

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

The King at Holmby House.—Army Independents.—Cromwell.—The Army proposed to be disbanded.—Petitions from Officers.—Adjutors.—The King removed from Holmby by Cornet Joyce.—Commissioners at Triploe Heath.—The Army advances towards London.—The King's treatment in the Army.—Proposals of the Independents to the King.—The King rejects the Proposals.—Tumults in London.—The Army advances.—The Speakers and Members go to the Army.—London submits.—The King at Hampton Court.—Cromwell.—The intercepted Letter of the King.—Charles makes his escape from Hampton Court.

HOLMBY HOUSE (or Holdenby), a mansion within six miles of Northampton, built by sir Christopher Hatton, no longer exists. We cannot judge of its capacity for the accommodation of a fallen king; but we have ample evidence that it was considered as a palace rather than a prison. There is an order of "the Committee of the Revenue" for fitting Holdenby House with hangings, beddings, and other wardrobe stuff and necessaries; and, with the Puritan contempt of the externals of religious worship, for melting the altar plate at Whitehall for the use of the king's table in his new abode. Seventy-six officers of the household and domestic servants are to be chosen by the earl of Northumberland, with Yeomen of the Guard. The king's diet was to be supplied at the cost of 30*l.* a day; and the estimate for the whole cost of the household amounted to 3000*l.* for twenty days.\* During this spring and early summer the king was not deprived of any of the trappings of royal state. Nor was his liberty much controlled. He rode to Althorp, and to more distant places, to enjoy his favourite game of bowls. He read, and he played at chess. He was attended by two gentlemen selected by the Parliament, Thomas Herbert and James Harrington, who became his fast friends. Of Harrington, Aubrey says, "The king loved his company, only he would not endure to hear of a Commonwealth; and Mr. Harrington passionately loved his Majesty. Mr. Harrington and the king often disputed about government."† To have "a genius which lay chiefly

\* These orders and estimates are in Peck's "Desiderata Curiosa."

† "Lives," vol. iii. p. 370.

towards the politics and democratical government," as Aubrey describes the author of the "Oceana," was not then held a dangerous quality in a philosophical theorist. "Democratical government" in the abstract was not regarded as incompatible with the order of a well-regulated State. Charles might contend for the security derived from absolute monarchy, such as he believed ought to exist in England; and Harrington might point to the republics of Holland and Switzerland, without offending royalty by the comparison. Had Charles seen how the safety of the crown would be best preserved by the largest enjoyment by the subject of civil liberty and the rights of conscience, Harrington and other republicans might have been more readily compelled to believe that freedom and toleration could be best secured under the free monarchy which was the basis of the English constitution. But Charles was impracticable with his convictions of divine right; and honest advocates of democratical government were equally impracticable in regard to a due balance of constitutional power. It is time only that has reconciled these apparent anomalies; and has rendered the hereditary crown of England the best type of republican freedom in the strictest alliance with monarchical solidity. But through what perils has this consummation been accomplished! Those who would properly value what we have attained, must steadily follow the difficult and uncertain steps of the people towards its attainment. Harrington at a later period is recorded to have found fault with "the constitution of our government, that it was by jumps."\* He said, "When no Parliament, then absolute Monarchy; when a Parliament, then it runs to Commonwealth." It was long before the "jumps" were converted into steady progress; and Monarchy and Commonwealth were reconciled into a Constitution whose practical excellence is best demonstrated by that slowness of maturity which has rendered a successful imitation almost impossible.

If the Presbyterian party, with whom were the powers of the executive government, treated the king with the respect due to his great station, they had little regard to the rights of conscience which he properly asserted. He required to have chaplains of the Episcopal church. The Parliament sent two Presbyterian ministers to Holmby; but the king refused even to let them ask a blessing upon his meals. The controversy of the dominant party with the representatives of the various religious sects, was growing more and more fierce. "Liberty of conscience was now the common argu-

\* "Lives," vol. iii. p. 374.

