

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

Liturgy in points which indicated a nearer approach to the Romish ritual. The consequences of this most ignorant rashness—ignorant, because of its utter blindness to the course of Scottish history during the previous hundred years, and to the character of the Scottish people—were wholly unforeseen. All political prudence was swallowed up in the one dominant passion of the king and of his prime adviser for an unvarying ecclesiastical uniformity, in and through which the minutest ceremonial observances should be rigidly enforced, as the test of orthodoxy, and therefore of loyalty. From the date of this violent defiance of the principles and habits of the Scottish people, the reign of Charles becomes the turning-point of English history. Perhaps no great public event has been without its ultimate effects upon the fortunes of a nation, although centuries may have passed away. The stirring action that commenced in Scotland in 1637 not only influenced all her own after-destinies;—"it preserved the liberties and overthrew the monarchy of England."*

Robert Baillie, Principal of the University of Glasgow, has, in his Letters and Journals, left some of the most interesting memorials of these times.† We find in the good man's narrative the ominous beginning of these Scottish disturbances. By sound of trumpet it is proclaimed that all subjects, ecclesiastical and civil, conform themselves to the Liturgy by the next Pasch [Easter]. The books were not ready till May, and then every minister was commanded to buy two copies. The book is lent about from hand to hand; its "popish points" are shown; it is imposed without any meeting of church or state, say the dissatisfied. A letter comes down from the king commanding its use without farther delay. "The whole body of the town murmurs and grudges all the week exceedingly; and, who can marvel, discourses, declamations, pamphlets, everywhere." Sunday, the 23rd of June, arrives; and thus Principal Baillie tells us what happened:—"When the bishop and his dean, in the great church, and the bishop of Argyle, in the Grayfriars, began to officiate, as they speak, incontinent the serving-maids began such a tumult as was never heard of since the Reformation in our nation." History has preserved the name of one turbulent heroine, who may have sat for the "Trulla" of Hudibras: "Jane or Janet Geddes (yet living at the writing of this rela-

* Hallam, chap. xvii.

† "Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A. M., edited by David Laing, Esq." 3 vols.

tion) flung a little folding-stool, whereon she sat, at the dean's head, saying 'Out, thou false thief! dost thou say the mass at my lug?'"* A threatening outburst of popular fury followed this exhibition, but no wounds were given. The chancellor writes to the king, and there is "great fear for the king's wrath." The country is getting hot, as well as Edinburgh. Preachers who defend the Liturgy are maltreated, and mostly by "enraged women of all qualities." Gradually the nobles, the gentry, and "burrows" [members for boroughs] take up the supplications against the Service-book. By December, some of the most influential agree together to oppose its use, and resist the further intrusion of Prelacy. They become organised. The king, who at first had threatened the Scottish authorities, now endeavours to moderate the people by proclamations that declare his abhorrence of Popery, and his resolution to maintain the religion then professed. But there are symptoms that these professions are delusive. The idea of submission to the authority of the Scottish prelates is utterly rejected. The whole community enters into a National Covenant to abjure the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the Romish Church, and to resist the innovations which the prelates had introduced. In the High Church of Edinburgh, on the 1st of March, 1638, this Covenant was read, and the whole congregation rose and swore to maintain what is set forth. Copies of the deed were sent throughout the land, and with tears and protestations the Covenant was sworn to and signed by hundreds of thousands.

