home, they would have no pretence for complaining, though every county town should be polluted by an assize resembling that which Jeffreys had held at Taunton. That some hundreds of people — the jacobites put the number so low as five hundred — were to be hanged without mercy was certain; and nobody who had concurred in the revolution, nobody who had fought for the new government by sea or land, no soldier who had borne a part in the conquest of Ireland, no Devonshire ploughman or Cornish miner who had taken arms to defend his wife and children against Tourville, could be certain that he should not be hanged.

The queen and her ministers, instead of attempting to suppress James's manifesto, very wisely reprinted it, and sent it forth licensed by the secretary of state, and interspersed with remarks by a shrewd and severe commentator. It was refuted in many keen pamphlets; it was turned into doggerel rhymes; and it was left undefended even by the boldest and most acrimonious libellers among the nonjurors.

No man read the Declaration with more surprise and anger than Russell. Bad as he was, he was much under the influence of two feelings, which, though they cannot be called virtuous, have some affinity to virtue, and are respectable when compared with mere selfish cupidity. Professional spirit and party spirit were strong in him. He might be false to his country, but not to his flag; and, even in becoming a jacobite, he had not ceased to be a whig. The near prospect of an invasion, and the Declaration in which Englishmen were plainly told what they had to expect if that invasion should be successful, produced, it should seem, a sudden and entire change in Russell's feelings; and that change he distinctly avowed. "I wish," he said to Lloyd, "to serve King James. The thing might be done, if it were not his own fault. But he takes the wrong way with us. Do not think that I will let the French triumph over us in our own sea. Understand this, that if I meet them I fight them, aye, though his majesty himself should be on board."

This conversation was truly reported to James; but it does not appear to have alarmed him. He was, indeed, possessed with a belief that Russell, even if willing, would not be able to induce the officers and sailors of the English navy to fight against their old king, who was also their old admiral.

THE CONFEDERATE FLEET

The hopes which James felt, he and his favourite Melfort succeeded in imparting to Louis and to Louis' ministers. But for those hopes, indeed, it is probable that all thoughts of invading England in the course of that year would have been laid aside. For the extensive plan which had been formed in the winter had, in the course of the spring, been disconcerted by a succession of accidents such as are beyond the control of human wisdom. The time fixed for the assembling of all the maritime forces of France at Ushant had long elapsed; and not a single sail had appeared at the place of rendezvous. The Atlantic squadron was still detained by bad weather in the port of Brest.

1692 A.D.]

The Mediterranean squadron, opposed by a strong west wind, was vainly struggling to pass the pillars of Hercules. Two fine vessels had gone to pieces on the rocks of Ceuta.

Meanwhile the admiralties of the allied powers had been active. Before the end of April the English fleet was ready to sail. William had been hastening the maritime preparations of the United Provinces; and his exertions had been successful. The whole force of the confederate powers was assembled at Saint Helen's in the second week of May, more than ninety sail of the line, manned by between thirty and forty thousand of the finest seamen of the two great maritime nations.

No mightier armament had ever appeared in the British Channel. There was little reason for apprehending that such a force could be defeated in a fair conflict. Nevertheless there was great uneasiness in London. It was known that there was a jacobite party in the navy. Alarming rumours had worked their way round from France. It was said that the enemy reckoned on the co-operation of some of those officers on whose fidelity, in this crisis, the safety of the state might depend. Russell, as far as can now be discovered, was still unsuspected. But others, who were probably less criminal, had been more indiscreet. The queen and her counsellors were in a great strait. It was not easy to say whether the danger of trusting the suspected persons or the danger of removing them were the greater. Mary, with many painful misgivings, resolved, and the event proved that she resolved wisely, to treat the evil reports as calumnious, to make a solemn appeal to the honour of the accused gentlemen, and then to trust the safety of her kingdom to their national and professional spirit.

On the fifteenth of May a great assembly of officers was convoked at Saint Helen's on board the *Britannia*, a fine three decker, from which Russell's flag was flying. The admiral told them that he had received a despatch which he was charged to read to them. It was from Nottingham. The queen, the secretary wrote, had been informed that stories deeply affecting the character of the navy were in circulation. But her majesty was determined to believe nothing against those brave servants of the state. The gentlemen who had been so foully slandered might be assured that she placed entire reliance on them. This letter was admirably calculated to work on those to whom it was addressed. Very few of them probably had been guilty of any worse offence than rash and angry talk over their wine. They became enthusiastically loyal as soon as they were assured that the queen reposed entire confidence in their loyalty. They eagerly signed an address in which they entreated her to believe that they would, with the utmost resolution and alacrity, venture their lives in defence of her rights, of English freedom and of the Protestant religion, against all foreign and Catholic invaders. "God," they added, "preserve your person, direct your counsels, and prosper your arms; and let all your people say Amen."

The sincerity of these professions was soon brought to the test. A few hours after the meeting on board of the *Britannia* the masts of Tourville's squadron were seen from the cliffs of Portland. On the morning of the seventeenth of May the allied fleet stood out to sea.

BATTLE OF LA HOGUE

Tourville had with him only his own squadron, consisting of forty-four ships of the line. But he had received positive orders to protect the descent on England, and not to decline a battle. Though these orders had been given

before it was known at Versailles that the Dutch and English fleets had joined, he was not disposed to take on himself the responsibility of disobedience. He still remembered with bitterness the reprimand which his extreme caution had drawn upon him after the fight of Beachy Head. He would not again be told that he was a timid and unenterprising commander, that he had no courage but the vulgar courage of a common sailor. He was also persuaded that the odds against him were rather apparent than real. He believed, on the authority of James and Melfort, that the English seamen, from the flag officers down to the cabin boys, were jacobites. Those who fought would fight with half a heart; and there would probably be numerous desertions at the most critical moment.

Animated by such hopes he sailed from Brest, steered first towards the north east, came in sight of the coast of Dorsetshire, and then struck across the channel towards La Hogue, where the army which he was to convoy to England had already begun to embark on board of the transports. He was within a few leagues of Barfleur when, before daybreak, on the morning of the nineteenth of May, he saw the great armament of the allies stretching along the eastern horizon. He determined to bear down on them. By eight the two lines of battle were formed; but it was eleven before the firing began. It soon became plain that the English, from the admiral downward, were resolved to do their duty.

Russell had visited all his ships, and exhorted all his crews. "If your commanders play false," he said, "overboard with them, and with myself the first." There was no defection. There was no slackness. Carter was the first who broke the French line. He was struck by a splinter of one of his own yard arms, and fell dying on the deck. He would not be carried below. He would not let go his sword. "Fight the ship," were his last words: "fight the ship as long as she can swim."

The battle lasted till four in the afternoon. During the earlier part of the day the wind was favourable to the French: they were opposed to half of the allied fleet; and against that half they maintained the conflict with their usual courage and with more than their usual seamanship. After a hard and doubtful fight of five hours, Tourville thought that enough had been done to maintain the honour of the white flag, and began to draw off. But by this time the wind had veered, and was with the allies. They were now able to avail themselves of their great superiority of force. They came on fast.

The retreat of the French became a flight. Tourville fought his own ship desperately. She was named, in allusion to Louis' favourite emblem, the *Royal Sun* [*Le Soleil Royal*] and was widely renowned as the finest vessel in the world. The gallant ship, surrounded by enemies, lay like a great fortress on the sea, scattering death on every side from her hundred and four portholes. She was so formidably manned that all attempts to board her failed. Long after sunset, she got clear of her assailants, and with all her scuppers spouting blood, made for the coast of Normandy. She had suffered so much that Tourville hastily removed his flag to a ship of ninety guns which was named the *Ambitious*. By this time his fleet was scattered far over the sea. About twenty of his smallest ships made their escape by a road which was too perilous for any courage but the courage of despair. In the double darkness of night and of a thick sea fog, they ran, with all their sails spread, through the boiling waves and treacherous rocks of the race of Alderney, and, by a strange good fortune, arrived without a single disaster at St. Malo. The pursuers did not venture to follow the fugitives into that terrible strait, the place of innumerable shipwrecks.

Those French vessels which were too bulky to venture into the race of Alderney fled to the havens of the Cotentin. The *Royal Sun* and two other three deckers reached Cherbourg in safety. The *Ambitious*, with twelve other ships, all first rates or second rates, took refuge in the Bay of La Hogue, close to the headquarters of the army of James. The three ships which had fled to Cherbourg were closely chased by an English squadron under the command of Delaval. He found them hauled up into shoal water where no large man-of-war could get at them. He therefore determined to attack them with his fireships and boats. The service was gallantly and successfully performed. In a short time the *Royal Sun* and her two consorts were burned to ashes. Part of the crews escaped to the shore; and part fell into the hands of the English.

Meanwhile Russell with the greater part of his victorious fleet had blockaded the Bay of La Hogue. Here, as at Cherbourg, the French men-of-war had been drawn up into shallow water. They lay close to the camp of the army which was destined for the invasion of England. Six of them were moored under a fort named Lisset. The rest lay under the guns of another fort named St. Vaast, where James had fixed his headquarters, and where the union flag, variegated by the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, hung by the side of the white flag of France. Marshal Bellefonds had planted several batteries which, it was thought, would deter the boldest enemy from approaching either Fort Lisset or Fort St. Vaast. James,[1] however, who knew something of English seamen, was not perfectly at ease, and proposed to send strong bodies of soldiers on board of the ships. But Tourville would not consent to put such a slur on his profession.

Russell meanwhile was preparing for an attack. On the afternoon of May 23rd all was ready. A flotilla consisting of sloops, of fireships, and of two hundred boats, was entrusted to the command of Rooke. The whole armament was in the highest spirits. The rowers, flushed by success, and animated by the thought that they were going to fight under the eyes of the French and Irish troops who had been assembled for the purpose of subjugating England, pulled manfully and with loud huzzas towards the six huge wooden castles which lay close to Fort Lisset. The French, though an eminently brave people, have always been more liable to sudden panics than their phlegmatic neighbours the English and Germans. On this day there was a panic both in the fleet and in the army. Tourville ordered his sailors to man their boats, and would have led them to encounter the enemy in the bay. But his example and his exhortations were vain. His boats turned round and fled in confusion. The ships were abandoned. The cannonade from Fort Lisset was so feeble and ill directed that it did no execution. The regiments on the beach, after wasting a few musket shots, drew off.

The English boarded the men-of-war, set them on fire, and having performed this great service without the loss of a single life, retreated at a late hour with the retreating tide. The bay was in a blaze during the night; and now and then a loud explosion announced that the flames had reached a powder room or a tier of loaded guns. At eight the next morning the tide came back strong; and with the tide came back Rooke and his two hundred boats. The enemy made a faint attempt to defend the vessels which were near Fort St. Vaast. During a few minutes the batteries did some execution among the crews of the English skiffs: but the struggle was soon over. The French poured fast out of their ships on one side: the English poured in as fast

[1 It is reported that James, in spite of the frustration of his plans, could not refrain from exclaiming, "See my brave English!"]

on the other, and with loud shouts, turned the captured guns against the shore. The batteries were speedily silenced. James and Melfort, Bellefonds and Tourville, looked on in helpless despondency while the second conflagration proceeded. The conquerors, leaving the ships of war in flames, made their way into an inner basin where many transports lay. Eight of these vessels were set on fire. Several were taken in tow. The rest would have been either destroyed or carried off, had not the sea again begun to ebb. It was impossible to do more; and the victorious flotilla slowly retired, insulting the hostile camp with a thundering chant of "God save the King."

Thus ended, at noon on the twenty-fourth of May, the great conflict which had raged during five days over a wide extent of sea and shore. One English fireship had perished in its calling. Sixteen French men-of-war, all noble vessels, and eight of them three-deckers, had been sunk or burned down to the keel. The battle is called, from the place where it terminated, the battle of La Hogue.

REJOICINGS IN ENGLAND

The news was received in London with boundless exultation. In the fight on the open sea, indeed, the numerical superiority of the allies had been so great that they had little reason to boast of their success. But the courage and skill with which the crews of the English boats had, in a French harbour, in sight of a French army, and under the fire of French batteries, destroyed a fine French fleet, amply justified the pride with which our fathers pronounced the name of La Hogue.

That we may fully enter into their feelings, we must remember that this was the first great check that had ever been given to the arms of Louis XIV, and the first great victory that the English had gained over the French since the day of Agincourt. The stain left on English fame by the shameful defeat of Beachy Head was effaced. The Dutch had indeed done their duty, as they have always done in maritime war, whether fighting on our side or against us, whether victorious or vanquished. But the English had borne the brunt of the fight. Russell who commanded in chief was an Englishman. Delaval who directed the attack on Cherbourg was an Englishman. Rooke who led the flotilla into the Bay of La Hogue was an Englishman. The only two officers of note who had fallen, Admiral Carter and Captain Hastings of the *Sandwich* were Englishmen.

Yet the pleasure with which the good news was received here must not be ascribed solely or chiefly to national pride. The island was safe. The pleasant pastures, cornfields and commons of Hampshire and Surrey would not be the seat of war. The houses and gardens, the kitchens and dairies, the cellars and plate chests, the wives and daughters of our gentry and clergy would not be at the mercy of Irish rapperees, who had sacked the dwellings and skinned the cattle of the Englishry of Leinster, or of French dragoons accustomed to live at free quarters on the Protestants of Auvergne. Whigs and tories joined in thanking God for this great deliverance; and the most respectable nonjurors could not but be glad at heart that the rightful king was not to be brought back by an army of foreigners.

The public joy was therefore all but universal. During several days the bells of London pealed without ceasing. Flags were flying on all the steeples. Rows of candles were in all the windows. Bonfires were at all the corners of the streets. The sense which the government entertained of the services of the navy was promptly, judiciously and gracefully manifested. Sidney and Portland were sent to meet the fleet at Portsmouth, and were accompanied by

Rochester, as the representative of the tories. The three lords took down with them thirty-seven thousand pounds in coin, which they were to distribute as a donative among the sailors. Gold medals were given to the officers. While marks of respect were paid to the slain, the wounded were not neglected. Fifty surgeons, plentifully supplied with instruments, bandages, and drugs, were sent down in all haste from London to Portsmouth. It is not easy for us to form a notion of the difficulty which there then was in providing at short notice commodious shelter and skilful attendance for hundreds of maimed and lacerated men. At present every county, every large town, can boast of some spacious palace in which the poorest labourer who has fractured a limb may find an excellent bed, an able medical attendant, a careful nurse, medicines of the best quality, and nourishment such as an individual requires. But there was not then, in the whole realm, a single infirmary supported by voluntary contribution. Even in the capital the only edifices open to the wounded were the two ancient hospitals of St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew. The queen gave orders that in both these hospitals arrangements should be made at the public charge for the reception of patients from the fleet.[e]

FURTHER JACOBITE PLOTS; ENGLISH DEFEATS AND VICTORIES

James dismissed his troops for the present to their quarters, and returned himself to Saint Germain. But the correspondence was still kept up with Marlborough and Russell, who professed to be as zealous as ever in his service.

The principal events of the war in Flanders this time were, the taking of Namur by the French (June 5th,)and the battle of Steenkerke (July 24th) between King William and Marshal Luxembourg. The latter, deceived by one of his spies, suffered himself to be surprised; but the ill conduct of Count Solms in not supporting the van of the allies, which was composed of English troops who showed their usual heroism, and the arrival of Marshal Boufflers with a large body of French dragoons, caused the beam finally to turn against the allies. They retired, with the loss of three thousand slain (among whom were generals Mackay and Lanier) and an equal number wounded and taken. The loss of the French was not inferior.

Shortly after, a plot to assassinate King William was discovered: the agents in it were the jacobite colonel Parker, Grandval a captain of French dragoons, and a M. Dumont. King James is said to have both known and approved of it. It was, however, fortunately discovered, and Grandval, who had been inveigled into the quarters of the allies, was executed by sentence of a court-martial.

Fortune was everywhere favourable to the French the following year (1693). They reduced the strong towns of Huy (July 23rd) and Charleroi (October 11th). In the battle of Neerwinden, or Landen (July 29th), the honour of the day remained with them, but their loss was equal to that of the allies. The loss of a part of the rich Smyrna fleet was, however, more severely felt in England than that of the battle of Landen. Louis had made incredible efforts to renew his navy, and when Sir George Rooke was sent to the straits to convoy the great Smyrna fleet of England and her allies, consisting of four hundred vessels, he fell in with a French fleet of eighty ships of the line off Cape. St. Vincent. There was now no escaping. Two Dutch men-of-war were taken, and a Dutch and an English ship burnt; forty of the merchantmen were captured, and fifty sunk. The total loss was estimated at a million sterling.

In the commencement of this year one of the jacobite agents, a priest named Cary, went over to James with eight proposals from some of the English nobility, on his agreeing to which they would undertake to restore him. James sent them to Louis, and by his advice assented to them; and a declaration based on them having been drawn up by those lords, James published it (April 17th). In this he promised pardon and indemnity to all who would not oppose him; engaged to protect and defend the Church of England, and to secure to its members all their churches, colleges, rights, immunities, etc.; pledged himself not to dispense with the Test, and to leave the dispensing power in other matters to be regulated by parliament; to assent to bills for the frequent meeting of parliament, and the freedom of elections, etc., and to re-establish the Act of Settlement in Ireland. James owns that in this document he put a force on his nature, which he excuses by the necessity of the case. He consulted both English and French divines of his own communion about the promise to protect and defend the church; the former thought he could not in conscience do it, the latter (including Bossuet) that he could; but the king says that these last finally coincided with the others in thinking that he could only promise to maintain the Protestants in their possessions, benefices, etc.

This declaration did no service whatever to the cause of James. Those who proposed it became doubtful of his sincerity when they saw him so readily agree to it; the leading jacobites were offended at it, saying, that if he came in on these terms it would be the ruin of himself and his loyal subjects; they therefore sent him word "that, if he considered the preamble and the very terms of it, he was not bound to stand by it, or to put it out *verbatim* as it was worded," with more to that purpose. Marlborough wrote pretty much to the same effect; and indeed James owns that he did not consider himself bound by it.

James names as leading jacobites the nonjuring bishops of Norwich (Lloyd), Bath (Ken), Ely (Turner), and Peterborough (White), the marquis of Worcester and earl of Clarendon. "A decisive proof," observes Hallam,[d] "how little that party cared for civil liberty, and how little would have satisfied them at the Revolution if James had put the church out of danger."

The jacobites, we may here observe, were divided into compounders, or those who would restore James with limitations; and non-compounders, or those who, like the above, would invest him with the plenitude of despotism.

The machinations of the court of St. Germain were continued through the following year (1694). Russell, Marlborough, and Godolphin were as profuse as ever in their professions of devotion, yet James observes that they performed nothing. He very properly judged that they regarded only their own interest; and he even seems to have suspected that Russell was only deluding him. It is much to be regretted that the name of Lord Shrewsbury should be mixed up in these traitorous intrigues. It is a curious fact, but one for which there seems to be sufficient authority, that William made use of his knowledge of Shrewsbury's communications with the jacobite agents to oblige him to accept the post of secretary of state. Shrewsbury was a man of honour, and William had no reason ever to regret his magnanimity.

On the 6th of May the king sailed for Holland. He had previously made several promotions in the peerage. The earls of Shrewsbury, Bedford, and Devonshire were created dukes of the same name; the marquis of Carmarthen duke of Leeds, and the earl of Clare duke of Newcastle; the earl of Mulgrave marquis of Normanby, and Lord Sidney earl of Romney. No action of importance took place in this campaign. The allies recovered Huy,

and the advantage in general was on their side. William returned to England in the beginning of November.

MARLBOROUGH'S TREACHERIES

Early in the month of June a combined fleet of thirty sail, under Lord Berkeley, with six thousand troops on board, commanded by General Tollemache, had sailed with the intention of destroying the fleet and harbour of Brest. The fleet, however, had already sailed for the Mediterranean, and they found all due preparations made to receive them. Their attempts to silence the guns of the castle and forts having proved unavailing, Tollemache made a desperate effort to land his troops. In this attempt he received a mortal wound, and seven hundred of his men were slain or taken; it was then found necessary to abandon the enterprise. Tollemache declared that "he felt no regret at losing his life in the performance of his duty, but that it was a great grief to him to have been betrayed"; and betrayed he certainly was. On May 4th Marlborough had written to King James an account of the strength and destination of the expedition, and Godolphin is said to have done the same; yet, ere the fleet sailed, Marlborough, through Shrewsbury, had offered his services to William, "with all the expressions of duty and fidelity imaginable." This action of Marlborough's is not to be defended or even palliated. The attempt of his biographer, Dalrymple,[i] to do so is a complete failure.

After the failure on Brest, Berkeley bombarded and nearly destroyed Dieppe and Havre, and damaged Calais and Dunkirk. Russell meantime rode triumphant in the Mediterranean; and his wintering by the king's express command, against his own will, with his fleet of sixty sail, at Cadiz, ensured the preponderance of England both in that sea and on the ocean.[g]

Of Marlborough's numerous treacheries W. P. Courtney says: Churchill had been one of the first to send overtures of obedience to the prince of Orange. Although he continued in a high position under James, and drew the emoluments of his places, he promised William of Orange to use every exertion to bring over the troops to his side. James had been warned against putting any trust in the loyalty of the man on whom he had showered so many favours, but the warnings were in vain, and on the landing of the Dutch prince at Brixham, Churchill was sent against him with five thousand men. When the royal army had advanced to the downs of Wiltshire and a battle seemed imminent, James was disconcerted by learning that in the dead of night his general had stolen away like a thief into the opposite camp.

For this timely act of treachery Churchill received another advancement in the peerage. He had now become the earl of Marlborough and a member of the privy council, a mark of royal favour which during this and the next reign was more than an unmeaning honour. William felt, however, that he could not place implicit reliance in his friend's integrity; and, with a clear sense of the manner in which Marlborough's talents might be employed without any detriment to the stability of his throne, he sent him with the army into the Netherlands and into Ireland.

For some time there was no open avowal of any distrust in Marlborough's loyalty, but in May 1692 the world was astonished at the news that he had been thrown into the Tower on an accusation of treason.[1] Though the evidence which could be brought against him was slight, and he was soon set at

[1 The discovery of his baseness had moved William to exclaim, "Were I and my lord Marlborough private persons, the sword would have to settle between us."]

liberty, there is no doubt that Marlborough was in close relations with the exiled king at St. Germain, and that he even went so far as to disclose to his late master the intention of the English to attack the town of Brest. The talents of the statesmen of this reign were chiefly displayed in their attempts to convince both the exiled and the reigning king of England of their attachment to their fortunes.

The sin of Marlborough lay in the fact that he had been favoured above his fellows by each in turn, and that he betrayed both alike apparently without scruple or without shame. Once again during the Fenwick Plot he was charged with treason, but William, knowing that if he pushed Marlborough and his friends to extremities there were no other statesmen on whom he could rely, contented himself with ignoring the confessions of Sir John Fenwick, and with executing that conspirator himself. Not long afterwards the forgiven traitor was made governor to the young duke of Gloucester, the only one of Anne's numerous children who gave promise of attaining to manhood. During the last years of William's reign Marlborough once more was placed in positions of responsibility. His daughters were married into the most prominent families of the land.[k]

PARLIAMENTARY REFORMS: COMMENCEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT (1693 A.D.)

Turning over the index of the ponderous Statute Book to look for acts that have had a permanent influence on the condition of the country, we might perhaps pass over one Act of 1693 that bears this lengthy title: "An act for granting to their majesties certain rates and duties of excise upon beer, ale, and other liquors for securing certain recompenses and advantages in the said act mentioned, to such persons as shall voluntarily advance the sum of ten hundred thousand pounds towards carrying on the war against France." Under this statute commenced the national debt of England. The million of money which was to supply a portion of the expenses of the war "in a manner that would be least grievous," as the preamble says, was expected to be voluntarily advanced on the credit of the special provision of the new duties of excise, which were to be set apart as they were paid into the exchequer. The ten hundred thousand pounds were speedily subscribed; for the industry of the people had created capital which was seeking employment, although they had been far more heavily taxed during four years than at any previous period. There can be no doubt that the means first created by the Act of 1693 for the investment of superfluous capital, have largely contributed to the progressive development of the national resources. There can be no doubt, on the other hand, that the facilities of borrowing by the creation of stock, have often led to extravagant expenditure in wars that have averted no real danger nor secured any public advantage.

Although the statesmen and the people of the reign of William III felt that the war against the preponderance of France, and the consequent subjection of England, was for a great national interest, they also felt that the burden could not be borne in the existing state of the country without resort to the system of loans. In the case before us they did not contemplate a permanent loan.

In the next year, when the Bank of England was established upon the condition of lending a sum of money to the government, of which the principal could not be demanded by the lenders, though the borrowers had the privilege of paying it off, a permanent debt was begun to be contracted. The system of borrowing went on for three years, till at the Peace of Ryswick the debt

amounted to twenty-one millions and a half. Nevertheless, so strong was the objection to the continuance of that system, that, although engaged in a most expensive war for five years after the accession of Anne, the debt was reduced to sixteen millions. In half a century more it had increased to seventy-five millions. It was then the received opinion of financiers that if it ever reached a hundred millions the nation must become bankrupt.

When we look at the one million borrowed on life annuities in 1693, and the eight hundred and three millions constituting the public debt of the United Kingdom in 1858, we may be amazed at the vast amount of the burthen which has been gradually accumulating, but we also can now distinctly perceive how that burthen has been borne. It has not weighed down the country, because all the material resources of the country have been increasing with it. The increasing wealth — of which this vast debt owing by the nation to the nation is a symbol — produced by the incessant applications of capital and labour, of science and invention, has increased the ability of the great body of the people to participate in the advantages to be derived from a ready and secure investment of their savings, with the condition that the sum so invested might be easily transferable. To this cause may be attributed the ease with which the government of that day could obtain loans by the creation of public funds at a fixed rate of interest, chiefly upon annuities.

That facility shows the growing importance of the trading class, who most readily lent their surplus capital. Money, also, was no longer hoarded by those who had no means of employing it commercially; although, for a considerable period, there were vast numbers who had not sufficient confidence in the government to lend. The time was far distant when there would be three hundred thousand persons receiving dividends upon stock, and when one million three hundred and forty thousand persons would also lend their small accumulations through the agency of savings banks. The country was steadily growing more prosperous, as the national debt went on increasing to six times the amount at the period when inevitable bankruptcy was predicted. It was six hundred millions at the Peace of Amiens. The eighteenth century, deficient as it was in many social improvements which we now command, was a period of rapid progress in agriculture and manufactures; and with this progress came a greater command of food and clothing, better dwellings, less frequent and less fatal epidemics for the great bulk of the people. The loan of 1693 has furnished data for a remarkable inquiry into the prolongation of life in the eighteenth century, consequent upon the bettered condition, and therefore improved health, of the population. The loan of 1693 was a tontine. Every contributor of £100 might name a life, to receive a fixed dividend during the duration of that life. As the annuitants dropped, their shares of the dividends were also to be divided amongst the survivors, till the whole number of annuitants was reduced to seven. In 1790, during the ministry of William Pitt, another tontine was negotiated. The comparative results, as exhibiting the probable duration of life at the two periods, have been worked out by Mr. Finlaison, upon the assumption that the 438 females and 594 males named in 1693, and the 3974 females and 4197 males named in 1790, were the youngest and the healthiest lives that the shareholders could select. Taking the dates at which the annuities of 1693 fell in, and estimating those of 1790 that had fallen or were still remaining in 1851, the calculation showed that in 1790 the expectation of life had increased one-fourth.

There were two attempts made in this session to produce what may be called a reform in parliament. The commons passed a bill [called a Place Bill] excluding all placemen from sitting in the house who should be elected

after February, 1693. Men holding office of every kind, civil and military, were in parliament. It was unwisely proposed to exclude all persons who should in future hold office under the crown. It was prudently determined by the sitting members not to exclude themselves. They passed no "Self-Denying Ordinance." The lords rejected this measure by a very small majority.

A bill providing that the existing parliament should end on the 1st of January, 1694, and that no parliament should in future sit more than three years, was introduced to the house of lords, by Shrewsbury, who represented the whigs. It passed both houses. On the last day of the session, the king rejected the measure, in the words of Norman French, which would now be the most fatal words ever spoken by a sovereign. The Constitution has worked itself clear of such contending powers. The use of the veto was not then thought to be what Hallam[d] calls "an exercise of prerogative which no ordinary circumstances can reconcile either with prudence or a constitutional administration of government." The bill for triennial parliaments was passed in the next year, without opposition from the crown.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CABINET: THE JUNTO OF 1693

At the beginning of November, 1693, William was at Kensington. The parliament was to meet on the 7th. A great change in the administrative system of England was about to take place. The king for five years had endeavoured to govern by choosing his ministers from each of the two great parties of the state; sometimes giving the preponderance to the whigs, at other times to the tories. These ministers carried on the public affairs of their several departments without very well defined principles of action, amidst personal hatreds and jealousies which were too often highly injurious to the national interests. An experiment was now to be made to substitute for this individual direction of public affairs the administration of a party. The heads of departments were to be united by some common consent upon political principles. "Party divisions," says Burke,[l] "whether on the whole operating for good or evil, are things inseparable from free government." He held it to be a duty for public men "to act in party," with all the moderation consistent with vigour and fervency of spirit — a duty not very easy at any time, and almost impossible in the earlier stages of representative government, when all were going through a sort of education in constitutional principles. William was about to change some of his ministers; at the same time to select new advisers from those who would "act in party"; who would submit their own wills to a general agreement; who would constitute what we now understand as a ministry, whose possession of power under the authority of the sovereign, and with the command of a parliamentary majority, implied the superior influence of the general principles which constituted their bond of political union. William had become convinced that he could best carry on his government through the party which had mainly accomplished the revolution. He would not compose his administration exclusively of whigs, but there should be such a preponderance of those who held whig principles, that the tory party so closely bordering upon the jacobite party, should be neutralised in what we may now call a cabinet. The functions of the privy council had become merged in the cabinet council. In a debate in 1692, on advice given to the king, one member exclaimed, according to Waller[m]: "Cabinet council is not a word to be found in our law books. We knew it not before. We took it for a nickname." However strong was the parliamentary jealousy of a cabinet

the exclusion of the privy council from the real business of the state became more and more established in the reign of William. As representative government gradually compelled the sovereign to choose an administration founded upon the preponderance of a party, so this administration by party gradually broke up that unseemly division of the servants of the crown into factions, which was occasionally manifested until the middle of the eighteenth century.

The earl of Sunderland had become a confidential adviser of King William. He had publicly supported the most tyrannous actions of James, however he might have secretly opposed some of them. To please his master, he had declared himself a papist. To make himself safe in the Revolution which he saw at hand, he had betrayed that master. He vanished from the scene of active politics when William became king, retired to Holland, and again declared himself a Protestant. He was excluded from William's Act of Grace as one of the chief instruments of the late tyranny. But he came back to England, and made himself a necessity for the new government. He had cut off all hope of being reconciled to the jacobite party; he could be very useful to the party of the Revolution. His long experience made him master of all the complications of political action. He was the representative in 1693 of that class of unprincipled politicians of which Talleyrand was the representative when the Bourbons were restored to France. His advice was not to be despised, however the man might be odious. William saw that Sunderland's distinction between the affection for monarchy, and the love of the monarch *de facto*, was a sound one. William did trust and rely more upon the whigs than he had done. Somers had been made his keeper of the great seal; the choice was wise. The attorney's son had rendered the highest service in that great crisis which was to establish the government of England upon the basis of law. He was the leader of his party, as much by his moderation as by his eloquence and learning. Russell, who had more than once been tempted to betray the government he served, but when the hour of trial came did his duty to his country, was restored to the command of the fleet. With Somers, Russell, and Wharton was joined, in William's new ministry [known as the Whig Junto], Charles Montague. He had cast off the honours of a second-rate poet to become a first-class politician. His parliamentary eloquence was almost unrivalled. His financial abilities were more necessary to a government conducting a most expensive war, even than his eloquence. One more whig was to be won, and he was Shrewsbury. He resigned the office of secretary of state in 1690, when William favoured the tories. He had been tampered with from St. Germain, and was faithless to his trust. But he had seen his error, and was now to be called back by William to a hearty allegiance. The seals were again offered to Shrewsbury. The king had a personal regard for him; but he refused to accept the office which Nottingham had relinquished. At last Shrewsbury yielded, and had his dukedom and the Garter. The chief female negotiator on the part of the king was Mrs. Villiers — one whom the scandal of the time regards as his mistress. Elizabeth Villiers, maid of honour to the princess of Orange — afterwards married to the earl of Orkney — was a woman of remarkable ability, with whom Swift delighted to talk for hours; but who was not formed for the usual female conquests, however great her mental powers. "I think," writes Swift[w] to Stella, "the devil was in it the other day when I talked to her of an ugly squinting cousin of hers, and the poor lady herself, you knows, squints like a dragon."

The king and his new ministers did not shrink from demanding from the parliament a larger supply than ever for carrying on the war. Eighty-three thousand troops were voted for the service of 1694; and the naval estimates

were also largely increased. The whig majority in the house of commons was strong enough to bear down all unreasonable opposition. There were violent debates on the naval miscarriages, but no blame was thrown on the conduct of the late disastrous campaign. How to raise the large sums necessary to maintain the land and sea forces was a matter of anxious discussion. A land-tax, a poll-tax, stamp-duties, a tax on hackney coaches, and a lottery, were the expedients. High and low were the adventurers in this new system of state gambling, as Evelyn *p* records: "In the lottery set up after the Venetian manner by Mr. Neale, Sir R. Haddock, one of the commissioners of the navy, had the greatest lot, 3,000*l*.; my coachman, 40*l*." But money was still wanting. The necessity gave birth to one of the greatest public establishments of this or any other country, the Bank of England.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND (1694 A.D.)

The statute under which this national institution was formed bears a very ambiguous title: "An Act for granting to their majesties several rates and duties upon tonnage of ships and vessels, and upon beer, ale, and other liquors, for securing certain recompenses and advantages in the said Act mentioned, to such persons as shall voluntarily advance the sum of fifteen hundred thousand pounds towards carrying on the war against France." The subscribers for the advance of a loan, upon the conditions set forth, were to be constituted a corporate body "by the name of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England." The money really required to be advanced was twelve hundred thousand pounds. The subscription list was filled in ten days. The trading community had been sufficiently prepared for a right appreciation of the project which was carried in the house of commons by the energy of Montague. The scheme of a bank had been the subject of discussion for three years.



MARY II
(1662–1694)

William Paterson — a man whose name is associated with this most successful scheme of a great national bank of England, and with another most unfortunate project of a great national system of colonisation for Scotland — had in 1691 submitted proposals to the government somewhat similar to the plan which was carried out in 1694. His scheme was ably supported amongst commercial men by Michael Godfrey, an eminent London merchant; and when the government at last adopted it, Godfrey's influence in the city was as useful as Montague's eloquence in parliament. The original plan of a national bank

was met by every sort of objection. In 1694, says Bannister,[n] "the men who were supposed to have lost money opposed and appeared against it [the bank] with all their might, pretending it could not do without them, and they were resolved never to be concerned." Tories said that a bank and a monarchy could not exist together. Whigs said that a bank and liberty were incompatible, for that the crown would command the wealth of the bank. A clause was introduced in the act, which prevented the Bank of England making loans to the government without authority of parliament, which neutralised the whig objection. With this restriction the Bank of England has yet, in all times, been a powerful ally of the government.

The king prorogued the parliament on the 25th of April, 1694, and again set out for the Continent at the beginning of May [returning on the 9th of November after the campaign already described].

THE DEATH OF QUEEN MARY (1694 A.D.)

"The small-pox raged this winter about London," writes Burnet,[o] in 1694. To comprehend at this time the significance of the word "raged," we must carry our minds back, far beyond the period when Jenner discovered vaccination — beyond even the period when Lady Mary Wortley Montague made inoculation fashionable. When Burnet adds, that "thousands" were dying of this fatal disease, we must understand him literally. When the small-pox entered a house, it was considered as terrible a visitation as the plague. William went sorrowfully from the parliament house to Kensington. Mary had been ill two days. She had never had the small-pox; but her regular physicians disputed about the symptoms. Ratcliffe, the most skilful, pronounced the fatal word "small-pox." William was in despair. He "called me," says Burnet,[o] "into his closet, and gave a free vent to a most tender passion. He burst out into tears, and cried out that there was no hope for the queen, and that from being the happiest, he was now going to be the miserablest creature on earth. He said, during the whole course of their marriage he had never known one single fault in her; there was a worth in her that nobody knew besides himself."

Mary's fortitude and resignation were above all praise. The religious consolations which her faithful friend and counsellor, the archbishop of Canterbury, Tillotson, would have administered to the dying queen were to be bestowed by his successor, Tenison. Tillotson had died five weeks before. When Tenison made Mary aware of her danger, but with "some address not to surprise her too much," she was perfectly calm. "She thanked God she had always carried this in her mind, that nothing was to be left to the last hour." Queen Mary died on the 28th of December, in the thirty-third year of her age. All parties agreed in acknowledging the beauties of her character. Burnet, the whig, says, "she was the most universally lamented princess, and deserved the best to be so, of any in our age, or in our history." Evelyn,[p] the tory, writes: "She was such an admirable woman, abating for taking the crown without a more due apology, as does, if possible, outdo the renowned queen Elizabeth."

She had many arduous duties to perform in the repeated absences of the king; and not the least important was the distribution of ecclesiastical preferments. With a deep sense of religion she marked her preference for those divines who were moderate in their opinions, and earnest in the proper discharge of their high functions. When there were state affairs to attend to, she never shrank from the proper labours of the sovereign. Her tastes were

simple and unostentatious; her morals of unblemished purity; her charity was universal. Her deep attachment to her husband was founded upon her admiration of his high qualities.

William's grief for her loss "was greater," says Burnet, "than those who knew him best thought his temper capable of; he went beyond all bounds in it. When she died, his spirits sunk so low, that there was great reason to apprehend that he was following her." Queen Mary was sumptuously interred in Westminster abbey. The funeral cost fifty thousand pounds. A more worthy expenditure of public money in her honour took place when William determined to erect Greenwich hospital, in compliance with that desire which she had expressed after the battle of La Hogue, to provide an asylum for disabled seamen. Mary, in following the fortunes of her husband and accepting with him the sovereign power of these kingdoms to the exclusion of her father, discharged a higher duty even than that of filial affection. But she was always solicitous for that father's personal safety. The paltriness of James's character was manifested upon his daughter's decease, in a manner which St. Simon [q] thus records: "The king of England [James] prayed the king [Louis] that the court should not wear mourning. All those who were related to the prince of Orange, including M. de Bouillon and M. de Duras, were forbidden to wear it. They obeyed and were silent; but this sort of revenge was considered very petty."

The death of the queen appears to have prostrated William. Shrewsbury could hardly approach him till a month after, in consequence of "the retired manner his majesty has lived in since his last great misfortune." His "former application to business" had not yet returned with the healing power of strenuous occupation.

PARLIAMENTARY CORRUPTION

William gradually recovered his serenity. The houses of parliament went on as usual with their labours. The proposed renewal of the Licensing Act was rejected without a division in the commons. The press had been more than commonly bold, even seditious. But the representatives of the English people did not choose to interfere with that noble principle which, half a century before, had been proclaimed to all the civilised world by the most eloquent of freedom's advocates, John Milton [r]: "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple. Who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?"

The proceedings of the session of 1695 disclosed, what was no secret to men of all parties, the frightful corruption [1] by which statesmen in power and statesmen in opposition were moved to support or to resist some measure in which large pecuniary interests were involved; or to screen some public delinquent. Guy, a member of parliament and secretary of the treasury, was sent to the Tower for receiving a bribe, in connection with some inquiries into the conduct of a colonel of a regiment, who had appropriated the money for which he ought to have paid the quarters of his troops. Trevor, the speaker of the house of commons, was proved to have received a bribe of a thousand guineas from the corporation of London, for assisting in passing

[1 Gardiner [s] says: "No wonder William trusted his Dutch servants as he trusted no English ones, and that he sought to reward them by grants, which, according to precedents set by earliest kings, he held himself entitled to make out of the property of the crown."]

[1695 A.D.]

"An act for relief of the orphans and other creditors of the city of London." Trevor had to put the question from the chair whether he himself was guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor; and had to say, "The ayes have it." He was expelled the house.

The East India Company had spent a hundred and seven thousand pounds in secret service money, as an examination of their books had proved to a parliamentary committee. Eighty-seven thousand pounds had thus been distributed in 1693 and 1694. Sir Thomas Cook, the chairman of the company, had the management of these delicate matters. He was member for Colchester. In his place in parliament he refused to answer inquiries. The commons then passed a bill compelling him to answer, under enormous penalties. Upon the bill going to the upper house, the duke of Leeds — the earl of Danby of Charles II, the marquis of Carmarthen of 1689 — spoke strongly against the bill, and laying his hand on his breast, protested that he was perfectly disinterested in the matter. The inquiries went on, implicating others; and the commons finally impeached the duke of Leeds, for that he did, "in breach of the great trust reposed in him, by himself, his agents, or servants, corruptly and illegally treat, contract, and agree, with the merchants trading to the East Indies, for five thousand five hundred guineas, to procure their charter of confirmation." One Bales admitted that he had received the money to bribe the duke, and had given it to a Swiss, who was the confidential manager of the duke's private business. The Swiss fled; the parliament was prorogued; and the impeachment fell to the ground. The king's personal friend, Portland, was found to have been proof against these temptations, having refused a bribe of fifty thousand pounds.[e]

Concerning the almost universal corruption, White says: "William was probably the only honest man in the English court — the only man who felt bound to do a thing because he had sworn to do it, or to abstain from doing a thing because he had sworn to abstain. The others were brought up in a school of profligacy and duplicity which only a despotic court pretending to liberality can supply. The statesman of forty, when the deliverer came over, had been educated in the early days of the restoration, and had grown up amid the enormous wickedness and want of principle encouraged by the example of the king. The baseness of a period is most felt in its effects on the succeeding generation.

"England was now suffering from its Rochesters and Charleses. It was demoralised in its upper ranks and brutalised in its lowest. From the middle class, which grandeur had neglected and which commerce daily enriched and enlightened, improvement was to spring; and the parliament contained a majority of the smaller gentry and richer townsfolk, who had remained equally free from the grace of manner and looseness of conduct which characterised their superiors. They were coarse, but honest; swore and drank a great deal, but were proud of their independence, and hated the pope. These were the instruments with which William had to deal, and the difficulty of the task often made him wish to lay down the uneasy burden, and return to the comparative obscurity and repose of his hunting-box near the Hague. But William was Protestant champion as well as English king, and saw the realisation of his long-cherished dreams of checking the power of Louis XIV."[f]

Macaulay paints the court with equal disgust: "The machinery was all rust and rottenness. From the time of the Restoration to the time of the Revolution, neglect and fraud had been almost constantly impairing the efficiency of every department of the government. Honours and public trusts, peerages, baronetcies, regiments, frigates, embassies, governments,

commissionerships, leases of crown lands, contracts for clothing, for provisions, for ammunition, pardons for murder, for robbery, for arson, were sold at Whitehall scarcely less openly than asparagus at Covent Garden or herrings at Billingsgate. Brokers had been incessantly plying for custom in the purlieus of the court. From the palace which was the chief seat of this pestilence, the taint had diffused itself through every office and through every rank in every office, and had everywhere produced feebleness and disorganisation. So rapid was the progress of the decay that, within eight years after the time when Oliver had been the umpire of Europe, the roar of the guns of De Ruyter was heard in the Tower of London. The vices which had brought that great humiliation on the country had ever since been rooting themselves deeper and spreading themselves wider. James had, to do him justice, corrected a few of the gross abuses which disgraced the naval administration.

"Yet the naval administration, in spite of his attempts to reform it, moved the contempt of men who were acquainted with the dockyards of France and Holland. The military administration was still worse. The courtiers took bribes from the colonels; the colonels cheated the soldiers; the commissaries sent in long bills for what had never been furnished; the keepers of the arsenals sold the public stores and pocketed the price.

"Yet these evils, though they had sprung into existence and grown to maturity under the government of Charles and James, first made themselves severely felt under the government of William. For Charles and James were content to be the vassals and pensioners of a powerful and ambitious neighbour, they submitted to his ascendency, they shunned with pusillanimous caution whatever could give him offence; and thus, at the cost of the independence and dignity of that ancient and glorious crown which they unworthily wore, they avoided a conflict which would instantly have shown how helpless, under their misrule, their once formidable kingdom had become.

"Their ignominious policy it was neither in William's power nor in his nature to follow. It was only by arms that the liberty and religion of England could be protected against the most formidable enemy that had threatened the island since the Hebrides were strewn with the wrecks of the Armada. The body politic, which, while it remained in repose, had presented a superficial appearance of health and vigour, was now under the necessity of straining every nerve in a wrestle for life or death, and was immediately found to be unequal to the exertion. The first efforts showed an utter relaxation of fibre, an utter want of training. Those efforts were, with scarcely an exception, failures; and every failure was popularly imputed, not to the rulers whose mismanagement had produced the infirmities of the state, but to the ruler in whose time the infirmities of the state became visible.

"William might indeed, if he had been as absolute as Louis, have used such sharp remedies as would speedily have restored to the English administration that firm tone which had been wanting since the death of Oliver. But the instantaneous reform of inveterate abuses was a task far beyond the powers of a prince strictly restrained by law, and restrained still more strictly by the difficulties of his situation." [c]

WILLIAM'S SUCCESS AT NAMUR (1695 A.D.)

The king was no doubt rejoiced to get away from this tainted atmosphere to the bracing air of a campaign. He was first reconciled to the princess Anne, and then departed for the Continent, having prorogued the parliament

on the 3rd of May, 1695. The energy and perseverance of William were at length to be crowned with success. It was a real advantage to him that Luxemburg was dead. It was a greater advantage that Louis had appointed as his successor an accomplished courtier, but a feeble general, Villeroi, and that this sycophant of the great king entrusted an important command to the duke de Maine, the most favoured of the illegitimate children of Louis. But the numbers, and the high discipline, of the French armies, would have probably interfered with any signal advantage on the part of the allies, if William had not exercised in this campaign many of the highest qualities of a great commander. The opening of the campaign, says Saint-Simon,[q] was a beautiful game of chess; the prince of Orange, the elector of Bavaria, and the earl of Athlone moving in detached bodies; and Villeroi, Boufflers, Harcourt, and Montal regulating their own movements by those of their enemy which they saw, or by those which they expected. William, "who had well taken all his measures to cover his main design," suddenly turned his course towards Namur. The elector of Bavaria, and the Brandenburg army, arrived at the same point. That strongest fort of Europe was invested by this united force at the beginning of July. Vauban had materially strengthened the fortifications since it had been taken by the French. The court of Louis thought William's attempt a rash one, and that it would signally fail. Villeroi marched with eighty thousand men to attack the besieging army at Namur; but Vaudemont had joined his force to that already on the banks of the Meuse and Sambre. Meanwhile the siege had proceeded with a vigour almost unparalleled. The two armies, that of William and of Villeroi, stood for three days in presence of each other, whilst the siege was proceeding under an incessant bombardment. Then the French army retired. The elector of Bavaria had the immediate charge of the siege, whilst the king was watching Villeroi; and when it was known that the French had moved off, the storm of the citadel of Namur commenced. Portland had summoned Boufflers to surrender upon the retirement of Villeroi, but the French commander still held out. The assault was undertaken by the Bavarians, the Dutch, the Brandenburgers, and the English. The Brandenburgers had amongst their leaders, the prince of Anhalt-Dessau, a young man of nineteen, who afterwards had the honour of introducing important changes in military science. According to Carlyle,[r] "He invented the iron ramrod; he invented the equal step; in fact, he is the inventor of modern military tactics." The Dutch and Brandenburgers accomplished their duty with little difficulty. The Bavarians suffered severe loss. The English, under Cutts, were at first driven back; but their intrepid commander, though wounded, led them on again, and they carried a battery which had swept away many in its deadly fire. Two thousand men were sacrificed in this terrible assault. Boufflers agreed to surrender with the honours of war. The French garrison, now reduced to five thousand men, marched out.

The return of William to England was hailed by the popular enthusiasm which naturally attends success. The good man struggling with misfortune may be the noblest sight in the world, but it calls forth no huzzas or bell-ringings. The king reached Kensington through the illuminated streets on the night of the 10th of October, and immediately went to business. A proclamation was issued for a new parliament. In a week William set forth upon a most unusual mission, to propitiate the people by showing himself amongst them. The elections generally were favourable to the government. The whig party acquired a considerable accession of strength. The taxes were heavy; the currency of the kingdom was in a frightful state of depreciation; the price

of grain was unusually high — and yet the nation manifested no alarming discontent. The jacobites plotted; but they were as far from success as ever.

REFORMS IN THE CURRENCY, AND IN TREASON TRIALS

The defective state of the coinage was now to be effectually redressed. The evil had become insupportable. The established prescription of the gallows was found to be no remedy for the disease. In July, 1694, we read in Evelyn [p]: "many executed at London for clipping money, now done to that intolerable extent, that there was hardly any money that was worth above half the nominal value." Bannister [n] quotes a writer of the period, who speaks with full knowledge of his subject: "the almost fatal symptoms of the general corruption of the silver money, like covered flames or distracted torrents, universally broke out upon the nation, as it were at once. Guineas on a sudden rose to thirty shillings per piece; all currency of other money was stopped; hardly any had wherewith to pay; public securities sank to about a moiety of their original value, and buyers hard to be found even at these prices; no man knew what he was worth; the course of trade and correspondency almost universally stopped; the poorer sort of people plunged into inexpressible distress, and, as it were, left perishing, whilst even the richer had hardly wherewith to go to market for obtaining the common conveniences of life." This writer adds that "the intolerable corruption of the coin was alone sufficient to have provoked any nation on earth to extremities. . . . . Nevertheless, the remainder of gratitude in the people to their deliverer, King William, was even still such, that they bore these inexpressible afflictions with an inimitable temper and patience." In 1695, of the various coinages of Elizabeth, of James I, and of Charles I, it was computed that five millions were in circulation, in common with about half-a-million of the new coinages of Charles II, James II, and William III. The old money, which had no milled edge, had been gradually clipped, so that at last the current silver coin had been diminished in weight nearly one-half. Of this clipped money four millions were considered to be in circulation; whilst £1,600,000 of unclipped coin were hoarded, or only appeared occasionally in remote places. As fast as new silver coins were issued from the mint they disappeared. They were worth twice as much as the old clipped coin. Whilst a single unclipped shilling was circulating in the same town with the shilling that was not intrinsically worth more than sixpence, traders would perpetually demand the honest shilling from their customers, and not being able to get it would put a higher price upon their commodities to bear a proportion with the clipped shilling. The labourer who was paid his weekly wages in the depreciated coin could only obtain a small loaf instead of a large one. The dealer who had to make remittances in guineas, or in bills which represented guineas, was obliged to give at least thirty shillings to obtain the guineas. The money-changers and bankers were making large fortunes out of the perplexities of all those who had to sell or to buy.

The new parliament was opened November 22nd. The most important part of the king's speech was that in which he said, "I must take notice of a great difficulty we lie under at this time, by reason of the ill state of the coin, the redress of which may perhaps prove a further charge to the nation." How were these words to be interpreted? Was the nation to bear the great loss of converting four millions of money, intrinsically worth only two millions, into money of the true standard? Was the public to sustain a loss of two millions?

The subject had been widely agitated. It had been proposed to issue money of less than the intrinsic value to replace the old — to make a ninepenny shilling that would pass for twelvepence. Locke demolished the theory of the little shilling in a masterly tract. His opinion was, that after a certain time the old money should only pass by weight, and that upon this principle it should be exchanged for a silver coinage of which a shilling should be worth twelvepence. By this plan the state would have effected the restoration of the currency without a national cost, but at the price of what individual misery! When the house of commons came to debate this important question, the resolutions proposed by Montague, the chancellor of the exchequer, were finally agreed to. A new coinage of intrinsic value was to be issued [with milled edge to aid in the instant detection of clipping]; the loss of the clipped money was to be borne by the public, for which a special fund was to be provided by a house-tax and a window-tax. This was something like a revival of the hearth-money, but cottages were exempt. Up to May 4th the clipped money would be received in payment of taxes. The old money had then mostly disappeared; but the mechanical resources of that time were not sufficient to produce the new money in sufficient quantity to carry on the exchanges of the people. The difficulty was in some measure relieved by the issue of exchequer bills. The difficulty was conquered when Newton was appointed master of the mint, and by vast exertions, connected with the establishment of provincial mints, gradually sent forth a supply of circulating medium equal to the demand. The distress and confusion had been enormous; but those who had thought the great change was ill-managed, at last said, in North's[t] words, "better and worse in the means is not to be reflected upon, when a great good is obtained in the end."[c]

A bill for regulating trials for treason, which had failed before, was now brought in by the tories, and it was passed unanimously. It enacted that the accused should have a copy of the indictment and of the panel of the jury, and the aid of counsel; that every overt act should be proved by two witnesses; that the prisoner should be enabled to compel his witnesses to appear, and be allowed to challenge peremptorily thirty-five of the jury, etc. A third measure caused much annoyance to the king. His Dutch favourite, Bentinck, earl of Portland, who was somewhat rapacious, had begged and obtained three royal lordships in Denbighshire. The gentry of the county petitioned against the grant; the commons addressed the king to recall it, and William complied with their wishes; but he forthwith conferred on the favourite manors and honours in no less than five several counties. At the same time it is to be recorded to Bentinck's honour that he was inaccessible to bribery, as was shown in the case of the East-India Company.

LAST OF THE JACOBITE ASSASSINATION PLOTS (1696 A.D.)

The discovery of a nefarious plot against the life of the king soon occupied the whole attention of parliament and the nation. One captain Fisher called on Lord Portland (February 11th, 1696), and informed him of a plot for seizing the king and invading the kingdom; he afterwards (13th) gave the particulars of the conspiracy to Sir William Turnbull the secretary. The attempt on the king, who was in the habit of going on Saturdays to hunt in Richmond Park, was to be made in the lane leading from Brentford to Turnham Green. He was therefore urged not to hunt on that day; but he laughed at the idea of the plot, and declared his resolution of taking his sport as usual. On Friday evening (14th), however, an officer named Prendergast came to Lord Portland,

and advised him to persuade the king to stay at home the next day or else he would be assassinated. He gave the same details as Fisher had done; but both refused to name any of the parties. Prendergast said that he was an Irishman and a Catholic, but, though his religion was accused of sanctioning such deeds, the thought of it had filled him with horror. Portland went to the king that very night; and William, now thinking there was something in the matter, put off his hunting for that week. Next day, a third witness, named De la Rue, gave exactly similar information, and he and Prendergast being examined personally by the king, were prevailed on to name the conspirators. These had deferred their project to the following Saturday (22nd); when finding that the king did not go to Richmond, they suspected that the plot was discovered and thought of providing for their safety. That night, however, several of them were arrested in their beds, and next day a proclamation was issued offering a reward of 1000*l.* for each of the persons who had escaped.

On Monday (24th) the king went in person and informed both houses of the discovery of the plot. They made in return a most loyal and affectionate address, empowered him to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act; and drew up a form of association, binding themselves to the support of his person and government against the late king James and his adherents, and in case he should come to a violent death to revenge it on his enemies, and to maintain the Act of Settlement. All the members of both houses signed this bond. As some of the tories scrupled at the words "rightful and lawful king," a slight change was made to content them.

The plot seems to have been as follows. King James had sent Sir George Barclay, a Scottish Catholic officer of his guards, over to England with a commission authorising and commanding all his loving subjects to rise in arms and make war on the prince of Orange and his adherents. About two-and-twenty officers and men of James' guards came over to aid in the project, which was communicated to several of the king's friends in England. Various places were proposed for making the attempt, and the above-mentioned lane was finally fixed on. Meantime a French fleet and army were to be assembled at Dunkirk and Calais, of which James himself was to take the command. The principal persons charged with this conspiracy were the earl of Aylesbury, Lord Montgomery, Sirs George Barclay, John Fenwick, John Friend and William Perkins, Major Lowick, captains Charnock, Knightley and Porter, with messieurs Rookwood, Cooke, Goodman, Cranbourne, and others. Of these, Porter, Goodman and some others were admitted as witnesses; and on their evidence, with that of Fisher, Prendergast and De la Rue, Friend, Perkins, Charnock, Lowick, King, Cranbourne, and Rookwood, were found guilty and executed. Cooke and Knightley were also found guilty; but the former was banished, the latter pardoned.

At the execution of Friend and Perkins, the celebrated Jeremy Collier and two other nonjuring divines gave them absolution in sight of the people with a solemn imposition of hands. For this they were indicted, but not punished. The two archbishops and twelve of the bishops (all that were in town) published a declaration strongly censuring their conduct, as the dying persons had made no confession and expressed no abhorrence of the crime for which they suffered. King James, who had come to Calais, after remaining there some weeks, returned disconsolate to St. Germain. He utterly denied all knowledge of the assassination plot; but there seems to be sufficient evidence of his having sanctioned this and other attempts on the life of King William.

Sir John Fenwick was arrested at New Romney, on his way to France (June

11th). When he heard that the grand jury had found the bill against him, he prayed for a delay, offering to tell all that he knew provided he got a pardon and was not required to appear as a witness. The king, when this proposal was transmitted to him in Flanders, refused to accede to it. Fenwick then threw himself on his mercy, and wrote him an account of the plots of the jacobites, in which he mentioned the secret dealings of lords Marlborough, Shrewsbury, Godolphin, Bath, and Admiral Russell with the court of St. Germain; but the duke of Devonshire told him, "that the king was acquainted with most of those things before." An order therefore was issued to bring him to trial unless he made fuller discoveries. Fenwick then took to tampering with the witnesses Porter and Goodman; the former betrayed the intrigue to the government, but the latter was induced to go to France. As he could not be convicted by law, his enemies took another course. Admiral Russell, with the king's permission (November 6th), laid before the house of commons the informations of Fenwick against himself and others, and desired that they might be read in order to give him an opportunity of justifying himself. Fenwick was brought to the bar and examined; but as he had had his information only at second-hand, he could not prove his assertions, and he thought it the wiser course not to repeat them. His papers therefore were voted to be false and scandalous, and it was resolved to bring in a bill to attaint him. The bill was vigorously opposed in all its stages; but it finally passed the commons by a majority of thirty-three. In the lords the divisions were still closer, the majority being only seven. In the minority voted the dukes of Leeds and Devonshire, and lords Pembroke, Sunderland, Bath and Godolphin; the duke of Shrewsbury was absent; Marlborough voted in the majority, revenge proving stronger than his toryism. Fenwick was beheaded on Tower Hill (January 28th, 1697).

In the course of the proceedings against Fenwick, a circumstance came to light which covered Lord Monmouth with disgrace. Finding himself not named in Fenwick's discoveries, he wrote a paper of instructions for him to found his defence on, so as to implicate Godolphin and the others; and on Fenwick's not doing so, he came and spoke for two hours in favour of the attainder. Fenwick then on a re-examination told the whole story, and Monmouth was committed to the Tower and deprived of his employments. The king however did not wish to drive him to extremity; he sent Bishop Burnet to soften him, and made up his losses secretly.

Monmouth was afterwards the celebrated earl of Peterborough. Speaker Onslow says of him on this occasion, "I wonder any man of honour could keep him company after such an attempt. He was of the worst principles of any man of that, or perhaps of any age; yet from some glittering in his character he hath some admirers."

This was the last attempt made by the partisans of James for his restoration. Men of prudence saw that it would be nothing but a return to the former despotism. The whigs no longer let their discontent get the better of their regard for liberty; and those among William's ministers who had kept up a treacherous correspondence with their former master, gradually withdrew from his hopeless cause. There is certainly reason to think that some of those who engaged in it were not sincere, and that their object was to learn and defeat the plots of the jacobites. Still the selfishness, the treachery, or at best the vacillation of so many of the principal public characters in the period succeeding the Revolution, form a picture, from which the virtuous mind will frequently turn with disgust.

Before the king left England this year, he raised to the peerage the cele-

brated John Somers, who had been for some time lord-keeper, and made him chancellor. Admiral Russell was created earl of Orford, and Lord Sunderland was now made lord chamberlain.

THE PEACE OF RYSWICK (1697 A.D.)

The war had languished of late, and in the course of this year it was terminated by the Peace of Ryswick (September 20th). Louis gave up all his late conquests except Strasburg, and he acknowledged William as king of England. James published manifestoes in assertion of his rights; but they were unheeded. It appears that Louis had proposed to William to have the crown settled on the prince of Wales after his death, and that the latter, who had no great affection for the princess Anne, consented to it. But the princess had a sure ally in the bigotry of her father and his queen. The idea of their son being reared a Protestant, and in such case he must be, filled them both with horror, and they rejected the proposal without hesitation.

PARLIAMENT FORCES THE REDUCTION OF THE ARMY (1697 A.D.)

The peace was on the whole an honourable one, considering that all the advantages of the war had been on the side of France; it was also absolutely necessary from the exhausted state of the English finances. But William knew that it was likely to be little more than a truce, and in his speech to the parliament (December 2nd) he gave it as his opinion, "that for the present England cannot be safe without a land force." The necessity however of reduction and economy was strongly felt, the war having caused a debt of seventeen millions, and a dread of standing armies as the instruments of despotism pervaded the minds of most people, not considering that in the Mutiny Bill and the necessity of annual votes of supply, they had abundant security against those dangers. It was therefore voted that all the troops raised since 1680 should be disbanded, and it was finally resolved (on the 18th) that ten thousand men should be the force for the ensuing year. To gild the pill for the monarch, and prove that they were not wanting in gratitude and affection to him, they voted that a sum of 700,000*l.* should be granted him "for life" for the support of the civil list. The king however neglected the former vote, and when he was next going to Holland, he left sealed orders with the regency to keep up a force of sixteen thousand men.

During the king's absence (1698) a new parliament was elected. The members were mostly men of revolution principles, attached to the government, but not very courteous to the king. When on his return from the Continent the parliament met, he hinted in the speech from the throne (December 9th) his opinion of the necessity of a large land force. But the commons, irritated at his neglect of the vote of their predecessors on this point, forthwith resolved that it should not exceed seven thousand men, and these to be his majesty's natural-born subjects. As this last clause went to deprive him of his Dutch guards, to which he was so much attached, and of the brave regiments of French Protestants, the insult coupled with ingratitude (as he deemed it) sank deep into his mind. He seriously resolved to abandon the government and retire to Holland, and he had actually written the speech which he intended to make on that occasion, when he was diverted from his purpose. He therefore gave his assent to the bill (February 1st, 1699). Ere however he dismissed his guards, he made a final appeal to the good feelings of the commons. He sent them (March 18th) a message in his own hand-

[1700 A.D.]

writing, to say that all the necessary preparations were now made, and that he would send them away immediately, "unless, out of consideration to him, the house be disposed to find a way for continuing them longer in his service which his majesty would take very kindly." But the commons were inexorable, and the guards departed. "It was a moving sight," says the whig Oldmixon,[a] "to behold them marching from St. James' park through London streets, taking a long farewell of the friends they left in England with kisses and tears in their eyes; many of them having English wives and children following them into a land strange to them, after their husbands and fathers had spent so many years in the service of that country out of which they were now driven." There was only one regiment of these guards, which makes the barbarity the greater. We feel it impossible to approve of this conduct of the commons; though it was termed national feeling it showed more of party spirit. They should have recollected, that had it not been for these troops, who won the battle of the Boyne, they would probably have no power over them or any other troops. "The foreign troops," says Hallam,[d] "had claims which a grateful and generous people should not have forgotten; they were many of them the chivalry of Protestantism, the Huguenot gentlemen, who had lost all but their swords in a cause which we deemed our own; they were the men who had terrified James from Whitehall, and brought about a deliverance, which, to speak plainly, we had neither sense nor courage to achieve for ourselves, or which at least we could never have achieved without enduring the convulsive throes of anarchy."



JOHN SOMERS
(1652–1716)

THE COMMONS COERCE THE KING AND THE LORDS IN THE IRISH GRANTS

In the following session (1700) the commons proceeded a step further in making the king feel their power. The lands of those who had fought on the side of James in Ireland, exceeding a million of acres, were forfeited, and, in a legal sense, were at the disposal of the crown; yet still in all equity they should be applied to the public service. But William, who was of a generous temper, and who never could divest himself of the idea that as king he was entitled to all the prerogative exercised by his predecessors, had granted away the far greater part of them, chiefly to his mistress, Mrs. Villiers, now countess of Orkney, to the insatiable Portland, to Ginkel earl of Athlone, to Sidney Lord Romney, and to another Dutch favourite, Keppel, who had been page, then private secretary to the king, and who now had eclipsed Portland in his

favour, and had been created earl of Albemarle. Still he had only exercised a lawful prerogative, and the commons were not justified in the Act of Resumption which they passed, and still less in "tacking," as it was termed, its provisions to a money bill in order to prevent the lords from altering them. "This most reprehensible device," observes Hallam,[d] "though not an unnatural consequence of their pretended right to an exclusive concern in money bills, had been employed in a former instance in this reign (February, 1692). They were again successful on this occasion; the lords receded from their amendments and passed the bill at the king's desire, who perceived that the fury of the commons was tending to a terrible convulsion. But the precedent was infinitely dangerous to their legislative power. If the commons, after some more attempts of the same nature, desisted from so unjust an encroachment, it must be attributed to that which has been the great preservative of the equilibrium in the English government — the public voice of a reflecting people, averse to manifest innovation, and soon offended by the intemperance of factions."

The king was tolerant in his own temper, and he was pledged to the emperor and his Catholic allies to indulge his Catholic subjects. But the commons now, on the resort of priests to England and their usual imprudence, brought in a terrific bill to check the growth of popery. By this act any one informing against a priest exercising his functions was to receive £100 reward, and the priest to be imprisoned for life; every person professing the popish religion must, after attaining the age of eighteen, take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and subscribe the declaration against transubstantiation and the worship of saints, or become incapable of inheriting or purchasing lands, and during his life his next of kin being a Protestant was to enjoy them. The lords and the king gave no opposition to the will of the commons; but the spirit of liberty and equity rendered the barbarous enactment of no effect, and no properties were lost by it.

FALL OF THE WHIG JUNTO; A TORY MINISTRY IN POWER

The earl of Sunderland, foreseeing the coming storm, had already resigned his office of chamberlain, much against the wishes of the king. Lord Orford, fearing the commons, followed his example; the duke of Leeds was dismissed from his post of president of the council. But the tories had persuaded the favourites Albemarle, and Villiers Lord Jersey, that it would be for the king's advantage to employ them instead of the whigs. The king himself seems to have thought that course necessary, and in compliance with the wishes of the tories, he consented to take the great seal from Lord Somers, the leader of the whig party.[1] William wished him to resign it of his own accord, but this Somers declined doing, as it might appear to be the result of fear or guilt. The earl of Jersey was then sent (April 7th) to demand it; he delivered it up and it was committed to Sir Nathan Wright. The duke of Shrewsbury immediately resigned.

When the king returned from the Continent this year, he modelled the ministry to the content of the tories. Godolphin was set again over the treasury, Lord Grey of Werk, now earl of Tankerville, was made privy seal, and Rochester lord-lieutenant of Ireland; and to diminish the power of the whigs in the commons, their leader in that house, Charles Montague, was raised to the peerage under the title of baron of Halifax, Savile, marquis of Halifax,

[1 As Gardiner's notes, this established the principle that a minister unsatisfactory to the house of commons must resign.]

having died without heirs. The ministers having advised a dissolution, a new parliament was summoned, and met (February 10th, 1701).

The two great measures which were now to occupy the attention of the parliament were the succession and the partition treaty.

Of all the children that the princess Anne had borne, only one had survived. This was William Duke of Gloucester, born in 1689. When this young prince had attained his ninth year, the king assigned him a peculiar establishment, and appointed the earl of Marlborough to be his governor, and Bishop Burnet his preceptor. But the prince having over-exerted himself on his birth day (July 24th, 1700), took a fever of which he died. The next heir to the crown was the duchess of Savoy, daughter of Henrietta, youngest child of Charles I, but her religion excluding her, the nearest Protestant to the throne was Sophia, dowager-electress of Hanover, daughter of the queen of Bohemia, the sister of that monarch. In the speech from the throne, the subject was pressed on the attention of parliament, and no time was lost in preparing a bill for the purpose.

THE ACT OF SETTLEMENT AND THE TREATIES OF PARTITION (1701 A.D.)

The Act of Settlement which was now passed, limited the succession of the crown to the princess Sophia, and the heirs of her body being Protestants. It further provided, that no foreigner should hold any place of trust, civil or military, or take any grant from the crown; that the nation should not be obliged to engage in war for the defence of any dominions not belonging to the crown of England; that the sovereign should join in communion with the Church of England, and not go out of the country without the consent of parliament; that no pardon should be pleadable to an impeachment; that no person holding an office or pension under the crown should be capable of sitting in the house of commons; that judges' commissions should be made *quamdiu se bene gesserint*, and their salaries be ascertained; that all business properly belonging to the privy council should be transacted there, and all the resolutions be signed by the councillors present, etc.

The regard for liberty shown in this important bill certainly does honour to the tories. Some of the articles seemed no doubt to reflect on the king, but recent experience had shown their necessity, and future experience proved their utility.[1] There was, however, one fatal omission in the bill; the foreign prince coming to the throne should have been required to surrender his former dominions.

The affair of the treaty of partition was much more intricate. Charles II of Spain was childless; the emperor, the elector of Bavaria, and the king of France had all married daughters of Spain. Louis' queen, it is true, had at her marriage solemnly renounced her right of succession, but the ambition of Louis, it was well known, would not be held in by so slender a cord; and if he could add the Spanish dominions to his own, his power, it was feared, would be irresistible. In 1698, William having seen, from the temper of parliament,

[1 The Act of Settlement was the seal of our constitutional laws, the complement of the Revolution itself and the Bill of Rights, the last great statute which restrains the power of the crown, and manifests, in any conspicuous degree, a jealousy of parliament in behalf of its own and the subject's privileges. The battle had been fought and gained; the Statute Book, as it becomes more voluminous, is less interesting in the history of our constitution; the voice of petition, complaint, or remonstrance is seldom to be traced in the journals; the crown in return desists altogether, not merely from the threatening or objurgatory tone of the Stuarts, but from that dissatisfaction sometimes apparent in the language of William; and the vessel seems riding in smooth water, moved by other impulses, and liable perhaps to other dangers, than those of the ocean-wave and the tempest.— HALLAM.d]

how little chance there was of prevailing on the English nation to engage in a war, resolved if he could not avert the evil entirely to diminish it as much as possible. Louis too was, or pretended to be, satisfied to be secured in a part rather than have to fight for the whole. Accordingly, when William returned to Holland that year, a secret treaty was concluded between the kings of England and France, and the states of Holland, for partitioning the Spanish dominions, by which the dauphin was to have Naples and all the other Italian dominions of the crown of Spain, except the duchy of Milan, which was to go to the emperor's second son, Charles. The dauphin was also to have the province of Guipuzcoa, in the north of Spain; but the crown of Spain, with all its other dominions, was to go to the electoral prince of Bavaria.



COSTUME ABOUT 1700 A.D.

The death of this young prince having frustrated this arrangement, a new one was concluded (March 15th, 1700). By this the archduke Charles was to have Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands, while the dauphin should have Guipuzcoa and all the Italian dominions, but Milan was to be exchanged for Lorraine.

The object proposed by William and the states was, to preserve the balance of power as much as possible; but it was certainly a bold step thus to parcel out the Spanish monarchy without the consent of the crown or people of Spain. Accordingly, the pride of the Spanish nation was roused, and through the arts of the French ambassador and his party, the king, when on his death-bed (November 1st), was induced to make a will leaving all his dominions to Philip the second son of the dauphin. Louis, after an affected hesitation, allowed his grandson to accept the splendid bequest. He then used all his arts to obtain the acquiescence of the king of England and the states, but finding them unavailing, he had recourse to stronger measures. By what was called the Barrier Treaty, Namur, Antwerp, and some other places in the Netherlands, were garrisoned by Dutch troops; and by a secret and rapid march, the French in one night surprised and captured all these garrisons, which amounted to twelve thousand men. The states, to free their soldiers, and urged by the clamour of a large faction at home, and the terror of the French arms now at their doors, acknowledged Philip, and King William found it necessary to follow their example (April 17th, 1701).

It is asserted that Louis scattered his gold with no sparing hand among the members of the English parliament, in order to avert the danger of a war. Be this as it may, his game was played effectually in that assembly. The peers (March 21st) presented an address condemnatory of "that fatal treaty" of partition, and the commons, after a furious debate, in which Mr. Howe, a zealous jacobite, termed it a "felonious treaty," made a still stronger address, and then proceeded to impeach the earls of Portland and Orford, and the lords Somers and Halifax, for their share in it. Disputes, however, arising between the two houses, the commons refused to go on with the impeach-

ments, under the pretext that they could not expect justice, and the lords then acquitted the accused peers.

THE DEATH OF JAMES II, 1701, AND OF WILLIAM III, 1702

The war spirit, however, was on the increase in the country, and the king on his return to the Continent was party (September 7th) to a second grand alliance with the emperor of Austria and the states for procuring the Netherlands and the Italian dominions of the crown of Spain for the emperor, and for preventing the union of France and Spain under the one government. Just at this time, an event occurred which roused the indignation of the whole English nation against Louis. King James died September 16th, 1701, and Louis, who had promised the dying monarch to recognise his son as king of England, performed that promise under the influence of the celebrated Madame de Maintenon, in opposition to his wisest ministers. William immediately ordered his ambassador to quit the court of France without taking leave, and the French secretary of legation was required to depart from England. The city of London made an address, expressive of their indignation at the conduct of the court of France, and their resolution to stand by the king in the defence of his person and just rights; and similar addresses soon poured in from all parts of the kingdom.

The current had evidently set in against the timid anti-national policy of the tories, and the sagacious Sunderland when consulted by the king strongly advised him to discard his tory ministers and bring in the whigs. William wrote to Lord Somers, their acknowledged leader, for his advice, and that statesman urged him to dissolve the parliament, and to rely on the present temper of the nation. Accordingly, the king soon after his return acted in conformity with that counsel.

When the new parliament met (December 30th), the tories proved stronger in it than had been anticipated, but many of them were of that moderate party which was headed by Harley, whose election to the office of speaker was carried by a majority of either four or fourteen. The speech from the throne, the composition of Somers, was a most able piece, showing the danger of England and of Europe, and calling on the parliament to act with vigour and unanimity. The two houses responded to the royal call; they voted ninety thousand men for the land and sea service; a bill was passed for attainting the pretended prince of Wales, and another obliging all persons employed in church and state to abjure him, and swear to William as rightful and lawful king, and his heirs, according to the Act of Settlement.

The nation had not been so united or the king so popular at any time since the Revolution; but William was not fated to enjoy the happy results. He felt his constitution to be so greatly broken, that he had told Lord Portland this winter, in confidence, that he could not expect to live another summer. Toward the end of February (1702), as he was riding through Bushy Park, on his way to Hampton Court, he put his horse to the gallop on the level sod: but the animal stumbled and fell, and the king's collar-bone was broken.[1] It was set immediately, and he was brought back to Kensington. For some days he seemed in no danger whatever; but one day (March 3), after walking for some time in the gallery, he sat down on a couch and fell asleep. He awoke with a shivering fit. A fever ensued; he grew worse

[1] It was maliciously remarked that the horse he rode had formerly belonged to Sir John Fenwick. As his fall was ascribed to a mole hill, the jacobites in their political compotations used to drink to the health of "the little gentleman in black velvet."

daily; on Sunday (7th) he received the sacrament from Archbishop Tenison and at eight o'clock next morning he breathed his last, in the fifty-second year of his age.[g] As a fitting close to this great career, we may quote the estimate of Macaulay, whose *History of England* is really a history chiefly of William III of Orange. Macaulay's sister, Lady Trevelyan, in her preface to the last volume of her brother's works, calls William, Macaulay's "great hero."[a]

Macaulay's Estimate of William III

Nature had largely endowed William with the qualities of a great ruler; and education had developed those qualities in no common degree. With strong natural sense, and rare force of will, he found himself, when first his mind began to open, a fatherless and motherless child, the chief of a great but depressed and disheartened party, and the heir to vast and indefinite pretensions, which excited the dread and aversion of the oligarchy then supreme in the United Provinces. He was scarcely fifteen years old when all the domestics who were attached to his interest, or who enjoyed any share of his confidence, were removed from under his roof by the jealous government. He remonstrated with energy beyond his years, but in vain. Vigilant observers saw the tears more than once rise in the eyes of the young state prisoner. His health, naturally delicate, sank for a time under the emotions which his desolate situation had produced. Such situations bewilder and unnerve the weak, but call forth all the strength of the strong. Surrounded by snares in which an ordinary youth would have perished, William learned to tread at once warily and firmly. Long before he reached manhood he knew how to keep secrets, how to baffle curiosity by dry and guarded answers, how to conceal all passions under the same show of grave tranquillity. Meanwhile he made little proficiency in fashionable or literary accomplishments. The manners of the Dutch nobility of that age wanted the grace which was found in the highest perfection among the gentlemen of France, and which, in an inferior degree, embellished the court of England; and his manners were altogether Dutch. Even his countrymen thought him blunt. To foreigners he often seemed churlish. In his intercourse with the world in general he appeared ignorant or negligent of those arts which double the value of a favour and take away the sting of a refusal. He was little interested in letters or science. The discoveries of Newton and Leibnitz, the poems of Dryden and Boileau, were unknown to him. Dramatic performances tired him. He had indeed some talent for sarcasm, and not seldom employed, quite unconsciously, a natural rhetoric, quaint, indeed, but vigorous and original. For all persecution he felt a fixed aversion, which he avowed, not only where the avowal was obviously politic, but on occasions where it seemed that his interest would have been promoted by dissimulation or by silence. His theological opinions, however, were even more decided than those of his ancestors. The tenet of predestination was the keystone of his religion. He often declared that, if he were to abandon that tenet, he must abandon with it all belief in a superintending Providence, and must become a mere Epicurean. Except in this single instance, all the sap of his vigorous mind was early drawn away from the speculative to the practical. The faculties which are necessary for the conduct of important business ripened in him at a time of life when they have scarcely begun to blossom in ordinary men. Since Octavius the world had seen no such instance of precocious statesmanship. Skilful diplomatists were surprised to hear the weighty observations which at seventeen the prince made on public affairs, and still more surprised

to see a lad, in situations in which he might have been expected to betray strong passion, preserve a composure as imperturbable as their own. At eighteen he sat among the fathers of the commonwealth, grave, discreet, and judicious as the oldest among them. At twenty-one, in a day of gloom and terror, he was placed at the head of the administration. At twenty-three he was renowned throughout Europe as a soldier and a politician. He had put domestic factions under his feet: he was the soul of a mighty coalition; and he had contended with honour in the field against some of the greatest generals of the age.

His personal tastes were those rather of a warrior than of a statesman, but he, like his great-grandfather, the silent prince who founded the Batavian commonwealth, occupies a far higher place among statesmen than among warriors. The event of battles, indeed, is not an unfailing test of the abilities of a commander, and it would be peculiarly unjust to apply this test to William; for it was his fortune to be almost always opposed to captains who were consummate masters of their art, and to troops far superior in discipline to his own. Yet there is reason to believe that he was by no means equal, as a general in the field, to some who ranked far below him in intellectual powers. To those whom he trusted he spoke on this subject with the magnanimous frankness of a man who had done great things, and who could well afford to acknowledge some deficiencies. He had never, he said, served an apprenticeship to the military profession. He had been placed, while still a boy, at the head of an army. Among his officers there had been none competent to instruct him. His own blunders and their consequences had been his only lessons. "I would give," he once exclaimed, "a good part of my estates to have served a few campaigns under the prince of Condé before I had to command against him." It is not improbable that the circumstance which prevented William from attaining any eminent dexterity in strategy may have been favourable to the general vigour of his intellect. If his battles were not those of a great tactician, they entitled him to be called a great man. No disaster could for one moment deprive him of his firmness or of the entire possession of all his faculties. His defeats were repaired with such marvellous celerity that, before his enemies had sung the *Te Deum*, he was again ready for conflict; nor did his adverse fortune ever deprive him of the respect and confidence of his soldiers.

That respect and confidence he owed in no small measure to his personal courage. Courage, in the degree which is necessary to carry a soldier without disgrace through a campaign, is possessed, or might, under proper training, be acquired, by the great majority of men. But courage like that of William is rare indeed. He was proved by every test; by war, by wounds, by painful and depressing maladies, by raging seas, by the imminent and constant risk of assassination, a risk which has shaken very strong nerves, a risk which severely tried even the adamantine fortitude of Cromwell. Yet none could ever discover what that thing was which the prince of Orange feared. His advisers could with difficulty induce him to take any precaution against the pistols and daggers of conspirators. Old sailors were amazed at the composure which he preserved amidst roaring breakers on a perilous coast. In battle his bravery made him conspicuous even among tens of thousands of brave warriors, drew forth the generous applause of hostile armies, and was never questioned even by the injustice of hostile factions. During his five campaigns he exposed himself like a man who sought for death, was always foremost in the charge and last in the retreat, fought, sword in hand, in the thickest press, and, with a musket ball in his arm and the blood streaming

over his cuirass, still stood his ground and waved his hat under the hottest fire. His friends adjured him to take more care of a life invaluable to his country; and his most illustrious antagonist, the great Condé, remarked, after the bloody day of Seneffe, that the prince of Orange had in all things borne himself like an old general except in exposing himself like a young soldier. William denied that he was guilty of temerity. It was, he said, from a sense of duty and on a cool calculation of what the public interest required that he was always at the post of danger. The troops which he commanded had been little used to war, and shrank from a close encounter with the veteran soldiery of France. It was necessary that their leader should show them how battles were to be won. And in truth more than one day which had seemed hopelessly lost was retrieved by the hardihood with which he rallied his broken battalions and cut down with his own hand the cowards who set the example of flight. Sometimes, however, it seemed that he had a strange pleasure in venturing his person. It was remarked that his spirits were never so high and his manners never so gracious and easy as amidst the tumult and carnage of a battle. Even in his pastimes he liked the excitement of danger. Cards, chess, and billiards gave him no pleasure. The chase was his favourite recreation; and he loved it most when it was most hazardous. His leaps were sometimes such that his boldest companions did not like to follow him. He seems even to have thought the most hardy field sports of England effeminate, and to have pined in the great park of Windsor for the game which he had been used to drive to bay in the forests of Guelders, wolves, and wild boars, and huge stags with sixteen antlers.

