

CHAPTER XXII.

Act for the non-dissolution of parliament.—Jealousy of the Commons.—Principal legislative measures.—Ship-money; Star chamber; Local arbitrary Courts; Court of High Commission; Forests; Writs for knighthood.—English and Scottish armies disbanded.—The king goes to Scotland.—Intrigues with Montrose.—Parliament re-assembles.—The Irish Insurrection.—The king's progress to London.—Debate on the Remonstrance.—The king's entertainment in the city.—Struggle of parties.—The Remonstrance presented.—The king at Whitehall.—Tumults.—Protest, and committal of twelve bishops.—Articles of treason exhibited against lord Kimbolton and five members of the Commons.—The king attempts to seize the five members.—The house adjourned.

THE consent of the king to the bill for the attainder of Strafford, and to the measure which was afterwards called "The Act for the Perpetual Parliament," can scarcely be attributed to any other feeling than a sense of his immediate weakness. Mr. Hallam imputes Charles's ready acquiescence in this parliamentary bill, to his own shame and the queen's consternation at the discovery of the army plot.* Lord Clarendon says, "after the passing these two bills, the temper and spirit of the people, both within and without the walls of the two Houses, grew marvellous calm and composed."† The Parliament now went boldly and steadily forward in the work of reform. A subsidy and a poll-tax were granted; but another subsidy of tonnage and poundage was granted for a very limited time, from May 25 to July 15; so that the Commons might exercise the right of renewal, according to circumstances. This subsidy was renewed, by subsequent Acts, until July 2, 1642. It is difficult to blame them for this excessive jealousy of the designs of the Crown. The bill for triennial parliaments was absolutely necessary, to take out of the hands of the king the power to govern again without a parliament. The more unconstitutional measure of preventing the dissolution of parliament by the king without its own consent, thus rendering the Commons independent of the Crown and of their own constituents, cannot be justified upon any principle consistent with the just balance of the mon-

* "Constitutional History," c. 9.

† "Rebellion," vol. i. p. 459, ed. 1628.

archical and democratic interests in the State. Nothing but a well-grounded suspicion of the designs of the king could have induced both Houses hastily to pass such a measure, upon the simple allegation that money could not be borrowed under the authority of parliament if there was a prospect of its being suddenly dissolved. "It is impossible to think," writes sir Philip Warwick, "how so intelligent a person as this king was, should by any persuasions, which certainly were great on the queen's side, or treachery, which certainly was great on the side of many of his great courtiers, be induced thus to divest himself of all majesty and power."* The queen, under the influence of terror, as some have believed, but more probably with the hope of procuring the interference of foreign powers to restore the absolute authority of Charles, was preparing to leave the country. The princess royal was betrothed to the eldest son of the prince of Orange. A secret article of the treaty stipulated that the prince should assist the king, if the disputes with his Parliament came to an open rupture. The queen, a few months later, alleging her ill-health, wished to seek a remedy in the Spa-waters. Upon the remonstrance of both Houses of Parliament she consented to remain in England. Amidst the contradictory and obscure traces of court secrets, one thing is manifest—that there was not the slightest approach to a real union between the king and the Parliament for the public good. The royal concessions were made with a sort of recklessness which argues that there was a hope and belief that they might become nugatory under some turn of fortune. The suspicions of the Commons were never wholly set at rest.

In the great legislative measures of this session, the Houses were invariably anxious to rest their reforms upon the ancient foundations of law and liberty. Thus in the Statute granting Tonnage and Poundage, it is declared and enacted, "That it is and hath been the ancient right of the subjects of this realm, that no subsidy, custom, impost, or other charge whatsoever ought or may be laid or imposed upon any merchandise, exported or imported by subjects, denizens, or aliens, without common consent in Parliament."† In "An Act for the declaring unlawful and void the late proceedings touching ship-money," it is declared that the writs and judgments thereupon "were and are contrary to and against the laws and statutes of the realm, the right of property, the liberty of the subject, former resolutions in parliament, and the

* "Memoirs," p. 181.

† 16 Car. I. c. 8.