ment and quarrel," says Clarendon. The Presbyterians held the sectaries, as well as the prelatjcal party, "enemies to all godliness;" and they relied upon their parliamentary majority to effect another remodelling of the army. Cromwell, on the other hand, was bringing the army into a more general dislike of the narrow views of their Presbyterian rulers. Chaplains were in his camp who contended that all attempts to fetter men to the dogmas and ceremonies of any Church were "to restrain the Spirit." Cromwell preached and prayed with his officers and his men. The soldiers prayed and preached amongst themselves. The Ironsides, who had the Bible with them as constantly as their powder and bullet, and who in their night-watches meditated upon all the events of the Jewish history, and repeated every inspiriting verse that had reference to the fall of tyrants and the glory of the saints,—these gradually got banded together in a common enthusiasm which only required an influential head to obtain a victory more difficult even than Marston-Moor or Naseby. Cromwell gradually became that leader, although Fairfax was the commander of the army. The indignation of the Presbyterians against those "who were called by a new name, fanatics,"\* was therefore principally directed against him who was considered their military chief. Soon after the death of the earl of Essex, Cromwell, walking with Ludlow in sir Robert Cotton's garden, inveighed bitterly against the Presbyterian party; saying, "that it was a miserable thing to serve a Parliament, to whom let a man be never so faithful, if one pragmatical fellow amongst them rise up and asperse him, he shall never wipe it off." † Ludlow considers that Cromwell "had already conceived the design of destroying the civil authority and setting up for himself," when, in this conversation, he concluded by saying, "When one serves under a general he may do as much service, and yet be free from all blame and envy." This, we apprehend, is an opinion resulting from the republican convictions of Ludlow, which were firmly opposed to Cromwell's later career. Be that as it may, the rapid course of events threw a power into the hands of Cromwell which rendered the subsequent months of 1647 the most difficult and dangerous period of his life. That he should have come out of such a whirlwind of contending interests and passions with safety to himself, and without witnessing universal confusion if not anarchy, is one of the most striking proofs of the extraordinary sagacity of the man who saw, at every turn of affairs, a demand

\* Clarendon.

† Ludlow, vol. i. p. 185.

upon his common sense rather than upon any philosophical theory; and whose dominant will was sustained by the conviction that he was chosen to do the work appointed for him by a Power higher than that of man, whose aid he invoked on every occasion in which human doubts prevailed over habitual confidence. In the sense in which the new word of opprobrium was used then, and has continued in use, Cromwell was termed, from the religious bias of his character, the most fanatical of "the fanatics." But this remarkable man's principles and conduct are fast passing out of the narrow limits of historical partisanship; and we shall therefore be careful to speak of him without the flippant prejudice with which his name has been surrounded by the continued violence of the most opposite opinions. His revilers have disagreed on every point except that of calling this great Englishman, fanatic and regicide, hypocrite and tyrant.

At the period when the war had terminated, the leading men of the Independent party were in thorough agreement. As to civil rights, they held that an appeal having been made to the God of battles, and the issue having been decided against the king, he ought not to be restored except upon conditions which would render the public liberties no longer insecure. They held that such a restoration ought to be accompanied by the most complete provision for liberty of conscience. Their conviction of the king's insincerity was fatal to any hasty re-acknowledgment of his authority. Their dislike of the Presbyterian exclusiveness prevented a cordial union with that party to rebuild the Constitution in its ancient harmony of king and parliament. The Presbyterian majority in the Houses wished to dissolve the army, from which they had to apprehend the only effectual resistance. The Independents, headed by Cromwell, Ireton, Vane, St. John, were equally determined that the army should remain intact. The City was in accord with the parliamentary majority; and in the subsequent events the two great parties seemed to resolve themselves into the City party and the Army party. There is one view of this conflict,—of which we have only the most obscure, prejudiced, and contradictory details,—which has been so justly and forcibly put, that we shall not attempt to add to its impressiveness: "Modern readers ought to believe that there was a real impulse of heavenly Faith at work in this Controversy; that on both sides, more especially on the Army's side, here lay the central element of all, modifying all other elements and passions;—that this Controversy was, in several re-

spects, very different from the common wrestling of Greek with Greek for what are called 'political objects.' Modern readers, mindful of the French Revolution, will perhaps compare these Presbyterians and Independents to the Gironde and the Mountain. And there is an analogy; yet with differences. With a great difference in the situations; with the difference, too, between Englishmen and Frenchmen, which is always considerable; and then with the difference between believers in Jesus Christ and believers in Jean Jacques, which is still more considerable.\*