The audacity of his spirit was the more remarkable because his physical organisation was unusually delicate. From a child he had been weak and sickly. In the prime of manhood his complaints had been aggravated by a severe attack of small-pox. He was asthmatic and consumptive. His slender frame was shaken by a constant hoarse cough. He could not sleep unless his head was propped by several pillows, and could scarcely draw his breath in any but the purest air. Cruel headaches frequently tortured him. Exertion soon fatigued him. The physicians constantly kept up the hopes of his enemies by fixing some date beyond which, if there were anything certain in medical science, it was impossible that his broken constitution could hold out. Yet, through a life which was one long disease, the force of his mind never failed, on any great occasion, to bear up his suffering and languid body.

He was born with violent passions and quick sensibilities, but the strength of his emotions was not suspected by the world. From the multitude his joy and his grief, his affection and his resentment, were hidden by a phlegmatic serenity, which made him pass for the most coldblooded of mankind. Those who brought him good news could seldom detect any sign of pleasure. Those who saw him after a defeat looked in vain for any trace of vexation. He praised and reprimanded, rewarded and punished, with the stern tranquillity of a Mohawk chief: but those who knew him well and saw him near were aware that under all this ice a fierce fire was constantly burning. It was seldom that anger deprived him of power over himself. But when he was really enraged the first outbreak of his passion was terrible. It was indeed scarcely safe to approach him. On these rare occasions, however, as soon as he regained his self command, he made such ample reparation to those whom he had wronged as tempted them to wish that he would go into a fury again. His affection was as impetuous as his wrath. Where he loved, he loved with

the whole energy of his strong mind. When death separated him from what he loved, the few who witnessed his agonies trembled for his reason and his life.

To a very small circle of intimate friends, on whose fidelity and secrecy he could absolutely depend, he was a different man from the reserved and stoical William whom the multitude supposed to be destitute of human feelings. He was kind, cordial, open, even convivial and jocose, would sit at table many hours, and would bear his full share in festive conversation. Highest in his favour stood a gentleman of his household named Bentinck, sprung from a noble Batavian race, and destined to be the founder of one of the great patrician houses of England. The fidelity of Bentinck had been tried by no common test. It was while the United Provinces were struggling for existence against the French power that the young prince on whom all their hopes were fixed was seized by the small-pox. That disease had been fatal to many members of his family, and at first wore, in his case, a peculiarly malignant aspect. The public consternation was great. The streets of the Hague were crowded from daybreak to sunset by persons anxiously asking how his highness was. At length his complaint took a favourable turn. His escape was attributed partly to his own singular equanimity, and partly to the intrepid and indefatigable friendship of Bentinck. From the hands of Bentinck alone William took food and medicine. By Bentinck alone William was lifted from his bed and laid down in it. "Whether Bentinck slept or not while I was ill," said William to Temple with great tenderness, "I know not. But this I know, that, through sixteen days and nights, I never once called for anything but that Bentinck was instantly at my side." Before the faithful servant had entirely performed his task, he had himself caught the contagion. Still, however, he bore up against drowsiness and fever till his master was pronounced convalescent. Then, at length, Bentinck asked leave to go home. It was time: for his limbs would no longer support him. He was in great danger, but recovered, and, as soon as he left his bed, hastened to the army, where, during many sharp campaigns, he was ever found, as he had been in peril of a different kind, close to William's side.

Such was the origin of a friendship as warm and pure as any that ancient or modern history records. The descendants of Bentinck still preserve many letters written by William to their ancestor: and it is not too much to say that no person who has not studied those letters can form a correct notion of the prince's character. He whom even his admirers generally accounted the most distant and frigid of men here forgets all distinctions of rank, and pours out all his thoughts with the ingenuousness of a schoolboy. He imparts without reserve secrets of the highest moment. He explains with perfect simplicity vast designs affecting all the governments of Europe. There is a singular charm in such letters, penned by a man whose irresistible energy and inflexible firmness extorted the respect of his enemies, whose cold and ungracious demeanour repelled the attachment of almost all his partisans, and whose mind was occupied by gigantic schemes which have changed the face of the world.

His kindness was not misplaced. Bentinck was early pronounced by Temple to be the best and truest servant that ever prince had the good fortune to possess, and continued through life to merit that honourable character.

William was not less fortunate in marriage than in friendship. Yet his marriage had not at first promised much domestic happiness. His choice had been determined chiefly by political considerations: nor did it seem likely that any strong affection would grow up between a handsome girl of sixteen, well disposed indeed, and naturally intelligent, but ignorant and simple, and

a bridegroom who, though he had not completed his twenty-eighth year, was in constitution older than her father, whose manner was chilling, and whose head was constantly occupied by public business or by field sports. For a time William was a negligent husband. He was indeed drawn away from his wife by other women, particularly by one of her ladies, Elizabeth Villiers, who, though destitute of personal attractions, and disfigured by a hideous squint, possessed talents which well fitted her to partake his cares. He was indeed ashamed of his errors, and spared no pains to conceal them; but, in spite of all his precautions, Mary well knew that he was not strictly faithful to her. She, however, bore her injuries with a meekness and patience which deserved, and gradually obtained, William's esteem and gratitude. Her generous affection completely gained the heart of William. Till the sad day when he was carried away in fits from her dying bed, there was entire friendship and confidence between them. Many of her letters to him are extant; and they contain abundant evidence that this man, unamiable as he was in the eyes of the multitude, had succeeded in inspiring a beautiful and virtuous woman, born his superior, with a passion fond even to idolatry.

William had long observed the contest between the English factions attentively, but without feeling a strong predilection for either side. Nor in truth did he ever to the end of his life, become either a whig or a tory. He wanted that which is the common groundwork of both characters; for he never became an Englishman. He saved England, it is true; but he never loved her, and he never obtained her love. To him she was always a land of exile, visited with reluctance and quitted with delight. Even when he rendered to her those services of which, at this day, we feel the happy effects, her welfare was not his chief object. Whatever patriotic feeling he had was for Holland. Yet even his affection for the land of his birth was subordinate to another feeling which early became supreme in his soul. That feeling was enmity to France, and to the magnificent king who, in more than one sense, represented France, and who to virtues and accomplishments eminently French joined in large measure that unquiet, unscrupulous, and vainglorious ambition which has repeatedly drawn on France the resentment of Europe.

It was in the agony of that conflict, when peasants were flying in terror before the French invaders, when hundreds of fair gardens and pleasure houses were buried beneath the waves, when the deliberations of the states were interrupted by the fainting and the loud weeping of ancient senators who could not bear the thought of surviving the freedom and glory of their native land, that William had been called to the head of affairs. For a time it seemed to him that resistance was hopeless. He looked round for succour, and looked in vain. Spain was unnerved, Germany distracted, England corrupted. Nothing seemed left to the young stadholder but to perish sword in hand, or to be the Æneas of a great emigration, and to create another Holland in countries beyond the tyranny of France. The French monarchy was to him what the Roman republic was to Hannibal, what the Ottoman power was to Scanderbeg, what the southern domination was to Wallace.

To the confidence which the heroic fatalist placed in his high destiny and in his sacred cause is to be partly attributed his singular indifference to danger. He had a great work to do; and till it was done nothing could harm him. Therefore it was that, in spite of the prognostications of physicians, he recovered from maladies which seemed hopeless, that bands of assassins conspired in vain against his life, that the open skiff to which he trusted himself on a starless night, on a raging ocean, and near a treacherous shore, brought him

safe to land, and that, on twenty fields of battle, the cannon balls passed him by to right and left. The ardour and perseverance with which he devoted himself to his mission have scarcely any parallel in history. In comparison with his great object he held the lives of other men as cheap as his own. It was but too much the habit, even of the most humane and generous soldiers of that age, to think very lightly of the bloodshed and devastation inseparable from great martial exploits; and the heart of William was steeled, not only by professional insensibility, but by that sterner insensibility which is the effect of a sense of duty. Three great coalitions, three long and bloody wars in which all Europe from the Vistula to the western ocean was in arms, are to be ascribed to his unconquerable energy. He was in truth far better qualified to save a nation than to adorn a court. In the highest parts of statesmanship, he had no equal among his contemporaries. He had formed plans not inferior in grandeur and boldness to those of Richelieu, and had carried them into effect with a tact and wariness worthy of Mazarin. Two countries, the seats of civil liberty and of the reformed faith, had been preserved by his wisdom and courage from extreme perils. Holland he had delivered from foreign, and England from domestic foes. Obstacles apparently insurmountable had been interposed between him and the ends on which he was intent; and those obstacles his genius had turned into stepping stones. Under his dexterous management the hereditary enemies of his house had helped him to mount a throne; and the persecutors of his religion had helped him to rescue his religion from persecution. Fleets and armies, collected to withstand him, had, without a struggle, submitted to his orders. Factions and sects, divided by mortal antipathies, had recognised him as their common head. Without carnage, without devastation, he had won a victory compared with which all the victories of Gustavus and Turenne were insignificant. In a few weeks he had changed the relative position of all the states in Europe, and had restored the equilibrium which the preponderance of one power had destroyed. Foreign nations did ample justice to his great qualities. In every continental country where Protestant congregations met, fervent thanks were offered to God, who, from among the progeny of his servants, Maurice, the deliverer of Germany, and William, the deliverer of Holland, had raised up a third deliverer, the wisest and mightiest of all. At Vienna, at Madrid, nay, at Rome, the valiant and sagacious heretic was held in honour as the chief of the great confederacy against the house of Bourbon; and even at Versailles the hatred which he inspired was largely mingled with admiration.

Here he was less favourably judged. In truth, our ancestors saw him in the worst of all lights. By the French, the Germans, and the Italians, he was contemplated at such a distance that only what was great could be discerned, and that small blemishes were invisible. To the Dutch he was brought close, but he was himself a Dutchman. In his intercourse with them he was seen to the best advantage, he was perfectly at his ease with them; and from among them he had chosen his earliest and dearest friends. But to the English he appeared in a most unfortunate point of view. He was at once too near to them and too far from them. He lived among them, so that the smallest peculiarity of temper or manner could not escape their notice. Yet he lived apart from them, and was to the last a foreigner in speech, tastes, and habits.

One of the chief functions of our sovereigns had long been to preside over the society of the capital. That function Charles II had performed with immense success. His easy bow, his good stories, his style of dancing and playing tennis, the sound of his cordial laugh, were familiar to all London. One day he was seen among the elms of St. James's park chatting with Dryden

about poetry. Another day his arm was on Tom Durfey's shoulder; and his majesty was taking a second, while his companion sang "Phillida, Phillida," or "To horse, brave boys, to Newmarket, to horse." James, with much less vivacity and good nature, was accessible, and, to people who did not cross him, civil. But of this sociableness William was entirely destitute. He seldom came forth from his closet; and, when he appeared in the public rooms, he stood among the crowd of courtiers and ladies, stern and abstracted, making no jest and smiling at none. His freezing look, his silence, the dry and concise answers which he uttered when he could keep silence no longer, disgusted noblemen and gentlemen who had been accustomed to be slapped on the back by their royal masters, called Jack or Harry, congratulated about race cups or rallied about actresses. The women missed the homage due to their sex. They observed that the king spoke in a somewhat imperious tone even to the wife to whom he owed so much, and whom he sincerely loved and esteemed. They were amused and shocked to see him, when the Princess Anne dined with him, and when the first green peas of the year were put on the table, devour the whole dish without offering a spoonful to her royal highness; and they pronounced that this great soldier and politician was no better than a Low Dutch bear.

One misfortune, which was imputed to him as a crime, was his bad English. He spoke our language, but not well. His accent was foreign, his diction was inelegant; and his vocabulary seems to have been no larger than was necessary for the transaction of business. To the difficulty which he felt in expressing himself, and to his consciousness that his pronunciation was bad, must be partly ascribed the taciturnity and the short answers which gave so much offence. Our literature he was incapable of enjoying or of understanding.

He never once, during his whole reign, showed himself at the theatre. The poets who wrote Pindaric verses in his praise complained that their flights of sublimity were beyond his comprehension. Those who are acquainted with the panegyrical odes of that age will perhaps be of opinion that he did not lose much by his ignorance.

It is true that his wife did her best to supply what was wanting, and that she was excellently qualified to be the head of the court. She was English by birth, and English also in her tastes and feelings. Her face was handsome, her port majestic, her temper sweet and lively, her manners affable and graceful. Her understanding, though very imperfectly cultivated, was quick. There was no want of feminine wit and shrewdness in her conversation; and her letters were so well expressed that they deserved to be well spelt. She took much pleasure in the lighter kinds of literature, and did something towards bringing books into fashion among ladies of quality. The stainless purity of her private life and the strict attention which she paid to her religious duties were the more respectable, because she was singularly free from censoriousness, and discouraged scandal as much as vice.

William's end was worthy of his life. His intellect was not for a moment clouded. His fortitude was the more admirable because he was not willing to die. He had very lately said to one of those whom he most loved: "You know that I never feared death; there have been times when I should have wished it; but, now that this great new prospect is opening before me, I do wish to stay here a little longer." Yet no weakness, no querulousness, disgraced the noble close of that noble career. To the physicians the king returned his thanks graciously and gently. "I know that you have done all that skill and learning could do for me: but the case is beyond your art; and I submit." From the words which escaped him he seemed to be frequently


[1702 A.D.]

engaged in mental prayer. Burnet and Tenison remained many hours in the sick room. He professed to them his firm belief in the truth of the Christian religion, and received the sacrament from their hands with great seriousness. The antechambers were crowded all night with lords and privy councillors. He ordered several of them to be called in, and exerted himself to take leave of them with a few kind and cheerful words. Among the English who were admitted to his bedside were Devonshire and Ormonde.

But there were in the crowd those who felt as no Englishman could feel, friends of his youth who had been true to him, and to whom he had been true, through all vicissitudes of fortune; who had served him with unalterable fidelity when his secretaries of state, his treasury and his admiralty had betrayed him; who had never on any field of battle, or in an atmosphere tainted with loathsome and deadly disease, shrunk from placing their own lives in jeopardy to save his, and whose truth he had at the cost of his own popularity rewarded with bounteous munificence. He strained his feeble voice to thank Auverquerque for the affectionate and loyal services of thirty years. To Albemarle he gave the keys of his closet, and of his private drawers. "You know," he said, "what to do with them." By this time he could scarcely respire. "Can this," he said to the physicians, "last long?" He was told that the end was approaching.

He swallowed a cordial, and asked for Bentinck. Those were his last articulate words. Bentinck instantly came to the bedside, bent down, and placed his ear close to the king's mouth. The lips of the dying man moved; but nothing could be heard. The king took the hand of his earliest friend, and pressed it tenderly to his heart. In that moment, no doubt, all that had cast a slight passing cloud over their long and pure friendship was forgotten. It was now between seven and eight in the morning. He closed his eyes, and gasped for breath. The bishops knelt down and read the commendatory prayer. When it ended William was no more.

When his remains were laid out, it was found that he wore next to his skin a small piece of black silk riband. The lords in waiting ordered it to be taken off. It contained a gold ring and a lock of the hair of Mary.[e]





CHAPTER XII

QUEEN ANNE

[1702–1714 A.D.]

THE successor to the throne was in the thirty-eighth year of her age. She had always been remarkably firm in her attachments to the Protestant religion, and her inclination was strong to the tory party. This, however, was much controlled by the great influence exercised over her mind by Lady Marlborough [formerly Sarah Jennings], who was a whig, which led to a hope that the high tory party would not be dominant during her reign. In her familiar intercourse with Lord and Lady Marlborough, the queen called herself and was called by them Mrs. Morley, and they were Mr. and Mrs. Freeman. When waited on by the privy-council the day of William's death, she spoke with great respect of that monarch, and announced her intention of treading in his steps. She renewed this declaration in her speech to the parliament, and her resolution was communicated without loss of time to the states-general, who had been overwhelmed with affliction at the news of the king's demise.

King William, with that noble spirit of patriotism, and of regard for the interests of Europe in general, which distinguished him, though aware of the treachery of Marlborough to himself, had destined him to the command of the English troops in the approaching war, for of his military and diplomatic talents he had the highest opinion. For this reason he had confided to him the task of negotiating the Grand Alliance, and Marlborough's conduct of it had fully justified his anticipations. The queen now declared that nobleman captain-general of the land-forces in England, and appointed him her ambassador at the Hague, whither he repaired without delay (28th) to assure the states of the intentions of his royal mistress, and to arrange the plan of the ensuing campaign.

The commons settled on the queen for life the revenue of £700,000 a year enjoyed by the late king, £100,000 of which she assured them she would

annually devote to the national service. The oath of abjuration was taken by all persons without any difficulty.

In forming her ministry Queen Anne gave the preference to the tories. Lords Halifax and Somers were dismissed; the duke of Leeds was sworn of the privy-council; Godolphin was made treasurer, Nottingham and Sir Charles Hedges secretaries, Normanby privy-seal, and Sir Nathan Wright chancellor; while of the whigs the duke of Somerset was president of the council, and the duke of Devonshire lord steward. Anne made her husband, Prince George, generalissimo of all her forces by sea and land, and Sir George Rooke vice-admiral of England. Seymour, Howe, Harcourt, and other tories also obtained employments.

On the very same day (May 15th), as had been previously arranged, war was declared against France at London, Vienna, and the Hague. In the beginning of July Marlborough took the command of the allied army in Flanders. He forthwith crossed the Maas and advanced to Hamont. The caution of the Dutch field-deputies restraining him from action, no battle was fought in Flanders this campaign; but by the capture of Venloo and other places on the Maas, and finally of Liège, the navigation of that river was completely opened. With this last acquisition the campaign closed.

It had been the plan of King William to send an expedition against Cadiz. The queen's ministry, in pursuance of that design, fitted out a fleet of thirty ships of the line, which, joined with twenty Dutch men-of-war, with frigates and transports, and carrying a body of fourteen thousand men, was destined for that service. The supreme command was given to the duke of Ormonde; Sir George Rooke commanded the fleet under him. On the 23rd of August the expedition arrived off Cadiz; but, instead of landing at once, three days were spent in debates and discussions about the place of landing and other matters which should have been arranged long before. By this delay time was given to the marquis Villadarias, the captain-general of Andalusia, to store the city with provisions and to place a boom across the mouth of the harbour. The English commanders resolved to reduce the forts on the mainland, instead of debarking in the isle of Leon; they therefore landed in the bay of Bulls, and advanced to Rota, which was given up by the governor; they thence moved to Port St. Mary's, a wealthy town; they found it deserted, and they fell at once to the work of plunder and destruction, not even sparing the churches. By this conduct they completely alienated the minds of the Andalusians from themselves and their cause; and seeing but slender hopes of any final success, they resolved to abandon the enterprise. They departed (September 30th), as Stanhope, one of those in command, expressed it, "with a great deal of plunder and of infamy." The naval and military commanders charged each other with the blame of the failure.

Fortune, however, seemed resolved to save them from the popular indignation at home. They learned on the coast of Portugal that the great Cadiz plate-fleet had put into Vigo bay, in Gallicia, and they resolved to attempt its capture. On reaching that bay (October 22nd) they found the entrance defended by a boom and two ruinous old towers; while the convoying ships of war, of which ten were French, lay moored along the shore, and the peasantry were all in arms. Ormonde landed with two thousand men, and reduced the towers; the English ships broke the boom; but while the ships of war gave them occupation, the galleons ran further up the gulf to try to save their cargoes; the English, however, soon overtook them. The crews then began to fling the cargoes into the sea, and to burn the galleons, but six of them and seven ships of war were captured. The total loss of the Spaniards

exceeded eight millions of dollars, of which the captors did not get more than one-half.

Admiral Benbow, a brave and able seaman, but rude and rough in his manners, was at this time in the West Indies with a squadron of ten ships. He fell in (August 19th) with a French squadron of equal force, under M. de Casse. A running fight was maintained for several days; but Benbow found that the greater part of his captains neglected his orders, and would not come into action. His right leg being broken by a chain-shot (24th), and, his captains still continuing refractory, he gave up the chase and bore for Jamaica, where he ordered a court-martial to be held on six of them; and two, Kirby and Wade, were sentenced to be shot, which sentence was executed at Plymouth, when they were sent home. Benbow died of his wounds at Kingston.



QUEEN ANNE
(1665–1714)

During the summer the parliament was dissolved, and a new one summoned. When it met (October 20th) it proved tory and high-church.[1] In its address to the queen it reflected on the memory of the late king, saying, for example, that Marlborough had retrieved the ancient glory and honour of the English nation. It was proposed to substitute the word maintained for that invidious term, but the proposal was rejected by a large majority. They also talked of the church being restored to its due rights and privileges. As the dissenters all belonged to the whig party, the commons now opened a battery on them, which long continued in operation. This was the bill for preventing occasional conformity; for many of the dissenters, viewing the different sects of Protestants as merely different forms of the common Christianity, made no scruple to conform to the Church of England, by taking the test and receiving the sacrament in it, as a qualification for office, but still adhered to their own sect. The pride of the church party had also been wounded by the imprudent vanity and insolence of Sir Humphrey Edwin, the lord mayor of London in 1697, who went to the meeting-house of Pinners' hall with all the insignia of his civic dignity. The bill now brought in enacted penalties against persons in office who should frequent dissenters' meeting-houses. It passed the commons by a large majority, but the lords made sundry amendments in it, which the commons would not admit, and it thus was lost for this session.

At the desire of the queen, an annual income of £100,000 was voted to

[1] The distinction between high and low-churchmen had lately come up. The former were so denominated from their claims to high sacerdotal power both in church and state, the latter from the opposite character.

her consort in case of his surviving her. The earl of Marlborough having been created a duke for his services in the late campaign, the queen informed the house of commons that she had granted him £5,000 a year out of the post-office revenue for his life, and that she wished an act to be passed for continuing it to his heirs; but the commons were indignant at the proposal, asserting, with truth, that he had been abundantly remunerated for his services; and the duke prudently requested the queen to recall her message.

We shall now briefly narrate in continuity the events of the war of the Succession, by land and sea, in which the troops and fleets of the queen of England were engaged. Our narrative will extend over a space of eight years.

The campaign of 1703 was opened by the capture of the city of Bonn, in the electorate of Cologne: the towns of Huy, Limburg, and Guelder were also reduced; but the energy of Marlborough was so cramped by the caution and dilatoriness of the Dutch, that he could venture on no action of importance. In this year the king of Portugal and the duke of Savoy joined the confederacy, and the archduke Charles assumed the title of king of Spain. He came to England in the close of the year, and, having partaken of the Christmas festivities of the court, was conveyed by Sir George Rooke, with a powerful squadron, to Lisbon.

BLENHEIM (AUGUST 13TH, 1704)

The year 1704 opened with gloomy prospects for the confederates. The emperor, pressed by the Hungarians, who were in rebellion, on one side, and by the Bavarians and French on the other, and totally unprovided with troops, was expecting every day to be besieged in his capital. Marlborough, who saw that, if the emperor was forced to yield the confederation was at an end, resolved to make a bold effort to relieve him. He secretly arranged his plans with Prince Eugene of Savoy, the imperial general, and then, pretending to his own government and the states that his object was merely to act on the Moselle, he induced the latter to be content with the protection of their own troops, and allow him to open the campaign where he proposed.[b]

It was entirely Marlborough's own idea, and at the same time his greatest one, to undertake that unexpected march from the lower Rhine to the Danube, by means of which he joined his own forces to those of Germany and Austria, and was thus enabled to strike a great blow at the main strength of the French. The tories, who were more than usually excited at a recent change in the ministry, looked upon the undertaking with disfavour, and yet (for they expected it to fail) with secret satisfaction. A saying was reported to have come from some of them, that they would mob the general, if ever he came back, as hounds worry a hare. Marlborough knew all that well enough; he made no secret of the fact that if he were not victorious he was lost.

On the plains of Blenheim was the great European conflict fought out to the defeat of France. It was one of those battles which determine the relation of powers to one another, and the fate of nations dependent thereupon, for many years to come. In the library at Windsor strangers are shown the spacious bay window, where Queen Anne was enjoying in stillness the landscape there spread out to view, when she received the news of her army's victory. It was the great moment of her life. That, after which her predecessors had striven in vain, had been achieved under her auspices, under the leadership of a man who stood nearest to herself among the politicians

of the time; a limit had been set once for all to the supremacy of France on the Continent.[c]

The loss of the French, in killed, drowned, taken, and deserters, was forty thousand men; among the prisoners was Marshal Tallard and twelve hundred of his officers. The allies had forty-five hundred killed and seventy-five hundred wounded. The victory would have been still more complete but for the misconduct of the imperial troops, which enabled the elector to retire in good order and with little loss.



JOHN CHURCHILL, FIRST DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH
(1650–1722)

Ulm and several other places were reduced; the allied army recrossed the Rhine; and the campaign was terminated with the sieges of Landau, Treves, and Traerbach. In December the duke returned to England; he received the thanks of the queen and the two houses; the royal manor and honour of Woodstock were conferred on him and his heirs, and the queen gave orders for a splendid mansion, to be named Blenheim castle, to be erected on it at the cost of the crown.

CAMPAIGNS OF 1704–1708

Sir George Rooke had sailed from Lisbon, carrying a corps of five thousand troops, under the prince of Hesse Darmstadt, for an attempt on Barcelona; but their strength not proving sufficient, they abandoned the enterprise. On their way back they attacked and captured the strong fortress of Gibraltar, of which Rooke took possession in the name of the queen of England. He then fought an indecisive action with a French fleet off Malaga.

The campaign of 1705 in Flanders produced no great battle, owing to the opposition of the Dutch field-deputies. Its most important event was the forcing of the French lines, extending from Namur to Antwerp, defended by seventy thousand men, and strong by nature as well as art. This exploit was performed in a masterly manner, and without any loss. Marlborough came up with the French army on the banks of the river Dyle, but, when he would attack it, the Dutch deputies interposed and prevented him. Toward winter he visited the new emperor, Joseph, at Vienna, by whom he was created a prince of the empire, and the principality of Mindelsheim was conferred on him. He there arranged the terms of a new alliance between the emperor and the maritime powers.

On the 3rd of June Lord Peterborough sailed from Portsmouth with a land force of about five thousand men. His instructions were to aid the

duke of Savoy, or to attack one of the Spanish ports and make a vigorous push in Spain. At Lisbon he was joined by the archduke Charles, and at Gibraltar by the prince of Darmstadt. They touched at Altea, in Valencia, where they found the people zealous in their favour. Peterborough then formed the daring project of making a dash for Madrid, which was only fifty leagues distant, but the archduke and Darmstadt insisted on proceeding to Barcelona. The want of money was another obstacle, and Peterborough gave way. When they came to Barcelona (August 16th) they found the fortifications of that town strong and in good repair, and the garrison as numerous as their own force. Peterborough and most of the officers were against making any attempt, but the archduke and Darmstadt were as obstinate as ever. To gratify them, the troops were landed, and lay for three weeks in inactivity before the town. Dissension prevailed among the commanders, and there seemed no course but to re-embark the troops, when Peterborough (September 13th), by a fortunate and well-conducted piece of temerity, made himself master of the strong fort of Montjuich, which commands the city. Numbers of the Miquelets, or armed peasantry, now flocked to the standard of Charles, and the siege was carried on with vigour. At length a breach was effected; but ere the assault was given, the soldiers of the garrison forced the brave old viceroy, Velasco, to propose terms. An honourable treaty was concluded (October 9th); but several of the Miquelets had stolen into the town, and they and the discontented townsmen appeared in arms early next morning, with the resolution of massacring the viceroy and his friends. Peterborough, on hearing the tumult, rode to one of the gates of the city and demanded admittance. The gate was opened to him, and his first act was to save a noble lady from the pursuit of the Miquelets. He suppressed the riot, enabled the viceroy to escape to Alicant, and then withdrew from the town till the term of the treaty should have expired. The viceroy, however, had left orders for an immediate surrender. All Catalonia now rose in favour of Charles, and its example was followed by Valencia.

Wearied by the opposition of the Dutch generals and field-deputies, and disgusted with the slowness and indecision of the imperialists, Marlborough planned for the campaign of 1706 the leading of an army in person into Italy to co-operate with Prince Eugene of Savoy, while a British army should land on the coast of Saintonge to endeavour to raise the Huguenots of the south of France. But the French having been successful on the Upper Rhine, the states became alarmed, and they implored Marlborough to retain the command in the Netherlands, offering to free him from the control of the deputies. He complied with their wishes and prepared to open the campaign by the siege of Namur. The French court sent positive orders to Marshal Villeroy to risk a battle in defence of that town. He therefore advanced to the village of Ramillies beyond Tirlemont, where, on Whitsunday (May 23rd), he was attacked by the allied army of sixty thousand men, his own force being about sixty-two thousand. The action commenced after one o'clock and lasted till the evening; the French sustained a total defeat, losing thirteen thousand men in killed, wounded, and taken, beside two thousand who afterwards deserted, eighty stand of colours, and nearly all their artillery and baggage; the loss of the allies was one thousand killed and twenty-five hundred wounded. The immediate consequence of this glorious victory was the submission of the states of Brabant to King Charles, and the surrender of Brussels, Ghent, Oudenarde, Antwerp, and the other towns of that province. Dendermond, Ostend, and Aeth stood each a siege, and the campaign closed with the capture of this last.

In Spain this year Barcelona was invested by land and sea by the French and Spaniards under Philip in person, while its small garrison of not more than two thousand men was animated by the presence of Charles. The enthusiasm almost peculiar to the Spaniards was manifested in the defence; monks and women appeared in arms, and Peterborough advancing from Valencia carried on a guerilla-warfare (for which no man was better adapted) in the enemy's rear. The city however would have been reduced but for the arrival of an English fleet with troops, at the sight of which the blockading squadron retired to Toulon, and the garrison being now reinforced, the besieging army marched off with all speed to Roussillon. In the mean time the Anglo-Portuguese army under the earl of Galway and the marquis Das Minas had entered Spain, and, on hearing of the relief of Barcelona, they advanced and occupied Madrid. But instead of pressing at once on Philip, who was at Burgos, they loitered for a month in the capital. Charles in like manner stayed at Barcelona, and then went to Zaragoza instead of Madrid. The national antipathy between Castilians and Aragonese revived; the former showed themselves enthusiastic for Philip; and Galway and Das Minas, unable to get back into Portugal, had to retire into Valencia, pursued by the duke of Berwick. Philip then returned to Madrid.

After the misfortunes of the last campaign Louis had made proposals for a treaty, first to the states alone and then to them and Marlborough, offering to cede to Charles either Spain and the Indies or the Italian dominions, with a barrier to the Dutch and compensation to the duke of Savoy. His offers, however, were rejected, and Marlborough again took the field (1707). But the campaign proved utterly inactive, as the duke of Vendome, the French general, would give no opportunity for fighting. In Spain the allied forces under Galway and Das Minas (contrary to the opinion of Peterborough, who advised a defensive system) advanced into the kingdom of Murcia to engage the duke of Berwick. They found him (April 25th) encamped on the vega or plain of Almanza; his army, which had been reinforced from France, amounted to about twenty-five thousand men, while that of the allies did not exceed seventeen thousand. His superiority in cavalry was very great; his troops were fresh, while theirs were fatigued with a morning's march. The battle commenced at three in the afternoon; the contest was for some time most obstinate; but Galway and Das Minas both being wounded and obliged to leave the field, the allies were finally routed. They left four thousand men dead on the spot; nearly all the remaining infantry were obliged to surrender; the generals fled to Catalonia with about three thousand five hundred cavalry. Valencia and Aragon were speedily reduced to the obedience of Philip, and the campaign closed with the siege and capture of Lerida.

In the month of July the duke of Savoy and Prince Eugene had entered Provence with an army of thirty thousand men and laid siege to Toulon, while a British fleet under Sir Charles Cloudesley Shovel attacked it from the sea. The defence of the garrison, however, was gallant; and as a large army was said to be hastening to its relief, the duke raised the siege and retired. As Admiral Shovel was returning to England his fleet ran on the rocks westward of Scilly. His own ship, the *Association*, foundered, and himself and all his crew perished; the same was the fate of the *Eagle* and the *Romney*.

In the spring of 1708, Louis, encouraged by intelligence of the discontent which prevailed in England and still more in Scotland, fitted out a fleet at Dunkirk, in which the son of James II, now called the Chevalier de St. George,

and in England the Pretender, embarked and sailed for Scotland. But Sir George Byng was at the Firth of Forth with an English squadron, and they found it impossible to effect a landing. After being beaten about by storms for a month, they got back in a shattered condition to Dunkirk.

The French army in the Netherlands was commanded by the king's grandson, the duke of Burgundy, aided by the duke of Vendome. They surprised Ghent and Bruges and laid siege to Oudenarde. At the approach of Marlborough to its relief they retired; but he brought them to action at no great distance from that town (July 11th). The battle did not commence till evening, and the coming on of night saved the French from a rout which might have ended the war. They lost three thousand men killed and seven thousand taken; the loss of the allies was about two thousand men. After this victory Marlborough invested (August 13th) Lisle, the capital of French Flanders, a city of remarkable strength and largely garrisoned. Every possible effort for its relief was made by the French generals; but at length the town (October 25th) and finally the citadel (December 10th) were forced to surrender. Ghent was then besieged and recovered, and the campaign, regarded as one of the ablest during the war, terminated. The taking of the islands of Sardinia and Minorca gave some lustre to the cause of the allies in the south.

EXACTIONS OF THE ALLIES CAUSE A RENEWAL OF WAR

The losses which France had sustained now (1709) made Louis sincerely anxious for peace, and he was willing to surrender all the Spanish dominions except Naples, to give the Dutch a sufficient barrier, etc. The allies, however, insisted on the cession of the Spanish dominions without exception, and even on Louis aiding to drive his grandson out of Spain. These terms he rejected as an insult; he addressed a manifesto to his subjects; and, exhausted as they were by famine and taxation, the eminent loyalty of the people enabled him to renew the war with augmented vigour.

The fortune of war was, however, still adverse to France. The first act of the renewed drama was the investment of Tournay by the allies and its surrender after a gallant defence (September 3rd). Prince Eugene and Marlborough then prepared to invest Mons. Marshal Villars hastened to its relief; he posted his army between two woods near Malplaquet, and fortified his camp with redoubts and intrenchments. Here, however, he was attacked (September 11th) by the allies. The armies were nearly equal in number, each being about ninety thousand men: the action was the most desperately contested during the war; the honour of the day remained to the allies with a list of twenty thousand killed and wounded, while the French retired with the loss of fourteen thousand. The siege and capture of Mons terminated the campaign. In Spain fortune was adverse to the allies; they lost the town of Alicant, and they were defeated on the plain of Gudiña.

Negotiations for peace were resumed in 1710, and a congress sat at the little town of Gertruydenburg. Louis seemed to be most moderate; but his sincerity was doubted and the conference was broken off. The taking of Douay and some other towns alone signalised the campaign in the Netherlands; but events of greater importance took place in Spain.

The army of Charles was commanded by the English general Stanhope and the Austrian marshal Staremburg; that of Philip by the marquis of Villadarias. The former entered Aragon, while the latter invaded Catalonia: as it was on its return, the allies wished to cut it off from Lerida, and on the

evening of the 27th of July, their cavalry, led by Stanhope in person, engaged and routed, near the village of Almenara, a superior body of the Spanish cavalry. Night saved the Spanish army from a total rout. They retired to Lerida and thence to Zaragoza, whither they were followed by the allies, who passed the Ebro unopposed. The rival monarchs were present with their armies; that of Philip counted twenty-five thousand, that of Charles twenty-three thousand men. A battle was fought under the walls of that ancient city (August 20th), which ended in the total defeat of the Spaniards, who lost five thousand slain and wounded, four thousand prisoners, and all their colours and artillery. The loss of the victors was only fifteen hundred men. Philip fled to Madrid and thence to Valladolid, and Charles soon after entered the capital, but he found it nearly deserted. The fidelity of the Castilians to his rival was invincible, and their efforts soon placed him at the head of another army, of which the duke of Vendome took the command.

As Catalonia was menaced by the French, the allies resolved to return thither; on account of the difficulty of procuring supplies they were obliged to march in separate divisions, and Vendome, having with his entire army surrounded Stanhope, who had about five thousand English troops, in the town of Brihuega, forced him to surrender (December 9th) after a most gallant defence. Next day Vendome gave battle on the plain of Villa Viciosa. to Staremburg, who was advancing to the relief of Stanhope. The honour of the day remained with the German; but he was so harassed by the partisans in his retreat that he did not bring more than seven thousand men back to Barcelona. The war in Spain was now virtually at an end; it was plain that the Castilian spirit was not to be subdued; and the succession of Charles to the imperial throne soon altered the relations of Europe.

AGITATION REGARDING THE SEPARATION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

We now return to the domestic affairs of England during the time of the war. Since the accession of James I, the necessity of a closer union between the two British kingdoms had been apparent to judicious statesmen. The Act of Security passed by the Scottish parliament in 1704 proved the danger of delaying that measure any longer; for by this it was enacted that, on the death of the queen without issue, the estates should appoint a successor of the royal line and a Protestant; but that it should not be the same person who would succeed to the throne of England, unless the independence of the Scottish nation and parliament, and the religion, trade, and liberty of the people had previously been secured against English influence. The queen gave her assent to this act by the advice of Godolphin, whose object is said to have been to frighten the English into a union of the kingdoms by the terror of a separation of the two British crowns. If such was his plan, it was eminently successful. The act was regarded in England as almost a declaration of war. A bill rapidly passed both houses, empowering the queen to appoint commissioners for a union of the kingdoms; declaring the Scots aliens if they did not accede to a treaty or adopt the Hanoverian succession within a year; prohibiting the importation of their cattle and linens; and appointing cruisers to prevent their trade with France. An address was made to the queen to put the towns of Carlisle, Berwick, Newcastle, and Hull in a state of defence; troops were marched to the borders; and the six northern counties were called on to arm for their defence.

In the Scottish parliament there were three parties; the court party,

headed by the duke of Queensberry; the jacobites, whose chief was the duke of Hamilton; and the country party, who, though zealous for the independence of the kingdom, were attached to the Protestant succession. In this party there were various shades of opinion; it contained royalists and republicans, of which last class Fletcher of Saltoun was by far the most eminent. This man was the perfect model of those who with pure motives seek to convert a monarchy into a republic. He was, as it was expressed, "brave as the sword he wore," of unstained honour, of strict probity, of ardent patriotism, of simple and nervous eloquence, of extensive reading and knowledge of mankind; but he was stern and obstinate, impatient of contradiction, chimerical in his projects, and enthusiastic in his spirit; in a word, a man who would dictate, not concede; and meliorate on his own principles, or not at all. A portion of the country party, comprising the marquis of Tweeddale, Lord Belhaven, and other late ministers of the crown, formed what was termed the *Squadrone Volante*, and sought to trim the balance between the two parties of court and opposition.[b]

Apart from all other considerations, looking to the position of affairs in the world at that time, there lay in the conflict of the great powers a most pressing call for the union. At any moment the French could invite the very numerous adherents of the pretender in Scotland to rise; what then would become of the security of their religion or of the liberty of the people? The party which conducted the administration could maintain itself only by means of a union with England. And for England it was of the utmost importance to anticipate a change of affairs in Scotland. The union was one of the wishes of the whigs in accordance with their previous policy; but the tories also declared themselves in favour of it: they would otherwise have been regarded as opponents of the Protestant succession.

But if the English were so inclined, they had a price moreover to offer which Scotland could not withstand. We have noticed the sudden awakening of the commercial spirit of Scotland; the animosity then felt was founded chiefly on the opposition which the English had showed to the first risings of this spirit. They now determined to offer their hand to the Scots in this particular. They guaranteed them a share in their colonies and in their foreign trade; in return for which the Scots adopted the English imposts and a part of their system of taxation, especially the excise duties. This of course involved also a share in paying the interest of the English national debt: but a compensation to the Scots [known as the Equivalent] was voted. The essence of the agreement lies in a union of imposts and trade which for the more wealthy country could be neither agreeable nor advantageous; but all special interests had now to be given up once for all. It was hard for the Scots to let go their legislative and administrative autonomy, for this too had been hitherto secured to them by the maintenance of a special privy council of their own. When they on the other hand stipulated for the integrity of their church constitution, the Anglicans on their side consented with the greatest reluctance. But the sense of danger to both parties if the separation continued overruled all difficulties. In the meetings of the commissioners of both countries to deliberate about conditions, which Lord Somers, though not holding any public office at the time, conducted with that legal and political superiority which is always so decisive, no ill feeling or discord for this once arose.[c]

The Scottish parliament met on the 13th of October: the duke of Queensberry, a man of the highest rank and most conciliating manners, prudent and resolute, sat as the royal commissioner. The treaty was read, and then

printed and published. Forthwith a storm of indignation burst forth over the whole kingdom; each class saw danger to its own peculiar interests; all fired at the thought of the loss of national independence. Addresses against it were poured in from all parts; tumults arose in Edinburgh; the Cameronians of the west were preparing to take up arms and dissolve the parliament by force. Two-thirds of the nation, in fact, were decidedly opposed to the union.

THE ACT OF UNION (1707 A.D.)

However, the force of reason, the force of argument, but, above all, the force of the Equivalent, finally prevailed against all the efforts of mistaken patriotism. The *Squadrone Volante* was gained to the court; Hamilton proved false to his party; and the act of ratification was passed by the large majority of one hundred and ten. By a separate act the Presbyterian form of church government was secured. To gratify the poor nobility so numerous in Scotland, the privilege of freedom from personal arrest was accorded to the Scottish peerage. The Act of Union, when transmitted to England, after encountering some opposition from the high tories in the house of peers, received the approbation of the English legislature, and (May 1st, 1707) the two kingdoms were incorporated into one, to be called Great Britain.

PARTY FACTION

During this time the struggle of parties went on in the English parliament and cabinet. The tories twice renewed their efforts to carry their bill against occasional conformity, even attempting to tack it to the bill for the land-tax. In the cabinet, Marlborough and Godolphin were thwarted by them in their views respecting the mode of conducting the war. These ministers contrived, however, to get rid of Rochester in 1703; and in the following year they were equally successful with respect to Nottingham, Jersey, and Sir Edward Seymour. The duchess was most anxious to effect a union between Marlborough and the whigs, but, great as her influence was over him, she did not succeed. Harley became secretary in place of Nottingham; and Henry St. John, a young man of great promise, was made secretary of war. The attempts of the tories to depreciate his glorious victory at Blenheim tended however greatly to alienate Marlborough from them; and the result of the elections for a new parliament in 1705, which gave a clear majority to the whigs in the commons, led him and Godolphin to contemplate a union with that party. Even previous to the meeting of parliament, the whig influence had been sufficient to cause the dismissal of the duke of Buckingham (late marquis of Normanby) from the privy seal, and the appointment of the duke of Newcastle; and the transfer of the great seal from Sir Nathan Wright to Mr. William Cowper. The contest for the office of speaker was between Mr. Smith of the whig and Mr. Bromly of the tory party: the former was supported by the court, and carried it by a majority of forty-three. The speech from the throne accorded with the views of the whigs, and the addresses of the two houses re-echoed it.

The first attack of the tories on their rivals was a motion in the lords (November 15th) to address the queen to invite the presumptive heiress of the crown to reside in England. By this they hoped to reduce the whigs to a disagreeable dilemma; for, if they supported it, they would offend the queen; if they opposed it, they would injure themselves both with the house of Han-

over and with the nation. They, however, manfully opposed it, and brought in a bill for the appointment of a regency to act in case of the queen's demise, and another for naturalising the whole of the electoral family. These bills were carried, after much opposition to the former from the tories; and the dislike of the queen to the whigs was now evidently diminished. As much had been said during the debate of the church being in danger, Lord Halifax moved to appoint a day for inquiry into that danger. When the day came, an angry debate took place; but both houses concurred, by large majorities, in a resolution that the church was in a most safe and flourishing condition.

The strength of the tory party was weakened by division, while the whigs acted in one compact body, under the direction of the junto, as it was named, which was composed of the lords Somers, Halifax, Wharton, Orford, and Sunderland; this last the son of James' minister, and son-in-law of Marlborough, but the devoted admirer of Somers. The bias of the queen, the general, and the treasurer was to the tories; but the first had been offended by their late conduct, and the last two saw that it was only from the whigs that they could expect support in their foreign policy. The junto felt their power, and insisted on a larger share for their party on the profits and influence of office. They required that Sir Charles Hedges should be dismissed, and Sunderland be made secretary in his place; but it was the policy of the queen to give sway to neither party; and she had, moreover, a personal dislike to Sunderland. The policy of her two great ministers had been the same as hers, but they saw the necessity of giving way; yet it cost them a year's labour and the threat of resignation to overcome the reluctance of the queen (1708).

Harley's Treachery

They had, however, been secretly thwarted in the whole affair by their colleague Harley, and a bed-chamber influence of which they were not aware. The duchess of Marlborough had a cousin who was married to a Mr. Hill, an eminent Turkey merchant, who became a bankrupt; his family in consequence fell into great poverty, and the duchess kindly provided for his children. She placed Abigail, one of the daughters, about the person of the queen as bed-chamber woman, reckoning, of course, that she would always adhere to the interests of her patroness. But Miss Hill soon found that she might aspire higher. The queen, weak and yielding as she was, gradually became weary of the domineering temper of the duchess, and she poured her complaints into the ear of her obsequious attendant, who, it was soon observed, was fast rising in favour and influence. It happened that Miss Hill was related to Harley on the father's, as to the duchess on the mother's side; and, as her politics were tory, that wily statesman entered into a close alliance with her, and by her means influenced the queen. The duchess' friends warned her in vain of the way in which her power was being undermined. At length the private marriage of Miss Hill with Mr. Masham, an officer in the royal houshold, celebrated in the presence of only the queen and Doctor Arbuthnot the court physician, opened her eyes. Godolphin about the same time obtained convincing proofs of Harley's secret machinations.

The policy of Marlborough and Godolphin in joining neither party had the usual fate; both were alienated from them. The ill success of the war in 1707 afforded topics of attack to the discontented. The two ministers saw more strongly than ever the necessity of conciliating the whigs; and they received further proofs of Harley's treachery. The whigs having given them

the strongest assurances of their support, they waited on the queen and told her that they could serve her no longer unless Harley were dismissed. She remained firm.

On the next meeting of the cabinet-council the two ministers were absent. Harley was proceeding to business, when the duke of Somerset said he did not see how they could deliberate without the general and treasurer. The looks of the others expressed their assent; Harley was disconcerted; the queen broke up the council in anger and alarm. The commons and the city gave signs of their discontent. Still the queen was unmoved; but Harley himself saw the difficulties of his situation, and resigned. St. John and the attorney-general, Sir Simon Harcourt, followed his example, and their places were given to Mr. Boyle, Mr. Robert Walpole, and Sir James Montague, brother of Lord Halifax. This last appointment was long resisted by the queen; and all the influence of Marlborough and Godolphin failed to procure a seat in the cabinet, though without office, for Somers. The queen, in fact, disliked the whigs more than ever, and was still secretly actuated by Harley; and they showed themselves as factious as the tories had been; for, bent on coming into office, they had resolved to annoy both the queen and Marlborough by an attack on the admiralty, that is, on her husband and on his brother, Admiral Churchill, by whom the prince was guided. Marlborough had consented to give up his brother, when the opportune death of the prince (October 28th) removed all difficulties. Lord Pembroke was made lord high-admiral, and was succeeded by Somers as president of the council; and Wharton became lord-lieutenant of Ireland.

THE WHIG MINISTRY; THE TRIAL OF SACHEVERELL (1710 A.D.)

Nothing, however, would content the whigs short of the possession of all offices of emolument and influence; and the condition of the general and treasurer, between them and the queen, was far from enviable. To add to their embarrassments, the desire of peace was becoming general. The apparent willingness of Louis to concede weighed with many; the pressure of taxation with others; the want of French wines and other foreign luxuries rendered numbers pacific; and Marlborough was charged with desiring to prolong the war from selfish motives. "All the bottle-companions," says Cunningham, "many physicians, and great numbers of the lawyers and inferior clergy, and in fine the loose women too, were united together in the faction against the duke of Marlborough." "It was strange," says he, "to see how much the desire of French wine and the dearness of it alienated many men from his friendship."

Orford having replaced Pembroke at the admiralty, the ministry may be regarded as whig from the close of the year 1708, when a new parliament met, and Sir Richard Onslow, a whig, was chosen speaker. In its second session (1709) the violence of party zeal hurried it into a measure which eventually overthrew the ministry.

There was a clergyman, named Sacheverell, a preacher at St. Saviour's, Southwark, a man of little talent and less learning, but of a restless and ambitious temper. This man took on him to be a champion of high-church doctrines; and, in a sermon preached before the lord-mayor and aldermen on the 5th of November, he asserted the monstrous doctrine of passive obedience, in the most unqualified terms; attacked the dissenters and the toleration; styled the moderate bishops "perfidious prelates and false sons of the church"; and called on the people to stand up in its defence. He also

[1710 A.D.]

assailed the administration, particularly Godolphin, whom he styled Volpone. This wretched farrago was published at the desire of the lord-mayor; the tories extolled it as almost inspired, and they circulated forty thousand copies of it. The ministers held several consultations. Somers and Marlborough were, it is said by Coxe,[d] for leaving the matter to the ordinary tribunals; but Godolphin, whose feelings were wounded, and the others resolved on an impeachment. Articles were therefore exhibited against Sacheverell, and the 27th of February, 1710, was the day fixed for the trial in Westminster Hall. In the interval the tories and the clergy in general made every effort to inflame the minds of the populace and excite their zeal for the church.

The trial lasted for three weeks. The managers were Sir Joseph Jekyl, General Stanhope, Walpole, King, and others. The Doctor, as he was called, was defended by Harcourt and Phipps, and assisted by doctors Atterbury, Smallridge, and Friend. He was brought each day from the Temple, where he had been placed, to the hall in a coach, round which the people pressed, eager to kiss his hand. The queen came daily to hear the trial; and the populace used to crowd round her sedan, crying, "God bless your majesty and the church; we hope your majesty is for Doctor Sacheverell."

The managers had a delicate part to act; for, as Sacheverell had asserted that the Revolution was not a case of resistance (he did not impugn it), they had to show that it was, and thence to assert the lawfulness of taking arms against the law, and that in the presence of the queen. They, however, did not shrink from their duty. Sacheverell's counsel freely acknowledged the lawfulness of resistance, but they maintained that he was justified in his doctrine of non-resistance by the homilies and the writings of eminent Anglican divines. He was voted guilty by a majority of sixty-nine to fifty-two, of which last thirty-four signed a protest. He was sentenced to be suspended from preaching for three years, and his sermon to be publicly burned; and the Oxford decree of 1683 was condemned to share its fate. This gentle sentence was regarded by the tory party as a triumph, and such in fact it was. Bonfires and illuminations, in London and all over the kingdom, testified their joy; and addresses in favour of non-resistance poured in from all quarters.

The Triumph of the Tories

Harley and the favourite, now sure of the temper of the nation, resolved to hesitate no longer. They had already sought to mortify Marlborough, by getting the queen, on the death of Lord Essex, to give his regiment to Major Hill, Mrs. Masham's brother. Marlborough, highly indignant, insisted on the favourite being dismissed, or else he would resign; but the efforts of Godolphin and other friends accommodated the matter, and he was contented with the disposal of the regiment being left with him. To prove, as it were, the influence of the favourite, the queen soon after gave Hill a pension of £1,000 a year; and she made the duke consent to raise him to the rank of brigadier.

It was Harley's plan to overthrow the ministry by degrees. He began by causing the queen to take the office of lord-chamberlain from the marquis of Kent, and confer it on the duke of Shrewsbury; for this amiable but versatile nobleman, who had returned from Italy, where he had resided for some years, was now alienated in some degree from the whigs on public and even on private grounds, as they did not, he thought, pay due attention to

his lady, an Italian countess who had been originally his mistress, and who now governed him. He was therefore easily gained over by Harley. The queen made the appointment (April 13th) while Godolphin was at Newmarket, and announced it to him by a dry letter. The treasurer acted with his usual indecision: the whigs fearing a dissolution suffered themselves to be cajoled by Shrewsbury; and Harley, now reckoning the victory sure, made his next attack on Sunderland, a man whose overbearing temper had raised him many enemies, and to whom the queen had a peculiar antipathy. The treasurer was as usual without spirit, his whig colleagues clung to their places with the pertinacity distinctive of their party, and abandoned Sunderland; and the queen had the gratification (June 14th) of dismissing him and giving the seals to Lord Dartmouth, a zealous high-church man. Jacobites and high tories now flocked to court and congratulated the queen on her emancipation, as they affected to regard it; the duke of Beaufort, for instance, said to her, "Your majesty is now queen indeed."

The next stroke stunned the whigs. On the 7th of August, Godolphin, who saw that the queen was annoyed at some things he had said in council, had an audience of her. He concluded his discourse by asking, "Is it the will of your majesty that I should go on?" "Yes," said she, without hesitation. That very evening he received a letter from her, desiring him to break his white staff of office! The treasury was put into commission, Harley taking the chancellorship of the exchequer.

The temper of the nation had now been ascertained in various ways, and the prevalence of the high-church and tory spirit was beyond question. That wretched tool Sacheverell having been presented by a Mr. Lloyd with a living in North Wales, his party took advantage of his going to take possession of it to make a demonstration. His progress thither, as it was termed, resembled those of the monarchs in former times. The nobility entertained him sumptuously at their houses; the University of Oxford showed him equal honour; the magistrates of corporate towns met him with their insignia of office. The hedges were for miles decked with garlands and lined with spectators, streamers waved from the steeples of the churches, the air resounded with the cry of, "The church and Doctor Sacheverell!" At Bridgenorth, a Mr. Cresswell met him at the head of four thousand men on horseback, and as many on foot, wearing white knots edged with gold and leaves of gilt laurel in their hats. It is a pity that so much really good and honest feeling should have been wasted on so unworthy an object.

Emboldened by these signs of the popular sentiment, the cabal thought they might now safely venture on a dissolution and a total change of ministry. The queen therefore came to the council (September 21st), and ordered a proclamation to be issued for dissolving the parliament. The chancellor rose to speak, but she said she would admit of no debate, for that such was her pleasure. A general change of administration immediately followed; Lord Somers, the duke of Devonshire, and Mr. Boyle resigned, and their places were taken by Lord Rochester, the duke of Buckingham, and Mr. St. John. Wharton and Orford having also resigned, the lieutenancy of Ireland was given to the duke of Ormonde, and the admiralty was put into commission. All the efforts of Harley and the queen having failed to induce Lord Cowper to retain the great seal, it was put into commission, but was soon given to Sir Simon Harcourt. Of all the whigs, the dukes of Somerset and Newcastle alone remained in high offices.

Thus fell the most glorious, the most able, and we may add perhaps the most virtuous and patriotic administration that England had possessed since

[1711 A.D.]

the days of Elizabeth. It fell by disunion in itself, by the imprudent impeachment of a contemptible divine, and by the intrigues of the bed-chamber, where a weak woman, whom the constitution had invested with power, was domineered over by one waiting-maid and wheedled and flattered by another. When the parliament met on the 25th of November, it proved almost entirely tory, and Bromley was chosen speaker with little or no opposition.

Marlborough on his return was subjected to every kind of indignity. The queen herself desired him not to allow a vote of thanks to him to be moved in parliament, and he had the mortification to see the thanks of the houses bestowed on Peterborough for his Quixotic exploits in Spain. In spite of his most urgent solicitations, his duchess was deprived of her places at court, which were divided between the duchess of Somerset and Mrs. Masham, and an attempt was even made to convict her of peculation. Swift and the other libellers in the service of the ministry poured out all their venom on him. "He was ridiculed," says Smollet,[e] "in public libels, and reviled in private conversation. Instances were everywhere repeated of his fraud, avarice, and extortion; of his insolence, cruelty, ambition, and misconduct. Even his courage was called in question, and this consummate general was represented as the lowest of mankind." Among his other annoyances, he had to listen to lectures on his military conduct from Harley and St. John. Yet he did not resign; for Godolphin and the whigs, the emperor, and all the allies implored him to retain the command of the army, as otherwise all their hopes would be gone.

Harley, in the midst of his triumph, found that he was not to lie on a bed of roses. The more violent tories, headed by Rochester, regarding him and his friend as lukewarm, formed to control him a combination of not less than one hundred and thirty members of the house of commons, under the name of the October Club, and the whigs on their part had a powerful auxiliary in the duchess of Somerset, a lady of high character, and loved and respected by the queen. Harley and St. John immediately began to make overtures to the duke of Marlborough, and it is probable that they must have come to terms with the whigs, or have succumbed to the October Club, had not a fortunate event arisen to extricate them (1711).

There was a French refugee, called the marquis Guiscard, who had had the command of a regiment, which being broken after the battle of Almanza, he obtained a pension of £500 a year. Harley reduced this pension to £400, and Guiscard in his rage proposed to the French cabinet to acquaint them with sundry secrets of state which he possessed. His letters were intercepted, and he was arrested on a charge of high treason. He was brought before the council at the Cockpit (March 8th), and an order was made to convey him to Newgate. He resisted the messenger, and rushing forward struck Harley in the bosom with a penknife which he had concealed; the blade broke against the bone; he struck again with the stump, but St. John and the others drawing their swords fell on and gave him several wounds. He was then taken to Newgate, where he died of the injuries which he had received. The general sympathy was thus awakened for Harley, and he was regarded as a victim to his zeal for the public service. The death of Lord Rochester (May 2nd) was also of advantage to him, and he was forthwith (24th) raised to the peerage by the title of earl of Oxford and Mortimer, and (29th) made lord high-treasurer. The duke of Buckingham succeeded Rochester on the 12th of June, and several other promotions took place in the course of the year.

THE FALL OF MARLBOROUGH

The military events of this year, the last of Marlborough's glorious career of victory, were few; but no campaign better displayed his consummate military skill. Villars had drawn strongly fortified lines from Bouchain on the Schelt to Arras, and he proudly styled them Marlborough's *ne plus ultra*. Yet the duke, by a skilful manœuvre, passed them without the loss of a single man, and then invested and took Bouchain (September 14th), though situated in a morass strongly fortified, and defended by a large garrison, with an army more numerous than that of the allies at hand to relieve it.

But it was needless for Marlborough to gain victories and capture towns; the ministry were so bent on peace that they were actually in secret negotiation with the court of France. In the beginning of the year (January 11th) their agent Gaultier, a French priest, waited on the marquis de Torcy, the French secretary of state, and abruptly asked him if he wished for peace, which was, says Torcy, "like asking a sick man whether he wishes to recover." Louis however saw his advantage, and affected not to be in any great need of it; he endeavoured to draw the English cabinet into a separate negotiation. Matthew Prior, the poet, was sent secretly to Paris, and M. Mesnager to London, and preliminary articles were agreed on (October 8th), which were then communicated to the Dutch and imperial ministers at the court of London, the latter of whom caused them to be inserted in the paper called the *Postboy*, and their appearance excited the indignation of all who had a feeling of national dignity and honour.

The ministers of the allies made strong representations against the peace, and the whig party was now strengthened by the accession of Lord Nottingham, who was offended with the ministers. The queen tried to no purpose the effect of closeting on Marlborough, Somers, Cowper, and others: an amendment to the address, declaring that no peace could be safe or honourable if Spain and the West Indies were to be allotted to any branch of the house of Bourbon, was proposed by Nottingham and carried against the ministry, who however had influence enough to have a similar clause rejected in the commons by a large majority. But the queen herself now gave symptoms of wavering, and the timid and self-interested in both houses began to look about them. Oxford saw that he must act with decision or be lost. As he ascribed the power of the opposition chiefly to the influence of Marlborough, he resolved to strike him down; charges of fraud and peculation were therefore made against him, and the queen, over whom the bed-chamber party had recovered their influence, wrote him a letter on New Year's Day, 1712, dismissing him from all his employments. To follow up their victory, the ministers had recourse the very next day to a most unconstitutional act of prerogative, by calling no less than twelve new peers to the upper house, among whom was the husband of the favourite. The queen then sent a message, desiring the house to adjourn to the 14th: as this was an unusual measure, a debate arose, and the resolution was carried only by the votes of the new peers. When the question was about to be put to them, Wharton, alluding to their number, asked one of them if they voted individually or by their foreman.

Secure of majorities in both houses, the ministry proceeded in the charges against Marlborough. These were two: the one, the having received an annual sum from the contractor of bread for the army; the other, a deduction of 2½ per cent. on the pay of the foreign auxiliaries; and the whole was

made to amount to the sum of £282,366. These charges had been made before the return of the duke, and he had sent home a refutation of them. With respect to the first, he said that it had been a perquisite of the general commanding-in-chief in the Low Countries even before the Revolution; and this was proved by Sir John Germain, who had been aide-de-camp to Prince Waldeck in 1689. The percentage, he said, was the voluntary gift of the allied princes, to be employed for secret service. It had been originally granted for that purpose to King William by the members of the Grand Alliance, and had been continued to the duke, with the approbation of the queen, whose warrant, countersigned by Sir Charles Hedges, was produced. It amounted only to £30,000 a year; and the duke was always better served than King William had been, who spent £50,000 a year in this way. But it was useless to refute, the ministers were sure of their majority; and it was voted, by two hundred and seventy to one hundred and sixty-five, that the former was illegal, and that the latter was public money, and ought to be accounted for. An address was made to the queen, and she ordered the attorney-general to prosecute the duke; but there the matter ended. The ministers did not dare to impeach him, or to reply to a vindication of him which was published, or to prosecute it as a libel. An attempt to fix on him the stigma of trafficking in commissions served only to show the malignity of his enemies.

During these disgraceful proceedings Prince Eugene arrived in London (January 5th) with proposals from the emperor for carrying on the war with vigour. He was received, of course, with all due marks of attention, both public and private, and the queen presented him with a sword worth £4,500; but the ministers were too much bent on a dishonourable peace to attend to his proposals, and he quitted England in disgust (March 17th). Some of the ministers had even countenanced a profligate Jesuit named Plunket in his pretended discovery of a plot of Eugene, Marlborough, and the leading whigs to seize the queen, murder Oxford and his friends, and place the elector of Hanover on the throne.

THE PEACE OF UTRECHT (1713 A.D.)

The negotiations for peace were now going on at Utrecht, whither all the allies had sent ministers; but the courts of Paris and London were still treating in secret. In the midst of the negotiations an event occurred which threatened to put an end to them. The dauphin had died in the preceding year, and death now swept away his son the duke of Burgundy, with his wife and their eldest son; and there only remained the youngest son, a sickly infant in the cradle, between Philip and the throne of France. As his retention of the crown of Spain had been all along a condition of the peace, Louis offered that he should make a formal renunciation of his right to that of France; at the same time candidly owning that such an act would be, by the laws of France, utterly invalid. Yet even this feeble security contented the English cabinet, and they agreed to desert their allies if they refused to consent to it.

The English troops in the Netherlands were now commanded by the duke of Ormonde; the whole confederate army of 122,000 men was directed by Prince Eugene. The French army under Villars amounted only to 100,000 men, ill-equipped and dispirited. To force their camp, pour the allied troops over the plains of Picardy and Champagne, and dictate peace under the walls of Paris, were now not only possible but probable events. But no glory

awaited Ormonde. When the queen had informed parliament of the preliminaries having been agreed on, orders were sent to him to cease from all operations, and march with his troops to Dunkirk, which Louis had engaged to give to the English. The foreign troops in British pay spurned the orders to separate from the confederates. "The Hessians," said their gallant prince, "will gladly march, if it be to fight the French." "We do not serve for pay, but for fame," said another commander. A general hiss ran through the English camp when the cessation of arms was proclaimed; the soldiers tore their hair with rage, and reviled their general; the officers shut themselves up in their tents: tears flowed from their eyes when they thought of Marlborough and his glories. Ormonde's troops were refused admittance into the fortified towns, and he had to seize Ghent and Bruges. Louis hesitated to give up Dunkirk till admonished of the danger of refusal.

Eugene captured Quesnoy; but the desertion of England had struck a damp to the hearts of the allies; and Villars restored the ascendancy of France. The Peace of Utrecht was signed on the 14th of April, 1713, by all the powers except the emperor and the empire. By this peace Philip was to retain Spain and the Indies, giving the Netherlands and Italian dominions to the emperor, and Sicily to the duke of Savoy. The title of the queen of England and the Protestant succession were acknowledged; Gibraltar and Minorca and some parts of America were ceded to England; and an *asiento*, or contract for supplying the Spanish colonies with negroes for thirty years, was granted to the English merchants.

There can be no doubt that by this peace all the ends of the Grand Alliance were frustrated, and the splendid victories of Blenheim and Ramillies rendered useless; and had not heaven preserved the life of the puny heir in France, another general war must have ensued, or Philip have been tamely suffered to unite the two crowns. On the other hand, it seemed manifestly unjust to impose a sovereign on the Spanish nation; yet it was hardly less so to dismember the monarchy. But loss of honour was the great loss of England in this opprobrious treaty. She basely deserted and betrayed her allies; and the infamy would be indelible, were the fact not certain that it was the deed of an unprincipled minister, the secret foe of the Protestant succession, and supported by the jacobites and high tories, and not the act of the nation.

THE DEATH OF GODOLPHIN (1713 A.D.)

While the treaty which was to blight all the glorious promises of his administration was pending, Lord Godolphin died. This upright and disinterested statesman, who had enjoyed so many opportunities of amassing wealth, left only £12,000 behind him. Yet the present ministry had made a base attempt to fix a charge of peculation on him also; they had, however, signally failed.

The character of Lord Godolphin ranks high for probity and disinterestedness. Burnet says that "he was the silentest and modestest man who was perhaps ever bred in a court. His notions," he adds, "were for the court, but his incorrupt and sincere way of managing the concerns of the treasury created in all people a very high esteem for him. He had true principles of religion and virtue, and never heaped up wealth. So that all things being laid together, he was one of the worthiest and wisest men who were employed in that age." The prelate elsewhere speaks of Godolphin in similar terms, and others express themselves to the same effect.[b]

"The administration of Marlborough and Godolphin," says Stanhope, "shines forth with peculiar lustre in our annals. No preceding one, perhaps, had ever comprised so many great men or achieved so many great actions. Besides its two eminent chiefs, it could boast of the mild yet lofty wisdom of Somers, the matured intellect of Halifax, and the rising abilities of Walpole. At another time, also, the most subtle statesman and the most accomplished speaker of their age, Harley and St. John, were numbered in its ranks. It had struck down the overgrown power of France. It had saved Germany, and conquered Flanders. 'But at length,' says Bishop Fleetwood, with admirable eloquence, 'God for our sins permitted the spirit of discord to go forth, and, by troubling sore the camp, the city, and the country (and oh that it had altogether spared the place sacred to his worship!) to spoil for a time this beautiful and pleasing prospect, and give us in its stead—I know not what. Our enemies will tell the rest with pleasure.'

"To our enemies, indeed, I would willingly leave the task of recording the disgraceful transactions of that period. Let them relate the bed-chamber influence of Mrs. Masham with her sovereign, and the treacherous cabals of Harley against his colleagues—by what unworthy means the great administration of Godolphin was sapped and overthrown — how his successors surrendered the public interests to serve their own — how subserviency to France became our leading principle of policy — how the Dutch were forsaken and the Catalans betrayed — until at length this career of wickedness and weakness received its consummation in the shameful Peace of Utrecht. It used to be observed, several centuries ago, that as the English always had the better of the French in battles, so the French always had the better of the English in treaties. But here it was a sin against light; not the ignorance which is deluded, but the falsehood which deludes. We may, perhaps, admit that it might be expedient to depart from the strict letter of the Grand Alliance — to consent to some dismemberment of the Spanish monarchy — to purchase the resignation of Philip, or allow an equivalent for the elector of Bavaria by the cession of Sicily and Sardinia, or, perhaps, of Naples. So many hands had grasped at the royal mantle of Spain that it could scarcely be otherwise than rent in the struggle. But how can the friends of Bolingbroke and Oxford possibly explain or excuse the fact that they offered far better terms at Utrecht in 1712, than the French had been willing to accept at Gertruydenberg in 1709? Or if the dismissal of the duke of Marlborough raised the spirits of England's enemies and impaired the chances of the war, how is that dismissal itself to be defended?" *f*

WHIMSICAL AND JACOBITE TORIES

An attempt to dissolve the union at this time offers a curious instance of the change of party tactics. It was moved in the house of lords by one of the Scottish peers, was supported by the whigs and opposed by the tories, and lost by a majority only of four.

Oxford and St. John (lately created Viscount Bolingbroke), though they had united to overthrow the Godolphin ministry, had never been cordial friends. The former had the superiority in principle and in knowledge of business; but he was procrastinating, dissembling, cautious, mysterious, and intriguing, and therefore unable to gain the confidence of any party. He was of that class of statesmen who deal in expedients, and are always manœuvring; whose minds are too little to conceive anything grand and vast. The character of Bolingbroke was the very opposite; his talents were

splendid, his eloquence commanding, his manners and person graceful and elegant; but he was dissolute and unprincipled — an English Alcibiades. While Oxford leaned to the whigs and favoured the Protestant succession, Bolingbroke sought for support among the high tories, brought many of them into office, and formed a close alliance with the lady Masham. Devoid of religion, he affected to be a champion of the church; and, with a thorough contempt of the Stuarts and their maxims of government, he engaged in projects for their restoration. In these projects the dukes of Ormonde and Buckingham, the chancellor Harcourt, Sir William Wyndham, and other members of the cabinet shared; but the duke of Shrewsbury, the lords Dartmouth, Trevor, and Paulet, and Robinson bishop of London were firm to the Protestant succession. Lady Masham was a zealous jacobite. The queen hated the electoral family, and had no love for her brother, though she had some scruples about his right, which, however, were balanced by her attachment to the church. She veered about as the influence of Lady Somerset or Lady Masham prevailed.



A Beau of the Time of Queen Anne

The parliament having been dissolved, a new one met (February 16th, 1714). Its composition was much the same as before; but the tory portion was less powerful, being divided into Hanoverian tories, nicknamed Whimsicals, and jacobite tories, i.e., friends of the electoral family, or of the pretender. The danger was now in fact thought to be very imminent. The queen during the winter had a severe attack of gout, and it was manifest that she was fast drawing to her end; Oxford's influence was on the decline; the adherents of the house of Stuart were, through the influence of Bolingbroke, put into civil and military posts; and the jacobites gave open demonstrations of their designs. It was the general opinion that whichever of the competitors had the start would get the crown; and Schutz, the Hanoverian envoy, therefore, by the advice of the whig leaders, demanded a writ of summons for the electoral prince, as duke of Cambridge, with a view to his residence in England. The writ could not be refused, but the queen was highly indignant: she forbade Schutz the court, and wrote in strong terms to the electoral family. The sudden death, by apoplexy, of the princess Sophia (June 7th) was by some ascribed to the effect on her of the queen's letters.[b]

At any rate, she had been much affected by reading them, and on the day after their receipt, the 28th of May, whilst walking in the gardens of Herrenhausen, she fell dead into the arms of the electoral princess, afterwards Queen Caroline. She was a woman of most amiable temper and no mean acquirements, being perfect mistress of the Dutch, German, English, French, and Italian languages, and during her long life she had never belied the character that becomes an English and a royal birth. She used to say that she should die happy if she could only live to have "Here lies Sophia, queen of England," engraved upon her coffin; and it is remarkable within how very few weeks her wish would have been fulfilled.

The death of the princess enabled the elector, now become immediate heir to the English crown, to steer his course without disobliging either the sovereign or his friends. After pausing for nearly three weeks, he answered the queen's letter in most civil and submissive, but very vague, terms; and despatched orders to Baron Bothmar, his envoy at the Hague, to proceed to London, and to consult with the whig leaders, whether, after all the unavoidable delay that had occurred, any idea of sending over the electoral prince had not better be postponed till next session.

THE SCHISM ACT (1714 A.D.)

Meanwhile the English ministers were not inactive. Oxford, who had constantly endeavoured to keep well with the court of Hanover — who perhaps really intended its interests — who had early in the year sent thither his cousin Mr. Harley with warm expressions of duty and attachment, saw, with despair, that the late events had confirmed the distrust and aversion in that quarter, whilst he had failed to push his negotiations with the other. His influence with the queen was also daily declining, or, rather, had already ceased. In spite of all his whispers and manœuvres, Bolingbroke, in conjunction with Atterbury, perceiving how necessary it was to their ultimate designs still further to discourage, nay, even to crush the dissenters, drew up in council, and brought into parliament, as a government measure, the celebrated Schism Act. This act enjoins that no person in Great Britain shall keep any public or private school, or act as tutor, that has not first subscribed the declaration to conform to the Church of England and obtained a licence from the diocesan, and that upon failure of so doing the party may be committed to prison without bail; and that no such licence shall be granted before the party produces a certificate of his having received the sacrament, according to the communion of the Church of England, within the last year, and also subscribed the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.

This tyrannical act, introduced in the commons on the 12th of May by Sir William Wyndham, was of course vehemently opposed by the whigs. We know that Sir Peter King, Mr. Hampden, Sir Joseph Jekyll, and Robert Walpole spoke against it, although nothing beyond their names has been preserved on this occasion. But some observations of General Stanhope, which appear in the scanty reports of those debates, and which seem to have excited much attention, may perhaps be said, without undue praise, to be far in advance of the time at which they were delivered, and to show a large and enlightened toleration, which it was reserved for a much later generation to feel, acknowledge, and establish. We are told that he "showed, in particular, the ill consequences of this law, as it would of course occasion foreign education, which, on the one hand, would drain the kingdom of great sums of money, and, which was still worse, would fill the tender minds of young men with prejudices against their own country. He illustrated and strengthened his argument by the example of the English popish seminaries abroad, which, he said, were so pernicious to Great Britain, that, instead of making new laws to encourage foreign education, he could wish those already in force against papists were mitigated, and that they should be allowed a certain number of schools." It is singular that some of the most plain and simple notions, such as that of religious toleration, should be the slowest and most difficult to be impressed upon the human mind.

The Schism Act passed the commons by a majority of 237 against 126. In the lords, the second reading was moved by Bolingbroke and ably opposed

by lords Cowper and Wharton. "It is somewhat strange," said the latter, "that they should call schism in England what is the established religion in Scotland; and therefore if the lords, who represent the nobility of that part of Great Britain, are for this bill, I hope that, in order to be even with us and consistent with themselves, they will move for the bringing in another bill to prevent the growth of schism in their own country." Lord Halifax drew an animated contrast between the oppression now meditated on our own Protestant dissenters and the protection and encouragement of the reformed Walloons by Queen Elizabeth, and of the French Huguenots by William III, when both fled hither from domestic persecution. Lord Townshend said that he had lived a long time in Holland, and had observed that the wealth and strength of that great and powerful commonwealth lay in the number of its inhabitants; and, at the same time, he was persuaded that, if the states should cause the schools of any one sect tolerated in the United Provinces to be shut up, they would soon be as thin of people as Sweden or Spain. The earl of Nottingham concluded an eloquent speech on the same side with a bitter and impressive allusion to Swift, whose favour with the ministers was now firmly established and generally known. "My lords," he said, "I have many children, and I know not whether God Almighty will vouchsafe to let me live to give them the education I could wish they had. Therefore, my lords, I own I tremble when I think that a certain divine, who is hardly suspected of being a Christian, is in a fair way of being a bishop, and may one day give licences to those who shall be entrusted with the education of youth!"

All parties looked with great interest to the conduct of the lord treasurer on this occasion. It was, as usual, in the highest degree irresolute and ambiguous. In the cabinet he proposed to soften the most rigorous clauses; in the house he declared that he "had not yet considered of it"; and having induced the opposition to allow the second reading to pass without dividing, took care to absent himself on the day when it finally came to the vote. Such vacillating weakness sealed his political ruin.

THE DIVISION OF THE MINISTRY; THE FALL OF OXFORD

The passing of this bill appears to have flushed the jacobites with the most eager hopes, insomuch as to draw them from their usual fenced and guarded caution in debate. One of them, Sir William Whitlocke, member for the University of Oxford, speaking in the house of commons of the elector, said: "If he comes to the crown, which I hope he never will—" Here there was a loud cry and confusion, the whigs all calling out that Sir William should be brought to the bar to answer for his words. But he, with great adroitness, eluded their attack, and repaired his own imprudence. He said he would retract nothing; he only meant that, as the queen was younger than her heir presumptive, he hoped she would outlive him!

Meanwhile, the division amongst the ministers and the murmurs of their partisans had been daily rising higher. Bolingbroke himself was loud in his complaints. "If my grooms," he says, "did not live a happier life than I have done this great while, I am sure they would quit my service." His breach with the lord treasurer, which had long been widening, was now open and avowed. Their common friend, Swift, made indeed another effort for their reconciliation, and induced them to meet at Lady Masham's, when he preached union to them warmly, but in vain. Finding his remonstrances fruitless, and unwilling to take part against either of his patrons, he declared that he would leave town, and cease his counsels. Bolingbroke whispered

him, "You are in the right," whilst the lord treasurer said, as usual, "All will do well." Swift adhered to his intention, and retired into Berkshire, and with him departed the last hopes of Oxford.

Another former friend of the lord treasurer had become not less active in striving for his downfall than she had been in promoting his power. Lady Masham, still the ruling favourite of the queen, was now the close confederate of Bolingbroke and the jacobites. In July she was so far impelled by her resentment as to tell Oxford to his face, "You never did the queen any service, nor are you capable of doing her any"; and what is more surprising, Oxford bore this taunt with silence and submission, and made no reply, and went to sup with her at her house the same evening! Such meanness never yet averted a fall.

What had Oxford to oppose to these bed-chamber intrigues? Nothing. His own artifices had become too refined for success, and too frequent for concealment. His character was understood. His popularity was gone. His support, or, at least, connivance, of the Schism Act, had alienated his remaining friends amongst the Puritans. Nay, even the public favour and high expectations with which he entered office, had, from their reaction, turned against him. The multitude seldom fails to expect impossibilities from a favourite statesman; such, for instance, as that he should increase the revenue by repealing taxes; and, therefore, no test of popularity is half so severe as power.

We also find it positively asserted by Marshal Berwick, in his *Memoirs*, that the court of St. Germain had intimated to the queen, through the channel of the duke of Ormonde and of Lady Masham, its wish to see the lord treasurer removed. It is the more likely that Ormonde was employed in this communication, since it appears that, in the preceding April, he had offered to receive a letter from the Pretender to the queen, and to put it into the hands of her majesty, which Oxford had always declined to do. Thus, then, all the pillars which had hitherto upheld his tottering authority were sapped and subverted, and on the 27th of July came the long-expected crisis of his fall. Her majesty had that afternoon detailed to the other members of the council some of the grounds of her displeasure with Oxford; and it is remarkable that even his confidant and creature Erasmus Lewis appears to admit their just foundation. After a personal altercation, carried on in the queen's presence, and continued till two in the morning, Anne resumed the White Staff; and the whole power of the state with the choice of the new administration were left in the hands of Bolingbroke.

BOLINGBROKE; THE REAPPEARANCE OF MARLBOROUGH

The first step of the new prime minister was an attempt to cajole his political opponents. On the very day after Oxford's dismissal, he entertained at dinner, at his house in Golden square, Stanhope, Walpole, Pulteney, Craggs, and the other most eminent whig members of the house of commons; but he altogether failed either to conciliate or delude them. The whigs positively required, as a security for the Protestant succession, that the pretender should be removed from Lorraine; whilst Bolingbroke confessed that such a banishment of her brother would never be sanctioned by the queen. It is difficult to conceive how Bolingbroke could possibly have anticipated any other issue to these overtures than disappointment; and they are the more surprising, since, on the same day, he had an interview with the chief agent of France and the Pretender, whom he assured of his undiminished

regard, and since he was, in fact, steadily proceeding to the formation of a purely jacobite administration. His projected arrangements were as follows: The seals of secretary, and the sole management of foreign affairs were to remain with himself; whilst to prevent his being overshadowed by any new lord treasurer, that department was to be put into commission, with Sir William Wyndham at its head. The privy seal was to be transferred to Atterbury; Bromley was to continue the other secretary of state; and the earl of Mar, the third for Scotland; the duke of Ormonde, commander-in-chief; the duke of Buckingham, lord president; and Lord Harcourt, chancellor. To fill up the other inferior appointments was considered a matter of great difficulty, there being very few whom Bolingbroke thought sufficiently able to be useful, or sufficiently zealous to be trusted. But the cabinet he intended (for it was never nominated), consisting as it did of scarcely any but jacobites, and comprising not a few who afterwards openly attached themselves to the pretender, and were attainted of high treason, can leave no doubt as to his ultimate design, and must convince us that, had the queen lived only three months longer, English religion and liberties would have been exposed to most imminent peril.