Petition of Right made in the third year of the reign of his majesty that now is."* Again and again the principle of arbitrary taxation was made to hear its death-knell. In the Act for dissolving the Court of Star Chamber and taking away the whole of its powers, all the ancient statutes, including the Great Charter, which declare that no freeman shall be imprisoned or condemned but by judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land, are recited; and it is affirmed that the authority of the Star Chamber, under the Statute of Henry VII., has been abused, and the decrees of the Court, have been found "to be an intolerable burthen to the subjects, and the means to introduce an arbitrary power and government."† This Statute not only abolishes the Court of Star Chamber, but the jurisdiction of the Courts of the Marches of Wales, of the Northern Parts, of the Duchy of Lancaster, and of the County Palatine of Chester. Under these arbitrary Courts one-third of the people had been deprived of the protection of Common-law, and were at the mercy of such local despots as Strafford.

In the Act for abolishing the Court of High Commission, it is maintained that, under the Statute of the first of Elizabeth "concerning commissioners for causes ecclesiastical," the commissioners "have to the great and insufferable wrong and oppression of the king's subjects used to fine and imprison them, and to exercise other authority not belonging to ecclesiastical jurisdiction." The Act of abolition goes farther, and takes from the Ecclesiastical Courts the power to inflict temporal penalties for spiritual offences.‡ The "Act for the certainty of forests, and of the meres, meets, limits, and bounds of the forests," goes back to the days of Edward I. as to ancient boundaries, and, reprehending their real or pretended extension confines forests within such limits as were recognised in the twentieth year of James I. § In "An Act for preventing vexatious proceedings touching the order of knighthood," reference is made to an ancient usage that men seized of lands to the yearly value of forty pounds might be compelled to take upon themselves the order of knighthood, or else to make fine; but it declares that many have been put to grievous fines and vexations, for declining to receive the same dignity, being wholly unfit for it in estate or quality. In all these enactments for the removal of great oppressions, constant reference is had to the origin of the abuses. There is no unreasoning pretext for their abolition, as if the subject were to be benefited by arbitrarily curtailing the preroga-

* 16 Car. I. c. 14.

† *Ibid.*, c. 10.‡ *Ibid.*, c. 14.§ *Ibid.*, c. 16.

tive of the Crown. Clarendon fully admits all the abuses which these enactments swept away; and yet, in the spirit of that ignoble belief which he has done so much to perpetuate, that justice to the subject can only be derived from the favour of the sovereign, he says, of these Acts of Parliament, that they "will be acknowledged by an uncorrupted posterity, to be everlasting monuments of the king's princely and fatherly affection to his people."* Much more rationally do we now feel that, "in by far the greater part of the enactments of 1641, the monarchy lost nothing that it had anciently possessed; and the balance of our constitution might seem rather to have been restored to its former equipoise than to have undergone any fresh change."† It is to the Long Parliament, in this triumphant session, that we owe a new era of civil liberty. If they had rested here in their great work, they would have placed the political rights of Englishmen upon the broad foundation upon which the national greatness and security has been since built up. Other questions, incident to the particular crisis, prevented that concord between the sovereign and the people upon which the safety of the monarchy must rest.

The pacification with Scotland was concluded by Act of Parliament; ‡ and by another Act, the sum of 300,000*l.* was agreed "to be given for a friendly assistance and relief towards the supply of the losses and necessities of our brethren of Scotland." § On the 10th of August the king left London for Scotland. On the 9th of September the Parliament adjourned. Charles had manifested great impatience to proceed to Scotland. On his journey he passed through the English army in the North, which was disbanding; and he dined at Newcastle with Lesley, the general of the Scottish army, which was returning home. The king was accompanied by two commissioners named by the Lords, and four named by the Commons, amongst whom was Hampden. Clarendon calls them "spies." There was no discourtesy between Charles and these commissioners; but they were evidently there to watch and counteract his secret designs. The king had met the Scottish Parliament; had sanctioned all their proceedings even to the abolition of episcopacy; and seemed bent upon securing the affections of the nation by swearing to the terms of the Covenant, and attending the presbyterian worship. There can be no doubt he was plotting to destroy those whom he chose to consider as his personal ene-

* "Rebellion," vol. i. p. 504.

