much more chargeable than it was before these proclamations were published." Some of the proclamations of Charles appear to have had no other object than that of a wanton interference with the convenience of the people. It was the age of Hackney-Coaches. Garrard says, that there were one thousand nine hundred in London and Westminster. At the beginning of 1635 he writes, "There is a proclamation coming forth to prohibit all hackney-coaches to pass up and down in London streets; out of town they may go at pleasure, as heretofore." It is true that the narrow streets were somewhat overcrowded with the coaches. The great enemy of these vehicles, John Taylor, the water-poet, who saw the demand for the Thames wherries grievously reduced, tells us that "butchers cannot pass with their cattle for them; market-folks, which bring provision of victuals to the city, are stopped, stayed, and hindered." The streets were kept narrow by the absurd proclamations through which the natural extension of the town was impeded. It is clear enough that no interference of the government could put down the coaches; but the limitation of their use had the effect of encouraging the system which was introduced in 1634, by a speculating traveller, of "carrying people up and down in close chairs," called Sedans.

Whilst the Star-chamber was pulling down houses in London, those who pulled down cottages in the country, called depopulators, were equally fined. "Much noise is here of the depopulators that are come into the Star-chamber; it will bring in great sums of money." Such means of filling the Treasury were, however, small affairs. Six years of irresponsible government have made the administration bolder. In the spring of 1635 Garrard writes that it was resolved in full council, "to take double rates, just as much more as was taken before, of all goods imported into the kingdom." Double rates upon imports were nothing, however, compared to an universal tax. There is gone out a special writ to the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, requiring him, for the safeguard of the sea and defence of the realm, to issue forth writs to the several counties, cities, and towns, therein mentioned, to provide ships, men, ammunition, provision and wages. The Lord Mayor of London demurred to the writ; but, being threatened, the corporation yielded, "and instantly fell to seizing in all the wards." The courtly Mr. Garrard, who rejoiced in all the monopolies because they brought money to the king, is rather discomposed about a tax which at last touches himself. "I had rather give," he says,

"and pay ten subsidies in parliament, than ten shillings this new-old way of dead Noy's." Dead Noy, the old Attorney-General, who plagued all mankind with his writs, has in this, the last of his performances, left a terrible bequest to the government that bought his desertion of the popular party, as it had bought Wentworth's, by the offer of great place. He had always a precedent ready for an injustice, and thus Garrard calls his writ of ship-money a "new old way." Yet Noy's scheme was a very limited one compared with that which was afterwards adopted; on the suggestion, it is said, of Finch, chief justice of the Common Pleas—the courtly Speaker whom Eliot and Hollis held in the chair, when he refused to put a remonstrance to the vote. The original writs were only sent to London and to the sea-port towns; and there was some reason in the demand, for the English navy had fallen into such a miserable condition that Algerine pirates boldly seized upon merchant vessels in the Channel, and the whole commerce of England had become insecure. These first writs required that certain maritime places should furnish one or more ships, or their equipments, or pay, as London had paid. In 1635 a fleet was sent to sea, for the protection of trade. In 1636 the real writs of ship-money were issued; under which the sheriffs were directed to make a general assessment in all counties and towns specified, according to the means of the inhabitants, to produce the proportions at which the several places were rated. The schedules appended to these writs enable us to form some notion of the comparative opulence of particular districts. Of the counties, Yorkshire, Devonshire, Essex, Kent, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Somersetshire, Suffolk, Wiltshire, are assessed at the highest rate; 12,000*l.* for York, 8000*l.* or 6000*l.* others. Durham, Northumberland, and Monmouth are put at the lowest rate, 2000*l.* or 1500*l.* The inland agricultural counties are at an intermediate scale, about 4000*l.* Next to London, Bristol and Newcastle are the most heavily assessed. The difference of two centuries ago and the present time in local population can scarcely be more strikingly shown than by these schedules; in which Liverpool is only rated at twenty-five pounds, whilst Bristol is set at eight hundred pounds; Birmingham is not rated at all, nor Sheffield, nor Bradford, nor Sunderland, nor Manchester. Preston and Banbury are at the same humble scale of forty pounds each; Boston and Buckingham are equal; and amongst the more flourishing towns Nottingham is not held as wealthy as Reading. But we must not jump to the conclusion that such places as Man-