In the midst of his triumph, the new prime minister found his exultation dashed with alarms at the approaching reappearance of Marlborough on the political scene. That illustrious man had early in the spring determined to return to England so soon as the session should be closed, and was already at Ostend, awaiting a favourable wind. His motives for coming over at this period have been often canvassed, but never very clearly explained On the one hand, we find, from the despatches of the Hanoverian agents, that his journey had not been undertaken in concert with them. On the other hand, the common rumour of his secret cabals and intended junction with Bolingbroke is utterly disproved by the evidence of Bolingbroke himself, who, in his most private correspondence, expresses his apprehensions at this journey, and hints that it proceeded from some intrigues of Lord Oxford. How far may we believe this latter suspicion to be truly founded? It is certain that, at the close of 1713, Oxford had written to the duke in most flattering terms, and obtained a grant of £10,000 to carry on the works at Blenheim. It is no less certain, however, that the confidential letters of the duchess, during June and July, 1714, speak of Oxford with undiminished aversion. On the whole, it seems probable that Marlborough had some private communication with the lord treasurer, but had not committed himself in even the slightest degree; that he was returning to England to see and judge for himself of the prospect of affairs; and that he did not feel himself so far pledged to his former colleagues as to be entirely debarred from any new political connection.

THE ILLNESS AND DEATH OF QUEEN ANNE (1714 A.D.)

But a mightier arm that that of Marlborough was now stretched forth to arrest the evil designs of Bolingbroke. The days, nay, even the hours, of Queen Anne were numbered. Her Majesty's spirits had been so much agitated by the altercation in her presence, on the night of the 27th, as greatly to affect her health; and she herself said to one of her physicians, with that instinct of approaching dissolution so often and so strangely found before any danger is apparent, that she should not outlive it. The imposthume in her leg being checked, her gouty humour flew to her brain; she was seized with an apoplectic fit early in the morning of Friday, the 30th, and imme-

diately sank into a state of stupefaction. It may easily be supposed what various emotions such an event at such a crisis would occasion; yet it is a very remarkable proof of the bad opinion commonly entertained of her majesty's counsels, and of the revolutionary result anticipated from them, that the funds rose considerably on the first tidings of her danger, and fell again on a report of her recovery.

Bolingbroke and the jacobites, stunned and bewildered by this sudden crisis, were unable to mature their plans so rapidly as it required. The whigs, on their part, were found much better prepared — having already, under the guidance of Stanhope, entered amongst themselves into an organised association, collected arms and ammunition, and nominated officers. They had in readiness several thousand figures of a small fusee in brass, and some few in silver and gold, to be distributed amongst the most zealous followers and the most active chiefs, as signals in the expected day of trial. Stanhope was now taking every measure for acting with vigour, if necessary, on the demise of the queen — to sieze the Tower, to secure in it the persons of the leading jacobites, to obtain possession of the outports, and to proclaim the new king. Most anxious eyes were also cast upon the coasts of Dover, where the hero of the age and the idol of the army was daily expected from Ostend.

The genius of the duke of Marlborough would no doubt have rendered any such struggle successful, but it was reserved for the duke of Shrewsbury to avert its necessity. That eminent man — the only individual who mainly assisted in both the great changes of dynasty of 1688 and 1714 — cast aside, at this crisis, his usual tergiversation and timidity, and evinced an honest zeal on behalf of "the good old cause." His means, it is true, were still strongly marked with his characteristic duplicity. Whilst Bolingbroke appears to have fully confided in this attachment, he secretly concerted measures with two of the great whig peers, the dukes of Argyll and Somerset.

The result appeared on Friday the 30th. That morning the council met at Kensington, it being then, as now, composed only of such councillors as had received a special summons, and the high officers alone were present. The news of the queen's desperate condition had just been received. The jacobites sat dispirited, but not hopeless, nor without resources. Suddenly the doors were thrown open, and Argyll and Somerset announced. They said that, understanding the danger of the queen, they had hastened, though not specially summoned, to offer their assistance. In the pause of surprise which ensued, Shrewsbury rose and thanked them for their offer. They, immediately taking their seats, proposed an examination of the physicians; and on their report suggested that the post of lord treasurer should be filled without delay, and that the duke of Shrewsbury should be recommended to her majesty. What a scene for a painter — Shrewsbury, with his usual lofty air and impenetrable smoothness; the courtly smile, under which the fiery soul of St. John sought to veil its anguish and its rage; the slow, indecisive look of Ormonde; and the haughty triumph of Argyll.

The jacobite ministers, thus taken completely by surprise, did not venture to offer any opposition to the recommendation of Shrewsbury; and accordingly a deputation, comprising Shrewsbury himself, waited upon her majesty the same morning, to lay before her what seemed the unanimous opinion of the council. The queen, who by this time had been roused to some degree of consciousness, faintly acquiesced, delivered the treasurer's staff to Shrewsbury and bade him use it for the good of her people. The duke would have returned his staff as chamberlain, but she desired him to keep them both;

and thus, by a remarkable, and I believe unparalleled, combination, he was invested for some days with three of the highest offices of court and state, being at once lord treasurer, lord chamberlain, and lord lieutenant of Ireland. How strange to find all these dignities heaped upon a man who had so often professed his disinclination to public business—who had, during many years, harassed King William with applications to resign, and repeatedly entreated his friends to allow him to be "an insignificant cipher, instead of a bad figure!" "Had I a son," he said on one occasion, "I would sooner breed him a cobbler than a courtier, and a hangman than a statesman!"

Another proposal of the dukes of Somerset and Argyll, which had passed at the morning meeting, was to send immediately a special summons to all privy councillors in or near London. Many of the whigs accordingly attended the same afternoon, and, amongst them, the illustrious Somers, who, in spite of his growing infirmities, would not be absent—for the first time in his life—from the post of duty. His great name was in itself a tower of strength to his party; and the council, with this new infusion of healthy blood in its veins, forthwith took vigorous measures to secure the legal order of succession. Four regiments were ordered to London, seven battalions recalled from Ostend, an embargo was laid on all the ports, and directions sent that a fleet should put out to sea.

The next day the queen had sunk back into a lethargy, and the physicians gave no hopes of her life. The council hereupon sent orders to the heralds-at-arms, and to a troop of the life-guards, to be in readiness to proclaim the successor. They sent express to Hanover Mr. Craggs, with a despatch to the elector, earnestly requesting him to hasten to Holland, where a British squadron should attend him, and be ready to bring him over, in case of the queen's demise. They also wrote to the states of Holland, reminding them of their guarantee to the Protestant succession. They appointed Lord Berkeley to command the fleet. They ordered a reinforcement to proceed to Portsmouth, and an able general officer to Scotland—great importance being attached to the former, and much disaffection apprehended in the latter; and, in short, no precaution was neglected to ensure tranquillity, or to check disturbances in any quarter where they might arise.

At seven the next morning, the 1st of August, the queen expired. She had not recovered sufficient consciousness either to take the sacrament or to sign her will. "The earl of Oxford was removed on Tuesday—the queen died on Sunday! What a world is this," says Bolingbroke,[g] "and how does fortune banter us."

The character of the queen [says Stanhope, having chiefly in mind the political influence of Anne], need not detain us long. She was a very weak woman, full of prejudices, fond of flattery, always governed blindly by some female favourite, and, as Swift bitterly observes, "had not a stock of amity to serve above one object at a time." Can it be necessary to waste many words upon the mind of a woman who could give as a reason—a lady's reason!—for dismissing a cabinet minister that he had appeared before her in a tie-wig instead of a full-bottom? Is it not evident that in such a case we must study the advisers and not the character of a sovereign—that we must look to the setting rather than to the stone?[f]

POLITICAL GROWTH IN REIGN OF ANNE

With Anne ended the dynasty of the Stuarts. She was [says Keightley[b]] a woman of narrow intellect, but of good intentions; a model of conjugal

and maternal duty. The title of "Good Queen Anne," given to her, proves the public sense of her virtues. She possessed, however, a portion of the obstinacy of her family, and had some of their notions of prerogative. In person the queen was comely, and her voice was so melodious that it acted like a charm on the auditors when she spoke from the throne.[1] All through her reign she was highly and deservedly popular.

During the reigns of William and Anne the constitution, as was to be expected, received many improvements. By the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement the limits of the prerogative were ascertained; the Toleration Act, imperfect as it was, put an end to the persecution of the nonconformists; the law of treason was improved and made certain; the liberty of the press was completely established. The judges now for the first time became really independent, as they were to retain their places during good behaviour, and be removable only in case of the commission of some great offence or by an address of both houses of parliament.

It was at this period that a national bank was first established in England, and paper-money, that most valuable aid to commerce, if judiciously managed, was introduced. The system of funding and the consequent formation of a national debt were now first brought into action by the inventive genius of Mr. Montague (Lord Halifax) when chancellor of the exchequer. It originated in the issue of exchequer-bills (some for as low a sum as £10 or £5) to the amount of £2,700,000 bearing interest and transferable. The advantage to government of this happy temerity, as it was termed, was speedily discerned, and the practice of mortgaging future revenue, which has since been carried to such an enormous extent, was soon commenced.

To this period may also be referred the permanent establishment of a standing army in England. The efforts of the last two princes of the house of Stuart to obtain this implement of despotism, as they held it to be, had proved abortive; but the two great wars which had succeeded the Revolution, and the close connection in which England was thereby engaged with the continental powers, had formed the army into a profession, and also made apparent that she must at all times have in readiness for domestic defence or external operation a force more efficient than trained bands, which in skill and discipline might be on a footing with those of the continental powers. Much jealousy was entertained for a long time at this new description of force, and it formed a fruitful subject of declamation for pretended patriots, though the annual mutiny bill, on which it depended for its existence, made it be completely under the control of parliament. It has ever since proved the most efficient instrument, not merely in protecting the country from foreign enemies but in preserving internal tranquillity, and has never been employed in encroachments on the liberty of the subject. It is worthy of remark that from the very commencement commissions in the British army have been matters of purchase, and that at a very high rate.

The despatches of foreign ambassadors, which furnish so many materials for the history of the houses of Tudor and Stuart, now become comparatively of little importance. Foreign envoys were no longer on the same footing of familiar intercourse with the British sovereigns or their ministers; and as the struggles in parliament henceforth were more for place than for principles, they had less occasion to take any share in the parliamentary contests. They transacted their business with the secretaries of state, and the accounts of

[1 Of Anne in her later years, however, W. H. S. Aubrey[h] says: "She was a victim of gluttony and obesity. Her embonpoint was colossal. A popular sobriquet applied to her was Brandy Nan because of her potations."]

events which they used to write to inform their courts of were now generally to be found in the columns of the newspapers which appeared daily.

LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC ADVANCEMENT

It may finally be observed that this period and the early part of the succeeding one were the golden age of literary men if not of literature in England. Though the sovereigns themselves were indifferent to them, the ministers loved and encouraged literature and science. Thus Sir Isaac Newton was master of the mint, and John Locke a commissioner of trade; Matthew Prior an envoy at the court of France, and Joseph Addison, a secretary of state; not to mention Swift and others, who were promoted in their professions.[b] Foremost among this distinguished company was Sir Isaac Newton. This pre-eminent light of the modern world in mathematical and astronomical science was born at Closterworth, in the county of Lincoln, on Christmas Day, 1642 (old style). Even his boyhood was devoted to science, and his sports were scientific experiments; for his time was chiefly spent in constructing models of clocks, windmills, and other articles of nice and accurate calculation in mechanics, so that, while at school at Grantham, his lodging-room was a workshop that resounded with continual hammering. He even improved the kites of his school fellows by contriving their shape and proportions, and adjusting the string, upon mathematical principles.

All this was accompanied with such superiority of intellectual power in other departments that when he pleased he could outstrip his companions at their daily tasks, and was soon at the head of the school. At the age of eighteen he was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he quickly arrested the attention not only of his fellow students but of Dr. Isaac Barrow, by his rapid proficiency in the science of mathematics. His regular study of Euclid, it has been said, was at first animated by a desire to explore the wonders of judicial astrology; but on having tested it by severe calculation, and discovered its emptiness, he threw both it and Euclid aside, and advanced to higher pursuits. The first result of these studies was his *New Method of Infinite Series and Fluxions*, which was published in Latin. In 1664, he turned his attention to the improvement of telescopes, and having procured a prism he detected, by careful observation, the fallacy of Descartes' doctrine of colours, upon which he published his *New Theory of Light and Colours*. The plague having broke out at Cambridge in 1665, Newton retired to his own house in the country, where he prosecuted his studies in solitude; and while thus occupied, his great theory of gravitation [which found ultimate expression in his *Principia*] first suggested itself to his mind. Thus, the foundation of all his stupendous discoveries was laid when he was only twenty-four years of age.

The career of Sir Isaac Newton after this period, and the works which he published illustrative of his discoveries in the laws of nature and the science of astronomy, would of themselves require a lengthened chapter; it is enough to state that, being revolutions, they met with their full share of envy and opposition. But they established themselves at last as immutable, inexpugnable truths, and the reflective world, upon which they dawned like a sunshine, was lost in delight and wonder. "Does Mr. Newton eat, or drink, or sleep like other men?" exclaimed the marquis de l'Hospital, himself a very eminent mathematician: "I represent him to myself as a great celestial genius entirely disengaged from matter." The amiable and accomplished Queen Caroline, (wife of George II), who took great delight in the philosopher's society, declared herself happy in having come into the world at a time which

put it into her power to converse with him. Honours, both literary and political, were conferred upon Newton; he was appointed professor of mathematics at Cambridge, sent to parliament as one of its representatives, made warden of the mint, and invested with knighthood; But these distinctions which he did not need, and which are now seldom remembered, were themselves honoured by his accepting them. His life, which was extended to his eighty-fifth year, was employed in the same philosophical researches, until its termination on March 20th, 1727, when he died, leaving behind him a renown which can only perish with that universe of whose laws of action he was the inspired expounder. His amiable moral qualities, and his devotedness to revealed religion, that were in contrast with the selfish and irreligious spirit of the age, are too universally known to require description.

A fit contemporary for Sir Isaac Newton was John Locke, one of the greatest philosophers and most powerful writers which England, rich in such minds, has produced. He was born at Wrington, Somersetshire, on the 29th of August, 1632. He was educated first at Westminster School, and afterwards at Christ Church College, Oxford, where, having thoroughly studied the philosophy of the schools which still predominated at the university, and acquired all the benefit which its training was fitted to impart, he attained the higher knowledge of perceiving its inefficiency as a guide to truth, and the necessity of better lights than the peripatetics. This perception was greatly aided by his study of the writings of Descartes; and thus both Locke and Newton, though in different ways, owed much to the influence of that bold and original thinker.

In consequence of a feeble constitution, Locke combined the study of medicine with that of ethics and metaphysics; but though he never took the degree of doctor, or practised the healing art professionally, his knowledge of it was so respectable that he was generally addressed by the title of doctor of medicine. After the Restoration he had tempting offers to become a diplomatist; but he preferred the study of philosophy to political honours, although he became the friend and counsellor of the earl of Shaftesbury. After a life chiefly spent in study, Locke, in 1675, repaired to the south of France for the benefit of his health; and his journal of a four years' residence there shows how closely he watched and how sagaciously he investigated the great events that passed before his notice. His connection with Shaftesbury involved him in the earl's disgrace; and when the latter was obliged to retire to Holland, Locke followed at the close of 1683, and remained in that country until the Revolution, when he returned home in the same fleet that conveyed the princess Mary to England. But during the interval his exile had not been unmolested; for through a groundless charge of treason preferred against him in his absence, he was formally ejected from his student's place in Christ Church College; and in consequence of the Monmouth insurrection, in which he was causelessly suspected to have had a share, an application was made by the English envoy to the Dutch government, to have Locke sent home a prisoner. On the settlement of William and Mary, Locke had high offers to go abroad in a public capacity, but contented himself with the office of commissioner of appeals, which brought him a small revenue of £200 per annum.

Matters of greater importance, indeed, and more congenial to his character than embassies and state negotiations, were at present absorbing his attention; for in the following year (1690) he completed and published his renowned masterpiece, the *Essay on Human Understanding*, a work which he had begun to plan so early as 1670. Its appearance was startling: it was a revolution

in the intellectual world for which men were not prepared, much as they had been lately accustomed to changes; and the schoolmen, especially, were little inclined to unread their learning, abandon their old authorities, and adopt rules of thought and reasoning more accordant with every-day language and commonplace reality. In this recusancy the University of Oxford went so far that at a meeting of the heads of the institution it was agreed, that each should prevent Locke's book from being read by the students of his college. But in spite of this and similar opposition, the principles of the essay forced their way with the resistlessness of truth, and the work was recognised as "one of the noblest, most useful, and most original books the world ever saw." It is not too much, indeed, to say that it constituted a new era in the history of human thought, from the importance of its innovations, and the influence they have more or less exercised upon all the succeeding systems of philosophy. But much though the world has been indebted to Locke as a philosopher, it scarcely owes him less as a political writer; and his productions on toleration, on civil government, on money and the raising of its value, on education, etc., were as bold and original, and as persuasive as his *Essay on Human Understanding*. These, with his religious works in defence and illustration of the doctrines of Christianity, though so numerous as to fill ten octavo volumes, have been frequently republished, not only in portions, but collectively. Having thus, during a sickly but extended life, done so much for intellectual renown, and won the love of all who knew him by his uprightness, meekness, and Christian charity, the close of his life, in 1704, was in consistency with its whole tenor, being spent in the study of the Bible, and a calm, hopeful preparation for eternity. To a young gentleman's inquiry as to the shortest and surest way to attain a true knowledge of the Christian religion, Locke's memorable answer was, "Let him study the Holy Scripture, especially the New Testament; it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter." Till his last hour its perusal was his chief occupation; and when the dimness of approaching death was gathering upon his eyesight, its consolatory pages were read to him by his own desire, until the moment of his departure had arrived.

Such were Newton and Locke, the ornaments of the age, who divided between them the empire of human thought, and who taught the world not only by their wisdom, but by their example and high moral worth. It was such men whom the age especially needed to give philosophy its right direction, and inquiring spirits their best example. The change, indeed, for the present was imperceptible, and years were to elapse before it could be realized. But its coming was as certain as that of the buried harvest, and the present generation is living in its abundance.

ARCHITECTURE

In turning our attention to the progress of literature, science, and the fine arts, as manifested in the productions of that period, the department of architecture also solicits our notice. This at once is evident from the fact that the metropolis of the empire, which in a few days was swept away, was replaced by another, richer, statelier, and larger, than the former, and that so great a work was accomplished in a very few years. No other nation could have achieved such a stupendous feat; and London restored was a triumph of English wealth, resources, and enterprise, that gave full promise of the ascendency which the country was afterwards to attain. On this occa-

sion, too, it may emphatically be said that the emergency called forth the man, so that when a new metropolis worthy of the national grandeur was to be created, a great architect was at hand to direct the undertaking. The vast, varied and creative mind of Sir Christopher Wren, extending over a long life, sufficed not only to commence but complete the work, so that upon the gates of the capital itself, as well as upon his tomb in St. Paul's, the motto might have been engraved: *Si monumentum quæris, circumspice.*

This great architect, who at the commencement of his career seems to have been ignorant of his proper vocation, as well as the great work which he was destined to accomplish, was originally a student at Oxford, where mathematics and astronomy occupied his chief attention; and such was his proficiency in these sciences that at the early age of eighteen he was one of the most distinguished of those illustrious philosophers who afterwards, in 1660, constituted the Royal Society. England, however, was to be sufficiently enriched by her Newton; and therefore Wren, after obtaining a high reputation in the mathematical and astronomical sciences, turned his attention to their practical application by the study of architecture, so that, in 1661, he was appointed coadjutor to Sir John Denham, the poet, who, on the death of Inigo Jones, had been raised by royal favour to the post of surveyor-general.

Of course, the duties of such a partnership would fall upon Sir Christopher, and one of the first was to survey and plan the restoration of St. Paul's cathedral, now gradually falling into ruin. Sir Christopher soon found that such a restoration would at best be but a patchwork; and while the question was pending whether the building should be repaired or wholly rebuilt, the great conflagration stepped in to decide the controversy. Both capital and cathedral were now a heap of rubbish, and all must be made anew. It would be unfair to ask how much the exultation of Wren at being thus emancipated from the tinkering-up of an old worn-out city may have qualified his regret at the demolition and sympathy for the sufferers; it is enough to know that he set to work to repair the evil, and soon created a better London than the former. Never upon any one architect, perhaps, had such a task been devolved since the days of the building upon Shinar. As the legislature had now a full opportunity for passing such enactments as might secure comfortable healthy houses and commodious streets, it was decreed that in future all buildings in London should be of brick or stone; that party walls, of sufficient strength and thickness, should separate one house from another; and that rain-water pipes should be substituted for the spouts that had been wont to pour their torrents from the house-tops upon the heads of those who walked below; while builders were exhorted to devise improvements for their structures by making mouldings, and projections of rubbed brick.

In the meantime, Wren had surveyed the ruins, and presented his plan for laying out the new town. Need it be added that this plan, though grand, regular, and comprehensive, was crossed, altered, and curtailed, through the caprice, the jealousy, or poverty of those at whose expense it was to be realised, and who therefore claimed a principal voice in its details? Still, much was accomplished, although it fell far short of the original. Such was also the fate of St. Paul's, the crowning work and masterpiece of the great architect, the plan of which the duke of York altered to suit the popish ceremonial, when Romanism should be restored in Britain, although Wren with tears remonstrated against the interference. Such, too, in a still greater degree was the fate of the London monument, the original plan of which, as presented by Sir Christopher, was highly graceful and appropriate; but which had the fate to

fall into the hands of the civic authorities for realisation. Let us forget, if we can, what they made of it:

> London's column, pointing to the skies,
> Like a tall bully lifts the head and lies.

The amenities of modern society have prevailed at last. The lie is expunged, and the "tall bully," as if he had just escaped the infliction of the pump, stands shivering and crestfallen in a corner.

Besides St. Paul's, which Sir Christopher had the singular good fortune to complete as well as plan, he superintended the erection of fifty-one churches in London, which still constitute the chief architectural ornaments of the now greatly changed and improved metropolis. To these might be added public buildings both in London and elsewhere, of which a mere list would exceed our limits. After having done so much for his country, and raised the character of its architecture to so high an eminence, his fate was that which usually awaits the greatest of benefactors: society united to persecute that excellence which it could not equal, and return injuries for those benefits which it could not repay. Deprived of his office of surveyor-general, which he had held for forty-nine years, he calmly exclaimed, "*Nunc me jubet fortuna expeditius philosophare*"; and retired to the country at the age of eighty-six, where he spent the remaining five years of his life in contemplation and reading, and chiefly in the study of the Holy Scriptures. There, also, he closed his career; "cheerful in solitude," says his son, "and as well pleased to die in the shade as in the light." His final resting-place, as well as fittest monument, was the vault of St. Paul's, in which his remains were deposited.

JOHN DRYDEN

The greatest poet of the age next to Milton, and the most influential in forming the spirit and developing the maturity of English literature, was John Dryden, the Chaucer of the seventeenth century. He was born at Aldwinkle, Northamptonshire, in 1632, and educated first at Westminster School under the celebrated Dr. Busby, and afterwards at Trinity College, Cambridge. His first poetical attempt, which he gave to the world in 1649, was an elegy on the death of Lord Hastings, a young nobleman of high character and promise; but a subject so well fitted to call forth affectionate enthusiasm at least, if not poetical inspiration, from a young poet of seventeen, was such a tissue of cold conceits and overstrained artificial figures, as to give no promise whatsoever of the excellence he was afterwards to attain. The young lord had died of the small-pox, and Dryden, directing his admiration to the pustules, converts them into ornaments on the soil of Venus — into jewels — into rosebuds — and finally into pimples, each having a tear in it to bewail the pain it was occasioning! This was enough; and he remained in silence for nine years afterwards — not idly, however, as was manifested not only by his general scholarship, but the superior taste of his next production, in which he had the resolution to abandon his models of Donne and Cowley, and become a genuine follower of nature. This poem, entitled "*Heroic Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell*," was a proper theme for Dryden, who had been educated among Puritans, and patronised at the court of the Protector. With the Restoration, however, he was ready with a palinode under the title of "*Astræa Redux*," welcoming the return of Charles II, and predicting from the event a millennium of political happiness; and in 1666 appeared his "*Annus Mirabilis*,"

the subjects of which were the Dutch War and the fire of London. It was only now, indeed, that his mind broke forth in full vigour after so thorough a maturing, and established him in the highest rank of poetry. Long before this, however, his republican and Puritan sympathies had expired; the new king and court were more to his taste; and as his small patrimonial estate yielded only about £60 a year, while his wants equalled a tenfold amount, his chief dependence was royal favour, which he was ready to purchase at any price. And seldom, indeed, has such an amount of genius been so mercilessly exacted, or so poorly repaid. It was Samson in the prison-house grinding for his daily subsistence.

During a literary life, continued to such a period, and urged to such constant exertion by the claims of necessity, the productions of Dryden were both numerous and diversified. Besides many smaller poems, which of themselves would fill several volumes, he wrote eight of considerable length, of which *The Hind and the Panther*, and *Absalom and Achitophel*, are the most distinguished. As a dramatic writer he wrote twenty-eight plays. Besides a poetical version of Vergil, he gave translations from Ovid, Theocritus, Lucretius, Horace, Juvenal, and Persius. He also wrote adaptations, under the name of *Fables*, from Chaucer and Boccacio, which, though produced in his old age, constitute the most popular and pleasing of his writings. Indeed, it is perceptible throughout the course of his writings, that although his mind was slow in maturing, it continued in active operation to the close, and that, too, with growing improvement, so that his latest productions were also his best.[i]

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The manners of the English gentry, in this age, were, in a great measure, purely national; and, except at court, had received from foreign nations neither polish nor corruption. To travel had not yet grown to be a very common practice. It was not yet thought that a visit to more genial climes or more lovely landscapes was the best preparation for afterward living happily and contented in one's own. In fact, according to the old English maxims, no one could go abroad without special permission from the sovereign. Thus, in the reign of Elizabeth, Sir William Evers was severely punished because he had presumed to make a private journey to Scotland. In the first part of the eighteenth century, the same authority seems to still have existed, at least with respect to the great nobility. The duke of Shrewsbury, for example, could not go abroad, in 1700, until he had obtained leave from King William. Thus, also, the duke of Marlborough's application for a passport, in 1712, was opposed by several members of the cabinet. The fees for a passport at the foreign office amounted to upwards of £6, a sum far from inconsiderable in those days, and serving as a check upon the lower class of travellers. To travel with passports from the foreign ministers resident in England is a later innovation.

Thus amongst the gentry and middle classes of Queen Anne's time the French language was much undervalued, and seldom studied. At court, however, the case was very different; and, though few could speak French very accurately, it is remarkable how much the style of many eminent men at this period, in their private correspondence, teems with gallicisms. The letters of Marlborough, especially, appear written by a Frenchman. Thus, for example, he uses the word "opiniatrety" for obstinacy, and "to defend" instead of to forbid.

At the Peace of Utrecht the population of England was not much above

five millions. It may be doubted whether that of Scotland exceeded one million, or that of Ireland, two. It is certain, however, that the rural inhabitants of England then very far outnumbered those in the towns; but the latter having since increased in a much greater proportion, more especially in the manufacturing districts, the two classes have come nearly to an equality; a change which has involved within it the germ of other changes.

The national debt, at the accession of Anne, had been only £16,000,000, with an interest of £1,300,000. In 1714, it had grown to £52,000,000, with an interest of £3,300,000. By the accounts presented to parliament in that year, it appeared that the expense of the late war during twelve years amounted to nearly £69,000,000, making a yearly average of above five millions and a half. The debts, during this period, seem to have been contracted on very moderate terms. Lord-Treasurer Godolphin observes, in one of his letters, in 1706: "Though the land and trade both of England and Holland have excessive burdens upon them, yet the credit continues good, both with us and with them; and we can, either of us, borrow money at four or five per cent.; whereas, the finances of France are so much more exhausted that they are forced to give 20 and 25 per cent. for every penny of money they send out of the kingdom, unless they send it in specie." In 1709, the supplies voted exceeded seven millions, a sum that was unparalleled, and seemed enormous. In fact, though these sums at present may appear light in our eyes, they struck the subjects of Anne with the utmost astonishment and horror. "Fifty millions of debt, and six millions of taxes!" exclaimed Swift: "the high allies have been the ruin of us!" Bolingbroke points out, with dismay, that the public revenue, in neat money, amounted, at the Revolution, to no more than two millions annually; and the public debts, that of the bankers included, to little more than £300,000. Speaking of a later period, and of a debt of thirty millions, he calls it "a sum that will appear incredible to future generations, and is so almost to the present!" How much juster and more correct on this point were the views of Secretary Stanhope. In the minutes of a conference which he held in 1716, with Abbé Dubois, the following remark is recorded of him: "However large our national debt may be thought, it will undoubtedly increase much more, and believe me it will not hereafter cause greater difficulty to the government, or uneasiness to the people, than it does at present."

But, though we might astonish our great-grandfathers at the high amount of our public income, they may astonish us at the high amount of their public salaries. The service of the country was then a service of vast emolument. In the first place, the holder of almost every great office was entitled to plate; secondly, the rate of salaries, even when nominally no larger than at present, was, in fact, two or three times more considerable from the intermediate depreciation of money. But even nominally, many offices were then of higher value, and when two or more were conferred upon the same person he, contrary to the present practice, received the profits of all. As the most remarkable instance of this fact, I may mention the duke and duchess of Marlborough. Exclusive of Blenheim, of parliamentary grants, of gifts, of marriage portions from the queen to their daughters, it appears that the fixed yearly income of the duke, at the height of his favour, was no less than £54,825, and the duchess had, in offices and pensions, an additional sum of £9,500 — a sum infinitely greater than could now be awarded to the highest favour of the most eminent achievements.


There can be no doubt that the former scale was unduly high: but it may be questioned whether we are not at present running into another as dangerous extreme; whether by diminishing so much the emoluments of public service


[1714 A.D.]

we are not deterring men with genius, but without fortune, from entering the career of politics, and forcing them rather to betake themselves to some lucrative profession; whether the greatest abilities may not thereby be diverted from the public service; whether we are not tending to the principle that no man, without a large private property, is fit to be a minister of state; whether we may not, therefore, subject ourselves to the worst of all aristocracies, an aristocracy of money; whether we may not practically lose one of the proudest boasts of the British constitution under which great talent, however penniless, or lowborn, not only may raise but frequently has raised itself above the loftiest of our Montagus or Howards.

In Queen Anne's time the diplomatic salaries were regulated according to a scale established in 1669. Ambassadors-ordinary in France, Spain, and the emperor's court had £100 a day, and £1,500 for equipage; in Portugal, Holland, Sweden, and the other courts, £10 a day and £1,000 for equipage. Ambassadors-extraordinary had everywhere the same allowances as the ambassadors-ordinary, and differed only in the equipage money, which was to be determined by the sovereign according to the occasion. Considering the difference in the value of money, such posts also were undoubtedly more lucrative and advantageous than at present. But, on the other hand, these salaries — and sometimes even those of the civil government at home — were very irregularly paid, and often in arrear. "I neither have received nor expect to receive," says Bolingbroke,*j* in one of his letters, "anything on account of the journey which I took last year by her majesty's order (into France); and as to my regular appointments, I do assure your lordship I have heard nothing of them these two years."

Ministerial or parliamentary corruption — at least so far as foreign powers were concerned — did not in this generation, as in the last, sully the annals of England. Thus, for example, shamefully as the English interests were betrayed at the Peace of Utrecht by the English ministers, there is yet no reason whatever to suspect that they, like the patriots of Charles II's reign, had received presents or "gratifications" from Louis XIV. Should we ascribe this change to the difference of the periods or of the persons? Was the era of the Peace of Utrecht really preferable to that of 1679, hailed by Blackstone as the zenith of British constitutional excellence? Or were Bolingbroke and Oxford more honest statesmen than Littleton and Algernon Sidney?*l*





CHAPTER XIII

THE REIGN OF GEORGE I

[1714–1727 A.D.]

"The era of the Georges may be compared to the era of the Antonines at Rome. It was a period combining happiness and glory — a period of kind rulers and a prosperous people. While improvement was advancing at home with gigantic strides — while great wars were waged abroad — the domestic repose and enjoyment of the nation were scarcely ever for a moment broken through. The current was strong and rapid, but the surface remained smooth and unruffled. Lives were seldom lost, either by popular breaches of the law or by its rigorous execution. The population augmented fast, but wealth augmented faster still; comforts became more largely diffused, and knowledge more generally cultivated. Unlike the era of the Antonines, this prosperity did not depend upon the character of a single man. Its foundations were laid on ancient and free institutions, which, good from the first, were still gradually improving, and which alone, amongst all others since the origin of civil society, had completely solved the great problem, how to combine the greatest security to property with the greatest freedom of action."—STANHOPE.[b]

THE Regency Bill, passed in 1705, had provided for the government on the demise of Anne, and the seven great officers of state, together with eighteen peers, named in an instrument signed by the elector of Hanover, took upon themselves the temporary administration. Of the eighteen peers named by George, the greater number were determined whigs; and Argyle, Cowper, Halifax, Townshend, and Devonshire were among them. Marlborough was not named, nor was his son-in-law, Sunderland: this was not extraordinary, but it excites some surprise to see the illustrious Somers excluded also. The great general, on landing at Dover, received an enthusiastic welcome, and his entry into London was like a triumph. Two hundred gentlemen on horseback met him on the road, and the procession was joined by a long train of horses and carriages. Marlborough went straight to the house of lords and took the oaths to King George; but then, mortified at his exclusion from the regency, he retired into the country. The lords-justices appointed Joseph Addison to be their secretary, and ordered that all despatches addressed to Bolingbroke should be delivered to Addison. In the Scottish capital King George was proclaimed without opposition; but for some days there prevailed great doubt and anxiety as to Ireland: and the lords of the regency, or lords-justices, thought at one moment of despatching thither General Stanhope as commander-in-chief, and Marlborough's son-in-law, Sunderland, as lord-lieutenant, without losing time in waiting for the king's instructions; but

they soon received intelligence that all was quiet, and that King George had been peaceably proclaimed at Dublin by the lords-justices of Ireland, the archbishop of Armagh, and Sir Constantine Phipps, whose toryism had formerly been suspected to be of the jacobite bias.

Not a moment was lost by the whigs in England in putting forth claims to the honours and emoluments of office, and in scheming what should be the new cabinet. The bishopric of Ely, and every good thing that happened to be vacant in the church, was asked for, and every place at court, such as the captaincy of the band of gentlemen pensioners, the groomship of the bedchamber, etc., was grasped at by several competitors. Baron Bothmar was made the medium of these applications to Hanover.

But we may turn from these pettinesses, which were the inevitable consequences of a demise and a new succession, to matters of greater weight, in which the interests of three nations were concerned, and in which they were but too often sacrificed to private ambition and the interests of worthless individuals. According to a very important provision in the act of regency, the houses of parliament met on the day of the queen's death, though it was a Sunday, and all such members as were in or near town hastened to their seats. The tories attempted to procure an adjournment till the following Wednesday; but Sir Richard Onslow represented that the state of the nation was too critical to allow of delay; and the houses met again on Monday. Three days were spent in administering and taking oaths to the new sovereign. In the same breath, and with the same drop of ink, they expressed their deep grief at the death of their late sovereign lady Queen Anne, of blessed memory, and their lively pleasure at the accession of King George, whose right to the crown was so undoubted, and whose virtues were so princely.

THE KING, THE PRETENDER, AND THE NEW PARLIAMENT

All those who wished well to the Protestant succession were impatient for the arrival of the new king, whose delay on the Continent excited universal surprise. Other princes had shown the extreme of eagerness for a far less glittering prize; but the phlegmatic George I seemed to look almost with indifference to the crown of three great and rising kingdoms; and it was not till six o'clock in the evening of the 18th of September, or nearly seven weeks after the death of Anne, that he landed at Greenwich with his eldest son, Prince George. His subjects of Hanover had witnessed his departure with regret and tears — his English subjects received him with joy and acclamations, although on a near view they saw little to admire in his personal appearance or in his bearing, which were plain and undignified.

His majesty presently proceeded to complete his ministerial arrangements: Lord Halifax was appointed first lord-commissioner of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Cowper, again chancellor; Nottingham, president of the council; Marlborough, commander-in-chief and master-general of the ordnance; Wharton, (who was made a marquis), lord privy-seal; Orford, first lord of the admiralty; Shrewsbury, lord-chamberlain and groom of the stole; the duke of Devonshire, lord-steward of the household; the duke of Somerset, master of the horse; Sunderland, lord-lieutenant of Ireland; and Robert Walpole, whose ability in debate was worth a high price, paymaster of the forces. In Scotland, the jacobite earl of Mar was turned out, and the duke of Montrose put in his place; and the duke of Argyll was entrusted with the supreme command of the forces there. In Ireland, Sir

Constantine Phipps was deprived of the seals, and Mr. Broderick made chancellor. These ministerial arrangements were all completed before the 20th of October, on which day the coronation was performed at Westminster with the usual solemnities. The old abbey was thronged with nearly all the peers, whether whig, tory, or jacobite; the indolent *insouciant*-looking Oxford was there, and so was his keen-eyed, animated rival, Bolingbroke. The usual promotions in the peerage followed the ceremony.



GEORGE I

On the 29th of August the Pretender, who had gone from Bois-le-Duc to drink the mineral waters of Plombière, signed and sent forth a manifesto asserting his right to the throne of Great Britain, and explaining somewhat too clearly the causes of his inactivity up to "the death of the princess our sister, of whose good intention towards us we could not for some time past well doubt: and this was the reason we then sat still, expecting the good effects thereof, which were unfortunately prevented by her deplorable death." This was at once a capital blunder and a glaring proof of the little attention the exiled prince paid to the safety of his friends in England. The whigs instantly caught at the words as additional and incontrovertible evidence as to the intentions of the late ministry: the tories insisted that the manifesto was a false document basely forged by the whigs, to throw discredit upon them and dishonour the late queen; but they were driven from this position by the thick-headed and thick-hearted pretender, who openly acknowledged the authenticity of the manifesto.[c]

IMPEACHMENT OF BOLINGBROKE, OXFORD, AND ORMONDE

The parliament being dissolved, a new one met (March 17th, 1715). It proved decidedly whig, and it proceeded without delay to the impeachment of some of the late ministers for the Peace of Utrecht and other matters; and a committee of secrecy, with Walpole for its chairman, was appointed to examine the papers of Bolingbroke and others which had been seized. When it had made its report, Walpole arose and impeached Henry Lord Bolingbroke of high treason. Lord Coningsby then rose and said, "The worthy chairman of the committee has impeached the hand, but I impeach the head; he has impeached the clerk, I impeach the master"; and he impeached Robert Earl of Oxford and Mortimer of high treason. On the 21st of June Stanhope impeached the duke of Ormonde of high treason; the next day Lord Strafford was impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours by Mr. Aislabie. Sir Joseph Jekyl, a whig of unquestionable honesty, was against impeaching

either Oxford or Ormonde, and he spoke warmly in favour of the latter; but the spirit of the commons was not to be controlled. Bolingbroke and Ormonde both fled to the Continent; Oxford more manfully stood his ground, and was committed to the Tower.

The subsequent fate of these noblemen was as follows: Bolingbroke repaired to the court of the Pretender, which was at Commerci in Lorraine, and became his secretary of state. He exerted all his abilities in the service of that contemptible prince; but, the facti ns of the petty court proving too strong for him, he was charged with treachery, and dismissed. He then bent all his efforts to procuring the reversal of his attainder in England, which he at length obtained in 1723, through the influence of the duchess of Kendal. The interest of the venal duchess was procured by a bribe of £11,000, and Walpole was threatened with a dismissal by the king if he refused to promote the measure. Walpole consented to the restoration of Bolingbroke's estates, but would not agree to his being permitted to resume his seat in the house of peers. Bolingbroke forthwith commenced a political warfare against Walpole and the whig party, which only ceased with his life in 1751. Ormonde, against whom nothing could be proved, unwisely followed the ex mple of Bolingbroke, and was like him attainted; he remained to the end of h s life in the cheerless court of the Pretender, almost its solitary ornament. Oxford, after lying two years in the Tower, took occasion of a new modification of the ministry to petition for his trial being brought on. All the customary solemn preparations were made for it; but a disagreement arising between the two houses, the commons refused to proceed with their impeachment, and the peers acquitted the earl, who, however, was excepted from an act of grace then passed, of which the only consequence to him was a prohibition to appear at court.

MAR'S RISING (1715-1716 A.D.)

Meantime the Pretender and his partisans were secretly preparing to make an effort for the overthrow of the new government. The earl of Mar, disgusted at the manner in which his declaration of loyalty had been received by the king on his landing, and alarmed at the vindictive spirit shown by the whigs, lent an ear to the agents of the pretender, retired to the Highlands, and in concert with some noblemen and chiefs of clans raised the standard of James III (September 6th). Two vessels arrived with arms, ammunition, and officers from France, and he was soon at the head of ten thousand men. The government proceeded to act with great vigour; the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended and several suspected noblemen and members of the house of commons were arrested. The death at this conjuncture of Louis XIV was a great prejudice to the cause of the Pretender; for the duke of Orleans, who became regent during the minority of the young king, found it his interest to attach himself to the house of Brunswick.

While Mar had his headquarters at Perth, and the duke of Argyll, who commanded the royal forces, lay at Stirling, the Pretender was proclaimed in the north of England by the earl of Derwentwater and Mr. Forster, who were joined by the Scottish lords Winton, Nithsdale, Carnwath, and Kenmure. At Kelso they were reinforced by a body of Highlanders sent by Mar, under the command of Brigadier Mackintosh. They thence proceeded to Penrith, where the *posse comitatus* of Cumberland fled at their approach, and advanced till they reached Preston in Lancashire; but here they were assailed by the royal troops under generals Willis and Carpenter, and obliged to surrender at discretion (November 13th).

The very day of the surrender at Preston a battle was fought between Argyll and Mar. As the latter was preparing to march southwards the duke advanced from Stirling and spread his camp from the village of Dunblane to the Sheriff-muir. His forces did not exceed four thousand men, while the army with which Mar attacked him amounted to nine thousand. The left wing of the royalists was in the short space of seven minutes routed and driven off the field by the clansmen; but the right wing, led by the duke in person, defeated and chased the left of the enemy. When the victorious troops on each side returned from the pursuit, they found themselves facing each other, each occupying the ground held by the other previously. They remained inactive till the evening, when the duke retired to Dunblane and the rebels to Ardoch. Next morning the duke returned and carried off the wounded and four pieces of cannon left by the enemy. The loss was five hundred slain on each side; each claimed the victory, but it was really on the side of the duke.

Mar returned to Perth, and soon after (December 22nd) the Pretender himself landed at Peterhead, and having been proclaimed, issued proclamations and received addresses as he passed through Aberdeen, Dundee, and Scone. He joined the army at Perth and his coronation was fixed for the 23rd of January (1716); but ere that day arrived, the intelligence of Argyll's being strongly reinforced had convinced his supporters of the hopelessness of resistance. The Pretender, therefore, with the lords Mar, Melford, and some others, got aboard a French vessel at Montrose, and standing for the coast of Norway to escape the English cruisers, arrived within five days safely at Gravelines. The rebel army was disbanded at Badenoch; the common people retired to their homes; most of the leaders escaped to France.[g]

When the Pretender arrived, *incognito*, in the neighbourhood of Paris, Bolingbroke waited upon him, attempted to revive his spirits, and to prescribe a political line of action. The prince professed the greatest affection, begged his lordship to follow him into Lorraine, and pressed him in his arms at parting, like a bosom friend. But, three days after this, when Bolingbroke thought his master was many a French league off, his lordship received a visit from the duke of Ormonde, who handed him two orders just written by the Pretender, and stating, *sans phrases*, that he was dismissed from his post as secretary of state, and must deliver to the duke of Ormonde all the papers in his office! The witty profligate says that this all might have been contained in a moderate-sized letter-case, but the rage which this treatment excited was scarcely to be contained in any space. Bolingbroke, with all his genius, had been duped and insulted by a blockhead and a bevy of women. Instead of taking post for Lorraine, as he had promised his secretary he would do, the Pretender had merely gone to an obscure house in the Bois de Boulogne, close to Paris, and had there confabulated and plotted with a set of kept-women and secretaries of foreign embassies, who used the place, and the majority of the persons assembled in it, for two kinds of intrigues.

Bolingbroke says that he had in his hands matter wherewith to damp the triumph of the duke of Ormonde, who was now secretary of state as well as lord-general to the prince without state or army, but that he scorned to make use of it. But Bolingbroke instantly renounced and denounced all connection with the jacobites; made overtures to Lord Stair, who was too conscious of his ability to despise him, and told Maria d'Este, the wretched mother of a wretched son, that he wished his arm might rot off if he ever again drew sword or pen for that cause. The duke of Berwick saw at once the enormous blunder that had been committed in thus dismissing the only Englishman the Pre-

tender ever had able to manage his affairs, and dismissing him in such an insulting manner as to make reconciliation impossible.

But, in the meantime, hundreds, thousands of Englishmen and Scots were paying a severe penalty for their rash doings. In Scotland, the number of prisoners was very small, and little work was done by the courts of law; but the clans were set loose upon one another, and the troops of George were put to live at free quarters in the houses and upon the estates of the jacobites. But, in England, Forster's imbecile conduct and dastardly surrender at Preston had filled the jails of the north with prisoners of a strange variety of conditions — nonjuring Protestants, high-church divines, popish priests and monks in disguise, fox-hunting jacobite squires, and Catholic officers and non-commissioned officers who had been turned out of the army on account of their religion; and mixed with these were Highland chiefs and dunnie-wassails, and jacobite Lowland lairds, who had marched with Forster from Kelso. Upon some of these unfortunate captives military law was executed, and they were tried in bands by a court-martial, and then shot in a heap; while above five hundred prisoners of inferior condition were left inhumanly to starve of hunger and cold in various castles and jails in the north.

Forster and the most conspicuous of the leaders were marched off for London, where they arrived on the 9th of December. When these unfortunate gentlemen had crossed Finchley common, and reached the brow of Highgate hill, they were made to halt, and to submit to numerous indignities: their arms were tied behind their backs like cut-throats and cut-purses; their horses were led by foot-soldiers, and their ears were stunned by all the drums of the escort beating a triumphal march, and by the shouts, scoffs, and jeers of the multitude. Upon their reaching the city, such as were lords or noblemen were sent to the Tower — the rest were divided among the four common jails. They were not long suffered to remain there in doubt and uncertainty: the nation, the parliament which re-assembled on the 9th of January were eager for an example, in the spirit of the time, and far too anxious for blood. Mr. Lechmere, after a long and vehement speech, impeached James, earl of Derwentwater, of high treason. Other members of the commons, with fewer words, but equal heat, impeached Lord Widdrington, the earls of Nithsdale, Winton, and Carnwath, Viscount Kenmure, and Lord Nairn. Not a single voice was raised in opposition, not an effort made in debate to avert the doom of these incompetent revolutionists, though certainly there was still many a jacobite in the house. On the 19th of January these noblemen were all brought before the house of lords, assembled as a court of justice in Westminster Hall, with Earl Cowper, the chancellor, presiding as lord high-steward. They knelt at the bar till the chancellor desired them to rise; and then they all, but one, confessed their guilt, and threw themselves upon the mercy of King George — a prince neither unmerciful nor cruel, but far indeed from possessing either a tender heart or a lively imagination. Sentence of death, as traitors, was forthwith pronounced upon Derwentwater, Widdrington, Nithsdale, Carnwath, Kenmure, and Lord Nairn; and preparations were ordered for the trial of Lord Winton, who had pleaded not guilty. Secretary Stanhope, who was a man of feeling, interposed and saved the life of Lord Nairn, who had been his schoolfellow: but the united interest and earnest supplications of the duchess of Cleveland and Bolton, of the young countess of Derwentwater pleading with tears for the husband she tenderly loved, and of many other ladies of rank, failed in moving the rough and sturdy king, who admitted them to an audience, but adhered to his purpose, which was the purpose of the majority of his ministers.

Bribes, which had succeeded before in like circumstances, were offered now without effect. Sixty thousand pounds was tendered for the single pardon of Lord Derwentwater, for whose present hard fate tears were shed and lamentations raised in every valley and on every hillside in Cumberland. Some of the best of the whigs in the commons, and among them poor Steele, would have saved life without money or bribe; but Robert Walpole, who in after life was certainly not a cruel minister, was on the present occasion perfectly obdurate: he expressed his horror and disgust at the leniency of these whigs, whom he called "unworthy members of this great body," since they could, "without blushing, open their mouths in favour of rebels and parricides." As, however, favourable circumstances had arisen for the earl of Carnwath and Lord Widdrington, and as some respect was due to the opinion and feeling of the house of lords, those two noblemen were respited. The three remaining victims were left for execution, and, to prevent any further interference, orders were sent to the Tower to have the block ready on the following morning. But during that night the conjugal affection and heroism of Lady Nithsdale robbed the block of a head. She dressed her lord in her own clothes, and he escaped by night, and in that disguise, out of the Tower. There thus remained only two victims — the English Lord Derwentwater and the Scottish Lord Kenmure; and they, at an early hour the next morning — the 24th of February — were brought to the scaffold on Tower Hill.

Lord Winton, who had pleaded not guilty, embarrassed his prosecutors, for, though he seemed at times crazy or half idiotic, he managed his business with considerable craft and skill, and on his trial struck one of the first of whigs and ministers with a sharp repartee. He was not put upon his trial till the 15th of March, having gained time by petitions and other devices. He was found guilty of high treason, and sent back to the Tower; but it appears that there was no real intention to proceed to execution, and, after lying some time in that state prison, he effected his escape.

In the beginning of April a commission for trying the rebels of inferior rank met in the court of common pleas. Forster, Brigadier Mackintosh, and twenty of their confederates were found guilty on indictments for high treason. Forster and Mackintosh were both fortunate enough to break their prison and escape, and seven others followed their example, and got safe to the Continent. But four were executed in London, and twenty-two in Lancashire, where above a thousand submitted to the king's mercy, and petitioned to be transported to the colonies in America. The amount of punishment and of blood seemed in those days unaccountably and imprudently small.[c]

Punishment was not, however, the only object of the ministers; they thought also of prevention. On the 1st of March, Lechmere moved for leave to bring in "a bill to strengthen the Protestant interest in Great Britain by enforcing the laws now in being against papists" — such, in those times, being the panacea for all evils! Lechmere was seconded by Lord Coningsby, and, no member venturing to oppose his motion, the bill was passed on the 17th of April; and we find that one of its clauses provided for the "effectual and exemplary punishment of such as being papists shall enlist themselves in his majesty's service."

THE SEPTENNIAL ACT (1716 A.D.)

But by far the most important and most celebrated measure of the government was their change in the duration of parliament. Under the act passed in 1694 its period had been fixed at three years. The cause of that

narrow limitation may probably be found in the enormous period of seventeen years, to which Charles II had prolonged his second parliament, and which, by a natural revulsion, drove the minds of men into the opposite extreme. The triennial system had now been tried for upwards of twenty years, and found productive of much inconvenience without any real benefit. There is no evidence whatever to prove that the house of commons had even in the smallest degree shown itself more watchful or public spirited during that epoch than either before or since; nay, on the contrary, it may be asserted that the grossest and most glaring cases of corruption that could be gleaned out of the entire parliamentary annals of Great Britain belong to those twenty years. The speaker (Sir John Trevor), on one occasion, accepted a bribe of 1000 guineas from the city of London, and, on its detection, was himself obliged to put to the vote that he had been guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour. The secretary of the treasury (Mr. Guy), on another occasion, was sent to the Tower for a similar offence. A shameful system of false endorsement of exchequer bills on the part of several members was detected in 1698; and even Burnet,[i] the apologist of those times, is reduced to admit the existence, and deplore the extent, of the corruption.

It is not to be supposed, however, that this was the cause which principally, if at all, influenced the ministers in proposing the restoration of septennial parliaments. Theirs was a case of pressing and immediate danger. A rebellion scarcely quelled — an invasion still threatened — parties in the highest degree exasperated — a government becoming unpopular even from its unavoidable measures of defence: such were the circumstances under which, according to the act of 1694, the parliament would have been dissolved at the risk of tumults and bloodshed — a most formidable opposition — and, perhaps, a jacobite majority. What friend of the Protestant succession could have wished to incur this terrible responsibility? Even those who may approve of triennial parliaments in general, would hardly, I think, defend them at such a juncture. According to this view of the subject, there was at first some idea of providing only for the especial emergency; but it was judged more safe and constitutional to propose a uniform and permanent recurrence to the former system. It was, therefore, on permanent grounds that the question was argued in 1716; and we need scarcely add that it is on such only that it should be considered now.

In considering, therefore, the general question, we may, in the first place, cast aside the foolish idea that the parliament overstepped its legitimate authority in prolonging its existence; an idea which was indeed urged by party spirit at the time, and which may still sometimes pass current in harangues to heated multitudes, but which has been treated with utter contempt by the best constitutional writers.[1] If we look to the practical effects of the change, the most obvious and most important is the increased power of the popular branch of the legislature. Speaker Onslow, a very high authority on this subject, was frequently heard to say that the Septennial Bill formed the era of the emancipation of the British house of commons from its former dependence on the crown and the house of lords.

The ministers determined that their proposed bill should originate in the house of lords. It was there that they felt least sure of a majority; and they wished, that, in case of failure, their friends in the commons should not at

[1] Mr. Hallam[h] observes: "Nothing can be more extravagant than what is sometimes confidently pretended by the ignorant, that the legislature exceeded its rights by this enactment, or, if that cannot legally be advanced, that it at least violated the trust of the people and broke in upon the ancient constitution."

least incur needless unpopularity, nor lose ground at the ensuing elections. Accordingly, on the 10th of April, a bill for the repeal of the Triennial Act was brought in by the duke of Devonshire. It was of course keenly opposed by the whole weight of the opposition, yet their numbers were less formidable than had been apprehended; and their chief division on the bill going into committee, gave them only sixty-one votes against ninety-six.

The Septennial Bill, having passed the lords, was sent down to the commons, and read a second time on the 24th of April. Walpole being then severely indisposed, he was unable to take any part in support of the measure; but it had his full concurrence.

In committee on the bill, Lechmere proposed a clause to disable such persons from becoming members of either house of parliament as have pensions during pleasure. But Stanhope urged that such a clause would only clog the bill and endanger its miscarriage, a part of it being an infringement on the privileges of the peers; and he announced his intention of himself bringing in a separate bill with reference to pensioners in the house of commons. Accordingly, he over-ruled Lechmere's proposition (probably intended as a stratagem for defeating the Septennial Bill altogether); and the same evening he moved for leave to bring in a bill to disable any person from being chosen a member of, or sitting or voting in, the house of commons, who has any pension during pleasure, or for any number of years, from the crown. This bill was accordingly prepared, and ordered to be brought in by Stanhope, Craggs, and Boscawen, and it passed on the 8th of June. As for the Septennial Bill, it was read a third time on the 26th of April, the minority mustering no more than 121.

THE KING AND THE PRINCE OF WALES

During the time that the ministers were carrying the Septennial Act and their other measures through parliament, they had another struggle, almost as important and far more difficult to maintain, at court. The king's impatience to revisit his German dominions could no longer be stemmed. It was in vain that his confidential advisers pointed out to him the unpopularity that must attend, and the dangers that might follow, his departure at such a crisis; their resistance only chafing instead of curbing his majesty, and at length the ministers let go the reins. Two great obstacles, however, still remained to delay his journey — first, the restraining clause in the Act of Settlement; and, secondly, his jealousy of the prince of Wales, whom, in his absence, it would be indispensable to invest with some share at least of power and sovereign authority.

As to the first of these difficulties, it might have been met in two modes; by proposing to parliament either an occasional exception, or a total repeal of the restraining clause. The former would certainly have been the more safe and constitutional course, but the latter was thought the most respectful, and accordingly preferred. Accustomed as George was to foreign habits, and attached to his Hanoverian subjects, his ardent desire to visit them should be considered a misfortune indeed to Great Britain, yet by no means a blemish in his character. But it certainly behoved the legislature to hold fast the invaluable safeguard which they already possessed against his foreign partialities. It might, therefore, be supposed by a superficial observer, that the repeal of the restraining clause, when proposed by Sir John Cope in the house of commons, would have been encountered with a strenuous opposition. On the contrary, it passed without a single dissentient voice; the whigs and the

[1716 A.D.]

friends of government supporting the wishes of the king, and the tories delighted at the prospect that his majesty's departure would expose his person to unpopularity and his affairs to confusion.

The jealousy which George I entertained of his son was no new feeling. It had existed even at Hanover, and been since inflamed by an insidious motion of the tories in the house of commons, that, out of the civil list, £100,000 should be allotted as a separate revenue for the prince of Wales. The motion was over-ruled by the ministerial party, and its rejection offended the prince as much as its proposal had the king.

Such being his majesty's feelings, he was unwilling to entrust the prince with the government in his absence, unless by joining other persons in the commission, and limiting his power by the most rigorous restrictions. Through the channel of Bernsdorf, his principal favourite, he communicated his idea to the members of the cabinet, and desired them to deliberate upon it. The answer of Lord Townshend to Bernsdorf is still preserved. He first eagerly seized the opportunity of recapitulating in the strongest manner the objections to the king's departure, and then proceeded to say, that the ministers having carefully perused the precedents, found no instance of persons being joined in commission with the prince of Wales, and few, if any, of restrictions upon such commissions; and that they were of opinion "that the constant tenour of ancient practice could not conveniently be receded from." Under such circumstances, the king found it impossible to persevere in his design. Instead, however, of giving the prince the title of regent, he named him Guardian of the Realm and Lieutenant — an office unknown in England since the days of the Black Prince. He also insisted that the duke of Argyll, whom he suspected of abetting and exciting his son in ambitious views, and who, as groom of the stole to the prince, had constant and easy access to his person, should be dismissed from that and all his other employments. Having thus settled, or rather unsettled matters, George began his journey on the 9th of July, and was attended by Stanhope.

It cannot be denied that at this period the popularity of George I was by no means such as might have been expected from his judicious choice of ministers, or from his personal justice and benevolence of disposition. These qualities, indeed, were not denied by the multitude, but they justly complained of the extreme rapacity and venality of his foreign attendants. Coming from a poor electorate, a flight of hungry Hanoverians, like so many famished vultures, fell with keen eyes and bended talons on the fruitful soil of England. Bothmar and Bernsdorf, looking to the example of King William's foreign favourites, expected peerages and grants of lands, and were deeply offended at the limitations of the Act of Settlement. Robethon, the king's private secretary, whilst equally fond of money, was still more mischievous and meddling; he was of French extraction, and of broken fortunes: a prying, impertinent, venomous creature, forever crawling in some slimy intrigue. All these, and many others, even down to Mahomet and Mustapha, two Turks in his majesty's service, were more than suspected of taking money for recommendations to the king, and making a shameful traffic of his favour.

But by far the greatest share of the public odium fell upon the king's foreign mistresses. The chief of these, Herrengard Melesina von Schulenburg, was created by his majesty duchess of Munster in the Irish peerage, and afterwards duchess of Kendal in the English. She had no great share of beauty; but with George I a bulky figure was sufficient attraction. To intellect she could make still less pretension. Lord Chesterfield, who had married her niece, tells us that she was little better than an idiot; and this

testimony is confirmed by the curious fact that one morning, after the death of her royal lover, she fancied that he flew into her window in the form of a raven, and accordingly gave the bird a most respectful reception. She affected great devotion, and sometimes attended several Lutheran chapels in the course of the same day — perhaps with the view of countenancing a report which prevailed, though probably without foundation, that the king had married her with the left hand, according to the German custom. Her rapacity was very great and very successful. After the resignation of the duke of Somerset, no master of the horse was appointed for several years, the profits of the place being paid to the duchess; and there is no doubt that her secret emoluments for patronage and recommendations far surpassed any outward account of her receipts. Sir Robert Walpole more than once declared of her (but this was after the death of George I), that she would have sold the king's honour for a shilling advance to the best bidder.

The second mistress, Sophia Baroness Kilmanseck, created countess of Darlington, was younger and more handsome than her rival; but, like her, unwieldy in person and rapacious in character. She had no degree either of talent or information, it being apparently the aim of George, in all his amours, to shun with the greatest care the overpowering dissertations of a learned lady.[b]

ENGLAND AND THE CONTINENTAL POWERS

In the spring of 1716, defensive alliances had been concluded by the British government with the states general and with the emperor, to operate in case of aggression on either by France or other powers. The issue, however, of the rebellion of 1715 had entirely indisposed the government of the regent of France to any rupture with England. The duke of Orleans was moreover anxious to procure the support of England to his succession to the crown of France, in the event of the death of Louis XV, a sickly boy. The claim to that crown had been renounced by the Bourbon king of Spain; but Philip V might interpret that renunciation according to the power which he might possess of setting his agreement at nought. Whilst George I was at Hanover this summer, negotiations were going forward between Stanhope, his secretary of state, and the abbé Dubois, the profligate but most able servant of the regent. The English government desired the expulsion of the Pretender from France and its dependencies; and was anxious to stipulate that a new harbour should be abandoned which Louis XIV had begun to construct at Mardyke, to serve the same warlike purposes as Dunkirk, which had been demolished according to the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht. The agent of the regent was ready to yield these points, to secure the friendship of the government of King George. Thus the policy of England and France tended towards peace and a more intimate alliance. On the other hand, the continental objects of George I threatened to involve his island subjects in a war, in which they would certainly not have engaged had their king not also been elector of Hanover. When Charles XII of Sweden, in 1714, after those five years of seclusion at Bender which followed the disastrous day of Pultowa, burst upon Europe again, he found a large part of his territories divided among many rapacious neighbours, with whom he would have to fight if Sweden were to regain any semblance of her old power. Frederick IV of Denmark, in 1712, had conquered Schleswig and Holstein, Bremen and Verden. To strengthen himself against Charles, "the Swedish-iron hero" — as Mr. Carlyle calls him — Frederick bartered away Bremen and Verden to

[1717 A.D.]

the elector of Hanover, in 1715, for £150,000, on condition that George should join a coalition against Sweden. George's son-in-law, Frederick William of Prussia, had gone to war that same year, with his giant grenadiers, to compel Charles to resign his pretensions to Stettin, which Prussia had obtained in pawn for a payment of £60,000. The northern war blazed furiously. The elector of Hanover sent a British fleet into the Baltic to coerce Sweden; and with six thousand Hanoverians joined the Prussians, Danes, and Russians, against "the lion-king." At Stralsund Charles made his last effort. He was overpowered; and getting away to Sweden, meditated schemes of vast import, but thoroughly impracticable. Charles endeavoured to gratify his revenge against England in stirring up another jacobite insurrection. Northern Europe was now still more agitated; for the czar Peter had marched with his Muscovites into Mecklenburg, and was threatening Denmark. George was for violent measures against Russia, which his minister Stanhope very wisely discountenanced. This smoke did not burst into flame. In the conduct of the negotiation with France there was a difference of opinion between Stanhope at Hanover, and Townshend at home; and this, with other less dignified causes, produced a partial breaking up of King George's first whig ministry.

MINISTERIAL DISSENSIONS

The popularity which the prince of Wales acquired during the king's absence was looked upon with fear and suspicion at Hanover. He was affable; appeared fond of English customs; spoke our language tolerably well; and went amongst the people in a free and unreserved manner. Party writers began to contrast the son with the father. The prince was not discreet in a position where discretion was so essential. He manifested an eagerness to open the parliament in person during the king's absence; whilst the king desired that the prorogation might be extended, to enable him to remain longer at Hanover. Townshend, in his communications with Stanhope, had pressed that the king should speedily decide as to his return; intimated the prince's wish to open parliament; and suggested that in certain emergencies a larger discretionary power should be given to the "guardian of the realm." The king was enraged; and avowed his determination to dismiss his chief minister from his office of secretary of state. To soften this dismissal Townshend was offered the office of lord-lieutenant of Ireland. The secretary at first stoutly refused. His colleagues were indignant. Stanhope, from Hanover, tried to persuade them to acquiesce in the king's determination. The whigs, he wrote to Mr. Methuen, one of the commissioners of the treasury, "may possibly unking their master, or (which I do before God think very possible) make him abdicate England; but they will certainly not force him to make my lord Townshend secretary." The fallen minister was at last induced to accept the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland; and Methuen was appointed secretary of state as the colleague of Stanhope. The apparent renewal of the friendly relations of the sovereign and his ministers was not of long duration.

The king opened the session of parliament on the 20th of February, 1717. He announced that a Treaty of Alliance had been concluded between Great Britain, France, and the states general. There were to be no longer apprehensions about Dunkirk and Mardyke; the pretender was to be removed beyond the Alps. This treaty, concluded on the 4th of January, 1717, is known as the Triple Alliance. The king further notified that he had directed

papers to be laid before parliament, "which contain a certain account of a projected invasion." These papers were "copies of letters which passed between Count Gyllenburg, the barons Görtz, Spaar, and others, relating to the designs of raising a rebellion in his majesty's dominions, to be supported by a force from Sweden." The discovery of this scheme had delayed the opening of the session. In October, some letters between Baron Görtz, the bold and intriguing minister of Charles XII, and Count Gyllenburg, the Swedish envoy in London, had been intercepted and deciphered by the English government. On the 29th of January, Stanhope, as secretary of state, laid the information thus obtained before the council; and it was determined to resort to the extraordinary measure of arresting the Swedish envoy, and of seizing his papers. Gyllenburg, of course, stoutly resisted; and pleaded the protection to which the representatives of foreign governments are entitled by the law of nations. That law, however, does not sanction an ambassador in being the active instrument of plots against the government to which he is accredited. General Wade carried off the contents of the Swede's escritoire, and put a guard over his prisoner. The contents of the papers fully justified the act of the government. Görtz had organised a scheme for an insurrection in England, and a simultaneous invasion of Scotland by the king of Sweden. Spain had entered into the confederacy. Its prime minister, Alberoni, had remitted a million of French livres to Spaar, the Swedish envoy in Paris, to set the forces of Charles XII in motion. The Pretender had offered £60,000 for the same object. The whole affair exploded upon the arrest of Gyllenburg. The king of Sweden did not disown the act of his ministers, neither did he own them; but he ordered the British resident at his court to be put under arrest. Apprehensions of danger from Sweden were still professed by the English ministry; and on the 3rd of April, Stanhope delivered to the commons a royal message, asking for an additional supply, "not only to secure his majesty's kingdoms against the present dangers with which they are threatened from Sweden, but likewise to prevent as far as possible the like apprehensions for the future." The motion for a supply was only carried by a majority of four votes. It was opposed by many of the whigs, and coldly supported by others. Walpole, to whom the house looked up on all financial questions, spoke indeed in favour of the motion, but with a reserve that was more significant than censure. It was clear that the most important of the whig leaders were jealous of the influence of Sunderland, who was now held to be the king's chief adviser. The result of this debate was that the same evening Townshend was dismissed from his office of lord-lieutenant of Ireland; and that, the next morning, Robert Walpole resigned — firm in his resistance to the entreaties of the king to keep the seals of chancellor of the exchequer. Other resignations followed, including that of Methuen. Stanhope now became the head of the government; Sunderland and Addison were appointed secretaries of state; and James Craggs secretary for war.

THE QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE

The period during which Stanhope had the chief administration of affairs, from 1717 to his death in 1721, was a period of extraordinary excitement in the complicated policy of various European states, and of momentous embarrassment in the financial operations of the English people and the English government. The chief instigator of the disputes which in 1717 threatened to involve Europe again in a general war was Cardinal Alberoni, the prime

minister of Spain. He had great projects in view, which he thought would raise Spain in the scale of nations. He prepared an armament at Barcelona, whose destination was wholly unknown. In August, 1717, a Spanish fleet anchored in the bay of Cagliari; and eight or nine thousand troops made a descent on the island of Sardinia, of which they took possession after a stout resistance from Spaniards of the Austrian party. The expedition was not merely intended to seize this barren territory. Spain had an eye to Sicily, which had been ceded at the peace to Victor Amadeus. England interposed, in the endeavour to preserve the peace of Europe. Negotiations went forward, without much effect; Stanhope having sent his cousin, afterwards earl of Harrington, as ambassador to Spain. The regent of France also sent his ambassador. But the bold and crafty Alberoni wanted only to gain time, and he made the most extensive preparations for war upon a great scale. Spain, directed by the energy of this adventurer, threw off her accustomed lethargy. In a year or two he had set in motion every instrument of intrigue against France and England. The Turks had been totally defeated by Prince Eugene at the great battle of Peterwaradin. Alberoni urged the sultan to persevere in the war with the emperor. He had encouraged Baron Görtz in his schemes for the invasion of England by Sweden. He had entered into correspondence with the Pretender, and proposed a Spanish expedition to land in Britain, to be commanded by James, or by the duke of Ormonde. He fomented insurrections and conspiracies in France. In 1718 it became evident that the British government must prepare for warlike operations, and give up its attempts at mediation. Alberoni, whose vanity made him presumptuous, but whose acuteness gave him signal advantages over ordinary politicians, must have offered many a rude shock to the complacency of diplomatic routine.



EASTGATE HOUSE, ROCHESTER
(Original of the "Nun's House" in *Edwin Drood* by Dickens)

The English negotiators had to attempt the difficult task of reconciling the conflicting interests of the emperor and the Bourbon king of Spain. The Treaty of Utrecht had failed in placing the peace of Europe on a durable foundation. There must be other territorial arrangements, which it was the object of the Quadruple Alliance of England, Holland, France, and the emperor to effect. Exchanges of dominion were to be made between the rivals; something gained and something yielded on either side; doubtful successions guaranteed; compensations; all interests consulted but that trifling one, the welfare of those handed about from potentate to potentate. Alberoni resolved for war, exclaiming, "The Lord's hand is not shortened."

ARREST OF THE PRINCE OF WALES

With this threatened interruption to the peace of Europe, the administration of Stanhope, who was now raised to the peerage, had to meet the parliament which was summoned for the 21st of November. Just at this time a scene took place within the walls of St. James' palace, which threatened as much embarrassment to the tranquil progress of government as any complication of foreign affairs. The king and the prince of Wales openly quarrelled. The rupture was deemed of sufficient importance to warrant the secretary of state in writing an explanation of the circumstances to the foreign ministers.

Then was exhibited the unbecoming spectacle of the heir-apparent in opposition to the government of his father; of the court of Leicester House in rivalry to the court of St. James. The discarded members of the whig cabinet could at Leicester House lament, in common with tories and jacobites, over their exclusion from power. Walpole and Shippen could make common cause as assailants of the existing government, however irreconcileable themselves upon the principles upon which the government could be conducted. The king, on the other hand, was surrounded by some indiscreet and unscrupulous adherents. After his majesty's death, Queen Caroline found amongst his private papers a proposal from the earl of Berkeley, first lord of the admiralty in 1718 — which proposal was in the handwriting of Charles Stanhope — to seize the prince of Wales, and carry him off to America. George I had too much sense to adopt the kidnapping project; but he formed a crude plan to obtain an act of parliament that the prince should be compelled to relinquish his German possessions upon coming to the throne of Great Britain. The friends of constitutional monarchy were alarmed at these proceedings; and it was fortunate that the power which the great abilities of Walpole eventually secured under George I, enabled him to use, for the purpose of outward reconciliation, the influence which he had obtained over the prince of Wales during his term of opposition politics.

WAR WITH SPAIN

Into fightings arising out of the squabbles of the empire and of Spain — or rather out of the squabbles of [in Carlyle's[d] phrase] "Kaiser Karl VI and of Elizabeth Farnese, termagant queen of Spain" — was England precipitated. When the number of troops to be maintained came to be discussed in parliament, "downright Shippen" said that some expressions of the king's speech "seem rather calculated for the meridian of Germany than of Great Britain." He added, "It is the only infelicity of his majesty's reign that he is unacquainted with our language and constitution; and it is therefore the more incumbent on his British ministers to inform him, that our government does not stand on the same foundation with his German dominions, which, by reason of their situation, and the nature of their constitution, are obliged to keep up armies in time of peace." For these expressions Mr. Shippen was sent to the Tower, and there remained till the prorogation of parliament in March. There were interesting debates in both houses on the evident tendency to engage in war indicated by the number of troops to be employed; but the parliament was prorogued with the royal expression of a hope that such treaties might be concluded, "as will settle peace and tranquillity amongst our neighbours." The hope was illusive; and indeed was contrary to a message from the crown, just at the close of the session, pointing out the

necessity of an increase of the navy. No specific object was named; but Walpole observed that the message and the address which was voted had the air of a declaration of war against Spain.

On the 4th of June, Admiral Byng sailed for the Mediterranean, having twenty ships of the line under his command; for intelligence had been received that an armament of twenty-nine ships of war, with transports for thirty-five thousand soldiers, had sailed from Barcelona with sealed orders. The English prime minister, Lord Stanhope, in the desire to avert war, had proceeded to Madrid; and he was even prepared to give up Gibraltar, which it appears he thought "of no consequence." Alberoni, amidst pacific professions, had manifested no disposition to abate his pretensions. Whilst Stanhope was talking of peace, the Spanish fleet had sailed into the bay of Solento, and having landed a large force upon Sicilian ground under the marquis di Lede, the troops in a few days had become masters of Palermo. The chief military operation was the siege of Messina. On the 31st of July the citadel was invested. On the 1st of August, Sir George Byng's fleet was anchored in the bay of Naples, where he took on board two thousand German troops to reinforce the Piedmontese garrison of Messina. The Spanish fleet would have been in comparative safety if they had remained at anchor in the road of Messina, in line of battle, with the batteries behind them that Di Lede had constructed. The admirals chose to put to sea, and Byng hurried after the Spaniards, through the straits of Faro. On the 11th of August the English squadron was carried by a breeze into the heart of the Spanish fleet, off Cape Passero. Six of their men of war had been separated from their main body, and a division, commanded by Captain Walton, was despatched by the English admiral to intercept them. The battle, it is held, was commenced by the Spaniards. Byng was superior in force; and the Spanish admirals acted without a settled plan. But they fought bravely, till the main fleet was all taken or destroyed. The report of Captain Walton to his admiral, is the very model of a business-like despatch: "Sir, we have taken and destroyed all the Spanish ships which were upon the coast: the number as per margin." The Spanish fleet was thus swept away; but Byng, in a letter to Di Lede, affected to consider this catastrophe as not necessarily involving a war between the two nations. Messina fell before the Spanish troops, at the end of September; and Byng again anchored in the bay of Naples. Alberoni did not quietly endure the pacific mode in which his fleet had been annihilated. He seized all British vessels and goods in Spanish ports.

The war smouldered on during two years; for an object which, as Carlyle[d] truly said, "could not be excelled in insignificance." King George, in opening parliament on the 11th of November, announced that he had concluded terms and conditions of peace and alliance between the greatest princes of Europe, but that Spain "having rejected all our amicable proposals, it became necessary for our naval forces to check their progress." Walpole headed in the commons the opposition to an address of thanks, contending, that by their giving sanction to the late measures, they "would screen ministers, who, having begun a war against Spain, would now make it the parliament's war." The motion for an address of thanks was carried by a majority of sixty-one.

BILL FOR RELIEF OF DISSENTERS

A domestic measure of real interest to the nation, and honourable to the ministry to have proposed, was carried during this session, with some curtailments of its original design. It was a bill for the relief of Protestant dis-

senters, entitled "a bill for strengthening the Protestant interest in these kingdoms." Stanhope took a liberal view of the religious differences which had so long agitated the nation, and he desired to repeal, not only the Act against Occasional Conformity, the Schism Act, and the Test Act, but to mitigate the penal laws against Roman Catholics. It was contended, and perhaps prudently, by some of his colleagues, that by aiming at too much nothing would be accomplished. The debates were warm in both houses; and finally, by a majority of only forty-one, the measure was passed, without the repeal of the Test Act, and without any attempt to put the Roman Catholics upon a juster footing of equality, however limited, with their fellow-subjects.

SETTLEMENT OF THE SPANISH DIFFICULTIES

The hostility of Alberoni towards the government which had proved the most formidable enemy to his designs for the extension of the power of the Spanish monarchy, now assumed the somewhat dangerous form of an alliance with the Pretender, and a direct assistance to him in another attempt at the invasion of Great Britain. There was no longer to be hope for the house of Stuart in the rash designs of Charles of Sweden. He had fallen by a stray bullet — probably by the hand of an assassin — in the trenches of Frederickshall. He no more will terrify the world with his volcanic outbreaks. Alberoni was to accomplish, by weaving his web of intrigue around the persevering adherents of James, what his brother intriguer Görtz had failed to accomplish. Upon the sister of Charles XII succeeding to the crown of Sweden, there had been a political revolution, and the restless minister of the late king had perished on a scaffold. Alberoni had failed in the issue of a conspiracy which he had stirred up against the regent Orleans. It was effectually crushed; and, whatever were the private views of the regent, his lenity in this affair was a proof that he possessed one of the best attributes of power, "the quality of mercy." The plot of the duke and duchess of Maine being clearly traced to the schemes of the Spanish minister, war was declared by France against Spain. There was one great card more to play. The Pretender was invited to Madrid. He safely reached that capital from Italy, and was received with signal honours. The duke of Ormonde, and the earl Marischal and his brother, had also passed from France into Spain. An expedition had been prepared by Alberoni, which it was originally intended that James should lead.

But it was at length arranged that Ormonde should land in England; that Lord Marischal should sail with some forces to Scotland; and that Keith, his brother, should go through France to gather together the jacobites who had taken refuge there. The armament which sailed from Cadiz, consisting of five men-of-war, with twenty transports, carrying five thousand men, was scattered by a great storm in the Bay of Biscay. The crews threw overboard the stands of arms, the munitions of war, and the horses, to lighten their vessels; and the greater part of the armada returned to Spanish ports, in a dismantled condition. The earl Marischal, with two frigates, carrying about three hundred troops, proceeded to Scotland; and his brother, with Tullibardine, Seaforth, and a few other noble refugees, joined him in a small vessel. The whole proceeding was known to the British government, through information furnished by the regent of France. The adventurers, with the Spanish soldiers, landed on the banks of Loch Alsh, in the month of May, 1719. The vessels returned to Spain; and the Scottish leaders were left to

face their desperate enterprise. They established themselves in an old castle in the inner reach of the loch; but their attempts to fortify it afforded them no safety. Three English vessels of war entered these solitary waters, and battered the rude tower to the ground. Scattered parties of Highlanders joined the Spaniards; and the whole body, about fifteen hundred — some accounts say two thousand — encamped at Glenshiel. In this valley, surrounded by mountains, whose pathways were known only to the natives, they remained inactive, expecting to be joined by large bodies of insurgents. No general rising took place in the Highlands. No great chiefs again ventured to appear in arms against a strong government. In June, General Wightman, with sixteen hundred troops, marched from Inverness. He hesitated to attack desperate men in their formidable pass; but a sharp struggle took place with detached bodies on the mountain sides, which lasted three hours. The next day the Spaniards surrendered as prisoners of war; but the Highlanders had disappeared. Wightman had twenty-one men killed, and a hundred and twenty-one wounded. He brought into Edinburgh two hundred and seventy-four Spanish prisoners. The Scottish leaders took shelter in the Western Isles; and finally escaped to Spain.

Whatever opposition might be raised to the origin and objects of the war in which England was engaged against France, no one could complain that the naval power of the country was inefficiently employed. No British admiral could have manifested more energy and promptitude than Admiral Byng displayed, in exploits that required the utmost courage and decision of character. He rendered the most efficient aid to the forces of the emperor in the contest with the Spaniards for the possession of Sicily. By his sagacious counsels he gave a successful direction to the languid efforts of the imperial commanders, who were jealous of each other, and divided in their plans. Their troops were destitute of provisions, and he supplied them by sea with stores, to prevent them starving in the interior of the island. They were insufficiently supplied with ammunition, and he furnished them with the means of attack and defence. With such aid the Austrians, after a serious defeat at Franca Villa, in June, 1719, were enabled to besiege the Spaniards in Messina, of whose citadel they obtained possession in October. There were military operations of less importance before the Spaniards finally evacuated Sicily and Sardinia.

Meanwhile, the French had sent an army against Spain, under the command of the duke of Berwick, the natural son of James II — the general who had won the victory of Almanza for the Bourbon king of Spain. Berwick was now to lead an army against the same king; and he was to be assisted by English sailors belonging to the government of the sovereign who was regarded as an usurper by the head of his own family. The French made themselves masters of Fuenterabia and St. Sebastian; and Lord Cobham, with an English squadron, captured Vigo. These disasters might have convinced Alberoni that the conflict with these great powers, in which Spain had engaged, was an undertaking in which his own abilities could not supply the want of material resources. But he probably was not prepared to be deserted by the court which he had so ably served in the endeavour to increase its power and importance. Before the reverses in Sicily, Alberoni had made overtures for peace. Stanhope proposed to Dubois, to demand from King Philip the dismissal of his minister. His ambition, said Stanhope, had been the sole cause of the war; and "it is not to be imagined that he will ever lose sight of his vast designs, or lay aside the intention of again bringing them forward, whenever the recovery of his strength, and the remissness of the allied powers, may

flatter him with the hopes of better success." King Philip submitted to this dictation.

In December, 1719, Alberoni, by a royal decree, was dismissed from all his employments, and was commanded to leave the Spanish territory within twenty-one days. Incapable grandees rejoiced that the son of an Italian gardener no longer ruffled their solemn pride; some loftier spirits testified their respect to fallen greatness. The cardinal went back to Italy, a poor man. After vain attempts to resist or evade the demands of the allies that Spain should accede to the Quadruple Alliance, that accession was proclaimed in January, 1720; Philip declaring that he gave peace to Europe at the sacrifice of his rights. He renewed his renunciation of the French crown. Europe was again at peace. Even the czar of Muscovy had been warned by the presence of an English fleet in the Baltic, that he would not be permitted utterly to destroy Sweden. By England's protection of the female successor of Charles XII, the elector of Hanover secured Bremen and Verden. The policy of foreign affairs did not exclusively contemplate the safety of King George's island subjects, but there was no advocacy of merely German policy of which the nation had a right to complain. The reputation of Great Britain was not damaged by the mode in which the war had been carried on. Her naval strength had been successfully exerted. A peace of twelve years, with a very trivial interruption, was the result of the Quadruple Alliance.