‡ 16 Car. I. c. 17.

† Hallam, vol. ii. c. 9.

§ *Ibid.*, c. 18.

mies. Montrose had been in correspondence with the king. Argyle had intercepted a letter in cypher, and the Parliament had imprisoned the daring man who was now the great supporter of the old order of affairs in the Scottish Church and State. Montrose contrived to correspond with Charles, through one of his pages, offering to produce proofs of the secret communications of Hamilton and Argyle, with Hampden, Pym, and other parliamentary leaders, to bring the Scottish army into England in 1640. Hamilton and Argyle, having learnt that they were in danger of liberty or life, absented themselves. For Montrose had endeavoured to persuade the king to arrest them, and if resistance was made, to remove them by assassination. Such was political and religious hatred, when mixed up with the semi-barbarism of Scottish clanship. Clarendon says, "the king abhorred that expedient." There was great alarm in Edinburgh; but the king and the Scottish parliament thought it wise to accommodate matters; and the nobles returned to receive marks of honour from Charles. But Hampden and the other commissioners saw the danger with which they might be threatened. "The leaders," says M. Guizot, "thought their former relations with the Scottish insurgents had been pardoned, together with the rebellion itself, by the last treaty of peace." It was natural that they should so think. The Act of Parliament for the pacification has these express words: "It is expedient for making the peace and unity of his Majesty's dominions the more firm and faithful, and that his Majesty's countenance against all fears may shine upon them all the more comfortably, that an Act of Pacification and Oblivion be made in the Parliament of all the three kingdoms for burying in forgetfulness all acts of hostility, whether betwixt the king and his subjects or between subject and subject, or which may be conceived to arise upon the coming of any English army against Scotland, or the coming of the Scottish army into England, or upon any action, attempt, assistance, counsel, or device, having relation thereto and falling out by the occasion of the late troubles preceding the conclusion of the treaty and the return of the Scottish army into Scotland; that the same and whatsoever hath ensued thereupon whether touching upon the laws and liberties of the Church and kingdom, or upon his Majesty's honour and authority, in no time hereafter may be called in question or resented as a wrong national or personal, whatsoever be the quality of the person or persons, or of whatsoever kind or degree civil or criminal the injury be supposed to be, and that no mention be made

thereof in the time coming, neither in judgment nor out of judgment, but that it shall be held and reputed as though never any such thing had been thought nor wrought." The Statute for the pacification does not expressly pass such an Act of Oblivion; but after the king by his royal assent had declared its expediency, this manifestation of duplicity could only tend to widen the breach between the sovereign and the legislature.

During the parliamentary recess a Committee sat at Westminster; and they instituted inquiries, and authorized acts, which were certainly beyond their legislative functions. The news from Scotland led this Committee to believe, according to Clarendon, that "there was some desperate design on foot;" and he adds that the Scottish business, which was called "the incident," "had a strange influence at Westminster, and served to contribute to all the senseless fears they thought fit to entertain."* Other news soon came to Westminster that produced there, and throughout the kingdom, a consternation far more intense and lasting than any "senseless fears." The House of Commons re-assembled on the 20th of October. On the 25th the Lords of the Council communicated to the House that a fearful insurrection had broken out in Ireland; and shortly after the king sent a letter to the Parliament, apprising them of a "formed rebellion" which must be prosecuted with a sharp war; "the conducting and prosecuting which he wholly committed to their care and wisdom." A Committee of both houses at once took upon themselves the authority thus confided to them; "the mischief whereof, though in the beginning little taken notice of," says Clarendon, "was afterwards felt by the king very sensibly." Such a voluntary concession of the executive power to the legislature was indeed a dangerous precedent.