Within three days after the king had arrived at Holmby House, the Commons voted that the army should be disbanded, with the exception of the troops required for the suppression of rebellion in Ireland, and for the service of the garrisons. This motion was adopted upon a division in which there was a majority of twelve. It was also voted that there should be no officers under Fairfax of higher rank than colonel; that every officer should take the Covenant, and conform to the Presbyterian church. There were large arrears of pay due to the army, and a loan was raised in the City to satisfy a portion of them. What was proposed to be paid was very insufficient. There were murmurings amongst men and officers. On the 25th of March, a petition, signed by fourteen officers, was presented to parliament on the subject of arrears; asking that auditors should report upon what was due to them for their service; and submitting some conditions with regard to their employment in Ireland. The anger of the parliamentary majority is expressed by a passage in the Memoirs of Hollis: "For an army, or any part of it, to join in a petition, though but for pay, when their superiors—that authority which they are to obey—require any duty to be performed, or service to be done by them, as the present relieving of Ireland was,—this, I think, by the rules of war, has in all armies been held a mutiny, and the authors at least punished with death." † The House, on the 30th of March, declared that whoever had a hand in promoting this petition, or other such petitions, was "an enemy to the State, and a disturber of the public peace." The declaration became in itself a cause of hostility between the army and the parliament. It was "a blot of ignominy." Deputations from the House went to the army. Officers were examined at the bar. On the 30th of April, Skippon produced in his place in parliament a letter which had been brought to him by some troopers, expressing the com-

\* Carlyle; "Cromwell," vol. ii. p. 222.

† "Memoirs," p. 77.

plaints and demands of eight regiments of horse. "They saw designs upon them, and upon many of the Godly Party in the kingdom." Three troopers who brought the letter were examined as to the meaning of certain words which it contained. They were only the agents of their regiments, they said. Did their officers approve of their proceedings? Very few knew anything about them. The more violent Presbyterian members were very indignant. Cromwell whispered to Ludlow, "These men will never leave till the army pull them out by the ears."\* A new class of malcontents had arisen, more dangerous than the officers, who said to the parliamentary commissioners, "We hope, by being soldiers we have not lost the capacity of subjects, nor divested ourselves thereby of our interests in the Commonwealth." The army had organised itself into a Council of Officers, and a Council of Adjutors. The Adjutors, who came to be called Agitators, were delegates named by the common soldiers. The difficulties of reconciliation are now growing very formidable. The servants are fast advancing to become masters. Meanwhile the king has written to the Parliament, with reference to the proposals made to him at Newcastle. He still declared against Presbytery; and his application was unheeded. The army Councils grow more and more resolved to have greater concessions than the Parliament is disposed to make. They are voted eight weeks' pay. A committee goes to the army at Saffron Walden to see it disbanded. That is not so easy. We want eight times eight weeks' pay, say the Adjutors. There are disturbances in some of the military quarters. Will this contest end in something anarchical? Fairfax is told, that if their officers refuse to take part with them in asserting their rights, they know how to meet and act without them. They petition again through their general. It is in vain that "when the House, wearied with long sitting, was grown thin, Mr. Denzil Hollis, taking that opportunity, drew up a resolution on his knee, declaring the petition to be seditious. It is in vain that there have been London petitions against the Army, and that the getters-up of counter-petitions in its favour have been imprisoned. There is a great gathering of Adjutors to confer with the general; and it is agreed that on the 4th of June there shall be a rendezvous of all the soldiers at Newmarket. Two days before that general assembly, an event has taken place which goes much farther to decide the question between Army and City, than resolutions at St. Stephen's, or

\* Ludlow, vol. i. p. 189.

petitions at Guildhall. A great crisis is impending. "It was privately resolved," says Clarendon, "by the principal persons of the House of Commons, that when Cromwell came the next day into the House, which he seldom omitted to do, they would send him to the Tower; presuming, that if they had once severed his person from the Army, they should easily reduce it to its former temper and obedience. . . . When the House expected every minute his presence, they were informed that he was met out of the town by break of day, with one servant only, on the way to the army."\* That same morning that Cromwell left London, there was a memorable scene in Northamptonshire, also about "break of day" according to Clarendon.