THE PEERAGE BILL (1719 A.D.)

The two parliamentary sessions of 1719 were remarkable for ministerial attempts to carry a measure which would have produced a vital change in the composition of the house of lords. It was proposed to limit the royal power of creating peers; and the king was persuaded to send a message to the lords, that his majesty has so much at heart the settling the peerage of the whole kingdom upon such a foundation as may secure the freedom and constitution of parliament in all future ages, that he is willing his prerogative stand not in the way of so great and necessary a work.

In February, resolutions were proposed in the upper house that the English peers should not be increased beyond six of their present number; with the exception of princes of the blood; and that instead of there being sixteen elective peers for Scotland, the king should name twenty-five as hereditary peers. In the house of lords, the resolutions were carried by a large majority. The proposition produced an excessive ferment. The whig members and the whig writers took different sides. Addison supported the bill; Steele opposed it. The measure was abandoned on account of the strong feeling which it produced on its first introduction; but it was again brought forward in the session which commenced on the 23rd of November. It passed the lords, with very slight opposition. In the commons the bill was rejected by a very large majority, 269 to 167. On this occasion Walpole, generally the plainest and most business-like of speakers, opposed the bill with a rhetorical force which, according to the testimony of Speaker Onslow, "bore down everything before him." The exordium of his speech is remarkable: "Among the Romans, the wisest people upon earth, the Temple of Fame was placed behind the Temple of Virtue, to denote that there was no coming to the Temple of Fame, but through that of Virtue. But if this bill is passed into a law, one of the most powerful incentives to virtue would be taken away, since there would be no arriving at honour but through the winding-sheet of an old

decrepit lord, or the grave of an extinct noble family; a policy very different from that glorious and enlightened nation, who made it their pride to hold out to the world illustrious examples of merited elevation:

Patere honoris scirent ut cuncti viam."

The opponents of the Peerage Bill did not fail to use the obvious argument, that although the prerogative of the crown might be abused by the creation of peers, as in the late reign, to secure a majority for the court, there was a greater danger in so limiting the peerage as to make the existing body what Walpole called "a compact impenetrable phalanx."

THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE

The great event of the sixth year of the reign of George I was the exciting affair of the South Sea scheme — an event upon which, after the lapse of nearly two hundred years, we may still look with greater interest than upon the treaties and the wars of which Carlyle[d] has said, with some truth, that they are to us as the "mere bubblings up of the general putrid fermentation of the then political world." Few people of that time clearly understood what this famous South Sea project meant; and it is somewhat difficult to make it intelligible now.

In the infant days of the national debt the great terror of statesmen was its increase and duration. At the accession of Queen Anne, the debt amounted to sixteen millions; at her death it had reached fifty-two millions. In 1711 there was a floating debt of about ten millions. Harley, then lord-treasurer, proposed to create a fund for that sum; and to secure the payment of interest, by making certain duties of customs permanent. Capitalists who held debentures were to become shareholders in a company incorporated for the purpose of carrying on a monopoly of trade to the Spanish coasts of South America; making the new fund a part of their capital stock. Thus was established the South Sea Company. When the Peace of Utrecht was completed, Spain refused to permit any approach to the free trade which would have made such a commercial company of value. One ship only was allowed to be sent annually. A few factories were established, and the one ship sailed in 1717. Alberoni broke the treaty, and seized the British goods. But the company had other means for the employment of capital; and many opulent persons were amongst its shareholders and directors.

At the opening of the session of parliament in November, 1719, the king said to the commons, "I must desire you to turn your thoughts to all proper means for lessening the debts of the nation." In January, 1720, a proposal was read to the house of commons from the South Sea Company, in which it was set forth that if certain public debts and annuities were made part of the capital stock of the company, it would greatly contribute to that most desirable end adverted to in his majesty's speech. Before that speech was delivered Sir John Blunt, a South Sea director, had been in communication with the ministers, who gave a favourable ear to his projects. There was an annual charge upon the revenue of eight hundred thousand pounds, for irredeemable annuities granted in the reigns of William and Anne. To buy up these annuities was the advantageous point in the proposal of the company. The house of commons agreed in the necessity of reducing the public debts. "Till this was done," said Mr. Brodrick, who moved that other companies should be allowed to compete, "we could not, properly speaking, call ourselves a nation." The Bank of England accordingly sent in a rival proposal;

and the two companies went on outbidding each other, till the South Sea Company's large offer to provide seven millions and a half to buy up the annuities was accepted. The annuitants were not compelled to exchange their government security for the company's stock; and the chief doubt seemed to be whether the greater number would consent to this transfer. Although the terms offered by the company to the annuitants were not encouraging, there was a rush to accept them. To hold stock in a company whose exclusive trading privileges might realise that "potentiality of wealth" which is never "beyond the dreams of avarice," was a far grander thing than to receive seven, eight, or even nine per cent. upon annuities. Within six days of the announcement of the company's terms, two-thirds of the annuitants had exchanged their certain income for the boundless imaginary riches of South America.

Upon this foundation was built the most enormous fabric of national delusion that was ever raised amongst an industrious, thrifty, and prudent people. It had been long manifest that there was a great amount of superfluous capital, especially of the hordings of the middle classes, which wanted opportunities for employment. To obtain interest for small sums was scarcely practicable for the mass of those who were enabled to keep their expenditure below their incomes. Before the beginning of the century, companies, more or less safe, had been formed to meet this desire for investments. In spite of the long wars of the reigns of William and Anne, and the jacobite plots and rebellions which threatened the Protestant succession, the country was going steadily forward in a course of prosperity. Wherever there is superfluous wealth, beyond the ordinary demands of industry for capital, there will be always projectors ready to suggest modes for its co-operative uses. In the summer of that year, the South Sea year, "the dog-star rages" over Exchange Alley with a fury that has never been equalled; because no capitalist, even to the possessor of a single shilling, was then too humble not to believe that the road to riches was open before him. Subscribers to projects recommended by "one or more persons of known credit," were only required to advance ten shillings per cent. A shilling, and even sixpence per cent. was enough to secure the receipt for a share in the more doubtful undertakings. Shares of every sort were at a premium, unless in cases where the office that was opened at noon on one day was found closed on the next, and the shillings and sixpences had vanished with the subscription books.

But the great impulse to the frantic stock-jobbing of that summer was the sudden and enormous rise in the value of South Sea stock. In July, Secretary Craggs wrote to Earl Stanhope, who was abroad with the king, "it is impossible to tell you what a rage prevails here for South Sea subscriptions at any price. The crowd of those that possess the redeemable annuities is so great, that the bank, who are obliged to take them in, has been forced to set tables with clerks in the streets." The hundred-pound shares of the South Sea Company went up to a thousand pounds in August. The shares of the Bank of England and of the East India Company were transferred at an enormous advance. Smaller companies of every character — water companies, fishery companies, companies for various manufactures, companies for settlements and foreign trade — infinite varieties, down to companies for fattening hogs and importing jackasses from Spain — rushed into the market amidst the universal cry for shares and more shares. The directors of the South Sea Company opened a second, a third, and a fourth subscription. They boldly proclaimed that after Christmas their annual dividend should not fall short of fifty per cent. upon their £100 shares. The rivalry of the



THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE

(From the painting by E. M. Ward, R.A., in the Tate Gallery)

[1720 A.D.]

legion of projects of that season was odious to these great lords of the money market. The government itself began to think that some fearful end would come to the popular delusion; and a royal proclamation was issued against "mischievous and dangerous undertakings, especially the presuming to act as a corporate body, or raising stocks or shares without legal authority." It was calculated that the value of the stock of all the companies, with corporate authority or no authority, amounted at the current prices to five hundred millions sterling; being five times as much as the circulating medium of Europe, and twice as much as the fee simple of all the land of the kingdom. The attempt of the South Sea Company to lessen the number of their competitors was the prelude to their own fall. At their instance, writs of *scire facias* were issued, on the 18th of August, against four companies; and the subscribers to these, and to all other projects not legalised, were ordered to be prosecuted by the officers of the crown. A panic ensued. In a day or two, the stocks of all the companies not incorporated rapidly fell; and with the downward rush went down every description of stock. Before August, knowing and cautious holders of South Sea stock began to sell out.

Walpole, who had originally opposed the scheme, did not carry his opposition to the extreme of neglecting his opportunity of largely adding to his fortune, by investing at the proper time, and selling out at the proper time. The earl of Pembroke applied to Walpole for his advice as to the great question of selling when the shares were at their culminating point. The adroit financier coolly answered: "I will only tell you what I have done myself. I have just sold out at £1,000 per cent., and I am fully satisfied." By the middle of September holders of South Sea stock were crowding the Exchange, not as eager buyers, but as more eager sellers. The stock was at 850 on the 18th of August; in a month it had fallen to 410. Mr. Brodrick, on the 13th of September, writes that the most considerable men of the company, "with their fast friends, the tories, jacobites, and papists," had drawn out; "securing themselves by the losses of the deluded thoughtless numbers, whose understandings were overruled by avarice, and hopes of making mountains of mole-hills. Thousands of families will be reduced to beggary. The consternation is inexpressible; the rage beyond expression; and the case is so desperate, that I do not see any plan or scheme for averting the blow." On the 29th of September, South Sea stock had fallen to 175. This greatest of bubbles had burst.

Many persons of rank and station were not so prudent as Walpole and the earl of Pembroke had been. The duke of Portland, Lord Lonsdale, and Lord Irwin were provided with colonial governments to enable them to live. Merchants, lawyers, clergy, physicians passed from their dream of fabulous wealth and from their wonted comforts into poverty; some "died of broken hearts; others withdrew to remote parts of the world, and never returned." It has been observed by Craik*i* that "the calamitous effects of the madness were rather individual and immediate, than permanent or general. There was little, if any, absolute destruction of capital. The whole mischief consisted in a most quick and violent shifting of property from one hand to another." But the derangement of the ordinary course of industry was to be added to this shifting of property. Serious as was this temporary evil; furious as it made the sufferers in their reproaches against every one but themselves; eager as it rendered the legislature for confiscation of the property of the South Sea directors, the national credit was not permanently impaired by the infatuation which produced so much private misery. In this respect, the issue of the South Sea scheme was essentially different from the Mississippi scheme of

John Law in France, which also exploded in that fatal year for projectors; producing there what was equivalent to a national bankruptcy. When the South Sea crash came, there was an alarm for its public consequences. But Walpole, who had again joined the government, though in a subordinate office, applied his great financial abilities to avert the difficulties which this convulsion might occasion to the state; and instead of joining the first cry for vengeance upon the South Sea directors, he calmly said in parliament that if London were on fire wise men would endeavour to extinguish the flames before they sought for the incendiaries. When the king opened the session on the 8th of December, the royal speech recommended measures "to restore the national credit." Walpole was regarded by all parties as the man to effect this.

WALPOLE TO THE RESCUE (1721-1722 A.D.)

To endeavour to equalise, to the most inconsiderable extent, the losses and gains of individuals by the extravagant rise and sudden depression of South Sea stock, would have been a task far beyond the province of any minister of state. The financial abilities of Walpole were necessarily directed to the very difficult labour of disentangling the government from the embarrassments of the South Sea Company. The English ministry had never attempted to sustain the value of the company's shares by arbitrary edicts; or to interfere with their fall by regulations that were based upon other principles than the great natural laws by which the money market, like every other market, must be governed. The French ministry, when the scheme of Law for relieving its exhausted finances by a paper currency, based on the imaginary riches of Louisiana, was in the course of breaking down, gave its orders that individuals should not retain in their possession any sum beyond a small amount of gold and silver, and should be compelled to carry on their transactions in Law's substitute for money. The shares were not to fall according to the rate at which their owners were willing to sell them, but to sink in nominal value, by a monthly reduction, till they had reached half their original price, at which rate they were to be fixed.

All this, of course, was the merest convulsion of despotism. The regent had shifted a large amount of the debts of the state to the deluded people, and no attempt was made to retrieve the national credit. Walpole had to pursue a policy which was the only possible one under a limited monarchy; and which indeed was not beset with the difficulties that the government of the regent would have had to encounter in any struggle to be honest. The French finances were hopelessly embarrassed by a long course of extravagance, before Law thought he could perform the part of the magician in the Arabian story, making a scrap of paper pass as a piece of silver. The English finances were healthy, though the national debt amounted to fifty or sixty millions. The French government adopted the schemes of Law, to furnish the means of new extravagances. The English government went into the scheme of the South Sea Company, with the view of redeeming a portion of the national debt, and thus of lessening the amount of taxation. Voltaire records that he had seen Law come to court with dukes; marshals, and bishops following humbly in his train. The English court was not free from shame in the South Sea project. Half a million of fictitious stock had been created by the directors, previous to the passing of the bill. The duchess of Kendal, as well as other favourites of the king, had large douceurs out of the profits which the directors made by the transfer of these shares; and it is lamentable to add that

Craggs, the secretary of state, his father the postmaster-general, and Aislabie, the chancellor of the exchequer, were amongst the recipients of this bribery. It was the business of parliament to trace the extent of the corruption; and to punish in some degree those directors for vengeance upon whom the nation was frightfully clamouring.

Although in the petitions to parliament "for justice on the authors of the present calamities," we may see how individuals come to consider the losses produced by their own insensate desire for sudden riches as national misfortunes, we may yet observe how general is the calamity when a people think to grow rich by gambling instead of by work. Want of money is the universal cry. No branch of industry had been exempted, according to these petitions, from suffering. There may be exaggeration in these complaints. But it is nevertheless easy to understand how difficult it would be, in a condition of society where commercial credit was not upheld by large banking operations, to escape very serious evils, when the many streams and rills in which capital ordinarily flowed were diverted into one vast flood, and thus for a while the channels were left dry from which industry derived its regular nourishment.

The commons, through the entire session, were occupied with investigations and discussions connected with the financial convulsion. Walpole brought forward his plan for sustaining the national credit, and had induced the house to agree that the public contracts with the South Sea Company should be undisturbed. His first proposal, to engraft a portion of the stock of that company into the Bank of England, and another portion into the East India Company, was carried after much debate; but this plan was ultimately merged into another measure. The private estates of the directors were to be regarded as a fund to provide some remedy for the public embarrassment. A bill was passed, to compel them to deliver on oath an estimate of the value of their property, and to prevent them going out of the kingdom. A secret committee of inquiry was appointed. After they had examined Mr. Robert Knight, the cashier of the company, he fled to Brabant. A reward of £2,000 was offered for his apprehension; but it was believed that there were influences at work powerful enough effectually to screen him. Knight was arrested at Antwerp; but the states of Brabant refused to give him up. "Screen" became a bye-word. Caricatures — which it is said were become common at this period for political objects — had for their point the duchess of Kendal and the flight of the cashier. "The Brabant Screen" exhibited the king's mistress sending Knight upon his travels, giving him his dispatches from behind a screen.

The prudent cashier took care to obliterate, as far as possible, the evidence that great ladies and ministers of state had been corrupted by the South Sea directors. The committee of the commons reported that "in some of the books produced before them, false and fictitious entries were made; in others entries with blanks; in others entries with erasures and alterations; and in others leaves were torn out." They found, further, that some books had been destroyed, and others taken away or secreted. Out of the mouths of the directors the committee extracted evidence to show that there had been extensive appropriation of stock to "certain ladies," at the instance of Mr. Secretary Craggs; and the proof was clear that persons high in office had received and held stock during the time that the company's bill was depending in parliament, "without any valuable consideration paid, or sufficient security given for the acceptance of, or payment for, such stock." Nevertheless, Charles Stanhope, one of the accused, was cleared by a majority of three. The earl of Sunderland was exonerated by a larger majority; but he

could not stand up against the popular odium, and resigned his post of first commissioner of the treasury. Aislabie, the chancellor of the exchequer, was expelled the house, and was sent to the Tower. James Craggs died of small-pox, during the heat of this inquiry. His father, the postmaster-general, destroyed himself by poison.

Their charges against the directors were founded upon their practice of "selling their own stock at high prices, at the same time that they gave orders for buying stock upon account of the company"; and upon their various contrivances "to give his majesty's subjects false notions of the value" of the South Sea stock. Their punishment, under the bill that was passed, was severe. Their estates, amounting to two millions sterling, were confiscated for the relief of the sufferers by their schemes. A small allowance was made to each; but they were disabled from ever holding any place, or for sitting in parliament. Such visitations for their offences were thought far too lenient by the greater number of their contemporaries. They may now be considered excessive.

DEATH OF STANHOPE AND MARLBOROUGH

During a debate in the lords upon the conduct of the South Sea directors, the duke of Wharton, as profligate as he was able, made a furious attack upon Stanhope, comparing him to Sejanus. The anger to which the earl was moved produced a rush of blood to his head. A temporary relief by cupping was obtained; but the next day the skilful and honest secretary of state suddenly expired. No suspicion of improper connection with the South Sea scheme had affected his honour. Lord Townshend again became secretary of state. With Walpole, chancellor of the exchequer, salutary measures were pursued to restore confidence. The South Sea Company were relieved from certain engagements to make advances to the government; and the credit of their bonds was sustained at its just value.


The session of 1722 was a busy session. Questions more important than those connected with party interests were discussed. An act had been passed in the last session — under the apprehension of the plague, which was raging in France — for the building of pest-houses, to which infected persons and even the healthy of an infected family, were to be removed; and lines were to be drawn round any infected town or city. Earl Cowper, the ex-chancellor, a man of liberal and enlightened views, moved for the repeal of these powers, as unknown to our constitution, and inconsistent with the lenity of free government. But his motion was rejected. "The people called Quakers" had presented a petition, complaining that, under their present form of affirmation, they were unable to answer in courts of equity, take probates of wills, prove debts on commissions of bankruptcy, take up their freedoms, and be admitted to poll at elections for their freeholds. Upon a debate in the lords, Atterbury, the bishop of Rochester, spoke against indulgences "to be allowed to a set of people who were hardly Christians." The London clergy petitioned against a bill for their relief, contending that, however the Quakers might be injured in their private affairs, "an oath was instituted by God himself as the surest bond of fidelity amongst men," and that any relaxation of that principle would only tend to multiply a sect "who renounce the divine institution of Christ, particularly that by which the faithful are initiated into his religion." The bill for the relief of the Quakers was passed, in spite of the hard terms in which they had been assailed. The session was prorogued to the 15th of March; and it was previously dissolved,

[1722 A.D.]

under the provisions of the Septennial Act. During the prorogation, the earl of Sunderland died; and his father-in-law, the great duke of Marlborough, terminated his chequered career of political time-serving and of military glory.

STUART ASPIRATIONS

In 1720, the wife of James Edward carried forward the aspirations of the house of Stuart into another generation, by giving birth to a son. Atterbury, the most uncompromising of partisans, considered this "the most acceptable news which can reach the ears of a good Englishman." Charles Edward Louis Casimir, whose royal descent was put beyond suspicion by the presence of seven cardinals in the chamber of the princess, was destined even in his cradle to give the signal for conspiracies and possible insurrections. The duke of Ormonde was again to lead foreign forces to the invasion of Britain. The jacobites in England, amongst whom there were five earls, and the undaunted bishop of Rochester, were to get possession of the Tower, seize all the deposits of public treasure, and to proclaim James III. A judicious, and in many respects impartial, historian, ascribes what he calls "the second growth of jacobitism" to the publication in the reign of Anne of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*. Atterbury was one of its editors. The "gray discrowned head" of Charles; the exile and the restoration of his son — these were the stirring recollections that made the remnant of the old cavaliers, now bearing the somewhat less glorious name of tories, turn to the first Charles' grandson "pining in a distant land, under circumstances not far unlike to those of Charles Stuart in France."



A JACOBEAN MANSION IN BIRMINGHAM

The departure of the king, in the summer of 1722, upon his usual visit to his German dominions, was to be the signal for an invasion of England by the Pretender and his faithful Ormonde. Disbanded troops of various countries were being collected together for this enterprise. The managers of the plot had the supreme folly to apply to the regent of France for the aid of five thousand men; and the regent, having more respect for treaties than Louis XIV, informed the British minister at Paris of the application. The vigilant Walpole was soon acquainted with the plan of action and the names of the actors. The king was advised not to go to Hanover; a camp was formed in Hyde Park; and some of the conspirators — two nonjuring clergymen, two Irish priests, a young barrister, and two lords — were apprehended. After a delay of three months, the bishop of Rochester was arrested, and, after examination before the council, was sent to the Tower.

For nearly thirty years had Francis Atterbury been known as the keenest of controversialists, as well as the most impressive of preachers. From the beginning of the century he had been considered as the leader of the high church party; the great asserter of the independence of convocation. Grad-

ually he had become identified with the most extreme principles of passive obedience; was the prompter of Sacheverell in his defence in 1710; was recognised as having earned a bishopric when Harley came into power; and had, upon the death of Queen Anne, taken a very decided part in his hostility to the Hanoverian succession. His arrest in August, 1722, produced the most violent ferment amongst his church party. The Episcopal order, it was proclaimed, was outraged. Atterbury was prayed for in the London churches. Atterbury was represented, in a print intended to move the popular sympathy, as standing behind his prison bars, gazing upon a portrait of Laud. The plot, it was maintained, was a base fiction. The new parliament met in October; and the king, in his speech on the 11th, announced the discovery of a dangerous conspiracy, and the arrest of some of the conspirators. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended for a whole year; and the consent of the house of peers was desired to sanction the detention in the Tower of the bishop of Rochester, lords North and Grey, and the earl of Orrery. A foolish declaration, signed "James Rex," had been issued on the 22nd of September, in which James III, king of England, Scotland, and Ireland, proposed that George should quietly deliver to him the throne of those kingdoms; when he, King James, would bestow upon George the title of king in his native dominions, and invite all other states to confirm it. Moreover, the British crown should be confirmed to the penitent usurper, if ever he should attain it in the due course of legitimate succession. This wonderful production was ordered by parliament to be burnt by the common hangman, as "a false, insolent, and traitorous libel." On the 1st of March, 1723, a committee of the commons made a report of their examinations into the evidence of the conspiracy. It is a document of great length. It involved other eminent persons besides those who had been arrested. Christopher Layer, the barrister, had been previously tried and condemned in the King's Bench. He was the only person who suffered capital punishment. Bills of pains and penalties were passed against the two Irish priests. The most important person amongst the accused, the bishop of Rochester, was also proceeded against by bill, enacting his punishment and deprivation. This bill passed the commons without a division. Atterbury declined making a defence before the lower house; but on the 6th of May he stood at the bar of the house of lords; and after the evidence against him had been gone through he defended himself with great ingenuity and eloquence.

The debate amongst the peers on the question of the passing of the bill was remarkable for the constitutional opposition of Lord Cowper, the ex-chancellor.

The connection of Atterbury with the exiled family, before his banishment, has been abundantly proved by other evidence than that within the reach of his accuser and judges. The bill against him was passed by a majority of forty peers; most of the bishops voting against him. He embarked for France in June, 1723; and died at Paris in 1732.

AFFAIRS OF IRELAND; WOOD'S BRASS HALF-PENNIES

In 1724, through the ordinary course of ministerial rivalries and jealousies, the accomplished Lord Carteret was removed from the office of secretary of state, which he held in conjunction with Lord Townshend, and the same course was pursued towards him, as towards Townshend himself in 1716. Carteret was appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland — a post considered of far less anxious responsibility than that of secretary of state. During his lord-

lieutenancy Ireland became no bed of roses. Amongst the many real wrongs which Ireland has borne, and the not less numerous imaginary grievances of which she has complained, in her connection with England, there is probably no example of a national ferment so wholly disproportionate to the extent of the injury, as that of Wood's patent for a coinage of copper farthings and halfpence. No one can doubt that when a nation is in almost utter want of money of the lowest denomination, the extortions practised upon the humblest classes must be considerable. Ireland was so completely without a currency to conduct the smaller operations of trade, that labourers were paid by cards bearing the seals and signatures of their employers. In all such cases of a questionable or a depreciated currency, it is the poor man who has to bear the largest amount of trouble or loss. In 1722, a patent was granted to William Wood, a proprietor and renter of iron and copper mines in England, to enable him to coin farthings and halfpence for Ireland to the value of £108,000. There is no doubt that the patentee was to make a profit, for the duchess of Kendal had been bribed to promote the grant of the patent. But Walpole and his subordinates took every reasonable measure of precaution that the coinage should not become an opportunity for fraud or excessive gain. Sir Isaac Newton, as master of the mint, approved the terms of the contract; and when the coins were in circulation, and it was seen that discontent was assiduously stirred up, an assay was made by the officers of the mint, and it was declared that in weight and fineness of metal the pieces were satisfactory. The difference of exchange between England and Ireland had been thought a satisfactory reason for a slight diminution in weight of the copper currency for Ireland.

The Irish parliament, moved in some degree by the apparent neglect of this exercise of the royal prerogative, without consulting the Irish privy council, voted an address to the king, that the terms of the patent would occasion a loss to the nation of 150 per cent. Walpole was astonished, as he well might be, at this impudent declaration of a legislative body. He examined the matter carefully; and perceived that the assertion was founded upon a computation that the rough Irish copper was worth twelvepence a pound, and that a pound of halfpence and farthings coined out of fine copper were to pass for thirty pence. He found that the mint of London paid eighteenpence per pound for prepared copper; that the charge of coinage was fourpence per pound; and that the duties and allowances upon copper imported into Ireland amounted to 20 per cent. A committee of the English privy council went into a searching examination of the whole affair; and fully justified the patentee from any charge of having abused the fair terms of his patent. It was, however, conceded that the amount of farthings and halfpence issued should not exceed £40,000 in value; and that this money should not be a legal tender for a larger sum than fivepence halfpenny in one payment.

Under these circumstances, in 1724, a letter was published by M. B. Drapier, addressed "to the tradesmen, shopkeepers, and country people in general, of the kingdom of Ireland, concerning the brass halfpence coined by one William Wood, hardware man," which letter thus solemnly opens: "What I intend now to say to you is, next to your duty to God and the care of your salvation, of the greatest concern to yourselves and your children: your bread and clothing, and every common necessary of life, entirely depend upon it." The writer, as every one guessed, was the famous dean of St. Patrick's; and certainly no pen was so able as that wielded by Jonathan Swift, to raise a popular clamour by the most skilful treatment of his subject; and,

what was perhaps as much to the purpose, by the most unscrupulous assertions.

Throughout the whole of the Drapier Letters, Swift's argument rests upon the most solid basis of political economy; but his premises are utterly false. He knew well what England and Ireland had suffered by the depreciation of the coin. This bold opponent of the government which had delivered his country from despotism, says, "I intend to truck with my neighbours, the butchers and bakers and the rest, goods for goods; and the little gold and silver I have I will keep by me, like my heart's blood, till better times, or until I am just ready to starve; and then I will buy Mr. Wood's money, as my father did the brass money in King James' time, who could buy £10 of it for a guinea." Against such logic as this what could simple truth avail? The Irish went mad about Wood's halfpence.



JONATHAN SWIFT
(1667–1745)

When Carteret came over, he found the Irish people in a state of frenzy. He tried what are called strong measures. He offered a reward of £300 for discovering the author of the Drapier letters. He prosecuted their printer. The grand jury threw out the bill; and another grand jury made a presentment, setting forth, that "several quantities of base metal coined, commonly called Wood's Halfpence, have been brought into the port of Dublin, and lodged in several houses in this city, with an intention to make them pass clandestinely"; and that "having entirely his majesty's interest and the welfare of our country, and being thoroughly sensible of the great discouragements which trade hath suffered by the apprehensions of the said coin, whereof we have already felt the dismal effects; and that the currency thereof will inevitably tend to the great diminution of his majesty's revenue, and the ruin of us and our posterity, do present all such persons as have attempted or shall endeavour by fraud or otherwise, to impose the said halfpence upon us, contrary to his majesty's most gracious intention, as enemies to his majesty's government, and to the safety, peace, and welfare of all his majesty's subjects of this kingdom." It was in vain that the government attempted to stand up against this storm. The grand jury said, "we do, with all great gratitude, acknowledge the services of all such patriots as have been eminently zealous for the interest of his majesty and this country, in detecting the fraudulent imposition of the said Wood, and preventing the passing of his base coin." Swift wrote this eulogy upon his own patriotism. He had beaten the government of King George. The patent was withdrawn.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE LORD CHANCELLOR (1725 A.D.)

In 1725, England presented the miserable spectacle which she had witnessed in the reign of James I — a lord chancellor impeached for malversation in his great office. Thomas Parker was a very different man from Francis Bacon; and the offences of which the earl of Macclesfield was accused were of another character than those which were the ruin of the viscount St Albans. The chancellor of King James was disgraced upon the charge of having received bribes from suitors. The chancellor of King George was impeached, found guilty, excluded forever from office, and fined thirty thousand pounds, upon the charges of selling masterships in the court of chancery, and of conniving at the frauds of the masters in trafficking with the trust-money of the suitors, and the estates of widows and orphans. Lord Campbell, in controverting a disposition in some writers of recent times to consider that Lord Macclesfield was unjustly condemned, holds that "his conviction was lawful and his punishment was mild."

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The foreign policy of George I, under the able administration of Walpole, had become decidedly pacific. The nation was manifestly prospering under the relief which peace had brought. The fear of the Pretender, and of Spanish or Swedish invasions, had passed away. The house of Brunswick, after ten years of struggle, was firmly fixed on its constitutional throne. Yet there were still threatenings of war. The congress of Cambrai, to which the difficulties that had not been finally settled by the peace of 1720 had been referred, had been wearily discussing certain royal claims and disputes — "bailing out water with sieves" — for four or five years. The regent Orleans had died during these tedious protocollings, in 1723. Louis XV, declared of age, had taken the government of France into his own hands, with the duke de Bourbon as his minister. The alliance of France with England continued uninterrupted. But the emperor Charles, and the king of Spain, Philip, were coming to a closer understanding about territorial arrangements than England, France, and Russia thought safe.

The Treaty of Hanover bound England, France, and Prussia — the date, September 3rd, 1725 — in an engagement to hold by each other, if either were attacked. The tables were turned since the War of the Succession. The old foes were fast friends, and the old friends bitter foes; and all these changes took place, as in private friendship, for "some trick not worth an egg." War seemed imminent, however pacifically disposed were Fleury and George. When the English parliament met on the 20th of January, 1726, the king announced the conclusion of his defensive treaties with the most Christian king and the king of Prussia, to which several of the powers had been invited to accede.

Warlike movements were very soon organised in England. The czar Peter was dead. The czarina Catherine I had prepared a fleet for co-operation with Austria and Spain. Admiral Wager sailed to the Baltic with an English fleet; and the politics of Russia became more pacific. A squadron under Admiral Hosier blockaded Porto Bello — an unfortunate enterprise, for the brave admiral and a large number of his fleet's crews perished of yellow fever in the Spanish main. If this activity was not war, it was very like war. In the parliament which met in January, 1727, the king announced that he had received information upon which he could wholly depend, that

one of the secret articles of the Treaty of Vienna was an agreement to place the Pretender upon the throne of Britain. The parliament instantly voted a large increase of the army and navy. The emperor was advised by Palm, his minister at London, to disavow such a secret agreement. The indiscreet resident addressed a memorial to the king, a translation of which was printed and published; in which the secret articles were disavowed, and the royal word was spoken of with disrespect. The two houses were indignant at "the insolence" of the imperial minister in dispersing his memorial through the kingdom; declaring "their utmost abhorrence of this audacious manner of appealing to the people against his majesty." Palm was commanded immediately to leave England.

Spain was assembling an army for the siege of Gibraltar, under the command of the count de las Torres; who boasted that in six weeks he would drive the heretics into the sea. On the 11th of February the siege was commenced. English men-of-war in the harbour secured a constant supply of provisions for the garrison from the coast of Africa. Lord Portmore — one of the men whose energy age appeared unable to cripple — hastened from England, in his eightieth year, to defend the fortress of which he was governor. For four months the Spaniards ineffectually fired upon the rock, and then they raised the siege.

THE DEATH OF GEORGE I (1727 A.D.)

On the 15th of May, 1727, King George closed the session of parliament preparatory to his departure for Hanover. He adverted to the attack upon Gibraltar. He had suspended, he said, his resentments under such provocation; and instead of having immediate recourse to arms, and demanding that assistance of his allies which they had engaged, and were ready, to give, he had concurred with France and the states general in making overtures of accommodation. Sweden had acceded to the Treaty of Hanover; and a convention had been signed by Denmark. The overtures of accommodation, thus mentioned, had been successful. The Austrian ambassador signed, on the 31st of May, preliminaries of peace with England, France, and Holland. Spain remained alone; neither prepared for war, nor acceding to the conditions of peace.


At this juncture the power of Walpole seemed to be somewhat endangered. Bolingbroke — who had been allowed by the intervention of Walpole to return to England; who was about to embark at Calais at the close of his exile, when Atterbury landed there a banished man; who had been restored to his estates by act of parliament in 1725 — was intriguing to reach once more the possession of power under George which he had obtained under Anne. He had secured, by bribes and protestations, the favour of the duchess of Kendal, the mistress, or according to some, the left-handed wife of the Hanoverian king. The duchess presented to her royal admirer a memorial from Bolingbroke, in which he denounced Walpole as the author of every public evil. The king put this paper into the hands of Walpole, with his usual straightforward mode of action. The ambitious statesman therein requested an interview with his sovereign. George was indisposed to grant this meeting. Walpole earnestly pressed it, with his never-failing sagacity; for, as he himself said, "if this was not done, the clamour would be, that I kept his majesty to myself, and would allow none to come near him to tell the truth." George told his minister that Bolingbroke's complaints and representations were "bagatelles."

The king set out for Hanover on the 3rd of June, accompanied by the duchess of Kendal and Lord Townshend. The unhappy wife of George had

[1727 A.D.]

died on the 13th of November, 1726, after many schemes of escape. The king landed on the 7th at Vaert, in Holland. On the 8th he proceeded on his journey, leaving the duchess of Kendal on the Dutch frontier. On the 9th, he slept at Delden; and was again in his coach at four o'clock in the morning of the 10th, accompanied by two official persons of the court of Hanover. In the forenoon of that day he was struck by apoplexy. He refused to stop at Ippenburen, as his attendants wished. His hands fell; his eyes were heavy; but his will was strong. "Osnabruck! Osnabruck!" he exclaimed. His one surviving brother, the prince bishop, had his palace at Osnabruck. The king's voice grew fainter. He murmured in his death-sleep, "*C'est fait de moi*" (All is over with me). All was over. When the bishop was roused by the gallop of horses in his court-yard at midnight, George, king of Great Britain, and elector of Hanover, was dead. He was buried in Hanover.





CHAPTER XIV

THE REIGN OF GEORGE II

[1727–1760 A.D.]

> George II was the last foreigner by birth who has held the English throne; he was a monarch almost as foreign in his tastes and interests as in his nativity. Yet there was an openness and honesty about his personal dealings which gained his subjects' respect. He was blind to the charms of what, in his German accent, he called bainting and boetry, but he was unambitious; he remained true to the principles under which he succeeded to the crown; he did not trick nor quibble; and was more useful and infinitely more safe, in those days of loose political morality and unprincipled selfishness, than if he had had greater abilities with more unscrupulous desires. — WHITE.[1]

GEORGE II was born in 1683, and had married in 1705 Princess Caroline of Anspach, by whom he had four daughters and two sons; Frederick, Prince of Wales, born in 1707, and William, duke of Cumberland, in 1721. His parts were not so good as his father's, but, on the other hand, he had much less reserve and shyness, and he possessed another inestimable advantage over him — he could speak English fluently, though not without a foreign accent. His diminutive person, pinched features, and frequent starts of passion, were not favourable to the royal dignity, and his mind still less. He had scarcely one kingly quality, except personal courage and justice. The former he had highly signalised at the battle of Oudenarde as a volunteer, and was destined to display again as sovereign at Dettingen; and even in peace he was so fond of the army, and of military details, that his nickname among the jacobites was the Captain. A love of justice was apparent in all the natural movements of his mind. But avarice, that most unprincely of all passions, sat enshrined in the inmost recesses of his bosom. Its twitches were shown on all occasions. His purse was often in his hands, not to give from it, but to feel, and count over. "Soon after his first arrival in England," Walpole[c] tells us, "Mrs. one of the bedchamber women, with whom he was in love, seeing him count his money over very often, said to him, 'Sir, I can bear it no longer; if you count your money once more I will leave the room.'" An extreme minuteness and precision in keeping his private accounts saved him a little money, and lost him a great deal of time. "He has often told me himself," says Lord Chester-

[1727 A.D.]

field, "that little things affected him more than great ones; and this was so true, that I have often seen him put so much out of humour at his private levee, by a mistake or blunder of a *valet de chambre*, that the gaping crowd admitted to his public levee have from his looks and silence concluded that he had just received some dreadful news.

"He troubled himself little about religion, but jogged on quietly in that in which he had been bred, without scruples, doubts, zeal, or inquiry." Of acquired knowledge he had little, professing great contempt for literature; but he sometimes read history, and had an excellent memory for dates. His habits were very temperate, and so regular that he scarce ever deviated from his beaten daily track: in the words of one of his courtiers,[d] "he seems to think his having done a thing to-day an unanswerable reason for his doing it to-morrow." Business he understood well, and transacted with pleasure. Like his father, he was far too Hanoverian in his politics, nor wholly free from the influence of mistresses. But his reign of thirty-three years deserves this praise — that it never once invaded the rights of the nation, nor harshly enforced the prerogatives of the crown; that its last period was illumined by the glories of Wolfe and of Chatham; and that it left the dynasty secure, the constitution unimpaired, and the people prosperous.

Queen Caroline had been handsome in her youth, and to the last retained great expression in her countenance, and sweetness in her smile. Her character was without a blemish, and her conduct always marked by judgment and good sense. During the violent quarrels between her husband and his father, she had behaved so prudently that she equally retained the affection of the first and the esteem of the latter. With the nation also she was more popular than any other member of her family, till George III. Her manner most happily combined the royal dignity with female grace, and her conversation was agreeable in all its varieties, from mimicry and repartee up to metaphysics. In fact, her only faults were those of a Philaminte or a Belise. She was fond of talking on all learned subjects, and understood something of a few. Her toilet was a strange medley; prayers, and sometimes a sermon, were read; tattle and gossip succeeded; metaphysics found a place; the head-dress was not forgotten; divines stood grouped with courtiers, and philosophers with ladies! On the table, perhaps, lay heaped together, the newest ode by Stephen Duck upon her beauty, her last letter from Leibnitz upon free will, and the most high-wrought panegyric of Doctor Clarke, on her "inimitable sweetness of temper," "impartial love of truth," and "very particular and uncommon degree of knowledge, even on matters of the most abstract speculation." So great was the influence of Queen Caroline over her husband, that neither in the church nor in the state were any appointments made without her having at least some share in them, and during ten years she may be said to have governed England. But she was one of those "who if she rules him, never shows she rules." Her power was felt, not displayed. She had the art of instilling ideas into the king's mind, which after a time he found there, and believed to be his own.

THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE II (1727 A.D.)

The despatch from Lord Townshend, announcing the king's death, reached London on the 14th of June. Walpole immediately hastened to the palace of Richmond, where he was told that the prince, according to his usual custom, had retired to bed for an afternoon slumber. His highness (so we may call him for the last time) being awakened, at Walpole's desire, started up and

made his appearance half-dressed. Walpole knelt down and kissed his hand; but the king was at first incredulous, nor convinced of the truth, until Townshend's letter was produced. The minister then inquired whom his majesty would be pleased to appoint to draw up the necessary declaration to the privy council, fully hoping that the choice would fall upon himself. "Compton," answered the king, shortly, and Walpole withdrew in the deepest disappointment.



GEORGE II
(1683–1760)

Sir Spencer Compton, the second surviving son of the earl of Northampton, was chosen speaker in 1715, and a Knight of the Bath, on the revival of that order. He and Lord Scarborough had been the chief favourites of the king as prince of Wales. He was respectable in his private, regular in his public, character. In the speaker's chair, where form rather than substance is required, he had fulfilled his duty well, but the seals of office were too heavy for his hands. So little acquainted was he with real business that when Walpole conveyed to him the king's commands he avowed his ignorance, and begged Walpole to draw up the declaration for him. Sir Robert willingly complied and the declaration which he wrote was carried by Compton to the king.[b]

WALPOLE CONTINUES IN POWER

The king when prince had taken offence at some expressions used by Walpole and had declared that he would never employ him, and that minister now regarded his dismissal as certain. George had actually fixed on Sir Spencer Compton for his prime minister, and his obstinacy was well known; yet after all Walpole retained his post and held it for many years. For this he was indebted to the queen, who knew his abilities; she recollected that the late king had said to her that Walpole could "convert stones into gold"; Walpole also engaged to obtain from the commons an augmentation of £130,000 to the civil list, and a jointure of £100,000 a year for the queen; and as Compton candidly avowed his own incompetency for the situation, the king gave up his purpose. The ministry therefore remained unchanged, and. Walpole, when the new parliament met, performed his engagements to the king and queen. He continued to be the moving power of government for a space of nearly fifteen years, during which period England enjoyed tranquillity. Cardinal Fleury, who governed France, was a decided lover of peace and steadily attached to the English alliance; so that though Hanover

was the means of engaging England in the mazes of German politics, there was no war till towards the close of Walpole's administration, when hostilities broke out with Spain.

The ministerial majority in the house of commons was considerable; but there was a strong opposition composed of three sections. These were the discontented whigs headed by William Pulteney, a man of high character and great abilities; the tories, about one hundred and ten in number, chiefly country gentlemen, led by Sir William Wyndham; and the jacobites, who counted fifty, under the consistent and honest Shippen. The principal supporters of the minister were his brother Horace Walpole, Lord Hervey, Henry Pelham (brother to the duke of Newcastle), Sir William Yonge, and Mr. Winnington. In *The Craftsman*, a periodical conducted by Bolingbroke, aided by Pulteney, the opposition had a powerful organ of offence.

Various attacks were made on the ministry on the subjects of the standing army (the great bugbear of the age) and the subsidies paid to some of the petty sovereigns of Germany; but they were always repelled by numbers if not by arguments. On the subject of pensions the minister felt his position less tenable, and he found it necessary to vary his tactics. From the Restoration, when it first became permanent, the house of commons had always contained a large portion of venality within its walls. Direct bribes in hard cash were the first and simplest course, and this continued long to prevail; pensions, which are of a similar nature, gradually came into operation.

It was against the system of pensions that the opposition now directed its efforts. There were already acts incapacitating the holders of them from sitting in the house of commons; but they had proved useless, as the government would not tell who had pensions, and the amount of secret-service money was considerable. Mr. Sandys therefore brought a bill (1730), by which every member was to swear that he did not hold a pension, and that in case of his accepting one he would make it known to the house within fourteen days. This the king called a "villainous bill"; but Walpole would not incur the odium of opposing it, and it passed the commons by a majority of ten. But, as he expected, it was thrown out in the lords, and its fate was similar whenever it was brought in again.

Shortly after the rejection of the pension bill a partial change took place in the ministry. Lord Townshend and Walpole, though brothers-in-law, had been for some time at variance on questions of foreign and domestic policy; their tempers were opposite; the former being frank, haughty, and impetuous; the latter, cool, calm, and pliant. They have, not unaptly, been compared to Mark Antony and Augustus, Lady Townshend being their Octavia. But she was now dead; and Townshend, finding his influence inferior to that of Walpole, gave in his resignation. He retired to his paternal seat of Rainham in Norfolk, where he devoted himself to agriculture, and abandoned politics so completely that he never even revisited the capital. The two secretaries now were the duke of Newcastle, and Stanhope, lately created Earl of Harrington.

THE EXCISE BILL (1733 A.D.)

Sir Robert Walpole far outwent his contemporaries in the knowledge of the true principles of finance and trade; and having had ample information of the ruinous extent to which the practice of smuggling had been carried in consequence of the defective state of the laws of the customs, he formed a grand scheme for abolishing the land-tax, preventing fraud, increasing the

revenue, simplifying the taxes and collecting them at the least possible expense. This was what was called the "excise scheme," of which Dean Tucker, a most competent judge, asserts that the effect would have been to make "the whole island one general free port, and a magazine and common storehouse for all nations."[e]

The excise duties, first levied in the civil wars, and continued, but curtailed at the Restoration, had been progressively increased during the stormy reigns of William and Anne. The chief articles subject to them were malt, salt, and the distilleries: their average yearly proceeds rose, under William, to nearly one million; under Anne, to nearly two millions. No additional excise was laid on during the whole reign of George I, except a small duty on wrought plate by Stanhope. From the progress of consumption, however, they had come in 1733 to produce about £3,200,000. But, meanwhile, the frauds and abuses in other parts of the revenue had become so great, and so repeatedly forced upon the consideration of Walpole, as to turn his thoughts to the whole subject, and induce him to frame a comprehensive measure upon it.

Early intelligence reached the opposition that some such plan was brewing, and they took care to poison and prepossess the public mind against it even before it was known. When the sinking fund was discussed, Pulteney pathetically cried, "But, Sir, there is another thing, a very terrible affair impending! A monstrous project! yea, more monstrous than has ever yet been represented! It is such a project as has struck terror into the minds of most gentlemen within this house, and of all men without doors! I mean, Sir, that monster the excise! That plan of arbitrary power which is expected to be laid before this house in the present session!" The sensible advice of Mr. Pelham, to wait till the plan was disclosed, and not "to enter into debates about what we know nothing of," was utterly unheeded; and while the secrecy of the plan did not suspend the censures of the opposition, it enabled them to spread throughout the country the most unfounded and alarming rumours respecting it. A general excise is coming! was the cry; a tax on all articles of consumption; a burden to grind the country to powder; a plot to overthrow the ancient constitution, and establish in its place a baleful tyranny! *The Craftsman* had scarcely words enough to express his terror and resentment; and his eloquent voice found a ready echo in the bosoms of the people. For the excise duties, partly from their burden and partly from their invidious mode of collection, were most highly unpopular. They were considered oppressive, and contrary to the spirit of the constitution — called sometimes the cause and sometimes the consequence of bad government; and these feelings, which had arisen long before the scheme of Walpole, continued long after it. Perhaps the strongest proof of them is displayed by the invectives of so great a writer as Doctor Johnson, in so grave a work as his *Dictionary*, In the first edition, published in 1755, the word "excise" is explained as "a hateful tax levied upon commodities, and adjudged, not by common judges of property, but by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid!"

Thus the public mind being highly sensitive, and easily excited upon the subject, and Walpole, as usual, paying little attention to the power of the press, there was a general ferment against the new scheme, even while its true nature and object remained entirely unknown. Many constituent bodies — amongst them the citizens of London — held meetings and sent instructions to their members, entreating them to vote against every extension of the excise laws, in any form or on any pretence whatsoever. It was under these unfavourable circumstances, and after several preliminary skirmishes, that

[1733 A.D.]

Sir Robert, on the 14th of March, disclosed his design in a temperate and masterly speech. He first complained of the common slander, that he had intended to propose a general excise. "I do most unequivocally assert," said he, "that no such scheme ever entered my head, or, for what I know, the head of any man I am acquainted with. My thoughts have been confined solely to the duties on wine and tobacco; and it was the frequent advices I had of the shameful frauds committed in these two branches, and the complaints of the merchants themselves, that turned my attention to a remedy for this growing evil. I shall, for the present, confine myself entirely to the tobacco trade."

He next proceeded to detail the various frauds on the revenue in this trade — frauds so frequent and so complicated, that while the gross produce of the tax was on an average £750,000, the net produce was only £160,000. The remedy he proposed was, stating it briefly, to bring the tobacco duty under the laws of excise, and to effect some improvements in the latter. The same might afterwards be applied to the similar case of the wine duty; and thus would the revenue be increased, at the same time that the fair dealer was protected. A system of warehousing for re-exportation, if desired, was likewise to be instituted, "which will tend," said the minister, "to make London a free port, and, by consequence, the market of the world." By the increase in the revenue the land-tax would no longer be required, and might be altogether abolished. "And this," added Walpole, "is the scheme which has been represented in so dreadful and terrible a light — this the monster, the many-headed monster, which was to devour the people, and commit such ravages over the whole nation!"

To the country gentleman, the abolition of the land-tax was clearly a great boon. To the merchant importer, the turning of the duties on importation into duties on consumption was undoubtedly no less a benefit. The working classes were not at all concerned in the question, since the retailers already sold tobacco at the rate of duty paid. Thus, then, unless we are prepared to say, with Sir William Wyndham, that "in all countries, excises of every kind are looked on as badges of slavery," we shall rather join some of the ablest writers on finance of later times in approving the main principles and objects of Walpole's scheme.

Far different was the language of the opposition of the day. In answer to the complaint of previous misinterpretation, Sir John Barnard declared it "such a scheme as cannot, even by malice itself, be represented to be worse than it really is!" Pulteney assailed it with raillery. "It puts me in mind of Sir Ephraim Mammon in *The Alchemist:* he was promised the philosopher's stone, by which he was to get mountains of gold, and everything else he could desire, but all ended at last in some little charm for curing the itch!" The eloquence of Wyndham was more solemn: he thundered against corrupt motives and impending tyranny, and evoked the shades of Empson and Dudley, those two unworthy favourites of old time. "But what," he added, "was their fate? They had the misfortune to outlive their master, and his son, as soon as he came to the throne, took off both their heads!" — no obscure allusion to Frederick, Prince of Wales, who was then present under the gallery.

During the debate, the doors were beset by immense multitudes, all clamorous against the new measure, and convened partly, perhaps, by the efforts of the opposition, but still more by their own belief that some dreadful evil was designed them. To this concourse Sir Robert referred in his reply: "Gentlemen may give them what name they think fit; it may be said that

they came hither as humble supplicants, but I know whom the law calls 'sturdy beggars,'" — a most unguarded expression! For though the minister meant it only to denote their fierce and formidable clamours, yet it was ever afterwards flung in his teeth as though he had wished to insult the poverty of the people and debar their right of petition; and the phrase immediately became the war-whoop of the opponents to the bill.

At two o'clock in the morning, and after thirteen hours' debate, the house divided, and the numbers were found to be, for the measure 266, against it 205 — a victory, indeed, for the minister, but a large and most alarming increase of the usual minority against him. As Sir Robert went out to his carriage some of the "sturdy beggars," highly exasperated, seized him by the cloak, and might have done him some injury, had not Mr. Pelham interposed. Two days afterwards, on reporting the resolutions carried in committee, the debate was resumed with fresh vigour on the part of the opposition. However, the resolutions were carried by the same majority as before. Several other debates and divisions ensued before the bill came to a second reading, but the majority in these gradually dwindled from sixty to sixteen.

During this time, also, the popular ferment grew higher and higher. Petitions poured in from several large towns. The common council of London indited the most violent of all, under the guidance of Alderman Barber, a noted jacobite, who had been Swift's and Bolingbroke's printer, and was now lord mayor. The instructions sent by different places to their representatives to oppose the bill were collected and published together, so as to stir and diffuse the flame; and the minister was pelted by innumerable other pamphlets; various in talent but all equal in virulence. "The public," says a contemporary, / "was so heated with papers and pamphlets, that matters rose next to a rebellion."

The storm thus thickening around the court, Queen Caroline applied in great anxiety to Lord Scarborough, as to the king's personal friend, for his advice. His answer was, that the bill must be relinquished. "I will answer for my regiment," he added, "against the Pretender, but not against the opposers of the excise." Tears came into the queen's eyes. "Then," said she, "we must drop it!" Sir Robert, on his part, summoned a meeting of his friends in the house of commons, and requested their opinion. The general sentiment amongst them was still to persevere. It was urged that all taxes were obnoxious, and that there would be an end of supplies if mobs were to control the legislature in the manner of raising them. Sir Robert, having heard every one first, declared how conscious he felt of having meant well; but that, in the present inflamed temper of the people, the act could not be carried into execution without an armed force; and that he would never be the minister to enforce taxes at the expense of blood.

The voice of moderation having thus prevailed, when on the 11th of April there came on the order of the day for the second reading, Walpole rose, and moved that it should be postponed for two months; and thus the whole measure was dropped. The opposition were scarcely satisfied with this hard-won victory, and wished to reject the bill with the brand of their aversion upon it; but the general sense of the house was so evidently against the suggestion, that it was not pressed, nor even openly proposed. Throughout England, however, the news was hailed with unmixed pleasure, and celebrated with national rejoicings. The Monument was illuminated in London; bonfires without number blazed through the country; the minister was in many places burnt in effigy amidst loud acclamations of the mob; any of his friends that came in their way were roughly handled; and cockades were eagerly

[1734 A.D.]

assumed with the inscription, "Liberty, property, and no excise!" But amidst the general joy their ill-humour against the minister gradually evaporated, or rather spent itself by its own force; and their loyalty was immediately afterwards confirmed and quickened by the welcome intelligence that the princess Anne, the king's eldest daughter, was espoused to the young prince of Orange. Walpole congratulated himself on this new turn given to the public feeling, and determined to run no risk of stirring it once more against him. It was indeed his favourite maxim at all times, as his son assures us, *Quieta ne moveas* (Let sleeping dogs lie) — a maxim bad under a bad constitution, but surely good under a good one; a maxim to be shunned at Milan, to be followed in London. When, in the next session, Pulteney insinuated that the excise scheme was to be revived, "As to the wicked scheme," said Walpole, "as the honourable gentleman was pleased to call it, which he would persuade us is not yet laid aside, I, for my own part, can assure this house I am not so mad as ever again to engage in anything that looks like an excise, though, in my own private opinion, I still think it was a scheme that would have tended very much to the interests of the nation." It is very remarkable, however, that, after his time, some of the least popular clauses of the excise scheme were enacted, and that there was no renewal of clamour, because there was a change of title. So little do things weigh with the multitude, and names so much![b]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The last session of the parliament chosen in 1727 was opened by the king on the 17th of January, 1734. The policy of a government anxious to maintain neutrality whilst other nations were at war, and at the same time to make it understood that a strong desire for peace was no symptom of national weakness, was never more emphatically expressed than in the words which Walpole put into the mouth of George II. A new quarrel had broken out in Europe upon the death, in 1733, of Augustus II, king of Poland. Austria and Russia advocated the succession of his son. France supported the election of Stanislaus, who had been king before Augustus. The war assumed a more general character, and revived some of the old disputes between France, Spain, and Austria. An army of French, Spaniards, and Sardinians overran Austria. Lombardy, Naples, and Sicily were invaded by Don Carlos, duke of Parma, the son of the queen of Spain; and the Austrians being unable to resist, he was crowned king of Naples and Sicily as Charles III. On the Rhine the war was conducted by Prince Eugene, still vigorous, against Marshal Berwick. The son of James II was killed at the siege of Philipsburg. The companion in arms of Marlborough held his ground in this campaign, and died two years after.

The great merit of Sir Robert Walpole, in resolutely maintaining the policy of neutrality, may be better appreciated from the circumstance that the king and queen were opposed to his pacific views. George used daily to tell his minister that it was with the sword alone he desired to keep the balance of Europe. He could not bear the thought of growing old in peace, and rusting in the cabinet, whilst other princes were busied in war, and shining in the field. The observant vice-chamberlain says that the queen, with all her good sense, was as unmanageable as the king. "Wherever the interest of Germany and the honour of the empire were concerned, her thoughts and reasonings were often as German and imperial as if England had been out of the question." The perseverance of Walpole had its reward. He

was odious at Vienna; but before the end of the summer of 1734, George said to his minister, "I have followed your advice, Walpole, in keeping quiet, contrary often to my own opinion and sometimes I have thought contrary even to my honour, but I am convinced you advised me well." The king had discovered that overtures of friendship from all parties had been the result of the pacific policy of his minister; that as a possible mediator he was of more importance than as a rash belligerent.

Walpole continuing firm in maintaining the neutrality of England, in conjunction with the states general, the emperor sent an emissary to London, to intrigue with some members of the opposition against the prime minister. Sir Robert detected the Austrian agent, and the abbé Strickland, bishop of Namur, was obliged to depart, although he had been graciously received at court. The pacific minister had an argument for the king and queen, which sounds like insular selfishness, but which insular common sense will always applaud: "There are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe, and not one Englishman." Under the mediation of England and Holland, peace was concluded in 1735. By this pacification, France added Lorraine to her territory.

WALPOLE VERSUS BOLINGBROKE

The repeal of the Septennial Act was the great domestic question of this session. The party that advocated a return to triennial parliaments would possess the superior popularity in the coming elections. No doubt many who now opposed the government upon this measure would be open to the charge of inconsistency; for "whig patriots," especially Pulteney, had supported the Septennial Act of 1716. Bolingbroke, the arch enemy of Walpole, was at hand to combat every scruple of conscience, and induce the listeners to his sophistries to believe that political tergiversation was a virtue. The prime minister must be struck down, and for that purpose any weapon was lawful. In the debate upon this constitutional question, Sir William Wyndham, the great tory chief, made an attack upon Walpole, which Walpole treated as the inspiration of Bolingbroke. Over the parliamentary bitterness of adverse factions oblivion mercifully spreads her veil in most cases. But in this case, the portrait of Walpole drawn by Wyndham, and the portrait of Bolingbroke drawn by Walpole, are masterpieces of invective, which take us into the very heart of those days when the right honourable member in the blue ribbon had to endure the taunts of his adversaries with rare equanimity, or to turn upon them like a noble animal at bay, as he did upon this memorable occasion.

The session was closed on the 16th of April, and on the 18th the parliament was dissolved. The boldness with which Walpole had stood up against attack had produced a sensible effect upon his adversaries. To Walpole's philippic against Bolingbroke has been attributed the resolution of that most able but dangerous man to leave England and English politics. This view is perhaps overstrained. But he was a disappointed intriguer. He retired to France. "My part is over," he said, "and he who remains on the stage after his part is over deserves to be hissed off."

THE GIN ACT (1736 A.D.)

The first session of the new parliament, which met in January, 1735, was prolonged only till May. The king announced his determination to visit his

[1736 A.D.]

dominions in Germany, and the queen was appointed regent. George was sorely tempted to engage in the war by an offer of the command of the imperial army on the Rhine. Walpole had foreseen such a possible flattery of the king's military ambition; and had prepared him to say, that he could not appear at the head of an army as king of England, and not have an Englishman to fight under him. The summer passed without any important military operations. On the 22nd of October the king returned from Hanover — according to Lord Hervey in very bad temper, and dissatisfied with everything English. His majesty had left a lady in Hanover, Madame Walmoden, to whom he wrote by every post. Soon after his return the preliminaries of a general peace were signed at Vienna. Europe would be at rest again for four years. "The happy turn which the affairs of Europe had taken" was announced at the opening of parliament in January, 1736. The tranquillity of England and Scotland was seriously disturbed in this season of foreign pacification.

On the 20th of February a petition against the excessive use of spirituous liquors was presented to the house of commons from the justices of peace for Middlesex. The drinking of Geneva, it was alleged, had excessively increased amongst the people of inferior rank; the constant and excessive use of distilled spirituous liquors had already destroyed thousands, and rendered great numbers of others unfit for labour, debauching their morals, and driving them into every vice. Upon the motion of Sir Joseph Jekyll, it was proposed to lay a tax of twenty shillings a gallon upon gin, and to require that every retailer should take out an annual licence costing £50. Walpole gave no distinct support to this measure, nor did he oppose it. He saw that a greatly reduced consumption of spirituous liquors would affect the revenue; that a high duty would produce less than a low duty; and he therefore proposed that £70,000 which had been appropriated to the civil list from the smaller duties on spirits should be guaranteed, if the prohibitory rate were adopted. Pulteney opposed the bill altogether, upon the principle that he had heard of sumptuary laws by which certain sorts of apparel had been forbidden to persons of inferior rank; but that he had never before heard of a sumptuary law by which any sort of victuals or drink were forbidden to be made use of by persons of a low degree. Yet the magnitude of the evil certainly warranted some strong legislative measure. It was stated that there were twenty thousand houses for retailing spirituous liquors. Sudden deaths from excessive gin-drinking were continually reported in the newspapers. The extent of this vice was too obvious to allow the arguments against the impossibility of preventing evasion of the duties to have much weight. Compliance with the statute was to be enforced by the machinery of the common informer. So the bill was passed, and was to come into operation after the 29th of September.

On that day the signs of the liquor-shops were put in mourning. Hooting mobs assembled round the dens where they could no longer get "drunk for a penny and dead-drunk for twopence." The last rag was pawned to carry off a cheap quart or gallon of the beloved liquor. As was foreseen, the act was evaded. Hawkers sold a coloured mixture in the streets, and pretended chemists opened shops for the sale of "cholick-water." Fond playful names, such as Tom Row, Make Shift, the Ladies' Delight, the Baulk, attracted customers to the old haunts. Informers were rolled in the mud, or pumped upon, or thrown into the Thames. Gin riots were constantly taking place, for several years. "The Fall of Bob" was the theme of ballad and broadside, which connected the minister with "Desolation, or the Fall of Gin." The

impossibility of preventing by prohibitory duties the sale of a commodity in large request was strikingly exemplified in this gin struggle. It became necessary in 1743, when the consumption of gin had positively increased, to reduce the excessive duty. A ludicrous example of one of the abortive attempts at minute legislation is exhibited in a rejected clause of the act of 1736. In the wish to protect the sugar colonies by encouraging the consumption of rum, it was proposed to exempt punch houses from the operation of the Gin Act, provided the agreeable liquor so retailed was made of one-third spirit and two-thirds water, at the least, so mixed in the presence of the buyer. If the liquor were stronger than what sailors call "two-water grog," the tippler might pay for his bowl by laying an information.

THE PORTEOUS TRAGEDY IN EDINBURGH (1736 A.D.)

The Porteous tragedy of Edinburgh in 1736 has become the property of romance. One writer appears to think that the function of the historian has been superseded by that of the novelist. But "the real events," "the true facts," have a significance which the writer of fiction does not always care to dwell upon. They strikingly illustrate the condition of society. They are essentially connected with the history of public events which preceded them, and of public events which came after. They illustrate the policy of the government and the temper of the governed. We cannot pass them over or deal with them slightingly. They form the subject of very important parliamentary proceedings in 1737, which are necessary to the proper understanding of the relations between England and Scotland. An impartial review in this as in most other cases, is as much to be aimed at as a picturesque narrative.

Smuggling in England had long been carried on to an enormous extent. The seafaring population were accustomed to look upon many gainful adventures as lawful and innocent which we now regard as criminal. The slave trade, with all its odious cruelties, was a regular mercantile undertaking. Buccaneering in the South Seas was a just assertion of the rights of the British flag. The contraband trade in brandy, tea, and tobacco, was a laudable endeavour to sell their countrymen goods at a cheap rate bought in a fair market. But the principle of smuggling was not recognised as a national benefit. The merchant was opposed to it. The wealthy consumer had conscientious scruples against encouraging it. In Scotland the nation, with the exception of a few flourishing trading communities, abetted smuggling, and regarded smugglers as useful members of society. In a report attributed to Duncan Forbes, it is said, "The smuggler was the favourite. His prohibited or high-duty goods were run ashore by the boats of whatever part of the coast he came near. When ashore, they were guarded by the country from the custom-house officer. If seized, they were rescued; and if any seizure was returned, and tried, the juries seldom failed to find for the defendant. Mr. Burton[n] points out the difference in the circumstances of England and Scotland which made the principle of equality of taxation odious; and emphatically says, "For more than half a century after the union, English fiscal burdens were as unbearable to the Scots as they would be to the Norwegians at the present day."

The small seaports on the coast of Fife were more remarkable than any other districts of the wide and ill-defended seaboard of Scotland, as the haunts of the most daring bands of systematic smugglers. Two such persons, named Wilson and Robertson, having had some goods seized by the officers of revenue, entered with two associates the custom-house of Pittenweem,

THE POTTERS' MOB

and, when the collector fled, carried off a large sum of money. Wilson and Robertson were apprehended, were tried, and were sentenced to death. Mr. Lyndsay related that Wilson maintained, to the last moment, that he was unjustly condemned. "He admitted," to one of the reverend ministers of Edinburgh, "that he had taken money from a collector of the revenue by violence; that he did it because he knew no other way of coming at it; that the officers of the revenue had by their practice taught him this was lawful, for they had often seized and carried off his goods by violence; and so long as they had goods of greater value in their hands than all the money he took from them, they were still in his debt, and he had done no wrong." There can be no doubt that the mob of Edinburgh, and many above the mob, took the same view of Wilson's offence; and held the same opinion about revenue laws.

The attempt of Wilson and Robertson to escape from the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, when Wilson, a bulky man, stuck fast in the iron bars of his cell, is as well known as any of the adventures of Jack Sheppard. His generous effort to save his comrade after the condemned sermon in the Tolbooth church, has redeemed his memory from the ignominy of the common malefactor. Surrounded by four keepers, Wilson held two with his hands and a third with his teeth, whilst Robertson knocked down the fourth and escaped. This heroism made Wilson's own fate certain. He was executed on the 14th of April; whilst the populace looked on with stern compassion. No attempt at rescue was made, for the place of execution was not only surrounded by the city guard, but by a detachment of the Welsh fusiliers. After the body was taken down, a rush was made to seize it from the hangman. The populace then attacked the city guard, who were under the command of John Porteous, their captain. Porteous was a man of strong passions, very often brought into conflict with the blackguards of the city, and now in peculiarly ill temper from his dignity being interfered with by the unusual presence of a military force, called to assist in keeping the peace. He is said to have fired himself; he certainly ordered his gendarmerie to fire upon the people. Several persons were killed or wounded. The fusiliers also fired; but in firing above the heads of the mob, they hit several who were lookers-on from the adjacent windows. Porteous was brought to trial in July, before the high court of justiciary, on a charge of murder, for having caused the death of citizens without authority from the civil magistrate. He was convicted, and sentenced to capital punishment; but his conduct being considered by the council of regency in London as an act of self defence, he was reprieved by the English secretary of state. His execution had been fixed by the authorities of Edinburgh for the 8th of September. The news of the reprieve produced a sensation that foreboded mischief.

The 8th of September fell on a Wednesday. A report had gone forth that some tumult would take place on that day, when the populace, being disappointed of a legal sacrifice to their revenge, would attempt some daring act against Porteous. This was deemed a foolish story; but the lord provost of Edinburgh took some precautions to resist any outrage on that Wednesday. Porteous himself had no fears. A Scottish clergyman, Mr. Yates, had preached in the Tolbooth church, Porteous being present, on Sunday the 5th; and he afterwards saw Porteous, and told him of the report, and advised him to be cautious about admitting persons to his room. Porteous slighted his information; and said, were he once at liberty, he was so little apprehensive of the people that he would not fear to walk at the Cross of Edinburgh with only his cane in his hand as usual. The Tolbooth of the Scottish capital,

like most other places of confinement, had its feasts for those who could pay, and its starvation for those who were destitute. On the evening of Tuesday, the 7th of September, Porteous was surrounded by a jolly party, draining the punch-bowl in toasting the speedy liberation of their friend. There was another remarkable festal assembly in Edinburgh that night. Mr. Lind, captain of the city guard, deposed that, "being informed that the mob was gathering, he went to Clark's tavern, where the provost was drinking with Mr. Bur, and other officers of his majesty's ship the *Dreadnought*, then stationed in the road of Leith; and upon acquainting him with the danger, the provost desired him to go immediately back, and draw out his men, and that he would instantly follow him, and put himself at the head of the guard to face the mob."

The mob was quicker than the provost or his captain. They had disarmed the guard; had taken possession of the guard-house; and were arming themselves with muskets, halberds, and Lochaber axes, which they there found. Edinburgh had suddenly fallen into the complete possession of a lawless multitude. The multitude went about their work with a calm resolution which was long attributed to an organisation proceeding from leaders much above the ordinary directors of mobs. No point was neglected. Magistrates rushed out to ring the alarm bell; the tower in which the bell hung was in the possession of the insurgents. Onward they marched, in numbers rapidly increasing, to the Tolbooth. Here they made a solemn demand that Captain John Porteous should be delivered up to them. Being refused, as they expected, they proceeded to batter the outer gate. Crowbars and sledge hammers were employed in vain. Fire accomplished what bodily strength could not effect. The rioters rushed to the apartment of the unhappy man. He was concealed in the chimney; but they dragged him down, and bade him prepare for death. Struggling ineffectually, he was carried to the Grass-market, the usual place of execution. He was carried on men's hands, as two boys carry a third, by grasping each other's wrists. This stern multitude went on in silence, the glare of torches lighting up their lowering brows and the pallid features of their victim. Near the spot where the gallows had stood on which Wilson was hanged, a pole projected from a dyer's shop. A rope was fastened round the neck of Porteous. He was not hanged quickly. There was a terrible scene of butchery. The organisers of this daring act were never discovered, after the most rigid investigation.

The Porteous outrage took place whilst Queen Caroline was regent in the absence of the king. She felt it as an insult to her authority, and the ministry were inclined to visit the apparent neglect of the magistracy of Edinburgh with serious humiliation. A bill was brought in for disabling the lord provost from ever holding office, and for imprisoning him; for abolishing the town guard of Edinburgh; for taking away the gates of the Netherbow-port. The Scottish peers, and the Scottish members of the commons, fired up at this supposed assault upon the national honour. In the course of the parliamentary inquiry the Scottish judges were summoned to give evidence upon some legal points. It was contended by the duke of Argyll and other peers that these judges ought to sit on the Woolsack as do the English judges, when their presence is wanted in the house of peers. There was no precedence for such a course, and the Scottish judges were required to stand at the bar. Scotland was outraged by this distinction. The debate in both houses upon the proposed measures of pains and penalties assumed the character of a national controversy. "Unequal dealing," "partial procedure," "oppression to be resisted," and an independent nation "forced back into a

[1737 A.D.]

state of enmity," were expressions which showed the danger to which this affair was tending.

Walpole hinted that when the bill was committed he should not object to amendments founded on reason and equity. When it finally went to the lords, it merely disqualified the lord provost from holding office, and imposed a fine upon the city of Edinburgh of £2,000, for the benefit of the widow of Porteous. Burton[n] has remarked that "no one can read these debates without seeing reasons why the conduct of Scotland was so different from that of England in the insurrection which broke out eight years afterwards." Although the modified statute upon the Porteous riot could scarcely be a reasonable cause for national irritation, a supplementary measure produced a violent opposition from the Presbyterian clergy. It was enacted that they should read from their pulpits, once a month, a proclamation for discovering the murderers of Captain Porteous. This was held to be an Erastian measure, interfering with the spiritual authority of the kirk. That proclamation also contained the offensive words, "the lords spiritual in parliament assembled." This was held to be a recognition of that church government which Scotland had rejected. At this period there was a schism amongst the Scottish clergy, and this measure had not a healing tendency. Some read the proclamation; some refused to do so. Compliance with the order of the government was held to be faithlessness to the church.[k]

DISSENSIONS IN THE ROYAL FAMILY

The principal hopes of the opposition in 1737 rested on Frederick, Prince of Wales, whose secret encouragement had now ripened into open support. His disagreements with his father were by no means of recent date. Even whilst he remained at Hanover, and whilst his father, as prince of Wales, had gone to England, they were near enough to bicker. His own wishes were strongly fixed on an alliance with the princess royal of Prussia, the same who afterwards became Margravine of Bareith, and who, in her memoirs, has left us a strange and probably exaggerated portrait of all her own relations. The marriage was earnestly desired by the queen of Prussia, and, indeed, by the chief members of both families; but the brutal temper of the king, who used to beat his daughter, and who wished to behead his son, and the personal antipathy[1] between him and his cousin George II, finally broke off the negotiations. Prince Frederick, in as much despair as a lover can be who has never seen his mistress, sent from Hanover one La Motte as his agent, to assure the queen of Prussia that he was determined, in spite of his father, still to conclude the marriage, and that he would set off in disguise for Berlin to execute his purpose. But the queen, in an overflowing transport of delight, could not refrain from imparting the good news to the English envoy at her court. He, as was his duty, gave timely notice to his own; the rash project was prevented; and the headstrong prince was summoned to England, where he arrived, to the great joy of the nation, in 1728.

For some years after his arrival, the prince remained tranquil; but, as he became familiar with the English language and customs, and conscious of his own importance, he entered more and more into cabals against his parents. His character was weak, yet stubborn; with generous impulses, and not without accomplishments; but vain, fond of flattery, and easily led by flatterers. Even after his marriage, and whilst devoted to his wife, he thought it incum-

[1 "The terrible Frederick William, satirically styled George II, 'My brother the comedian.'" — AUBREY.o]

bent upon him to affect the character of a man of intrigue: this reputation, and not beauty, appears to have been his aim; and his principle favourite, Lady Middlesex, is described as "very short, very plain, and very yellow, and full of Greek and Latin!"[b] He professed a love of literature; and his home was a resort for such men of talent as Pulteney, Chesterfield, Wyndham, Carteret, Cobham, and Bolingbroke. In fact, the time came when nearly all the wit and genius were ranged on the side of opposition.

The marriage of Frederick, in April, 1736, to Augusta of Saxe-Gotha, a princess of beauty and excellent judgment, did not, as was hoped, restore union to the royal family. Immediately afterward the prince began to complain unceasingly of the narrowness of his income; and, urged on by unwise advisers, he applied to Parliament to increase his annual allowance from £50,000 to £100,000. He even had the indelicacy to make promises to peers and commoners of what he would do for them when he came to the throne, if they would support him now; but, despite all his efforts, he was unable to accomplish his object.

At last one of the most extraordinary events in the private annals of royal houses separated the king and his son for years. At the time the prince and princess of Wales were residing with the king and queen at Hampton Court, the princess being far advanced in pregnancy. On the evening of Sunday, the 31st of July, the princess was taken ill; but the prince out of hostility to his father, insisted that his wife should not be confined at Hampton Court, and against all remonstrances, caused her to be transferred to Saint James', where she gave birth to a girl within an hour of her arrival. A correspondence ensued between George II and his rash son; the outcome of which was that, although the prince confessed his fault, the king ordered him to leave St. James' with all his family. Frederick did so, and took up his residence at Norfolk House.

DEATH OF QUEEN CAROLINE (1737 A.D.)

In the midst of these unseemly exhibitions, Queen Caroline who had long been afflicted with a dangerous complaint, was on the 9th of November taken dangerously ill. The prince of Wales expressed great desire to see his mother, but she refused consent. It was soon found that the disease had progressed too far to allow hope. On the 14th Sir Robert Walpole arrived from Houghton, and was conducted by the king to her majesty's bedside. Realising that her end was near, the queen pathetically recommended the king, her children, and the kingdom to the minister's care.

As the news that the queen was expected to die spread abroad there were many who expected that her death would mean the fall of Walpole, and Sir Robert himself seems to have shared this opinion. Lord Hervey[d] relates a curious conversation which occurred at this time between the great minister and himself. "Oh, my lord," said Sir Robert, "if this woman should die, what a scene of confusion will here be! I defy the ablest person in the kingdom to foresee what will be the consequence of this great event." Lord Hervey replied that the king would grieve for his wife a fortnight, forget her in a month, have two or three women with whom he would pass most of his time, and that Walpole would be more influential than ever. As Hervey predicted, the hopes of Walpole's enemies and the minister's own fears proved groundless.

The queen died on Sunday night, the 20th of November.[a] The king, with all his silliness about mistresses — a silliness which he avowed even to

[1737 A.D.]

his dying wife in well-known words indicative of the loose morality of the period — loved and respected Caroline; and the grief he showed for her, being universally known, made him for some time more popular and better spoken of than he had been before this incident. Truly does Carlyle say, "There is something stoically tragic in the history of Caroline with her flighty, vapouring little king: Seldom had foolish husband so wise a wife." [k]

THE RISE OF METHODISM

Far more important in its ultimate effects upon humankind than quarrels in the royal family or the death of the queen was a movement which was to awaken the religious spirit in England from the lethargic condition into which it had fallen. The movement originated in the meetings during the years 1729 to 1735 of a number of earnestly inclined Oxford students who were anxious to attain a deeper religious life. Chief among the members of this society were John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield; the first two the sons of the episcopal rector of Epworth, and the last the son of an inn-keeper in Gloucestershire. The society and its members were much ridiculed by some of the other students; and, probably because the word "method," a favourite of their mother's, was much used by the Wesleys, the members of the society were called in derision "Methodists."

In 1735 the two Wesleys went out to the newly established colony of Georgia; but in 1738 John Wesley, after a somewhat stormy experience in the colony, returned to England, whither his brother had already preceded him. In the colony and in England John Wesley fell under Moravian influences, and shortly after his return he adopted the Moravian doctrine of "justification by faith." The society was then reconstituted, on the basis of a church within a church; a strict rule of life was adopted by the leaders; weekly confession of sins to one another, and weekly communion being among their practices. The leaders, all of whom were ordained ministers of the Church of England, became itinerant preachers, who held it to be their chief duty to preach repentance to sinners. By their earnestness and enthusiasm they quickly succeeded in arousing a passionate enthusiasm, but by their extemporaneous preaching, extravagant gestures, and stern denunciation of the idleness of the clergy, they also roused an almost equally passionate hostility, as a result of which most of the pulpits were closed against them. Circumstances thus compelled them by degrees to take steps in the direction of an independent organisation; in 1739 they began to create Methodist chapels, and in the same year they inaugurated the custom of field-preaching.

Despite all opposition, their following increased with wonderful rapidity. Their success was partly due to the fact that they made their appeals in large part to the poor and the illiterate, to whom they preached in the most impassioned manner an emotional religion which carried everything before it. But it was also due in perhaps equal measure to the remarkable ability of the leaders, particularly the Wesleys and Whitefield. Charles Wesley became the poet of the movement, and his hymns, many of which are in use to-day, were a powerful factor in melting the hearts of the people. Whitefield was a man of wonderful oratorical abilities, and, as a popular preacher, has rarely if ever been equalled in England. Possessing a voice so powerful that he could be heard distinctly in the open air by 30,000 people, a master of gestures faultless in beauty and propriety, he was equally capable of reducing to tears vast crowds of the half-savage colliers of Kingswood or of the rude colonists of America, or of fascinating the most refined

audiences in London. Many of the foremost men of the time, including the historian Hume and the statesman Bolingbroke, have left testimonials of their admiration of his wonderful effectiveness. "I happened," says Benjamin Franklin, "to attend one of his sermons, in the course of which I perceived he intended to finish with a collection, and I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my pocket a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and five pistoles in gold. As he proceeded I began to soften, and concluded to give the copper. Another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed of that and determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably that I emptied my pocket wholly into the collector's dish, gold and all." On another occasion, in illustrating the peril of sinners, Whitefield portrayed a blind beggar drawing gradually nearer and nearer to the verge of a dizzy precipice, and so realistic did he make his description that when he reached the catastrophe, Lord Chesterfield, who formed one of the audience, was so carried away that he involuntarily exclaimed: "Good God, he's gone." John Wesley was neither so good a hymn writer as his brother, nor so eloquent a preacher as Whitefield; but he combined the earnestness of a religious enthusiast with talents for organization and management, and was the real leader of the movement.

John Wesley never acknowledged himself a non-conformist, and in the year of his death, 1791, he wrote, "I live and die a member of the Church of England, and no one who regards my judgment or advice will ever separate from it." But facts were too strong for him. He had already gone so far as to bestow orders, and a few years after his death the Methodist ministers began to administer the sacraments; as time went on the position of the Methodists as a separate religious body became clearly defined.

Not least important among the results of the movement was the growth within the Church of England of a considerable body, which, while holding aloof from the Methodists, nevertheless adopted many of their principles and practices. These persons, including John Newton, Hannah More, the poet Cowper, and many others, became known as the "Evangelical Party," and were active in furthering almost all the great philanthropic and religious works which marked the closing years of the 18th century.[a]

THE SPANISH WAR

The state of internal and external tranquillity which Walpole made it his task to maintain was not allowed to continue. For many years the merchants had been making complaints of the injuries done to English trade in the West Indies by the right of search for contraband goods exercised by the Spanish *guarda-costas*, or guardships, and the cruel treatment experienced by English mariners; in other words, that the Spanish government, whether wisely or not, exercised its undoubted rights, and that attempts were made to suppress the extensive smuggling trade which they carried on with the Spanish colonies. The opposition, glad of an occasion to embarrass the minister, joined heartily in the cry; papers were moved for, witnesses were examined before the house, and resolutions were passed. "The fable of Jenkins' ears," as Burke calls it, was of great service. This was a Scottish master of a ship, who said that seven years before he was taken by a Spaniard, who, beside treating him with great cruelty in other respects, cut off one of his ears and bade him carry it to his king, whom he would serve in the same way if he was there. When asked how he had acted on this occasion, Jenkins replied, "I recommended my soul to God and my cause to my country."

The story produced such an effect that Pulteney declared that the very name of Jenkins would raise volunteers. Jenkins always carried his ear about him wrapt in cotton. Some, however, said he had lost it on a very different occasion. Various attempts were made by Walpole to settle the Spanish matter by negotiation; at length (1739), rather than part with his power which he loved too much, he resolved to act contrary to his better judgment, and yield to the public will. War was therefore declared against Spain, an event which filled the nation with joy and exultation.

Admiral Vernon, a brave but presumptuous and self-sufficient officer, who commanded in the West Indies, with a squadron of six ships of war took, plundered, and destroyed Porto Bello (November 21st). His success having given a false idea of his abilities, he was selected to command an expedition on a large scale against Carthagena, having on board a body of land-forces under General Wentworth. It however proved a total failure.