The ecclesiastical government was an anomaly, which Clarendon describes in few words: "Though there were bishops in name, the whole jurisdiction, and they themselves were, upon the matter, subject to an assembly which was purely presbyterian." But when Clarendon adds "no form of religion in practice, no liturgy, nor the least appearance of the beauty of holiness," he speaks with a very imperfect knowledge of the Scottish earnestness in religion, in which the strength as well as the beauty of holiness was manifest. The "enraged women" of Edinburgh were not very favourable specimens of the national spirit. But in the history of the nations there is no grander spectacle than a whole people, for the assertion of a principle, assembled in separate congregations, large or small, in the crowded city and in the mountain solitude, to defend the doctrine and discipline which their fathers had established; and to declare, "before God, his angels, and the world," their resolution

* "Continuation of Baker's Chronicle," edit. of 1670; quoted by Mr. Carlyle.

to adhere to the same all the days of their life. During this wonderful movement in Scotland, the Council of England, and indeed the people, were as men in their midnight sleep whilst their neighbour's house is on fire. "The truth is," says Clarendon, "there was so little curiosity either in the court, or the country, to know anything of Scotland, or what was done there, that when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland, and all other parts of Europe, no man ever inquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom a place or mention in one page of any gazette."* There were gazettes in that day. "The Weekly News," and "The Weekly Account," and little sheets called "Currantoes," were the staple of the half-yearly "Intelligencer." Few, indeed, and very meagre, were these peep-holes out of the prison in which public opinion was then locked up. For the Star-chamber was in full activity for the regulation of the press; and by its decree at this very period master printers were limited to twenty who found sureties; and "printing in corners without a license" was punishable by the orthodox process of whipping and the pillory. It was seven years later when Milton raised his eloquent voice for the "Liberty of Unlicensed Printing," and spoke the words which tyranny had always most dreaded to hear, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." If the petty newspapers of 1637 and 1638 had told of Janet Geddes and her doings, they would soon have been silenced. The people had no curiosity about Scotland, because they knew nothing about Scotland. The king suffered no transaction of his native kingdom to be debated or communicated to his privy-council, "but handled all these affairs himself with two or three Scotsmen."† Gradually the knowledge of the riots of Edinburgh creeps out: "Horrible ado against the bishops in Scotland, for seeking to bring in amongst them our Church-Service." (October, 1637.) "Small hope yet in Scotland to bring our Church-Service into use there; they still oppose it with great violence." (November, 1637.) "Messengers come weekly thence." (March, 1638.) So writes Garrard to his great patron, but intimates that there is one who informs the Lord-Deputy much better than himself of the proceedings there. The weekly messengers have told something of the truth in the court of purlieus; for even the king's fool has been moved to speak his mind, poor fellow: "Archy is fallen into a great misfortune. A

* "History of the Rebellion," temp. 1637. † Clarendon.

fool he would be, but a foul-mouthed knave he hath proved himself. Being in a tavern in Westminster, drunk he saith himself, he was speaking of the Scottish business; he fell a railing on my lord of Canterbury; said he was a monk, a rogue, and a traitor. Of this his grace complained at Council, the king being present. It was ordered he should be carried to the porter's lodge, his coat pulled over his ears, and kicked out of the court, never to enter within the gates, and to be called into the Star-chamber. The first part is done; but my lord of Canterbury hath interceded to the king that it should end."* Opinions are getting troublesome in England in higher places than taverns in Westminster. "They grow foolish at Oxford, for they had a question about the legality of Ship-money, as also, whether the *Addita* and *Alterata* in the Scottish liturgy did give just cause of scandal; but my lord's grace of Canterbury hearing of it, forbad them such question." (July, 1638.) In another year the very courtiers are taking the Scottish matters to heart: "Most certain it is, that the Scots is grown a most obstinate rebellious people. God turn their hearts. Daily they fall more and more from their obedience." (May 1639.)