The Irish insurrection of 1641 was one of the most terrible events in the history of that unhappy country. It was an event which long perpetuated the hatred between the Irish natives and the English settlers, and in a series of bitter revenges kept alive the more deadly animosity between Catholics and Protestants. The Irish army, which had been raised by Strafford, had been kept together against the desire of the Parliament. The king had wished to establish that army in Flanders, to be ready for any service under the king of Spain; but his plan had been prevented by a parliamentary resolution, which afterwards became a law, against "the raising and transporting of forces of horse or foot out

* Appendix to "History of Rebellion," vol. ii. p. 576 (ed. 1826).

of his Majesty's dominions of England or Ireland." This Catholic army was therefore disbanded; and it became a dangerous power in a distracted country. The vigilant rule of Strafford was at an end. There was no resident viceroy. The government was administered by the two lords justices. The Protestant troops in Ireland were few, and they were scattered. Charles had striven to prevent the disbanding of Strafford's eight thousand papists; and after that measure was accomplished, he had intrigued to prevent the dispersion of these men. They were told to rally round their sovereign, and by defending the throne prevent the extirpation of the ancient religion. A general rising was at length determined upon amongst some Irish chieftains and some of the ancient settlers of the Pale, for the purpose of seizing the castle of Dublin, and proclaiming that they would support the sovereign in all his rights. The plot was betrayed as far as regarded the attack upon Dublin castle; but Ulster was in open insurrection on the 22nd of October. Sir Phelim O'Neal was at the head of thirty thousand men. What was intended to be an insurrection, for the redress of civil wrongs and the removal of religious disabilities, soon became a general massacre of Protestants. The conspirators in Ulster were rendered desperate by the failure of the plot for the seizure of Dublin. The puritan settlers of the north were especially obnoxious to those who were in arms. They were driven from their houses in an inclement season. They fled to the hills and morasses, where they perished of hunger. They were put to death, with all the horrors that only savages and fanatics can inflict. Women and children were murdered with relentless fury. Multitudes fled towards Dublin as their only city of refuge. The number of those that perished has been variously estimated. Clarendon says that "about forty or fifty thousand of the English Protestants were murdered before they suspected themselves to be in any danger, or could provide for their defence by drawing themselves into towns or strong houses." Troops at length arrived from England; and after months of horror the insurrection was quelled. The king could never wholly remove the belief that he had instigated this fearful rising, or had connived at it. The Irish insurgents themselves pretended that they acted under the royal authority. There is a curious illustration of this circumstance in a manuscript relation of the "Siege of Ballgaly Castle," in the County of Clare, at the beginning of 1642, written by one of the besieged. "After this the enemy would daily in our sight draw

forth their skenes and swords, flourishing them, swearing many dangerous oaths that ere long they would draw us forth and hack us to pieces, terming us puritan rogues, and all the base names that might be invented, vowing that shortly sir Phelim O'Neal, and at least 40,000 soldiers, would come into Thomond and not leave a Protestant living, praying heartily for them, pretending that they then fought for them, but within a short time after they pretended that they were wholly the queen's army, and that she and her mother were in the north aiding them, but no Protestant admitted to look upon her. This note suddenly altered, and then they were all for the king, vowing deeply that they had his Majesty's commission for what they did, and that they were his Majesty's Catholic forces." *

When the parliamentary commissioners quitted Edinburgh they urged the king's speedy return to London. His intentions were, however, kept secret. He had left the earl of Essex commander of the forces south of Trent; but the earl was not in the confidence of the court. The queen, on the 20th of November, writes to the secretary of state that he may now tell Essex when the king is coming; for, she adds, "the king commanded me to tell this to my lord of Essex, but you may do it, for these lordships are too great princes now to receive any directions from me." † In his progress from Scotland the king was received with demonstrations of respect and affection. At York he was told by the mayor, "our wintry woods assume spring leaves to welcome home so indulgent a sovereign." At Stamford the mayor alluded to the Irish rebellion, expressing his conviction that "although Rome's hens should daily hatch of its preposterous eggs crocodileous chickens, yet under our royal sovereign we should not fear." The king was to reach London on the 25th, and there to dine with the lord mayor, who was a devoted royalist. It was natural that the people of themselves should express these sentiments of good will to Charles. A vast number of the grievances of the nation had been swept away, and the people would necessarily attribute much of the merit to the king, and be willing to lay aside their doubts and complainings. It is not easy to understand why the parliamentary leaders should have chosen the moment of the king's return to greet him, not with their professions of love, but with the strongest remonstrance against the whole tenour

* "Narratives of the Contests in Ireland." Camden Society.