chester, Sheffield and Birmingham, were too small and unimportant to have a special levy apart from their counties. Birmingham in the time of Henry VIII. was described by Leland as "a town of smiths and cutlers," and Camden, in 1607, mentions it as "swarming with inhabitants and echoing with the noise of anvils." Sheffield was always famous for its cutlery, but Camden mentions it as "remarkable among other little towns hereabouts for blacksmiths." Manchester was undoubtedly of importance at a much earlier period than the 17th century. Leland calls it "the fairest, best builded, quickest, and most populous town of Lancashire." The statistics of the past are not more to be implicitly trusted than the statistics of the present.

When these writs were issued by the sheriffs in their respective districts there was a general consternation. The people, who had been formerly accustomed to the regular collection of subsidies by commissioners, doubted the legality of this new system. But the greater number submitted, with the full knowledge that individual resistance to oppression was more dangerous under king Charles than at any previous time. The whole country was under the pressure of tyranny. The judges, by the royal command, put forth an opinion, not arising out of any question before the courts, that the king might command, for the safety of the kingdom, all his subjects to provide such number of ships as he might think fit; that he might compel obedience to this command; and that he was the sole judge of the danger of the country, and the means of preventing it. Richard Chambers, who had bravely resisted the illegal levy upon his merchandise, was again imprisoned because he declined to pay his assessment of ship-money. When the case was taken into the courts at Westminster, one of the judges refused to hear counsel, and said there was a rule of law and a rule of government, and that many things which could not be done by the first rule might be done by the other. It is to such that Clarendon alludes when he says "the damage and mischief cannot be expressed, that the crown and state sustained by the deserved reproach and infamy that attended the judges, by being made use of in this and like acts of power; there being no possibility to preserve the dignity, reverence, and estimation of the laws themselves, but by the integrity and innocency of the judges." But if Clarendon, writing in after years, saw the damage that the State sustained by such servility, Wentworth, at the date of the extra-judicial opinion upon ship-money, was in raptures. He

declares it to be the greatest service the profession has done the Crown in his time, and then gives this significant opinion: "But, unless his majesty hath the like power declared to raise a land army upon the same exigent of state, the Crown seems to me to stand but upon one leg at home, and to be considerable but by halves to foreign princes abroad." Hume, in noticing the conduct of Charles in dissolving his second parliament, observes, that if the king had possessed "any military force on which he could rely, it is not improbable that he would at once have taken off the mask, and governed without any regard to parlimentary privileges." Wentworth, now that the mask had been taken off, desired a land-army to effect many things that were not wholly to be accomplished by fine and imprisonment, administered by a merciless Star-chamber and a corrupt bench.

England lies in a dead-sleep; except that the high-sheriffs "bestir themselves apace in their several counties: moneys they bring in daily, and I do not hear of any numbers that are refusers, so that it will prove a good business." So writes hopeful Mr. Garrard, in December, 1635. On the 11th of January, 1636, there is a public assembly at which all the persons attending, the entire body of landowners and housekeepers of the parish, are "refusers." The very assessors and constables are refusers. Of what was said in the vestry of "Kimbell Magna," to make the two esquires in the list of defaulters, and the twenty-nine yeomen, so resolute not to pay the 21*l.* 15*s.* 6¼*d.* assessed upon that humble village amidst the Chiltern hills, there is no record. But the document which sets forth the sums assessed upon each, from 31*s.* 6*d.* to 6*d.*, is in existence, and it records the names of those bold men as "refusing to pay." At the head of that list is the name of "John Hampden, Esquire." * Great Kimble is not far distant from the manor-house where John Hampden dwelt, in the parish called by his name. There his forefathers had dwelt even in the Saxon days, and had continued for six or more centuries to be lords of Great and Little Hampden, Stoke Mandeville, and other Buckinghamshire manors. John Hampden, who refused to pay thirty-one shillings and sixpence to king Charles, abode under the same roof where his grandfather entertained queen Elizabeth, in 1585,—a mansion whose front is now modernised and vulgarised, but of which enough is left to interest many more than the mere local antiquary. In this pleasant woodland country, whose surrounding hills were covered with beech;