The steps by which the Scots arrived at this "obstinate rebellious" condition were those of the steady march of an irritated population under experienced leaders. The first resistance of the Service-Book was a sudden outburst. The national Covenant was a deliberate act which was to be sustained on the battle-field. Charles and his one fatal adviser chose to regard it as the affair of a rabble; and the king commissioned the Marquis of Hamilton to reduce "the rascally people" to obedience. The commissioner was to allow the Scots six weeks to renounce the Covenant. If not renounced, power was to be sent from England; and the king himself would hazard his life rather than suffer authority to be contemned. In June, 1638, the Marquis of Hamilton arrived at Edinburgh. He had written to nobles and gentlemen, the most of note, to attend him at Haddington, previous to his entry into the capital. Two or three only met him, and they carried him an excuse in the name of all. Baillie records that huge multitudes received him at Leith—nobles, gentry, women, the town magistrates. But, says the good minister, "we were most conspicuous in our black cloaks, about five hundred on a brae-side in the links." These Geneva cloaks must have suggested some serious considerations to the Commissioners. The discussions between Hamil-

* Strafford Letters.

ton and the Covenanters only shewed how earnest and resolute they were. Nothing but a General Assembly and a Parliament would induce them to renounce their league. The Commissioner was directed to temporise, and not to take any extreme measures till an armed force was ready to support them. He went to England for further instructions; but he returned with powers to announce a General Assembly and a Parliament, and to propose that the Confession of Faith, of 1589, should be signed instead of the Covenant. A proclamation was issued, setting forth that the Liturgy and the Canons should be given up, on condition that this Confession should be adopted. The Covenanters protested against this; as an attempt to make them, under cover of a new oath, recant what they had been doing. "We thought this subscription," says Baillie, "a very deep and dangerous plot, and so opposed it everywhere, what we could." In November, a General Assembly was convened at Glasgow. "The Town did expect and provide for multitudes of people." On the 17th the Commissioner arrived. On the 20th there was a solemn fast. The Assembly was opened on the 21st. Seven days did this great meeting debate and protest. The chief grounds of difference were the introduction of lay members into the Assembly; and the general determination to remove the bishops. On the 28th the Marquis dissolved the Assembly, and left Glasgow. It continued its sittings till the 20th of December; and, against the opinions of a few of the moderate, declared the total abolition of episcopacy in the kirk of Scotland. The determined opposition of the Scottish nobility to episcopacy may be attributed to some motives, not unjust ones, besides a desire for the safety of the Reformed Church. The prelates had engrossed some of the high civil offices; they formed a large proportion of the Privy-Council; they had Courts with very obnoxious powers, like those of the High-Commission Court in England. The whole system of episcopacy seemed to the people and to their leaders full of danger to their consciences and their liberties. "The Canterburian faction," says Baillie, "was hayling us all away to Rome for our religion, to Constantinople for our policy."*

At the beginning of 1639 it became clear that these contests would end in an appeal to arms. Charles was ill-prepared for a war. In November, 1638, Lord Cottington writes to the Lord Deputy, "Our business of Scotland grows every day worse, so as we are almost certain it will come to a war, and that a defensive one on

* Letters, &c. vol. i. p. 185.

our side, and how we shall defend ourselves without money is not under my cap. . . . The king will not hear to a Parliament."* On the following 26th of January, Charles sent out a letter, "commanding all the nobles and gentry of England to attend his royal standard at York against the 1st of April, where he was to go to the border to oppose the Scots there."† But the Scots, instead of having a discontented commonalty to impede the exertions of the nobles and gentry, were all firmly banded together, peer and peasant, merchant and mechanic, to maintain a cause which they held to be the cause of God and their country. The whole land was full of military preparation. The nobles headed their forces in every shire. In every great town there were frequent drillings; "every one, man and woman, encouraged their neighbours." The castle of Edinburgh was surprised by Leslie, one who had gained a large experience in the great Protestant war in Germany, and in whom all confided; for, says Baillie, "such was the wisdom and authority of that old, little, crooked soldier, that all, with an incredible submission, from the beginning to the end, gave over themselves to be guided by him." Dumbarton castle was seized by the Earl of Argyle. Stirling was held by a Covenanter. Onward marched the king towards York. His army, under the lords Arundel, Holland, and Essex, was very insufficient for attack or defence, though formidable enough for the plunder of their countrymen. "As for the forces of England, they failed like the summer brooks; the country was filled with their own grievances."‡ In the same spirit Mrs. Hutchinson writes, "the commonalty of the nation, being themselves under grievous bondage, were loath to oppose a people that came only to claim their just liberties." Wentworth made prodigious exertions to keep down the Scottish settlers in Ulster; and he sent some Irish to the king's army—"a matter of fifteen hundred ragged Arabians," says Baillie. The marquis of Hamilton sailed into the Firth of Forth; but his forces were quite unequal to subdue or even to awe an armed population; and the Scots appear to have despised his "five thousand land-sojourns, taken up in a violent press". The marquis made war upon his countrymen in a merciful way. He fired no shot; and was content with intercepting supplies. His men, closely packed in their small ships, could obtain neither fresh meat nor water, for the shores were closely watched; and the old fortune of the miserable naval enterprises of this reign attended