On the afternoon of the 2nd of June the king is playing bowls on Althorpe Down. The parliamentary commissioners and his accustomed attendants are looking on. There is a man standing amongst them, in the uniform of Fairfax's regiment. He is asked questions as to news from the army, which he answers civilly but somewhat proudly. A report spreads that a party of cavalry is in the neighbourhood. About midnight there is a tramping of horse around Holmby House; and entrance is demanded by the man who was looking at the game of bowls on Althorpe Down. He was a cornet, he said, in the general's guard; his name was Joyce, he desired to speak with the king. The commissioners had directed the garrison to hold themselves in readiness to repel the presumptuous soldiers; but the men on duty greeted their old comrades, and the gates were opened. The day wore on, amidst the alarm of the commissioners, who saw that armed resistance was impossible. At night Joyce requested to be taken to the king. He was in bed; but the inflexible cornet was conducted to the door of the royal apartments. By the king's desire he was at length admitted. Charles had a long conference with him, in the presence of the commissioners, who had been sent for; which ended in his cheerfully saying "Good night, Mr. Joyce," adding that he would readily go with him if the soldiers confirmed what the cornet had promised. The next day the king asked Joyce under what authority he acted. He was sent, he said, by authority of the army, to prevent the designs of its enemies, who would once more plunge the kingdom in blood. "Where is your commission?" said the king. "There, behind me," pointing to the soldiers. "Believe me," replied Charles, "your instructions are written in a very legible character."†

\* "History," vol. v. 436.

† Warwick, p. 29.

The king then said that force must be employed to remove him, unless he was promised that nothing should be required of him against his conscience or honour. "Nothing," exclaimed the men as one voice. The commissioners asked if they all agreed in what Mr. Joyce had said. "All, all." In a few hours, the king and the unwilling commissioners were on their way towards the army.

Whilst the king has been journeying towards the head-quarters of Fairfax, the appointed Rendezvous has taken place on Kentford Heath, near Newmarket. Another meeting of this military parliament is arranged for the 10th, at Triploe Heath, near Cambridge. The king arrives at Royston on the 7th. "Fairfax and Cromwell wait on him both together. He asks them whether they commissioned Joyce to remove him: they deny it. 'I'll not believe you,' says the king, 'unless you hang him.'"\* Colonel Whalley had been sent by Fairfax, when he learnt of the king's seizure at Holmby, to take him back; but Charles refused to go. When in presence of Fairfax and Cromwell he expressed the same desire to remain with the army. He preferred 'the air' of Newmarket to 'the air' of Holmby. Cromwell went to London; and took his place in the House. There is no very reliable account of what occurred when he who was held to be the chief manager of the great *coup-d'état*, appeared in his seat. Hollis represents Cromwell, as well as Ireton, Fleetwood, and Rainsborough, who were members of the House as well as officers of the army, "blaming the soldiers at that distance, as Cromwell did openly in the House, protesting, for his part, he would stick to the Parliament."† He then, continues the wrathful Presbyterian, "did steal away that evening, I may say run away post down to the Army, and presently join in the subscription of a rebellious letter." The narrative of a more candid chronicler says, that Cromwell got hastily and secretly out of town, and without stop or stay rid to Triploe Heath, his horse all on a foam, and there was welcomed with the shouts of the whole Army, to whom he declared the actions and designs of the Parliament."‡ Commissioners were again coming to the Army on the 10th; and Cromwell has arrived a little before them. Twenty-one thousand men are drawn up on Triploe Heath; not an ordinary body of soldiers, but men, as they described themselves in one of their petitions, "who had abandoned their estates, trades, callings, and the contentments of a quiet life, for the perils and fatigues of war in defence of the public liberty." Fairfax and the commissioners ride to each regi-