* A fac-simile is given in Lord Nugent's "Memorials of Hampden," vol. i.

close by an ancient well-preserved church standing in a parklike enclosure, dwelt John Hampden. When he sent to his dear friend Eliot, a prisoner in the Tower, a buck out of his "paddock," he writes that it "must be a small one, to hold proportion with the place and soil it was bred in." * Clearly not a very wealthy man was this esquire,—a man in worldly importance not to be named with Wentworth and his hereditary six thousand a year; a man of whom the Lord Deputy of Ireland, hearing of his very irregular proceedings at Kimble Magna and other parishes—and all for some trumpery thirty-one shillings and sixpence, or twenty shillings—said in his grand way, "In truth, I shall wish Mr. Hampden, and others to his likeness, were well whipped into their right senses." A more cumbrous instrument than the "rod" for the mendicant was necessary to bring Mr. Hampden to submit to "all that ever authority ordains"—the test of a good subject in Wentworth's view. There were six weeks of solemn pleading in the Exchequer Chamber before all the judges—the greatest cause that ever was tried in Westminster Hall—followed by many months of judicial deliberation before the king's right to enforce the tax of ship-money was adjudged to be lawful; "which judgment," says Clarendon, "proved of more advantage and credit to the gentleman condemned than to the king's service." Hampden was singled out to be proceeded against by the Crown upon his refusal to pay twenty shillings assessed upon his lands at Stoke Mandeville; and the formal pleadings upon the writ of Scire Facias had occupied five months before the question came to be argued. The speeches of the crown lawyers and of Hampden's counsel occupy one hundred and seventeen pages in Rushworth's folio volume. After these protracted arguments before the judges, these twelve sages of the law occupied three terms in delivering their opinions. They were not agreed in their judgment. Two of the number had from the first decided that judgment should be given for the defendant. Two others, in the next term, followed their example. One other held that the tax was lawful, but that no portion of it ought to go into the Privy-Purse. But on the 9th of June, 1637, the Chief Justices decided against Hampden; and the sentence was for the king, upon the opinion of the majority. Of Sir John Finch, one of the Chief Justices, Clarendon says, "He took up ship-money, where Mr. Noy left it; and, being a judge, carried it up to that pinnacle from whence he almost broke his own neck; having, in his journey

* Nugent's Memorials, vol. i. p. 171.

thither, had too much influence upon his brethren, to induce them to concur in a judgment they had all cause to repent." Hampden at once became "the most famous man in England"—"the pilot who must steer the vessel through the tempests and rocks that threatened it."* After the judgment the resistance to ship-money was much more general. Some refusers were punished; many were threatened; but in town and country the opposition became a very resolved manifestation of the temper of the people. It was not such "a good business" as Mr. Garrard had predicted.