* *Strafford Letters*, vol. ii. p. 246.

† Baillie. ‡ *Ibid.*

them. Leslie marched towards the border. The king had advanced to Berwick; and from his camp at the English side of the Tweed, saw "through a prospect" [telescope] twelve thousand Scots encamped on Dunse-Law; the hill-top crowded with cannon; the gentle hill-sides stirring with experienced musqueteers and "stout young ploughmen and highlanders with their plaids, targes, and dirlachs."* Before the tent of every captain was a colour bearing the Scottish arms, and a legend, in golden letters, "For Christ's Crown and Covenant." The camp was full of the kirk-ministers; and the soldiers were encouraged, not only by the presence of their nobles, but by "the good sermons and prayers, morning and even under the roof of heaven, to which their drums did call them for bells." † The armies had looked upon each other, and certainly the English commanders had very substantial reasons for not risking a battle. A small body of the royal cavalry had fled before a smaller body of Scots. Some advances to pacification were made from the Scottish side. On the 6th of June, the earl of Dunfermline was sent to the royal camp with a petition that a meeting might be held between a few worthy men of each kingdom to settle the points in dispute. Charles returned an answer signed by his Secretary. The Covenanters required an answer under his own hand; and the signature was given, assenting to the proposal. On the 11th of June, the Scottish deputies—consisting of four nobles, with Alexander Henderson, Moderator of the General Assembly, and the Clerk-Register of that body, arrived in the camp. The king appointed his Commissioners; but during the proceedings he suddenly appeared amongst the negotiators. His lofty tone, however, did not prevent a pacification being concluded on the 18th of June. The articles were very loosely expressed; and it soon became clear that the peace was a hollow one. Charles returned to London on the 1st of August. The Scottish army was disbanded. The fortresses were restored to the officers appointed by the Crown. But the conditions of the Covenant were inflexibly maintained in the General Assembly, and in the Parliament which met in August. Moreover, that Parliament demanded privileges which appeared to weaken the royal authority; and the king's Commissioners decided upon its prorogation. The members held that such prorogation was illegal without their own consent. On either side of the border the note of preparation for war was again heard.

* Baillie, p. 212-13.