\* Warwick, p. 299. † Hollis, p. 84. ‡ "Perfect Politician," p. 22. 1

ment. The votes of parliament are first read to the general's own regiment. An officer stands forth, saying that the regiment would determine upon an answer when the votes had been submitted to a Council of Officers and Adjutors. The men are asked if that is their answer? "All, all." This is not a tumultuous reply; they speak when leave is given. The question is also put, if any be of a contrary opinion to say "No." Not a voice is heard. The same formality is observed towards every regiment, with a similar result; and a cry goes up from each, as the commissioners pass on, of "Justice, Justice." In the afternoon, this Army is on its march towards London; and the "rebellious letter;" of which Hollis speaks, is sent to the lord-mayor and aldermen. It is remarkable letter, the composition, as Mr. Carlyle thinks, of Cromwell; signed by Fairfax, Cromwell, Ireton, and other chief officers—in number thirteen. "We desire," a settlement of the peace of the kingdom and of the liberties of the subject, according to the votes and declarations of Parliament which, before we took arms, were, by the Parliament, used as arguments and inducements to invite us and divers of our dear friends out, some of whom have lost their lives in this war. . . . For the obtaining of these things we are drawing near your city; professing sincerely from our hearts, that we intend not evil towards you; declaring, with all confidence and assurance, that if you appear not against us in these our just desires, to assist that wicked Party which would embroil us and the kingdom, neither we nor our soldiers shall give you the least offence. . . . And although you may suppose that a rich city may seem an enticing bait to poor hungry soldiers to venture far to gain the wealth thereof,—yet, if not provoked by you, we do profess, rather than any such evil should fall out, the soldiers shall make their way through our blood to effect it.\* This is plain speaking. The Army has reached St. Alban's; and a respectful answer is conveyed thither by a deputation from the City. On the 16th the Army demands the impeachment of eleven members of the Commons, Hollis, Stapleton, Massey, and eight others of the leading Presbyterians—the men of whom Cromwell spoke when he whispered about the army pulling them out by the ears. The City is in consternation. The Parliament is incapable of acting with any vigour. Messages are daily going between St. Alban's and Westminster with the interminable arguments of each of these great powers. But the one possesses a strength more immediately effect-

\* "Letters of Cromwell," vol. i. p. 230.

ive than the highest ability of the pen. If the parliamentary negotiators appear obstinate, the Army advances. On the 25th of June it is at Uxbridge. The shops in the City are shut. The Army has received a month's pay, as it demanded. But it has continued to advance. The effect is instantaneous. On the 26th the eleven obnoxious members retire from Parliament; the Commons vote for the adoption of all the proceedings of the Army; and commissioners are appointed on each side to regulate the affairs of the kingdom. There is no longer any talk of defending London; and the Army falls back a few miles.

For more than three months have these serious differences between Parliament and Army gone on. There is a pause of nearly another month, in which the kingdom does not seem approaching to a settlement. We have lost sight of the monarch during the busy two months in which London lies under the shadow of that eagle's wing. Is he a guest or a prisoner amidst that Army, so differently composed from his own roustering Cavaliers? He is certainly not an ill-used prisoner. "His majesty," says Clarendon, "sat still, or removed to such places as were most convenient for the march of the army; being in all places as well provided for and accommodated, as he had used to be in any progress." All persons were allowed to resort to him—"the best gentlemen of the several counties through which he passed." His own chaplains had leave to attend upon him for his devotions, and "performed their function at the ordinary hours, in their accustomed formalities." Royalists of rank visited him without restraint; "and many good officers who had served his majesty faithfully were civilly received by the officers of the army, and lived quietly in their quarters." The king lodged at great houses in the neighbourhood of the army;—at the earl of Salisbury's at Hatfield, when the troops were at St. Alban's; at Caversham, the earl of Craven's, when the army had moved further from London. Sir Philip Warwick has a curious passage, implying that there was some general belief that the king's disgust at the harsher treatment he had received from the Presbyterians would moderate his own desire for episcopal uniformity, and lead him to look with approbation upon that liberty of conscience which the Independents professed and demanded: \* "At Causham [Caversham] I had the honour to come into his presence, though I staid not there; but, by all I could perceive either from himself or