Thorough for the State has not altogether succeeded. Archbishop Laud and the Star-chamber have meanwhile been seeing what they can accomplish by *Thorough* for the Church. Ship-money judgment for the Crown was given on the 12th of June, 1637. Two days after, William Prynne, who was brought up from his prison, but with his ears sewed on; Henry Burton, who had been Clerk of the Closet to Prince Charles, and was incumbent of a London parish; and Robert Bastwick, a physician of Colchester, were sentenced by the Star-chamber to be fined £5000 each, to be degraded from their professions, to be placed in the pillory, to have their ears cut off and their cheeks and foreheads branded, and to be confined for life in distant prisons. Their offences were these. Prynne had published a book against Sabbath-breaking, in which the clergy who had read the Book of Sports were bitterly stigmatised; Burton had offended in a sermon, and in a tract had accused the Bishop of Norwich of being guilty of Romish innovation; Bastwick had in a book called "Elenchus Papismi," identified prelacy and popery. Garrard has a somewhat merry statement of an exhibition in Palace Yard, on the 30th of June, in fulfilment of the sentence of the 14th. "They stood two hours in the pillory, Burton by himself. . . . . The place was full of people, who cried and howled terribly, especially when Burton was cropt. Dr. Bastwick was very merry; his wife, Dr. Poe's daughter, got a stool, kissed him; his ears being cut off she called for them, and put them in a clean handkerchief, and carried them away with her. Bastwick told the people, the lords had collar-days at court, but this was his collar-day." † A more serious account mentions the solemn defiance of Prynne to Lambeth, calling upon the primate to show that these practices were according to the laws of England. There are some awkward symptoms of indignation at these barbarities, besides the howling in Palace Yard. The sheriff of Chester is sent

* Clarendon. † Strafford Letters, vol. ii. p. 85.

for by a poursuivant to answer a charge of having been kind to Mr. Prynne as he passed on his way to prison at Caernarvon. "Strange flocking of the people after Burton, when he removed from the Fleet towards Lancaster Castle. Mr. Ingram, sub-warden of the Fleet, told the king that there was not less than one hundred thousand people gathered together to see him pass by, between Smithfield and Brown's well, which is two miles beyond Highgate. His wife went along in a coach, having much money thrown to her as she passed along." * Very strange flocking indeed.

Before we enter upon the stormy period which succeeded the nine or ten years of enforced tranquillity from 1629, let us inquire whether the possession of arbitrary power enabled the king and his advisers to assist the people in the development of their industry, the enlargement of the conveniences of life, or the cultivation of arts and letters. The industry of the people was in every way oppressed,—not only by irregular taxation, but by interferences totally at variance with the advancing intelligence of the time. The merchants were unprotected from pirates; the landowners were harassed by inquiries into their titles, and by obsolete demands under forest-laws. The plague was always in London, and no exercise of authority was employed for its prevention; indeed its ravages were increased by the excessive crowding of inhabitants caused by the proclamations against new buildings. When despotism manifests itself to the world in erecting gorgeous palaces; in sweeping away miserable dwellings from narrow streets, and substituting buildings that astonish by their magnificence or delight by their commodiousness; in turning barren wastes into beauteous gardens, which the humblest may enjoy in common with the greatest; in delighting the pleasure-loving multitude with displays of military pomp, with illuminations and fireworks—the world is somewhat too ready to believe that despotism is a magician that can perform wonders far beyond the reach of limited authority or combined popular action. To Charles the First cannot be assigned either the praise or the blame of having expended his revenues in any such efforts to throw a factitious splendour over the decay of public liberty. He was to some extent, indeed, a patron of the Fine Arts. He is looked upon by many as the English monarch from whom the Fine Arts received the highest encouragement. Charles was a large purchaser of paintings, and his galleries were adorned with several glorious works of Raffaelle and Titian, of Corregio

* Strafford Letters, vol ii. p. 114.