† Green's "Letters of Henrietta Maria," p. 46.

of his past government. The only solution is that they acted under a distinct persuasion that it was impossible, at that time, that a just balance could be restored between the monarchy and the democratic principle, unless one power yielded something more than had been already conceded, or the other power gave up some of the advantages which it had already won. The conviction in the mind of the king that he had a right to be absolute had never been removed or lessened by the events of the past twelve months. The resolution of the Commons that he should not be again absolute was as strong as ever. But at this crisis the men who had been unanimous in 1640 divided into two great parties,—those who held that the monarchy should be still more abridged of its power, and those who believed that any further assertion of parliamentary authority would be to destroy the monarchy. With the question of the due limits of popular rights was mixed up the equally difficult question, whether episcopacy should be regulated or abolished; and this question, in time, became merged in the wider question, whether England, like its neighbour kingdom, should become presbyterian, or whether all state religion should come to an end, and every congregation of Christians be a church of itself. We cannot understand the real spirit of this great time, if we judge the parties and the individuals in an uncharitable temper—if we believe that the cavaliers, as the loyalists were called, meant to fight for slavery and popery; and that the round-heads, as the parliamentarians were called, were furious anarchists or blind fanatics. An Englishman who will now look honestly and calmly at the events of this period, will rejoice that he is descended from men who, whatever be their opinions, were earnest in their advocacy; who were, for the most part, no trading politicians, merely intent upon their individual advancement; who were truly heroic in their passionate loyalty or their passionate love of civil or religious liberty; who, whether vilified as profligates or as hypocrites, displayed, each in his own way, some of the noblest traits of human character; for they each were fighting with a conviction that the eye of God was upon them, and the greater number of them, whether Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Independent, believing in his conscience that he was doing God's work in the world.

The debate on the Remonstrance was the great trial of strength in the House of Commons. That debate began at nine o'clock of the morning of the 22nd of November. It went on through that day till it grew dark. Candles were called for. Twelve hours of

passionate talk, and yet no rest. The House thinned under the faintness and exhaustion of this unusual sitting. But the excitement was greater than the weariness. The Remonstrance was adopted by one hundred and fifty-nine votes against one hundred and forty-eight. "At three of the clock in the morning," says Philip Warwick, "when they voted it, I thought we had all sat in the valley of the shadow of death; for we, like Joab's and Abner's young men, had caught at each other's locks, and sheathed our swords in each other's bowels, had not the sagacity and great calmness of Mr. Hampden, by a short speech, prevented it, and led us to defer our angry debate till next day." The Remonstrance had been carried, but the "angry debate" was continued on the question of printing it. As they went into the house, Falkland said to Cromwell that "it would take some debate," which Cromwell doubted. As they went out, Falkland asked Cromwell whether it had been debated? to which he answered, "he would take his word another time; and whispered him in the ear, with some asseveration, that if the Remonstrance had been rejected, he would have sold all he had the next morning, and never have seen England more; and he knew there many honest men of the same resolution." This statement of Clarendon has been called "a vague report, gathered over dining-tables long after, to which the reader need not pay more heed than it merits."* This Remonstrance is a document of 206 articles. It may be read in Rushworth and Rapin, and its general tone is very like a declaration of war by one potentate against another. We do not believe what Clarendon affirms, that "the only end of passing it was to incline the people to sedition;"† but we may admit with Mr. Hallam, that if Charles "were intended to reign at all, and to reign with any portion either of the prerogative of an English king, or the respect claimed by every sovereign, the Remonstrance of the Commons could but prolong an irritation incompatible with public tranquillity."‡

The manifestations of popular feeling at this eventful period can scarcely be regarded as indications of public opinion. There can be no doubt that, on either side, many arts were practised to procure such demonstrations as might influence the temper of Parliament, or support the wishes of the king. One of the most important of these was the splendid welcome that was given by the city of London to Charles on the 25th of November. Clarendon says,

* Carlyle's "Cromwell's Letters," vol. i. p. 95.