\* At p. 506 we gave an extract from the letter of Cromwell, in which, on the very day of the Battle of Naseby, he asserts this ruling principle of his mind.

any other, he was very apprehensive in what hands he was, but was not to let it be discerned. Nor had he given that countenance to Dr. Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying' which some believed he had.\* The prejudices of his education, and the principles of his government, were too exclusive to allow Charles to admit the doctrine of Toleration, although proclaimed by his own favourite chaplain. When Jeremy Taylor from his lowly retreat in Wales sent forth this plea for religious liberty into an unquiet world, he said, "I thought it might not misbecome my duty and endeavours to plead for peace, and charity, and forgiveness, and permissions mutual; although I had reason to believe that such is the iniquity of men, and they so indisposed to receive such impresses, that I had as good plough the sands or till the air as persuade such doctrines."† It was reserved for a happier age to understand and act upon these principles. Taylor had been favoured by Laud; but he had broken away from Laud's narrow estimate of what was necessary for the security of an established Church. The problem that its power and dignity and usefulness might be upheld in connection with the most absolute spiritual freedom beyond its pale, required to be practically worked out for two centuries before it could be held to be solved. The reasoners in steel, who were as impatient of the denomination of "New Presbyter" as of "Old Priest,"‡ were dealing more practically with this question of toleration than any previous set of men who had so advocated the rights of conscience. Few had advocated those rights, having strong religious convictions of their own. Cromwell was the great expositor of their principle; and he probably went as far as the spirit of Protestantism would then permit. Charles hated the Presbyterians, but he gave no confidence to the Independents. The king and his conqueror now sometimes met. The king had been allowed by Fairfax, with an instant attention to his request, to have an interview with his children, the dukes of York and Gloucester, and the princess Elizabeth. Sir John Berkeley, who came over from the queen when Charles had informed her of his reception by the army, had many conferences with Cromwell; who, although "wishing that the king was more frank, and would not tie himself so strictly to narrow maxims," told Berkeley "that he had lately seen the tenderest sight that ever his eyes beheld, which was the interview between the king and his children; and wept plentifully at the

\* "Memoirs," p. 301.

† "Epistle Dedicatory to Lord Hatton."

‡ "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large."—Milton.

remembrance of it, saying, that never man was so abused as he in his sinister opinions of the king, who, he thought, was the uprightest and most conscientious man of his three kingdoms." And yet Berkeley, whilst he records this trait of Cromwell's character, which, after the accustomed fashion, we must call hypocrisy, writes, "I was of his majesty's sense, that men whose hands were yet hot with the blood of his most faithful subjects, ought not entirely to be trusted; but thought they ought absolutely to be well dissembled with, whilst his majesty was in their hands at least, that he might the better get out of them."\*

It was towards the end of June that the king and the Independents,—Cromwell and Ireton, Vane and Henry Marten,—appeared to have come to such an understanding as promised a termination to the miseries of the kingdom; an understanding that would have restored the king to those just rights which were compatible with the existence of civil and religious liberty. Whether such an arrangement would have endured, had it been affected, may justly be questioned. But the proposals which were made by the leaders of the Army to Charles at this juncture, were far more moderate than any which had been previously tendered or suggested. They were to the effect that the Long Parliament should be dissolved within a year; that future Parliaments should be biennial, and not to be dissolved or adjourned except by their own consent, unless they had sat a hundred and twenty days; that the representation should be made more equal, by disfranchising decayed and inconsiderable towns, and giving a greater number of members to counties or other divisions of the kingdom; that the judicial power of both Houses should be limited; that grand jurymen should be chosen in some equal way, and not at the discretion of the sheriff. These were national reforms, not materially affecting the royal prerogative; reforms which have been gradually established in the working of the constitution. The great question of the power of the sword was proposed to be settled, upon the principle that the royal authority over the militia should be subject to the advice of Parliament and a Council for ten years. The other great subject of difference, that of religion, was provided for by the proposition that an Act should be passed, taking away all ecclesiastical jurisdiction extending to civil penalties; that there be a repeal of all Statutes enjoining the use of the Common Prayer under penalties, as well as of those that imposed penalties for not