A squadron, under Commodore Anson, was sent to sea in September, 1740, in order to attack the Spaniards in the Pacific Ocean. The history of this celebrated voyage cannot be given here in detail. We need only notice the dreadful ravages committed by the scurvy; the furious tempest encountered in the straits of Le Maire, in which the *Wager* was wrecked, and the *Pearl* and the *Severn* forced to return to Rio Janeiro. After a short stay at the island of Juan Fernandez to recover his men, Anson, with his two remaining ships, the *Centurion* and *Gloucester*, proceeded along the coast of Peru capturing the Spanish traders, and he took and burned the town of Paita. To capture the galleons from Manila, he sailed with the *Centurion* alone (being obliged to burn the *Gloucester*) across the Pacific. He stopped to refresh his crew at the isle of Tinian, and then proceeded to Canton in China. He afterwards captured a galleon immensely rich, and returned to England by the Cape of Good Hope, being the first Englishman who had circumnavigated the globe since the time of Drake. He arrived on the 15th of June, 1744, after an absence of nearly four years.

RETIREMENT OF WALPOLE (1742 A.D.)

The success of this war was not agreeable to the wishes of those who had urged it on. British trade suffered from the Spanish privateers, and the French gave symptoms of an intention to share in the contest. The blame of course was thrown on the minister, and the opposition now resolved to make a strenuous effort for his overthrow. Sandys moved (February 13th, 1741), after a long speech, for an address to his majesty to remove him from his presence and councils forever; Pulteney exerted all his eloquence in favour of the motion; but the minister was supported not only by his own friends but by several of the tories who regarded the motion as tending to an inquisitorial system, and Shippen left the house at the head of thirty-four of his adherents. After an able reply from Walpole, it was negatived by a large majority; the same was the fate of a similar motion in the lords.

A dissolution succeeded. Walpole is said to have relaxed in his usual exertions on these occasions, while all branches of the opposition made the utmost efforts: even the pretender wrote, directing his adherents to labour strenuously against the obnoxious minister. There was also a schism in the cabinet, many of his colleagues being his secret foes. In the new parliament the proceedings on contested elections showed the minister that his power was gone; and when that of Chippenham was decided against him (February 3rd, 1742), he declared to the successful candidate that he would never again

sit in that house. An adjournment followed; Walpole was created Earl of Orford (9th), and two days after he resigned. The king accepted his resignation with tears, and never ceased to repose confidence in him. An attempt made by a secret committee of the commons for an inquiry into his conduct, for the purpose of fixing on him a charge of corruption and peculation, failed.[e]

STANHOPE'S ESTIMATE OF WALPOLE

The character of a statesman so reckless in opposition, but so eminent in office, deserves the most attentive consideration, and affords the best clue to the history of England for more than twenty years. During his life he was loaded with unmerited censures; since his death he has sometimes received exaggerated praise. Amidst the showers of invective which his enemies have poured, amidst the clouds of incense which his flatterers have raised, the true lineaments of his mind are dimly and doubtfully seen.

The talents of Walpole were eminently practical, and fit for the conduct of great affairs. He was always steady, and therefore usually successful in his schemes. His views of policy were generally most acute, and his knowledge of finance profound. No fanciful theory, no love of abstract principles, ever warped his judgment; even the most trying circumstances could very seldom ruffle his good humour; and calm himself, he worked upon the passions of others. So closely had he studied all the weak points of human nature — so skilfully were his address and management adapted to them, that he scarcely ever failed, either in public or in private, to gain upon his hearers. There have certainly been many more eloquent orators, but never, I believe, a more dexterous debater. He would not willingly leave even the least part of his subject untouched. He knew that weak minds seldom yield to a single argument, even to the strongest, but are more easily overpowered by a number, of whatever kind. Always catching and always following the disposition of the house — knowing exactly when to press, and when to recede — able at pleasure to unfold the most intricate details, or to involve in specious reasoning the grossest fallacies — he, in the long run, prevailed over spirits far more lofty and soaring.

We are assured, however, that the powers of debate were not those to which he entirely or principally trusted for the management of the house of commons. The indignant clamour of his contemporaries — the eloquent voice of a Wyndham — the magic pen of a Bolingbroke — have denounced in glowing terms the patron and parent of parliamentary corruption. Beneath the flowers of their rhetoric, and the venom of their party rancour, there is no doubt a foundation of truth. But the more equal tribunal of posterity has discovered no small excuse for him in the political turpitude even of many who thus arraigned him — in the general lowness and baseness of his age — in the fact, that so many of the representatives of the people were on sale, and ready, if not bought by Walpole, to be bid for by the jacobites. The more the private letters of this period come to light the more is this truth apparent. What shall we say, for example, when we find the great-grandson and representative of Hampden, and himself a distinguished statesman, having the effrontery to threaten in writing, as he does in a letter to Lady Suffolk, July 30th, 1727, that, unless he can obtain a pension from the reigning family, he will "very soon take service in some other family" — meaning the Pretender's? Are we really justified in speaking as if public men had been all disposed to be virtuous and incorruptible during Walpole's government, and were turned from the paths of honour by the address of that wily tempter?

[1742 A.D.]

Besides, are not these charges against Walpole marked by extreme exaggeration, even on the testimony of his enemies themselves? At the fall of Walpole a select committee was appointed to inquire into his public conduct during the last ten years, and out of its twenty-one members, that committee comprised no less than nineteen of his bitterest enemies. The minister then stood forsaken and alone — there was no court favour at his back — no patronage or lucre in his hands; much popularity to gain, and no danger to run by assailing him. Yet, even under such favourable circumstances, what did this ten years' siege upon his character, this political Troy, really bring forth at last? What facts does the report allege in support of its avowed hostility? An attempt upon the virtue of the mayor of Weymouth! The promise of a place in the revenue to a returning officer! The atrocity of dismissing some excise officers who had voted against the government candidate! Vague surmises from the large amount of secret service money! Now if Walpole had in real truth been the corrupter of his age; if he had prostituted public honours or public rewards in the cause of corruption; if fraudulent contracts, undue influence at elections, and bribed members of parliament, were matters of every-day occurrence — if, in short, only one-tenth part of the outcry against Walpole was well founded, how is it possible that powerful and rancorous opponents should be able to find only so few, imperfect, and meagre proofs to hurl against him? No defence on the part of Walpole's friends is half so strong and convincing as this failure of his enemies.



ROBERT WALPOLE
(1676–1745)

The administration of Walpole was prudently and beneficially directed to the maintenance of peace abroad, to the preservation of quiet, and the progress of prosperity at home. It may, however, be doubted whether, in his domestic policy, he was not too fond of palliatives, and applied himself merely to silence complaints, instead of redressing wrongs. It is also to be observed, that though he loved peace much, he loved his own power more. He kept the country from hostilities so long as he could do so with safety to himself; but when the alternative lay between a foolish war and a new administration, he never hesitated in deciding for the former. Office was, indeed, his natural element; when excluded from it, he was, as we have seen, most turbulent and restless; he crept back to it, through a peculiarly humbling coalition; and even at the end, Speaker Onslow assures us that he "went very unwillingly out of his power."

The knowledge of Walpole was very limited, and he patronised literature as little as he understood it. "In general," says his son, "he loved neither reading nor writing." "How I envy you!" he exclaimed to Fox, whom he found one day, after his fall, reading in the library at Houghton. His splendid success in life, notwithstanding his want of learning, may tend to show what is too commonly forgotten in modern plans of education — that it is of far more importance to have the mind well disciplined than richly stored — strong

rather than full. Walpole was, however, fond of perusing and quoting Horace, to whom, in his private character, he might, perhaps, not unaptly be compared. He was good-tempered, joyous, and sensual, with an elegant taste for the arts; a warm friend, an indulgent master, and a boon companion. We are told of him, that whenever he received a packet of letters, the one from his gamekeeper was usually the first which he opened. He had an easy and flowing wit, but too commonly indulged it to the utmost limits of coarseness; and Savage who had seen him familiarly at Lord Tyrconnel's, used to say of him that the whole range of his mind was from obscenity to politics, and from politics to obscenity. In his private expenses, he was not only liberal, but lavish; and it must be acknowledged that the magnificence of his buildings, the extent of his purchases, and the profusion of his entertainments at Houghton, gave his enemies no small handle for invective.

It would be unjust to Walpole to conclude his character without alluding to his mildness and placability towards his political opponents. The system under which contending statesmen used to raise up rival scaffolds, and hunt down one another even to the death, ended during his administration; although I must own that I think no small part of the praise belongs to the personal clemency and kindliness of George I and George II. On the whole [concludes Stanhope] Walpole appears to me to have been a man of many useful and some great qualities; who faithfully served his country, but who never forgot his own family; and who rose partly by the frailties of others, as well as by merits of his own. With every allowance for the "evil days and evil tongues" amongst which his lot had fallen, it is impossible not to own that his character wants something of moral elevation. Name him in the same sentence with a Chatham, and who will not feel the contrast? The mind of Chatham bears the lineaments of a higher nature; and the very sound of his name carries with it something lofty and august. Of Walpole, on the other hand, the defects — nay, perhaps, even the merits — have in them something low and common. No enthusiasm was ever felt for his person; none was ever kindled by his memory. No man ever inquired where his remains are laid, or went to pay a homage of reverence at his tomb. Between him and Chatham there is the same difference as between success and glory![b]

WALPOLE'S SUCCESSORS

The fall of Walpole was followed by a shifting of some of the officers of government. The people looked on, and saw that nothing else was changed. They had joined the cry of a parliamentary faction to hunt down one man. They looked in vain for any bettering of their domestic condition — for any signal display of national greatness. Some violent demagogues had talked of the scaffold for the minister who had governed the nation without bloodshed or proscription, at a period when a less firm hand would have encouraged the jacobites, and a less merciful hand would have hunted them into desperation. The mob carried about his effigy. "Satan" and "Bob" figured together in caricatures. The excitement was soon over. Walpole's ascendancy was the real keystone of the opposition arch, itself composed of very loose materials. The keystone was displaced, and the arch fell to pieces. Some of the opposition got places, others got none. The only change which could be popularly understood was, that an apparent reconciliation took place between the king and the prince of Wales. The prince went to court; and the king asked

his royal highness after the health of the princess. The duke of Argyll desired to form a coalition ministry — what was then first termed "a broad bottom." The plan would not succeed; and the duke retired in disgust. The king would have nothing to say to the tories.

Lord Carteret was the only member of the cabinet who possessed high ability. Pitt was not called to office. His exclusion was no doubt owing to the personal dislike of the king. Neither had Chesterfield or Lyttleton places. Carteret was a favourite of George and of his son. He was a general favourite, from his wit, his accomplishments, his gay humour. But he was a very indifferent substitute for the keen and painstaking Walpole, who, like all really great men, did not despise petty things, or think it beneath him to attend to the small details of public affairs. Carteret was satisfied to lead the king, by entering into his majesty's aspirations to hold the scales of European policy, and to command armies. He was asked by the chief justice to make an appointment to some office. "What is it to me," exclaimed the dashing minister, "who is a judge and who is a bishop? It is my business to make kings and emperors, and to maintain the balance of Europe." The balance was to be held by taking sixteen thousand Hanoverian troops into English pay.

ENGLAND AND THE WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION

When the king opened the session on the 16th of November, 1742, and mentioned "sixteen thousand of my electoral troops," as sent to the Low Countries, "with the Hessians in the British pay," it was felt that England was getting mixed up with Hanover in a way that Walpole would have scarcely dared to attempt. A grant of £657,000 was proposed by the secretary of war, to defray the cost of these troops. Then the national jealousy of foreign mercenaries, which the genius of William III was unable to stand up against, burst forth in contemptuous disregard of the king's relations with his hereditary state. Sir John St. Aubyn said that undoubtedly his majesty had a most passionate love for his native country — a passion which arises from virtue. "I wish that those who have the honour to be of his councils would imitate his royal example, and show a passion for their native country too; that they would faithfully stand forth and say, that as king of this country, whatever interests may interfere with it, this country is to be his first, his principal care; that in the Act of Settlement this is an express condition." Pitt was even bolder: "It is now too apparent that this great, this powerful, this formidable kingdom, is considered only as a province to a despicable electorate." The ministers commanded a majority. But such invectives went deep into the heart of the nation. It must be borne in mind that England was really not engaged in war with France, though she was paying troops to fight against the cause which France supported. She sent auxiliaries to the house of Austria, and these auxiliaries would necessarily come into conflict with the auxiliaries which France sent against the house of Austria. The absurdity of the situation was well expressed by Horace Walpole: "We have the name of war with Spain without the thing, and war with France without the name."

When Walpole fell, and England was at war with Spain and France — when the pacific French minister, Cardinal Fleury, was succeeded by the more energetic and more wily Cardinal Tencin — the vulnerable point in the position of the house of Brunswick was to be hit. In 1743 a great invasion was projected from France. Charles Edward was urged to leave Rome and

repair to Paris. He was nominally to command an army of veterans assembled at Dunkirk, having the great Marshal Saxe to lead the troops which were to drive the elector of Hanover from his usurped throne. The expedition sailed at the beginning of 1744 from Dunkirk. A great storm destroyed or scattered the fleet of transports; and Sir John Norris, who was ready for a fight in the Channel, was content to pick up a few dismantled vessels. Marshal Saxe went to take the command of an army in the Low Countries; and Charles Edward secluded himself at Gravelines, till a more favourable occasion should arise, when he should emerge from his obscurity as regent of Great Britain and Ireland.

When the king prorogued the parliament on the 21st of April, 1743, he announced that, at the requisition of the queen of Hungary, he had ordered his army, in conjunction with the Austrian troops, to pass the Rhine. His majesty immediately departed for Germany. The British troops in Flanders, under the command of the earl of Stair, had marched towards the Rhine in February. They were joined by the sixteen thousand Hanoverians in the pay of England; and by some Austrian regiments, commanded by the duke of Aremberg. In May the army had crossed the Rhine, and had taken up a station at Hochst, near Frankfort. Stair was waiting for Hanoverians and Hessians to add to his numbers; for the French marshal de Noailles, with an army of sixty thousand men, was within a few leagues of the British general's position. Stair made an imprudent movement, by which he was cut off from his supplies at Hanau. King George reached the army on the 19th of June, accompanied by his second son, the duke of Cumberland. The forty thousand men were reduced to thirty-seven thousand; they were on short rations, and the horses without forage. Their position was an unfavourable one near the village of Dettingen; the French general was at hand with a superior force. It was absolutely necessary that the allies should return to their magazines at Hanau.

On the 27th of June, before sunrise, they had commenced their march from Aschaffenburg towards Dettingen. They were ignorant of the exact position of the French, fancying their principal force was towards Aschaffenburg, in their rear. In this belief the king took the command of the rear-guard, as the post of danger. A large body of French were in their front, to contest the passage of the allies through the defile of Dettingen. George immediately rode from the rear to form his army in order of battle, with the almost desperate resolution of forcing the strong French lines. The brave little man was surrounded by dangers. As he marched from Aschaffenburg the French entered the place with twelve thousand men. Behind and before was the enemy, in most formidable numbers, shutting him up in a narrow valley. Grammont, the nephew of Noailles — eager to engage, in the temporary absence of his uncle, who had ridden off to bring up additional force — rushed forward from a formidable position covered by a morass, to charge with his cavalry. George dismounted, drew his sword, and put himself at the head of the right of his British and Hanoverians, exclaiming: "Now, boys, now for the honour of England; fire, and behave bravely, and the French will soon run."[1] The infantry thus led on did behave bravely, and did make the French soon run. The duke of Cumberland, who commanded the left, displayed the same courage as his father. The battle of Dettingen afforded no display for high military skill on the part of the British commanders. They had desperately to fight their way out of a difficulty; and they had troops

[1 "The battle of Dettingen," says Aubrey,° "was the last battle in which a king of England personally took part."]

upon whose bravery and steadiness they could confidently rely. The battle was not over till four in the afternoon, but the victory was complete on the part of the allies. The French could offer no resistance to the retreat to Hanau, which again gave the half-starved British, Hanoverians, and Austrians the command of abundant supplies. At Hanau they were joined by their reinforcements, and an invasion of France was even talked of. It was wise in King George not to be flushed with his triumph, and to resist the advice of Stair to attempt some perilous adventure. It was complained that the king did not listen to the counsels of his English officers, but had Hanoverian partialities. Stair, the duke of Marlborough, and others, resigned their commissions. The success of the allies in the campaign was completed with the expulsion of the French armies from Germany by the forces under Prince Charles of Lorraine. The king was received in England with an enthusiasm which he had never before excited. But the complaints of Lord Stair, and others, revived the old cry of Hanoverian influence. The Hanoverian White Horse, in cocked hat and jack-boots, riding the feeble British Lion, was the subject of a popular caricature.

In August, 1743, whilst the king was on the Continent, Henry Pelham, brother of the duke of Newcastle, had been appointed first lord of the treasury. Walpole had identified this office with the position of a prime minister; but Carteret, the secretary of state, who had accompanied George in his campaign, had really controlled the cabinet. Carteret was now the great object of attack from the opposition. He was the Hanoverian minister — the wicked minister. Succeeding to some of the power of Walpole, he had inherited no inconsiderable portion of the odium which attached to every servant of a king who, unfortunately, had other interests to promote than that of the country which had called his family to the throne. The violent tone of the parliamentary debates led foreigners to believe, as they always believe under such circumstances, that Great Britain was torn to pieces by internal dissensions, and that the time was ripe for dynastic changes, if not for invasion and conquest. It was this belief which suggested the abortive attempt of 1744, which we have briefly noticed. The instant that the country really appeared in danger, the most eloquent opponents of the administration — the most indignant declaimers against Hanoverian partialities — those who would have disbanded every foreign soldier, without any substitute for national defence — raised a voice in parliament for the defence of the nation and the throne, which, as in many similar instances, made foreigners wonder at the inconsistencies of representative assemblies. On the 20th of March, 1744, France declared war against England. There was an end of that anomalous state of things, in which two great states were fighting against each other, not as principals, but as auxiliaries of other governments. The English declaration of war was issued on the 31st of March.

The continental war of 1744 was chiefly marked by the sudden movement of the king of Prussia against the Austrians. He overran Bohemia; but evacuated it before the end of the year. The king of England, very much against his will, was restrained by the general voice of his council, with the exception of Carteret, now Earl Granville, from leaving England. The difference of opinion on these Hanoverian questions soon made it impossible that the ministry could hold together. Pelham had succeeded Walpole in his command of the house of commons. Granville had the king with him. It was clear which party would triumph. The king was obliged to part with his favourite — a man far more able than those who insisted on his dismissal, but whose very ability was more dangerous than their mediocrity. The duke

of Newcastle and his brother desired a coalition of parties. They wanted old jacobites, like Sir Hinde Cotton, to be associated with young patriots, like Chesterfield and Pitt. The greatest member of the opposition refused to take an office inferior to that of secretary of state. But Pitt did not oppose the new government. At the risk of that charge of inconsistency which feeble statesmen always dread, he supported a grant for the continuance of the army in Flanders — a measure which he had before opposed.

The earl of Chesterfield, before he entered upon the appointment he had accepted as lord-lieutenant of Ireland, went upon a mission to the Hague, to concert military operations with the Dutch government. The great object to be obtained was, that the duke of Cumberland should be appointed commander-in-chief of the confederate army. Before the campaign of 1745 was opened, the emperor Charles VII died at Munich. His son, the new elector of Bavaria, withdrew his claim to the Austrian succession, and separated his troops from the army of the French. Maria Theresa restored her conquests in Bavaria. In March, 1745, Lord Orford died. The evils which he had for many years averted by his pacific policy were coming thick upon his country.

The campaign of 1745 in Flanders was long memorable for such a display of the qualities of the British soldier as have often made the purely military nations of Europe look on with wonder. As often, in the long interval between the days of Marlborough and of Wellington, have they equally wondered at the incapacity of those commanders under whom these qualities were displayed.[k] On the 11th of May, 1745, a battle of more importance was fought between the French and allied armies of English and Dutch at Fontenoy. The duke of Cumberland, the king's younger son, was in command, and was opposed to the king of France and the dauphin, who followed the advice of the famous Marshal Saxe. Prodigies of valour can do no good unless they are directed to practical objects. The march of that column of Englishmen across a rough plain, in face of a great army, and commanded on both the flanks by infantry and artillery, filling up their ranks as the men fell, and keeping step as regularly as on parade — onward, onward — till the French princes were ordered to retire — till the marshal despaired of the battle — till all chance seemed gone of stopping that great avalanche of bayonet and sword that made so terrible an advance — this march is commemorated by French historians themselves as one of the greatest feats of arms on record. But the heroism was useless. Their Dutch auxiliaries took shamefully to flight at the very crisis of the engagement. A cannonade was opened on their front, and tore through the whole length of the column. They turned, but did not flee. With the same imperturbable steadiness they reversed their march, and the retreat of the whole army was conducted with such order that it lost all the obloquy of defeat. It was magnificent, but it was not war.

THE YOUNG PRETENDER IN SCOTLAND (1745–1746 A.D.)

Events thickened as the contest went on. The visit of George to Germany, and his threat of invading France, were returned by a visit from the pretender — no longer the stubborn James III, who had been so nearly crowned at Scone, but his gay and graceful son, the chevalier de St. George, well known to us in legend and ballad as the winner of every heart, and the "darling Charley" of a repentant nation. But the "young chevalier" is depicted in the soberer hues of history as a weak and selfish adventurer, who never comprehended the generosity of the high-souled supporters of his

[1745 A.D.]

cause, and who, in the words of one of his gallant adherents, when the day of trial came, "knew neither how to fight like a man nor to die like a gentleman." We can only remark that all the sad songs and beautiful laments which have gathered round this crazy expedition were never heard of till all chances of its success had disappeared. While it was going on, there was a little alarm at first, and afterwards a great deal of contempt; but it was left for the peaceful times of thirty years after the event to clothe with romance and poetry the attempt of a few savages and a few fanatics to overthrow a rapidly spreading civilisation and a religion of progress and improvement. Let us enjoy the jacobite ballads, and rejoice in the defeat of the jacobite cause.

The course of the rebellion was run within the year. Landing in July in the north of Scotland, with seven companions, of whom the majority were Irish, the prince was joined, though slowly and with a foreknowledge of their fate, by several Highland chiefs, who summoned their clans to aid. Their clans came to aid with the same alacrity with which they would have come to resist; for the laird's will was their only law. Clanronald, M'Donald, and, finally, Cameron of Lochiel, were great names to utter to Highland ears, and the march began. In August the royal standard was hoisted, and fifteen hundred of the Gaël gathered round it, and prepared for a rush on the fertile lowlands. There were very few troops to oppose them. Of the three thousand constituting the garrison of all Scotland, not above a half could be collected, under Sir John Cope — one of those wretched pedants from whom England has suffered so much — who would rather be defeated by rule than successful by original measures. The burden of the ballads, with reference to this hero of pigtail and pipe-clay, turns constantly on his want of watchfulness; and insulting inquiries are made whether he is asleep or awake. It makes very little difference whether a Sir John Cope's eyes are open or shut. Perth opened its gates on the 3rd of September. Edinburgh was entered on the 17th, and something like royalty began to hedge the prince when he dwelt in Holyrood, and held a levee in the capital. On the 21st was the battle of Pinkey, where the same impetuous rush of the wild men of the hills which had carried the victory of Killiecrankie, astonished the mechanical mind of Cope, who expected to be attacked in a regular and gentlemanly manner, and sent him, with horse, foot, and marines, in headlong flight before it.

Charles Edward had defeated the king's troops, and was now a potentate carrying on war. For a month he limited his exertions to assemblies and feasts in Edinburgh, watching the castle, which still held out against him, and then marched forward, and crossed the border on the 8th of November. Carlisle yielded, after a brief resistance, and the advance continued. Those five or six thousand Scotsmen, ill armed and not very decently apparelled, went forward from town to town in the populous Cumberland and industrious Yorkshire, wondering at all they saw, and expecting every moment to be met by troops. But they were neither met by troops nor joined by friends. They were neglected, and began to despair. They saw noble houses, and cultivated fields, and foreign gardens, and many other things they had never seen before, and were so impressed with awe that they only robbed larders and hen-roosts. Meantime, parties of ladies and gentlemen of the towns near the road hired post-chaises and drove across to see the Highlanders go by, as if they had been a caravan of wild animals. Soldiers were gathering from abroad; the relics of the glorious column of Fontenoy came over with the duke of Cumberland; the archbishop of York mounted his horse as a prince of the church; newspapers roused the people to defend their Protestant

freedom, and resist a nominee of the French king, who had promised him twelve thousand men. So when the poor mountaineers from Kinloch Moidart had got all the way up to Derby, and found that the panic had passed away, that old George was courageous as at Dettingen, and pooh-poohed the whole business as a farce, the leaders differed, quarrelled, and fought, and Charles Edward, finding no enemy to oppose him, no multitudes to assist him, lost confidence in his followers and himself, and gave orders for retreat (December 6th).

Battles of Falkirk and Culloden

He got back to Carlisle, and left a garrison to protect his rear. Cumberland came thundering in pursuit, and took the garrison prisoners, earning the detested name of the Butcher by his cruelty to the misguided men. Onward the prince proceeded through Dumfries, which he put to ransom; Glasgow, where he raised a forced contribution; and, finally, to Stirling, where he counted his forces, and found he had nine thousand men. General Cope had a fitting rival in General Hawley, who commanded the king's troops at Falkirk (January 18th, 1746). The same faults were committed with the same result. The Highland rush discomposed the martinet, and in twenty minutes half of each army considered itself defeated. Hawley persisted longest in this erroneous belief, and retired to Edinburgh, and Charles Edward believed himself every inch a king once more.

But the Butcher was on his track. By the time Cumberland got to Aberdeen, the prince was at Inverness, for all hope of England or Scotland was at an end. Enough if he could effect his escape, and get his followers to defend him to the last. This they resolved to do and, after a mad attempt to surprise the enemy at Nairn, waited, grim and terrible, on the dark moor that stretches near the town of Inverness.

On the 16th of April, 1746, at the battle of Culloden, weary expectation came to an end. Trained soldiers from the Flemish wars, well fed, well clothed, and well officered, were now opposed to the wasted, hungry battalions of the Gaël, who scarcely recognised their chiefs in their military characters, and were broken down with the fatigues they had undergone. Courage, of course, was there, and desperate effort and generous devotion to the cause they had adopted; but these were of no avail against unflinching bayonets, heavy charges of horse, and a battery of artillery well served. In an hour all was confusion and dismay. The Highlanders, once broken, never could form again. The prince fled with his chief officers, and the infuriated English knocked out the brains of the wounded as they lay on the field, or dragged prisoners into the open air, and shot them by the dozen at a time. The pitiless executions of that sanguinary son of George II brought more weakness to the Hanoverian cause than a defeat would have done. By the Scots it was looked on as brutal hard-heartedness towards their own countrymen, for after all Donald was a Scotsman too; and by the English as a cowardly revenge for the alarm he had suffered. Hated, therefore, by both nations as a revengeful tyrant, the duke of Cumberland, while in England, retired from public life.

Escape of Charles; Prosecution of his Adherents

Charles Edward got safely off at last after a series of surprising and delightful adventures, which, even without the colouring given them by party spirit,

[1746 A.D.]

revealed such truthfulness in the Celtic character, and such devotion and purity in the heroic maidens, like Flora Macdonald, who aided his escape, that they are read like a chapter of romance.[l]

For some time he and his followers resided in a singular retreat, called the Cage, on the side of Mount Benalder; it was concealed by a close thicket, and half-suspended in the air. At this place Charles received intelligence that two French vessels, sent out expressly for his deliverance, under the direction of Colonel Warren of Dillon's regiment and with that officer on board, had anchored in Lochnanuagh. Immediately setting off for that place, but travelling only by night, he embarked on the 20th of September, attended by Lochiel, Colonel Roy Stuart, and about one hundred other persons, who had gathered at the news. It was the very same spot where Charles had landed fourteen months before, but how changed since that time, both his fate and his feelings! With what different emotions must he have gazed upon those desolate mountains, when stepping from his ship in the ardour of hope and coming victory; and now, when he saw them fade away in the blue distance, and bade them an everlasting farewell! Rapidly did his vessel bear him from the Scottish shores; concealed by a fog, he sailed through the midst of the English fleet; and he safely landed at the little port of Roscoff, near Morlaix, on the 29th of September.

The Scottish prisoners were removed for trial to England, lest their own countrymen should show them partiality or pity. At one time there were no less than 385 crowded together at Carlisle; of these, however, the common men were permitted to cast lots, one in twenty to be tried and hanged, the rest to be transported. There was no difficulty in obtaining proofs against individuals who had so openly appeared in arms. Amongst the earliest sufferers were Colonel Townley and eight other officers or privates of the Manchester regiment, who were hanged on Kennington Common near London. Other executions took place at York, at Brampton, and at Penrith; in all there were nearly eighty. The barbarous ceremony of disembowelling, mangling, and casting the hearts into a fire was not omitted, nor did it fail — such is the vulgar appetite for the horrible! — to draw forth exulting shouts from the spectators. Differing as the sufferers did in age, in rank, and temper, they yet, with scarcely an exception, agreed in their behaviour on the scaffold; all dying with firmness and courage, asserting the justice of their cause, and praying for the exiled family. Amongst these numerous condemnations the one perhaps of all others most open to exception was that of Charles Radcliffe, brother of the earl of Derwentwater, beheaded in 1716. Charles Radcliffe had then avoided a like fate by breaking from prison; he had lately been captured on board a French vessel bound for Scotland, with supplies for the insurgents; and he was now, after a long confinement, put to death upon his former sentence, which had slumbered for thirty years.

The noblemen who appeared for trial before their peers in July, 1746, were the earls of Cromarty and Kilmarnock, and Lord Balmerino. The two earls pleaded guilty, expressing the deepest remorse for their conduct, while Balmerino endeavoured to avail himself of a flaw in the indictment, as not having been at Carlisle on the day it set forth; but this being overruled, he declared that he would give their lordships no further trouble. On being brought up to receive sentence, both Cromarty and Kilmarnock earnestly sued for mercy. "My own fate," said Cromarty, "is the least part of my sufferings. But, my lords, I have involved an affectionate wife with an unborn infant as parties of my guilt to share its penalties. I have involved my eldest son, whose youth and regard for his parents hurried him down the

stream of rebellion. I have involved also eight innocent children, who must feel their parent's punishment before they know his guilt. Let the silent eloquence of their grief and tears supply my want of persuasion!" Kilmarnock urged, in extenuation of his own offence, the excellent principles he had instilled into his heir, "having my eldest son in the duke's army fighting for the liberties of his country at Culloden, where his unhappy father was in arms to destroy them!" But no acknowledgment of error, no application for mercy could be wrung from the haughty soul of Balmerino. In compassion chiefly to Lady Cromarty, who was far advanced in pregnancy, a pardon was granted to her husband, but the two others were ordered for execution on Tower Hill on the 18th of August. Kilmarnock met his fate with sufficient steadiness combined with penitence, owning to the last the heinousness of his rebellion. His companion in misfortune, on the contrary, as a frank resolute soldier, persevered and gloried in his principles. When at the gate of the Tower and on their way to the scaffold, the officers had ended the words of form with the usual prayer "God save King George!" Kilmarnock devoutly sighed "Amen"; but Balmerino stood up and replied in a loud voice, "God save King James!" And as he laid his head on the block he said: "If I had a thousand lives, I would lay them all down here in the same cause!"

The last of the martyrs, as their own party chose to call them, was Lord Lovat. Not having appeared in arms, nor committed any overt act of treason, this grey-haired hypocrite could not be so readily convicted as the bolder and better men who had walked before him to the scaffold. But a king's evidence was obtained in John Murray of Broughton, lately Prince Charles' secretary, who now consented to purchase safety for himself by betraying the secrets and hazarding the lives of his former friends. It was he who revealed to the government the whole train and tissue of the jacobite conspiracy since 1740, although, as the law requires two witnesses in charges of treason, it was not possible to proceed further against the duke of Beaufort, Sir Watkin Wynn, or other English jacobites; nor indeed did the government show any wish for their impeachment. In the case of Lovat, however, his own letters to the chevalier were produced by Murray, other conclusive documents and some corroborating evidence from his clansmen were also brought forward, and his guilt was thus established in the clearest and most legal manner. His trial, which did not commence until March, 1747, continued during several days. Lovat's own behaviour was a strange compound of meanness, levity, and courage — sometimes writing to the duke of Cumberland for mercy, and pleading how he had carried his royal highness in his arms, when a child, about the parks of Kensington and Hampton Court; sometimes striving by chicanery to perplex or rebut the proofs against him; sometimes indulging in ridiculous jests. "I did not think it possible," says Horace Walpole, "to feel so little as I did at so melancholy a spectacle, but tyranny and villany wound up by buffoonery took off all edge of compassion." When after his sentence he was taken from the bar, he cried, "Farewell, my lords, we shall never all again meet in the same place!" Like Balmerino and Kilmarnock, he was beheaded on Tower Hill; and he died with great composure and intrepidity, attended by a Roman Catholic priest, and repeating on the scaffold the noble line of Horace, *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.* But in truth no man was less strongly imbued with that sentiment — except perhaps its writer!

A few weeks afterwards, there happily passed an Act of Indemnity, granting a pardon to all persons who had committed treason, but clogged

[1747 A.D.]

with about eighty exceptions. By other legislative measures passed, with little opposition, the Disarming Act, the abolition of heritable jurisdictions, and the prohibition of the Highland garb, it was sought to precipitate the fall of feudal power, and to subdue the spirit of the vanquished mountaineers.[b]

PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS; THE RISE OF PITT

The interval between the suppression of the Scottish Rebellion, in 1746, and the conclusion of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, is perhaps as little interesting in its details as any period of English history. Nor are there many exciting events to give spirit to a narrative of the remaining six years of that administration which was broken up by the death of Mr. Pelham in 1754. Opinion became torpid after the excitement of the rebellion had passed away. Jacobitism slunk to its hiding-places. Patriotism looked out for pensions and sinecures. Party contests had nearly subsided into personal struggles for place and power, which those who are curious as to such mysterious affairs may drowsily meditate upon in the sober narrative of Coxe,[g] or laugh over in the sarcastic anecdotes of Walpole. During the agony of the rebellion, immediately after the defeat at Falkirk — at a time when it might be supposed that English statesmen would have cast away their petty ambitions — there came what is termed a ministerial crisis. Lord Granville (Carteret), although out of office, had the confidence of the king; whilst the duke of Newcastle, and his brother, Mr. Pelham, his majesty's chief ministers, were not favourites with him. They resolved to try their strength. They demanded office for Mr. Pitt, rather from their fear of him than from their love.

The king refused to give a place to one who had so bitterly thwarted his Hanoverian partialities. The Pelhams and the whole body of their whig followers resigned. Granville became minister — for forty-eight hours; for he could command no parliamentary support. The Pelhams returned triumphantly to power, upon their own terms; giving Pitt an office, but one which would not necessarily bring him into personal intercourse with the king. After this victory the Pelhams had little to fear even from the dislike or the coldness of their sovereign. The cabinet had little to dread but jealousies and dissensions amongst its members. It continued its temporising course through eight years of a monopoly of the real authority of the state. Opposition was hushed. The great parliamentary orators, Pitt, Fox, Murray, were propitiated into silence by office, and bided their time for power. The bitter opponents of Walpole and Carteret were no longer "the boys." Pitt professed to have cast away some of the extreme opinions of his nonage. "Never," says a reviewer of the Pelham administration, "was the tempestuous sea of parliament lulled into a profounder calm."

The appointment under the Pelhams of William Pitt to an office, however secondary, is an event of historical importance. The king refused to nominate him secretary at war — a post in which his energy might have produced some more decided successes than were obtained previous to the peace of 1748 by the supine Pelhams. Pitt was first appointed vice-treasurer of Ireland, and within a few months was promoted to be paymaster-general. The character of Pitt, who, without wealth or high birth, had made himself the marked man of his time, was now developed in a way that must have been somewhat incomprehensible to the greedy aspirants for the emoluments of place. He received his salary; he disdained to pocket more than his salary. The paymaster-general used to retain a hundred thousand pounds as a bal-

ance in his own hands, which he invested in government securities, for his private benefit; the public thus paying interest upon their own money to their own salaried servant. Pitt sent every balance, as it accrued, to the Bank of England, to be available for its proper purposes. The indirect modes in which ministers of state grew rich, through other means than the legal receipts of their highly paid offices, received another illustration from the self-denial of this extraordinary paymaster. When a subsidy was advanced to a foreign power, it had been customary for the itching palm of office to demand half per cent. as its honorarium. Pitt astonished the king of Sardinia by sending him without deduction the sum which parliament had voted; and he raised his majesty's astonishment still higher when he refused a present as a compliment to his integrity. Pitt was a poor man; but he had higher aspirations than the *auri sacra fames* of a venal age. His pride, which betrayed him into many errors, saved him from the degradation of the meanest of passions. Amidst their general contempt for the government, the people came to know that there was one man who professed some regard for public virtue.

END OF THE AUSTRIAN WAR; THE PEACE OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE

When the British troops, and foreign troops in the pay of Great Britain, had been withdrawn from the Low Countries to put down rebellion and defend British shores, the successes of the French were rapid and decisive. All the Austrian Netherlands submitted to their arms. On the other hand, the French were driven out of Italy by the Austrians and Sardinians. The year 1746 offered no prospect of a speedy termination of the war. In 1747 the maritime power of the country was signally asserted. Admiral Anson, on the 3rd of May, captured, sunk, or destroyed the French fleet off Cape Finisterre. The fleet thus annihilated had for its principal object to attempt the recovery of Cape Breton, which had been taken from the French in 1745. Commodore Fox, on the 16th of June, took forty French ships, richly laden from the West Indies. Admiral Hawke, on the 14th of October, defeated a French fleet off Belle-Île. England had acquired full confidence in the might of her naval arm. Her Channel fleet had rendered invasion almost impossible during the troubles of 1745. She had bold and skilful admirals. She had hardy seamen, confident in their national superiority if they were well commanded. The land operations of 1747 were of a different character.

The political importance of Holland had for some years been frittered away by an imbecile government. The republic was losing its ancient place amongst the European nations. Its thriving cities appeared likely, in the apparent decay of the old warlike spirit, to become the prey of the same enemy that had been driven back by the energy of William of Orange. Upon the death of that prince, the office of hereditary stadholder had been merged in that of grand pensionary. Louis XV in 1747 sent an army of twenty thousand men to invade Brabant. The hearts of the Dutch people were roused as in 1672; and they sought the same means of deliverance as at that period. Prince William of Nassau was proclaimed stadholder; and to him were entrusted the means of national defence. This young man had succeeded, as captain-general and lord high admiral, to the powers held by William III; but the popular acclamation could not evoke in him those qualities which made his great predecessor the saviour of his country. He was the son-in-law of George II. The favourite son of George and the husband of his daughter were to command the allied forces of British and Dutch.

[1747-1748 A.D.]

"Our two young heroes agree but little," wrote Mr. Pelham. "Our own is open, frank, resolute, and perhaps hasty; the other assuming, pedantic, ratiocinating, and tenacious." On the 2nd of July, at Lauffeld, near Maestricht, the "two young heroes," with an Austrian army commanded by Marshal Bathiany, were to encounter the French headed by Marshal Saxe. The duke of Cumberland, with his British, fought with desperation. "His royal highness' valour has shone extremely," says Walpole, "at the expense of his judgment. His prowess is so well established that it grows time for him to exert other qualities of a general." The prince of Nassau, with his Dutch, got out of the fight as soon as possible. The Austrian marshal never moved from his intrenched position. There was a terrible slaughter of the British and the French. Sir John Ligonier, who had commanded the English cavalry, was taken prisoner. Louis XV, who was present at the battle, hinted to this general, who first came to England as a French Protestant refugee, that it would be better to think of peace than to witness the destruction of so many brave men. Marshal Saxe talked confidentially with the prisoner upon the same subject. The war still went on unfavourably for the allies, Bergen-op-Zoom having surrendered to the French in September. Louis expressed sentiments of moderation; and finally Ligonier was sent by the French king to the duke of Cumberland, to intimate his desire that they should meet, and agree upon terms of peace. The English ministry did not believe that the duke was exactly fitted for a negotiator; and, much to his father's annoyance, sent the earl of Sandwich to watch over him. But it was many months before peace was accomplished. The "two young heroes" wanted more fighting. George II wanted to obtain some paltry advantage for his beloved Hanover which might be won by another campaign.

A congress was opened at Aix-la-Chapelle in March, 1748; even while the war of British, Dutch, and Austrians against the French was going on in Flanders. In April it became pretty clear that Cumberland, always ready to fight, was no match for De Saxe, who fought only when he saw his advantage in fighting. The French marshal had so conducted his operations that for Cumberland to hazard another battle before Maestricht would have been a rashness too great for an English ministry to sanction. The pacific members of the cabinet outvoted the warlike; and Mr. Pelham wrote to Lord Sandwich that, as it was impossible to check the progress of the French army, or to reconcile the discordant pretensions of the allies, the king resolved to accept the conditions of peace proposed by France, without having the concurrence of the other powers. The preliminaries were signed by the plenipotentiaries of England, Holland, and France, at the end of April.

The king, in his speech on opening the session of the new parliament in November, 1747, had announced that overtures of pacification had been made by France. He looked back to the origin of the war: "By the advice of my parliament I entered into the war against Spain, to vindicate and secure the trade and commerce of my subjects." The bells were ringing in October, 1739, upon the declaration of hostilities against Spain. They were ringing in April, 1748, upon the conclusion of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, by which not a single point was gained for which England had been fighting with Spain and France for eight years. The peace was such as a nation makes when it is weary of blood-shedding; when its government can no longer trust to the repetition of the parrot words, "just and necessary war." All conquests, in all parts of the world, that had been made by any of the powers engaged in the war, were to be restored. The English grumbled about the restitution of Cape Breton. They grumbled more, that the right of search claimed by

Spain off her American coasts should have been left precisely in its former position — a constant source of violence and animosity. One point was gained, which George and his ministers not unnaturally held of importance. The pretender and his descendants were to be renounced. Charles Edward was to be expelled from France. The French government intimated its intention to behave compassionately to the young prince who had dared and endured so much for his family. They proposed to establish him at Fribourg, with an adequate pension, and the honours that attached to the empty title of prince of Wales. The young man, with characteristic obstinacy, refused to quit Paris. He was entreated; he was threatened; but he defied what he termed the orders of the house of Hanover. He was at last arrested as he was going to the opera; imprisoned for a few days at Vincennes; and then turned loose on the frontier of Savoy.

The termination of the war was publicly celebrated as if it had been the glorious result of sagacious counsels and military bravery. On the 27th of April, 1749, there was an unequalled display of fireworks in the Green Park. Handel composed a grand overture of warlike instruments. An Italian artist designed a temple, a hundred and fourteen feet high, with statues and pictures — heathen gods and cardinal virtues; Neptune drawn by sea-horses; Mars drawn by three lions. The king was recorded in Latin inscriptions as having given peace to Europe, secured the faith of treaties, restored and enlarged commerce. Britannia joined hands with France and Spain, in renewed concord and for mutual benefit. The people were pleased, and cared little for caricatures in which the fireworks were called "the grand whim for posterity to laugh at." But the shouts of the multitude were not echoed in parliament. Mr. Pelham, who carried political candour somewhat beyond the point of prudence, spoke of the necessity for this peace in a tone which indicated very much of that prostration of national spirit of which there were too many evidences at this particular period. In a speech on the 5th of February, 1750, in reply to a motion of Lord Egmont on the article of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle respecting Dunkirk, Mr. Pelham, as head of the administration, said that the wonder was that England could have obtained such good terms as she did; that another campaign would have made the French masters of the Dutch provinces; that if the Dutch had joined France "in alliance against this country, we should not long have preserved our superiority at sea, the loss of which would soon have put an end to our sitting here, to debate about the demolition of Dunkirk, or any other point relating to the honour or interest of Great Britain."

THE REFORM OF THE CALENDAR (1751 A.D.)

The parliament which had commenced its sittings in November, 1747, was continued through its full septennial period until April, 1754. This tenth parliament of Great Britain holds an honourable place in history for two measures of permanent utility — the reform of the calendar, and the Marriage Act. The reform of the calendar, in 1751, is a measure of which no one can be more sensible of the advantage than he who has to write the annals of his country. The change which Pope Gregory XIII had introduced in 1582 had gradually been adopted by all European states except England, Russia, and Sweden. Thus, in reading a French historian, we not only find an event bearing date ten or eleven days in advance of the date of an English narrative, but the year is made to begin from the 1st of January in the foreign annalist instead of the 25th of March, as in the English. To prevent mistakes arising



DR. JOHNSON IN THE ANTE-ROOM OF LORD CHESTERFIELD

(From the painting by E. M. Ward, R.A. in the Tate Gallery)

[1751 A.D.]

out of this confusion requires perpetual vigilance in the historical writer. To attempt to reconcile these discrepancies in all cases would be needless; and most annalists are generally content to take the dates as they find them. The energy of Lord Chesterfield — a man of great and various ability, who had filled high offices, but in 1751 had retired from ministerial business — carried this reform through, with the learned aid of Lord Macclesfield, who was afterwards president of the Royal Society. The commencement of the year on the 1st of January was not calculated to disturb any popular prejudice; for the 25th of February, 1751, on which day the bill was introduced into the house of lords, was ordinarily written 25th February, 1750–51. But the necessity for another change was thus indicated by Lord Macclesfield: "The same day which, in each month, is with us the first, is called the twelfth day of the month throughout almost all the other parts of Europe; and in like manner, through all the other days of the month, we are just eleven days behind them." To make the legal year correspond in all future time with the solar year, was the result of scientific calculations, the rationale of which is now generally understood. It was necessary also to make a change in the calendar as to the time of finding Easter. There were many minor regulations essential to be provided for in consequence of the great change. The payments of rents, annuities, and salaries for public service were not to be accelerated; and thus the 5th of July, the 10th of October, the 5th of January, and the 5th of April, long held their place as rent days; and the dividends upon stock are still paid at those periods.

It may be supposed that such a reform, however valuable, would not be made without some popular discontent. The timid Newcastle told Chesterfield that he hated new-fangled things — that he had better not meddle with matters so long established. The witty earl was wiser. He made a speech of which he has given a most ingenuous account in a letter to his son: "I consulted the ablest lawyers and the most skilful astronomers, and we cooked up a bill for that purpose. But then my difficulty began. I was to bring in this bill, which was necessarily composed of law-jargon and astronomical calculations, to both which I am an utter stranger. However, it was absolutely necessary to make the house of lords think that I knew something of the matter; and also make them believe that they knew something of it themselves, which they do not. For my own part, I could just as soon have talked Celtic or Slavonian to them, as astronomy, and they would have understood me full as well; so I resolved to do better than speak to the purpose, and to please instead of informing them." The peers were amused by Chesterfield; the thinking part of the nation were convinced by Macclesfield, who published his speech. Hogarth has immortalised the vulgar opposition to the reform of the calendar in his picture of *An Election Feast*, in which the popular prejudices are flattered by the whig candidate in his banner inscribed with "Give us our eleven days."

DEATH OF THE PRINCE OF WALES (1751 A.D.)

In 1751 an event occurred which, for some time, disturbed all the calculations of the scheming politicians of this intriguing age. Frederick, prince of Wales, died after a short illness on the 20th of March. Leicester house, his town abode, had long been the central point of opposition to the government. We have seen how far the unhappy estrangement of the prince from his parents was carried before the death of Queen Caroline. Years had passed over, and yet the animosities between the reigning king and the heir-apparent were never

subdued. In 1751 George II, although a hale man, was in his sixty-eighth year. The worshippers of the rising sun grew bolder in their devotion. Bubb Doddington, the treasurer of the navy, resigned his office in March, 1749, having received a message from the prince that the principal direction of his royal highness' affairs should be put in the skilful intriguer's hands. He saw the prince at Kew, and was told that "what he could not do for me in his present situation must be made up to me in futurity." The prince further said "that he thought a peerage, with the management of the house of lords, and the seals of secretary of state for the southern provinces, would be a proper station for me, if I approved of it." Such was the mode in which England was to be governed by favoritism, had she endured the misfortune of a King Frederick I.

THE JEW BILL; THE MARRIAGE ACT (1753 A.D.)

The opposition to the measure known as the Jew Bill, and the ultimate fate of this attempt to render some justice to an industrious and thriving portion of the community, is one of the many proofs of the difficulty which attends a government when it is more enlightened than the people it governs. A bill was introduced in the commons, in the session of 1753, "which enabled all Jews to prefer bills of naturalisation in parliament, without receiving the sacrament." It was not a sweeping bill for the naturalisation of the whole body of Jews at once. The clamour which arose against this measure was not more illiberal than the arguments by which it was opposed in parliament. "If the Jews should come," said the city member, Sir John Barnard, "to be possessed of a great share of the land of the kingdom, how are we sure that Christianity will continue to be the fashionable religion?" But the worthy merchant delivered a sentiment which would come more nearly home to his fellow citizens: to put Jews, or any other foreigners, upon an equal footing with natives, would be only to take the bread out of the mouths of their own people, without adding anything to the national commerce. To naturalise Jews, said another member, was to rob Christians of their birthright. To allow Jews, said another, to purchase and hold land estates, was to give the lie to all the prophecies of the New Testament: they are to remain without any fixed habitation until they acknowledge Christ to be the Messiah. The bill was passed in the commons by a majority of forty-one. In the lords it was also carried, and received the support of many bishops. The prelates who had thus the courage to advocate this truly Christian measure were libelled by pamphlets and hooted by mobs.

The Marriage Act of 1753 was almost as unpopular as the Act for Jewish Naturalisation. The bill introduced by the chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, required that a marriage should be preceded by the publication of banns in a parish church, and that the marriage should be there celebrated; that a licence might be granted for a marriage to take place also in a parish church, but with the consent of parent or guardian if granted to a minor, or minors; that special licences might, as previously, be granted by the archbishop of a diocese. The proposed measure passed the peers; but in the commons it was resisted with a violence which is amusing to look back upon. Mr. Fox, who had clandestinely married the daughter of the duke of Richmond, was amongst the most strenuous of its opponents. It was carried, however, by a large majority. Goldsmith,[p] who published his *History of England* in 1771, sums up, with much gravity, his belief in the injurious consequences to society which this measure had produced: "The poor, by being prevented from

making alliances with the rich, have left wealth to flow in its ancient channel and thus to accumulate, contrary to the interests of the state. It has been found to impede marriage, by clogging it with unnecessary ceremonies. Some have affirmed that lewdness and debauchery have become more frequent since the enactment of this law; and it is believed that the numbers of the people are upon the decline." Goldsmith had no foundation for his assertion that the law had been found to impede marriage. "The number of marriages before the act of 1753 is not known. Since the act came into operation the registers of marriage have been preserved in England, and show an increase from 50,972 in the year 1756, to 63,310 in 1764."

One thriving occupation was seriously damaged by the new Marriage Act; and we do not find that any compensation was voted to the sufferers. Mr. Robert Nugent, one of the parliamentary orators against the act, said, "How fond our people are of private marriages, and of saving a little money, we may be convinced of by the multitude of marriages at Keith's chapel, compared with the number at any parish church." The reverend Alexander Keith originally officiated in May Fair; but being excommunicated, and committed to the Fleet, he continued to carry on the old trade by the agency of curates. According to Mr. Nugent, "at Keith's chapel there have been six thousand married in a year." Keith published a pamphlet during the progress of the bill, in which he said that the pure design of the measure was to suppress his chapel — a very worthy design, however Mr. Nugent might approve of the celerity and cheapness of Keith's ceremonials. May Fair was the fashionable "marriage shop"; but the Fleet prison had the advantage of being open to the humblest seekers of conjugal happiness. Keith generously records of this rival establishment, "I have often heard a Fleet parson say that many have come to be married when they have had but half-a-crown in their pockets and sixpence to buy a pot of beer, and for which they have pawned some of their clothes." The motto which worthy Mr. Keith affixed to his pamphlet was "Happy is the wooing that is not long a-doing"; and he avers that of the many thousands he had married the generality had been acquainted not more than a week, some only a day, or half a day.

The Marriage Act of 1753 has been justly regarded as the great step in the improvement of the conjugal relations of the people of England, high and low. Marriage was to become a solemn contract, in every case; not to be rushed upon without deliberation; not to be ratified without witnesses and public record. Like every other improvement in manners, the social tendency had preceded the legislative action to some limited extent; and then the legal reform hastened on the social amelioration. To the great change in the family relations of this country, of which the Marriage Act was an exponent as well as a cause, has been attributed the wondrous growth of the population in the ensuing century.

NEWCASTLE, FOX, AND PITT

The prime minister, Mr. Pelham, died on the 6th of March, 1754. Horace Walpole,[c] who underrates the public services of this statesman, has this tribute to his moderation and disinterestedness: "Let it be remembered that, though he first taught or experienced universal servility in Englishmen, yet he lived without abusing his power, and died poor." The king clearly saw what a hubbub of conflicting ambitions would result from the necessity of a new cast of characters for the political drama. "I shall now have no more peace," exclaimed the old man. The duke of Newcastle achieved the great

object of his ambition, in succeeding his brother as the head of the treasury. If experience could give a politician claims to be the ruler of a great nation, and moreover of a nation very difficult to manage, Newcastle had claims above most men. He had been secretary of state in 1724, under Sir Robert Walpole. Carteret had kept him in the same office, though he despised him. His thirst for power was insatiable. He impaired his estate to maintain and extend his parliamentary influence; and thus, whoever was turned out, Newcastle always kept in. Jealous of every man of ability to whom it was necessary to intrust some share of authority, he was always in terror that his subalterns might be called to command, although ever professing his anxiety for their promotion. Always seeking the doubtful support of "troops of friends," he never offended any man by a plain "No," and was often "under the same engagements to at least ten competitors," as Lord Waldegrave affirms. But he was in many respects incompetent to manage any public business that required resolution and steadiness; and his ignorance was so manifested in his flighty and inconsistent talk that what looks like a joke in Smollett's novel has been received as a reliable fact. He had heard that thirty thousand French had marched to Cape Breton. Where did they get transports? was asked. "Transports," cried he, "I tell you they marched by land." "By land to the island of Cape Breton!" "What! is Cape Breton an island?" It was pointed out in the map; and the delighted minister, hugging his informant, ejaculated, "Egad! I'll go directly, and tell the king that Cape Breton is an island."

In the house of lords, the duke's performances are thus described by a just and impartial observer: "Hear him speak in parliament, his manner is ungraceful, his language barbarous, his reasoning inconclusive. At the same time, he labours through all the confusion of a debate without the least distrust of his own abilities; fights boldly in the dark; never gives up the cause; nor is he ever at a loss either for words or argument." He has had many successors in this line; but at that period the house of commons required to be managed by a different species of oratory. Three of the great masters of eloquence were in that house — Pitt, Fox, and Murray. Newcastle offered the seals of secretary of state, with the lead of the commons, to Mr. Fox. The offer was fully justified by the ability and the experience of this gentleman, who started in public life — "a needy political adventurer," as he has been called — "at a time when the standard of integrity amongst statesmen was low."

This adherent of Sir Robert Walpole would not shrink from any participation in the corruption which gave ascendancy to the duke of Newcastle. Fox desired to be actively engaged in working the parliamentary system. As secretary of war, he had no seat in the cabinet; no responsibility beyond the routine duties of his office. The prospect of a place which would give him real power raised all the ambition of Fox; who, says Lord Hardwicke,[q] "within a few hours of Mr. Pelham's death, had made strong advances to the duke of Newcastle and myself." But there was a hitch in the completion of the arrangement proposed by Newcastle, which is singularly indicative of the political degradation of those times. Fox agreed to accept the secretaryship and the management of the house of commons. He very reluctantly gave up the disposal of the secret service money, but he stipulated that he was to know how the bribes were disposed of. The next day, Newcastle receded from this condition. How am I to understand, said Fox, how to talk to members of parliament, when some have received "gratifications," and others not? His brother, said Newcastle, had never disclosed these things, nor

[1754 A.D.]

would he. How, asked Fox, are the ministerial boroughs to be filled up? That is all settled, said the duke. Fox rejected the secretaryship; and Newcastle had to look out for a more pliant tool.

The prime minister and the lord chancellor appear now to have turned their thoughts to Mr. Pitt. There are apologetical letters to him from these great personages, obscurely intimating the difficulties which they had encountered in their abortive endeavours to add his strength to their party. Sir Thomas Robinson, a dull diplomatist, was appointed to the office which Fox had rejected. Pitt was indignant. The humiliation of his proud spirit may be read in this passage of a letter to Lord Hardwicke: "The weight of irremoveable royal displeasure is a load too great to move under; it must crush any man; it has sunk and broke me. I succumb; and wish for nothing but a decent and innocent retreat, wherein I may no longer, by continuing in the public stream of promotion, forever stick fast aground, and afford to the world the ridiculous spectacle of being passed by every boat that navigates the same river." Pitt found his consolations in a happy marriage with Lady Hester Grenville, a sister of Earl Temple. The calm of the domestic life of this eminent man presents a refreshing contrast to the agitations of his public career. Whenever we have glimpses of him in his country retreat at Hayes, we see him in the full enjoyment of as much tranquil pleasure as his infirm health would allow — exercising his taste in improving his little property; reading; educating his children; an exemplary husband and father in a dissipated age. Of those wonderful powers which gave him, without vanity, the right to claim the highest position amongst public men, his contemporaries were fully aware. We cannot judge, as they could, of that eloquence of which the admiration may appear to us overcharged, when we regard the fragmentary state in which it has come down to us. His faults were patent to all the world. They have been much paraded of late years — his haughtiness, his intractability, his self-assertion. But after a century and a half has passed, and all the petty men and paltry interests of the first William Pitt's time are hastening to oblivion, his grand figure stands out — a giant amongst pigmies. In the words of Frederick of Prussia, England had at length brought forth a man.

The Newcastle ministry, formed out of very fragile materials, had some months of respite from parliamentary opposition. The septennial term of parliament was nearly out when Mr. Pelham died. It was dissolved within a month of his decease. The new parliament met on the 14th of November. Pitt and Fox continued in their subordinate offices — Pitt as paymaster, Fox as secretary of war. But they each writhed under the arrangements by which Robinson had taken the management of the house of commons. "The duke might as well send his jack-boot to lead us," said Pitt to Fox. They could not decently obstruct public business, but they might attack persons. The feeble leader of the commons had an uneasy time between these two malcontents. "They have already mumbled poor Sir Thomas Robinson cruelly," writes Walpole on the 1st of December. But about this time a scene was acted which startled the house of commons out of its habitual slumber. An election petition is presented, which the younger Mr. Delaval ridicules; and the house is in fits of laughter about a complaint of bribery and corruption. Pitt is sitting in the gallery. He rushes down, and instantly rises to speak. "Do members laugh on such a subject as bribery? Do we try within the house to diminish our own dignity, when such attacks are made upon it from without?" "At his first two periods," says Fox, "he brought the house to a silence and attention that you might have heard a pin drop." He called upon the

speaker to extend a saving hand to raise the character of the house. "He called on all to assist, or else we should only sit to register the arbitrary edicts of one too powerful a subject." Newcastle was as much terrified by "this thunderbolt thrown in a sky so long serene," as the audience of Pitt were confounded. The minister contrived, by giving Fox a seat in the cabinet, to detach him from his concert with Pitt. Pitt felt the desertion; and told Fox that "they were upon different lines." It appears that the devotion of Fox to the will of the duke of Cumberland, "whose soldier Mr. Pitt was not," was an additional cause for this separation of their political action. Newcastle had silenced one of his formidable opponents. The other gave him no trouble for the rest of the session.

BORDER WARFARE IN AMERICA (1754 A.D.)

Events were maturing at this period which rendered it essentially important that England should have a firm and capable government. On the 25th of March, 1755, the king sent a message to both houses, to acquaint them that "the present situation of affairs makes it necessary to augment his forces by sea and land; and to take such other measures as may best tend to preserve the general peace of Europe, and to secure the just rights and possessions of his crown in America." The danger to America was from France, with whose colonists there had been perpetual disputes as to boundaries and alleged rights, from the period of the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.

The possession of Canada by France was a perpetual source of disquiet to the British colonists of New England, and of Virginia and Pennsylvania. The French Canadian settlers had penetrated to the Ohio, and had there built a fort which they named Duquesne. On the Ohio, the Virginians had also a fort called Block's Town. The settlement of Virginia, at this period, extended about two hundred miles from the seacoast, and spread over about one third of the state, according to its present limits. Its population was about two hundred thousand, of whom more than a fourth were slaves. The territory then unoccupied by the descendants of the colonists of the reign of James I was the hunting-ground of Indians; and the Virginians upon the Ohio were traders in skins. The French, also, were seeking a participation in that commerce which quickly perishes, as the extension of civilisation creates more profitable industries. The old families of Virginia were engaged in far more lucrative and less adventurous occupations than in exchanges with the Indians. They were cultivating tobacco upon every estate. Their tobacco fields were the Potosi of the first settlers of North America. Tobacco was their sole article of export. It brought them all the comforts and luxuries which England and Scotland could supply. It was the general measure of value, and the principal currency. Public officers, ministers of the church, had their salaries paid at so many annual pounds of tobacco. In 1758 the colony exported seventy thousand hogsheads of the precious weed, equivalent to seventy millions of pounds. The price was ten times higher than the present rate. Virginia was thriving. Her planters lived luxuriously on their estates, surrounded by their slaves, and affecting the aristocratic habits of grand old English families, from which many of them claimed to have sprung. Hospitable they were to profusion. In such a state of society was George Washington born; who, in 1754, then a young man of twenty-two, was fighting for the integrity of the colonial territory against the aggressions of the French. At the age of nineteen, he became an adjutant-general, having the rank of major, and taking the direction of one of the military districts into which the

province of Virginia was divided, for the purpose of resisting the encroachments of the French and the depredations of the Indians. These divisions were reduced to four, in 1752, and the young major had the command of the northern division. In the capacity of commissioner, in 1753, he went into the territory occupied by the French, to negotiate with their commander. He had no success in his diplomacy; but he brought back with him a plan of the fort which the French had constructed in the neighbourhood of Lake Erie. He had been employed, when at the age of sixteen, as a public surveyor, and in the wild district of the Alleghanies had acquired that practical mode of viewing large tracts of country which was of essential importance to him in his future great career. In 1754, under the command of an English officer, Colonel Fry, he was sent to occupy the British posts of the Ohio, in the presence of a French force. He defeated a detachment of the enemy, but was finally compelled to capitulate to superior numbers, who surrounded his intrenched fort. He was allowed to retreat with his men, with what are termed military honours. The feuds of the two nations were the subject of official discussions in Paris; but it was clear that this sort of half-warfare in America could not long endure.

In January, 1755, although no formal declarations of hostilities had taken place, General Braddock, with a body of English troops, was sent to the succour of the colonists in Virginia. His campaign was a most unfortunate one. Braddock was a commander of the old routine cast, who fancied that well-dressed and well-equipped soldiers, who could go through all the manœuvres of the Prussian drill, were sure to be victorious over any number of irregular troops. He marched against the French fort on the Ohio, taking Washington with him, although he despised the American militia and their officers. What the Highlanders were to Cope and Hawley, the Indians were to Braddock. In a valley between two woods, within ten miles of Fort Duquesne — utterly neglecting all precautions against surprise — the English general fell into an ambuscade of Indians. A few French only encountered him; but the unerring marksmen of the woods picked off his officers; and Braddock himself, fighting with desperate courage, was mortally wounded. Half his troops fled in confusion, abandoning their artillery. The other half were killed or wounded; and the terrible Indian scalping-knife left few to tell the tale of this fatal reverse.

NAVAL ENGAGEMENTS; GEORGE VISITS HANOVER

Whilst British and French were fighting in the waste regions of North America, their ships were engaged in the Atlantic. Admiral Boscawen, with eleven ships of the line, had been sent to watch a French expedition that had sailed from Brest. Off Newfoundland the squadrons met in a fog. Captain Howe, having received a signal to engage, took two of the French vessels. The others got into Louisbourg, the fortified harbour of Cape Breton. In the autumn of 1755, Sir Edward Hawke, upon a sudden resolve of the government, made some captures of French merchantmen in the Channel. Of the regency — for the king had gone to Hanover — some were inclined for immediate hostilities, and some for delaying them. The time had passed for any sudden and decisive blow; whilst the ministers were trembling at their own responsibility, afraid to declare war, and not taking sincere and active measures to preserve peace.

After the session had been terminated in April, 1755, the king, in opposition to a strong parliamentary feeling, had set out for Germany. He had left

the regency to take care of the great national interests of Britain, whilst he looked after the usual means of fencing round his own Hanover by subsidising auxiliary powers. He was now in dread of Prussia; and to counteract the growing strength of Frederick II, Russia was to receive a subsidy as well as the elector of Hesse, and smaller potentates. "A factory was opened at Herrenhausen, where every prince that could muster and clothe a regiment might traffic with it to advantage." With the elector of Hesse, the king, without the approval of his ministers at home, signed a contract for a large annual payment by England, with an additional stipulation for paying levy money for every Hessian soldier.

SINGLE-SPEECH HAMILTON; PITT'S INFLUENCE

The parliament met on the 13th of November. The king announced the increase of the naval and land forces, and mentioned the treaties he had concluded with Russia and Hesse. In the address of each house especial reference was made to Hanover. The address of the commons said, "We think ourselves bound in justice and gratitude to assist his majesty against insults and attacks that may be made upon any of his majesty's dominions, though not belonging to the crown of Great Britain." An amendment to omit such a pledge was moved in the lords by Earl Temple, Pitt's brother-in-law. A similar amendment was proposed in the commons. These were of course rejected; but they gave occasion to two remarkable orations. William Gerard Hamilton, a young member, made his maiden speech in favour of the original address — that one harangue, antithetical and familiar, argumentative and declamatory, which handed him down to after times as Single-speech Hamilton. Pitt made a speech on that famous battle night, of which no fragment remains to us but one which has been preserved by Walpole. The younger Pitt said he would prefer the recovery of a speech of Lord Bolingbroke to the restoration of the lost books of Livy or Tacitus. The contemporary accounts of his father's speeches would almost induce a similar wish, even if the recovery were confined to this effort of the 13th of November.

Walpole in a letter of the 15th of November to Conway, after rapturously noticing Hamilton's success, says, "You will ask what could be beyond this? Nothing, but what was beyond what ever was, and that was Pitt. He spoke at past one, for an hour and thirty-five minutes. There was more humour, wit, vivacity, finer language, more boldness, in short more astonishing perfections, than even you, who are used to him, can conceive." In a letter of the following day to Bentley, Walpole gives the fragments which, with similar detached passages of various other speeches, enable us to form some idea of the lustre which a rich imagination gave to Pitt's eloquence. "The most admired passage was a comparison he drew of the two parts of the new administration." By the new administration Walpole means the coalition between Fox and Newcastle. "It is," said Pitt, "as the conflux of the Rhone and the Saône, which I remember to have seen at Lyons; the latter a gentle, feeble, languid stream, languid but not deep; the other a boisterous and overbearing torrent. But they join at last, and long may they continue united, to the comfort of each other, and to the glory, honour, and happiness of this nation." The next morning Fox received the seals of secretary of state, as the reward for his support of the ministerial address. Pitt, on the 20th of November, was dismissed from his office of paymaster; and Legge and George Grenville were also superseded.

In a fortnight after his dismissal from office, Pitt, from his place in par-

[1756 A.D.]

liament, sent forth a voice whose echoes would be heard throughout the land. The nation was dreading a French invasion — sullenly trembling at the possible consequences of an assault upon the capital, and without confidence in the government to which the public defence was intrusted. Pitt seconded the motion of the secretary of war, for an army of thirty-four thousand men, being an increase of fifteen thousand. He had wanted even a larger increase in the previous year. The king's speech of the preceding session had lulled the nation into a fallacious dream of repose. "He wanted to call this country out of that enervate state, that twenty thousand men from France could shake it. The maxims of our government were degenerated, not our natives."

There can be little doubt that the nation required to be roused from its lethargy. Happily there was a man capable of rousing it. Pitt, in his speech of the 5th of December, had expressed his earnest wish to "see that breed restored, which under our old principles had carried our glory so high." The king, on the 23rd of March, announced the probability of an invasion, and informed the houses that he had made a requisition for a body of Hessian troops, in pursuance of the treaty recently concluded. Both houses acknowledged with gratitude his majesty's care for the national defence.

On the 29th of March, Mr. Fox moved, "that a humble address be presented to his majesty, that, for the more effectual defence of this island, and for the better security of the religion and liberties of his subjects, against the threatened attacks by a foreign enemy, he would be graciously pleased to order twelve battalions of his electoral troops, together with the usual detachment of artillery, to be forthwith brought into this kingdom." The address was voted by the large ministerial majority; but not without strong dissatisfaction. "That state alone," exclaimed Pitt, "is a sovereign state, which stands by its own strength, not by the help of another country." The Hanoverians and Hessians came, and were encamped in various parts of the kingdom.

THE LOSS OF MINORCA (1756 A.D.)

For half a century Great Britain had held possession of the island of Minorca, which General Stanhope and Admiral Leake had conquered during the palmy time of the War of the Succession. Port-Mahon, the best harbour of the Mediterranean, was thought a more important British possession even than Gibraltar. The English ministers had received intimation very early in the spring of 1756 that a formidable expedition was in preparation at Toulon, not provisioned for a long voyage. They shut their eyes to the exposed state of the island that lay within a few days' sail from the shores of Provence. The defence of Port-Mahon was intrusted to a small garrison, commanded by an aged and infirm general. The government was at last alarmed. They dispatched Admiral Byng (son of Lord Torrington, the Admiral Byng of Queen Anne's time), with ten ships, from Spithead, on the 7th of April. On the 10th of April, the French fleet, of twelve ships of the line, sailed from Toulon, with transports, having sixteen thousand troops on board. They were off the coast of Minorca on the 18th, and began to disembark at the port of Ciudadella. The only chance of defence against such an armament was in the strong castle of St. Philip. General Blakeney got together between two and three thousand troops, the officers of the English regiments being, for the most part, absent; and he prepared for resistance. The natural and artificial strength of the fortress prevented the French from proceeding in the siege without much cautious delay.

On the 19th of May, Admiral Byng's fleet, having been joined by two more men-of-war, arrived within view of St. Philip, whilst the batteries of the French were carrying on their fire against the fort, where the flag of England was still flying. Byng, who had touched at Gibraltar, had written home to explain that he could obtain no necessaries at that station; that the place was so neglected that he was unable to clean the foul ships with which he had sailed from England; and that if he had been sent earlier he might have been able to prevent the landing of the French in Minorca, whereas it was now very doubtful whether any good could arise from an attempt to reinforce the garrison. This was something like an anticipation of failure, with an indication of the neglect which made success difficult. On the 21st of May, De la Galissonnière, the French admiral, bore down upon the British fleet. Byng did not engage with that alacrity which the naval traditions of our country point out as the first duty of an admiral, even with a doubtful advantage.

Rear-Admiral West, on the contrary, with his portion of the squadron, had attacked with impetuosity, and had driven some of the French vessels out of their line of battle. Byng was scarcely engaged, except at the beginning of the action, when his own ship, being damaged in the rigging, became for a short time unmanageable. He hesitated about advancing, for fear of breaking his line. De la Galissonnière leisurely retired. Byng called a council of war; represented that he was inferior to the enemy in number of men and weight of metal, and proposed to return to Gibraltar. The council agreed to the proposal. The admiral sent home his dispatches; and on the 16th of June Sir Edward Hawke and Admiral Saunders were ordered to supersede Byng and his second in command. The unfortunate admiral was taken home under arrest; and was committed as a prisoner to an apartment in Greenwich Hospital. Admiral West was received with favour at St. James'.

After a defence as resolute as it was possible to make against an overwhelming force, St. Philip was surrendered, after an assault on the 27th of June headed by the duke de Richelieu. The garrison marched out with the honours of war, and were conveyed to Gibraltar. A tempest of popular fury had arisen, such as had rarely been witnessed in England. The news of Byng's return to Gibraltar, without having attempted to relieve the garrison in St. Philip, first came to London through the French admiral's dispatch to his government. "It is necessary," says Walpole, "to be well acquainted with the disposition of a free, proud, fickle, and violent people, before one can conceive the indignation occasioned by this intelligence." But when Byng's own dispatch came, in which he assumed the triumphant tone of a man who had done his duty, his effigy was burned in all the great towns. Every ballad singer had a ditty in which he was execrated. When he arrived at Portsmouth he was saved with difficulty from being torn to pieces by the mob. A chap-book related "a Rueful Story, by a Broken-hearted Sailor." A coarse print exhibited Byng hanging in chains. A medal was struck, having a figure of the admiral, with the inscription, "Was Minorca sold for French gold?" Addresses went up to the throne from London, and from almost every county and city, calling for inquiry and signal punishment. To the addresses of the city the king was made to pledge his royal word that he would save no delinquent from justice. Newcastle, "with a volubility of timorous folly, when a deputation from the city had made representations to him against the admiral blurted out, 'Oh! indeed he shall be tried immediately — he shall be hanged directly.'" The fate of the unhappy man was not determined until the spring of the following year.

HANOVER AND PRUSSIA

In closing the session of parliament on the 27th of May, the king announced that the injuries his subjects had sustained from the French having been followed by the invasion of Minorca, which had been guaranteed to the British crown by all the great powers of Europe, he had formally declared war against France. Important changes had taken place since, in the previous summer, the king had negotiated for a subsidy to Russia, to protect his Hanoverian possessions against the probable attacks of Prussia. George II and Frederick II were not exactly fitted for any cordial friendship. They had been fighting on opposite sides for eight years in the War of the Austrian Succession. George took the side of Maria Theresa, and — to use the words of Carlyle — "needed to begin by assuring his parliament and newspapers, profoundly dark on the matter, that Frederick was a robber and villain for taking the other side." Frederick cared little for what parliaments or newspapers might say of him. Perhaps to those who have followed his last historian in tracing the origin of the claims upon Silesia, he may be thought to have had justice upon his side — that sort of justice which encourages sovereigns to imperil the happiness of millions for the assertion of personal rights.

The War of the Succession came to an end, and Frederick got Silesia guaranteed to him. Beyond the public differences of George and Frederick, the Prussian king had indulged his unhappy talent of sarcasm; and his sharp sayings about his Britannic majesty were not easily to be forgiven. But the time was come when they became politically necessary to each other. A treaty was concluded at Westminster, on the 16th of January, 1756, by which the king of Great Britain and the king of Prussia, fearing that the peace of Europe might be disturbed in consequence of the disputes in America, entered upon a convention of neutrality, by which they were each bound not to suffer any foreign troops to enter Germany, and their several dominions were reciprocally guaranteed. The scheme of subsidising Russia was thus renounced. Some old money differences were at the same time adjusted. This treaty was not submitted to parliament till the close of 1756. In the mean time the terrible contest known as the Seven Years' War had commenced.

On the 4th of June, 1756, George, prince of Wales, completed his eighteenth year — the period determined by the Regency Act as that of his majority in case his grandfather had been dead. The king wished to give the prince a separate establishment, with an allowance of £40,000 a year, thus removing him from the control of the princess dowager. The young prince entreated the king not to separate him from his mother, although he was deeply grateful for the proposed royal bounty. They were both anxious that Lord Bute should be groom of the stole in the new household. Lord Waldegrave relates that he was present at a cabinet council, for the consideration of this appointment; when the chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, said he would not give credit to some very extraordinary reports; but that many sober and respectable persons would think it indecent. The court scandal, which Walpole dwells upon with peculiar gusto, continued some time after Prince George came to the throne, and was one of the misfortunes of the early part of his reign. Bute, in spite of the "extraordinary reports" — which are now held by most unprejudiced inquirers to have had their origin in party virulence and vulgar credulity — was appointed to the office in the household, very reluctantly on the part of the king. In this influential position, the favourite of the heir apparent, he had considerable participation in the politics of the time. One curious example of the mode in which Lord Bute kept the future before the

view of great parliamentary leaders may be seen in a passage of a letter to Mr. Pitt, during that first short time of his power, which we shall have presently to notice: "I am certain the firm support and countenance of him who is some day to reap the fruits of my friend's unwearied endeavours for the public safety would make him perfectly easy under the frowns of prejudiced, deluded, fluctuating men."

Mr. Fox had held the seals of secretary of state about ten months, during which period a heavy burden of obloquy had to be borne by the ministry. In October, 1756, he resigned his office. He probably was justified in abandoning his colleagues to the approaching censures of parliament in regard to measures of which he had been allowed no direction. The popular indignation about the loss of Minorca was taking a new direction. In September, "the whole city of Westminster was disturbed by the song of a hundred ballad-singers, the burden of which was, 'to the block with Newcastle, and the yard-arm with Byng.'" In October, "Poor Byng is the phrase in every mouth, and then comes the hackneyed simile of the scapegoat." The resignation of the secretary of state was a sudden blow to Newcastle, "who meant that Fox should have continued in a responsible office; with a double portion of dangers and abuse, but without any share of power." The prime minister was left without any support in the house of commons. Murray, the attorney-general, insisted upon being appointed lord chief justice, a vacancy having occurred by the death of Sir Dudley Ryder. Newcastle offered the great lawyer the choice of sinecures of fabulous amount — a pension — any terms, if he would remain in the house of commons. Murray was immoveable, and, to the enduring advantage of the nation, became chief justice and Lord Mansfeld. Pitt stood alone, without a rival — "no orator to oppose him, who had courage even to look him in the face."

PITT AS WAR MINISTER

Newcastle, in his extremity, induced the king to consent that an overture should be made to the awful commoner. Pitt refused to treat, saying that "a plain man, unpractised in the policy of the court, could never be the associate of so experienced a minister." The unhappy duke went about imploring this nobleman and that commoner to take the seals. "No man would stand in the gap," says Waldegrave. At last Newcastle himself resigned. "Perfidy, after thirty years, had an intermission," writes Walpole. Lord Hardwicke, the learned and able chancellor, who desired retirement, followed his old friend. A coalition was proposed between Fox and Pitt, which Pitt refused to agree to. At last, in November, the duke of Devonshire was appointed first commissioner of the treasury; Pitt, secretary of state; his brother-in-law, Temple, at the head of the admiralty; Legge, chancellor of the exchequer.

On the 2nd of December the parliament was opened with a speech from the throne, "which," says Lord Waldegrave, "by its style and substance, appeared to be the work of a new speech-maker." Never was a vital change of policy more boldly indicated. It declared that the succour and preservation of America "demand resolutions of vigour and dispatch." That, for a firm defence at home, "a national militia may in time become one good resource." "Relying with pleasure on the spirit and zeal of my people," said the king, "the body of my electoral troops, which I ordered hither at the desire of my parliament, I have directed to return to my dominions in Germany." Finally, his majesty said, "Unprosperous events of war in the

[1756 A.D.]

Mediterranean have drawn from my subjects signal proofs how dearly they tender my honour and that of my crown." To recommend a militia, which his majesty had always ridiculed; to trust to the British people for the defence of their country, instead of trusting to the Hessians and Hanoverians; to call uncourtly addresses and popular clamour signal proofs of affection — these were indeed evidences of a new speech-maker. "The king," says Waldegrave, "in common conversation made a frank declaration of his real sentiments." A spurious speech had been circulated in town and country. This production was burned by the common hangman, and the printer was ordered to be prosecuted. George, who sometimes displayed a quaint sarcastic humour, "hoped the man's punishment would be of the mildest sort, because he had read both speeches, and, as far as he understood either of them, he liked the spurious speech better than his own."

The electoral troops were sent home. A Militia Bill was now passed, although a similar bill had been rejected in the previous session. Under this act thirty-two thousand men were to be called out in England and Wales. The measure was received with popular approbation, until it began to interfere with individual ease and freedom. The Protestant dissenters in London and the provinces remonstrated against the possible insertion of a clause in the bill that the militia might be exercised on Sundays; but the notion, although it did not appear to excite any displeasure amongst the clergy of the established church, was very wisely given up. Reinforcements were sent to the earl of Loudoun, who now commanded in America. The regular army had been increased to forty-five thousand men; and Pitt, at this time, adopted the politic suggestion made by Duncan Forbes in 1738 that the Highlanders should be enlisted in the service of the state, instead of being prompted to disaffection by needy chiefs. Two Highland regiments were raised, the command of one being given to Simon Fraser, son of Lord Lovat; of the other to Archibald Montgomery, brother of Lord Eglington. Twenty years afterwards, in one of his great speeches, in which Chatham urged conciliation towards "our brethren in America," he looked back upon the success of this first measure of his bold statemanship: "I remember, after an unnatural rebellion had been extinguished in the northern parts of this island, that I employed these very rebels in the service and defence of their country. They were reclaimed by this means; they fought our battles; they cheerfully bled in defence of those liberties which they attempted to overthrow but a few years before."

As the war minister of George II, Mr. Pitt had to modify some of his former opinions with regard to continental alliances. He brought down a message from the king on the 17th of February, to ask from his faithful commons that they would assist his majesty in maintaining an army of observation to protect his electoral dominions, and to fulfil his engagements with his good ally the king of Prussia. This was the first day that Pitt had entered the house of commons since his accession to office. His appearance there had been delayed by continual illness. He followed this demonstration of his individual opinions, by moving a grant of £200,000 in compliance with the message. Fox twitted his rival with a saying of the previous year, that "German measures would be a mill-stone about the neck of the minister." Yet Pitt was not inconsistent in proposing this measure. He had told Lord Hardwicke, in September, 1755, that he thought that "regard ought to be had to Hanover, if it should be attacked on our account." Lord Mahon has very justly defended Pitt against the sneer of Fox. "The French were preparing to invade the electorate, not from any injury, real or pretended, which

the electorate had done them, but notoriously and avowedly as a side-blow against George II — as a retaliation for the measures which his majesty had adopted in British America." Hanover was about to be attacked on the British account. Walpole, with reference to the Prussian subsidy, bitterly remarks, "One cannot say which was most ridiculous — the richest prince in Europe [Frederick] begging alms for his own country, or the great foe of that country [George] becoming its mendicant almoner." Frederick of Prussia commissioned the British envoy to express his thanks to Mr. Pitt for his speech of the 18th of February; and to inform him that he regarded the resolutions of parliament as the strongest assurances that can be given of the favourable and friendly disposition of the British nation towards him. Pitt, in his reply, expressed his "sentiments of veneration and zeal for a prince, who stands the unshaken bulwark of Europe, against the most powerful and malignant confederacy that ever yet has threatened the independence of mankind."