† *Ibid.*

Lowered in the eyes of his English subjects by the pacification of Berwick; the prestige of eleven years' pretensions to absolute power dissipated; without financial resources for military purposes, unless new exactions had been attempted, besides the old demands,—Charles at length summoned an English Parliament. It met on the 13th of April, 1640; it was dissolved on the 5th of May. In this Session of three weeks the great question of grievances preceding supplies was renewed with a vigour proportionate to the invasions of public liberty since 1629. But there was a moderation in the language of the Commons which was perhaps the best evidence of the steadiness of their resolves. The king demanded twelve subsidies in three years—a sum equivalent to about 840,000*l.*; and he offered to relinquish ship-money, which was estimated to produce 200,000*l.* a year. The Commons would hear of no compromise of such a nature. Ship-money was the opprobrium of the government; the Crown had claimed the right of taxation independent of the Commons; the people had been unconstitutionally taxed; the judgment of the Courts must be annulled, and the judges punished. The Commons would then enter upon the business of Supplies. The table of the House was covered with petitions against the abuses of the State and of the Church. The clouds were gathering all around; and the king thought to avert the tempest by dissolving the Parliament. The Convocation of the Clergy continued to sit; and large assistance was voted to the king. In that assembly Canons were framed which were well calculated to render the government of the Church more and more odious. No Englishman of sense, and especially no honest Puritan, would sanction the attack upon Laud's palace at Lambeth on the 11th of May. But they would regard his Canons,—which preached passive obedience to the divine right of kings and subjected Protestant dissentients to the same penalties as Popish recusants,—as an offence against the ancient liberties of Englishmen. Many of the Clergy would look forward to the time when this new yoke should be shaken off, by which the tenure of their livings was made to depend upon taking an oath offensive to their consciences—the *et cetera* oath as it was called. Meanwhile, members of the Commons were again imprisoned. Ship-money was more rigorously enforced. Citizens were punished for refusing a loan. The counties were subjected to novel charges for the troops that were levied for another Scottish campaign. On the 4th of June, a month after the dissolution of Parliament, the

earl of Northumberland, a courtier, said in a letter, "It is impossible that things can long continue in the condition they are now in; so general a defection in this kingdom hath not been known in the memory of any."*

The contest between the king and Scotland—we cannot call it a contest between England and Scotland—had for some time assumed the character of a war. Trade with Scotland had been prohibited. The English cruisers seized Scottish merchant-ships. In March and April levies had been called out by the Covenanters. On the 2nd of June, the Parliament met in Edinburgh, and put forth manifestoes which were of more effect than the royal proclamations denouncing the Scots as rebels and traitors. The Parliament imposed levies, which were not, however, very promptly paid. They formed a Committee of Estates which held the executive power of the realm. It was resolved to march to England with a petition, supported by an army of twenty-five thousand men. On the 20th of August they crossed the Tweed at Coldstream, wading through the river. Montrose, afterwards so prominent in another cause, was the first to pass the river on foot. The march at leisure through Northumberland. Lord Conway, the English general of the horse, had been in cantonments between the Tweed and the Tyne since the end of July. On the day that Leslie crossed the Tweed, Charles, having received news of the advance of this great army, hastily left London for York. He called all the tenants of the Crown to his standard. He offered by proclamation to forgive the Scots, if they would crave pardon for the past as penitent delinquents. Strafford had raised troops in Ireland that had joined the king's forces. Altogether twenty thousand men were in arms under the royal standard. There was no zeal in this army. There was little discipline. The courtiers, "merry lads," as Sir Philip Warwick names some of them, with a ready loyalty made no inquiry as to the principle of the war. The common soldiers "questioned in a mutinous manner whether their captains were papists or not," and uttered "in bold speeches their distaste of the cause, to the astonishment of many, that common soldiers should be sensible of public interest and religion, when lords and gentlemen seemed not to be." † The queen had recommended the Roman Catholics to make contributions to carry on the war against the Scottish Covenanters, and "with more noise and vanity than prudence admitted, they had made public collections of money to a

* "Sidney Papers," quoted by Mr. Hallam. † May.