† "Constitutional History," vol. ii. c. ix.

"Gourney, the lord mayor, was a man of wisdom and courage, and expressed great indignation to see the city so corrupted by the ill artifices of factious persons; and therefore attended upon his majesty, at his entrance into the city, with all the lustre and good countenance it could show, and as great professions of duty as it could make or the king expect." The "Ovatio Carolina," as this reception was called in a pompous account of the ceremonial,* was in many respects the greatest pageant that "the royal chamber" of London had ever witnessed. The lord mayor and aldermen, and five hundred horsemen selected from the liveries, in velvet and plush coats, with pendants, and footmen, and trumpeters, rode out to Kingsland. A new way through the fields was made to Shoreditch, for the ordinary road was "impassable, in regard to the depth and foulness of it." The lord mayor had a tent pitched in the fields near Kingsland, and thither the king and queen, with the prince of Wales, and the duke of York, and the princess Mary, were escorted by the sheriffs. Alighting from the royal coach, the king received an address, to which he answered, that he was returned with as hearty and kind affection to his people in general, and to London in particular, as could be desired by loving subjects. To mark his particular affection to the city, he gave back "that part of Londonderry" from which the citizens had been evicted. "This, I confess," he said, "is now no great gift; but I intend first to recover it and then to give it you whole and entirely." Perhaps some of that assembly might have recollected that Londonderry was taken from the citizens because they had refused to comply with the illegal demand of a forced loan. Onward went the gorgeous cavalcade to Moorgate, and so on to the Guildhall; and the houses were hung with tapestry, and the conduits ran with claret-wine, and the people cried "God bless, and long live, king Charles and queen Mary." The banquet was of proportionate splendour; and the old hall was brilliant on that November day with the gorgeous dresses of lords and ladies; and the city dames vied in splendour with the high-born; and it seemed in that hour of festival as if in that large town of seven hundred thousand people all were of one accord of loyal content. After the banquet the king and the court were conducted in solemn procession to Whitehall, the footmen carrying lighted torches, "so that the night seemed to be turned to day." But even amidst this well-arranged demonstration, there was doubt and alarm. The multitude gazed

* "Harleian Miscellany," vol. v. p. 86, edit. of 1810.

from behind the rails four feet distant from the houses, and admired the splendid array of courtiers and citizens, of footmen and whiffers. But "because some seditious libels were at that time dispersed, which bred a panic fear in some, order was taken, that there should be two companies of the city's trained bands placed in several parts of the city upon that day; as also that at every door a man should be placed, sufficiently appointed, to be ready upon all occasions to appease any disorders."*

The reception of the king by the city, appears to have given him confidence in making a demonstration of his disposition towards the Parliament. He withdrew the guard which Essex had appointed for the security of the two houses. The struggle of parties quickly began to assume a more formidable character. Men of great influence changed their sides. The earl of Holland, who had been a successful courtier in the time of James I.; who was afterwards a favourite of Charles's queen; and whom the king, says Clarendon, "but four months before had looked on as his own creature, as he had good reason to account himself from the beginning, joined himself close to and concurred with those councils which, with the greatest bitterness, were held against him." Holland House, at Kensington, one of the few mansions whose quaint architecture carries us back two centuries and a-half, was the scene of many a secret deliberation of the popular party. The earl of Essex and the earl of Leicester also took their side with those who were considered the king's enemies. On the other hand, Mr. Hyde, though without office, had become an adviser of the king. So, also, sir John Colepepper, one of the most able of the parliamentary leaders. More important than either, was the subsequent accession of lord Falkland to the king's councils. Colepepper became chancellor of the exchequer; and Falkland, in a short time after, secretary of state. Falkland was most reluctant to accept office; but he yielded to the persuasions of Hyde. With this additional support of able and moderate advisers, Charles might have attained the enviable position of a patriot king had he adhered to their advice, which, without any violent compromise of their former opinions, would have tended to the maintenance of tranquillity. The Remonstrance of the Commons was presented to Charles at Hampton Court on the 1st of December. He received it with temper. The Remonstrance was published; and the king's answer to it, written by Hyde, was also published. But the king had other ad-

visers with whom moderate measures were the last in their thoughts. Falkland had not openly seceded from his party till after the king, by one rash act which we shall presently have to relate, and the Commons, by a series of demands for power which grew more imperative as the control of the House fell into the hands of the more violent, had each rendered it impossible that a pacification could be effected, without unduly crippling the monarchy, or without returning to absolutism. The battle had to be fought out by physical force. The wordy war was coming to an end.