\* "Memoirs of Sir John Berkeley," 1699.

attending the service of the Church; and, further, that the taking of the Covenant should not be enforced upon any, and all penalties taken away that had been imposed upon the refusers. These propositions being received as the basis for securing the rights, liberties, peace, and safety of the kingdom, it was to be provided that "his majesty's person, his queen and royal issue, may be restored to a condition of safety, honour, and freedom in the nation, without diminution of their personal rights, or further limitation to the exercise of the legal power." How the proposals were received by the king is minutely detailed by sir John Berkeley. Charles appears to have mainly objected to the minor condition which excepted seven of his adherents from a general amnesty, and from the privilege of compounding for their estates; and to that which stipulated that royalists should not sit in the next Parliament. "I procured his Majesty a sight of the Army's Proposals six or eight days before they were offered to him in public. His Majesty was much displeased with them in general, saying, That, if they had a mind to close with him, they would never impose so hard terms upon him. I replied, That, if they had demanded less than they had done, I should have suspected them more than I now did of intending not really to serve his Majesty, but only to abuse him; since it was not likely that men who had, through so great dangers and difficulties, acquired so great advantages, should ever sit down with less than was contained in the Proposals; and, on the other side, never was a crown (that had been so near lost) so cheaply recovered, as his Majesty's would be, if they agreed upon such terms. His Majesty was of another advice, and returned, That they could not subsist without him, and therefore he did not doubt but that he should see them very shortly be glad to condescend farther; and then objected to three particular points of the Proposals. The first was, The exception of seven, not named, from pardon. The second, The excluding his party from being eligible in the next ensuing Parliament. And the third, That though there was nothing done against the Church-government established, yet there was nothing done to assert it. To these, I replied, That after his Majesty and the Army were accorded, it would be no impossible work to make them remit in the first point; and, if he could not, when his Majesty was re-instated in his throne, he might easily supply seven persons beyond the seas, in such sort as to make their banishment supportable to them. To the second; That the next Parliament would be necessitated to lay great

burdens upon the kingdom; and it would be a happiness to the king's Party, to have no voice in them. To the third, That the Law was security enough for the Church, and it was happy that men, who had fought against the Church, should be reduced (when they were superiors), not to speak against it. His Majesty broke from me with this expression, 'Well! I shall see them glad ere long to accept more equal terms.'" The king rejected the proposals; and he did so in a manner that sufficiently showed his resolution to persevere in his course of endeavouring to profit by the dissensions of the two great parties, but to concede nothing of importance to either. Berkeley attributes his dangerous resolve to the secret advice of Ashburnham, and to "the encouraging messages which his majesty had, by my lord Lauderdale and others, from the Presbyterian party and the City of London, who pretended to despise the Army, and to oppose them to death." He says, "his majesty seemed very much excited, in-somuch that, when the proposals were solemnly sent to him, and his concurrence most humbly and heartily desired, his majesty, not only to the astonishment of Ireton and the rest, but even to mine, entertained them with very tart and bitter discourses." The king said, "You cannot be without me; you will fall to ruin if I do not sustain you." Those leaders of the Army who were present looked with wonder upon the scene. Berkeley at last went up to the king and whispered, "Sir, your majesty speaks as if you had some secret strength and power that I do not know of; and since your majesty hath concealed it from me, I wish you had concealed it from these men too." The king "soon recollected himself, and began to sweeten his former discourse with great power of language and behaviour. But it was now of the latest." This remarkable interview took place at Woburn. The cause of this deportment of the king—the "secret strength and power" which he believed himself to possess—was the expectation that the City would be too powerful for the Army. Bands of apprentices had surrounded Westminster Hall, clamorously demanding the return of the king. An engagement, signed by thousands, was entered into, pledging those who signed it to make all efforts to accomplish the king's return to London. This was at the exact period when Berkeley had shown Charles the proposals of the Army; but before the interview with Ireton and the other officers. Upon the news of these proceedings in London, Fairfax and his army had moved towards the capital. The tumults grew more serious.