and Guido. He brought Raffaelle's Cartoons into England, as Cromwell saved them from going away. Vandyck was invited by him to his court; and his encouragement has been amply repaid by the ideal of the king which this great painter has handed down to us. Mytens, also the court portrait-painter, was scarcely so favoured. The one had £200 a year, the other £40 as pension.* Rubens painted for Charles the ceiling of the Banqueting-house. Dobson was encouraged by him, and received from him the name of "The English Tintoret." All this is highly creditable to the monarch; but it must not be forgotten that no consideration of public benefit influenced this elegant expenditure of revenue. Individual gratification was its sole end and aim. Individual vanity was abundantly satisfied by flattering portraits; but great original compositions were not produced for this court. Nor was there wanting amongst the nobility and richer commoners a desire to cultivate those Arts which England had in some measure neglected. The earl of Arundel had begun the formation of his noble collection of sculpture when Charles was a boy. To his "liberal charges and magnificence," says a writer about 1634, "this angle of the world oweth the first sight of Greek and Roman statues, with whose admired presence he began to honour the gardens and gallery of Arundel House, and hath ever since continued to transplant old Greece into England." † The Arundel collection was formed by a costly and judicious private expenditure. The royal collection might have been increased by influences not strictly honourable to the head of an independent kingdom. Charles was most anxious to obtain a statue of Adonis from a private collection at Rome. The queen's confessor urged his desire for that and other rare works of ancient art. Cardinal Barberini seconded these efforts; and he wrote to Mazarine, "The statues go on prosperously; nor shall I hesitate to rob Rome of her most valuable ornaments, if in exchange we might be so happy as to have the king of England's name amongst those princes who submit to the Apostolic See." ‡ It is to be hoped that Charles resisted such temptations.

During this reign there were invasions enough of the subject's liberty by proclamations against the extension of London; but they were for no purpose of regulating that extension upon any systematic plan of convenience or beauty. There were still more direct violations of the rights of property, in ordering the sheriff

* See Note at end of this chapter. † Peacham, "Compleat Gentleman."
‡ Quoted by Mr. D'Israeli from Panzani's Memoirs.

to pull down shops and houses in the vicinity of St. Paul's, compelling the owners to accept any compensation that was offered to them. Here was the vigour of despotism, but not such a vigour as England was formed to endure. All shops also in Cheapside and Lombard-street, except those of the goldsmiths, were commanded to be shut up, that the great avenue to the cathedral might not exhibit any trace of vulgar industries; and that when foreigners went to the city to see the Lord Mayor's procession, they might not be offended by butchers' stalls and "fripperies." This was to enforce arbitrarily the custom, which partially prevailed, that those of the same trade should occupy the same street. The greatest thoroughfare was to display the most striking wealth. What Cheapside then was on gala-days may be seen in a print of the entry of Mary de Medicis, who came to England very much against the wishes of the king, in 1638. The print accompanies a description, in French, by the Sieur de la Serre, historiographer of France,* of the ceremonies that attended this visit of the queen-mother,—a visit of which Laud, in his Diary, says, "great apprehensions of this business." She came, however, and Cheapside—"la grande rue"—had its houses, which a previous visitor had described as "all windows," crowded with fair city dames and portly livery-men; and the city companies sat on elevated platforms covered with blue cloth; and the lord mayor and the recorder were there, and twenty-four aldermen, in their robes of scarlet; and, above all, a sight that in a few years was not so agreeable—six thousand soldiers of the city separated in divers companies. These were trained bands, whose numbers does not seem to have varied from that of 1617, when the chaplain of the Venetian ambassador could not eat his dinner in peace from the noise of "musket and artillery exercise" in the fields near Bishopsgate-street Without.† London was accustomed to processions and pageants, and especially to its Lord Mayor's shows, in which all the dignitaries of the land followed the civic magistrate to his dinner in Guildhall, amidst a very merry and boisterous crowd, that scarcely gave way to the "twenty savages or green-men, walking with squibs or fire-works to sweep the streets." Though the times were evil when Mary de Medicis came to London, the love of sight-seeing and sight-performing kept the crowd of idlers pleased, and even the discontented of the city quiet,

* "Histoire de l' Entrée Royale de la Reyne Mère," London, 1639. Reprinted in 1775.

† "Quarterly Review," October, 1857, p. 411.

though the corporation had been fined £70,000 by the Star-chamber, upon a complaint that the conditions by which they held lands in Ulster had been infringed. The city offered, by way of compensation, to build the king a palace in St. James's park. The courtiers wanted the money to squander in masques and banquets, and the offer was refused. Charles had employed Inigo Jones to prepare plans for a magnificent Whitehall. The Banqueting-house is the only architectural monument of the taste of the two first Stuarts.