The two days after the Committee of the House of Commons had been at Hampton Court with the Remonstrance, the lord mayor and a select number of aldermen of London arrived there with an address. It was a harmless policy thus to attempt a counter-manifestation of public opinion, as if to neutralise the acts of the Commons. But the machinery was very insufficient for the object. The lord mayor implored the king and the queen to return to Whitehall, "to give a good quickening to the retail trade;" and the king said he would return. The lord mayor begged that the king would not impute to the city, or to the better sort of citizens, disorders which had occurred about Westminster; for "the skirts of the city are more populous than the city itself, fuller of the meaner sort of people;" and if any dwellers in the city should have been concerned in such disorders, "as who can deny among millions of people, some there may be," yet their purpose was unknown to the city magistrates. This loose way of talking of millions of people, as inhabitants of the capital, long prevailed. And so the king and his family, at the sole instance of the obedient portion of the corporation of London, returned to the palace of Whitehall a few days after, "there to keep their Christmas," as the king had promised. It was an awful Christmas and an awful new year. For six centuries of occasional troubles—of kings dethroned, of the red rose and the white alternately prevailing, of Tyler and Cade insurrections, of papist and protestant struggles,—the State had never been so near anarchy as in this winter of 1641. The real constitutional strength, both of the king and the Parliament, was so balanced, that military power or popular fury might each decide the preponderance. About Whitehall gathered bands of ardent gentlemen of town and country, some of generous loyalty and unstained life, but more of loose habits and broken fortunes,—full of contempt for puritans, and perfectly ignorant of the real causes of dif-

ference between the king and the Parliament. Many of them were Romanists. Ludlow's account, however coloured, is true in the main, as to the character of those who called themselves the king's body-guard. "The king, finding that nothing less would satisfy the Parliament than a thorough correction of what was amiss, and full security of their rights from any violation for the future, considered how to put a stop to their proceedings; and to that end encouraged a great number of loose debauched fellows about the town to repair to Whitehall, where a constant table was provided for their entertainment. Many gentlemen of the Inns of Court were tampered with to assist him in his design, and things brought to that pass, that one of them said publicly in my hearing, 'What! shall we suffer those fellows at Westminster to domineer thus? Let us go into the country and bring up our tenants to pull them out.'"* The king gave a sanction to the opinion that he contemplated a resort to force, in his injudicious appointment of a Romanist and a desperado, Colonel Lunsford, to be governor of the Tower. Clarendon thus speaks of the appointment:—"The king, finding that the seditious preachers every day prevailed in the city of London, and corrupted the affections and loyalty of the meaner people towards the government of the Church and State, resolved to put that place, which some men fancied to be a bridle upon the city, into the hands of such a man as he might rely upon."† The Commons requested the Peers to join them in a petition against this appointment; but the king superseded Lunsford upon the private advice of the Peers. The popular cry finally set in against the bishops. A bill was before the Lords which had been carried in the other House six months before, for taking away the votes of bishops and removing them from the House of Peers. In August, thirteen of the bishops had been impeached by the Commons, for having taken part in passing the Canons of 1640. The archbishop of Canterbury was still imprisoned in the Tower. The idea of the abolition of episcopacy was become familiarised to the people by the example of Scotland, and by the ready adhesion which the king had given to the presbyterian establishment there in his recent visit. There was now a change in the demonstrations of the corporation of London. A petition of the aldermen and common council was carried to Westminster in a procession of sixty coaches, praying that the House of Commons would still be a means to concur with the king and the Lords in redressing the

* "Memoires," vol. i. p. 21.