THE FATE OF ADMIRAL BYNG

Amongst the difficult questions which the recently formed administration had to deal with was that of the fate of Admiral Byng.[k] His court-martial was held at Portsmouth, presided over by Admiral Smith, an illegitimate brother of Lord Lyttleton; it began in December, 1756, and continued through great part of January. Besides his defence before his judges, the admiral had published a statement in his vindication. Thus far he certainly succeeded in proving that many and flagitious arts had been employed to blacken him. It was shown how his own letters and reports to the admiralty had been garbled and perverted before they were allowed to appear in the gazettes, so as to give some colour to the charge of cowardice; thus the words "making the best of my way to Gibraltar" were substituted for the passage, "making my way to cover Gibraltar." Before the court-martial many witnesses were examined on both sides.

Towards the close of the proceedings an express was despatched to the admiralty in London to inquire, on the part of the officers of the court, whether they were at liberty to mitigate an article of war on which they had doubts. They were answered in the negative. Their doubts related to the twelfth of the articles, which had been new-modelled some years before, and which, to strike the greater terror into remiss or careless officers, left no alternative but death as the punishment on neglect of duty. Thus confined to the rigorous bounds of the law, the court-martial framed their sentence, fully acquitting the admiral either of treachery or of cowardice, but declaring that in their unanimous opinion he had not done his utmost, either to relieve St. Philip's Castle or to defeat the French fleet. They therefore pronounced that he fell under part of the twelfth article, and, as the law required, adjudged him to be shot to death. But with the same unanimity the court declared that, on weighing all the circumstances of the case, they most earnestly recommended him as a proper object of mercy to the crown.

The admiral's conduct during his imprisonment had, on some points, appeared ill-judged and froward, but was throughout manly and firm. When one of his friends was endeavouring to inform him, by degrees, of his sentence, and dropping a hint of ill-news, Byng started, and exclaimed, "What! they have not put a slur on me, have they?" — apprehending that they had condemned him for cowardice. On being assured that they had not, his countenance at once resumed its serenity, and he went with the utmost calmness and composure to hear the sentence of his death pronounced.

[1756 A.D.]

At this crisis the conduct of Pitt appears in no small degree deserving of honour and respect. He saw the tide of popular opinion running decidedly and strongly against Byng. And it was on popular opinion only that Pitt himself leaned for support. He could not trust to dexterous cabals, like Fox, nor to royal favour, as once did Granville, nor to patronage of boroughs, like Newcastle. Yet this public feeling, which alone had borne him to office, which alone could maintain him in office, he now, when he deemed justice at stake, deliberately confronted and withstood. He openly declared in the house of commons his wish that the king's prerogative might be exerted in mitigation of the sentence, adding that he thought more good would come from mercy than from rigour. To his majesty in private Pitt detailed whatever other relenting indications had, though timidly, appeared in the debate, and said that the house of commons wished to see the admiral pardoned. "Sir," replied the king, "you have taught me to look for the sense of my subjects in another place than in the house of commons."

The royal ear had been, however, prepossessed by other advisers, and remained deaf to all arguments for the mitigation of the sentence. His majesty appears to have entertained the opinion — in common with a large majority of his subjects at the time — that some rigorous example was required for the future discipline of the navy. One of Voltaire's tales has well portrayed this prevailing idea, when he makes his imaginary traveller land at Portsmouth, and witness the execution of an admiral who is shot, as he is told, on purpose to encourage the others! Voltaire, however, did not confine himself to satire on this subject; having received by accident from the duke de Richelieu a letter containing some laudatory expressions on Byng, he sent it over to the unfortunate admiral to be used in his defence — an act of much humanity, but of no result.

Nowhere did the admiral find more strenuous intercessors than among his former judges. Several of the court-martial were constantly urging the admiralty with entreaties that his life might be spared. One of them, Captain Augustus Keppel (famous in after years as admiral and lord), authorised Horace Walpole the younger, and he in his turn authorised Sir Francis Dashwood, to declare to the house of commons that Keppel and some of his brethren desired a bill to absolve them from their oath of secrecy, as they had something of weight to say in relation to their sentence. Keppel was himself a member of the house, but too bashful to speak in public. Being, however, generally called upon to rise and explain himself, after Sir Francis' communication, he again expressed his wish, and named four other members of the court as concurring in it. There was here, however, some misapprehension on his part or some treachery on theirs, since of these four, two afterwards disclaimed what Keppel had alleged in their name. "The house," says an eyewitness,[t] "was wondrously softened." Next day the king sent a message, through Pitt, announcing that he had respited the admiral's execution while these suggestions for disclosures were in progress. A bill to absolve the members of the court-martial from their oath of secrecy was accordingly brought in by Sir Francis Dashwood, supported by Pitt, and cavilled at by Fox. "Is it proper," asked he, "that a set of judges should go about for three weeks, hearing solicitations from the friends of the prisoner, and then come and complain of their own sentence?" The bill was carried rapidly and tumultuously by 153 against 23. But in the upper house it was treated with judicial accuracy and precision by two chiefs of the law — lords Hardwicke and Mansfield. They examined at their bar separately and on oath every member of the court-martial, requiring answers especially to these two ques-

tions: "Whether you know any matter that passed previous to the sentence upon Admiral Byng, which may show that sentence to have been unjust?" And, "Whether you know any matter that passed previous to the said sentence which may show that sentence to have been given through any undue practice or motive?" To the general surprise every member of the court-martial — even Keppel himself — answered both these questions in the negative. It thus plainly appeared that the bill owed its origin rather to kind feeling than to settled judgment, and that its whole foundation had now crumbled away; it was accordingly rejected by the lords, not without some expressions of contempt for the haste and heedlessness of the house of commons.

No further obstacles interposed, and the completion of the tragedy was fixed for the 14th of March. Byng's whole behaviour was most manly — equally unaffected and undaunted. A few days before one of his friends standing by him said, "Which of us is tallest?" He answered, "Why this ceremony? I know what it means; let the man come and measure me for my coffin."

More than once he declared his satisfaction that at least he was acquitted of cowardice, and his conviction that he had acted throughout to the utmost of his ability. These sentiments were also expressed in a written paper, which he delivered to the marshal of the admiralty a few moments before his execution. For some time past he had been confined on board the *Monarque* in Portsmouth harbour; he now desired to be shot on the quarter-deck, and not in the place assigned to common malefactors. At the appointed hour of noon he walked forth with a firm step, and placed himself in a chair, refusing to kneel or allow his face to be covered, that it might be seen whether he betrayed the least symptom of fear. Some officers around him, however, represented that his looks might confuse the soldiers, and distract their aim, on which he submitted, saying, "If it will frighten them, let it be done; they would not frighten me." His eyes were bound; the soldiers fired, and Byng fell.

On reviewing the whole of this painful transaction it appears just to acknowledge that, notwithstanding the party insinuations of that time, the officers of the court-martial were swayed only by pure and honourable motives. They judged right in pronouncing that Byng did not do as much as he might have done for the relief of Minorca; they judged right in acquitting him both of treachery and cowardice. But they seem to err when they proceed to apply to the case of Byng the severe penalties prescribed by the twelfth article of war. They confound the two ideas — neglect of duty and error of judgment. It was not from any heedless omission that the admiral had failed to pursue the French fleet, or to relieve the English garrison; it was from inferior talent and inferior energy of mind. To such deficiencies the twelfth article, with its penalty of death, was clearly not intended to apply. But further still, supposing the sentence passed, it was surely no light stain on the royal prerogative, or on those who wielded it, to set at nought the unanimous recommendation of the judges. To deny the claim of mercy in such a case could scarcely be palliated even by the strongest motives of state policy.

In truth, however, all sound state policy points in the opposite direction. Whenever a disproportionate severity is applied to an involuntary fault, the sure result, after a short interval, is to enlist public sympathy on the side of the sufferer, to change condemnation into pity, and to exalt any ordinary officer, who has acted to the best of his small abilities, into the fame of a hero and a martyr.

DISMISSAL AND RE-APPOINTMENT OF PITT (1757 A.D.)

Notwithstanding the readiness that Pitt had shown for the support of Hanover, he had by no means succeeded in surmounting the aversion of the king. Early in 1757 his majesty sent for Lord Waldegrave, as his personal friend, to hear his complaints. According to Waldegrave's own testimony (and there can be none higher), the king, who had a quick conception, and did not like to be kept long in suspense, expected that those who talked to him on business should come at once to the point. Now Pitt and Lord Temple, being orators even in familiar conversation, endeavoured to guide his majesty's passions, and to convince his judgment, according to the rules of rhetoric.

In the king's own statement to Lord Waldegrave, however, a wide distinction was made between Pitt and Temple. "The secretary," said his majesty, "makes me long speeches, which, possibly, may be very fine, but are greatly beyond my comprehension; and his letters are affected, formal, and pedantic. But as to Temple, he is so disagreeable a fellow that there is no bearing him. When he attempts to argue he is pert, and sometimes insolent; when he means to be civil he is exceedingly troublesome, and in the business of his office he is totally ignorant." Above all, his majesty resented a parallel with which the first lord of the admiralty had indulged him between Byng's behaviour at Minorca and the king's own conduct at Oudenarde in 1708, giving a preference to the former, and thus leaving his majesty to draw the inference, that if Byng deserved to be shot, his royal master must deserve to be hanged! — It may seem incredible that any minister, even Lord Temple, should be thus rash and presuming, yet the narrative of Lord Orford to that effect will be found substantially confirmed by Lord Waldegrave.

Another train of events brought matters to a crisis. The king had during the winter mustered his electoral army at Hanover for the defence of his dominions, and to the command of that army he appointed the duke of Cumberland. The time for action was now close at hand, and the duke's departure for his post became of pressing importance. But the duke had conceived a strong prejudice against Pitt as an anti-Hanoverian, and felt most reluctant to commence his operations with such a secretary of state to control them. He urged the king at all hazards to dismiss his ministers before his royal highness embarked, and this importunity of a favourite son prevailed over all the dictates of prudence.[b]

In April, 1757, Pitt was unceremoniously dismissed, Legge and the Grenvilles resigned of course, and Fox regained the ascendant. But petitions were poured in from all quarters, and the national feeling in favour of Pitt was so unequivocally manifested that Fox would not venture to resist it. Pitt and Legge therefore resumed their stations, Newcastle became once more the nominal chief, and Fox obtained the lucrative post of paymaster of the forces (June 29th). All opposition in parliament was now at an end, and Pitt had the entire conduct of the war, and thus commenced an administration one of the most brilliant in English annals.

It almost amazes one to read in the contemporary memoirs and letters, of the degree of despondency and dejection to which the public mind had been reduced by the late untoward events of the war. Lord Chesterfield thus describes the state of affairs at this time: "Whoever is in, or whoever is out, I am sure that we are undone both at home and abroad; at home by our increasing debt and expenses; abroad by our ill-luck and incapacity. The king of Prussia, the only ally we had in the world, is now I fear *hors de combat*

[he had just been defeated by the Austrians at Kolin]; Hanover I look upon to be by this time in the same state with Saxony, the fatal consequence of which is but too obvious. The French are masters to do what they please in America. We are no longer a nation; I never yet saw so dreadful a prospect." On the other hand it is cheering to behold the magic influence of genius and high-toned ambition and public spirit. At the voice of Pitt despondency fled and hope and zeal revived. Money was liberally contributed, for the confidence in the minister was unbounded. Expeditions were judiciously planned, and officers were selected for command from merit, and not from family or parliamentary interest, and success in consequence crowned their efforts.

This happy condition of things could not, however, be brought about all at once. It took some time to renovate and regulate the machine of war. Mr. Pitt was also too much attached to the absurd system of seeking to injure France by descents on her coasts, and his operations in this way proved utterly unsuccessful. A powerful expedition sent in September against Rochefort, under Sir Edward Hawke and Sir John Mordaunt, proved a total failure. The chief blame was laid on the general, but a court-martial acquitted him. In Germany, meantime, the duke of Cumberland, at the head of forty thousand Hessians, Hanoverians, and Brunswickers, being hemmed in by the French between the sea and the rivers Elbe and Weser, actually capitulated at Closter-Seven, and the electorate was thus given up to the French. In America the marquis de Montcalm, governor of Canada, had taken Fort William Henry, on the shore of Lake George, and thus obtained the command of the entire range of the lakes.

The following year (1758) the tide of war began to turn in favour of England. Admiral Boscawen and General Amherst took the island of Cape Breton in America. On the coast of Africa the French settlements at the Senegal and Goree were also reduced. Another of those expeditions to which Mr. Pitt was so much attached was sent to the north coast of France. It landed at Concale, whence it advanced to St. Malo, where it destroyed the shipping and naval stores; but as the enemy was collecting a large force, the troops were re-embarked, and the fleet moved on to Cherbourg. A hard gale which came on prevented their landing at that place, and the expedition returned to St. Helens. These expeditions, in which the cost was great and the damage done to the enemy trifling, were not unaptly styled "A scheme to break windows with guineas."

VICTORIES IN AMERICA, IN INDIA, AND ON THE SEA (1759 A.D.)

The year 1759 is one of the most glorious in the naval and military annals of England. Admiral Boscawen, who commanded in the Mediterranean, where he was blockading the port of Toulon, being obliged to retire to Gibraltar for water and repairs, the Toulon fleet, under M. de la Clue came out with the hope of being able to pass the straits. They succeeded in their object; but they were descried off the coast of Barbary; and Boscawen, though he did not hear of it till seven in the evening and most of his ships had their topmasts struck and sails unbent, by great exertions got to sea by ten that night. Next day (August 10th) he came up with them and took one ship, and the following day, off the bay of Lagos, he destroyed the admiral's ship, the *Ocean*, and three others.

In this year also was fought (August 1st) the great battle of Minden, in which the English infantry covered themselves with glory, while the blame of the victory's not being more complete was laid on the inactivity of Lord

[1759 A.D.]

George Sackville who commanded the cavalry of the right wing. By sentence of a court-martial in the following year this officer was dismissed the service, and his name was struck out of the list of privy-councillors.[e]

When the English minister cast his eyes on the condition of Canada, the prospect would have been disheartening to anyone but himself. In all the essentials of power the enemy had an incontestable superiority. A fortress at the Fall of Niagara was garrisoned by six hundred French. Lake Champlain was commanded by their small sloops of war, and Quebec itself was a position of great natural advantages, and strengthened with all the art of the engineer. The defenders were trained soldiers, assisted by militia and native Indians, and amounted to upwards of ten thousand men. But while the great blow was preparing under the suggestions of Pitt himself, the indomitable energy of the English character was shown in the achievements of the local commanders. Every place was ransacked for aid, and possession taken of every spot of vantage ground. Indians were engaged on the English side as numerously as on the French, and the two civilised nations of Europe had equal cause to be ashamed of the barbarity of their savage allies. While General Amherst launched vessels, built in the roughest way, upon Lake Champlain, and destroyed the French flotilla, Sir William Johnstone, a civilian with an innate genius for war, succeeded, after a severe engagement, in capturing the citadel of Niagara. All further outrage on the British colonies was rendered impossible by the destruction of the French superiority on those inland seas; and when the way was cleared by these successes, and only the great castle of Quebec dominated over the colony, Wolfe made his appearance on the Isle of Orleans a little below the city, and interrupted the communications of the garrison by occupying the St. Lawrence. Montcalm, the French commandant, was equal to the occasion, and kept constant watch on the proceedings of his enterprising assailant. Wolfe moved up the river, and failed in making a lodgment on the shore; but his attention had been attracted by a steep bank rising from the water's edge to the level platform above, which had evidently been considered so impracticable that it was left undefended by outpost or rampart. Orders were given to get the boats all ready to float down the stream, and embarking his whole force in a very dark night, the anchors were lifted, and the flotilla noiselessly glided down. A rush was made up the precipice when they landed, and, following closely with the main body of his forces, Wolfe found himself, at break of day on the 12th of September, in possession of the Heights of Abraham, in rear of the least defended portion of the town.

Montcalm, thus out-generalled, resolved to fight, and if courage and numbers could avail, he had every prospect of success. Wolfe, during that dark voyage to the landing place, had repeated in a whisper to his officers Gray's beautiful *Elegy in a Country Churchyard*, then recently published; and the choice of the poem was afterwards remembered as ominous of his approaching fate. He had dwelt particularly, we may suppose, on the line, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave"; for if death and defeat had been the result of his attempt, they would only have realised the forebodings contained in a letter he wrote to the minister describing the difficulties of his position. When the depression which had seized the public on this intelligence was relieved by the arrival of the next dispatch announcing the battle of Abraham, the capture of Quebec, and the submission of many of the French occupants of Canada, the joy was universal, and the hero's name was on every lip. Particulars were inquired into, and the triumph of the people rose higher than ever when they heard the last words of their favourite soldier. He had been

wounded in the breast, and was lying bleeding on the ground. An officer near him said, "They run, sir; they run!" Wolfe raised his head, and asked curiously, "Who run?" "The French." "Thank God! I die content," was the reply, and in a few minutes he died. His gallant rival, Montcalm, was also carried mortally wounded from the field. When he was told he had no chance of surviving, he said, "So much the better; I shall not see the fall of Quebec." But the fall of Quebec was but the prelude to greater triumphs. The whole English force was directed on the town of Montreal. It was surrounded on all sides; and the governor, with too much generosity to waste his comrades' lives, capitulated to Lord Amherst. France was without a citadel or a soldier in North America, and Canada became thenceforth a possession of the British crown. No pang of humiliation embittered the transference of the French to their new king. Their civil and religious rights were secured. They became fellow-citizens, and not a conquered colony. As if to mark that their connection is one of equality and not force, a tall column is erected in one of the public squares of Quebec with the simple words inscribed on it — "Wolfe. Montcalm."


Another young man had risen in India to be the avenger of the wrongs suffered by the English residents in Calcutta, whom the tyrannical ruler of that country had immured in the Black Hole till only a few survived. Clive's great battle of Plassy was almost contemporaneous with Pitt's appointment to office; and victories in Hindostan were responded to by triumphs in other parts of the world. Cherbourg was taken and destroyed. The French settlements on the African coast were seized. In the intervals of his own triumphs, the minister listened to the joy-bells ringing for the successes of his German ally. He pleased the king by breaking the humiliating convention which the duke of Cumberland had entered into at Closter-Seven, and taking the Hanoverian troops again into his pay. England and Prussia defied the whole world; and with a king so indomitable as Frederick, and a minister so high-spirited as Pitt, eventual defeat or lengthened despondency was impossible.[1]

Parliament was opened by commission on the 13th of November. Peace was talked of; but it was urged that such supplies should be given as would enable his majesty "to sustain and press, with effect, all our extensive operations against the enemy." In the course of the session fifteen millions and a half was voted for supplies — an enormous sum by comparison with the estimates of previous years of war. Pitt on the 20th moved that a public monument should be erected to the memory of General Wolfe. He moved also the thanks of the house to the generals and admirals, whose merit, he said, had equalled those who have beaten armadas — "May I anticipate?" cried he, "those who *will* beat armadas." At the hour at which Pitt used this remarkable expression, a naval battle was being fought, which made his anticipation look like some mysterious sympathy which outran the ordinary means of intelligence — the "shadows before" which a sanguine mind sees in "coming events." Admiral Hawke was driven by the equinoctial gales from his blockade of Brest. Conflans, the French admiral, came out with twenty-one ships of the line and four frigates. Admiral Duff was off Quiberon Bay with his squadron; and Conflans hoped to attack him before Hawke could come to the rescue; But Hawke did return; and then Conflans hurried to the mouth of the Vilaine — fancying himself secure amidst the rocks and shoals on that shore to which the Britons sailed to the aid of the Veneti. The danger of a sea-fight in such a perilous navigation had no terrors for Hawke. The pilot pointed out the danger. "Lay me alongside the French admiral," was Hawke's reply to the pilot's remonstrance. "You have done your duty,

[1759–1760 A.D.]

but now obey my orders." The fight went on till night whilst a tempest was raging. Signal guns of vessels in distress were heard on every side. When the morning came, two British ships were found to be stranded, but their crews were saved. Four of the French fleet had been sunk, amongst which was the admiral's ship. Two had struck. The rest had fled up the Vilaine. This final victory put an end to all those apprehensions of a descent upon England, which prevailed before Pitt had infused his spirit into commanders by land and sea. The French admiral, Thurot, was to have co-operated with Conflans in an attempt at invasion. He landed in the north of Ireland; attacked Carrickfergus, which was bravely defended by seventy-two men; and then went again to sea, having plundered the town, and carried off the mayor and three other inhabitants as his prisoners.

It was the determination to believe nothing impossible to a strong will, and to think no loss irretrievable, which sustained Frederick of Prussia through the reverses of 1759 — the most disastrous of all his campaigns. The defeat by the Russians at Kunersdorf would have annihilated a less resolute man. But he rallied; and he fought through another year of chequered fortune, during which his own territories suffered the extremities of misery, to win the two victories of Legnitz and of Torgau.



A CORNER OF ST. PAUL'S

DEATH OF GEORGE II (1760 A.D.)

The year 1760 was not a year of excitement to the English people. The war went on; but even the defence of the conquests of 1759 required no great exertions. Quebec was besieged; but the besiegers were compelled to retire, when an English fleet appeared in the St. Lawrence. There was little domestic agitation, except a ministerial difference with the court, which somewhat detracts from the dignity of Pitt, in his exhibition of contempt for that influence which prevented his brother-in-law, Earl Temple, from obtaining the Garter. Parliament had little more to do than vote supplies. "Success," said Pitt, "had produced unanimity, not unanimity success." A sudden event came, destined in a short time to change the whole aspect of affairs — to involve England once again in political contests more to be dreaded than the ordinary course of party warfare — more to be dreaded, because other leaders appeared than those of parliament, and the representatives of the people were not on the popular side. The reign of George II came suddenly to a close on the 25th of October. The king had risen at his usual hour of six: had taken his cup of chocolate; and had been left alone by his attendants. A noise as of a heavy fall was heard; then a groan. The old man lay on the ground, and never spoke more. The right ventricle of his heart had burst.[k]

ESTIMATES OF GEORGE II

"When George II. died in 1760," says Gardiner, "he left behind him a settled understanding that the monarchy was one of the least of the forces by which the policy of the country was directed. To this end he had contributed much by his disregard of English opinion in 1743; but it may fairly be added that, but for his readiness to give way to irresistible adversaries, the struggle might have been far more bitter and severe than it was. Of the connection between Hanover and England in this reign two memorials remain more pleasant to contemplate than the records of parliamentary and ministerial intrigues. With the support of George II., amidst the derision of the English fashionable world, the Hanoverian Handel produced in England those masterpieces which have given delight to millions, whilst the foundation of the university of Göttingen by the same king opened a door through which English political ideas afterwards penetrated into Germany."

Lecky,[m] in summarising the character of George II., quotes with approval the remark of Chatham in the succeeding reign: "The late good old king had something of humanity, and amongst many other royal virtues he possessed justice, truth, and sincerity in an eminent degree." Many a greater man lacks so good an epitaph.[a]



CHAPTER XV

THIRTY YEARS OF GEORGE THE THIRD

[1760-1791 A.D.]

George III — whose reign, including the years of regency, proved to be the longest and the most eventful in the English annals — was, at the time of his accession, twenty-two years of age. His figure was tall and strongly built; his countenance open and engaging. A heartfelt and unaffected Christian piety formed the foundation of his character. In the private and domestic virtues few men, and certainly no monarch, ever excelled him. But his manner in conversation did great injustice to his endowments. His rapid utterance and frequent reiteration of trivial phrases — his unceasing "What! What!" and "Hey! Hey!" — gave him an aspect of shallowness to mere superficial observers, and obscured (literary subjects apart) the clear good sense, the sterling judgment within. Thus also his own style in writing was not always strictly grammatical, but always earnest, plain, and to the point. To the exalted duties of his station he devoted himself with conscientious and constant attention. At all times, and under all vicissitudes — whether in victory or in disaster — whether counselled by ministers of his own choice, or in the hands of a party he abhorred — he was most truly and emphatically an honest man. — STANHOPE.[b]

THE young prince of Wales—henceforth King George III—was riding with Lord Bute in the neighbourhood of Kew, when a groom first brought him the hasty tidings of his grandfather's decease. Ere long the groom was followed by Pitt as secretary of state. His majesty, after returning to Kew, proceeded to Carlton house, the residence of the princess dowager, to meet the privy council and, according to ancient form, read to them a short address, which he had directed Bute to prepare. Next morning he was proclaimed in London with the usual solemnities. On these and the ensuing days the demeanour of the young monarch was generally and justly extolled. He seemed neither elated, nor yet abashed and perplexed, by his sudden accession; all he said or did was calm and equable, full of graciousness and goodness. The address to his council was well and feelingly delivered, and he dismissed the guards on himself to wait on his grandfather's body. "He has behaved throughout,"

says Horace Walpole, a critic of no courtly temper, "with the greatest propriety, dignity, and decency."

From the first moment of the new reign the ascendancy of Bute had been foreseen and foretold. Only a few days afterwards a hand-bill was affixed to the royal exchange, with these words: "No petticoat government—no Scotch favourite—no Lord George Sackville!" Of the second of these surmises confirmation was not, indeed, slow in coming. On the next morning but one after his accession the king directed that his brother, Edward duke of York, and his groom of the stole, Lord Bute, should be sworn of the privy council; and Bute appears henceforward to have been consulted on all the principal affairs. The quick-eyed tribe of courtiers at once perceived that this was the channel through which the royal favours would most probably flow, and to which their own applications would most wisely be addressed.

But while the king thus indulged his predilection towards the friend of his early years, he received all his grandfather's ministers with cordial kindness, and pressed them to continue in his service. Pitt declared his willingness to remain on the same footing as before. Newcastle, now sixty-six years of age, made at first a show of resignation, with a view, no doubt, of enhancing his importance, but as he took care to consult only such followers and expectants as had an interest in his stay, he did not fail to receive earnest entreaties in support of his real inclinations, and magnanimously consented to resume the treasury.

On the 31st of October the king highly gratified the more serious portion of his people by a proclamation "for the encouragement of piety and virtue, and for preventing and punishing of vice, profaneness, and immorality." Such proclamations are worth little more than the paper they are written on when not consonant to the personal conduct of the sovereign, but in this case the document was happily upheld by half a century of undeviating royal example. It was also observed, with satisfaction, that the archbishop of Canterbury, proud of so promising a pupil, and having no longer a Lady Yarmouth to encounter, had become frequent in attendance at the court.

The parliament, which had been prorogued for a few days on account of the demise of the Crown, was on the 18th of November opened by the king. Never, it was remarked, had there been greater crowds at such a ceremony, nor louder acclamations. The royal speech had been drawn up by Lord Hardwicke, and revised by Pitt; but when complete his majesty is said to have added with his own hand a paragraph as follows: "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton; and the peculiar happiness of my life will ever consist in promoting the welfare of a people whose loyalty and warm attachment to me I consider as the greatest and most permanent security of my throne." Such cordial language met with no less cordial responses from both houses. "What a lustre," exclaim the lords, "does it cast upon the name of Briton, when you, sir, are pleased to esteem it among your glories!" "We acknowledge," say the commons, "with the liveliest sentiments of duty, gratitude, and exultation of mind, these most affecting and animating words."

In other passages his majesty's speech professed a thorough concurrence in the counsels which during the last few years had guided his grandfather's reign. It praised the "magnanimity and perseverance, almost beyond example," of his good brother the king of Prussia; to British victories it adverted in becoming terms of exultation: it declared that his majesty would have been happier still could he have found his kingdoms at peace; "but since," it added, "the ambition, injurious encroachments, and dangerous designs of my

enemies rendered the war both just and necessary, I am determined to prosecute this war with vigour." In conclusion, the king expressed his delight at the present happy extinction of divisions, and recommended to his parliament "unanimity." Never was any recommendation more fully complied with; scarce one public difference of opinion appeared. Another annual subsidy of £670,000 to the king of Prussia was proposed by Pitt, and granted by the house of commons. Supplies to the unprecedented amount of nearly £20,000,000 were cheerfully voted. The civil list for the new reign, on the king's surrendering the branches of his hereditary revenue, was fixed at £800,000 a year. Nothing was heard in either house but dutiful addresses and loyal congratulations.



GEORGE III
(1738–1820)

But, however fair and specious seemed the unanimity which greeted the new reign, it was no more than apparent. Beneath that smooth surface jealousy, rancour, and ambition were already beginning to stir and heave. A small knot of grasping families among the peers—which wished to be thought exclusively the friends of the Hanover succession, and which had hitherto looked upon court officers, honours, and emoluments as almost an heirloom belonging to themselves — viewed with envious eyes the admission of new claimants, not as involving any principle of politics, but only as contracting their own chances of appointment. Such malcontents found a congenial mouthpiece in the duke of Newcastle.

On the other hand, the cabals of Bute were to the full as numerous and as crooked as Newcastle's. It was his object to hold himself forth as the sole expounder of the king's wishes and opinions — as the single and mysterious high priest of the royal oracle. On the 21st of March the parliament was dissolved by a proclamation; and the *Gazette* of the same day announced several changes in the ministry. On the 25th of March the *Gazette* made known to the world that his majesty had been pleased to appoint the earl of Bute one of his secretaries of state — Holderness being the minister removed. Neither Pitt nor Holderness himself had received any notice of the contemplated change as to the seals until that change was matured, and on the very point of execution. To soften Pitt, his kinsman, James Grenville,

was promoted from a lordship of the treasury to the lucrative post of cofferer of the household. Such a concession was not likely to have much weight with such a statesman as Pitt. It must, however, be owned that on this occasion he showed none of that haughty impracticability with which he has been often and not unjustly charged. He patiently endured the want of confidence, indicated by the removal or the appointment of colleagues without his previous knowledge. But he was determined to allow no infringement of his province — to direct with full powers both the war and the negotiations — and to resign his office sooner than sacrifice his judgment.

THE KING'S MARRIAGE AND CORONATION (1761 A.D.)

On the 8th of July an extraordinary privy council was held; all the members in or near town having been summoned, without distinction of office or of party, to meet, as was declared, "on the most urgent and important business." The object, it was concluded on all sides (so carefully had the secret been kept), was to ratify or reject the treaty with France. It proved—to declare a queen. His majesty announced to the council his intended marriage with Charlotte, second sister of the duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, a house of ancient lineage and of tried Protestant principles. Of the princess herself, who was scarcely seventeen, and not remarkable for beauty, little as yet was or could be known. The character of this princess in after life — as queen consort of England for fifty-seven years—confirmed the soundness of the judgment which had raised her to that rank. An ever present, yet unostentatious piety; to the king an affectionate reverence; to her children an unremitting care, prudence, economy, good sense, and good temper—were amongst her excellent qualities. Pure and above all reproach in her own domestic life, she knew how to enforce at her court the virtues, or, at the very least the semblance of the virtues, which she practised. To no other woman, probably, had the cause of good morals in England ever owed so deep an obligation.

The form of announcement to the privy council having been duly gone through at St. James', Earl Harcourt was despatched to Strelitz on another form — a public demand of the princess in marriage. The duchesses of Ancaster and Hamilton and the countess of Effingham were likewise sent over to attend upon the person of their future sovereign. A royal yacht, the *Carolina*, was appointed to convey her, its name being first with much solemnity, and in the presence of all the lords of the admiralty, altered to the *Charlotte;* and the fleet that was to serve as escort was commanded by Anson himself. The contract of marriage having been signed in state, the princess proceeded on her journey amidst great public rejoicings in the towns of Mecklenburg and Hanover, until Cuxhaven, where her highness embarked for England. At length on the 6th of September, and at Harwich, she set foot on English ground. On the 8th she arrived at St. James'. The king met her in the garden, and when she would have fallen at his feet prevented and embraced her. That same afternoon they were married in the chapel royal by the Archbishop of Canterbury. On the ensuing day their majesties held a crowded drawing-room, and gave a splendid ball. Horace Walpole, who was present, thus describes her: "She is not tall, nor a beauty; pale, and very thin; but looks sensible, and is genteel." And in another letter he adds: "She has done nothing but with good-humour and cheerfulness. She talks a great deal; is easy, civil, and not disconcerted. Her French is tolerable."

The coronation of both their majesties followed on the 22nd of September. Never had there been greater eagerness among all classes of the people to

[1761 A.D.]

behold the gorgeous pageant. Thus the platform from St. Margaret's round-house to the church door, which at George II's coronation had been let for £40, produced at this no less than £2,400. Thus, also, any disguise, however humble, was readily assumed as a passport of admission. A gentleman present writes as follows to his friend in the country: "I should tell you that a rank of foot-soldiers was placed on each side within the platform; and it was not a little surprising to see the officers familiarly conversing, and walking arm-in-arm with many of them, till we were let into the secret — that they were gentlemen who had put on the dresses of common soldiers." It has been said—a rumour which we are not able either to confirm or to deny—that, mingled among the spectators, in another disguise, stood the ill-fated pretender to that day's honours — Charles Edward Stuart. The solemn rite in Westminster abbey, and the stately banquet in Westminster hall — when a Dymoke, clad in full armour, and mounted on the same white horse which George II had ridden at Dettingen, asserted, as champion, the king's right against all gainsayers, and flung down his iron gauntlet in defiance — were equally admired for their magnificence.[b]

THE RETIREMENT OF PITT (1761 A.D.)

Meantime the war was still prosecuted. An expedition under Commodore Keppel and General Hodgson succeeded in taking the isle of Belleisle on the coast of Brittany (June 7th). The island of Dominica in the West Indies was also reduced.

France had hitherto been a great sufferer by the war; for she made no progress in Germany, she had lost her colonies, and her commerce had nearly been destroyed. She was therefore anxious for a peace with England, and a treaty for that purpose was entered on; but as she required that England should abandon the king of Prussia and make certain concessions to Spain, Mr. Pitt spurned at the proposals. A treaty, named the Family Compact, had been secretly arranged between the courts of Versailles and Madrid, where Charles III (late king of Naples, and the ablest monarch that Spain has possessed since the days of Philip II) now reigned. It was signed at this time; and Pitt, who, it is said, had procured secret information of its contents, which were hostile to England, proposed in the council to recall the British ambassador from Madrid and to send a fleet to intercept the Spanish galleons; but the majority of the council rejected the measure, affecting to regard it as contrary to good policy and to justice and honour. Finding he could not prevail on them, the haughty minister exclaimed, "I was called to the administration by the voice of the people; to them I have always considered myself accountable for my conduct; and therefore I cannot remain in a situation which makes me responsible for measures I am no longer allowed to guide." Lord Granville, the president of the council, made a dignified and sensible reply.[c]

Pitt, adhering to his first opinion, and having delivered his reasons in writing, on the 5th of October resigned his office. In this course he was followed by Lord Temple. When on the same day he waited on his sovereign to give up the seals, he found the demeanour of the young king most kind and gracious. His majesty expressed his concern at the loss of so able a servant, and offered him any reward in the power of the crown to bestow, but declared that his own judgment was adverse to the sudden declaration of war, adding that if even his cabinet had been unanimous for it he should have felt the greatest difficulty in consenting. Pitt, who appears to have anticipated a

different reception, was deeply touched by the king's cordiality of manner and expression. "I confess, sir," said he, "I had but too much reason to expect your majesty's displeasure. I did not come prepared for this exceeding goodness. Pardon me, sir; it overpowers, it oppresses me." And he burst into tears.

Such then was the close of Pitt's justly renowned administration. Even amidst the full blaze of its glory there arose some murmurs at its vast expense — the only objection of any weight, it seems, that has ever been urged against it. Yet, as a shrewd observer writes at the time, "It has cost us a great deal, it is true, but then we have had success and honour for our money. Before Mr. Pitt came in we spent vast sums only to purchase disgrace and infamy."

THE ASCENDENCY OF BUTE

The retirement of Pitt from the administration left a complete and undisputed ascendency to Bute. It was now his lordship's object to strengthen himself by large and powerful connections. The privy seal was kept in reserve for the duke of Bedford, while the seals of secretary were bestowed upon the earl of Egremont, who had been intended for plenipotentiary at the congress of Augsburg, but who was chiefly remarkable as the son of Sir William Wyndham.

But the most pressing object with Lord Bute was to avert or soften the resentment which the removal of the great commoner might probably excite in the nation. Under these circumstances, on the very day after Pitt's resignation, Bute addressed a letter to him by the king's commands, declaring that his majesty was desirous, nay, "impatient," to confer on him some mark of his royal favour. His majesty, continued Bute, requests some insight into Mr. Pitt's own views and wishes, and meanwhile proposes to him either the government of Canada, combined with residence in England, and a salary of £5,000 a year, or the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster, with as much of emolument and nearly as little of business. The reply of Pitt — after a profusion of obsequious thanks — states himself "too proud to receive any mark of the king's countenance and favour, but, above all, doubly happy could I see those dearer to me than myself comprehended in that monument of royal approbation and goodness with which his majesty shall condescend to distinguish me." In compliance with the hint thus given a peerage was conferred on Lady Hester, by the title of Baroness Chatham, with remainder to her issue male, and a pension of £3,000 a year was granted to Pitt for three lives: namely, his own, Lady Chatham's, and their eldest son's.

The bestowal of the title and the pension on the retiring minister fully attained the object which Lord Bute had in view. He was enabled in the same *Gazette* to insert, first the resignation, next the honours and rewards, and, lastly, a despatch from the earl of Bristol, stating at large the favourable and pacific assurances of the Spanish court. "These," says Burke, "were the barriers that were opposed against that torrent of popular rage which it was apprehended would proceed from this resignation. And the truth is, they answered their end perfectly; this torrent for some time was beaten back, almost diverted into an opposite course."

On the 3d of November the new parliament met. The king's speech on opening the session was nearly in the same strain as those former speeches which Pitt had drawn; like them it promised a vigorous prosecution of the war; like them it praised the "magnanimity and ability" of the king of Prus-

sia. How far Lord Bute was in earnest when framing these expressions will presently be seen. Meanwhile the turn of the debates afforded Pitt several opportunities to explain or vindicate his recent course of policy. He spoke with unwonted temper and moderation, defending his own conduct without arraigning that of his former colleagues. If, as some detractors allege, his harangues at this time were inflammatory, they were so from the force of his topics, and not from the violence of his language.

Notwithstanding the eloquence and the popularity of Pitt, it appears that he had at this time but few parliamentary followers. On a motion to produce the papers respecting the Spanish negotiation so scanty were his numbers that he could not venture a division.

WAR WITH SPAIN (1762-1763 A.D.)

During this time the progress of the Spanish negotiations had been precisely such as Pitt had foreseen and foretold. On the 21st of September Lord Bristol announced to the secretary of state that the *flota* had safely anchored in the bay of Cadiz; and on the 2nd of November he adds: "Two ships have lately arrived at Cadiz with very extraordinary rich cargoes from the West Indies, so that all the wealth that was expected from Spanish America is now safe in Old Spain." In that very same despatch of the 2nd of November the ambassador has to report a "surprising change in General Wall's discourse," and "haughty language now held by this court, so different from all the former professions." It now became evident, even to Lord Bristol's apprehension, that the Spaniards had been pacific only while awaiting and expecting their resources for war. The claims of Spain upon England were urged anew in the most peremptory terms, while the request of the court of London for some information or explanation respecting the rumoured Family Compact was met with a positive refusal. Further notes or further interviews served only to widen the breach. Before the close of the year the earl of Bristol received orders to leave Madrid, and the count de Fuentes orders to leave London. All hope of conciliation had vanished, and a declaration of war against Spain was issued on the 4th of January, 1762.[b]

A new change in the British cabinet took place in the following month of May; the duke of Newcastle resigned, and Lord Bute now occupied the post of which he was so covetous, but for which he was utterly unfit, and became the prime minister. The duke of Newcastle, whose fidgety temper, vanity, jealousy, meanness of spirit, and disregard of promises were the general topics of ridicule,[1] had, by his great wealth, his command of votes in the commons, a certain degree of talent of his own, and the far superior abilities of his late brother, maintained himself in office with little interruption since the year 1724. He now retired with some dignity; for though he had greatly injured his private property by his zeal for the house of Brunswick, as it was termed, he refused a pension when offered, saying, that "if he could be no longer permitted to serve his country, he was at least determined not to be a burden to it."

The courts of France and Spain called on the king of Portugal to break through all the ties of gratitude, honour, and interest, and join in the confederacy against England. On his refusal, they both declared war against him, and their troops invaded his kingdom at three several points. The king called

[1 "Newcastle," says Gardiner,[h] "was ignorant and incompetent, and made himself ridiculous by his fussy attempts to appear energetic. He always, it was said, lost half an hour in the morning and spent the rest of the day in running after it."]

on England for aid, which was promptly afforded. English troops were sent to Portugal, where the supreme command was given to the count de la Lippe-Buckeburg, a German prince of high military character, and the invaders were speedily obliged to recross the frontiers.

An expedition of considerable magnitude, under Lord Albemarle and Admiral Pocock, sailed from Portsmouth on the 5th of March. Its object was to give a heavy blow to the Spanish commerce; and its destination was Havana, in the isle of Cuba, which it reached on the 5th of June. Many difficulties, from climate and from the number of the garrison, the strength of their defences, and the gallantry of their resistance, impeded the operations of the besiegers; but the abilities of the commanders, seconded by the indomitable spirit and courage of their men, overcame them all, and the town at length surrendered (August 14th). The loss to Spain was fourteen sail of the line and four frigates taken or destroyed in the harbour, and treasure and merchandise to the amount of £3,000,000. This was perhaps the greatest and richest conquest ever made by the British arms. It was not, however, the only loss sustained by Spain. An expedition from Madras in India, under Admiral Cornish and Sir William Draper, took Manila, the capital of the Philippine islands. All the public property was given up to the English, and a ransom of £800,000 was agreed to be paid for the private property. Two ships of the British squadron then intercepted and took the *Santissima Trinidad*, a ship from Acapulco with a cargo worth £600,000. To add to the misfortunes of Spain, the *Santa Hermione*, from Peru, with treasure on board to the amount of £1,000,000, was captured off Cape St. Vincent. The losses of France this year were the islands of Martinique, Grenada, St. Lucia, Tobago, and St. Vincent, in the West Indies.

These brilliant successes almost turned the head of the nation; visions of glory and wealth floated before the public eye; and the mercantile interest clamoured loudly for continuing a war by which they were great gainers. The ministry, however, were not so dazzled; they saw that all the objects of the war were gained, the pride of the house of Bourbon was humbled, the king of Prussia was secured; at the same time the expense to England had been and would be enormous. The overtures of France for peace were therefore readily listened to; and both parties being in earnest, the preliminaries were readily settled at Fontainebleau (November 3rd). In spite of the declamation of Mr. Pitt and his party, they were approved of by large majorities in both houses of parliament, and a treaty was finally signed at Paris (February 10th, 1763).

By this treaty England was to retain all Canada with Cape Breton and the other islands in the gulf of St. Lawrence, and Louisiana eastward of the Mississippi; in the West Indies, Dominica, St. Vincent's, and Tobago; in Africa, Senegal. She was to receive back Minorca in exchange for Belleisle, and was secured divers advantages in India. Spain ceded to her the two Floridas, gave up all claim to fish on the banks of Newfoundland, and allowed the English to cut logwood on the coast of Honduras. England restored all her other conquests.

England has never concluded a more honourable peace than this, and Lord Bute was justified in declaring that "he wished no other epitaph to be inscribed on his tomb than that he was the adviser of it." Mr. Pitt, who, great as he undoubtedly was, had too violent a lust for war, condemned it; the selfish king of Prussia exclaimed against it, as if England were bound to waste her blood and treasure for his aggrandisement; but history pronounces the Peace of Fontainebleau an honourable termination of a war which had added seventy-five millions to the national debt of Great Britain.

BUTE IS SUCCEEDED BY GRENVILLE (1763 A.D.)

Soon after the conclusion of the peace, Lord Bute retired from office. He was never popular; his manners were cold and repulsive; his partiality for his countrymen, the Scots, was extreme; and the outcry against the peace was general. The passing of a bill for an excise on cider raised the clamour to its height. He therefore resigned a post for which he felt himself unsuited, alleging his preference for domestic life and literary retirement.[c]

This sudden step, it is said, took the king by surprise nearly as much as the people. After the first pause for wonder, men began to inquire Lord Bute's motive, and according to their own prejudices or partialities assigned the most various — from a philosophic love of retirement down to a craven fear. According to some friends he had always declared that as soon as he had signed the peace, and carried through the budget, he should consider his objects as attained and his official life as ended. Others thought that his nerves had been shaken by the libels and clamours against him.

On calmly reviewing the whole of this transaction there seems no reason to doubt that, according to Lord Bute's own statement of his motives, his coolness with his colleagues and his sense of duty to his sovereign might weigh with him no less than the violence of his opponents. It is certain, however, that he did not then, nor for some time afterwards, lose his back-stairs influence, nor lay aside his ambitious hopes. It is probable that he expected to allay the popular displeasure by a temporary retirement, and meanwhile, in merchants' phrase, to carry on the same firm with other clerks.

With Lord Bute retired both Dashwood and Fox. For the former an ancient barony, to which he was one of the co-heirs, was called out of abeyance, and thus he became Lord le Despencer. Fox was likewise raised to the upper house as Lord Holland — the same title which had been already bestowed upon his wife. But although Lord Holland, during two more years, continued a placeman, it may be said of him that he had ceased to be a politician. Henceforth, until his death in 1774, he took little or no further part in public affairs. In his retirement his principal pleasure was the construction of a fantastic villa at Kingsgate, on the coast of Thanet.

The successor to Lord Bute proved to be George Grenville, who on the very day that the favourite resigned kissed hands on his appointment as both first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. No one doubted that this choice had been made under the influence of Lord Bute, and was designed for the preservation of that influence. At the same time it was intimated to the foreign ministers that the king had now entrusted the principal direction of his affairs to three persons, namely, to Mr. Grenville and the secretaries of state, lords Egremont and Halifax. Thus it happened that the chiefs of the new administration received from the public the name of the Triumvirate.[b]

THE AFFAIR OF WILKES AND THE *North Briton* NO XLV

When the Grenville administration was formed, a tremendous fire was opened on it from the press. The most destructive battery was a periodical named the *North Briton*, conducted by John Wilkes, esquire, member for Aylesbury, a man of considerable talent, but profligate in character and ruined in fortune. He was, like almost every demagogue, strongly aristocratic in feeling; but being refused a lucrative post, he took up the trade of patriotism, and commenced a series of attacks on the persons and measures of the minis-

ters. Of these they took no notice, till in the forty-fifth number of his paper he assailed the speech from the throne (April 19, 1763), accusing the king of having uttered direct falsehoods. A general warrant was issued from the office of the secretary of state to seize the authors, printers, and publishers of the *North Briton*, and their papers, and bring them before the secretary. Wilkes was accordingly taken and committed to the Tower. On his application to the court of common pleas for a writ of *habeas corpus*, it was granted, and Chief-Justice Pratt having decided that his privilege of parliament (which can only be forfeited by treason, felony, or breach of the peace) had been violated, he was discharged.

The attorney-general then commenced proceedings against him for a libel, and Wilkes, now the idol of the mob, took every mode of courting prosecution. The ministers, instead of leaving the courts of law to deal with him, unwisely brought the matter before the house of commons, by whom number forty-five of the *North Briton* was voted to be a false, scandalous, and seditious libel against the king and both houses, and was ordered to be burned by the common hangman. At the same time, as Wilkes had printed at a press in his own house a poem called an *Essay on Woman*, in which impiety contended with obscenity, and had affixed to the notes on it the name of Bishop Warburton, it was voted in the house of lords to address his majesty to order a prosecution against Mr. Wilkes for breach of privilege and for blasphemy. It was very injudiciously arranged that the mover should be Lord Sandwich, a man whose own private character was anything but immaculate.

The question of privilege was then taken up in the house of commons; and in spite of the eloquence of Mr. Pitt, and in the face of the decision of the court of common pleas, it was decided by a large majority that privilege of parliament does not extend to the case of writers and publishers of seditious libels. With this decision the house of lords concurred after a long debate.

A riot took place when the attempt was made to burn the *North Briton;* and when several of the persons who had been arrested brought actions against the messengers, juries gave them damages. Wilkes himself brought actions, against the two secretaries of state, and against Mr. Wood, the under-secretary, and he obtained a verdict against the latter for £1,000 and costs. On this occasion Chief-Justice Pratt pronounced the general warrant to be illegal, and a similar decision by Lord Mansfield, the chief justice of the king's bench, set the question at rest.

Wilkes was expelled the house; he was tried and convicted for publishing number forty-five and the *Essay on Woman;* and as he did not appear in court to receive sentence, he was outlawed, and fled to France.[c]

THE STAMP ACT (1765 A.D.)

We shall see, in a few years, John Wilkes, and all the chorus of his political drama, passing away, "like an insubstantial pageant faded." Another scene was to be opened, which, devoid of interest as it might at first appear, was to be developed in a series of long-continued action which involved not only the interests of England but eventually the destinies of the Anglo-Saxon family, and incidentally of all the human race. The triumphant administration of Mr. Pitt had given a firmness and compactness to the British Empire in North America, which appeared to promise a long continuance of prosperity to the mother country and her colonies. These colonies were founded upon principles of freedom and toleration, by a race nurtured in those principles, and, in some cases, seeking for a happier field for their establishment than they could

find under a temporary suspension of the old English right to be well governed. The colonial assemblies or parliaments of the thirteen provinces of North America, elected by the people, trained men of industry and ability to the consideration of questions of public policy and local administration. The trade between Great Britain and her colonies had been always based upon principles wholly opposite to those of commercial freedom. The Englishman was forbidden to smoke any other than Virginia-grown tobacco, and the Virginian could wear no other coat than one of English-made cloth. It was an age of regulation and balance in small matters as well as in great — in commerce as in war. No particular injury was contemplated towards the colonists in the trade regulations; although the monopoly of the English merchants was regarded as the supreme advantage of colonial possessions. The state regarded these colonists as a happy family of good children, to be kept in order by that paternal authority which knew best what was for their advantage. At last the parent took up the fancy of compelling the children to pay something in acknowledgment of the heavy cost of past protection, and as a contribution towards the expense of that protection in future. A Stamp Act to raise £60,000 produced a war that cost £100,000,000.

On the 10th of March, 1764, Mr. Grenville moved in the commons a series of resolutions for imposing small duties on certain articles of American commerce; to "be paid into the receipt of his majesty's exchequer, and there reserved, to be from time to time disposed of by parliament, towards defraying the necessary expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the British colonies and plantations in America." Following this resolution for the appropriation of the produce of duties upon the foreign trade of the American colonies, came the 14th of the series, in these words: "That towards further defraying the said expenses, it may be proper to charge certain stamp duties in the said colonies and plantations." Walpole says, "This famous bill, little understood here at that time, was less attended to. The colonies, in truth, were highly alarmed, and had sent over representations so strong against being taxed here, that it was not thought decent or safe to present their memorial to parliament." The colonists could not see, in Grenville's proposition for a paltry tax, any other than the beginning of an attempt to tax them largely without their own consent. They denied the right of the house of commons to tax them unless they had representatives in that house. Grenville had rashly termed his resolution for a stamp act as "an experiment towards further aid." Where was the system, thus begun, to end? The Stamp Act was passed, without a debate or division in the house of lords; and it received the royal assent on the 22nd of March, 1765. The act was to come into operation on the 1st of November. When the enactment first became known in America, there was a deep expression of grief, but scarcely any manifestation of resentment. But in the state assemblies, a determination not to submit without remonstrance was quickly manifested. Virginia, the most attached to the monarchy of all the provinces — the most opposed to democratic principles — was the first to demand a repeal of the statute by which the colonists were taxed without their own consent. The resolutions of the assembly of Virginia went forth as an example to the other provinces, many of which passed similar resolutions.

Yet the desire almost universally prevailed amongst the colonists to regard themselves as bound in allegiance to the British crown. The alienation was a gradual result of a mistaken view of the policy that ought to prevail, between a colony that had grown to a real capacity for independence and the parent state. It was a result, also, of that system of parliamentary corruption and of court influence which at that time entered so largely into the government

of England. Walpole[d] says that the Stamp Act "removed the burden of a tax to distant shoulders"; that Grenville contemplated his measure "in the light of easing and improving an over-burdened country." Burke in his memorable speech on American taxation on the 19th of April, 1774, exhibited this fact more distinctly. The Americans, Burke says, "thought themselves proceeded against as delinquents, or at best as people under suspicion of delinquency." They were irritated enough before the Stamp Act came. They adopted such counter measures as appeared efficient to a people that had not yet begun to feel their own strength, and understand their own resources. They agreed amongst themselves to wear no English manufactured cloth; and to encourage the breed of sheep that they might manufacture cloth from their own wool. They protested against the English monopoly; and they devised, feebly enough, such measures as they thought might overcome it. At last what Burke calls "the scheme of a regular plantation parliamentary revenue" was established — "a revenue not substituted in the place of, but superadded to, a monopoly; which monoply was enforced at the same time with additional strictness, and the execution put into military hands." It was one of the misfortunes of Mr. Grenville's scheme that his Stamp Act was popular in England. "Great was the applause of this measure here. In England we cried out for new taxes on America, whilst they cried out that they were nearly crushed with those which the war and their own grants had brought upon them." Such was the commencement of a struggle which ended in the independence of the American colonies.

THE REGENCY BILL (1765 A.D.)

During the progress of the bill for the taxation of the American colonies, the king was attacked by a serious indisposition. On the nature of that illness the greatest secrecy was maintained. The family of George III at that time consisted of George, prince of Wales, born on the 12th of August, 1762; and of Frederick, duke of York, born on the 16th of August, 1763. The differences of opinion between the king and his ministers upon the Regency Bill are of minor importance in a view of public affairs at this distance of time, and require no elaborate detail. The king wished that the power of nominating a regent should be vested in himself. The ministry thought it desirable that a regency during the minority of the successor to the throne should be distinctly named. The king, indignant at the conduct of his ministers, sent for his uncle the duke of Cumberland; and commissioned him to negotiate with Mr. Pitt for a return to power. It was an embarrassing time in which to contemplate a change of ministry. America was getting into a flame of anger at the Stamp Act. London was terrified by riots of Spitalfields weavers, upon the rejection of a bill which would have prohibited the importation of foreign silks. What Burke calls "the vertigo of the Regency Bill" produced changes which an untoward aspect of national affairs might have failed to effect.

The rumours that the king contemplated a change of ministers produced an opinion in one then unconnected with official life, but who looked upon political affairs, and public men, from a higher elevation than most observers of the shifting scenes of that time. Edmund Burke announced to a friend, with reference to Pitt, that "this crisis will show whether pride or patriotism be predominant in his character." The duke of Cumberland went to Hayes, and there learned the "plan of politics" which Pitt chose "to dictate"—that general warrants should be repudiated; that dismissed officers should be restored; that Protestant alliances should be formed, to balance the Family

[1765 A.D.]

Compact of the Bourbons. There was some difference of opinion about appointments, but these might have been removed. Earl Temple was sent for; and although he was intended for the office of first lord of the treasury, he persuaded his brother-in-law to give up the negotiation. He was seeking a ministerial alliance with his brother, George Grenville, to whom he had become reconciled, and he conceived the plan of inducing Pitt to join them; in which union he fancied he saw a power that would enable them to stand alone without the support of ducal whigs or courtly tories. The king was obliged to call back his ministers, Grenville and Bedford. They dictated terms to the king, who bowed to the ministers to retire, and said "if he had not broken out into the most profuse sweat he should have been suffocated with indignation." Pitt was again applied to; and he again declined to take office without Lord Temple, who persevered in his resolution, at an audience which both had of the king.

ROCKINGHAM ASSUMES THE MINISTRY (1765 A.D.)

The whig families were again resorted to. The duke of Newcastle again obtained a post of honour in receiving the privy seal; the duke of Grafton became one of the secretaries of state, with General Conway as the other secretary; and the marquis of Rockingham was named first lord of the treasury. Untried colts and worn-out hacks were harnessed together, to drag the state coach through the sloughs in which it was travelling. They pulled honestly side by side for a brief journey; and then came to a dead stop. This ministry had the lasting credit of bringing one man of extraordinary genius into public life, though in a subordinate situation. The eloquent gratitude of Edmund Burke to the marquis of Rockingham has made us think favourably of the head of this ministry, for "sound principles, enlargement of mind, clear and sagacious sense, and unshaken fortitude." Such qualities were needed at such a crisis.

The Rockingham administration came into office on the 10th of July. Parliament had been prorogued previous to their appointment; and a few months passed on without any disturbing events. At last came intelligence which demanded grave and anxious consideration. In the autumn of 1765, various letters were received by Mr. Secretary Conway, from official persons in America, relating the particulars of riots at Boston and in the colony of Rhode Island. At Boston, the effigy of the gentleman who had accepted the office of stamp-distributor was hung upon a tree, which was subsequently called Liberty Tree; his house was sacked, and he was compelled to promise to resign his office. These riots went on for a fortnight, with much wanton destruction of property. A letter from New York of the 25th of September, to Conway, says "the general scheme concerted throughout seems to have been, first, by menace or force, to oblige the stamp-officers to resign their employments, in which they have generally succeeded; and next, to destroy the stamped papers upon their arrival — that, having no stamps, necessity might be an excuse for the dispatch of business without them." But more important than the outrages of mobs were the solemn proceedings of a congress at New York, comprising delegates from nine assemblies. They continued their sittings for three weeks; and then passed fourteen resolutions, in which they maintained the right of every British subject to be taxed only by his own consent, or that of his legal representatives; and that their only legal representatives were those annually chosen to serve as members of the assembly of each province.

The administration was in a position of extreme difficulty. The strong opposition of the colonial assemblies was a reason for ministers re-considering the measures of their predecessors; but a submission to the violent resistance to the authority of the imperial legislature would be to manifest an unworthy fear, which might have the effect of encouraging other resistance to the law. But there were consequences arising out of the discontent and resentment of the colonists which were productive of immediate evils at home, and threatened greater dangers for the future. A petition of the merchants of London trading to North America set forth, that this commerce, so necessary for the support of multitudes, was under such difficulties that its utter ruin was apprehended; and that several millions sterling, due to the merchants of Great Britain, were withheld by the colonists, on the plea that the taxes and restrictions laid upon them had rendered them unable to meet their engagements. Scarcely seeing a way out of the difficulties that surrounded them, the ministers, on the meeting of parliament on the 14th of January, after the Christmas recess, laid the papers before the two houses which "give any light into the origin, the progress, or the tendency, of the disturbances which have of late prevailed in some of the northern colonies." Such were the terms of the king's speech. His majesty said, that he had issued orders for the exertion of all the powers of government for the suppression of riots and tumults; and added, "Whatever remains to be done on this occasion I commit to your wisdom."

THE REPEAL OF THE STAMP ACT (1766 A.D.)

A debate ensued in the commons, which was reported by two members, and printed in Paris — the houses still strictly forbidding the publication of their proceedings. On that night Burke made his first speech in parliament; and Pitt, whose voice had not been heard for a year, delivered one of those orations which, however imperfectly recorded, give us a notion of that supremacy that, broken as he was in health, wrapped in flannels, and giving effect to his action with a crutch, he still, above all men, exercised over his contemporaries. In a letter which he wrote from Bath on the 9th, he said, "If I can crawl, or be carried, I will deliver my mind and heart upon the state of America." What he then spoke was remembered and repeated as the great contest went on; and by none more diligently than by the colonists. He went with them to the full extent of denying the right of the British legislature to impose taxes without representation. He touched upon great principles that extended beyond this question of taxing the American colonies: "There is an idea in some that the colonies are virtually represented in this house. I would fain know by whom an American is represented here? Is he represented by any knight of the shire, in any county in this kingdom? Would to God that respectable representation was augmented to a greater number! Or will you tell him that he is represented by any representative of a borough — a borough, which, perhaps, its own representative never saw? This is what is called 'the rotten part of the constitution.' It cannot continue the century; if it does not drop, it must be amputated. The idea of a virtual representation of America in this house is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of a man; it does not deserve a serious refutation. The commons of America, represented in their several assemblies, have ever been in possession of the exercise of this, their constitutional right, of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it."

Grenville replied to Pitt, and defended his Stamp Act: "When I pro-

[1766 A.D.]

posed to tax America, I asked the house, if any gentleman would object to the right. I repeatedly asked it, and no man would attempt to deny it. Protection and obedience are reciprocal. Great Britain protects America; America is bound to yield obedience. If not, tell me when the Americans were emancipated? When they want the protection of this kingdom, they are always very ready to ask it. That protection has always been afforded them in the most full and ample manner. The nation has run itself into an immense debt to give them their protection: and now they are called upon to contribute a small share towards the public expense, an expense arising from themselves, they renounce your authority, insult your officers, and break out, I might almost say, into open rebellion. The seditious spirit of the colonies owes its birth to the factions in this house."

Pitt was permitted again to speak, the house being clamorous to hear him. There are passages in his second speech which show how much the house gained in this departure from its ordinary rules. We may give the concluding summary of the orator's opinions: "A great deal has been said without doors, of the power of the strength, of America. It is a topic that ought to be cautiously meddled with. In a good cause, on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. In such a cause, your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like a strong man. She would embrace the pillars of the state, and pull down the constitution along with her. Is this your boasted peace? Not to sheathe the sword in its scabbard, but to sheathe it in the bowels of your countrymen ? The Americans have not acted in all things with prudence and temper. They have been wronged. They have been driven to madness by injustice. Will you punish them for the madness you have occasioned? Rather let prudence and temper come first from this side. I will undertake for America that she will follow the example. There are two lines in a ballad of Prior's, of a man's behaviour to his wife, so applicable to you and your colonies that I cannot help repeating them:

> Be to her faults a little blind:
> Be to her virtues very kind.

Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the house what is really my opinion. It is that the Stamp Act be repealed absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, because it was founded on an erroneous principle. At the same time let the sovereign authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and be made to extend to every point of legislation whatsoever. That we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent."

The petitions against the American Stamp Act, and the papers laid before parliament, occupied in the commons the attention of a committee of the whole house for three weeks. Several persons were also examined, amongst whom was Benjamin Franklin. After this examination of papers and witnesses, the repeal of the Stamp Act was recommended by the committee of the whole house, and a declaratory resolution was adopted: "That the king's majesty, by and with the consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons of Great Britain, in parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever." The distinction which Pitt had maintained, that parliament was not competent to pass a law for taxing the colonies, was set at nought by this resolution. But it was contended that

though the right existed, it was impolitic to exercise it, and therefore the Stamp Act ought to be repealed. Pitt adhered to his opinion, but did not attempt to divide the house. A Declaratory Bill was passed, embodying the principle of the power of parliament to bind the colonies "in all cases whatsoever."

Whilst this bill was passing into law, a strong opposition was getting up against the bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act, which was about to be proposed by the government. The house of commons came to a decisive vote on the 21st of February, on the resolution that leave should be given to bring in a bill for the repeal of the Stamp Act. The resolution was moved by Conway. He drew a strong picture of the mischiefs that had already ensued. The trade of England was not only stopped, but in danger of being lost. The conflict would ruin both countries. "If we did not repeal the act, he had no doubt but France and Spain would declare war, and protect the Americans." Grenville exposed the futility of maintaining a right in the Declaratory Bill which the government would not dare to assert. Pitt demanded the repeal as due to the liberty of unrepresented subjects. The scene after the termination of the debate on that February morning has been described by Burke[i] in glowing words; but words not too lofty for the great occasion: "I remember, sir, with a melancholy pleasure, the situation of the honourable gentleman who made the motion for the repeal; in that crisis, when the whole trading interest of this empire, crammed into your lobbies, with a trembling and anxious expectation, waited, almost to a winter's return of light, their fate from your resolutions. When, at length, you had determined in their favour, and your doors, thrown open, showed them the figure of their deliverer in the well-earned triumph of his important victory, from the whole of that grave multitude there arose an involuntary burst of gratitude and transport. They jumped upon him like children on a long absent father. They clung about him as captives about their redeemer. All England, all America, joined to his applause. Nor did he seem insensible to the best of all earthly rewards, the love and admiration of his fellow citizens. Hope elevated and joy brightened his crest." Such was the enthusiasm towards Conway, the mover of the resolution. Walpole[d] has described the difference in the reception of Pitt and Grenville. When Pitt appeared, the crowd pulled off their hats, huzzaed, and many followed his chair home with shouts and benedictions. Grenville was hissed; and in a rage, seized the nearest man to him by the collar. "Providentially the fellow had more humour than spleen — 'Well, if I may not hiss,' said he, 'at least I may laugh,' and laughed in his face. The jest caught; had the fellow been surly and resisted, a tragedy had probably ensued." The bill for the repeal finally passed the commons by a large majority; and the lords, by a majority of more than thirty.

PITT CREATED EARL OF CHATHAM (1766 A.D.)

Pitt has been greatly blamed for not allying himself with the Rockingham administration. He was invited by them with an earnestness that approached to obsequiousness. He turned a deaf ear to their overtures. They fell, from their inability to stand against the unwilling support of the sovereign, and the intrigues of those who arrogated to themselves the exclusive title of the king's friends. This ministry did popular things. They gave in to the clamour of the weavers, by passing an act for restraining the importation of foreign silks. They repealed the cider tax. They passed resolutions declaring the illegality of general warrants, and condemning the seizure of private papers, to discover

the authors of libels. Their concessions in some degree indicated their weakness. Several of their minor supporters deserted them. The duke of Grafton left them, resigning his office of secretary of state, on the ground that they wanted "authority, dignity, and extension"; that he knew but one man who could give them strength and solidity; and that were that person to give his assistance, "he should with pleasure take up the spade and the pickaxe, and dig in the trenches."

A disagreement ensued in the cabinet; the king was told that the ministry could not go on as they were; and his majesty, in July, resolved to send for Mr. Pitt, and so told his servants. The king wrote him a letter, expressing his desire to have his thoughts "how an able and dignified ministry may be formed." Pitt answered the king — "penetrated with the deepest sense of your majesty's boundless goodness to me, and with a heart overflowing with duty and zeal for the honour and happiness of the most gracious and benign sovereign." Lord Temple was sent for by the king; and his majesty wrote to Mr. Pitt, who was ill, that he had opened a desire to see his lordship in the treasury; but that "he seems to incline to quarters very heterogeneous to my and your ideas, and almost a total exclusion of the present men." Temple was ambitious. He was indignant at the idea of being "stuck into a ministry as a great cypher at the head of the treasury, surrounded with other cyphers all named by Mr. Pitt." The ministry was at length formed. The duke of Grafton became head of the treasury; General Conway and Lord Shelburne, secretaries of state; Lord Camden, lord chancellor; Charles Townshend, chancellor of the exchequer. Mr. Pitt, to the great surprise of the world, on taking the office of lord privy seal went to the house of peers as earl of Chatham.

The transformation of Pitt into Chatham is held to have destroyed his popularity. "That fatal title blasted all the affection which his country had borne to him, and which he had deserved so well. The people, though he had done no act to occasion reproach, thought he had sold them for a title." The city of London declined to present an address on the appointment to office of the man they had idolised. The objectors seem to have forgotten the bodily infirmities which necessarily prevented him taking the post in the house of commons which a prime minister was expected to take; and they scarcely gave him credit for the power which remained to him of influencing his colleagues by the vigour of his plans, when he could not command a popular assembly by the splendour of his eloquence. He had large projects of statesmanship. He was anxious to cement an alliance with the Protestant states of Europe, to counterbalance the Family Compact of France and Spain, which was leading those powers again to meditate attacks upon England. He sent an ambassador to confer with the czarina of Russia and Frederick of Prussia; but Frederick was indignant at the treatment he had received at the peace, and could place no reliance on a policy so subject to the consequences of ministerial change. There is a strong testimony to the rare powers of Lord Chatham's mind, at an early period of his administration. Charles Townshend for the first time attended the cabinet as chancellor of the exchequer, when the great statesman developed his views of the position of Europe. "Mr. Townshend," says the duke of Grafton in his memoirs, "was particularly astonished; and owned to me, as I was carrying him home in my carriage, that Lord Chatham had just shown us what inferior animals we were, and that much as we had seen of him before, he did not conceive till that night his superiority to be so very transcendent." The minister contemplated important changes in the government of Ireland. "To enable himself to contend with the powerful connections there, he proposed to establish himself upon the basis of a just

popularity, by shortening the duration of parliament, and granting other measures which the Irish appeared to have most at heart." Lord Chatham also had in view organic changes in the constitution of the East India Company — their astonishing dominion having now become an anomaly in the absence of government control, and their vast revenues the means of administering to private rapacity and injustice.

The administration entered upon its duties at a period of domestic trouble. The season was one of extreme wetness. The harvest failed; and riots attended the rising price of corn. But the price had not quite reached the point at which exportation was forbidden. By an order in council an embargo was laid on exportation. The parliament had not been called together, as it might have been, to sanction the measure, which came into operation on the 24th of September. Parliament met, according to the date of its prorogation, on the 11th of November. The first appearance of Chatham in the house of lords was to defend the order in council on the ground of public necessity. Camden and others in both houses maintained its legality. Fierce debates ensued, in which this exercise of the prerogative was compared to former unconstitutional attempts to set up a dispensing power. It was thought essential to mark that such an exercise of the prerogative was not constitutional. An act of indemnity was therefore passed to exonerate those who had advised and acted upon the order in council. A parliamentary inquiry into the affairs of the East India Company was now forced on by Chatham, in opposition to the wishes of several of his colleagues. He refused to impart to them the nature and extent of his plans. Several of the Rockingham party resolved to secede from him. He had to form new combinations of public men, and to quiet the apprehensions of those who were accused of being despotically governed by him.

CHATHAM'S ILLNESS

During the Christmas recess Chatham went to Bath, where he became seriously ill. Parliament assembled, and the prime minister was not in his place. His cabinet fell into disorder. The fatal effects of the absence of the chief, and his unwillingness to entrust responsibility to his colleagues, were signally manifested, when the chancellor of the exchequer commended the Stamp Act, and again proposed to tax the colonies. Burke has described in his speech upon American taxation this strange disorganisation of Lord Chatham's minstry. "When his face was hid but for a moment, his whole system was on a wide sea, without chart or compass."

That portion of the life of Chatham when he was nominally the head of the administration, but wholly incapable of directing the national affairs, and altogether shrinking from that direction, is as difficult to understand as it is melancholy to contemplate. The true solution of this mystery is that the intellect of Chatham was temporarily enfeebled, almost destroyed; that he did not resign office, although incapable of performing its duties, because the ordinary perceptions of his mind were clouded to an extent that left him no power of judgment; and that when he did resign, in October, 1768, on account of "the deplorable state of his health," his mind had to some extent resumed its vigour, though his bodily infirmities were as great as ever.

The ministry struggled on with considerable difficulty through the session of 1768. There had been many changes in its composition. Charles Townshend had died of fever. His brilliant talents were neutralised by his levity; and it was clear that if his ambition had placed him at the head of the govern-

ment, he would have done some rash things — perhaps precipitated a war with America earlier than the nobleman, Lord North, who succeeded Townshend as the chancellor of exchequer. The parliament, now approaching the end of its septennial term, was dissolved on the 11th of March, 1768.

The new parliament was opened on the 10th of May, 1768. In this most important session the non-publication of debates was enforced with almost unequalled strictness. The rigid enforcement of the standing order for the exclusion of strangers went on from 1768 to 1774 — the whole term of the duration of this parliament, thus known as the Unreported Parliament.

ANOTHER WILKES CONTEST (1768 A.D.)

At the opening of parliament the ministry comprised Lord Camden, lord chancellor; the duke of Grafton, first lord of the treasury; Lord Shelburne, secretary of state; Lord North, chancellor of the exchequer. Lord Chatham still held the privy seal, but continued unable to discharge any official duties. It was the duke of Grafton's ministry. The new parliament commenced in a tempest of popular violence, such as had been unwitnessed in England for many years. John Wilkes, the outlaw, suddenly returned from France, at the time when the writs had been issued for a general election, and he declared himself a candidate for the city of London.[c] He was of course the favourite of the rabble; but prone as that constituency generally is to favour demagogues, he was rejected. The ministers, instead of trying to disarm him by clemency, or of crushing him at once by putting his sentence into execution, rested content with his letters to the law-officers of the treasury pledging his honour to appear in the court of king's bench. He forthwith stood for Middlesex; and the electors there being chiefly of the lowest class, he was chosen by a large majority. When he surrendered himself, he was committed to the king's bench prison; meantime the city was kept in a constant state of terror by the riots of his partisans. It was his boast that he could "halloo the rabble like so many bull-dogs" to any purpose he pleased, by the use of the words "liberty," "arbitrary power," and similar magic terms.

The court of king's bench reversed Wilkes' sentence of outlawry on account of some irregularity in it, but the two verdicts against him were confirmed, and he was condemned to pay two fines of £500, and be imprisoned for two years. Subscriptions were forthwith raised among his admirers to pay his debts; he received abundance of presents; and his face, which was remarkable for its ugliness, became the ornament of numerous signboards. The demagogue soon after, having got hold of a letter from Lord Weymouth, the secretary, to the Surrey magistrates, approving of their conduct in putting down a riot in St. George's fields, in which some lives were lost, published it with a preface, calling that affair in the true demagogic style "a horrid massacre, and the consequence of a hellish project deliberately planned"; and as at the bar of the house he claimed the thanks of his country for having set "that bloody scroll" in a proper light, he was expelled the house, and a new writ was ordered for Middlesex.

Every artifice for inflaming the populace was put in requisition, and Wilkes was re-elected; but the house declared him incapable of sitting during that parliament. He was returned again, and again his election was declared to be void. He stood once more, and Colonel Luttrell who opposed him was pronounced to be duly elected, though Wilkes had an immense majority of the votes. The needy patriot had already been relieved by a subscription; and the citizens of London, honouring the mere names of liberty and patriotism in

one who disgraced them both, with that absence of real political wisdom characteristic of such bodies, elected him to the dignity of alderman. A political club, named the "Society for supporting the Bill of Rights," of which he was a principal member, was formed in 1770, but it was soon discovered that a great part of the funds had been diverted to the payment of the patriot's debts and to the purchase of an annuity for him. The democratic party, however, still adhered to him; he was lord mayor in due course, and finally obtained the great object of his ambition, the lucrative post of city chamberlain.

A rival of Wilkes in the trade of patriotism, but a less fortunate adventurer, was the reverend John Horne. This man had entered the church, it would appear, merely as a profession, and without even a belief in its doctrines; but finding it not to answer his expectations, he abandoned it. A man who has been a teacher of religion, and who from scruples of conscience has retired from the sacred profession, should, in our opinion, select some pursuit, medicine for instance, which would harmonise in some measure with that which he had abandoned, if it were only to evince his having acted from pure motives. But Horne had none of this delicacy of feeling; he was ambitious of turbulent distinction; he aimed at being a lawyer and a member of parliament. He ran a career of vice and sedition; was familiar with the walls of prisons, and died a dependent on the bounty of his friends.

THE LETTERS OF JUNIUS

It was also at this time that that most powerful but most unscrupulous of political satirists who subscribed "Junius" to his letters attacked the king and his ministers in the most envenomed style. His letters now form a portion of our literature, and are models in their class of compositions. His secret was never divulged, and ingenuity has long been exercised in the attempt to discover the real author. Lord George Germaine and Sir Philip Francis[1] are those in whose cases the strongest apparent proofs have been given. Lord Chatham, Edmund Burke, and other persons have been on various grounds suspected of the authorship.[c]

The one paramount desire of Junius was to destroy the administration of the duke of Grafton. He had no large conception of a general policy that should unite a great party in the conduct of affairs if that administration were destroyed. The two questions which absorbed the thoughts and divided the opinions of all public men were the contest between parliamentary privilege and Wilkes, and the more perplexing quarrel between the mother country and the North American colonies. It was known that the king held the most decided opinions on both these questions — that he would have pursued Wilkes to the utmost reach of power, whatever might be the unpopularity; and that he would assert the right of taxation over the colonies, whatever might be the danger of rebellion and war. The ministry of the duke of Grafton was committed, in a great degree, to an agreement with the will of the sovereign, less perhaps from conviction than from an imperfect view of the consequences of persisting in a doubtful career. At this juncture Lord Chatham, having ceased to be at the head of affairs, was free to pursue his own declared sentiments on the subject of American taxation, and to form

[1 But who was Junius? Who lurked beneath that name, or rather, according to the motto he assumed, that "shadow of a name"? This question, which has already employed so many pens and filled so many volumes, cannot be so fully dealt with in these pages. But I will not affect to speak with doubt when no doubt exists in my mind. From the proofs adduced by others, and on a clear conviction of my own, which I am bound thus frankly to express, I affirm that the author of Junius was no other than Sir Philip Francis.—STANHOPE.[b]]

an independent judgment on the case of Wilkes. He had become reconciled to his brother-in-law, Lord Temple, and was looked upon as having joined the Grenville party. But though he agreed with George Grenville on the unconstitutional proceedings of the house of commons in the matter of the Middlesex election, he was totally opposed to him on the subject of America. The Rockingham party, of whose policy Burke was now the great parliamentary expositor, held fast to the popular principles in the dispute with the freeholders of Middlesex, but repudiated any such assertion of authority over the colonies as George Grenville had maintained. Junius not only supported but prompted Wilkes in every act that could damage the ministry. But he also spoke in the most contemptuous terms of any individual or any party that deemed the colonists anything but rebels, to be trodden down as troublesome vermin. Ostensibly he was an adherent of George Grenville. Had he any real principles? He was not a politician, in the higher sense of the word. He had some selfish ambition to gratify; he had some private grievances to revenge. He might be a writing puppet, moved by some one of higher mark — a Francis, or a Dyer, prompted by a Temple. He might be a man of noble birth, mining like a mole; whose vanity was gratified by the notoriety which he commanded — pleased with acquiring another self-consciousness than that which belonged to his proper person. Whoever he was, he had essentially a paltry mind.

THE REAPPEARANCE OF CHATHAM (1769 A.D.)

On the 9th of May, 1769, the parliament was prorogued. It was the day after the final decision on the Middlesex election. In the speech from the throne the members were exhorted, "with more than ordinary earnestness," to exert their utmost efforts for the maintenance of the public peace. The excitement throughout the country was considerable, but it rarely took the form of tumult. It was manifest, however, that the supposed victory of the government would not give the nation that quiet which sanguine courtiers anticipated. Lord Chatham came forth from his long retirement, and attended the king's levee on the 7th of July — "he himself, *in propria persona*, and not in a strait waistcoat," as Walpole writes. From the manuscript memoirs of the duke of Grafton we find that Chatham, when called by the king into his closet, objected to the course which had been pursued in the case of Wilkes, and stated "that he doubted whether his health would ever again allow him to attend parliament, but if it did, and if he should give his dissent to any measure, that his majesty would be indulgent enough to believe that it would not arise from any personal consideration."

On the 9th of January, 1770, the parliament was opened by the king. With a singular want of perception of the ridiculous, the first words of the royal speech were these: "My lords and gentlemen: It is with much concern that I find myself obliged to open the session of parliament with acquainting you that the distemper among the horned cattle has lately broke out in this kingdom." The petitions which had been presented from corporations and counties received no notice in this speech. Junius, with some justice, said to the duke of Grafton, "While the whole kingdom was agitated with anxious expectation upon one great point, you meanly evaded the question; and instead of the firmness and decision of a king, gave us nothing but the misery of a ruined grazier." But a voice more terrible than that of Junius was to rouse the government from its seeming unconcern. In the house of lords, Chatham moved an amendment to the address, pledging the peers that

they would take into their most serious consideration the causes of the discontents which so generally prevailed, and particularly the late proceedings in the house of commons touching the incapacity of John Wilkes, esquire, to be elected a member of the present parliament. The scene in the upper house on this occasion must have been as exciting as any in the history of England. The speech by which Chatham introduced the amendment, as well as the speech of Lord Mansfield, and Lord Chatham's reply, were first published in 1792, from a report of Mr. Francis, afterwards Sir Philip Francis, upon whom rests the prevailing opinion that he was Junius. We may judge by the following passage of the tendency of Chatham's speech: "The liberty of the subject is invaded, not only in the provinces, but here at home! The English people are loud in their complaints; they demand redress; and depend upon it, my lords, that, one way or another, they will have redress. They will never return to a state of tranquillity till they are redressed. Nor ought they. For in my judgment, my lords, and I speak it boldly, it were better for them to perish in a glorious contention for their rights, than to purchase a slavish tranquillity at the expense of a single iota of the constitution." Lord Mansfield spoke, contending that the proposed amendment was an attack upon the privileges of the other house of parliament. This produced a reply from Lord Chatham.



WILLIAM MURRAY, EARL OF MANSFIELD
(1705–1793)

After Chatham's speech, the lord chancellor, Camden, rose from the woolsack, and thus threw off all restraint: "I accepted the great seal without conditions; I meant not, therefore, to be trammelled by his majesty — I beg pardon, by his ministers — but I have suffered myself to be so too long. For some time I have beheld with silent indignation the arbitrary measures of the minister. I have often drooped and hung down my head in council, and disapproved by my looks those steps which I knew my avowed opposition could not prevent. I will do so no longer, but openly and boldly speak my sentiments; I now proclaim to the world that I entirely coincide in the opinion expressed by my noble friend — whose presence again reanimates us — respecting this unconstitutional vote of the house of commons. If, in giving my opinion as a judge, I were to pay any respect to that vote, I should look upon myself as a traitor to my trust, and an enemy to my country. By

their violent and tyrannical conduct, ministers have alienated the minds of the people from his majesty's government — I had almost said from his majesty's person — insomuch, that if some measures are not devised to appease the clamours so universally prevalent, I know not, my lords, whether the people, in despair, may not become their own avengers, and take the redress of grievances into their own hands."