NOTE ON THE PORTRAITS OF CHARLES I.

In the Manchester Exhibition of Art Treasures an opportunity was afforded of comparing the portrait of Charles by each of the painters, Vandyck and Mytens, almost in juxtaposition. There, was a family group by Mytens, and a family group by Vandyck. In that of Mytens the king and queen are preparing to ride; and there is Jeffrey Hudson, the dwarf, holding a small dog in a leash, the favourite spaniels, and a larger dog with a monkey. In the group by Vandyck the king is sitting by the side of his queen, with an infant on her lap. The Charles of Mytens' group is younger than in that of Vandyck. There are no decided markings of character in his face. The expression is gentle, almost feeble. The Charles of Vandyck's group has the almost invariable countenance which this painter gives to him—the well-known composed and reflective character, with a tinge of foreboding melancholy, as some imagine. Near these groups hung a whole length of the king by Mytens. The technical art of Mytens was little inferior to that of Vandyck; and he was more faithful in portraiture, if amongst the requirements of fidelity we ask that portraits of the same person at different periods of life, and in different situations, should have some variety. The portraits of Charles by Mytens show how much of the general expression of the character of the king is due to the ideal of Vandyck. The features are the same in both artists, but the contemplative and tender expression is wholly due to Vandyck. Mytens gives us a sober and apathetic face, more remarkable for the want of sentiment than for its excess—a face not wholly pleasant. The grace also belongs to the more poetical painter. In Mytens we can see how Charles would have grown into a likeness of his father. In the head of the king by Vandyck, in the same collection, painted in 1637, there is more animation than in his other portraits. But in all of them, not to yield too much to the historical evidences of character, there are the indications, however faint, of suspicion and mental reservation, and an especial want of those physiognomical traits which indicate self-reliance. Compare the Charles of Vandyck with the Strafford of Vandyck. Strafford has the care-worn expression, and the imagined presentiment of evil, to a far greater extent than his master. But it is the weight of responsibility pressing upon a powerful mind. What decision, what keenness of observation, what inflexibility, wholly wanting in the portraits of Charles.

CHAPTER XX.

Scotland.—Visit of the king in 1633.—A Service-book commanded to be used in 1637.—The National Covenant.—Progress of the troubles in Scotland.—The General Assembly.—The king and the Scots levy forces.—The king at Berwick.—Camp of the Covenanters.—An English Parliament.—Suddenly dissolved.—Convocation continues to sit.—The Scottish war resumed.—Rout of Newburn.—Council of Peers.—Cessation of arms.—An English Parliament summoned.—Character of the House of Commons.—Strafford.—Laud.

In the summer of 1633 Charles had paid a visit to Scotland, and was there crowned. Not only were the two nations as distinct in their civil and ecclesiastical systems of government as if they had been still ruled by two sovereigns, but the Scottish affairs were separately managed by Charles himself, without any reference to the English Council. One English adviser he, however, had, whose notions upon church government wholly over-rode the prudential considerations of civil polity. Laud, then bishop of London, accompanied the king on this Scottish journey. Although the bishop enters in his Diary, "King Charles crowned at Holyrood church in Edinburgh;—I never saw more expressions of joy than after it;" Laud himself gave great offence by the introduction of rites at the coronation which the people considered as part of the system which the Reformation had overthrown. His temper was violent; and the Scottish historians say that he thrust the archbishop of Glasgow from the king's side, because he refused to officiate in embroidered robes. Some of the Scottish prelates were not imbued with this love of simplicity; and they united with the powerful English bishop in the promotion of a plan for introducing a Service-book in Scotland, which should supersede the extemporaneous prayers of the presbyterian form of worship. The design was not then carried into effect. But in 1637, when Laud had become archbishop, and all moderate measures for producing conformity in England had been laid aside, the Scottish Church was suddenly called upon to receive a book of Canons approved at Lambeth; and a Service-book was directed to be used in all places of divine worship. This Prayer Book varied from the English