† "Rebellion," vol. ii. p. 81.

grievances of Church and State; "and for the better effecting thereof that the popish lords and bishops may be removed out of the House of Peers." The apprentices of London also agreed to a petition to the king, showing that they found by experience, great mischiefs coming upon their masters' tradings, "to nip them in the bud when they were first entering into the world; the cause of which they could attribute to no other but the papists and the prelates, and that malignant party which adhered to them." Truly enough does Clarendon call this apprentices' petition "such stuff." But the popular cry daily gathered strength. It was a small poetical exaggeration in the author of "Hudibras" thus to unite "All cries about the town," in one "hideous shout," around the palace, "to cry the bishops down!"

"The oyster-women lock'd their fish up,
And trudge'd away, to cry, No Bishop.
The mouse-trap men laid save-alls by,
And 'gainst evil counsellors did cry.
Butchers left old clothes in the lurch,
And fell to turn and patch the Church.
Some cry'd the Covenant, instead
Of pudding-pies, and ginger-bread.
And some for brooms, old boots and shoes,
Baw'd out to purge the Common-house.
Instead of kitchen-stuff, some cry,
A Gospel-preaching ministry:
And some for old suits, coats, or cloak,
No surplices nor Service-book."*

"The Christmas holidays giving more leave and licence to all kinds of people, the concourse grew more numerous about Westminster."† As the audacity of the multitude increased so did the fury of the cavaliers. Colonel Lunstord, disappointed of his governorship of the Tower, and other officers, were now engaged in skirmishes with the apprentices and such leaders of the daily mobs. "From these contestations the two terms of Roundhead and Cavalier grew to be received in discourse," says Clarendon. The hair of the London apprentices was cut close about their ears, and hence the name of contempt. The factions, royalist, and parliamentarian, were bitter in their reproaches against each other as encouragers of these passionate outbreaks. The dogged cries of the multitude, the insolent speeches of the king's friends, might have passed off without any serious results beyond a few broken heads, had not the bishops themselves become mixed up in the affray.

* Part i. canto ii. line 540.

† Clarendon.

Clarendon, who bore a decided ill-will to Williams, the archbishop of York, attributes the evil results to the Church, chiefly to the pride and passion of this archbishop. Hearing a youth in the street vociferating "no bishops," the fiery Welshman seized him, and there was a great scuffle, in which the archbishop's robes were torn from his back. He returned to his house, the deanery of Westminster, and having assembled twelve of the bishops, who had been often prevented attending in their places in parliament through these tumults, proposed "that they might unanimously and presently prepare a protestation to send to the House, against the force that was used upon them: and against all the acts which were, or should be, done during the time that they should by force be kept from doing their duties in the House." The archbishop soon drew this document, which all signed; and forthwith carried it to the king at Whitehall, who directed the lord keeper to present it to the Peers. The immediate result was that the Commons accused of high treason all those who had signed the paper; and the whole twelve were committed. "In all the extremity of frost, at eight o'clock in the dark evening, are we voted to the Tower," writes Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich—one who suffered much persecution undeservedly, but whose character was safe in the hands of impartial posterity. Imprudent and illegal as was this protest, it was a bold stretch of party-feeling to call it treasonable. In the debate on the bishops' offence in the House of Commons, one member only spoke in their behalf, and said, "he did not believe that they were guilty of high treason, but that they were stark mad; and therefore desired that they might be sent to Bedlam."*

The cry of "no bishop" was certainly not an expression of the national opinion. Although the arrogance and indiscretions of some of the higher clergy, and their extravagant enforcement of offensive ceremonies, had disgusted many sober and religious persons, and even at this time had called forth a petition for the reformation of the episcopal order from seven hundred beneficed clergymen, there was by no means a general sympathy with those who sought the destruction of the establishment. The Scots who were in England in 1641 were dreading that the people would be content with a modified episcopacy. "All are for the creating," writes Baillie, "of a kind of presbytery, and for bringing down the bishops, in all things spiritual and temporal, so low as can be with any subsistence; but their utter abolition, which is the aim

* Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 121.