In the house of commons, the marquis of Granby voted for the amendment which had been proposed in opposition to the government. The lord chancellor, and the commander-in-chief, were thus in open hostility with the other members of the cabinet. Such an anomalous state could not long endure. Chatham, Temple, and their friends, were waiting the issue with extreme solicitude. Granby had been earnestly entreated to retain his command of the army in spite of his vote. "The king, it seems, and the duke of Grafton are upon their knees to Lord Granby not to resign," writes Temple to Chatham. Chatham grieves that twenty-four hours' respite has been granted to a minister's entreaties. He was at last set at rest by Granby's resignation. But he regrets that the chancellor had dragged the great seal for an hour at the heels of a desperate minister. His high office had been offered to Mr. Charles Yorke, the son of Lord-chancellor Hardwicke. It was a prize he had long coveted; but to accept it would be to desert his party. He declined. Three days after he went to the levee at St. James'; and, at the earnest entreaties of the king, he kissed the royal hand as chancellor. Camden was dismissed. Yorke, borne down by agitation of mind, died, as was supposed by his own hand, on the 20th of January. On the 22nd there came on another great debate in the house of lords on the state of the nation, in which Chatham announced his cordial union with the party of Rockingham.

The continued debate on the state of the nation was deferred till the 2nd of February. On the 28th of January, the duke of Grafton resigned. The king was not unprepared for this event. On the 23rd of January he thus wrote to Lord North: "Lord Weymouth and Lord Gower will wait upon you this morning to press you in the strongest manner to accept the office of first lord commissioner of the treasury. My mind is more and more strengthened in the rightness of the measure, which would prevent every other desertion. You must easily see that if you do not accept, I have no peer at present that I would consent to place in the duke of Grafton's employment." "The rightness of the measure" was to be tested by twelve years of national calamity.

COLONIAL AFFAIRS

The domestic agitations during the period of the duke of Grafton's ministry required to be given in an unbroken narrative. We now take up the more truly important relation of those events in the North American colonies, and of the mode in which they were dealt with by the imperial government. These facts form the prologue to the tragedy of the American Revolution.

In 1768 a third secretary of state was appointed. The office of secretary of state for Scotland had been abolished; but now a new place was created for the earl of Hillsborough — the secretaryship of the colonies. It was a position of authority which demanded a rare union of firmness and moderation. But the secretary was a member of a cabinet divided in judgment on the great question of American taxation; and Lord Hillsborough was of the

party of the duke of Bedford, who held opinions on that subject, not exactly in consonance with that championship of our free constitution which has been claimed for him. Hillsborough had to deal with colonial subjects of the British crown, whose indignation at the Stamp Act had been revived by Charles Townshend's fatal measure for granting duties in America on glass, red and white lead, painters' colours, paper, and tea.

The king, on opening the parliament on the 8th of November, 1768, spoke in severe terms of the proceedings in North America. The spirit of faction had broken out afresh; one of the colonies had proceeded to acts of violence and of resistance to the execution of the law; the capital town of that colony was in a state of disobedience to all law and government — had adopted measures subversive of the constitution, and attended with circumstances that might manifest a disposition to throw off their dependence on Great Britain. Not a word was uttered of the cause of this disobedience. Turbulent and seditious persons were to be defeated. On the 15th of December, in the house of lords, the duke of Bedford moved an address to the king, recommending that the chief authors and instigators of the late disorders in Massachusetts should be brought to condign punishment; and beseeching his majesty that he would direct the governor of that colony "to take the most effectual methods for procuring the fullest information that can be obtained touching all treasons or misprision of treason, committed within this government since the 30th day of December last, and to transmit the same, together with the names of the persons who were most active in the commission of such offences, to one of your majesty's principal secretaries of state, in order that your majesty may issue a special commission for inquiring of, hearing and determining, the said offences within this realm, pursuant to the provisions of the statute of the 35th year of the reign of King Henry VIII, in case your majesty shall, upon receiving the said information, see sufficient ground for such a proceeding." This most arbitrary proposal was carried without a division. In the house of commons, at the opening of the session, Mr. Stanley, the seconder of the address, said that the people of the insolent town of Boston "must be treated as aliens."

We have now reached the period of Lord North's administration. On the 5th of March, 1770, on the house of commons proceeding to take into consideration the petition of the merchants of London trading to North America, the first lord of the treasury, in a temperate speech, moved the repeal of such portions of the act of 1767, as laid duties upon glass and other articles, omitting any mention of tea. "I cannot propose," he said, "any further repeal than what it was my intention to promise them. The Americans, by their subsequent behaviour, have not deserved any particular indulgence from this country." Upon this principle, many a mistaken policy has been persisted in, out of pure defiance of the excesses which that policy has provoked. "We will not be driven to repeal by any threats held out to us," said the minister. He anticipated no larger revenue than £12,000 a year from the tea duties, but he would not give up the right to tax America which was asserted in the preamble of the act imposing the duties. The proposition of Lord North was carried by a majority of sixty-two.

When the American colonists came to know that the British parliament had repealed all the duties laid by the act of 1767, except that on tea, the spirit which had prompted the non-importation agreements was somewhat allayed. The citizens of New York determined by a large majority to resume importations from England; and many orders were despatched in July for every kind of merchandise but tea. Other provinces were indignant with

the New Yorkers. Massachusetts maintained a position of sullen defiance. Although, for two or three years, there was in America an apparent calm — a deceptive absence of violence which looked like peace — the time was rapidly approaching when the exhortation of Mr. Wedderburn, in 1770, before he became Lord North's solicitor-general, would be looked upon as a prophecy: "How, sir, will it hereafter sound in the annals of the present reign, that all America — the fruit of so many years' settlement, nurtured by this country at the price of so much blood and treasure — was lost to the crown of Great Britain in the reign of George III?" Whilst there is a lull in this trans-Atlantic tempest, let us revert to our domestic affairs — petty in their details, but very significant in their tendencies.

ARRESTS FOR PUBLISHING PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

In the session of parliament of 1771, there was a contest between the house of commons and the corporation of London, which was eventually productive of the highest public benefit. Although both houses held strenuously to the principle that it was the highest offence to publish their debates, the speeches of particular members were frequently printed. On the 8th of February, 1771, Colonel Onslow complained to the house of commons that two newspapers had printed a motion he had made, and a speech against it; and moreover had called him Little Cocking George. Upon his motion, the papers were delivered in and read; and the printer of the *Gazetteer*, R. Thompson, and the printer of the *Middlesex Chronicle*, J. Wheble, were ordered to attend the house. The printers could not be found to serve the orders upon them, and then the house addressed the king that he would issue his royal proclamation for their apprehension. On the 12th of March, Colonel Onslow said he was determined to bring this matter to an issue. "To-day I shall only bring before the house three brace, for printing the debates." This wholesale proceeding was resisted by motions for adjournment and amendments, which protracted the debates till five o'clock in the morning, during which the house divided twenty-three times. Four of the printers obeyed the orders of the house, made their submission, and were discharged. But the affair now took a more serious turn. The sergeant-at-arms had been ordered to take J. Miller, of the *London Evening Post*, into custody. Wheble and Thompson had been previously arrested collusively, by some friends or servants; and being taken before Alderman Wilkes and Alderman Oliver, were discharged. Miller was apprehended by the officer of the house of commons at his house in the city; but the officer was immediately himself taken into custody by a city constable. The parties went before the lord mayor, Crosby; who was attended by Wilkes and Oliver. The lord mayor decided that the arrest of a citizen without the authority of one of the city magistrates, was a violation of its charters; and ordered Miller to be released, and the officer of the commons to give bail to answer a charge of assault.

On the 18th of March, the deputy-sergeant-at-arms was desired by the speaker to give an account of the transactions in the city. It was then moved that Brass Crosby, esquire, lord mayor, and a member of parliament, should attend in his place the next day. The lord mayor, although he was ill, came amidst the huzzas of a crowd that echoed through the house. He was permitted to sit whilst defending his conduct; and then he desired to go home, having been in his bed-chamber sixteen or seventeen days. The lord mayor was allowed to retire. Charles Fox said "there are two other criminals, Alderman Oliver and Alderman Wilkes," for which expression

"criminals" he was gently reproved by Wedderburn, who had become solicitor-general. Alderman Oliver was then ordered to attend in his place. Wilkes had written a letter to declare that he was the lawful member for Middlesex, and would only appear in the house as a member. Mr. Calcraft writes to Lord Chatham, "The ministers avow Wilkes too dangerous to meddle with. He is to do what he pleases; we are to submit. So his majesty orders; he will have 'nothing more to do with that devil Wilkes.'" On the 25th of March the lord mayor and Alderman Oliver were in their places. In the course of the debate upon a proposal to commit them to the Tower, members came in, and reported that they had been insulted on their way to the house. The magistrates of Westminster were called, and were ordered to disperse the mob. The debate proceeded. The lord mayor, being again permitted to withdraw, said he should submit himself to whatever the house should do. The populace took the horses from his coach, and drew him in triumph to the Mansion house. After a sitting of nine hours, a motion for adjournment was rejected. When the speaker asked Alderman Oliver what he had to say in his defence, he replied, "I know the punishment I am to receive is determined upon. I have nothing to say, neither in my own defence nor in defence of the city of London. Do what you please. I defy you."

Before the motion for committing Alderman Oliver to the Tower was carried, Colonel Barré left the house, followed by Dunning, and about a dozen other members. He wrote to Chatham, "I spoke to this question about five minutes only, but I believe with great violence." To the Tower was Oliver conducted quietly at seven o'clock on the morning of the 27th. On that day the lord mayor again came to the house to attend in his place. A tremendous riot ensued. Mr. Calcraft described the scene to Lord Chatham: "The concourse of people who attended the lord mayor is incredible. They seized Lord North, broke his chariot, had got him amongst them, and but for Sir William Meredith's interfering would probably have demolished him. This, with the insults to other members, caused an adjournment of business for some hours." The justices came to the bar to declare they could not read the Riot Act.

The lord mayor and Alderman Oliver remained prisoners in the Tower, till the parliament was prorogued on the 8th of May. A prorogation suspends the power under which the privilege of committal is exercised. The house wisely resolved not to renew the perilous dispute with the city in the ensuing session. With equal wisdom the printers of the debates were no more threatened or arrested. On the 1st of May, Chatham told the peers some wholesome truths, on the subject of the publication of parliamentary proceedings. The dissatisfaction of the people "had made them uncommonly attentive to the proceedings of parliament. Hence the publication of the parliamentary debates. And where was the injury, if the members acted upon honest principles? For a public assembly to be afraid of having their deliberations published is monstrous, and speaks for itself." It was some years before these principles were completely recognised, in the conviction that a full and impartial report of the debates in parliament is one of the best securities for freedom, for a respect for the laws, and for raising up a national tribunal of public opinion in the place of the passions of demagogues and the violence of mobs. The triumph of the "miscreants" of 1771 led the way to the complete establishment of that wonderful system of reporting, which has rendered the newspaper press of this country the clearest mirror of the aggregate thought of a reflecting people.

THE ROYAL MARRIAGE ACT (1772 A.D.)

On the 20th of February, 1772, the following royal message was brought down to both houses of parliament: "George R. his majesty being desirous, from paternal affection for his own family, and anxious concern for the future welfare of his people, and the honour and dignity of his crown, that the right of approving all marriages in the royal family (which ever has belonged to the kings of this realm as a matter of public concern) may be made effectual, recommends to both houses of parliament to take into their serious consideration whether it may not be wise and expedient to supply the defect of the laws now in being; and, by some new provision, more effectually to guard the descendants of his late majesty King George II (other than the issue of princesses who have married or may hereafter marry into foreign families) from marrying without the approbation of his majesty, his heirs, or successors, first had and obtained."

The Royal Marriage Bill was presented next day to the house of lords. It made provision that no prince or princess descended from George II — with the exception of the issue of princesses married abroad — should be capable of contracting matrimony without the previous consent of the king, his heirs, or successors. But it also provided that if any such descendant of George II, being above the age of twenty-five, should persist in a resolution to marry, the king's consent being refused, he or she might give notice to the privy council, and might at any time within twelve months after such notice contract marriage, unless both houses of parliament, before the expiration of twelve months, should expressly declare their disapprobation of such intended marriage. After continued and vehement debates in both houses, the bill became law; and it still continues in force. Its provisions appear to be imperfectly understood. It is called by Massey *f* "an encroachment upon the law of nature — an impious and cruel measure." There is a constitutional appeal against an unjust exercise of the prerogative. Such an appeal has never been made; but it would most probably not be made in vain, if any case should arise which would justify parliament in not supporting the sovereign in the assertion of an arbitrary power.

EAST INDIAN TEA IN BOSTON HARBOUR

In 1773, the parliament turned from its long course of anti-popular contests, to look seriously at a matter of paramount national importance. The pecuniary affairs of the East India Company had fallen into great disorder. On the 2nd of March a petition was presented from the company to the house of commons, praying for the assistance of a loan of a million and a half sterling. In the previous session a select committee of the house had been appointed to inquire into the affairs of the company. The necessity for such an inquiry was strongly urged, upon financial and moral grounds. The net revenues of Bengal had decreased; the natives were distressed and discontented; the company's servants were arbitrary and oppressive. General Burgoyne, the mover of the resolution for a committee, made an eloquent appeal to the feelings of the house: "The fate of a great portion of the globe; the fate of great states, in which your own is involved; the distresses of fifteen millions of people; the rights of humanity; are involved in this question."

[The details of this affair are given in our history of India (volume xxii) and need not be repeated here. But there was one feature of the parliamentary adjustment that has peculiar significance from our present standpoint.]

The directors of the East India Company had in their warehouses seventeen million pounds of tea, for which they wanted a market. Permission was given by act of parliament to export teas belonging to the company to any of the British plantations in America, with a drawback of the duty payable in England. The colonial tax of three pence in the pound was to be paid in the American ports. Ships were freighted, and consignees appointed to sell their cargoes. Fatal boon, whose consequences no one saw.

It was Sunday, the 28th of November, 1773, when there sailed into Boston harbour the English merchant ship *Dartmouth*, laden with chests of tea belonging to the East India Company. The act of parliament which allowed the treasury to license vessels to export the teas of the company to the American colonies, free of duty, was the signal for popular gatherings in Boston. Town meetings were held, when strong resolutions were adopted. In this state of things the first tea-ship arrived. A committee met twice on that Sunday, and obtained a promise from Rotch, the commander of the ship, not to enter his ship till the following Tuesday.

Thirteen days after the arrival of the *Dartmouth*, the owner was summoned before the Boston committee, and told that his vessel and his tea must be taken back to London. It was out of his power to do so, he said. He certainly had not the power; for the passages out of the harbour were guarded by two king's ships to prevent any vessel going to sea without a licence. On the 16th, the revenue officers would have a legal authority to take possession of the *Dartmouth*. For three days previous there had been meetings of the Boston committee; but their journal had only this entry — "No business transacted matter of record."

On the 16th of December there was a meeting in Boston of seven thousand persons, who resolved that the tea should not be landed. The master of the *Dartmouth* was ordered to apply to the governor for a pass for his vessel to proceed on her return voyage to London. The governor was at his country house. Many of the leaders had adjourned to a church, to wait his answer. The night had come on when Rotch returned and announced that the governor had refused him a pass because his ship had not cleared. There was no more hesitation. Forty or fifty men, disguised as Mohawks, raised the war-whoop at the porch of the church; went on to the wharf where the three ships lay alongside; took possession of them; and deliberately emptied three hundred and forty chests of tea into the waters of the bay. It was the work of three hours. Not a sound was heard but that of breaking open the chests. The people of Boston went to their rest as if no extraordinary event had occurred.

On the 27th of January, 1774, the news of this decisive act reached the English government. On the 29th there was a great meeting of the lords of the council to consider a petition from Massachusetts for the dismissal of Hutchinson, the governor, and Oliver, the lieutenant-governor. Doctor Franklin appeared before the council as agent for Massachusetts. Franklin was treated with little respect; and Wedderburn, the solicitor-general, assailed him with a torrent of invective, at which the lords cheered and laughed. Franklin bore the assaults with perfect equanimity; but from that hour he ceased to be a mediator between Great Britain and the colonists. The council reported that the petition from Massachusetts was "groundless, vexatious, and scandalous." Two days after, Franklin was dismissed from his office of deputy postmaster general. He said to Priestley, who was present at the council, that he considered the thing for which he had been so insulted as one of the best actions of his life.

THE BOSTON PORT BILL (1774 A.D.)

The parliament had met on the 13th of January. It was the 7th of March when Lord North delivered the king's message relating to "the violent and outrageous proceedings at the town and port of Boston, in the province of Massachusetts Bay, with a view to obstructing the commerce of this kingdom, and upon grounds and pretences immediately subversive of the constitution thereof." On the 14th of March, Lord North brought in a bill for removing the custom house from Boston, and declaring it unlawful, after the 1st of June, to lade or unlade, ship or unship, any goods from any landing-place within the harbour of Boston. There was little opposition to this measure, which was passed in a fortnight, and when sent to the lords was as quickly adopted.

The Boston Port Bill, backed up by military force, was to be followed by other measures of coercion. On the 28th of March, Lord North brought in a bill for regulating the government of Massachusetts Bay. "I propose," he said, "in this bill to take the executive power from the hands of the democratic part of government." The proposition went, in many important particulars, to annul the charter granted to the province by William III. The council was to be appointed by the crown; the magistrates were to be nominated by the governor. This bill also passed, after ineffectual debate. A third bill enacted that during the next three years the governor of Massachusetts might, if it was thought that an impartial trial of any person could not be secured in that colony, send him for trial in another colony; or to Great Britain, if it were thought that no fair trial could be obtained in the colonies. The object of the bill was distinctly stated by Lord North — "Unless such a bill should pass into a law the executive power will be unwilling to act, thinking they will not have a fair trial without it."

THE CONFLICT IMMINENT

Whatever may be now the prevailing sentiment upon the colonial quarrel, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the controversy was one that involved great principles, and called forth the highest energies of great intellects. On either side of the Atlantic was manifested the grandeur of the Anglo-Saxon mind. Chatham, in 1775, paid a deserved tribute to the qualities displayed in the first American congress: "When your lordships look at the papers transmitted us from America — when you consider their decency, firmness, and wisdom, you cannot but respect their cause, and wish to make it your own. For myself I must declare and avow that in all my reading and observation — (I have read Thucydides, and have studied and admired the master-states of the world) — that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity, and wisdom of conclusion, under such a complication of difficult circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general congress at Philadelphia. I trust it is obvious to your lordships that all attempts to impose servitude upon such men, to establish despotism over such a mighty continental nation, must be vain, must be fatal."

Gibbon[9] has described the striking scene he witnessed in the British house of commons: "I assisted at the debates of a free assembly; I listened to the attack and defence of eloquence and reason; I had a near prospect of the character, views, and passions of the first men of the age. The cause of government was ably vindicated by Lord North, a statesman of spotless integrity, a consummate master of debate, who could wield, with equal dexterity, the arms of reason and of ridicule. He was seated on the treasury-bench between

his attorney and solicitor-general, the two pillars of the law and state, *magis pares quam similes;* and the minister might indulge in a short slumber, whilst he was upholden on either hand by the majestic sense of Thurlow, and the skilful eloquence of Wedderburn. From the adverse side of the house an ardent and powerful opposition was supported by the lively declamation of Barré, the legal acuteness of Dunning, the profuse and philosophical fancy of Burke, and the argumentative vehemence of Fox, who, in the conduct of a party, approved himself equal to the conduct of an empire. By such men every operation of peace and war, every principle of justice and policy, every question of authority and freedom, was attacked and defended; and the subject of the momentous contest was the union or separation of Great Britain and America. The eight sessions that I sat in parliament were a school of civil prudence, the first and most essential virtue of an historian."

The differences of opinion in America ought to have retarded the terrible issue that was approaching. The fears of the timid, the hopes of the loyal, were opposed to the advocates of resistance, and might have prevailed to avert the notion of independence. In an unhappy hour, blood was shed; and conciliation then became a word that was uttered to deaf ears in England as in America. We must in this chapter rapidly trace the course of events till we reach that crisis.

The ministry after passing their coercive bills had determined to send out General Gage to supersede Hutchinson as governor of Massachusetts, and to be commander-in-chief in the colonies. He would have to act upon a system distinctly opposed to the old chartered system of free local government. He undervalued, as we have seen, the resistance which was to be brought against him, and relied too absolutely upon "four regiments." His appointment was not disagreeable to the New Englanders. He had lived amongst them, and had honourably executed the military authority with which he had been previously entrusted. In an unhappy hour he arrived at Boston, on the 13th of May, 1774. A vessel which came there before him brought a copy of the Boston Port Bill. When Gage came into the harbour, the people were holding a meeting to discuss that act of the British legislature which deprived them of their old position in the commerce of the world — which doomed their merchants and all dependent upon them to absolute ruin. There was but one feeling. The meeting entered into resolutions, to which they invited the co-operation of the other colonies, for the purpose of suspending all commercial intercourse with Great Britain, and the West Indies, until the act was repealed. Copies of the act were everywhere circulated, printed with a black border. But there was no violence. The new governor was received with decorum, but without the accustomed honours. General Gage gave the assembly notice that on the 1st of June, according to the provisions of the act, their place of meeting would be removed to the town of Salem. When the spirit of opposition to his dictates was rising, the governor suddenly adjourned the assembly. He was asked to appoint the 1st of June as a day of general prayer and fasting. He refused. In Virginia the house of burgesses appointed the 1st of June as a day of humiliation, to avert the calamity of their loss of rights, or the miseries of civil war. They were immediately dissolved. The assembly of Virginia did not separate without recommending a General Congress. The idea universally spread. Meanwhile, General Gage had an encampment of six regiments on a common near Boston, and had begun to fortify the isthmus which connects the town with the adjacent country. The 1st of June came. There was no tumult. Business was at an end; Boston had become a city of the dead.

The first congress, consisting of fifty-five members, met at Philadelphia on the 4th of September. The place of their meeting was Carpenter's hall. Peyton Randolph was chosen as their president. Their proceedings were conducted with closed doors. The more earnest party gradually obtained the ascendency over the more timid. They drew up a declaration of rights. They passed resolutions to suspend all imports from Great Britain or Ireland after the 1st of December, and to discontinue all exports after the 10th of September in the ensuing year, unless the grievances of America should be redressed. They published addresses to the people of Great Britain and of Canada, and they decided upon a petition to the king. These were the papers that called forth the eulogium of Chatham. The congress dissolved themselves on the 26th of October; and resolved that another congress should be convened on the 10th of May, 1775.

After the 1st of June the irremediable conflict between the governor and representatives of the people soon put an end to the legal course of government. General Gage was so wholly deserted by the council that the meeting of the assembly, which was proposed to take place at Salem in October, could not be regularly convened. Writs for the election of members had been issued, but were afterwards annulled by proclamation. The elections took place. The persons chosen assembled, and styled themselves a local congress. A committee of safety was appointed. They enrolled militia, called Minute-men, whose engagement was that they should appear in arms at a minute's notice. They appointed commanders. They provided ammunition. The knowledge of the two acts of parliament which had followed that for shutting up the port of Boston not only provoked this undisguised resolve to resist to the death amongst the people of Massachusetts, but called up the same growing determination throughout the vast continent of America.

The new parliament met on the 29th of November, 1774. There was an end of the agitations about Wilkes; for, having been elected for Middlesex, he took his seat without opposition. The king's speech asserted his determination "to withstand every attempt to weaken or impair the supreme authority of this legislature over all the dominions of my crown." Corresponding addresses were voted in both houses with a large majority. In January, Lord Chatham brought forward a motion to withdraw the troops from Boston. "I wish, my lords," he said, "not to lose a day in this urgent, pressing crisis. An hour now lost in allaying ferments in America may produce years of calamity. For my own part, I will not desert for a moment the conduct of this weighty business, from first to last. Unless nailed to my bed by the extremity of sickness, I will give it unremitted attention. I will knock at the door of this sleeping and confounded ministry, and will rouse them to a sense of their important danger." Chatham knocked in vain to awaken these sleepers. His voice, whose noble utterance cannot now be read without stirring the heart, was called by George III "a trumpet of sedition." Again, on the 1st of February, that voice was heard, when Chatham presented "a provisional bill for settling the troubles in America." On the first occasion he had only eighteen peers to vote with him against sixty-eight; on the second occasion he had thirty-two against sixty-one. Chatham's oratory was in vain. The ministry that night declared they would send out more troops, instead of recalling any. Chatham's conciliatory bill made some impression upon Lord North, who proposed a very weak measure, as a resolution of the house of commons that if any of the American provinces, by their legislature, should make some provision for the defence and government of that province, which should be approved by the king and parliament, then it might be proper to

forbear imposing any tax. This was to attempt to put out a conflagration with a bucket of water.

If the highest efforts of argument could have been availing, the speech of Edmund Burke, on the 22nd of March, would have arrested the headlong course of the government. At this moment a bill was passing both houses which Burke called "the great penal bill by which we had passed sentence on the trade and sustenance of America." It was a bill to prohibit certain colonies from fishing on the banks of Newfoundland. Burke proposed a series of conciliatory resolutions, of a less sweeping nature than those of Chatham, and therefore more likely to be acceptable to men of temperate opinions. They were rejected on a division of two hundred and seventy against seventy-eight.

The contrarieties of public opinion in Great Britain and Ireland upon the American question were exhibited in petitions from various corporate bodies. Many manufacturing towns petitioned against the coercion acts, as destructive of the commerce of the country. Other petitions called for an enforcement of the legislative supremacy of Great Britain as the only means of preserving a trade with the colonies. There were war petitions and peace petitions. Those who signed the war petitions were held to be mere party men known as tories. Those who signed the peace petitions were discontented whigs, or something worse. The Quakers, whilst they exhorted to peace, maintained the loyalty of all religious denominations in America to the king's person, family, and government. The citizens of London, with Wilkes at their head as lord mayor, presented an address and remonstrance to the king on the throne, in which they denounced the measures of the government as deliberately intended to establish arbitrary power all over America. The king answered, that it was with the utmost astonishment that he found any of his subjects capable of encouraging the rebellious disposition which existed in some of his colonies in America. From such different points of view did men regard this great argument.

The close of 1774 was, in Massachusetts, the silence before the storm. The people were arming. The provincial congress had formed an arsenal at Concord, an inland town. The British troops made no movements during the winter to interfere with these hostile demonstrations. In his speech of the 27th of January, Chatham alluded to the position of the royal forces: "Their situation is truly unworthy; penned up; pining in inglorious inactivity. I find a report creeping abroad that ministers censure General Gage's inactivity. It is a prudent and necessary inaction. This tameness, however contemptible, cannot be censured; for the first drop of blood shed in civil and unnatural war might be *immedicabile vulnus*." That incurable wound was, too soon, to be inflicted.[c]

OUTBREAK OF THE AMERICAN WAR

The full treatment of the war that ensued belongs to American history, and will be given in a later volume. Here we shall epitomise the greater features of the contest in briefest compass, dealing at greater length with certain phases of domestic policy.[a]

On the 19th of April, 1775, General Gage, who commanded at Boston, learning that the provincials had collected a quantity of stores at the town of Concord, sent a detachment of his troops to seize them. At a place named Lexington, on the way, they found the militia drawn up to oppose them; they drove them off, and proceeded to Concord, where they accomplished their

object; but on their way back they were greatly galled by the fire of the Americans from houses and from behind walls and hedges. They had sixty-five men killed and one hundred and eighty wounded; the provincials fifty killed and thirty-eight wounded. Soon after the militia assembled to the number of twenty thousand at Cambridge, and blockaded Boston. On the night of the 16th of June they threw up some intrenchments on an eminence near that town; the British advanced next day to drive them from it, and, though they suffered severely from the well-directed fire of the provincials, they succeeded in their object.



GRENADIER, 1775

The congress meantime had re-assembled (May 10th). They again drew up a petition and addresses, expressing the strongest desire for accommodation, at the same time adopting all possible measures for continuing the contest. The man on whom they fixed their choice for commander-in-chief of their forces was George Washington. He accepted that post of honour and danger; and, on joining the army at Cambridge, he found himself at the head of fifteen thousand men, ill-appointed and undisciplined. Fortunately for him, Gage, who had a superior force, was unenterprising; and his successor, General Howe, also remained inactive. By fitting out armed cruisers, the Americans succeeded in intercepting much of the stores and supplies destined for the troops in Boston.

In the spring of this year the provincials had conceived the daring design of invading Canada. They reduced the forts of Ticonderoga and Crown Point, and while one force, under General Montgomery, advanced and took Montreal; another, under Colonel Arnold, made its way through the wilderness to Quebec, where it was joined by the former (December 1st), and the city was besieged. An assault was attempted (31st), in which Montgomery was killed and Arnold severely wounded, but he still kept up a blockade. He was reinforced in the spring, but was eventually driven out of the province by General Carleton. On this occasion, Captain Forster, who had taken a great number of prisoners, released them, Arnold engaging that an equal number of the royal troops should be returned; but the congress broke this cartel, on the pretence, which was notoriously false, that Forster had treated his prisoners barbarously.

The opening of the year 1776 found Washington still engaged in the blockade of Boston; but the difficulties which he had to encounter were numerous. His force was mere militia, bound to serve only for the term of a year; so that a new army was to be raised at the end of that period, and the knowledge and discipline acquired in the campaign became useless: he was ill-supplied with the munitions of war, while he could not venture to make

his real condition known, and even found it prudent to exaggerate his strength; and hence successes were expected from him which he could not accomplish: add to this, the thwarting and paralysing influence of a popular form of government and the jealousies of the different states. Fortunately for him, he had an ally in the incapacity of the British general, who remained on the defensive, with a disciplined and well-appointed army.

In the spring Washington resolved to make a bold attempt on Boston. On the night of the 4th of March a body of the provincials threw up works on Dorchester heights, which commanded the harbour, in which no ships could now remain; and the attempt to dislodge the enemy offered so many difficulties, that General Howe agreed to evacuate the town. The British troops proceeded by sea to Halifax, in Nova Scotia, whence they sailed (June 10th) for New York, and landed on Staten Island. Having here received large reinforcements of British and Hessian troops, General Howe passed over to Long Island and routed the provincials, with a loss of two thousand slain and one thousand taken, among whom were their generals Lord Stirling, Sullivan, and Udell; but, instead of attacking at once their lines at Brooklyn, he resolved to proceed by regular approaches, and Washington thus had time to convey his troops over the river. New York, however, surrendered, and remained in possession of the English during the war. Washington was finally driven over the river Delaware, and the province of New Jersey was reduced. On the night of Christmas Day, however, this able commander secretly crossed the river, and surprised and captured a party of Hessians at Trenton; and he finally recovered a great part of New Jersey.

On the 4th of July, 1776, the congress of the United States of America, as they now styled themselves, put forth their Declaration of Independence. It detailed every real and imaginary grievance, laying the blame of everything on the king himself, whom they scrupled not to designate as a tyrant. The object of those who devised it was evidently to cut off all hope of reconciliation with the mother-country, and to afford a pretext for France and other powers to aid them; for they felt that single-handed they could not resist the power of Great Britain: in fact, they had already entered into secret relations with the court of France, which had agreed to assist them in an underhand manner.

In the campaign of 1777, the British general, after an ineffectual attempt at bringing Washington to action, embarked his troops for the invasion of Pennsylvania. They landed at the head of Chesapeake Bay, and (September 11th) routed the American army on the banks of a river named the Brandywine. After an ineffectual attempt to save Philadelphia, Washington retired, and (27th) the British troops entered that city.

While Sir William Howe was thus successful in the central states, General Burgoyne was advancing from Canada to the Hudson with an army of about ten thousand British and Canadians. The Americans retired before him; but the impediments offered by the nature of the country were tremendous, and all the supplies had to be brought through Canada. Accessions of strength came every day to the enemy, who were successful in two or three affairs. At length Burgoyne reached Saratoga, not far from Albany, whence he advanced to a place named Still Water. He repelled two attacks of the indefatigable Arnold; but judging it necessary to fall back to Saratoga, he there found himself surrounded by an American army, under General Gates, three times as numerous as his own, exposed to a constant fire of cannon and rifles, and with no means of procuring provisions. In a council of war a capitulation was resolved on. The most honourable terms were obtained, the troops being

granted a free passage to England, on condition of not serving again in America during the war. Desertion and other losses had reduced the British force to about five thousand eight hundred men, who laid down their arms (October 14th), and were marched to Boston.

Washington took up his winter quarters at a place named Valley Forge, and nothing could exceed the sufferings of the gallant men who served under him, unless it be their patient endurance. In miserable huts, without blankets or shoes, beneath the frost and snow of an American winter, often without food, they still endured, under the inspiring influence of their incomparable commander, and proved themselves worthy of eventual success.

FRANCE AND SPAIN AID THE COLONISTS

The intelligence of Burgoyne's surrender decided the court of France, and a treaty was signed, in which the independence of America was acknowledged. A loan was granted, and a fleet prepared to aid them. The English ambassador was recalled from Paris.

The command of the troops in America was now transferred to Sir Henry Clinton; and, in the prospect of a French war, it was resolved to evacuate Philadelphia and concentrate the forces. The army crossed the Delaware unopposed, but Washington impeded their march to New York in every possible manner. At a place named Monmouth an attack was made on the baggage, which brought on a partial action, in which the loss was between three and four hundred on each side. At the place of embarkation the British offered battle, which was declined, and they reached New York in safety (July 5th). A French fleet, under Count d'Estaing, with troops on board, having arrived, a combined attack was made by them and ten thousand Americans under General Sullivan on a British force at Newport, in Rhode Island; but Lord Howe, the English admiral at New York, though inferior in strength, having appeared off Newport, d'Estaing came out to engage him. An indecisive action was fought, after which d'Estaing, in spite of the remonstrances of his allies, went to Boston to refit; and Sullivan was soon driven out of Rhode Island.

The British troops were chiefly employed in petty expeditions, in which they did the provincials much injury by destroying their shipping and property in general. A corps of three thousand five hundred men, under Colonel Campbell, reduced the province of Georgia. In the West Indies, the island of Dominica was taken by the French; but St. Lucia surrendered to the English after d'Estaing had been repulsed, both by sea and land, by inferior forces, in his attempts to relieve it.

The following year (1779) Spain followed the example of France in declaring war against England, and a combined fleet of more than sixty sail of the line, with frigates, etc., appeared off Plymouth. Sir Charles Hardy, who commanded the Channel fleet, had only thirty-eight ships of the line, but he offered them battle, which they declined; and they quitted the Channel without having done more than give the ministry and nation a fright. Though d'Estaing acted mostly on the defensive in the West Indies, the islands of St. Vincent and Grenada fell into the hands of the French.

Washington directed his efforts chiefly to prevent the British from navigating the Hudson, for which purpose he fortified West Point, a strong position on that river, giving the command of it to General Arnold, and two other points, named Stony Point and Verplank. These last were taken and retaken

by the British during this year. An expedition from New York did great mischief in Connecticut, burning towns and shipping, and carrying off stores and ammunition. Another expedition did the same in Virginia. The chief seat of the war, however, was the southern provinces. At Savannah, in Georgia, General Prevost was besieged by d'Estaing, who had two-and-twenty ships of war, and was aided by an American army under General Lincoln. Colonel Maitland, who, with eight hundred men, had routed this officer and five thousand men in John's Island, arriving at Savannah, preparations were made for a vigorous defence. A proposal to d'Estaing to allow the women and children to leave the town was barbarously refused. An attempt, however, to storm the British lines having failed, with great loss, the assailants raised the siege and separated, and d'Estaing returned to France.



British Uniform, 1776

The year 1780 opened inauspiciously for England. Gibraltar was besieged by a combined Spanish and French force, and Minorca was equally hard pressed by the same nations. At the impulse of the empress of Russia, most of the European powers entered into an armed neutrality, on the principle that "free ships make free goods, with the exception of arms and munitions of war," in opposition to the right of search claimed by belligerent powers. But the sea is the element on which British glory has always risen in triumph, and England now had a hero equal to the emergency. Sir George Rodney had been selected for command by the king himself. He was to proceed for the West Indies, and, on his way, to convoy a squadron of transports for the relief of Gibraltar. As it was expected that he would leave the transports to proceed alone in a certain latitude, the Spanish admiral, Don Juan de Langara, was sent with eleven men-of-war to intercept them; but off Cape St. Vincent he was encountered by Rodney (January 16th). The action commenced at four in the afternoon, in a violent gale of wind, and was continued through a stormy night, and the whole Spanish fleet was taken or destroyed. Rodney relieved both Gibraltar and Minorca, and then sailed for the West Indies, where, soon after his arrival, he engaged off St. Lucia the count de Guichen. Rodney had twenty-one, the count twenty-three ships. By able manœuvres the English admiral had secured the prospect of a complete victory, but his captains (as formerly with Benbow), from jealousy, cowardice, or ignorance, disobeyed his signals, and the French fleet escaped. He brought one of the captains, Bateman, to a court-martial, and he was dismissed the service. Rodney tried ineffectually to bring the fleet again to action, but De Guichen sailed to Europe with the merchant-fleet, and Rodney then proceeded to the coast of America.

[1780 A.D.]

Though the independence of the revolted provinces had now been acknowledged by France and Spain, and these powers had, as it were, armed in their cause, never were the prospects of the colonists so gloomy. Even the firm mind of Washington began to despair.

Relieved of all apprehension from Washington, Sir Henry Clinton resolved to attempt the reduction of South Carolina in person. He sailed from New York and laid siege to Charleston, into which General Lincoln had thrown himself with seven thousand provincials. When he had completed his works and was preparing to batter the town, a capitulation was proposed and accepted. The whole province was speedily reduced, and Sir Henry Clinton then returned to New York, leaving Lord Cornwallis in Carolina with four thousand men. The American government sent thither General Gates, who assembled at Camden an army of six thousand men: Lord Cornwallis advanced to attack him with not more than two thousand, and (August 17th) gave him a complete defeat, killing eight hundred, and taking two thousand men, with all the baggage, stores, and artillery; his own loss in killed and wounded being only three hundred and fifty men.



NAVAL UNIFORM ABOUT 1782

In July a French fleet, having six thousand troops on board, under the count de Rochambeau, arrived at Rhode Island. It was proposed, when De Guichen, who was expected, should arrive, that a general attack by sea and land should be made on New York; but the activity of Rodney, as we have seen, disconcerted this plan.

While Washington was absent at a conference with Count Rochambeau, Arnold, who had been in secret correspondence with Sir Henry Clinton for betraying West Point, desired that some trusty agent might be sent to him. Major André, adjutant-general of the British army, volunteered his services, and he landed in the night from the *Vulture* sloop of war. At daybreak, when his conference with Arnold was concluded, he found it impossible to return to the sloop, and being furnished by Arnold with a pass under the name of Anderson, he attempted to reach New York by land. He was however met and stopped by three militia-men. He wrote without delay a letter to Arnold under his assumed name, and that general escaped on board the *Vulture* just before Washington's order to arrest him arrived.

André, who no longer concealed his name or quality, was brought before a court-martial, and tried as a spy. He denied that he was such, as he had come on shore under a passport or flag of truce from Arnold. The court however found him guilty, and sentenced him to be hanged. Every exertion was made to save him by Sir Henry Clinton, but in vain; Washington was inexorable; even the urgent request of the prisoner to be shot was refused, and he was hanged (October 2nd) amid the sympathy of the officers and soldiers of the American army.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

As the contest was now drawing to its close, we will here pause and take a view of the state of affairs at home, for the last few years.

On the subject of the war with the colonies, feelings and opinions were divided. The great body of the nation was beyond doubt on the side of the ministry, and desirous of reducing the refractory colonists by force; and the king himself, with his characteristic obstinacy of character, was firmly set against concession. On the other hand, the whig party, partly from prudence and a regard for justice, still more perhaps out of opposition to the court and ministry, were in favour of conciliation. The dissenters were, of course, on the side of the colonists. Doctor Price published a work at this time on the *Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government*, etc., in which, as is usual in such writings, the blemishes of the British constitution were studiously displayed and exaggerated, while free reins were given to imagination in discussing the spirit and nature of the American revolution. There was however a judicious set of men, such as Dean Tucker, who saw clearly that prudence and interest equally counselled an acknowledgement of the independence of the colonies; but their number of course was small, and their arguments were slighted.

Lord Chatham had from the very commencement of the troubles been the advocate of conciliation. He was for yielding to all the reasonable demands of the colonists; he reprobated the employment of foreign troops against them, and he poured forth a torrent of his most impassioned eloquence on the subject of the employment of the Indians in the war by Burgoyne. But nothing was further from the mind of this great man than the dismemberment of the empire.

The letters of the king sufficiently manifest the strong aversion which he had taken to the statesman who, in this crisis of his country's fate, was looked up to as the only Englishman who was likely to conciliate America while he alarmed France. The king declared on the 15th of March, that he did not object to Lord North applying to Lord Chatham to support his administration; but adding "that no advantage to my country, nor personal danger to myself, can make me address myself to Lord Chatham or to any other branch of opposition. Honestly, I would rather lose the crown I now wear than bear the ignominy of possessing it under their shackles." The national feeling with regard to Chatham was expressed in a letter by Thomas Coutts, the eminent banker. He said that "Every rank looks up to him with the only gleam of hope that remains." In a few weeks a higher power than courts or senates decided that Chatham should be at rest — indifferent to the hatred of a king, or the veneration of a people.

CHATHAM'S LAST SPEECH AND DEATH (1778 A.D.)

The duke of Richmond had given notice in the house of lords of a motion which he intended to make on the 7th of April, "for an address to the king upon the state of the nation." On the 5th the duke sent to Lord Chatham the draft of his proposed address; which Chatham returned the next day, expressing his concern "to find himself under so wide a difference with the duke of Richmond, as between the sovereignty and allegiance of America." Chatham was slowly recovering from a fit of the gout; but he determined to go to town from Hayes, and take his place in parliament. Lord Camden, in a letter to the duke of Grafton, describing the closing scene of the great



THE DEATH OF THE EARL OF CHATHAM

(From the engraving (1779) by F. Bartolozzi, R.A., of the painting by J. S. Copley, R.A., in the National Gallery.)

earl's public life, says, "he was not in a condition to go abroad; and he was earnestly requested not to make the attempt." Camden saw him in the prince's chamber before he went into the house; and remarked "the feeble state of his body, and the distempered agitation of his mind." An eye-witness has recorded his appearance: "Lord Chatham came into the house of lords, leaning upon two friends, lapped up in flannel, pale and emaciated. Within his large wig, little more was to be seen than his aquiline nose and his penetrating eye. He looked like a dying man; yet never was seen a figure of more dignity." The two friends were his son, William Pitt, and Lord Mahon, his son-in-law. The duke of Richmond had proposed his motion for an address. Viscount Weymouth had opposed the motion.

The earl of Chatham, continues the narrative of the eye-witness, "rose from his seat with slowness and difficulty, leaning on his crutches, and supported under each arm by his two friends. He took one hand from his crutch, and raised it, casting his eyes towards heaven, and said, 'I thank God that I have been enabled to come here this day, to perform my duty, and to speak on a subject which has so deeply impressed my mind. I am old and infirm — have one foot, more than one foot, in the grave — I am risen from my bed to stand up in the cause of my country, perhaps never again to speak in this house.'" Lord Camden describes the words of Chatham as "shreds of unconnected eloquence, and flashes of the same fire which he, Prometheus-like, had stolen from heaven; and were then returning to the place from whence they were taken." That withering sarcasm which occasionally found its place in his impassioned harangues was not absent in this last effort. Speaking of the probability of invasion, he said, "Of a Spanish invasion, of a French invasion, of a Dutch invasion, many noble lords may have read in history; and some lords may perhaps remember a Scotch invasion." He looked at Lord Mansfield.[e]

"My lords," said he in conclusion, "I rejoice that the grave has not closed on me, that I am still alive to lift up my voice against the dismemberment of this ancient and noble monarchy. Pressed down as I am by a load of infirmities, I am little able to serve my country in this most perilous conjuncture; but while I have sense and memory, I will never consent to deprive the royal offspring of the house of Brunswick, the heirs of the princess Sophia, of their fairest inheritance, or to tarnish the lustre of the nation by an ignominious surrender of its rights and possessions. Shall this great kingdom, that has survived whole and entire Danish depredations, Scottish inroads, the Norman Conquest, and the threatened invasion of the Spanish armada, now fall prostrate before the house of Bourbon? Shall a people, seventeen years ago the terror of the world, now stoop so low as to tell its ancient and inveterate enemy, Take all we have, only give us peace? It is impossible! I wage war with no man, or set of men; I wish for none of their employments; nor would I co-operate with those who persist in unretracted error; or who, instead of acting on a firm decisive line of conduct, halt between two opinions where there is no middle path. In God's name, if it be absolutely necessary to declare for peace or war, and if peace cannot be preserved with honour, why is not war commenced without hesitation? I am not, I confess, well informed of the resources of this kingdom, but I trust it has still sufficient to maintain its just rights, though I know them not. Any state, however, is better than despair; let us at least make one effort, and if we must fall, let us fall like men."

The duke of Richmond replied. As he proceeded in his argument, Lord Chatham, by the motion of his hand, indicated that he took notice of, and

would reply to some offensive expressions, but when he attempted to rise again to speak, he fell back in a convulsive fit. He was caught by those near him and carried into an adjoining apartment, whence he was conveyed to his villa of Hayes in Kent, where on the eleventh of the following May he breathed his last, in the seventieth year of his age. He was honoured with a public funeral, and his remains repose in Westminster Abbey.

The name of William Pitt, the great commoner, the man who by the sole force of talent raised himself to the highest point of eminence, stands in our annals invested with never-fading glory. His contemporaries speak with wonder of the powers of his eloquence, his commanding figure, his noble countenance, his eagle-eye, his graceful action, his lofty declamation, his withering invective, his keen irony and sarcasm. The purity of his private life gave lustre to his public virtues. In an age of corruption, calumny never ventured to breathe a suspicion on his name. The only charge that could be made against him was, that for the sake of embarrassing Walpole, he had advocated opinions which he renounced when himself in power. His ambition was boundless, his love of war was perhaps too great, and never did a minister more lavishly employ the resources of the country. Fortune, however, stood his friend; the successes of Wolfe in the west and of Clive in the east (with the last of which, however, he had no concern), shed glory on his administration; and the impulse which his genius had given to the nation, achieved resplendent triumphs even after his retirement from office. The chief defect in the character of this eminent man was a haughty and overbearing spirit, too often the concomitant of great political talents. As the vizir of an eastern monarch, Pitt would have been in his proper element, as all would then have yielded to his will, and there would have been no popular assembly to convince or to conciliate.[c]



WILLIAM PITT, FIRST EARL OF CHATHAM
(1708–1778)

ASSOCIATION FOR THE REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES (1780 A.D.)

The internal affairs of the country in the year 1780 are, in many respects, as interesting and instructive as those of any year in our annals. England was, unquestionably, distinctly threatened with some great political convulsion. The obstinate persistence in the war with America had brought upon the country its natural consequences — excessive taxation, and interruption to the usual course of profitable industry. Twenty years only had

[1780 A.D.]

elapsed since the nation looked back upon a period of unexampled prosperity, and of signal triumph; of victory abroad and of tranquillity at home. The nation had then confidence in the directors of its affairs; regarded the parliament as the true representative of public opinion; and viewed the sovereign power, according to the principles of the Revolution, as the especial guardian of the freedom and happiness of the people. A young prince had come to the crown, with every apparent disposition to rule righteously and constitutionally; and yet, from the first year of his accession, a system of favouritism had surrounded the throne with a host of placemen, who were chosen to assert an invidious distinction between the interests of the king and the measures of the responsible servants of the state. During these twenty years a great change had come over the popular convictions. The parliament had become opposed to the people; and the executive power had grown out of harmony with the theory of the constitution, through the tendency to govern by the corruption of the parliament. The preponderating influence of a great aristocratic party had indeed been weakened, and in many essentials destroyed; but with that weakness had come a proportionate weakness of the democratic element of the constitution. The time had arrived when the minority in parliament, whether peers or commoners, saw that, to renew their strength as a governing power, they must identify themselves more distinctly with the people. The abuses consequent upon the excessive number of sinecure offices, and of large pensions, unsanctioned by parliamentary authority, called for economical reform. The scandalous proportion of members of the house of commons returned for rotten boroughs demanded reform in parliament. A vast amount of public opinion was brought to bear upon these two points, in the form of associations for the redress of grievances.

On the 8th of February, Sir George Savile, the respected member for Yorkshire, presented to the house of commons the petition of a great meeting of the gentlemen, clergy, and freeholders of his county, which was signed by eight thousand persons. The Yorkshire petition set forth, as the consequences of a most expensive and unfortunate war, a large addition to the national debt, heavy accumulation of taxes, a rapid decline of the trade, manufactures, and land-rents of the kingdom. It then came to the chief grievance: "Alarmed at the diminished resources and growing burdens of this country, and convinced that rigid frugality is now indispensably necessary in every department of the state, your petitioners observe with grief, that notwithstanding the calamitous and impoverished condition of the nation, much public money has been improvidently squandered, and that many individuals enjoy sinecure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and pensions unmerited by public service, to a large and still increasing amount; whence the crown has acquired a great and unconstitutional influence, which, if not checked, may soon prove fatal to the liberties of this country."

The great meeting in Yorkshire gave an example to the rest of England. Twenty-three counties adopted similar petitions, and appointed their corresponding committees. Motions for economical reform had been brought forward in the house of lords before the recess; and Burke had given notice of the measure which he intended to propose. On the 11th of February he accomplished this intention, in the delivery of a speech which is amongst the masterpieces of English composition — unsurpassed in lucidness of detail, force of reasoning, historical research, and gleams of wit and poetry, by any example of parliamentary rhetoric. Out of seven fundamental rules which

he lays down, three, especially, will apply to all time; and, it may be feared, will never cease to require a vigilant application.

"That all jurisdictions which furnish more matter of expense, more temptation to oppression, or more means and instruments of corrupt influence, than advantage to justice or political administration, ought to be abolished.

"That all offices which bring more charge than proportional advantage to the state; that all offices which may be engrafted on others, uniting and simplifying their duties, ought, in the first case, to be taken away; and in the second, to be consolidated.

"That it is right to reduce every establishment, and every part of an establishment (as nearly as possible), to certainty, the life of all order and good management."

Burke, in his truly statesmanlike speech upon economical reform, argued that a temperate reform is permanent, because it has a principle of growth. Burke's proposals were so temperate, and so incapable of being refuted by argument, that Lord North offered no opposition to the reception of the first bill which was founded upon them. Other members were ready to go further than Burke. Sir George Savile, on the 15th of February, moved for an account of all places for life or lives, whether held by patent or otherwise, and also for an account of all subsisting pensions, granted by the crown, during pleasure or otherwise. The motion was opposed by Lord Nugent, upon the ground that many reduced gentry enjoyed his majesty's private bounty, and would not like their names to be made public — "many lady Bridgets, lady Marys, and lady Jennys." Lord North proposed an amendment, limiting the account to pensions payable at the exchequer. The whole amount payable under the name of pensions, he said, did not exceed £50,000. To publish a list would "prepare a feast for party-writers, and furnish materials for magazines and newspapers." Happy is the government that does not shrink from the eye of magazines and newspapers! Lord North carried his amendment only by a majority of two in a full house. The session was a series of parliamentary conflicts, some conducted with personal acrimony which involved the ridiculous arbitrement of duelling. A bill was carried in the house of commons against contractors sitting in parliament, which was rejected in the house of lords. Burke's own bill encountered every obstruction in its progress through committee; and the session was concluded without any practical result of the great statesman's incontrovertible exposition of abuses which agitated the minds of a whole people.

On the 18th of May the most important clauses in Burke's bill were lost in committee. The king has triumphed. "You cannot doubt," he writes to Lord North, "that I received with pleasure the account of Mr. Burke's bill having been defeated." His majesty was looking to a new parliament to continue the abuses that were odious to the nation, or, as it appeared to the royal mind, "to keep the present constitution of the country in its pristine lustre."

THE LORD GEORGE GORDON RIOTS (1780 A.D.)

According to the theory of a narrow-minded king, the pristine lustre of the constitution would have been shorn of its beams, if fifty useless places had not been held by members of parliament, to do the bidding of the court without the slightest reference to the interests of the nation. According to the theory of a large section of a somewhat intolerant public, the Protestant


succession would have lost the best part of its value, if English Roman Catholics were allowed to hold property in land; if their spiritual instructors were not subject to the penalties of treason or felony; if a Protestant son could no longer eject his papist father from his estate. These severities of the statutes of the tenth and eleventh of William III had ceased to be applied; but they existed as a temptation to informers to extort money from the timid, and as a stigma upon the loyal and peaceful. In 1778, upon the motion of Savile, seconded by Dunning, these obsolete penalties were repealed, with the approbation of men of all parties. The Acts of William III, dating before the union with Scotland, did not affect the position of Roman Catholics there; and it was subsequently contemplated to repeal a statute of the Scottish parliament, which was as odious to right-thinking persons as the enactments of the days when popery was the great terror of England. The proceedings of the parliament in 1778 stirred up the fanaticism of Edinburgh and Glasgow at the beginning of 1779. Riots took place in Edinburgh. Houses of reputed Roman Catholics were assailed and damaged. A house where Catholics assembled for worship was set on fire. Those who by speech or writing advocated freedom of opinion, were threatened with vengeance; the brutal zealots selecting as one of the objects of their hostility their distinguished countryman, the historian Robertson. A Protestant association and committee was set up in Scotland; and a silly nobleman, Lord George Gordon, was chosen as its president. This fanatic had sat in parliament for several years, raving and gesticulating when any debate excited his monomania. Contemptible as he was in intellect, he acquired some consideration from the position he had obtained as the leader of a body of people, large in numbers and dangerous in their enthusiasm.

On the 29th of May he called a public meeting at Coachmakers' hall; where he harangued a great audience about the dangers of popery; and proposed a resolution that the whole body of the Protestant association should meet in St. George's fields on the following Friday, to accompany him to the house of commons to deliver their petition. If less than twenty thousand persons should attend him, he would not present it. He proposed that they should assemble in four divisions — the Protestants of London the first, of Westminster the second, of Southwark the third, and the Scots resident in the metropolis the fourth; and that every real Protestant should come with a blue cockade on his hat.[e]

On Friday, June 2nd, the petitioners assembled in St. George's fields, to the number of from forty to fifty thousand, and with Lord George at their head, and wearing blue cockades inscribed with "No Popery," marched in four divisions to the parliament house, where they blocked up the avenues and insulted several of the members. On the arrival of some troops in the evening they retired, but proceeded to demolish the chapels of the Sardinian and Bavarian embassies. On Saturday the populace remained quiet, but on Sunday they demolished the chapels and dwelling-houses of the Catholics about Moorfields. Their efforts on Monday were directed against the house of Sir George Saville in Leicesterfields, which was saved with difficulty. On Tuesday, which was the day for taking their petition into consideration, the mob again surrounded the house, and the members having passed some resolutions suited to the occasion, adjourned. In the evening Newgate was broken open, and three hundred ruffians turned loose; the house of Sir John Fielding, the magistrate, was demolished; the rabble then rushed to Bloomsbury square and attacked the residence of Lord Mansfield; they plundered and destroyed the furniture, pictures, and statues, and burned the books and

manuscripts; the earl himself and his lady escaping with difficulty. The day concluded by the breaking open of Clerkenwell prison. On Wednesday the King's Bench, the Fleet, and other prisons were broken open and set on fire, as also were several private houses, and attempts were made on the bank and pay-office.

Hitherto the mob had rioted and destroyed at will. On this day a privy council sat, but was rising without coming to a conclusion, when the king asked if nothing effectual could be recommended. The attorney-general said that he knew of but one course, which was to authorise the military to act without the presence of a magistrate. The council, though approving, hesitated to adopt this course; when the king, nobly declaring that he would take the whole responsibility on himself, signed the order. The guards and militia forthwith began to act against the rioters; the slaughter was considerable, but next day by noon the city was tranquil. Lord George Gordon was committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason. Numbers of the rioters were tried by a special commission, and fifty-nine were capitally convicted.[c]



MARKET CROSS, WINCHESTER, EARLY 19TH CENTURY

Early in February, 1781, the trial of Lord Gordon came on before Lord Mansfield, as chief justice, and on a charge of high treason. The public mind had certainly much cooled since the numerous convictions in July, 1780, and the noble prisoner was no doubt far less criminal than silly. Still, however, it was fortunate for him that his defence depended on that most able advocate, Thomas Erskine, whose just fame will be ever blended with the records of this cause.

Erskine, as counsel for his lordship, found himself junior to Lloyd Kenyon. This was a worthy man, and excellent lawyer, deservedly raised both to the bench and to the peerage. But he was wholly destitute of eloquence, and in opening Lord George's defence, delivered a most ineffective speech. Under these circumstances, Erskine, contrary to the common rule, obtained permission to defer his own address until after the evidence for the prisoner had been closed. He rose soon after midnight, and quickly dispelled all feeling of weariness from all those who heard him, as he, with consummate skill, combined some passionate bursts of glowing oratory with a chain of the closest argument. Then, for the first and only time in our legal annals, did an advocate, addressing a court of justice, presume to use an oath. Erskine had been alleging whatever proofs the case could afford of his client's good and peaceful intentions; and when he had related how, in the midst of the disturbances, Lord George had gone to Buckingham House, and asked to see the king, and how he had told the secretary of state, Lord Stormont, whom alone he succeeded in seeing, that he would do his best to quell the riots; on completing this recapitulation, Erskine thus broke forth:—"I say, *by God*, that man is a ruffian who shall, after this, presume to build upon such honest, artless conduct as an evidence of guilt." So well did the voice, the eye, the

face, assist these words — so happily did the words chime in with the high-wrought feelings of the hearers — that instead of being shrunk from as profane, or rebuked as indecorous, they seemed rather to impart a tone of religious exaltation; and thus was the daring experiment crowned with complete success.

Erskine having ended, and the solicitor-general replied, the case was summed up by Lord Mansfield in remarks by no means favourable to the prisoner. The jury withdrew for half an hour, but at a quarter past five in the morning brought back to the thronged and anxious court their verdict of Not Guilty. There were still, in Scotland at least, some partisans left to Lord George, to rejoice at his acquittal, and subscribe nearly £500 towards his expenses. But the joy extended farther. It was felt on constitutional grounds by many who had not the slightest political leaning to the silly young fanatic. "I am glad," said Dr. Johnson, "Lord George Gordon has escaped, rather than a precedent should be established of hanging a man for constructive treason." *b*

CONCLUSION OF THE AMERICAN WAR

We now resume the narrative of the American War. The blockade of Gibraltar still continued (1781); famine preyed on the garrison and people, but Admiral Danby conveyed supplies to it in the face of a superior Spanish fleet lying in the bay of Cadiz. The besiegers then kept up for the space of three weeks one of the most tremendous bombardments in the annals of war, and they had brought their works to completion, when a sally of the garrison totally destroyed them. A combined force of sixteen thousand men was landed at Minorca for the attack of St. Philip's castle, and a combined fleet of seventy ships of war appeared in the British Channel.

The Dutch had joined in the war against England, but they paid dear for their treachery. Admiral Parker, as, with six ships of the line and some frigates, he was convoying a fleet from the Baltic, was encountered off the Dogger Bank (August 5th) by the Dutch admiral Zoutman, with ten sail of the line and frigates. The action, which lasted nearly four hours, was terrific; the English had five hundred, the Dutch twelve hundred, killed and wounded; both fleets were disabled, and the Dutch hardly got into their own ports. In the West Indies, Rodney took their island of St. Eustatius, in which, being a free port, immense wealth in goods and stores was collected: all this became the prize of the victors, who also captured a great number of merchantmen.

Sir Henry Clinton having sent General Arnold with a force into Virginia, directed Lord Cornwallis to form a junction with him. As he was advancing for that purpose, he sent Colonel Tarleton with a corps of eleven hundred men, to oppose General Morgan, who was acting on his left. At a place called the Cowpens, Tarleton came up with the enemy (January 17th), and in the hard-fought action which ensued, the British were defeated for the first time in an open field of battle. The American general Greene displayed considerable ability in impeding the measures of Lord Cornwallis till he found himself strong enough to engage him; he then (March 15th) gave him battle at Guilford Court House. The Americans had five thousand men, the British half the number. The latter gained the honour of the day, but want of provisions and the severity of the weather obliged them to retire, leaving their wounded to the care of the enemy. Lord Cornwallis then pushed on for Virginia, while Greene advanced toward South Carolina. At a place named Hobkirk's hill (April 25th) he was attacked and routed by Lord Rawdon; and,

after a variety of operations, he encountered (September 8th) at Eutaw Springs Colonel Stewart, who now commanded the British in that province. The action was the most obstinate that had yet been fought; the American militia acted nobly; both sides claimed the victory, but the British found it necessary to retire to Charleston.

Lord Cornwallis, meantime, having reached the Chesapeake, in spite of opposition, fortified Yorktown and Gloucester point. He applied in vain for reinforcements to Sir Henry Clinton, who feared for New York. A large French fleet, under Count de Grasse, then entered the Chesapeake, and Washington and Count Rochambeau having joined their forces, their united army of twelve thousand men appeared before Yorktown, while De Grasse blocked up the mouth of the York river. The British force did not amount to seven thousand men. A gallant defence was made, but they were obliged to yield to numbers and capitulate (October 19th). With this event the contest in America terminated.

Fortune was elsewhere unfavourable to Great Britain, whom France had now deprived of all the Leeward Islands, except Antigua and Barbadoes. Minorca was lost; St. Philip's castle, after one of the noblest defences on record, and the reduction of its garrison to eight hundred men, having been obliged to surrender.

The surrender of Yorktown sealed the doom of the North administration. An unfortunate minister is seldom secure in his power; the country gentlemen now opened their eyes to the folly of continuing the war; a formidable plan of attack was conceived and executed by the opposition, led on by General Conway and Mr. Fox, and sustained by their usual champions, with the accession of William Pitt, son of the great earl of Chatham, and Mr. Sheridan, both of whom had displayed great talent in debate. Day after day the ministerial majority declined. At length (March, 1782) Lord North announced that the cabinet was dissolved.

The opposition having gained the victory, had now to divide the spoils. But herein lay a difficulty. It consisted of two almost hostile parties; the one headed by the marquis of Rockingham, which was for conceding total independence to the colonies; the other, led by the earl of Shelburne, which though willing to yield up the right of taxation and terminate the war, trod in the steps of Lord Chatham, who almost with his dying breath had protested against a dismemberment of the empire. The new ministry was formed of five of each party; the chancellor, Lord Thurlow, to gratify the king, being allowed to retain the great seal. Lord Rockingham was premier; Lord Shelburne and Mr. Fox secretaries; General Conway commander-in-chief; Lord John Cavendish chancellor of the exchequer; Mr. Dunning (later Lord Ashburton) chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, etc; Burke was paymaster of the forces; Barré treasurer of the navy; Sheridan under-secretary of state. Pitt declined taking any office.

The watchword of the new ministry was peace, economy, and no patronage. Yet, when Mr. Pitt brought in a bill for a reform in parliament, it was rejected, and the whole of the retrenchments made amounted only to £72,000 a year, the far greater part of which was in the department of Mr. Burke, the great advocate of the measure. What further they might have done is not to be known, for the death of Lord Rockingham in the summer broke up the cabinet, as Fox and his friends refused to act under Lord Shelburne, and retired. Mr. Pitt now took office as chancellor of the exchequer, though only twenty-three years of age.

Negotiations for peace had been commenced, but the war still continued.

On the 12th of April Rodney brought De Grasse to action in the West Indies, and by executing the manœuvre of breaking the line, he gave him a complete defeat, taking or destroying eight ships, and reducing almost to wrecks the remainder, two of which were captured a few days after by Sir Samuel Hood. But as Admiral Graves was conducting the prizes to England, and convoying the homeward-bound merchant-fleet, a terrific storm came on, in which all the prizes but one, two British men-of-war, and several of the merchantmen, perished, and three thousand lives were lost. At home the loss of the *Royal George* of one hundred guns, which was upset by a squall (August 29th) at Portsmouth, and went down with Admiral Kempenfeldt and a thousand men and women on board, increased the calamities of the year.

The storm of war beat this year with unprecedented fury on the rock of Gibraltar and its heroic defenders. The duke of Crillon, the conqueror of Minorca, took the command of the besieging army; ten floating batteries, proof against shot and fire, were constructed; forty-seven sail of the line, beside frigates and other craft, were collected in the bay; while batteries, mounting two hundred guns and protected by forty thousand men, were raised on the isthmus. The whole force by land and sea amounted to a hundred thousand men. On the 13th of September a simultaneous cannonnade was opened on the fortress, which was returned by shells and red-hot balls. The whole peninsula seemed one blaze of flame, while the roaring of the artillery was not intermitted for a second. During the day no effect seemed to be made on either side, but in the night two of the floating batteries burst into flames; the light enabled the besieged to direct their guns, and by morning six more were in the same condition; the fire from twelve gunboats prevented the enemy from bringing off their crews, all of whom would have perished but for the humanity of the British, who saved about four hundred men. The siege was now at an end, and the war was thus concluded brilliantly by England in Europe as well as in the West Indies. Her success had been uniform in the east. General Elliot, the gallant governor of Gibraltar, was raised to the peerage with the title of Baron Heathfield.[c]

The parliament was opened by the king on the 5th of December, the houses having met on the previous 26th of November, and were then adjourned in the expectation of some definite result from the negotiations. The opening words of the speech are very memorable. His majesty declared he had lost no time in giving the necessary orders to prohibit the further prosecution of offensive war upon the continent of North America. Adopting with decision what he gathered to be the sense of his parliament and his people, he had directed all his measures to an entire and cordial reconciliation with those colonies. He had not hesitated to go the full length of the powers vested in him, and had offered to declare them free and independent states, by an article to be inserted in the treaty of peace. Provisional articles had been agreed upon, to take effect whenever terms of peace should be finally settled with the court of France. The king then said, "In thus admitting their separation from the crown of these kingdoms, I have sacrificed every consideration of my own to the wishes and opinion of my people. I make it my humble and earnest prayer to Almighty God, that Great Britain may not feel the evils which might result from so great a dismemberment of the empire; and that America may be free from those calamities which have formerly proved in the mother country how essential monarchy is to the enjoyment of constitutional liberty. Religion, language, interest, affections may, and I hope will, yet prove a bond of permanent union between the two countries."

On the 20th of January, 1783, the preliminaries of peace were signed

between Great Britain and France and Spain. With Holland there was a suspension of arms; and the preliminaries of peace were not signed until the 2nd of September. The articles of pacification with the United States, with the exception of the first article acknowledging their independence, are now of minor importance. By the treaty with France, England ceded St. Lucia and Tobago, and gained back Granada, St. Vincent, Dominica, St. Christopher, Nevis, and Montserrat. The French recovered some possessions in Africa, and in the East Indies. The old stipulations for the demolition of Dunkirk were given up. To Spain, Great Britain ceded Minorca and the Floridas. The principle of the final treaty with Holland was on the basis of mutual restitution.

PARLIAMENTARY CENSURES OF THE TERMS OF PEACE (1783 A.D.)

Thus, then, was finished one of the most calamitous wars that England had ever been driven into, through a mistaken view of the relative positions of a mother country and her colonies, and an obstinate reliance upon her power to enforce obedience. It might have been expected that a pacification which involved no humiliating conditions, beyond the acknowledgment of that independence of the United States which it was no longer possible to withhold, would have been received with unmingled satisfaction. On the contrary, a combination of parties was entered into for the purpose of removing Lord Shelburne and his ministry; a coalition which is not a pleasant exhibition of the motives which sometimes unite the most opposite factions in the pursuit of power. On the 17th of February, the two houses took into consideration the preliminaries of peace with France, Spain and America. In the house of lords the ministers carried the address of thanks to the crown by a majority of thirteen. In the house of commons they were defeated by a majority of sixteen. On the 21st of February Lord John Cavendish moved resolutions of censure on the terms of the peace, which were carried by a majority of seventeen. Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt were on this occasion brought into immediate conflict — "the tug of war" which was to last for twenty years was now begun. The particular points of attack or defence in the conditions of the peace have little to interest us. But the principles exhibited by these great rivals on so stirring an occasion have a permanent value. Fox defended the coalition of parties which some had censured; but he emphatically proclaimed his adhesion to his own party. Pitt was self-reliant in his own confidence in the purity of his intentions: "High situation, and great influence, are desirable objects to most men, and objects which I am not ashamed to pursue, which I am even solicitous to possess, whenever they can be acquired with honour, and retained with dignity. On these respectable conditions, I am not less ambitious to be great and powerful than it is natural for a young man, with such brilliant examples before him, to be. But even these objects I am not beneath relinquishing, the moment my duty to my country, my character, and my friends, renders such a sacrifice indispensable. Then I hope to retire, not disappointed, but triumphant; triumphant in the conviction that my talents, humble as they are, have been earnestly, zealously, and strenuously employed, to the best of my apprehension, in promoting the truest welfare of my country; and that, however I may stand chargeable with weakness of understanding, or error of judgment, nothing can be imputed to my official capacity which bears the most distant connection with an interested, a corrupt, or a dishonest intention." The struggle for office was over. On the 24th of February Lord Shelburne resigned. One of his secretaries of

state, Lord Grantham, wrote to Sir James Harris that the fallen minister trusted too much to his measures, and that the parliament, spoilt by long habits of interest, gave no credit to them. The measures of Lord Shelburne contemplated a much wider field of action than his opponents, with the exception of Burke, could have admitted into their views. In the king's speech at the opening of the session, his majesty recommended a revision of the whole English trading system, upon the same comprehensive and liberal principles that had been adopted concerning the commerce of Ireland. Shelburne's opinions upon a liberal system of commerce were before his time. They were entirely opposed to the existing ignorance of the commercial public, and they would necessarily have failed. If he had remained in power, the great trading communities would have ensured his fall, had he dared to promulgate the principles which could only be accepted when England had received the enlightenment of more than half a century's experience.

THE COALITION MINISTRY (1783 A.D.)

The coalition of the party headed by Lord North, and of the party headed by Mr. Fox, had succeeded in compelling Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt to resign; but it was not without difficulty that the coalesced chiefs could induce the king to admit them to power. After a considerable delay, the duke of Portland became first lord of the treasury, and Fox and North were appointed secretaries of state. The repugnance of the king to this extraordinary union of two political rivals — which, securing a majority in the house of commons, forced upon him as the real prime minister, a man whom he disliked with an intensity approaching to hatred — was more than tolerated by the majority of the nation. The coalition was odious to all men not bound by the trammels of the party. Fox and North received the seals on the 2nd of April, 1783. The acceptance of place by Fox rendered his re-election for Westminster necessary; and Romilly writes — "It is almost a general wish that some man of character and credit may be opposed to him as a candidate." He was re-elected, because no candidate was found; "but the populace received him with hisses, hooting, and every other mark of displeasure."

Pitt was now in opposition. He had in vain declared "a just and lawful impediment" to the "ill-omened and unnatural marriage," forbidding the banns "in the name of the public weal." The ministry were strong in their majorities. Pitt vainly opposed the conditions of the loan which they had raised upon very disadvantageous terms. On the 7th of May he, a second time, brought forward the question of parliamentary reform. He proposed that when the gross corruption of the majority of voters in any borough was proved before a committee of the commons, the borough should be disfranchised; and that a large addition of knights of the shire, and of members for the metropolis, should be made to the representative body. But Pitt openly declared against the practicability of a perfectly equal representation, and held that those places known by the popular appellation of rotten boroughs, were to be regarded in the light of deformities which in some degree disfigured the fabric of the constitution, but which he feared could not be removed without endangering the whole pile. Fox earnestly defended the proposition; North opposed it. Pitt's resolutions were rejected by a majority of 144. The young reformer was more successful in carrying through the house of commons a bill for preventing abuses in the public offices, the chief object of which was to abolish an odious system of perquisites and percent-

ages. In the house of lords the adherents of the ministry threw out the bill. The session came to a close on the 16th of July.

The session of parliament was opened on the 11th of November. The prince of Wales, previous to the arrival of the king, had been introduced to the house of peers, with great ceremony, and was conducted to his chair of state on the right hand of the throne. Carlton House had been assigned to him as a residence. The question of India was the most important topic of the king's speech: "The situation of the East India Company will require the utmost exertions of your wisdom, to maintain and improve the valuable advantages derived from our Indian possessions, and to promote and secure the happiness of the native inhabitants of those provinces." On the 18th of November Mr. Fox brought forward his India Bill. Mr. Fox proposed that the authority of the East India Company should be transferred to commissioners to be named by parliament, and not removeable at the pleasure of the crown. "His plan," he said, "was to establish a board, to consist of seven persons, who should be invested with full power to appoint and displace officers in India, and under whose control the whole government of that country should be placed." There were to be eight assistants to this board, who should have charge of the commercial concerns of the company, but subject to the control of the other seven. The board was to be held in England; it was to be established for three or five years, to try the experiment. If experience proved the utility of the board, then the king was to have the future nomination of its members.



CHARLES JAMES FOX
(1749–1806)

The principle of Mr. Fox's India Bill was resisted upon its first introduction to parliament. Mr. Pitt declared his opinion that the whole of the proposed system was nothing more on one side than absolute despotism, and on the other side the most gross corruption. Previous to the second reading of the bill, the corporation of London, in common council assembled, adopted a petition to the house of commons that the bill might not pass into law. The example of the city was followed by many other corporations. Nevertheless, Fox triumphed in the house of commons by large majorities. The second reading of his bills was carried by a majority of 114; and on the 9th of December they were presented by the minister and a numerous body of members at the bar of the house of lords.

On the day when the coalition ministry entered office, the king wrote to Earl Temple, then lord-lieutenant of Ireland, to express his hope that many months would not elapse before "the Grenvilles, the Pitts, and other men of character" would relieve him from a thraldom to which he had been compelled to submit. The opportunity which the king so ardently desired did

not come till the India Bill had provoked a manifestation of popular opinion which might enable the crown to defy a majority of the house of commons. It was a dangerous experiment. The nobleman to whom the king had confided his sorrows in April was ready in December not only to whisper to the peers, but confidently to state, that whoever voted for the India Bill would be considered by the king as his enemy. The effect upon all those who desired to live only in the sunshine of royal favour was instantaneous. "The bishops waver, and the thanes fly from us," writes Fitzpatrick. He adds, "the public is full of alarm and astonishment at the treachery as well as the imprudence of this unconstitutional interference. Nobody guesses what will be the consequence of a conduct that is generally compared to that of Charles I in 1641." The India bills were rejected in the upper house on the 17th of December, by a majority of ninety-five to seventy-six. On the 18th, at midnight, a message was sent by the king to Lord North and Mr. Fox, commanding them to give up their seals of office by their under-secretaries, as a personal interview would be disagreeable to his majesty.

PITT AT THE HELM (1783 A.D.)

On the 19th Pitt was appointed first lord of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. Earl Temple, who had received the seals of secretary of state, was for the immediate dissolution of parliament. Pitt was against this, and Temple resigned on the 22nd, leaving the young prime minister to sustain, almost alone, the most severe conflict for power recorded in the annals of parliament.

In forming his administration Pitt had scarcely a statesman of any reputation to support him, with the exception of Thurlow, as chancellor, and Dundas, who was not of the cabinet. His father's friend, Camden, stood by him in the house of lords, although not originally forming one of the ministry. Pitt had almost wholly to depend upon his own ability and courage to sustain the attack he had to expect from a large majority of the house of commons, headed by Fox, Burke, North, and Sheridan.

On the 12th of January, 1784, Pitt appeared in the house of commons as the head of the government. Violent were the debates on points of form and questions of principle. The minister was beaten upon two divisions, and five adverse motions were carried against him that night. The king wrote to him the next day, "I am ready to take any step that may be proposed to oppose this faction, and to struggle to the last period of my life." It was well that the king had found a minister whose prudence was equal to his courage. Regardless of his defeat, Pitt, on the 14th of January, brought forward his own plan for the government and management of the affairs of the East India Company. His bill was read a first time. In a committee of the whole house on the state of the nation, it was moved that "the continuance of the present ministers in trusts of the highest importance and responsibility is contrary to constitutional principles, and injurious to the interests of his majesty and his people." The resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-one. An adjournment took place for a few days; but still no resignation. On the 23rd of January, Mr. Pitt's India Bill was thrown out; and Mr. Fox reproduced his own bill. The contest between the two parties was carried on, in various shapes, till the 8th of March. Attempts were made to form a union between the leading members of the late government and those of the present; but Pitt steadily refused to resign as the preliminary condition of such a negotiation. At length, on the 8th of March, an elaborate

remonstrance, in the form of an address to his majesty, which was drawn up by Burke, and moved by Fox, was carried by a majority only of one. The battle was over. The victory remained with Pitt. The Mutiny Bill was passed; the supplies were voted; and on the 24th of March, the king went to the house of lords, to put an end to the session, and to say, "I feel it a duty which I owe to the constitution and the country, to recur as speedily as possible to the sense of my people, by calling a new parliament." On the 25th parliament was dissolved.

During this extraordinary contest, from the 12th of January to the 8th of March, there were fourteen motions, upon which the house divided, carried against Mr. Pitt; besides many others, upon which there was no division. The mode in which the coalition ministry was ejected, through the royal interference with the vote of the house of peers upon the India Bill, was mean and unconstitutional. It has been conjectured that Pitt was probably acquainted with the manœuvres of Thurlow and Temple. But it has been also said that when Temple resigned, he "carried away with him the scandal which the best friends of the new government could not but lament. The fame of the young prime minister preserved its whiteness. He could declare with perfect truth that, if unconstitutional machinations had been employed, he had been no party to them." Whatever opinion may be formed upon this point, even the political opponents of Pitt agree that in this fiery struggle of two months, he "joined to great boldness, sagacity and discretion. By patience and perseverance he wearied out a foe who was more ardent than measured in his attacks; and while he bore his defeats with calmness, the country, saturated with calumny, began to resent the attempt of the coalition party as the cabal of a domineering aristocracy."

Never did minister of Great Britain appear in so triumphant a position as William Pitt when he entered the house of commons, on the 18th of May, to meet the new parliament. He had been himself returned at the head of the poll for the University of Cambridge. His friend Wilberforce, the son of a Hull merchant, had contested the county of York against two whig candidates of large fortune and high connections. With the almost unanimous support of the manufacturers of Sheffield, and Halifax, and Bradford, and Leeds, he had beaten the great Yorkshire aristocracy, as the representative of the middle classes. The example presented by this stronghold of independent principles was powerful through the country. Pitt looked upon the benches of opposition, that for two months had echoed with the cheers of those who had denounced him with every virulence of invective, now thinned to a very powerless minority. The coalition had lost a hundred and sixty members. [The members of the opposition who lost their seats were popularly known as Fox's martyrs.]

PITT'S FINANCIAL MEASURES

Pitt commenced his career as a financial minister with more than common boldness. The permanent taxes produced half a million less than the interest of the debt, the civil list, and the charges to which they were appropriated. The annual land-tax and malt-tax fell far short of the naval and military expenditure and that of miscellaneous services. There was a large unfunded debt. The deficit altogether amounted to three millions. The confidence in the national resources was so low that the three per cents were fallen to about 56. Smuggling, especially of tea and spirits, was carried on to an enormous

extent. The tea vended in the smuggling trade, conducted in the most systematic manner through consignments from foreign ports, was held considerably to exceed the five million and a half pounds annually sold by the East India Company. Pitt took the only effectual way to prevent smuggling. He reduced the duty upon tea from 50 per cent. to 12½ per cent.; and he also reduced the duties on foreign spirits. To compensate for the expected deficiency of revenue, he increased the tax upon windows. To meet the large general disproportion between receipt and expenditure, he imposed other taxes, that have been abolished, as injurious to industry, by the sounder economists of later times. These taxes enabled him to provide for the interest of a new loan, in which a large amount of unfunded debt was absorbed. Taxes upon hats, linens, and calicos, have long been condemned, though the commons of 1784 willingly granted them. Duties upon horses, excise licences, and game certificates, hold their ground. Taxes upon candles, and upon bricks and tiles, were amongst the devices that have had no permanent existence. The tax upon paper, which Mr. Pitt increased, appears to be the last of those restraints upon industry to which purblind legislators have clung, upon the principle that the consumers do not feel the tax — the principle announced by the minister of 1784, when he proposed his additional duty on candles, namely, that as the poorest cottagers only consumed about 10 pounds of candles annually, that class would only contribute fivepence a year to his new impost.



A Buck from Old Fashion Book, South Kensington Museum

The chancellor of the exchequer carried his proposed taxes without any difficulty. He was equally successful with his India bills. He relieved the East India Company from its financial embarrassments. He associated with its directors in the government of India that body of commissioners, appointed by the crown, which was long known as the board of control.

In the session of 1785 Mr. Pitt brought forward a subject announced in the king's speech, the commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Ireland. The propositions of Mr. Pitt, large and liberal as they were, although encumbered with some provisions opposed to a really free commercial policy, were thoroughly distasteful to the manufacturers of England, and equally opposed to the narrowness of what in Ireland was deemed patriotism. The resolutions of the minister were carried by considerable majorities in the British parliament, but being passed by a very small majority in the Irish parliament, the bill was withdrawn. Whilst this measure was being debated at Westminster, Mr. Pitt a third time brought forward a bill for reform in parliament. His specific plan was to disfranchise thirty-six rotten boroughs, giving compensation to those who regarded them as property; to transfer

the right of election to counties and to unrepresented large towns; and to extend the franchise in counties to copyholders. The bill was not introduced as a government measure; and it was rejected by a large majority, as its author probably expected it would be.