considerable sum."* To oppose the old campaigner Leslie, a man of many battles, was selected lord Conway,—one who had seen some service, such as it was, but who is described by Clarendon as "a voluptuous man in eating and drinking, and of great license in all other excesses;" and who was said by sir P. Warwick to "lay under some reflection since the action of the Isle of Rhé." Strafford (Wentworth was now earl of Strafford) was to have taken the command; but sickness prevented him from joining the army till after it had sustained a perilous defeat, in what Clarendon terms "that infamous irreparable rout at Newburn." On the 27th of August, the Scots had reached the left bank of the Tyne about five miles above Newcastle, and on that night their camp fires blazed with the coal of the adjacent pits. The next day they occupied the town of Newburn. There appears to have been little disposition to come to an engagement; and the Scots had made some English welcome who visited their camp. But one of their officers having been killed by a shot from the opposite bank of the river, the artillery on both sides opened their fire. At low water two Scottish regiments crossed the Tyne. The English horse fled, and the whole army moved in great disorder to Newcastle. There was only one effort made by a gallant few to oppose the passage of the Scots across the river. Newcastle was itself abandoned at midnight. On the morrow, writes Baillie, "Newcastle was rendered to us; the soldiers and chief citizens had fled out of it in great haste." There they found stores of provisions and of arms. In Scotland, the Covenanters were equally successful; and Dumbarton, "questionless the strongest place in Britain," capitulated. The castle of Edinburgh also surrendered to Argyle. The king was coming on and had reached Allerton, when he heard of the rout of Newburn; and he returned to York. Newcastle was put by the Scots under contribution; and there they quietly sat down whilst some attempts were made for a pacification.

After these occurrences, the king, having adopted what Clarendon calls "a new invention," or rather "so old that it had not been practised in some hundreds of years," called a Great Council of Peers to attend him at York on the 24th of September. The first decision of the Council was to appoint a Commission of sixteen Peers to treat with the Scots at Ripon. After various vain attempts to come to a final understanding, a cessation of arms, for two months, was agreed to, on the 26th of October, that the demands

* Clarendon.

of the Covenanters might be discussed in London by the Commissioners. It had become known that the king had proposed to the peers again to summon a Parliament. During this cessation of arms the Scottish army was to be maintained by a payment of 850*l.* per day. The Parliament was to meet at Westminster on the 3rd of November.

For the fifth time during the reign of Charles the people are looking to a Parliament, that should establish the just distinctions between an absolute monarchy and a free monarchy. The barriers between Liberty and Despotism had been rudely thrown down. It is no vain difference about a theory. It is a vital question which has come home to every man. There is no falling off in the popular sentiment as to the character of those who have contended in former parliaments against the insolent claims of prerogative. These men are returned for county and borough, without a doubt that they have pursued the right course. A very short time had been given between the issue of the writs and the elections;—an advantage to the court party. Yet the elections had so completely gone against that party, that Clarendon says the House was packed by decisions upon controverted returns. This is one of the loose assertions of that historian, for there were only eight returns that were contested. He says also, "There was observed a marvellous elated countenance in many of the members of parliament before they met together in the house; the same men, who, six months before, were observed to be of very moderate tempers, and to wish that gentle remedies might be applied." Thus, in this dreary November season, have the Peers, and five hundred and six members of the House of Commons, come up from every shire and borough, to take their sides in the great battle for constitutional rights and liberty of conscience. Travelling in those wintry days to parliament was costly and not very agreeable. Principal Baillie, who was to go to Westminster from Newcastle on the Covenant business, with a safe conduct under the Great Seal, was eight days on the road; and on the eighth day he came from Ware to London, "all well, horse and men, as we could wish; divers merchants and their servants with us, on little nags." The whole journey was perilous in his eyes: "The way extremely foul and deep, the journeys long and continued; sundry of us unaccustomed with travel, we took it for God's singular goodness that all of us were so preserved. . . . We were by the way at great expenses; their inns are all like palaces; no marvel they extort their guests."*

* "Letters and Journals," vol. i. p. 271.