Pitt, at this time, was almost exclusively occupied with a great financial scheme, from which, with more than ordinary complacency, he sanguinely expected the most wonderful results. He wrote to Wilberforce, "The produce of our revenues is glorious; and I am half mad with a project which will give our supplies the effect almost of magic in the reduction of debt." It was the scheme of the sinking fund. The public income now happily exceeded the expenditure, and it was proposed that the notion of an accumulating fund to be applied to the reduction of the debt, which was partially attempted by Sir Robert Walpole, should be engrafted upon the perpetual financial arrangements; that a million should be annually placed in the hands of commissioners, so as to be beyond the power of a minister to withdraw. It was believed that, accumulating at compound interest, with the addition of such terminable annuities as should fall in, it would gradually extinguish the claims of the public creditor. The plan might have worked well, if the minister had been debarred from contracting any new loans. For years the public had as much confidence in this scheme as its author had. It was boasted that "in eight years, Mr. Pitt's sinking fund, in fact, purchased £13,617,895 of stock at the cost of £10,599,265 of cash"; and it was proclaimed that "this measure, then, is of more importance to Great Britain than the acquisition of the American mines." There was a superstitious belief, long entertained, that the new sinking fund would, "by some mysterious power of propagation belonging to money, put into the pocket of the public creditor great sums not taken out of the pocket of the tax-payer." The delusion was manifest when it was demonstrated that during the war the debt had been actually augmented, to the extent of eleven millions, by the less advantageous terms upon which money was borrowed by the exchequer, compared with the purchases made by the commissioners who managed the sinking fund. A great authority in finance has put the whole philosopy of the matter in the form of an axiom: "No sinking fund can be efficient for the purpose of diminishing the debt, if it be not derived from the excess of the public revenue over the public expenditure."

On the opening of the session on the 23rd of January, 1787, the king announced that he had concluded a treaty of navigation and commerce with the king of France. The negotiation was completed at Versailles, on the 26th of September, 1786. The provisions of this treaty were of the most liberal character. There was to be the most perfect freedom of intercourse allowed between the subjects and inhabitants of the respective dominions of the two sovereigns. The duties to be paid on French commodities in England were thus rated: Wines, no higher duties than on those of Portugal; brandy, seven shillings per gallon; vinegar, less than half the previous duty; olive-oil, the lowest duty paid by the most favoured nation. The following duties were to be levied reciprocally on both kingdoms: hardwares and cutlery, cabinet wares, furniture, turnery, not higher than 10 per cent. ad valorem; cotton and woollen manufactures, except mixed with silk, 12 per cent.; gauzes, 10 per cent.; linens, same as linens from Holland; saddlery, 15 per cent.; millinery, 12 per cent.; plate glass and glass ware, porcelain and earthenware, 12 per cent.

That the commercial treaty was not a failure as regarded the products of Great Britain is evident from the fact that the annual average export

[1788 A.D.]

of British manufactures to France in the six years ending with 1774 was £87,164; in the six years ending with 1792 it was £717,807.

To Mr. Pitt belongs the honour, in this, the fourth year of his administration, of simplifying the complicated system of indirect taxation, by consolidating the several duties of customs, excise, and stamps. The duties required to be paid upon one article were sometimes to be hunted through twenty or thirty acts of parliament, each charging some additional duty, or making a special appropriation of the proceeds of a particular tax. The complication may be judged from the fact that three thousand resolutions were required to carry a measure of consolidation into effect. When Pitt had introduced his measure, Burke characterised the speech of the minister as one of extraordinary clearness and perspicuity, and said that it behooved those who felt it their duty frequently to oppose the measures of the government, to rise up manfully, and, doing justice to the right honourable gentleman's merit, to return him thanks on behalf of themselves and the country, for having in so masterly a manner brought forward a plan which gave ease and accommodation to all engaged in commerce, and advantage and increase to the revenue. "Thus," says Lord John Russell, "in the course of little more than three years from Mr. Pitt's acceptance of office as first lord of the treasury, great financial and commercial reforms had been effected The nation, overcoming its difficulties, and rising buoyant from its depression, began rapidly to increase its wealth, to revive its spirit, and renew its strength. Such was the work of Mr. Pitt, now no longer the minister of the court, but of the nation. The cry of secret influence, and the imputation of his being an organ of an unseen power, was heard less and less as the resources of his powerful understanding developed their energies and ripened their fruits." *e*

THE ILLNESS OF THE KING (1788 A.D.)

Toward the close of the year 1788 an event occurred of considerable importance in the legislative history of the country. The health of the king had been lately in a precarious state, and his disorder finally terminated in mental derangement. When the fact had been ascertained, Mr. Pitt (December 10th) moved for a committee to inspect the journals for precedents. Mr. Fox insisted that the heir-apparent had an indisputable claim to the exercise of the executive authority. This Mr. Pitt denied, declaring such an assertion to be little less than treason to the constitution: "Kings and princes," he said, "derived their power from the people; and to the people alone, by means of their representatives, did it belong to decide in cases for which the constitution had made no specific provision." The prince, he maintained, had no more right in this case than any other subject, though it might be expedient to offer him the regency. In the house of lords, the same view of the constitution was taken by Lord Camden.

Mr. Fox, finding that the principles he had advanced were generally disapproved of, then sought only to procure for the prince the full, unrestricted enjoyment of the royal prerogative; but Mr. Pitt had his reasons for imposing limitations.

The usual position of the house of Brunswick, in fact, continued; the heir-apparent was in opposition to the king, and on the usual account — money. The prince of Wales, who was of a remarkably dissipated and extravagant temper, had been allowed £50,000 a year, a sum sufficient, it might be supposed, for a single man even in his exalted station; but as the king himself,

when prince of Wales, had been allowed £100,000 a year, the coalition ministry had insisted on the same sum being given to the present heir-apparent; but partly from parsimony, partly from disapproval of the prince's mode of life, and partly from dislike of the proposers, the king had obstinately refused his assent. The consequence was that the prince got deeply in debt—a state, from which, as subsequent events showed, even the larger sum would not have preserved him. In 1786 he applied to his father for assistance, and meeting with a harsh refusal, he set about a pretended system of economy, selling all his horses (his coach-horses included), suspending his buildings, shutting up the most splendid apartments in Carlton House, his residence, etc. When this had been supposed to have produced its effect on the public mind, his friends in the commons proposed (April 20th, 1787) an address to the king for his relief. Mr. Pitt earnestly required that the motion should be withdrawn, as it might lead to the disclosure of circumstances which he would wish to conceal. Mr. Rolle used still stronger language; while Fox, Sheridan, and others of the prince's friends insisted that he feared no investigation of his conduct.

The matter alluded to was the secret marriage of the prince of Wales with a Catholic lady of the name of Fitzherbert—a fact, of which we believe at present there can be no doubt. Mr. Fox, however, a few days after, by the authority of the prince, declared that "the fact not only could never have happened legally, but never did happen in any way, and had from the beginning been a vile and malignant falsehood." The greater part of the house was, or affected to be, satisfied, and a meeting having taken place between the prince and Mr. Pitt, an addition of £10,000 a year was made to his royal highness's income; £161,000 was issued for the payment of his debts, and £20,000 for the works at Carlton House. The prince then resumed his former mode of life, and soon got into debt as deeply as ever.

As there could be no doubt but that the prince, when regent, would select his ministers from the party with which he had long been connected, Mr. Pitt, we may be allowed to suppose, from private as well as public motives, was anxious to limit his powers. The regency was therefore offered to the prince, subject to the conditions of not being enabled to confer any peerage, or to grant any office, reversion or pension, except during the king's pleasure; while the care of the royal person, with the disposition of the household, and the consequent appointment to all places in it (about four hundred in number) should be committed to the queen. The prince, though mortified, consented to accept this limited sovereignty. Had Mr. Fox and his friends been wise (which they rarely showed themselves to be), they would have snatched the reins of power at once; but instead of doing so, they interposed such numerous needless delays (though it was well-known that the king's health was improving every day), that the bill did not reach its second reading in the house of lords till the 19th of February, 1788; the accounts of the royal health were by that time so favourable, that the house judged it decorous to adjourn to the 24th, on which day his majesty's intellect had recovered its usual state, and the cup of power was once more dashed from the lips of the whigs.[c]

On the 25th of February the issue of bulletins by the royal physicians was discontinued. On the 10th of March the commissioners who had been appointed by former letters patent to open the parliament, by another commission declared further causes for holding the same; and proceeded to state to both houses that his majesty, being by the blessing of Providence recovered from his indisposition, and enabled to attend to public affairs, conveyed

[1788 A.D.]

through them his warmest acknowledgments for the additional proofs they had given of affectionate attachment to his person. The other subjects of a royal speech on opening parliament were then detailed.

Pitt had won his second great victory. In 1784 against odds almost incalculable, he had defeated the coalition with almost the unanimous support of the people. He had employed his unassailable tenure of power in carrying forward the resources of national prosperity by a series of measures conceived, not in the spirit of party, but with a large comprehension of what was essential to the public good. Another great trial came. He had to conduct another conflict, full of danger and difficulty, in which, fighting for his sovereign, he had in the same manner the support of the nation. Major Cartwright, so well known for his subsequent endeavours to promote a reform in parliament, wrote to Wilberforce: "I very much fear that the king's present derangement is likely to produce other derangements not for the public benefit. I hope we are not to be sold to the coalition faction." When the battle was over, George III wrote to his persevering minister that "his constant attachment to my interest, and that of the public, which are inseparable, must ever place him in the most advantageous light." On the 23rd of April, a public thanksgiving was appointed for the king's recovery. His majesty went to St. Paul's accompanied by both houses of parliament, to return his own thanksgivings. The day was observed throughout the kingdom. Illuminations were never so general; joy was never so heartfelt. The minister, still only in his twenty-ninth year, had reached the pinnacle of power and popularity.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

On the 11th of July, 1788, the king, at the close of the session of parliament, said: "The general state of Europe, and the assurances which I receive from foreign powers, afford me every reason to expect that my subjects will continue to enjoy the blessings of peace." The differences with France on the subject of the United Provinces had been adjusted. On the 6th of September, Mr. Pitt exultingly wrote to the marquis of Stafford, "The state of France, whatever else it may produce, seems to promise us more than ever a considerable respite from any dangerous projects."[1] The "state of France" was that of a country in which the disordered condition of its finances appeared to render any new disturbances of Europe, from the ambition of the government and the restlessness of the people, something approaching to an impossibility. The "whatever else it might produce" was a vague and remote danger. Yet, in September, 1788, there were symptoms of impending changes, that, with a full knowledge of the causes operating to produce them, might have suggested to the far-seeing eye of that statesmanship that looked beyond the formal relations of established governments, some real cause for disquiet. The history of that Revolution is essentially connected with the history of England, almost from the first day of the meeting of the states general. The governments of the two countries were not, for several years, brought into collision, or into an exchange of remonstrance and explanation, on the subject of the momentous events in France. But these events, in all their shifting aspects, so materially affected the state of public opinion amongst the British people, that they gradually exercised a greater influence upon English external policy and internal condition, than any overthrow of

[1 A few months later the storm of the French Revolution was at its height.]

dynasties, any wars, any disturbances of the balance of power, any one of "the incidents common in the life of a nation" — to use the words of Tocqueville — even a far greater influence than the American Revolution, which was the precursor of that of France.

The time was approaching when those Englishmen who looked with apprehension upon the French Revolution, should be violently opposed to those who as violently became its partisans. The progress of this conflict of opinions was very gradual; but the tendencies towards a rupture of the old ties of one great political party were soon manifest. The distinctions of whig and tory would speedily be obliterated. Those who clung to the most liberal interpretation of the principles upon which the revolution of 1688 was founded, would be pointed at as jacobins — the title which became identified with all that was most revolting in the French Revolution. The tory became the anti-jacobin. Thus, through ten years of social bitterness, execration and persecution made England and Scotland very unpleasant dwelling places for men who dared to think and speak openly. Democratic opinions, even in their mildest form, were proscribed, not by a political party only, but by the majority of the people. Liberty and jacobinism were held to be synonymous.



COSTUME OF 1793

Burke, Fox, and Sheridan, from the commencement of the administration of Pitt, had been closely united as the chief leaders of the whigs. They had been brought intimately together as managers of the impeachment of Hastings, whose trial at the commencement of the session of 1790 had been proceeding for two years. Fox and Burke had cordially joined with Wilberforce, who was supported by Pitt, in taking a prominent part in advocating the total abolition of the slave trade, in 1789. On the 5th of February, 1790, when the army estimates were moved, Mr. Pitt held that it was necessary, on account of the turbulent situation of the greater part of the Continent, that England should be prepared for war, though he trusted the system uniformly pursued by ministers would lead to a continuance of peace. Mr. Fox opposed the estimates on the ground of economy alone. On the 9th of February, when the report on the army estimates was brought up, Mr. Burke proclaimed, in the most emphatic terms, his views on the affairs of France. He opposed an increase of our military force. He held that France, in a political light, was to be considered as expunged out of the system of Europe. Burke held that, in this fallen condition, it was not easy to determine whether France could ever appear again as a leading power. Six years afterwards he described the views he formerly entertained as those of "common speculators." He says, "deprived of the old government, deprived in a manner of all government, France, fallen as a monarchy, to common specu-

lators might have appeared more likely to be an object of pity or insult, according to the disposition of the circumjacent powers, than to be the scourge and terror of them all."

The influence of the French Revolution upon great questions of British domestic policy was very soon manifested in the proceedings of parliament. In 1789 a bill for the relief of Protestant dissenters was rejected by a very small majority. During the prorogation, the dissenters had agitated for the repeal of the Corporation and Test acts, with unwonted earnestness and considerable indiscretion. Some of the establishment were equally zealous in the encouragement of a resistance to the claims of the dissenters. Mr. Fox, on the 2nd of March, proposed the abolition of these religious tests. Mr. Pitt opposed the motion. Mr. Burke declared that had the repeal been moved for ten years before, he should probably have joined Mr. Fox in supporting it. But he had the strongest reasons to believe that many of the persons now calling themselves dissenters, and who stood the most forward in the present application for relief, were men of factious and dangerous principles, actuated by no motives of religion or conscience, to which tolerance could in any rational sense be applied. The motion was rejected by a very large majority. Two days after, a proposition made by Mr. Flood, to amend the representation of the people in parliament, was withdrawn; the minister, who had three times advocated reform, now holding that if a more favourable time should arise, he might himself bring forward a specific proposition; but he felt that the cause of reform might now lose ground from being agitated at an improper moment.

BURKE'S *Reflections on the Revolution (1790 A.D.)*

The sixteenth parliament of Great Britain, having nearly completed its full term of seven years, was dissolved soon after the prorogation in June, 1790. The new parliament assembled on the 25th of November, when Mr. Addington was chosen speaker. There was no allusion to the affairs of France in the king's speech. That the great events which had taken place in that country were occupying the thoughts of public men, there could be small doubt. Whilst the royal speech, and the echoing addresses, dwelt upon a pacification between Austria and the Porte, upon dissensions in the Netherlands, upon peace between Russia and Sweden, and upon war between Russia and the Porte, the national mind was absorbed almost exclusively by conflicting sentiments about the Revolution in France. A few weeks before the meeting of parliament, Burke had published his famous *Reflections on the Revolution.* Probably no literary production ever produced such an exciting effect upon public opinion at the time of its appearance, or maintained so permanent an influence amongst the generation to whose fears it appealed. The reputation of the author as the greatest political philosopher of his age; his predilections for freedom, displayed through the whole course of the American Revolution; his hatred of despotic power, as manifested in his unceasing denunciations of atrocities in India; his consistent adherence to whig principles as established by the Bill of Rights — this acquaintance with the character and sentiments of Burke first raised an unbounded curiosity to trace the arguments against the struggle for liberty in another country, coming from a man who had so long contended for what was deemed the popular cause at home. The perusal of this remarkable book converted the inquirer into an enthusiast. In proportion as the liberal institutions of Great Britain were held up to admiration, so were the attempts of France to build up

a new system of government upon the ruins of the old system, described as the acts of men devoted to "every description of tyranny and cruelty employed to bring about and to uphold this revolution." To the argumentative power was added an impassioned eloquence, which roused the feelings into hatred of the anarchists who led the royal family captives into Paris on the 6th of October, and directed every sympathy towards a humiliated king, a proscribed nobility, and a plundered church.

Six months elapsed between the publication of Burke's *Reflections* and his final separation from his party, involving an irrevocable breach of friendship with Fox.

THE BIRMINGHAM RIOTS (1791 A.D.)

In the debate on the proposed repeal of the Test and Corporation acts, on the 2nd of March, 1790, Mr. Burke read extracts from a sermon of Doctor Price, and from the writings of Doctor Priestly and other non-conformists; inferring from certain passages that the leading preachers among the dissenters were avowed enemies to the Church of England, and that thence its establishment appeared to be in much more serious danger than the church of France was in a year or two ago. The *Reflections on the Revolution* diffused this alarm more extensively through the country. The clamour was at last got up that the church was in danger. There were results of this spirit, which were more disgraceful to the English character than the violence of the Parisian populace in the attack upon the Bastille or the march from Versailles. It was a lower and a more contemptible fanaticism than had been evoked by the first call in France to fight for freedom, that produced the riots at Birmingham which broke out on the 14th of July, 1791.

Dr. Joseph Priestly, in 1780, became the minister of the principal Unitarian congregation in Birmingham. He was ardent in his political views, having written an answer to Burke's *Reflections*, and he did not hesitate to avow his opposition to the church, in his zeal to obtain what he deemed the rights of dissenters. But in his private life he was worthy of all respect, and in his scientific pursuits had attained the most honourable distinction. But even as a politician he avowed himself a warm admirer of the English constitution, as the best system of policy the sagacity of man had been able to contrive, though its vigour had been impaired by certain corruptions. He published, in 1791, *Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham*—a work in which, according to Robert Hall, "the seeds of that implacable dislike were scattered" which produced the outrages that we shall briefly relate.

On the 11th of July, according to a royal proclamation of the 27th of that month, "a certain scandalous and seditious paper was printed and published in the town of Birmingham," for the discovery of the author of which a reward of one hundred pounds was offered. This handbill called upon the people to celebrate on the 14th the destruction of that high altar and castle of despotism, the Bastille; but not to forget that their own parliament was venal; the ministers hypocritical; the clergy legal oppressors; the reigning family extravagant; the crown too weighty for the head that wears it. This paper, says the proclamation, was printed and published in the town of Birmingham. William Hutton, a cautious man, says that it was fabricated in London, brought to Birmingham, and a few copies privately scattered under a table at an inn. On that 14th of July about eighty persons assembled at a tavern, known as Dadley's, to commemorate this anniversary; and at the Swan Inn, some magistrates, and persons opposed to the celebrationists,

[1791 A.D.]

met to drink "Church and King." There was a small mob about Dadley's tavern, who hissed and hooted; and there was another mob around the Swan. The dinner went off quietly amongst the friends of French liberty, the king and constitution being duly toasted, and afterwards the national assembly of France. After the company had separated, a rabble broke into the tavern in search of Doctor Priestly, who had not dined there, crying out that "they wanted to knock the powder out of Priestly's wig." The loyal company at the adjacent Swan huzzaed; and it is affirmed that a gentleman said, "Go to the Meetings." In another hour Priestly's chapel, in New street, called the New Meeting-house, was on fire. This work accomplished, the Old Meeting-house was also quickly in a blaze. Doctor Priestly lived at Fair hill, about a mile and a half from the town. He and his family had fled from mob vengeance; but his house was destroyed, and his books burned, with his manuscripts and his philosophical instruments.

The burnings and plunderings, invariably of the houses of dissenters, continued till the night of Sunday, the 17th, in Birmingham and the neighbourhood. On the 15th the house of Mr. Ryland, at Easy hill, was burned down, six or seven of the rioters, who had drunk themselves insensible with the booty of the wine-cellar, perishing in the flames. Mr. Ryland was a friend of Priestly—a man devoted to the public interests of Birmingham, and emphatically described as "a friend to the whole human race." On that day Bordesley hall, the residence of Mr. Taylor, another dissenter, was burned. The warehouse of William Hutton was then plundered; and on the next morning his country-house, at Bennett's hill, was set on fire and consumed. Five other houses of dissenters, whether Presbyterians, Baptists, or Unitarians, were that day burned or sacked. Justices of the peace sat in conclave; squires made speeches to the mobs, telling them they had done enough. The Birmingham magistrates issued a placard, addressed to "Friends and Brother Churchmen," entreating them to desist; for that the damage, which already amounted to £100,000, would have to be paid by the parishes. On the Sunday there were burnings of chapels and private houses in the neighbourhood of Birmingham; and then three troops of light dragoons rode into the town, having come in one day from Nottingham, and this disgraceful exhibition was at an end.[e]

APPENDIX A

CHARLES JAMES FOX

By OSCAR BROWNING, M.A.

King's College, Cambridge, Lecturer in History to the University

One of the most interesting rooms in England, indeed in the British Empire, is the Upper School of Eton College. It is a long, lofty, and bare chamber, with windows that cannot be looked out of. The walls are covered with oaken panels, carved with the names of students of many generations. But attention is arrested by the busts which form the only decoration of the apartment,—the effigies of men who governed and fought for and illuminated England in the latter half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. Here are Chatham and North and Camden, Wellington, Wellesley and Howe, Shelley and Gray and Porson, Hallam and Gladstone, Grenville, Canning and Fox. Eton was not always the governing school, Westminster preceded it. But Westminster remained faithful to the Stuarts, and the supremacy of Eton began with William, developed under Anne, and reached its height under the Hanoverians. Eton has no doubt exercised a deep and lasting influence over the history of England. The spirit fostered, if not born, at Eton placed England at the head of Europe, and prepared her to be the mistress of the world. Any one who has not grasped the fact that the rulers of England during this momentous epoch were friends and school-fellows, calling each other by their nicknames, meeting daily in social intercourse, has failed to comprehend the real character of our history and government.

Another room at Eton, less known but scarcely less impressive, is the drawing-room of the Provost's Lodge. Here are portraits of Etonians of the same period, presented to the headmaster when they left the school. Many of these pictures are by famous artists, Reynolds and Gainsborough, Romney and Lawrence, but their interest lies not in their art, but in the characters they portray. They are boys, as we should now call them, of nineteen or twenty, but also grave men, with the seriousness of age married to the energy and vivacity of youth. They were statesmen from their cradles, nurtured for the conduct of high affairs, which in their hands seemed no different from the business of every day. Read through a hundred letters of that time, and in ninety of them there is not one whose date cannot be determined by its allusions to public events. Here lies the secret of English rule and the clue to the power of the English aristocracy.

The portrait of Charles James Fox in this collection, painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds in the summer of 1764, when Fox was fifteen, shows a singularly mature countenance, with handsome features, a long nose, and the bushy eyebrows which were so prominent in later life. He had already been to Paris

and taken part in its dissipation, and we are told that when he returned to school he was laughed at by the boys and the masters for his Frenchified tastes, and was actually flogged in order to take down his presumption. We are told that Fox's father brought up his children without any regard to morality, that in this first journey he encouraged the boy to indulge in vice, and sent him to the gaming table at Spa well supplied with money.

Fox was well educated at school, became a good scholar, and acquired a considerable knowledge of French. His despatches in the English Record Office show that he not only wrote good French, but could translate French into sound, idiomatic English, an accomplishment which is rare at the present day. He impressed his school-fellows with the conviction of his general ability, and especially with his gifts as an orator. We are told that in later years he could converse fluently in Italian and Spanish. German did not in those days form part of a liberal education in England. He had undoubtedly a strong passion for literature, especially for poetry, with a thorough knowledge of the classical English dramatists. His devotion to Greek and Latin writers was not confined to their language, but he appreciated their style, and read Homer and Vergil as if they were his own countrymen. At Oxford he devoted much time to mathematics, which was then, and for many years afterwards, regarded at that University as the complement of a classical education, and he found the study deeply interesting. He also acquired a taste for Italian art, which was, however, confined, as might be expected, to the post-Raffaellite School, Guido and the Caracci coming in for special recognition. But he said that poetry was the best thing after all, and that he loved all the poets.

He became stout and heavy at an early age, but he was very fond of exercise, cricket, tennis, hunting, racing, and swimming, walking and shooting. Such in those days was the education of an English gentleman, and the athletic part of it remains to the present day, even if the intellectual side has declined. His rival, William Pitt, was brought up in a different manner. He was prevented by feeble health from going to a public school, and he spent six studious years at Cambridge, where he never missed a morning chapel and never went out after dark. Pitt, although he drank more port wine than was good for him, never gambled, and his purity of life was well known and often ridiculed. Fox was also a good actor, indeed, as we know from the example of Byron, actors and play-acting exercised a great influence over the young bloods of the Georgian era.

One of the effects of Fox's foreign education was to make him a prodigious dandy, and he led the fashion among the maccaronis, as they were called. He appeared in London wearing an odd little French hat, shoes with red heels, and blue hair-powder. He and Lord Carlisle, best known for his mission to America to bring about a reconciliation before the war, once travelled from Paris to Lyons for the express purpose of buying waistcoats, and the poet Rogers tells us that during the journey they talked about nothing else. Fox, in his early days, spent much of his time and substance in gambling, which was a prominent vice of the society of that age. The Whigs gambled at Brookes's Club, the Tories at White's, and both at Almack's—a club founded for the purpose of play by a Scotchman named Macall, who gave it his own name reversed. Almack's assembly rooms, famous for their exclusive dancing parties, were a separate institution. One of the first rules of Almack's compelled its members to keep not less than fifty guineas at one table and twenty at another. The usual stakes were of £50, done up in rouleaux, and there was generally as much as £10,000 to be seen on the table. Lord Tankerville told Rogers that he had played cards with Fitzpatrick at Brookes's from ten at night till near six in the following

afternoon, a waiter standing by to tell them whose deal it was, they being too sleepy to know.

Charles, as his friends always called him, was a Triton amongst these minnows. After losing large sums at hazard, which was their favourite game, he would go home, not, as his friends sometimes feared, to destroy himself, but to sit down quietly and read Greek. Lord Carlisle was at one time security for Charles for £16,000 lost at play. His father at another time advanced him £40,000 to pay his debts. If he lost at play, Fox generally won at horse-racing, for he was a frequent visitor at Newmarket. Once, when it was known that he had won £8000, a Jew who had lent him money called and demanded payment. Fox said that he must first discharge his debts of honour. The creditor remonstrated, and Fox asked for the bond. On receiving it he tore it up and threw the fragments into the fire, saying, "Now, sir, my debt to you is a debt of honour," and it was immediately paid.

While Fox was absent from England, in March 1768, being then only nineteen years of age, he was elected to Parliament for the pocket-borough of Midhurst. He took his seat in the following November. His first speeches were on the Middlesex election. He gained an immediate success, and his father was very proud of it, writing, "I am told that few in Parliament ever spoke better than Charles did on Tuesday, off-hand, with rapidity, with spirit, and such knowledge of what he was talking of as surprised everybody in so young a man. If you think this vanity, I am sure you will forgive it." The father's judgment is borne out by a private letter, which says, "Mr. Charles Fox, who I suppose was your school-fellow, and who is but twenty, made a great figure in the debate last night upon the petition of the Middlesex freeholders. He spoke with great spirit, in very parliamentary language, and entered very deeply into the question on constitutional principles." Horace Walpole, the liveliest *raconteur* of the society of that age, wrote, "Charles Fox, not yet twenty-one, answered Burke with great quickness and parts, but with confidence equally premature." Shortly after this his father said again, "I am told, and I willingly believe it, Charles Fox spoke extremely well. It was all off-hand and argumentative, in reply to Mr. Burke and Mr. Wedderburn, and excessively well indeed. I hear it spoken of by everybody as a most extraordinary thing, and I am, you see, not a little pleased with it."

It will be seen that Fox, at the outset of his career, held, like Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield, opinions different from those which he adopted in his maturity, and this was often thrown in his teeth. Rogers tells us, referring to a later period, that never in his life did he hear anything equal to Fox's speeches in reply, that they were wonderful, whereas Burke did not do himself justice as a speaker, as his manner was hurried, and he seemed always in a passion, and Pitt's voice sounded as if he had worsted in his mouth. Porson, the great Greek scholar, remarked that Pitt carefully considered his sentences before he uttered them, but that Fox threw himself into the middle of his, and left it to God Almighty to get him out again. This early connection between Fox and Lord North does not belong to the most creditable part of his career. He broke with his chief and made friends again, and when in office forced the Prime Minister into popular courses against his will. At last the King came to the rescue, and North must have been relieved to get rid of the terrible infant whom he had fostered. George III. wrote to Lord North, "I am greatly incensed with the presumption of Charles Fox in obliging you to vote with him that night, but approve much of your making your friends vote in the majority; indeed, that young man has so thoroughly cast off every principle of common honour and honesty that he must become as contemptible as he is odious, and I hope you

will let him know that you are not insensible of his conduct towards you." A few days later North was able to write to Fox, "Sir, His Majesty has thought proper to order a new commission of the Treasury to be made out in which I do not see your name." Fox's connection with the Tory Government was thus severed, and from 1774 we may regard him as a Liberal. Fox declared that the greatest folly of his life was in having supported Lord North. The strength of Fox's convictions, and his ability in defending them, were now severely tested in the contest between England and the American Colonies. He took an early opportunity of deploring that the measures taken by Ministers tended rather to widen than to heal the differences which had so long existed between England and America. In his speech on this occasion he entered into the whole history and argument of the dispute, and made the greatest figure he had yet made in a speech of an hour and twenty minutes. Gibbon said that taking the whole compass of the question, he discovered a capacity for regular debate which neither his friends hoped nor his enemies dreaded. On another occasion he declared that Ministers had reason to triumph, that Lord Chatham, the King of Prussia, nay, Alexander the Great, never gained more in one campaign than the noble Lord had lost; he had lost a whole continent. Fox opposed the bill introduced to punish the colony of Massachusetts, he spoke and voted for Burke's plan for conciliation, and supported the reception of a remonstrance from New York. The King was so much afraid of him, that hearing that Charles was going to Paris, he urged North to press on business in his absence. But during the whole of this time he did not abandon his dissolute life, and was seldom in bed before five in the morning, or out of it before two in the afternoon.

The line which he took in these discussions was similar to that taken by Lord Chatham, whose fiery eloquence has become a permanent part of English literature. This is a specimen of his argument:—"I was in great hopes that the present Ministers had seen their error, and had given over coercion and the idea of carrying on war with America by Act of Parliament. In order to induce Americans to submit to your Legislature, you pass laws against them cruel and tyrannical in the extreme. If they complain of one law, your answer to their complaint is to pass another more rigorous than the former. But they are in rebellion, you say; if so, treat them as rebels are wont to be treated. Send out your fleets and armies against them and subdue them; but let them have no reason to complain of your laws. Show them that your laws are mild, and just, and equitable, and they are therefore in the wrong, and deserve the punishment they meet with. The very contrary of this has been your wretched policy. I have ever understood it as a first principle, that in rebellion you punish the individuals, but spare the country; but in a war against the enemy it is your policy to spare the individuals and lay waste the country. This last has been invariably your conduct against America." Horace Walpole was so impressed with his brilliancy that he wrote, "Charles Fox has tumbled Old Saturn (meaning Lord Chatham) from the throne of oratory, and, if he has not all the dazzling lustre, has much more of the solid material. His speech on Monday was marvellous for method and memory, and was really unanswerable, for not one of the Ministers knew what to say, and so said nothing, and that silence cost them many votes." During the whole of this time he was in the greatest pecuniary embarrassments, which he could have alleviated by taking office. He won £70,000 at Newmarket, but lost it all at hazard, so that he, as we are told, was £30,000 worse than nothing. He was often in need of the smallest sums, and his books were sold under a writ of execution. His dissipation brought on an illness—which eventually caused his premature death—but he kept himself going by shooting in Norfolk.

When France made an alliance with the revolted Colonies his affection for that country did not make him less of a patriot. He argued that the English troops should be withdrawn from America, and an offensive war be undertaken against France. "Attack France," he said; "she is your object; the war against America is against your own countrymen; that against France is against your inveterate enemy and rival. Every blow you strike in America is against yourselves, every stroke against France is of advantage to you. America must be conquered in France, France can never be conquered in America."

William Pitt, afterwards the most formidable rival of Fox, entered Parliament at the General Election of 1780, at the age of twenty-one. His first speech was in favour of Burke's Bill for the reduction of the Civil List, and it was declared by Lord North to be the best maiden speech he had ever heard. Fox warmly congratulated the young man, and an old member who was present, said, "Aye, Mr. Fox, you are praising young Pitt for his speech. You may well do so, for, excepting yourself, there is no man in the House can make such another, and, old as I am, I expect and hope to hear you both battling it within these walls, as I have heard your fathers before you." Fox, who disliked being praised, was much embarrassed, but Pitt said, with great tact, "I have no doubt, General, you would like to attain the age of Methuselah."

In 1782 Lord North resigned, having been Prime Minister for twelve years. Next to the King he was mainly responsible for the American war. Horace Walpole has left us a graphic account of his personal appearance. "Nothing could be more coarse or clumsy or ungracious than his outside. Two large prominent eyes, that rolled about to no purpose, for he was utterly shortsighted, a wide mouth, thick lips, and inflated visage, gave him the air of a blind trumpeter. A deep, untunable voice, which, instead of modulating, he confused with unnecessary pomp, a total neglect of his person, and ignorance of every civil attention, disgusted all who judge by appearance, or withhold their approbation till it is courted. But within that rude casket were enclosed many useful talents. He had much wit, good humour, strong natural sense, assurance and promptness both of conception and execution." He was indeed a perfect gentleman, and amongst his political adversaries had not a single enemy.

The famous or infamous coalition between Fox and North, who became Secretaries of State, under the Duke of Portland as figure-head, was brought about by the fact that it was impossible that Fox and Shelburne should work together. It is explained by Fox's easiness, perhaps levity of character, and by his conviction that North was at heart a gentleman. Fox defended himself on the ground that quarrels should be short and friendships long, and that the American war was over. But there is no doubt that North was in his principles a Tory, and Fox in his inmost nature a Liberal. The coalition ruined the Whigs, and kept them out of office for many years, indeed they did not return with any effective force till 1832. George III. hated the arrangement. He disliked Fox, not only for his political opinions, but for his dissolute and abandoned life, and more than all from the belief that he exercised a bad influence over the Prince of Wales, and estranged him from his father. He treated Fox with only bare civility, and when Fox's India Bill was rejected in the House of Lords, chiefly by the royal machinations, the King dismissed his Ministers with every sign of ignominy, sending an under-secretary to demand the seals from them on the ground that a personal interview would be painful. The next twenty years of Fox's life were spent in opposition, and he had no opportunity of seriously influencing the politics of his country.

After the death of Pitt, in January 1806, Fox became Foreign Secretary in Grenville's administration. But he was already a dying man, and his death

ensued on the thirteenth of the following September. His term of office was rendered memorable by the serious attempt to make peace with France, and to put an end to a war of which he had always disapproved. Trotter, his faithful secretary, makes the reflection that if Grenville, in 1793, had possessed the conciliating manner and the enlarged views of Fox, or had Pitt been able to foresee the future, and had possessed a more rational sympathy with the struggle of France for liberty, or had the Ministry acknowledged Chauvelin as the representative of a great nation, and had left France free to choose her own form of government, monarchical or republican, instead of ignominiously dismissing him, what seas of blood would have been spared to France and Europe.

During the peace which followed the Treaty of Amiens, Fox visited Paris with the object of working in the French archives with regard to the relations between Louis XIV. and James II., on whose history he was then engaged. Whilst at Paris he saw Bonaparte more than once, but not so often or so intimately as has sometimes been imagined. Paris showed evident signs of renewed prosperity and of the beginnings of a settled government. Trotter tells us, "Here all was gold and silver. In London a few guineas were with great difficulty procured from a banker as a matter of favour; in Paris your banker gave you your choice, silver or gold, and both were plentiful,—England having nothing but paper, and France nothing but gold and silver, a fact which spoke very intelligible language." When Fox went to the theatre he was soon recognised by the audience in the pit; every eye was fixed upon him, and every tongue resounded, "Fox! Fox!" the whole audience stood up, and the applause was universal. The First Consul, on entering, was received with some applause, but much inferior to that bestowed on Fox.

It was not till some time after his arrival that Fox was presented to Bonaparte at a public levee. Trotter described the First Consul as a small and by no means commanding figure, dressed plainly, though richly, in the embroidered consular coat, without powder in his hair, looking, at first view, like a private gentleman, indifferent as to dress, and devoid of all haughtiness in his air. He was supported by the two other consuls, large and heavy men, awkward and embarrassed. When Fox was introduced Bonaparte was a good deal flurried, and after showing considerable emotion, said very rapidly, "Ah! Mr. Fox! I have heard with pleasure of your arrival; I have desired much to see you. I have long admired in you the orator and friend of his country who, in constantly raising his voice for peace, consulted that country's best interests, those of Europe, and of the human race. The two great nations of Europe require peace; they have nothing to fear, they ought to understand and value one another. In you, Mr. Fox, I see with much satisfaction that great statesman who recommended peace because there was no just object of war, who saw Europe desolated for no purpose, and who struggled for its relief." Fox said nothing in reply, and the interview soon terminated. At a later period Fox met Bonaparte at an exhibition, held in the Louvre, and held a little conversation with him, and towards the end of his stay he dined with him, but merely in a formal way. Bonaparte at table took the lion's share of the conversation, which, in Trotter's opinion, ought to have been given to Fox; and Fox considered Bonaparte as a young man who was a good deal intoxicated with his success and surprising elevation, but he did not doubt of his sincerity as to the maintenance of peace.

The negotiations for peace in 1806 were shipwrecked on the question of Sicily. Napoleon naturally felt that Naples was insecure without the possession of Sicily, whereas the English were reluctant to take that island away from Ferdinand, the dispossessed monarch of Naples, or, in other words, to lose control of it themselves. To have given Sicily to the French would have been a serious

derogation from the advantages we derived from the occupation of Malta. It is, however, possible that if Fox had been in his first vigour, and if the negotiations had not been interrupted by his untimely death, peace might have been made on the basis that France should be master of the land, and England mistress of the sea. Fox was in many respects a typical English statesman of that epoch, very different indeed from the types which prevail at present either in England or elsewhere. He, his colleagues, and his adversaries were public-school men, university men, classical scholars, soaked in literature to the tips of their fingers, gay *débonnair*, and too often dissolute. They regarded themselves as the born governors of England, but they had been trained to govern her from their earliest childhood, and her interests were as dear to them as their own. Men of the same type, they thoroughly understood each other, and lived together in the most familiar intercourse. Fierce were their debates and passionate their quarrels, but ministry and opposition worked together for the good of their common country. No one ever suggested that Fox or Sheridan, in their worst distress, would have bartered their opinions or advocacy for money. They have been called Ciceronian statesmen, because they were nurtured upon the sounding periods and the lofty sentiments of the Latin orator. Vergil and Horace were their daily food. To read Homer was with them the synonym for retirement from office, the first occupation of a statesman's leisure. If it were permissible to refer to living persons, it might be shown that the type is not altogether extinct even in our own day. But it is perishing. The statesman of the future will be trained in science, political and natural, office will be the crown of a persistent ambition, society will fall into the background as a political force. But, if the standard of patriotism, of devotion, and of purity in public life is not to be lowered, we must recur to the great examples of the past whose names are carved in the schoolroom at Harrow, whose busts decorate the Upper School at Eton, or whose portraits, instinct with a youthful manliness, speak to us from the walls of the Provost's Lodge.

BRIEF REFERENCE-LIST OF AUTHORITIES BY CHAPTERS

[The letter [a] is reserved for Editorial Matter.]

Chapter I. The Civil War (1642–1646 A.D.)

[b] S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*.—[c] Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*.—[d] John M. Kemble, edition of Roger Twysden's *Government of England*.—[e] Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches with Elucidations*.—[f] Lord Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*.—[g] Charles Knight, *History of England*.—[h] Samuel Pepys, *Diary*.—[i] Osmund Airy, article on "Prince Rupert" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—[j] Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs*.—[k] Philip Warwick, *Memoirs*.—[l] John Aubrey, *Miscellanies*.—[m] T. B. Macaulay, essay on *Lord Nugent's Memorials of Hampden*.—[n] Thomas Arnold, *Lectures on Modern History*.—[o] Thomas May, *History of the Long Parliament*.—[p] Denzil Holles, *Memoirs*.—[q] S. R. Gardiner, article on "Pym" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.—[r] Daniel Neal, *History of the Puritans*.—[s] John Walker, *Sufferings of the Clergy*.—[t] Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*.—[u] Thomas Keightley, *History of England*.—[v] Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials*.—[w] S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's History of England*.—[x] William Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth*.—[y] F. von Raumer, *Political History of England*.—[z] Jeremy Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*.—[bb] Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*.—[cc] Charles Macfarlane and Thomas Thomson, *Comprehensive History of England*.

Chapter II. The Last Years of Charles I (1646–1649 A.D.)

[b] Leopold von Ranke, *Englische Geschichte*.—[d] Robert Vaughan, *History of England*.—[e] John Milton, *Iconoclastes*.—[f] F. von Raumer, *Political History of England*.—[g] Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs*.—[h] William Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth*.—[i] John Berkley, *Memoirs*.—[j] Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*.—[k] Lord Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*.—[l] D. Holles, *Memoirs*.—[m] Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*.—[n] Charles Knight, *History of England*.—[o] William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*.—[p] Philip Warwick, *Memoirs*.—[q] John Forster, *Life of Marten*.—[r] F. P. G. Guizot, *History of the English Revolution*.—[s] John Milton, *Defensio pro populo Anglicano*.—[t] T. B. Macaulay, *History of England*.—[u] S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*.—[v] John Lingard, *History of England*.

Chapter III. The Victorious Commonwealth (1649–1651 A.D.)

[b] S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*.—[c] F. P. G. Guizot, *History of the English Revolution of 1640*.—[d] F. P. G. Guizot, *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*.—[e] Frederick von Raumer, *Political History of England*.—[f] Clement Walker, *The High Court of Justice, or Cromwell's Slaughter-House*.—[g] Lord Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*.—[h] John Lingard, *History of England*.—[i] Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials*.—[j] Thomas Keightley, *History of England*.—[k] Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*.—[l] Earl of Castlehaven, *Memoirs*.—[m] Thomas Carte, *An History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde*.—[n] John Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*.—[o] William Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth*.—[p] Cardinal de Retz, *Mémoires*.—[q] Leopold von Ranke, *Englische Geschichte*.

Chapter IV. Cromwell Against Parliament (1651–1653 A.D.)

[b] Leopold von Ranke, *Englische Geschichte*.—[c] Edmund Ludlow, *Memoirs*.—[d] Charles Knight, *History of England*.—[e] James Heath, *A Chronicle of the Late Intestine War in the Three Kingdoms*.—[f] Thomas Keightley, *History of England*.—[g] William Petty, *Political*

Arithmetic.—[h] JOHN LYNCH, *Cambrensis Eversus.*—[i] BRUODIN, *Propugnaculum.*—[j] JAMES BALFOUR, *Annales of Scotland.*—[k] ROBERT CAREY, *Memoirs.*—[l] S. R. GARDINER, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.*—[m] JOHN LINGARD, *History of England.*—[n] HENRY HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England.*—[o] BULSTRODE WHITELOCKE, *Memorials.*—[p] WILLIAM GODWIN, *History of the Commonwealth.*—[q] JOHN FORSTER, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth.*—[r] F. P. G. GUIZOT, *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth.*—[s] DAVID HUME, *History of England.*—[t] LORD CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion.*—[u] PHILIP WARWICK, *Memoirs.*

CHAPTER V. CROMWELL AS PROTECTOR (1653-1658 A.D.)

[b] LEOPOLD VON RANKE, *Englische Geschichte.*—[c] S. R. GARDINER, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.*—[d] GIOVANNI SAGREDO, *Relazione.*—[e] JOHN LINGARD, *History of England.*—[f] F. P. G. GUIZOT, *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth.*—[g] EDMUND LUDLOW, *Memoirs.*—[h] THOMAS BIRCH, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.*—[i] BULSTRODE WHITELOCKE, *Memorials.*—[j] THOMAS KEIGHTLEY, *History of England.*—[k] CHARLES KNIGHT, *History of England.*—[l] LORD CLARENDON, *State Papers.*—[m] LORD CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion.*—[n] S. R. GARDINER, *Cromwell's Place in History.*—[o] JOHN MORLEY, *Oliver Cromwell.*—[p] HENRY HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England.*—[q] EDMUND BURKE, *Synopsis of English History.*—[r] T. B. MACAULAY, essay on *Hallam's Constitutional History of England.*—[s] DAVID HUME, *History of England.*—[t] LUCY HUTCHINSON, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson.*—[u] THOMAS CARLYLE, *Heroes and Hero-worship.*—[v] ROBERT BAILLIE, *Letters and Journals.*—[w] ALEX. NICOLSON, article on "Cromwell" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

CHAPTER VI. THE END OF THE COMMONWEALTH (1658-1660 A.D.)

[b] F. P. G. GUIZOT, *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II.*, translated by A. R. Scoble.—[c] CHARLES KNIGHT, *History of England.*—[d] EDMUND LUDLOW, *Memoirs.*—[e] LORD CLARENDON, *State Papers.*—[f] JOHN LINGARD, *History of England.*—[g] W. H. S. AUBREY, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation.*—[h] SAMUEL PEPYS, *Diary.*—[i] LORD CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion.*—[j] JOHN AUBREY, *The Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey.*—[k] THOMAS KEIGHTLEY, *History of England.*—[l] JOHN MILTON, *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Commonwealth.*—[m] LUCY HUTCHINSON, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson.*—[n] GILBERT BURNET, *History of His Own Times.*—[o] LADY ANNE FANSHAWE, *Memoirs.*—[p] THOMAS GUMBLE, *The Life of General Monk.*—[q] OSMOND AIRY, article on "Monk" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica.*—[r] ROBERT VAUGHAN, *History of England Under the Stuarts.*

CHAPTER VII. THE RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS (1660-1668 A.D.)

[b] DANIEL DEFOE, *The True-Born Englishman.*—[c] W. H. S. AUBREY, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation.*—[d] J. LINGARD, *History of England.*—[e] H. HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England.*—[f] G. BURNET, *History of His Own Times.*—[g] J. WHITE, *History of England.*—[h] T. B. MACAULAY, *History of England.*—[i] T. HUTCHINSON, *History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay.*—[j] EZRA STILES, *Most Illustrious and Heroic Defenders of Liberty.*—[k] CHARLES KNIGHT, *History of England.*—[l] T. KEIGHTLEY, *History of England.*—[m] S. PEPYS, *Diary.*—[n] D. DEFOE, *A Journal of the Plague Year.*—[o] R. BAXTER, *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ.*—[p] T. VINCENT, *God's Terrible Voice in the City of Plague and Fire.*—[q] LORD CLARENDON, *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England.*—[r] N. HODGES, *Loimologia.*—[s] J. EVELYN, *Diary.*—[t] C. WREN, *Parentalia, or Memoirs of the Family of the Wrens.*—[u] J. AUBREY, *Brief Lives, Chiefly of Contemporaries.*—[v] A. MARVELL, *Life and Works.*—[w] W. PETTY, *Political Arithmetic.*—[x] J. DRYDEN, *Annus Mirabilis.*

CHAPTER VIII. THE LATTER PART OF CHARLES II'S REIGN (1668-1685 A.D.)

[b] H. HALLAM, *Constitutional History of England.*—[c] T. B. MACAULAY, *History of England.*—[d] S. R. GARDINER, *A Student's History of England.*—[e] G. BURNET, *History of His Own Times.*—[f] R. NORTH, *Life of Lord Keeper Guildford.*—[g] R. VAUGHAN, *History of England Under the House of Stuart.*—[h] T. KEIGHTLEY, *History of England.*—[i] J. LINGARD, *History of England.*—[j] D. HUME, *History of England.*—[k] H. T. BUCKLE, *History of Civilisation in England.*

CHAPTER IX. THE STATE OF ENGLAND IN 1685.

[b] T. B. MACAULAY, *History of England.*

Chapter X. James II and the Glorious Revolution (1685–1688 A.D.)

[b] T. B. Macaulay, *History of England.*—[c] T. Keightley, *History of England.*—[d] R. North, *Life of Lord Keeper Guildford.*—[e] *Memoirs of James II.*—[f] J. Lingard, *History of England.*—[g] C. Knight, *History of England.*—[h] J. Peresby, *Memoirs.*—[i] Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors.*—[j] Lord Lonsdale, *Memoirs.*—[k] G. Burnet, *History of His Own Times.*—[l] R. Vaughan, *History of England Under the House of Stuart.*—[m] J. Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution in England in 1688.*—[n] H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilisation in England.*—[o] W. Wilson, *Life of Defoe.*—[p] H. Hallam, *Constitutional History of England.*

Chapter XI. William and Mary (1689–1702 A.D.)

[b] H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilisation in England.*—[c] C. Knight, *History of England.*—[d] H. Hallam, *Constitutional History of England.*—[e] T. B. Macaulay, *History of England.*—[f] J. White, *History of England.*—[g] T. Keightley, *History of England.*—[h] Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Chief Justices.*—[i] J. R. Green, *Short History of England.*—[j] J. Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland from 1681 to the Great Battle off La Hogue.*—[k] W. P. Courtney, article on "Marlborough" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica.*—[l] E. Burke, *Observations on a Later State of the Nation.*—[m] Waller, *Parliamentary History.*—[n] S. Bannister, *Life of William Paterson.*—[o] G. Burnet, *History of His Own Times.*—[p] J. Evelyn, *Diary.*—[q] Duc de St. Simon, *Mémoires.*—[r] J. Milton, *Areopagitica.*—[s] S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's History of England.*—[t] R. North, *Lives of the Norths.*—[u] J. Oldmixon, *Critical History of England.*—[v] T. Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II.*—[w] J. Swift, *Journal to Stella.*

Chapter XII. Queen Anne (1702–1714 A.D.)

[b] T. Keightley, *History of England.*—[c] L. von Ranke, *Englische Geschichte.*—[d] W. Coxe, *Life of Marlborough.*—[e] T. Smollett, *A Complete History of England.*—[f] P. H. Stanhope, *The History of England.*—[g] H. S. Bolingbroke, *Letter to Swift.*—[h] W. H. S. Aubrey, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation.*—[i] C. Macfarlane and T. Thomson, *Comprehensive History of England.*—[j] H. S. Bolingbroke, *Letters.*

Chapter XIII. The Reign of George I (1714–1727 A.D.)


[b] P. H. Stanhope, *History of England.*—[c] Charles Macfarlane and Thomas Thomson, *Comprehensive History of England.*—[d] T. Carlyle, *History of Friedrich II.*—[e] Gibbon, *Memoirs.*—[f] Charles Knight, *History of England.*—[g] T. Keightley, *History of England.*—[h] H. Hallam, *Constitutional History of England.*—[i] Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Times.*—[j] G. L. Craik, *History of British Commerce.*—[k] Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors.*

Chapter XIV. The Reign of George II (1727–1760 A.D.)

[b] P. H. Stanhope, *History of England.*—[c] Horace Walpole, *Memoirs of the Reign of George II.*—[d] Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Court of George II.*—[e] T. Keightley, *History of England.*—[f] N. Tindal, *History of England.*—[g] William Coxe, *The Administration of Henry Pelham.*—*Dr. Hunter's MS. Collection.*—[i] Horace Walpole, *Letter to H. Mann, March 3, 1757.*—Malthus, *Principles of Political Economy.*—[k] Charles Knight, *History of England.*—[l] James White, *History of England.*—[m] W. E. H. Lecky, *History of England in the 18th Century.*—[n] J. H. Burton, *History of Scotland.*—[o] W. H. S. Aubrey, *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation.*—[p] Oliver Goldsmith, *History of England.*—[q] Lord Hardwicke, *Chatham Correspondence.*

Chapter XV. Thirty Years of George the Third (1760–1791 A.D.)

[b] P. H. Stanhope, *History of England.*—[c] Thomas Keightley, *History of England.*—[d] Horace Walpole, *George III.*—[e] Charles Knight, *History of England.*—[f] W. N. Massey, *History of England during the Reign of George III.*—[g] E. Gibbon, *Autobiography.*—[h] S. R. Gardiner, *A Student's History of England.*—[i] Burke, *Speech on American Taxation.*



CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM 1642 TO 1791 A.D.

1642 Impeachment of the five members. The commons take refuge in the City. The struggle for the militia. Charles refused arms and ammunition at Hull. Division into royalists (under Prince Rupert), and Puritans (under Essex). Royalists withdraw from parliament. Charles sets up his standard at Nottingham (August 22d). Battle of Edgehill. Charles approaches London, but is intercepted at Turnham Green and retires to Oxford. Formation of the Association. Hobbes writes the *De Cive*.

1643 Royalist successes. Inaction of Essex. Conquest of Yorkshire by royalists. Rising of the Cornishmen. Death of Hampden at Chalgrove Field. Defeat of Fairfax at Atherton Moor. Battle of Roundaway Down. Waller's disasters. The Eastern Association's successes under leadership of Oliver Cromwell. Charles besieges Gloucester (August) and raises it again (September) before Essex. Death of Falkland at Newbury. Taking of the covenant by parliament to secure Scotch help. Cromwell defeats royalists at Winceby. The assembly of divines proposes ecclesiastical alterations. Death of Pym.

1644 King's army defeated at Nantwich. "Committee of Both Kingdoms" appointed to control the operations of both armies. Fight at Cropredy Bridge (June). Battle of Marston Moor (July). Cromwell drives the royalists before him. Essex's army surrenders at Lostwithiel. Battle of Tippermuir (September 2nd). Second battle of Newbury (October 22nd). Self-Denying Ordinance. The rise of independency under Cromwell: the revolt against Presbyterianism. Cromwell quarrels with Manchester.

1645 Milton's *Areopagitica*. The Self-Denying Ordinance (April). The new model army. The execution of Laud. Montrose in the Highlands. Remodelling of the parliamentary army. Battle of Naseby (June 15th). Fairfax victorious at Langport (July). Charles negotiates with the Scotch and Irish. Bristol surrendered by Prince Rupert. Earl of Glamorgan sent to Ireland. Defeat of Montrose at Philiphaugh (September 12th).

1646 Ireland disappoints Charles. Capture of Oxford by Fairfax. The king's surrender to the Scots at Newark. They dissociate from his intrigues.

1647 Scots surrender Charles to houses of parliament (January). Dispute between Presbyterians and the army. The Westminster assembly of divines. The army elects agitators. The army gets possession of the king, who is seized at Holmby House (June). It offers Charles moderate terms: the Heads of the Proposals. Presbyterian reaction in London: the exclusion of the eleven members. The army occupies London (August). King's flight to the Isle of Wight (November). Charles makes secret treaty with Scots (December).

1648 Royalist revolts in Kent and Wales and reaction in Charles' favour. The Scotch invade England under Hamilton. Scotch defeated at Preston, Wigan, and Warrington. Fairfax and Cromwell in Essex and Wales. Surrender of Colchester to Fairfax (August 27th). Charles taken from Carisbrooke. Pride's Purge (December).

Colonel Pride forcibly expels Presbyterian majority from house of commons. Royal Society founded.

1649 High court of justice tries Charles. Execution (January 30th). Establishment of the Commonwealth. Cromwell continues Irish war. Scotland proclaims Charles II king. Cromwell storms Drogheda and Wexford. Publication of *Eikon Basilike*.

1650 Defeat and death of Montrose. Cromwell accepts Scotch command. Enters Scotland. Wins battle of Dunbar (September 3rd). Capture of Edinburgh. Protesters and resolutioners.

1651 Charles marches into England. Battle of Worcester (September 3rd). Charles escapes to France. Foreign difficulties of commonwealth. The Navigation Act against the Dutch. Conference between parliament and the army. Hobbes' *Leviathan*. Act of Oblivion passed.

1652 Outbreak of Dutch War. Union with Scotland. Unpopularity of parliament. Parliament considers a dissolution. Victory of Tromp over Blake (November). Cromwell expels members of parliament.

1653 The Great Conference. Victory of Blake (February). Vane's Reform Bill. Cromwell dissolves Long Parliament (April 20th). Constituent convention (Barebone's Parliament). The convention dissolves (December). The protectorate and the Instrument of Government.

1654 Cromwell's vigorous government. Vowel's plot. Peace concluded with Holland. England and Holland united by ordinance. First protectorate parliament (September). Cromwell expels his opponents.

1655 Dissolution of the parliament (January). The major-general's division of England into eleven military districts. Anabaptist and royalist plots. Settlement of Holland and Ireland. Settlement of the church. The French Alliance. Blake in the Mediterranean. Readmission of Jews into England discussed.

1656 War with Spain and conquest of Jamaica. Second protectorate parliament. Cromwell interferes on behalf of the Vaudois subjects of Duke of Savoy.

1657 Blake's victory at Santa Cruz. Death of Blake. The Humble Petition and Advice. Plots against Cromwell's life. Cromwell refuses title of king. Cromwell's successes abroad, but failure at home.

1658 Dissolution of Second Protectorate Government (February). Cromwell absolute. Battle of the Dunes. Capture of Dunkirk. Death of Cromwell (September 3rd). Richard Cromwell, lord protector. He offends the godly party.

1659 Third protectorate parliament. Parliament dissolved. The Long Parliament restored. Displeasure of the army. Long Parliament again driven out. The Rump re-established by army. Retirement of Richard Cromwell. Quarrels of army and the Rump: Lambert and Desborough are dismissed.

1660 Monk enters London. The convention royalist parliament invites Charles to return; he lands at Dover (May). Charles II. Declaration of Breda. Convention parliament declares an amnesty. Hyde becomes lord chancellor. Trial of the regicides. Union of Holland and Ireland undone. Parliament settles property, the church, the revenue, and is then dissolved. Ecclesiastical debates: attempts to restore the prayer-book.

1661-1662 Cavalier parliament begins. Venner's plot and its results. The Corporation Act. The Savoy conference: Act of Uniformity re-enacted. Trial of Lambert and Vane. Puritan clergy driven out. Treason of Lamberdale and Sharp. Episcopal church established. Royal Society of London established.

1662 The Scotch Aide Act. Marriage of Charles to Catherine of Braganza. Profligacy of the court. Sale of Dunkirk to French. Charles' declaration favouring toleration.

1663 Charles' Catholic tendencies. Dispensing Bill fails.

1664 The Conventicle Act. Repeal of the Triennial Act. Growing hostility between England and the Dutch.

1665-1666 First Dutch War of Restoration begins. Victory at Lowestoft. The Plague. The Five-Mile Act. Clarendon's foreign policy attacked. Ambitions of Louis XIV. Continued struggle with Dutch. Newton's theory of fluxions. The fire of London. The Dutch in the Medway. Louis XIV declares war against England and makes alliance with Dutch.

1667 Dismissal of Clarendon, who escapes to the Continent. French and Dutch fleets defeated in West Indies. Louis deserts th Dutch. Peace of Breda. Discontent in England and Holland: maladministration of government. Louis attacks Flanders. Duke of Buckingham's ascendancy. Arlington. Cabal ministry takes office. Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

1668 The Triple Alliance. Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Charles negotiates with Louis in endeavour to introduce Catholicism. Ashley dissents from toleration to Catholics.

1669 Charles continues negotiations with France. Carteret dismissed from office of treasurer of navy.

1670 Secret treaty of Dover. The Cabal. Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* written.

1671 Buckingham's sham treaty. The exchequer fails: money obtained by a national bankruptcy. Milton's *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. Newton's theory of light.

1672 Declaration of Indulgence. War begins with Holland: Dutch victorious. Battle of Southwold Bay. Ashley becomes chancellor. Duke of York publicly received into Roman Catholic church.

1673 Withdrawal of Declaration of Indulgence. Parliament passes Test Act: its results. Duke of York's marriage. Dismissal of Shaftesbury. End of Cabal. Shaftesbury takes the lead of the country party. Sir Thomas Osborne becomes lord treasurer.

1674 Peace with the Dutch. Bill of Protestant Securities fails. Danby's ministry.

1675-1676 Parliamentary parties. Charles attempts arbitrary rule. Parliament wishing to check Louis, a treaty of mutual aid between Charles and Louis is made.

1677 Shaftesbury sent to the Tower. Bill for security of the church fails. Foreign policy: address of the houses for war with France. Marriage of prince of Orange to Mary. Danby's position. Parliament demands the dismissal of the army.

1678 The Peace of Nimeguen. Louis intrigues with the English opposition, and reveals secret treaty with Charles. Growing excitement. Oates invents the Popish Plot. Trials of leading Roman Catholics. Danby's position endangered; dissolution of the cavalier parliament.

1679 Meeting of the first Short Parliament; impeachment of Danby. Shaftesbury at head of new ministry. The Exclusion Bill. Temple's plan for new council fails. Habeas Corpus Act passed. Parliament dissolves. Popularity of Monmouth: his success at Bothwell Bridge. Shaftesbury dismissed. Charles' fourth parliament prorogued seven times.

1680 Monmouth's pretensions to the throne. Petitioners' second Short Parliament meets. Exclusion Bill thrown out by lords. Trial of Lord Stafford.

1681 Third Short Parliament meets at Oxford; is dissolved. Tory reaction. Charles' confiscation of the charters. Charles' fifth parliament. Treaty with France. Limitation Bill rejected. Arrest of Shaftesbury and Monmouth.

1682 The Scotch Test Act. The Duke of York's return. The city elections. Duke of Monmouth makes a progress through England. Conspiracy and flight of Shaftesbury. Penn founds Pennsylvania.

1683 Death of Shaftesbury. The remodelling of the corporations. The Rye-House Plot. The whig combination. Absolutism of Charles. Execution of Lord Russell and Algernon Sidney.

1684 Parties at court. Duke of York opposed by Halifax. Monmouth pardoned and banished. Town charters quashed, army increased. Rochester becomes president of the council.

1685 Death of Charles (February 6th). Accession of James II. A tory parliament. Rochester succeeds Halifax. Persecution of covenanters by Claverhouse. Punishment of Oates and Dangerfield. Insurrection of Monmouth. Battle of Sedgmoor. The bloody circuit. Execution of Monmouth. Climax of James' power; his violation of the Test Act. James increases army to twenty thousand men. Breach between king and parliament. James alienates the church. Triumph of the Catholic party: the king asserts his dispensing power. James gives benefices to Catholics. Revocation of Edict of Nantes. Sunderland made president of council.

1686 The ecclesiastical commission set up. Permanent army at Hounslow, in Ireland and Scotland.

1687 Clarendon is dismissed, superseded by Tyrconnel; dismissal of Rochester. Expulsion of the fellows of Magdalen. Declaration of Indulgence. The boroughs regulated. Attempt to pack a parliament. William of Orange protests against the Declaration.

1688 Newton's second Declaration of Indulgence. Clergy refuse to read it. Seven bishops petition against it. Their trial and acquittal. Aggressions of the court of high commission. Schemes for a Catholic successor. Son born to James. Invitation to William of Orange. William issues his Declaration. Landing of William at Tor Bay, and march upon London. Churchill's treason. Flight of James to France. The throne declared vacant. The peers assume the government.

1689 William decides for a convention. Compromise decided on. William and Mary to be joint sovereigns. Declaration of Right. Settlement of the revenue of the church. Establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland. The European War. William forms grand alliance against Louis. State of Ireland; the siege of Londonderry. The Irish parliament. Battle of Newton Butler. The revolution in Scotland. Dundee in the Highlands. Battle of Killiecrankie. Mutiny Bill. Toleration Bill. Bill of Rights and dissolution of the convention parliament. Secession of the "non-jurors." Factions of English parliaments.

1690 The conquest of Ireland begun. War with France. Abjuration Bill and Act of Grace. Jacobite plot discovered. Battle of Beachy Head. Battle of the Boyne. Siege of

Limerick: William, repulsed, returns to England. Halifax leaves the government and Danby takes the lead. James leaves Ireland for France. Godolphin first lord of the treasury.

1691 Siege of Limerick and capitulation of Irish. Jacobite plots in England. William's policy successful abroad. Conviction of Viscount Restoon.

1692 Disgrace of Marlborough. Massacre of Glencoe. Threatened invasion of England. Battles of La Hogue and Steinkirk. Origination of the national debt.

1693 Disorder in government. Sunderland's plan of a ministry. Montague's financial measures. Battle of Landen or Neerwinden. Loss of the Smyrna fleet. New charter granted to East India Company. The country party in parliaments.

1699 The Dutch guards are sent home. The failure of the Darien scheme causes irritation in Scotland against the English. Parliament attacks William's grants of royal property to his Dutch favourites. Question of Irish forfeitures. The shores of Australia explored by Dampier, an Englishman.

1700 The Resumption Bill. Severe act passed against Roman Catholics. Second Partition Treaty. Death of William, duke of Gloucester. New tory ministry: Rochester and Godolphin recalled.

1701 Act of Settlement passed. Impeachment of prominent whigs. Duke of Anjou becomes king of Spain. The tory foreign policy. The Kentish Petition. The Legion Memorial. Acquittal of Somers. The Grand Alliance. Death of James II. Louis XIV acknowledges the pretender. New parliament meets, with a fresh majority of whigs.

1702 William dismisses his tory ministers. New parliament. Bill passed for attainting the pretender. Bill passed to uphold Protestant succession. Death of William (March 8th). Accession of Anne. Combined ministry of whigs and tories. Marlborough's power. War declared against France. Marlborough's first campaign in the Netherlands. Contemplated union of England and Scotland. Rochester dismissed from office.

1703 Methuen Treaty concluded with Portugal. The Occasional Conformity Bill. Progress of the war in Italy, Spain, and Germany.

1704 Ministerial changes; Harley and St. John take office. Queen Anne's Bounty instituted. Critical position of Austria. Battle of Blenheim. Progress of the war in Spain. The Test Act extended to Ireland.

1705 Operations in Spain, Peterborough's success. Sunderland sent as English envoy to Vienna. Failure of Marlborough's plans. Lord Cowper becomes lord chancellor. Capture of Barcelona. Whig majority in parliament.

1706 Resumed negotiations for union of England and Scotland. Battle of Ramillies. Sunderland becomes secretary of state. Louis XIV makes overtures for peace. Marlborough rejects his terms.

1707 Turn of the tide of victory. Bill for the union of England and Scotland.

1708 Defeat of the allies in Spain. Threatened invasion of Scotland. Harley and St. John leave the ministry. Walpole becomes secretary of war. Byng repulses the French fleet. Battle of Oudenarde. Siege of Lille. Capture of Minorca, of Port Mahon. Somers becomes lord president of the council.

1709 Louis' terms again rejected. Marlborough captures Tournay. Battle of Malplaquet. Intrigues against Marlborough.

1710 Impeachment of Sacheverell. Fall of the whigs. Battles of Almenara and Saragossa. Conference at Gertruydenberg. Policy of Harley.

1711 Property Qualification Bill passed. The imperial election. Marlborough takes Bouchain in France. The duke and duchess of Marlborough dismissed from their offices. Peace negotiations. Robert Walpole is sent to the Tower. Formation of South Sea Company. Act against occasional conformity passed.

1712 Ormonde becomes commander-in-chief. First stamp duty imposed. An armistice declared.

1713 Treaty of Utrecht: its terms and effect. Oxford and St. John intrigue for a jacobite successor.

1714 The Schism Act passed. Quarrel between Bolingbroke and Oxford: dismissal of Oxford. Shrewsbury becomes lord treasurer. The Hanoverian succession is secured. Death of Anne. Government is carried on by "lords justices" until the arrival of George. Townshend, Stanhope, and Walpole become the leaders of the whig administration. Riots in the country.

1715 Dissolution of parliament. Oxford is committed to the Tower. The Riot Act passed. Jacobite revolt under Lord Mar. Disaffection in Scotland. Mar's success in the Highlands. Forster defeated at Preston. Mar defeated at Sheriff Muir. Death of Louis XIV.

1716 The pretender lands, but withdraws with Mar. Punishment of the rebels. Septennial Act passed. The disruption of the ministry. Stanhope becomes chief minister, in place of Townshend. Negotiations with France.

1717 The Triple Alliance between England, France, and Holland to guarantee the Hanoverian succession. The whig schism. Acquittal of Oxford. Charles XII intrigues with the jacobites against England.
1718 The Quadruple Alliance. Byng defeats the Spanish fleet. Repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism acts.
1719 Fall of Alberoni: dismissal by king of Spain. Rejection of the Peerage Bill. Irish parliament carries the Toleration Act.
1720 Walpole joins the ministry. Peace made with Spain. The South Sea Company: ensuing ruin.
1721 Walpole restores public credit and forms a ministry. Becomes prime minister. Punishment of the directors. Revival of jacobite hopes.
1722 Atterbury, bishop of Rochester, is sent to the Tower for complicity in plot.
1723 Bolingbroke returns. Atterbury is banished.
1724 Quarrel between Carteret and Walpole. The Glasgow riots. Excitement in Ireland: Wood's halfpence.
1725 Treaty of Austria and Spain against England. Disturbances in Scotland. Spanish difficulties.
1726 The Treaty of Hanover. Excitement of Europe. Pulteney joins the opposition.
1727 Bolingbroke's opposition to Walpole. Death of George I.
1727-1728 Accession of George II. Walpole retained as prime minister. Increase of the civil list. The Spaniards besiege Gibraltar unsuccessfully. Strength of the government. Depression of the jacobites. First Annual Bill of Indemnity for not observing the Test Corporation Acts is passed. European complications. Action taken against the publication of parliamentary debates.
1729 Congress at Soissons. Treaty with Spain at Seville.
1730 Rejection of the Pension Bill. Breach between Walpole and Townshend: the latter withdraws. John and Charles Wesley form their society. Free exportation of American rice allowed.
1731 Second Treaty at Vienna. Complete supremacy of Walpole. Use of Latin in law courts abolished. Carteret joins the opposition.
1733 Walpole's Excise Bill: its abandonment. War of the Polish Succession.
1734 New parliament meets. Opposition to Walpole.
1736 Porteous riots in Edinburgh.
1737 Prince of Wales at head of opposition. Dissensions in the royal family. Death of Queen Caroline. Walpole's influence over the king.
1738 The Methodists appear in London. George desires war with Spain.
1739 Walpole declares war with Spain. Capture of Porto Bello.
1740 Increased vigour of opposition to Walpole. The success of the war. War of the Austrian Succession.
1741 Failure of English attack on Cartagena.
1742 Walpole is defeated and resigns. Wilmington becomes prime minister. Committee appointed to inquire into acts of late government. Walpole and corruption. The Place Bill is passed.
1743 Battle of Dettingen. The question of the Austrian succession. England supports Austria. Treaty of Worms. Death of Wilmington. Pelham becomes prime minister.
1744 Fall of Carteret. The Broad-Bottomed Administration. Threatened invasion of England by French fleet. War declared between England and France.
1745 French victory over English at Fontenoy. Louisburg and Cape Breton are taken from the French. Charles Edward Stuart lands in Scotland. Gains victory of Preston Pass (September 21st). The pretender reaches Derby.
1746 Battle of Falkirk. Resignation of the ministry (February). Pitt and Fox admitted into the new ministry. Cumberland in command of army. The pretender finally defeated at Culloden. The rebellion is cruelly suppressed. Vigorous action against Highlanders. Execution of Lords Kilmarnock and Balmerino.
1747 Naval victories off Cape Finisterre and Ushant. Duke of Cumberland defeated at Lauffield.
1748 Resignation of Chesterfield. Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Results of the war. Pelham's conciliatory government.
1751 Death of Frederick, prince of Wales. Clive's surprise of Arcot. Death of Lord Bolingbroke. Reform of the calendar.
1752 Omission of the eleven nominal days between September 2nd and September 14th.
1753 Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act. Decay of the church. Bill passed and repealed for naturalisation of Jews.
1754 Death of Pelham. Newcastle succeeds. War between the English and French colonists on the Ohio. George's anxiety for Hanover.
1755 Seven Years' War begins. Defeat of General Braddock. Henry Fox becomes secretary of state.

1756 England allies with Prussia. War declared between England and France. The French capture Minorca. Newcastle resigns. Duke of Devonshire becomes prime minister. Pitt's vigorous government. The Black Hole of Calcutta.

1757 Disasters of the war. Bill passed for establishment of a national militia. Battle of Plassey (June 23). Execution of Byng. Pitt is dismissed and again admitted. Cumberland capitulates at Kloster-Seven.

1758 Change of generals. Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick is made commander-in-chief. Expeditions against Cherbourg and St. Malo. Naval victories off Carthagena and Basque roads. Capture of Louisburg and Cape Breton. Capture of Fort Duquesne.

1759 Capture of Guadaloupe and bombardment of Havre. Naval victories of Lagos and Quiberon Bay. Victory of Minden: success of Ferdinand. Capture of Quebec. Wolfe's victory on the Heights of Abraham.

1760 The battle of Wanderwash and the capture of Pondicherry. Pre-eminence of Pitt. Death of George II. Accession of George III.

1761 Bute is made secretary of state. Negotiations between France and England for peace. Pitt resigns office. Bute becomes premier.

1762 A bribery act is passed. England declares war against Spain. Newcastle resigns. Capture of Havana and Manila. Fox enters the cabinet. Peace with France concluded.

1763 The Peace of Paris is signed. Attack on the whigs. Bute resigns. Ministry of George Grenville begins. The triumvirate ministry. The Bedford ministry. The trial of Wilkes. Wedgwood establishes potteries. Origin of the American provinces.

1764 First expulsion of Wilkes from house of commons. Grenville's act imposing customs duties on the American colonies. Hargreaves invents spinning-jenny.

1765 The Stamp Act for America is passed. The king's illness. The Regency Bill. Retirement of Pitt. Rockingham forms a ministry.

1766 The Declaratory Act passed, declaring the authority of England over the colonies. Meeting and protest of American congress. Repeal of the American Stamp Act. House of commons condemns all general warrants as illegal. Fall of the Rockingham ministry. Pitt, as Lord Chatham, forms a strong government, but falls ill and Grafton assumes authority.

1767 Townshend, as chancellor and exchequer, passes act for taxing American imports. Death of Townshend. Lord North becomes chancellor of the exchequer.

1768 Second expulsion of Wilkes. Corruption of parliament. Riots in favour of Wilkes. Chatham leaves the government. Arkwright invents spinning-machine. Captain Cook makes first voyage to Australia and explores Botany Bay.

1769 The first of the "Junius" letters appears. Wilkes four times elected for Middlesex. Increase of American difficulties. Weakness of the ministry. Occupation of Boston by British troops.

1770 Resignation of the duke of Grafton. Lord North succeeds. Chatham's proposal of parliamentary reform. All the American import duties are removed, except the tax on tea. Grenville's act for reform of election petitions. Affair of the Falkland Islands.

1771 Debate on the freedom of exporting. Beginning of the great English journals.

1772 The Royal Marriage Act passed. Bill to relieve dissenting ministers. Lord Mansfield decides that slavery cannot exist in England.

1773 Organised opposition in America. The people of Boston board the ships and throw the tea overboard. Hastings appointed governor-general of India. Lord North's act for the regulation of India.

1774 The assembly of Massachusetts meets for the last time (under English crown). Congress meets at Philadelphia and denies the right of parliament to tax the colonies. The Boston Port Bill is passed, closing the port of Boston. Charges against Clive: his suicide. Wilkes elected lord mayor.

1775 Chatham's plan of conciliation rejected. Battle of Lexington. The Canada Bill. Congress assumes complete sovereignty. Washington becomes commander-in-chief. Americans, under Washington, besiege Boston. English victory at Bunker Hill. The Olive Branch Petition. The English repel an American invasion of Canada. The southern colonies expel their governors.

1776 Evacuation of Boston by English. The English drive the Americans from Long Island and take New York. The English take Rhode Island. Declaration of Independence (July 4th). Battles of Brooklyn and Trenton.

1777 French assistance to America. Washington recovers New Jersey. Chatham proposes federal union. The English win the battle of Brandywine and take Philadelphia. Battle of Germantown. Burgoyne surrenders at Saratoga. France acknowledges independence of America.

1778 Duke of Richmond's motion to recognise the independence of the United States. Spain allies with the United States. Burke's measure for relief of brush trade.

America rejects North's conciliatory measures. The English evacuate Philadelphia. Indecisive naval fight off Ushant.

1779 Difficulties in Ireland. Anti-popish riots in Scotland. Spain declares war against England. Siege of Gibraltar by French and Spanish. The Irish volunteers. Free-trade granted to Ireland.

1780 Petitions for economical reforms. The Lord George Gordon riots. Capture of Charlestown. Rodney defeats Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent. Catherine of Russia forces the armed neutrality of Norway, Russia, and Sweden against England. Descent of Hyder Ali on the Carnatic. Dunning's motion for diminishing the power of the crown. The English under Cornwallis defeat colonists and win successes in southern states. Major André hanged as a spy. War declared against Holland.

1781 Rodney captures St. Eustatius in West Indies. Surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. Battles of Guildford Courthouse, Hobkirk's Hill, and Eutaw Springs. The permanent Mutiny Bill (Ireland) is passed. Coote defeats Hyder Ali at Porto Novo. The French retake St. Eustatius.

1782 Minorca is taken by Spaniards. North's resignation. The Rockingham ministry. The civil list is regulated. The proceedings with reference to Wilkes are expunged from house of commons journals. Repeal of Poyning's Act. Agitation in Ireland. Economical reforms. Victories of Rodney in West Indies. Death of Rockingham. Shelburne becomes prime minister. Resignation of Fox and Burke. The siege of Gibraltar raised. Conclusion of American War: England acknowledges independence of United States.

1783 Peace of Versailles between France and England, and the United States and England. The coalition ministry of Fox and North: duke of Portland as prime minister. Fox's India Bill rejected. Fall of the coalition ministry. William Pitt becomes prime minister. Russia takes the Crimea.

1784 Pitt's Budget. Pitt's India Bill rejected and subsequently passed. The Mutiny Bill passed. Pitt's struggle with the coalition.

1785 Parliamentary Reform Bill. Free Trade Bill between England and Ireland. Charges against Warren Hastings.

1786 French Commercial Treaty. Pitt's sinking fund for payment of the national debt. Burke's impeachment of Warren Hastings. Lord Cornwallis, governor-general of India.

1787 Conduct of the prince of Wales. Association formed for abolition of the slave trade. English settlement made at Sierra Leone.


1788 Trial of Warren Hastings. The king's illness made public: the Regency Bill. Pre-eminence of Pitt: his foreign policy. Bill passed for regulation of slave-ships.

1789 The king's recovery: thanksgiving at St. Paul's. Beginning of French Revolution (May 5th): excitement in England. Resolution condemnatory of slave trade (Wilberforce, Burke and Fox). Grenville becomes secretary of state. Triple Alliance formed for defence of Turkey.

1790 Quarrel with Spain over Nootka Sound. The convention of Reichenbach. Pitt defeats Poland. Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution.* Rejection of the Abolition of Tests and the Reform Bill.

1791 Representative government set up in Canada. Fox's Libel Act. Mitford's bill removing disabilities of Roman Catholics. Resignation of the duke of Leeds. The Birmingham riots.

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co., Edinburgh.


MAP OF
THE WORLD
SHOWING
British and other Possessions
British Possessions
French "
United States "
Russian "
German "
Dutch "
Turkish "
ARCTIC OCEAN
GREENLAND
(Denmark)
NOVA ZEMBLA
SPITZBERGEN
NEW SIBERIA
Baffin Bay
Kara Sea
White Sea
Arctic Circle
ICELAND
(Den.)
SIBERIA
RUSSIAN EMPIRE
ALASKA
Davis Strait
Hudson Bay
St. Petersburg
BERING SEA
Sea of Okhotsk
NORTH AMERICA
DOMINION OF CANADA
BRITISH ISLES
North Sea
London
GERMANY
EUROPE
ASIA
Irkutsk
SAKHALIN
ALEUTIAN ISLANDS
NEWFOUNDLAND
ST. PIERRE
Ottawa
Chicago
New York
Paris
FRANCE
Route
CHINESE EMPIRE
Pekin
Japan
Port Arthur
San Francisco
UNITED STATES
Washington
Mediterranean Sea
CHINESE EMP.
PERSIA
Lhasa
Tokio
PACIFIC
ATLANTIC
Tropic of Cancer
Gulf of Mexico
CUBA
HAITI
INDIA
Calcutta
Arabian Sea
AFRICA
Manila
PHILIPPINE IS.
China Sea
HAWAII
WAKE I.
Caribbean Sea
JAMAICA
CENTRAL AMERICA
Panama
GUADELOUPE
MARTINIQUE
CEYLON
INDIAN OCEAN
Equator
SUMATRA
JAVA
SOLOMON IS.
MARQUESAS IS
TUAMOTU ARCHIPELAGO
TUTUILA I.
NEW HEBRIDES
FIJI IS.
SOUTH AMERICA
Pernambuco
BRAZIL
PERU
Rio de Janeiro
MADAGASCAR
AUSTRALIA
Tropic of Capricorn
Perth
Sydney
Melbourne
Santiago
Buenos Ayres
Cape Town
C. of Good Hope
Pretoria
NEW ZEALAND
Wellington
TASMANIA
AUCKLAND I.
CHATHAM I.
BOUNTY I.
ROYAL CO. I.
CAMPBELL I.
MACQUARIE I.
EMERALD I.
FALKLAND IS.
S. GEORGIA
C. Horn
SANDWICH GROUP
SOUTH SHETLAND IS.
ANTARCTIC OCEAN
KERGUELEN I.
AMSTERDAM
ST. PAUL
MAURITIUS I.
REUNION
Longitude East
Longitude West
Greenwich

Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

यह पुस्तक निम्नाँकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower,s No.

909
His
v.20

अवाप्ति संख्या 113057
वर्ग संख्या
Class No.
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No.
लेखक
Author
शीर्षक
Title The historians' history of the world : A -

909
His
V.20

9944

LIBRARY
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 113057

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Refrence books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.