The complexion of the House of Commons was such as to alarm some of those who had been concerned in the proceedings of the absolute government of eleven years. Sir John Bramston, a devoted loyalist, the son of one of the ship-money judges, writes thus of the composition of the House: "Those gentlemen who had been imprisoned about the loans, benevolences, or any other the like matters; such citizens as had been sued, imprisoned, or molested about tonnage or poundage, or the customs; all that had any ways appeared obstinate and refractory to the government and the king's commands about ship-money, coat-and-conduct money, or the Commission, were chosen either for counties or boroughs."* There were members of the government, the chief advisers of the king, to whom the presence in Parliament of "those gentlemen who had been imprisoned," &c., was not a promise of halcyon days. The Scots, before the treaty of Ripon, had demanded "the removal of three or four persons from about the king." † Strafford and Laud were especially pointed at. Of Laud, they distinctly said that his removal was necessary for the preservation of the Protestant religion, "which every honest man thought at present in great danger, by the exorbitant power of the Archbishop of Canterbury." The enemy of Strafford, "more terrible than all the others," was "the whole Scottish nation, provoked by the declaration he had procured of Ireland, and some high carriage and expressions of his against them in that kingdom." ‡ Strafford, though of undaunted courage, saw his danger in this parliament, which had been called at the moment when he would have fought in the north. He wished to retire to his government of Ireland. Charles pledged himself that not a hair of Strafford's head should be touched by the parliament. Laud was suffering an agony of superstitious fear in his Lambeth palace. There was real cause for alarm in the temper of the people. On the 22nd of October, the High Commission Court, so tyrannical and so odious, was sitting at St. Paul's. "Very near two thousand Brownists made a tumult at the end of the Court, tore down all the benches in the Consistory, and cried out they would have no bishop, nor no High Commission." † The unhappy state of Laud's own mind, credulous as ever about dreams and prognostications, may be judged by the following entry

* "Autobiography of Sir John Bramston," Camden Society. "Coat-and-conduct money," the name of a particular tax for the equipment of soldiers, is misprinted "Coal, and conduct-money," p. 73.

† Clarendon.

‡ Laud's Diary.

of his Diary: "October 27, Tuesday, Simon and Jude's Eve. I went into my upper study, to see some manuscripts, which I was sending to Oxford. In that study hung my picture, taken by the life; and coming in, I found it fallen down upon the face, and lying on the floor, the string being broken by which it was hanged against the wall. I am almost every day threatened with my ruin in Parliament. God grant this be no omen."

The real character of Revolutions is as rarely understood as their possible range is foreseen, by those first affected by them,—princes and their ministers. Laud, and to a less extent Strafford, could see nothing in the events which disturbed their power but the malignity of personal enemies, or the influence of ambitious and irreligious despisers of lawful authority. Laud himself writes, with an amusing simplicity, and no doubt with a sincere expression of his belief, that "the adverse party in the late parliament, or by and by after before they parted, ordered things so, and filled men's minds with such strange jealousies, that the king's good people were almost generally possessed that his majesty had a purpose to alter the ancient laws and liberties of the kingdom, and to bring in slavery upon his people,—a thing which, for aught I know, his majesty never intended."* Purlind and almost stone-blind must that minister have been who did not see that the systematic action of the government during the whole reign, and more especially from 1629 to 1640, had been to drive such an opinion into the heads of the whole community; and that nothing but their loyalty, which was as strong a principle as the love of freedom, could have long before averted some fearful outbreak of popular indignation, in the absence of the legitimate parliamentary mode of expressing the public voice. According to Laud's view of the matter, the Scots did not come to England with a Covenant in their hands, subscribed by an indignant nation, but because "some lords and others, who had by this time made an underhand solemn confederacy with a strong faction of the Scots, brought an army of them into the kingdom." Some may believe, as we do not, that Charles "never intended to bring in slavery upon his people;" but the people who saw the tyranny of his actions had no great reason to rely upon his intentions. The king and the archbishop, both weak men, were self-deceivers; and of the nature of the self-deceptions of both we may form an opinion from an entry in Laud's Diary, recording that he had been fined 500*l.* by the Par-

* Laud's "History of the Troubles," &c. p. 83.

liament (December 21, 1640), for the illegal imprisonment of sir Robert Howard: "In such a case, say the imprisonment were more than the Law allow; what may be done for Honour and Religion sake?" When Authority rides over Law in the name of Honour and Religion, it becomes more dangerous even than the brute force which knows no law but its own passionate will.

VOL. III.—25